

Competencies: Assessment of Declarative Metacognition Starting Cohorts 3 (Grade 6)

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: Meike Uhde
Bamberg, 2014

Assessment of Declarative Metacognition

Kathrin Lockl

University of Bamberg, National Educational Panel Study

Starting Cohort 3 –Grade 6

E-mail address of lead author:

kathrin.lockl@uni-bamberg.de

Bibliographic data:

Lockl, Kathrin (2013). *Assessment of declarative metacognition: Starting Cohort 3– Grade 6*. Bamberg: University of Bamberg, National Educational Panel Study.

Declarative Metacognition (Starting Cohort 3 – Sixth 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 3.

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. Overall, 4,876 subjects participated in the test on metacognitive knowledge. There were two different test sequences during the testing session. However, the test on declarative knowledge was always placed in third position after the test on scientific literacy or ICT literacy (abilities in handling information technologies). 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 6 is the same test that was administered in ninth grade (Starting Cohort 4). It includes eight different scenarios. Five of the scenarios are related to a school or learning context (two in the domain of reading), whereas the remaining three scenarios are embedded in out-of-school contexts, asking for domain-general strategy knowledge. Cognitive, metacognitive, and resource management strategies are realized, resulting in a knowledge test about solving cognitive tasks, such as remembering or organizing information, but also about planning and regulating (learning as well as leisure-time activities), and about general learning requirements, such as using resource management strategies (see Händel, Artelt & Weinert, 2013).

¹ www.neps-data.de

For each scenario, six strategies of differing quality are presented (see example, Figure 1). Subjects are asked to rate the usefulness of each strategy on a 4-point scale of usefulness (1 = *not at all useful*, 4 = *very useful*).

Peter has a lot to do this week: He is supposed to go to the swimming club twice, he has been given plenty of homework, and he has to buy a birthday present for his friend.

What should he do in order to manage everything?

Please judge the usefulness of the proposed strategies.

	not useful at all	barely useful	somewhat useful	very useful
He makes a plan for the week and organizes his time for the tasks. He follows his plan very closely.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
He combines different tasks and buys the birthday present on his way to the swimming club.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
He allows others to help him. He asks his brother to buy the birthday present.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
He completes only those pieces of homework which can be done quickly. Then he deals with the other things.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
First, he buys the birthday present. If this takes too long, he will skip the homework or the swimming.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
He does exactly what he feels like doing at this moment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 the same 69 valid pair comparisons as for ninth graders. 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. The items are labeled as 'grade 9' because the test was first used in ninth grade.

md	g9	01	12	_c
declarative metacognition	grade 9	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 69 pair comparisons.

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	mdg90112_c	0.68	0.47	0.36
	scenario 1: pair comparison 2	mdg90113_c	0.41	0.49	0.15
	scenario 1: pair comparison 3	mdg90115_c	0.47	0.50	0.33
	scenario 1: pair comparison 4	mdg90116_c	0.85	0.35	0.49
	scenario 1: pair comparison 5	mdg90123_c	0.60	0.49	0.18
	scenario 1: pair comparison 6	mdg90124_c	0.49	0.50	0.23
	scenario 1: pair comparison 7	mdg90126_c	0.74	0.44	0.28
	scenario 1: pair comparison 8	mdg90136_c	0.85	0.36	0.40
	scenario 1: pair comparison 9	mdg90145_c	0.38	0.49	0.22
	scenario 1: pair comparison 10	mdg90146_c	0.74	0.44	0.38
	scenario 1: pair comparison 11	mdg90156_c	0.86	0.35	0.32
2	scenario 2: pair comparison 1	mdg90213_c	0.85	0.36	0.32
	scenario 2: pair comparison 2	mdg90215_c	0.53	0.50	0.07
	scenario 2: pair comparison 3	mdg90216_c	0.73	0.44	0.33
	scenario 2: pair comparison 4	mdg90223_c	0.88	0.32	0.30
	scenario 2: pair comparison 5	mdg90226_c	0.77	0.42	0.37
	scenario 2: pair comparison 6	mdg90234_c	0.88	0.32	0.28
	scenario 2: pair comparison 7	mdg90235_c	0.90	0.30	0.37
	scenario 2: pair comparison 8	mdg90256_c	0.83	0.37	0.40
3	scenario 3: pair comparison 1	mdg90313_c	0.74	0.44	0.28
	scenario 3: pair comparison 2	mdg90314_c	0.94	0.23	0.41
	scenario 3: pair comparison 3	mdg90315_c	0.93	0.25	0.44
	scenario 3: pair comparison 4	mdg90323_c	0.54	0.50	0.26
	scenario 3: pair comparison 5	mdg90324_c	0.86	0.34	0.46

