

Information on Competence Testing

NEPS Starting Cohort 6 — Adults

Adult Education and Lifelong Learning

Wave 17: 38-75 years

Information on testing	
Sample	Study B160, Starting Cohort 6, Survey wave 17, Year 2024.
Test situation	The study was conducted as a CAPI interview with computer-based testing. Alternatively: Telephone questionnaire (CATI) without competence assessment.
Test sequence	Study participants first completed tasks on a laptop at home (technology-based testing = TBT). For this, they used the interviewer's field laptop. The interviewers were responsible for administering the transitions between test sections. Subsequently, the life-course questionnaire was administered.
	Rotations
	The tests were assigned in different rotations (test sequences). Rotation 1: Reading competence easy + procedural metacognition – Mathematical competence + procedural metacognition Rotation 2: Reading competence difficult + procedural metacognition – Mathematical competence + procedural metacognition Rotation 3: Mathematical competence + procedural metacognition – Reading competence easy + procedural metacognition Rotation 4: Mathematical competence + procedural metacognition – Reading competence difficult + procedural metacognition Reading competence: The assignment of easy or difficult reading competence tasks to each study participant was pre-allocated based on their performance in previous competence assessments. Mathematics: The mathematics tasks presented varied in difficulty and adapted during task conduction based on previous answers and the participant's estimated ability (adaptive multistage test).
Test duration (net test time)	58 minutes
Administration time (incl. survey)	approx. 90 minutes (58 minutes testing; 30 minutes questionnaire)

Information on constructs				
Constructs	Number of Items	Allowed Processing Time	Survey Mode	Next Measurement (expected)
Reading competence (easy/difficult booklet)	27/26	28 min	CAPI (TBT)	2028
Mathematical competence	29	28 min	CAPI (TBT)	2032
<i>Domain specific procedural metacognition</i>	1	1 min	CAPI (TBT)	2028

Main study B160, 2024

regarding the domain reading competence				
<i>Domain specific procedural metacognition</i> regarding the domain mathematical competence	1	1 min	CAPI (TBT)	2032

Preliminary note

The development of the individual tests is based on framework concepts. They constitute overarching concepts on the basis of which education-relevant competences are to be shown consistently and coherently over the entire personal history. Therefore, the following framework concepts that served as a basis for the development of the test tools to measure the above-mentioned constructs are identical in the different studies.

Reading competence

The ability to understand and use written texts is an important precondition for further developing personal knowledge and personal skills and a prerequisite for participating in cultural and social life. Manifold areas of knowledge and life are made accessible through reading. The range of reading occasions is very wide, and reading fulfills many different functions (cf. Groeben & Hurrelmann, 2004). They range from reading for expanding knowledge, which is crucial for further education, to lifelong learning as well as literary-esthetic reading. Not only do texts convey information and facts, but they also transfer ideas, moral concepts, and cultural contents. Accordingly, the concept of reading competence in the National Education Panel incorporates functional understanding as a basis for reading competence, as is also reflected in the Anglo-Saxon *Literacy Concept* (see also OECD, 2009), with a focus on competent handling of texts in different typical everyday situations.

In order to represent the concept of reading competence over the entire life span as coherently as possible, three characteristic features are specified in the framework concepts of the NEPS reading competence tests. They are considered in the following age- and stage-specific test forms:

1. text functions, text types
2. comprehension requirements
3. task formats

Text functions/text types

NEPS reading competence distinguishes between five text functions and associated text types, which are represented in each version of the test: a) factual texts, b) commenting texts, c) literary texts, d) instructions, and e) advertising texts (Gehrer, Zimmermann, Artelt & Weinert, 2013). This selection is based on the assumption that these five text functions have practical relevance for the various age backgrounds of the participants. The text functions and/or text types (Gehrer, & Artelt, 2013) can be characterized as follows:

Texts conveying factual information represent basic texts for learning, fundamental acquisition of knowledge, and extraction of information; examples of these are: articles, reports, reportages, and announcements. Texts with a commenting function are texts in which a stand is taken or contradictive arguments are discussed and in which reflection is integrated. Examples of such texts are cleverly worded essays or humorous comments, which are implemented in tests for college students and adult cohorts. In school cohorts, a text with a discussion about the pleasures and disadvantages of smoking may be used, for example. The literary-esthetic function of texts is included in the third category, which encompasses short stories and extracts from novels or stories. Specific literary text types such as stage plays, satires, or poems are excluded as a result of their specific reception, which is presumably strongly dependent on educational track and curriculum. The fourth category comprises text types that are product inserts such as building and assembly instructions, package inserts for medication, work instructions, and cooking recipes. The fifth category (appeals, advertisements, notifications) includes text types such as job advertisements and recreation programs.

