

Assessment of declarative metacognition: Starting Cohort 2 - Grade 1

Kathrin Lockl

Copyrighted Material
Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories (LifBi)
Wilhelmsplatz 3, 96047 Bamberg
Director: Prof. Dr. Hans-Günther Roßbach
Executive Director of Research: Dr. Jutta von Maurice
Executive Director of Administration: Dr. Robert Polgar
Bamberg, 2017

Assessment of Declarative Metacognition

Kathrin Lockl

*Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories,
National Educational Panel Study*

Starting Cohort 2 –Grade 1

E-mail address of lead author:

kathrin.lockl@lifbi.de

Bibliographic data:

Lockl, Kathrin (2017). *Assessment of declarative metacognition: Starting Cohort 2– Grade 1*. Bamberg: Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories, National Educational Panel Study.

Declarative Metacognition (Starting Cohort 2 – First Grade)

A major goal of the National Educational Panel Study (NEPS) is the assessment of competencies that are considered to be of particular importance for educational pathways and participation in society. Longitudinal measurements of reading competence, listening comprehension, mathematical competence and scientific literacy have been and will be carried out coherently across the life span. These measurements are supplemented with regular assessments of metacompetencies such as abilities to handle information technologies (ICT) and metacognition (cf. Weinert, Artelt, Prenzel, Senkbeil, Ehmke, & Carstensen, 2011).

Metacognition is conceptualized as cognition about cognition (Flavell, 1979) and encompasses two components. On the one hand, the declarative knowledge component refers to the knowledge about memory, comprehension, and learning processes that an individual can verbalize. The procedural component, on the other hand, focuses on how the learning process is controlled and regulated through planning, monitoring, and metastrategic activities. The NEPS aims at assessing both, that is, declarative and procedural aspects of metacognition over the life span. In the following, the focus is placed on the assessment of declarative metacognition in Starting Cohort 2.

1. The Design of the Study

The description of the design of the study, the sample, as well as the instruments used can be found on the NEPS website¹. The tests were administered in two days. There were different test sequences during the testing sessions. The test on metacognitive knowledge was administered on the first or on the second day. Moreover, it was placed on first position or on third position after the tests on listening comprehension on word and on sentence level. Overall, 6,488 subjects participated in the test on metacognitive knowledge. Testing time was 15 min.

2. The Assessment of Declarative Metacognition

The declarative aspect of metacognition is measured by scenario-based competence tests focusing primarily on different aspects of strategy knowledge (cf. Artelt, Beinicke, Schlagmüller, & Schneider, 2009; Schlagmüller & Schneider, 2007). The tests consist of several scenarios describing different school and leisure-time activities. Test scoring is done with reference to experts' judgments of the relative usefulness of the presented alternatives.

The test on declarative metacognition in Grade 1 is based on the same general rationale as the tests that are used in secondary schools within the NEPS (Starting Cohorts 3 and 4, see Händel, Artelt & Weinert, 2013). It includes ten different scenarios. The scenarios focus on conditional metacognitive knowledge, that is, knowledge about the appropriateness of different strategies in varying situations, and include cognitive, metacognitive, and resource management strategies. Accordingly, the test assesses knowledge about solving cognitive tasks like remembering or organizing information, but also about planning and regulating, and about general learning requirements. Four of the scenarios are related to a school or

¹ www.neps-data.de

learning context, whereas the remaining six scenarios are embedded in out-of-school contexts, asking for domain-general strategy knowledge (for more information on the development of this test, see Lockl, Händel, Haberkorn, & Weinert, 2016).

For each scenario, three strategies of differing quality are presented (see example, Figure 1). Children have to rate each strategy on a three-point Likert scale, labeled by a different amount of stars (1, 2, or 3) indicating the usefulness of the strategy.

Taking into account children’s poor reading abilities in the first grade the scenarios and proposed strategies are presented orally accompanied by pictures. That is, the experimenter reads aloud the scenarios and the corresponding strategies and the children can follow each approach by looking at the pictures.

Eva will have gym class the following day. She has already put all her sports clothes into her gym bag the previous evening. What can Eva do in order not to forget her sports clothes the next morning?

The following three pictures show what Eva can do in order not to forget her sports clothes.

	<p>Eva hangs her bag on the front door.</p>	☆	☆☆	☆☆☆
	<p>Eva tells her little brother to remind her.</p>	☆	☆☆	☆☆☆
	<p>Eva thinks strongly about her bag before she falls asleep.</p>	☆	☆☆	☆☆☆

Note: In the test booklets for the children no text is provided but the text is read aloud to them.

Figure 1: Example of a scenario in the domain declarative metacognition.

To score the test, pair comparisons (option X is more or less useful than option Y) are made with reference to experts’ judgments of the relative usefulness of the presented strategies.

To establish validity for the test on metacognitive knowledge, scientists in the field of educational psychology and learning strategies were asked to provide their judgments on the appropriateness of each strategy. The expert ratings served to develop an objectified scoring procedure for the students' responses. Based on those expert ratings, the relation between all potential pairs of strategies within a scenario was evaluated. For each strategy pair the percentage of expert agreement was computed favoring one strategy as superior over another (pair comparison). If for an individual pair-wise comparison at least 75% of the experts agreed that one strategy was superior to the other strategy within the same pair, the pair comparison was considered valid for the assessment of students' metacognitive knowledge. To evaluate students' performance, their responses were recorded into dichotomous response categories based on the expert ratings.