	scenario 3: pair comparison 6	mdg90325_c	0.82	0.39	0.42
	scenario 3: pair comparison 7	mdg90334_c	0.77	0.42	0.19
4	scenario 4: pair comparison 1	mdg90413_c	0.66	0.47	0.36
	scenario 4: pair comparison 2	mdg90414_c	0.74	0.44	0.31
	scenario 4: pair comparison 3	mdg90415_c	0.63	0.48	0.31
	scenario 4: pair comparison 4	mdg90423_c	0.87	0.33	0.38
	scenario 4: pair comparison 5	mdg90424_c	0.90	0.30	0.35
	scenario 4: pair comparison 6	mdg90425_c	0.83	0.37	0.34
	scenario 4: pair comparison 7	mdg90436_c	0.45	0.50	0.25
	scenario 4: pair comparison 8	mdg90446_c	0.55	0.50	0.25
	scenario 4: pair comparison 9	mdg90456_c	0.51	0.50	0.28
5	scenario 5: pair comparison 1	mdg90512_c	0.95	0.22	0.36
	scenario 5: pair comparison 2	mdg90515_c	0.83	0.37	0.40
	scenario 5: pair comparison 3	mdg90516_c	0.42	0.49	0.26
	scenario 5: pair comparison 4	mdg90523_c	0.92	0.27	0.29
	scenario 5: pair comparison 5	mdg90524_c	0.91	0.29	0.30
	scenario 5: pair comparison 6	mdg90526_c	0.90	0.30	0.14
	scenario 5: pair comparison 7	mdg90535_c	0.76	0.43	0.33
	scenario 5: pair comparison 8	mdg90545_c	0.80	0.40	0.35
	scenario 5: pair comparison 9	mdg90546_c	0.39	0.49	0.25
	scenario 5: pair comparison 10	mdg90556_c	0.79	0.41	0.17
6	scenario 6: pair comparison 1	mdg90613_c	0.55	0.50	0.27
	scenario 6: pair comparison 2	mdg90616_c	0.82	0.39	0.24
	scenario 6: pair comparison 3	mdg90623_c	0.38	0.49	0.15
	scenario 6: pair comparison 4	mdg90624_c	0.58	0.49	0.29
	scenario 6: pair comparison 5	mdg90634_c	0.65	0.48	0.40
	scenario 6: pair comparison 6	mdg90635_c	0.89	0.31	0.43
	scenario 6: pair comparison 7	mdg90636_c	0.87	0.33	0.41
7	scenario 7: pair comparison 1	mdg90713_c	0.79	0.40	0.47
	scenario 7: pair comparison 2	mdg90714_c	0.50	0.50	0.22
	scenario 7: pair comparison 3	mdg90716_c	0.66	0.47	0.31
	scenario 7: pair comparison 4	mdg90723_c	0.86	0.35	0.43
	scenario 7: pair comparison 5	mdg90734_c	0.71	0.45	0.22
	scenario 7: pair comparison 6	mdg90735_c	0.84	0.36	0.45
	scenario 7: pair comparison 7	mdg90745_c	0.60	0.49	0.19
	scenario 7: pair comparison 8	mdg90756_c	0.72	0.45	0.24
8	scenario 8: pair comparison 1	mdg90812_c	0.86	0.35	0.40
	scenario 8: pair comparison 2	mdg90813_c	0.74	0.44	0.33
	scenario 8: pair comparison 3	mdg90816_c	0.84	0.36	0.36
	scenario 8: pair comparison 4	mdg90824_c	0.80	0.40	0.46
	scenario 8: pair comparison 5	mdg90825_c	0.84	0.37	0.44
	scenario 8: pair comparison 6	mdg90834_c	0.71	0.45	0.34
	scenario 8: pair comparison 7	mdg90835_c	0.76	0.43	0.40
	scenario 8: pair comparison 8	mdg90846_c	0.81	0.39	0.37
	scenario 8: pair comparison 9	mdg90856_c	0.87	0.33	0.38
Scale	Cronbach's $\alpha = .89$ $N = 4,084$				

As can be seen in Table 1, the internal consistency (Cronbach's α) of the test instrument is .89 (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).

The mean test score is 0.72 ($SD = 0.15$) for the investigated sample. The mean scores for the eight single scenarios range from $M = 0.64$ ($SD = 0.24$) to $M = 0.79$ ($SD = 0.26$).

Please note: Although the overall reliability of the test instrument is good, there are a few pair comparisons with rather low item-total correlations (e.g., mdg90215_c). We have not excluded these pair comparisons to ensure comparability with the test for ninth graders. However, the user is asked to decide for him-/herself whether it might be reasonable to exclude pair comparisons with low item-total correlations and to compute a new mean score.

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 4-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.

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, 83.8% 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.
- 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.