The five selected text functions and their associated text types are implemented in each test booklet over the life span as a longitudinal concept, which means that each test/each test booklet for measuring reading competence contains five texts corresponding to the five text functions. Unlike the

PISA studies, the NEPS does not include discontinuous texts such as graphs, tables, and road maps. Discontinuous texts are excluded from the NEPS concept as they place special demands on readers, which are not always meaningful for each age group in which reading competence is measured.

Age-specific selection (text complexity, topic selection/task requirements):

For each age cohort, texts are selected according to their thematic orientation as well as their lexical, semantic, and grammatical properties which have to be appropriate for the respective group of readers.

The growth of reading competence from childhood to early adulthood is taken into account by increasing the text complexity (larger vocabulary, longer words, foreign words, higher complexity of sentence structures) and the basic length of texts. In addition, texts are selected on topics that correspond to and are appropriate for the environment of the respective age group. They cover a wide spectrum of topics ranging from animals (for children) to social and philosophical questions related to the meaning of life for adults. Additionally, the test material is adjusted to the respective age group through age-adapted phrasing of the questions, the answer options, and the comprehension requirements of the tasks.

Comprehension requirements / task types

From the literature on reading competence and text comprehension (e.g., Kintsch, 1998; Richter & Christmann, 2002), it is possible to derive different types of comprehension requirement which are reflected in the NEPS concept in three specific requirement types of tasks (task types). The variants are called *types* as there is no explicit assumption that the tasks of one type are necessarily more difficult or easier than tasks of another type (Gehrer, Zimmermann, Artelt, & Weinert, 2013).

For tasks of the first type (“finding information in the text”), detailed information must be identified at sentence level; in other words, the reader is required to decipher words and recognize statements or propositions. For tasks on this requirement cluster, the wording of the information needed to solve the respective tasks is either contained in the text and identical with the task itself, or the phrasing varies slightly.

In the case of the second task type (“drawing text-related conclusions”), conclusions have to be drawn from several sentences that have to be related to each other in order to extract local or global coherence. In some cases, the relevant sentences are located closely together. In others, several sentences are spread over entire sections. In another form of this task type, the reader has to understand the thoughts expressed in the entire text, which requires the comprehension and integration of larger and more complex text portions.

For the third type, the main requirement involves “reflecting and assessing”, which is often linked to the mental representation of the text in a situation model in literature. In one version of this task type, the task is to understand the central idea, the main events, or the core message of text, whereas in another version the purpose and intention of a text have to be recognized or the readers are asked to assess the credibility of a text.

The different comprehension requirements can be found in all text functions and are considered in the respective test versions in an almost well-proportioned ratio. (cf. Fig. 1.).




Fig. 1: Text functions and comprehension requirements (Gehrer, Zimmermann, Artelt, & Weinert, 2013, p. 63)

Task formats

A noticeable proportion of tasks have a multiple-choice format. This tasks format consists of a question/assignment about a text for which four answers are offered, one of which is the correct answer. As another task format, decision-making tasks are used, which require readers to judge individual statements and state whether they are right or wrong according to the text. So-called matching tasks represent a third format in which, for example, a subtitle must be chosen and assigned to different sections of a text. For tasks of the second and third formats, summaries are made, if necessary, thus creating answers with partly correct solutions (partial-credit items).)Since computer-based tests have been administered since 2016, additional formats have been developed for adults (SC6). One of these formats is text enrichment tasks, in which the subjects have to insert three or four additional sentences into appropriate places in the given texts (for description, see: Rohm, Scharl, Ettner, & Gehrer, 2019). Furthermore, starting in 2024, highlighting tasks will be included for the first time in the main SC6 survey (for description, see: Gnams, & Gehrer, 2026; Heyne, Artelt, Gnams, Gehrer, & Schoor, 2020), in which subjects have to mark text passages in order to answer given questions about the texts.

By systematically considering different text functions which are implemented in different age groups in realistic and age-adapted texts with appropriate text themes and different comprehension requirements, it is possible to operationalize reading competence as a comprehensive ability construct.

Scaling of items

Items of several task formats have been Rasch-scaled and longitudinally linked (Fischer, Rohm, Gnambs, & Carstensen, 2016). In addition, partial-credit items have been calculated based on the answers on decision-making tasks, matching tasks, text enrichment tasks, and highlighting tasks. Therefore, subjects' answers to the tasks are aggregated in one score and are not used as single items. The quality criteria and psychometric characteristics of the items are presented in the technical reports of the different starting cohorts (*for SC6*: Gnambs, & Gehrler, 2026; Hardt, Pohl, Haberkorn, & Wiegand, 2013; Koller, Haberkorn, & Rohm, 2014; Rohm, Scharl, Ettner, & Gehrler, 2019).