3. Data in the Scientific Use File

The data set contains 20 valid pair comparisons. These pair comparisons are scored as dichotomous variables with 1 indicating a correct response (judgment on a strategy pair in line with the experts' ratings) and 0 indicating an incorrect response (judgment on a strategy pair contrary to the expert ratings or the two strategies of a pair were considered as equal).

The following example demonstrates the composition of the variable names for the pair comparisons.

md	g1	01	12	_c
declarative metacognition	grade 1	scenario 1	pair comparison of the strategies 1 and 2	scored variable

Table 1 shows the mean scores, standard deviation, and item-total correlations for the 20 pair comparisons.

As can be seen in Table 1, the internal consistency (Cronbach's α) of the test instrument is .73 (cases with missing pair comparisons were excluded for this analysis).

In addition to the pair comparisons, an overall mean test score is reported, including all pair comparisons with equal weight. The values of the mean test score range from 0 (no pair comparisons solved correctly) to 1 (all pair comparisons solved correctly). Please note that the mean score is only provided if a participant has at least 3 valid (i.e., non-missing) pair comparisons.

The mean test score is 0.56 ($SD = 0.20$) for the investigated sample. The mean scores for the ten single scenarios range from $M = 0.28$ ($SD = 0.39$) to $M = 0.79$ ($SD = 0.32$).

There are different kinds of missing responses in the data set. These are a) nonvalid responses (for example, due to ticking two response categories on the 3-point scale), missing responses b) due to omitted items, c) due to items that are not reached, d) due to items that are not administered, and e) missing responses that are not determinable.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Pair Comparisons in the Domain of Declarative Metacognition

Scenario	Pair Comparison	Variable	m	SD	r_{it}
1	scenario 1: pair comparison 1	mdg10112_c	0.76	0.43	0.30
	scenario 1: pair comparison 2	mdg10113_c	0.56	0.50	0.19
2	scenario 2: pair comparison 1	mdg10212_c	0.33	0.47	0.16
	scenario 2: pair comparison 2	mdg10223_c	0.54	0.50	0.30
3	scenario 3: pair comparison 1	mdg10312_c	0.73	0.44	0.28
	scenario 3: pair comparison 2	mdg10313_c	0.85	0.35	0.31
	scenario 3: pair comparison 3	mdg10323_c	0.81	0.39	0.24
4	scenario 4: pair comparison 1	mdg10413_c	0.31	0.46	0.27
	scenario 4: pair comparison 2	mdg10423_c	0.24	0.43	0.27
5	scenario 5: pair comparison 1	mdg10512_c	0.60	0.49	0.28
	scenario 5: pair comparison 2	mdg10523_c	0.75	0.43	0.34
6	scenario 6: pair comparison 1	mdg10612_c	0.49	0.50	0.22
7	scenario 7: pair comparison 1	mdg10713_c	0.62	0.49	0.39
	scenario 7: pair comparison 2	mdg10723_c	0.52	0.50	0.36
8	scenario 8: pair comparison 1	mdg10812_c	0.54	0.50	0.29
	scenario 8: pair comparison 2	mdg10813_c	0.56	0.50	0.26
9	scenario 9: pair comparison 1	mdg10913_c	0.39	0.49	0.27
	scenario 9: pair comparison 2	mdg10923_c	0.55	0.50	0.39
10	scenario 10: pair comparison 1	mdg11012_c	0.60	0.49	0.39
	scenario 10: pair comparison 2	mdg11013_c	0.48	0.50	0.30
Scale	Cronbach's $\alpha = .73$ $N = 5,469$				

The coding of the missing responses in the pair comparisons is as follows: If just one kind of missing response in a pair comparison occurred, the corresponding pair comparison was labeled according to the missing response that occurred in the ratings of the single strategies. If different kinds of missing responses occurred in a pair comparison, the response was labeled as not determinable missing response. Overall, 84.3% of the participants show no missing response in the pair comparisons.

References

- Artelt, C., Beinicke, A., Schlagmüller, M., & Schneider, W. (2009). Diagnose von Strategiewissen beim Textverstehen. *Zeitschrift für Entwicklungspsychologie und Pädagogische Psychologie*, *41*(2), 96–103.
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, *34*(10), 906–911.
- Händel, M., Artelt, C., & Weinert, S. (2013). Assessing metacognitive knowledge: Development and evaluation of a test instrument. *Journal of Educational Research Online*, *5*(2), 162-188.
- Lockl, K., Händel, M., Haberkorn, K. & Weinert, S. (2016). Metacognitive knowledge in young children: Development of a new test procedure for first graders. In H.P. Blossfeld, H.-P., J. von Maurice, M. Bayer & J. Skopek (Eds.), *Methodological Issues of Longitudinal Surveys: The Example of the National Educational Panel Study* (S. 465-484). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Schlagmüller, M., & Schneider, W. (2007). *WLST 7-12. Würzburger Lesestrategie-Wissenstest für die Klassen 7 bis 12*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Weinert, S., Artelt, C., Prenzel, M., Senkbeil, M., Ehmke, T., & Carstensen C. H. (2011) Development of competencies across the life span. In H.-P. Blossfeld, H.-G. Roßbach & J. von Maurice (Eds.), *Education as a lifelong process: The German National Educational Panel Study (NEPS)* (pp. 67–86.). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.