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Introduction
One of the core ideas of many models of self-regulated learning concerns learners’ adaptation of their learning process to external conditions of learning scenarios. Additionally, theoretical models as well as empirical studies indicate that these adaptations might be influenced by learner characteristics. Based on the COPES-model (Winne & Hadwin, 1998) we examined learners’ adaptation to the external condition of task complexity and additionally explored the impact of prior domain knowledge and epistemological beliefs. A first exploratory study focusing on the preparatory stages of self-regulated learning (Stahl, Pieschl, & Bromme, 2007) showed promising results, e.g. students with “sophisticated” beliefs in uncertain knowledge showed better calibration to task complexity. This study set out to replicate these results. As the preparatory stage of self-regulated learning is an important constituent of most theoretical models, it is the exclusive focus of this study.

Method and Results
We selectively recruited university students with different prior domain knowledge, i.e. 52 biology and 50 humanity students. All were administered two questionnaires, one about their epistemological beliefs, e.g. about the variability of knowledge. Subsequently, each student was presented with six learning tasks from the topic of genetic fingerprinting representing all categories of Bloom’s revised taxonomy (i.e. in ascending complexity: remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluate, and create). These tasks had to be evaluated by means of a second questionnaire with the factors deep processing, dealing with multiple information sources, and surface processing.

Results indicate that students successfully discriminated between tasks of different complexity and that their judgments were significantly related to the underlying dimension task complexity, i.e. well-calibrated. Thus, students seem to metacognitively monitor task complexity and adapt their task definitions, goals and plans adequately. With regard to learner characteristics, prior domain knowledge impacted discrimination between tasks, i.e. biology students discriminated on a more fine-grained level than humanities students. As there were no further differences between these groups, it can be concluded that students might rely stronger on their general metacognitive knowledge about task demands and learning strategies instead of on their domain knowledge in this preparatory stage of learning. Epistemological beliefs on the other hand elicited multiple effects: e.g., students’ “sophisticated” beliefs in variable knowledge in genetics (CAEB-variability) were associated with judging deep processing strategies more important across all tasks (cf. Figure 1). These results are consistent with those from other empirical studies that indicate a general benefit of “sophisticated” beliefs.

Conclusion
This study scrutinized the preparatory stages of self-regulated learning. Results indicate that students seem to be able to successfully monitor presented tasks with regard to their complexity and seem to know reasonably well what kind of task definitions, goals and plans are adequate, i.e. possess adequate metacognitive knowledge. Such awareness and knowledge are necessary preconditions for successful self-regulated learning. These results are in line with the COPES-model and furthermore constitute a valuable extension of research about epistemological beliefs as it is still widely unknown how learners’ epistemological beliefs might affect their learning processes in detail.
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