Bibliography

- Fischer, L., Rohm, T., Gnambs, T., & Carstensen, C. H. (2016). *Linking the data of the competence tests* (NEPS Survey Paper No. 1). Bamberg, Germany: Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories, National Educational Panel Study. <https://doi.org/10.5157/NEPS:SP01:1.0>
- Gehrler, K. & Artelt, C. (2013). Literalität und Bildungslaufbahn: Das Bildungspanel NEPS. In A. Bertschi-Kaufmann, & C. Rosebrock (Hrsg.). *Literalität erfassen: bildungspolitisch, kulturell, individuell* (pp. 168–187). Weinheim, Germany: Juventa.
- Gehrler, K., Zimmermann, S., Artelt, C. & Weinert, S. (2012). *The assessment of reading competence (including sample items for grade 5 and 9)*. Scientific Use File 2012, Version 1.0.0. Bamberg: University of Bamberg, National Educational Panel Study. https://www.neps-data.de/Portals/0/NEPS/Datenzentrum/Forschungsdaten/SC4/1-0-0/com_re_2012_en.pdf
- Gehrler, K., Zimmermann, S., Artelt, C. & Weinert, S. (2013). NEPS framework for assessing reading competence and results from an adult pilot study. *Journal for Educational Research Online* 5(2), 50–79. <https://www.waxmann.com/artikelART102722>
- Groeben, N. & Hurrelmann, B. (Hrsg.) (2004). *Lesesozialisation in der Mediengesellschaft: Ein Forschungsüberblick*. Weinheim: Juventa.
- Heyne, N., Artelt, C., Gnambs, T., Gehrler, K. & Schoor, C. (2020). Instructed highlighting of text passages – Indicator of reading or strategic performance? *Lingua* Vol. 236, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102803>
- Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension. A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge: University Press.
- OECD (2009). *PISA 2009 assessment framework – Key competencies in reading, mathematics, and science*. Paris: OECD.
- Richter, T. & Christmann, U. (2002). Lesekompetenz: Prozessebenen und interindividuelle Unterschiede. In N. Groeben, B. Hurrelmann (Hrsg.), *Lesekompetenz: Bedingungen, Dimensionen, Funktionen* (S. 25–58). Weinheim: Juventa.

Technical Reports

- Gnambs, T., & Gehrer, K. (2026). NEPS technical report for reading competence: scaling results of starting cohorts 4 and 6 for wave 17 (NEPS Survey Paper No. xxx). Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories. <https://doi.org/xxx>
- Hardt, K., Pohl, S., Haberkorn, K., & Wiegand, E. (2013). *NEPS Technical Report for Reading – Scaling results of Starting Cohort 6 for adults in main study 2010/11* (NEPS Working Paper No. 25). Bamberg: University of Bamberg, National Educational Panel Study.
- Koller, I., Haberkorn, K., & Rohm, T. (2014). *NEPS Technical Report for Reading: Scaling results of Starting Cohort 6 for adults in main study 2012* (NEPS Working Paper No. 48). Bamberg: Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories, National Educational Panel Study.
- Rohm, T., Scharl, A., Eттner, J., & Gehrer, K. (2019). NEPS Technical Report for Reading: Scaling Results of Starting Cohorts 4 (*Wave 10*), 5 (*Wave 12*), and 6 (*Wave 9*) (NEPS Survey Paper No. 62). Bamberg: Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories, National Educational Panel Study. https://www.neps-data.de/Portals/0/Survey%20Papers/SP_LXII.pdf

Mathematical competence

In the National Education Panel Study, the construct of “*Mathematical Competence*” is based on the idea of *mathematical literacy* as was defined, for example, in PISA. Thus, the construct describes “[...] an individual’s capacity to identify and understand the role that mathematics plays in the world, to make well-founded mathematical judgments and to use and engage with mathematics in ways that meet the needs of that individual’s life as a constructive, concerned and reflective citizen.” (OECD, 2003, 24). Regarding children and adults, this idea refers to competent handling of mathematical problems in *age-specific contexts*.

Accordingly, mathematical competence in NEPS is operationalized by items assessing more than pure mathematical knowledge; instead, solving the items requires recognizing and flexibly applying mathematics in realistic, mainly extra-mathematical situations.




