NEPS

National Educational Panel Study

Information on Competence Testing

NEPS Starting Cohort 4 — Grade 9

School and Vocational Training — Educational Pathways of Students in Grade 9 and Higher

Wave 3: Grade 10

LIfBi

LEIBNIZ INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL TRAJECTORIES

Information on testing	
Test situation	Group testing in premises of the regular school, normally with 1 test instructor and 1 supervisory teaching stuff per test
Test sequence	The test took place on one day. The competence in English reading was exclusively collected. The tests were submitted in three versions (random assignment of test booklet versions to participants.)
Test duration (net processing time)	30 min

Construct	Number of items	Allowed Processing Time	Survey Mode	
Competence in English reading	53 (28, 31 or 32 items per test booklet, in each case 15 identical items at the beginning in all three test versions)	30 min	paper-pencil	
Domain-specific procedural metacognition				
Regarding the English domain	1	1 min	paper-pencil	

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.

Competence in English reading

The reading competence tasks for English developed by the Institute of Quality Development in Education (Institut für Qualitätsentwicklung im Bildungswesen (IQB)) take into account the different aspects of written texts listed in the National Educational Standards (Nationale Bildungsstandards (KMK, 2003, 2004)) and the Common European Framework of References (Gemeinsamen Europäischen Referenzrahmen (GER; Europarat, 2001)). The task texts are characterized by a high degree of authenticity in relation to English-speaking cultures, i.e. in the sense of representative expository and narrative texts from English-speaking societies.

Based on the National Educational Standards and the GER, the IQB developed test specifications that served as a basis for item development by trained experts. In order to ensure most effective recording of reading competence, maximum attention was paid to perfect fit in terms of text, item and answer format in the further development of tasks.

The tasks used in A48 study can be allocated to the levels B1 through C1 of the GER that are described as follows (Europarat, 2001, S. 227):

B1: […] At this level, it is possible to understand texts containing every day or job-related language. […]

B2: […] At this level, it is possible to understand articles and reports on current topics if the author gives his opinion on a problem or expresses a certain perspective. […]

C1: […] At this level, it is possible to understand complex technical and literary texts as well as recognize differences in style. One can understand technical language in articles and technical instructions, even if they are outside one's own subject.

A detailed description of the English competence test developed by the IQB, including the reading competence test, is contained in Rupp, Vock, Harsch und Köller (2008).

List of references

Europarat (2001). *Gemeinsamer europäischer Referenzrahmen für Sprachen: lernen, lehren, beurteilen [Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment]*. Berlin: Langenscheidt.

KMK (2003). *Bildungsstandards für die erste Fremdsprache (Englisch/Französisch) für den Mittleren Abschluss [National educational standards for the first foreign language (English/French) for the Mittlerer Schulabschluss]*. München: Luchterhand.

KMK (2004). *Bildungsstandards für die erste Fremdsprache (Englisch/Französisch) für den Hauptschulabschluss [National educational standards for the first foreign language (English/French) for the Hauptschulabschluss]*. München: Luchterhand.

Rupp, A. A., Vock, M., Harsch, C. & Köller, O. (2008). *Developing standards-based as-sessment tasks for English as a first foreign language – Context, processes, and out-comes in Germany*. Münster: Waxmann.

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.

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.

Usually, one question is asked per domain. For competence domains that can be divided into coherent individual parts (e.g. reading competence referring to different texts), the inquiry of procedural metacognition is referred to these parts as well, which, of course, leads to a longer processing time.

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.