Fig. 1: Framework of mathematical competence in NEPS

The NEPS framework of mathematical competence distinguishes between content-related and process-related components (cf. Fig. 1). In detail, the content areas are characterized as follows:

- **Quantity** comprises all kinds of quantifications when numbers are used to organize and describe situations.
Examples from the *elementary sector*: comparisons of sets, counting (ordinal/cardinal aspects of numbers), simple operations (e.g., adding)
Examples from the *adult sector*: percentage and interest calculations, area and volume calculations, various units of measurement, simple systems of equations
- **Space and Shape** includes all types of planar and spatial configurations, shapes or patterns.
Examples from the *elementary sector*: recognizing geometric shapes, simple properties of shapes, perspective
Examples from the *adult sector*: three-dimensional mathematical objects, geometric figures, elementary geometric theorems
- **Change and Relationships** includes all kinds of (functional) relationships and patterns.
Examples from the *elementary sector*: recognizing and continuing patterns, relationships among numbers, proportionality
Examples from the *adult sector*: Interpreting graphs/function curves, properties of linear, quadratic, and exponential functions, problems involving extrema

- **Data and Chance** comprises all situations involving statistical data or chance.
Examples from the *elementary sector*: intuitively assessing probabilities, collecting and structuring data
Examples from the *adult sector*: interpreting statistics, basic statistical methods, calculating probabilities

The cognitive components of mathematical thinking processes are distinguished as follows:

- **Applying technical skills** includes, among other things, using known algorithms and remembering mathematical knowledge or calculation methods.
- **Modelling** includes the representation in a situation model and in a mathematical model as well as interpreting and validating results in real-life situations.
- **Arguing** includes assessing explanations and proofs, but also developing own explanations or proofs.
- **Communicating** requires communication on mathematical contents and includes, among other things, the correct and adequate use of mathematical technical terms.
- **Representing** comprises the use and interpretation of mathematical representations such as tables, charts or graphs.
- **Problem Solving** takes place, when there is no obvious approach, and, therefore, includes systematic trying, generalizing or examining special cases.

The test items used in NEPS refer to one content area that is mainly addressed by the item, but may well contain several cognitive components (further description of the framework in Neumann et al., 2013). This differentiation renders the framework concept of mathematical competence in NEPS compatible with both the PISA studies and the German National Mathematics Education Standards. Some literature also show a high correlation between NEPS, the PISA studies and federal states comparisons from the Institute of Educational Quality Improvement (IQB): $r = .89$ for NEPS-PISA and $r = .91$ for NEPS-IQB (van den Ham, 2016).

Bibliography

- Neumann, I., Duchhardt, C., Grüßing, M., Heinze, A., Knopp, E., & Ehmke, T. (2013). Modeling and assessing mathematical competence over the lifespan. *Journal for Educational Research Online*, 5(2), 80–109. Retrieved <http://journal-for-educational-research-online.com/index.php/jero/article/view/362>.
- Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development [OECD] (2003). The PISA 2003 assessment framework – mathematics, reading, science and problem solving knowledge and skills. Paris: OECD.
- Van den Ham, A.-K. (2016). *Ein Validitätsargument für den Mathematiktest der National Educational Panel Study für die neunte Klassenstufe*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Leuphana University Lüneburg, Lüneburg.

Metacognition

Metacognition is the knowledge and control of the own cognitive system. According to Flavell (1979) und Brown (1987), declarative and procedural aspects of metacognition are differentiated which are both covered in the National Education Panel. In Starting Cohort 6, only procedural metacognition is assessed.

Procedural metacognition

Procedural metacognition includes the regulation of the learning process through activities of planning, monitoring and controlling. Within the framework of NEPS in combination with the competence tests of the individual domains, the procedural aspect of metacognition is not assessed as a direct measure of such planning, monitoring and controlling activities but as a metacognitive judgement that refers to the control of the learning performance during (and/or shortly after) the learning phase (also see Nelson & Narens, 1990). After the study participants have taken their competence tests, they are requested to rate their own performance. They are asked to state the portion of questions presumably answered correctly. Typically, one item is deployed per domain for this purpose.

Bibliography

- Brown, A. L. (1987). Metacognition, executive control, self-regulation, and other more mysterious mechanisms. In F. E. Weinert and R. H. Kluwe (Eds.), *Metacognition, motivation, and understanding* (pp. 65-116). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and Cognitive Monitoring: A New Area of Cognitive-Developmental Inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34, 906-911.
- Nelson, T.O. & Narens, L. (1990). Metamemory: A theoretical framework and new findings. In G.H. Bower (Hrsg.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (pp. 125-141). New York: Academic Press.