

Detailed program of the Research School

26-27-28 August 2018 — Ghent University



	Sunday August 26		Monday August 27		Tuesday August 28
13u-14u	Registration (main entrance)	8u30-10u	Parallel introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A. Assessing writing (<i>Renske Bouwer and Elke Van Steendam</i>): room 2.1. - B. Writing processes (<i>Thierry Olive</i>): room 2.2 	8u30-10u	Parallel introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - C. Writing and motivation/ Qualitative Linguistic Analysis (<i>Maarten Vansteenkiste</i>): room 2.1. - D. Writing interventions (<i>Gert Rijlaarsdam and Huub van den Bergh</i>): room 2.2
14u-14u30	RS-organizers and JURE-coordinator welcome you! (<i>Hilde Van Keer and Péter Fallman</i>): room 1.2.	10u-10u30	Break (Restaurant ground floor)	10u-10u30	Break (Restaurant ground floor)
14u30-15u30	Kick-off Training School: Writing research: An introductory overview (<i>David Galbraith</i>): room 1.2	10u30-12u	Parallel workshops <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A1. Benchmarking and comparative judgment (<i>Renske Bouwer and Marije Lesterhuis</i>): room 2.1 - B1. Analyzing writing processes: dual and triple task (<i>Thierry Olive</i>): room 2.2 	10u30-12u	Parallel workshops <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - C1. Measuring writing motivation (<i>Hilde Van Keer</i>): room 2.1 - D1. Reporting writing interventions (<i>Raquel Fidalgo</i>): room 2.2
15u45-16u30	Poster session A: Feedback from peers and experts (poster room on the second floor)	12u-13u	Lunch (Restaurant ground floor)	12u-13u	Lunch (Restaurant ground floor)
16u30-17u	Break (Second floor)	13u-14u30	Parallel workshops <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A2. Automated essay scoring (<i>Scott Crossley</i>): room 2.1 - B2. Think-aloud measures and analyzing pen movements and traces (<i>Emmelien Merchie</i>): room 2.2 	13u-14u30	Parallel workshops <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D2. Fidelity of implementation (<i>Monica Koster and Daphne Van Weijen</i>): room 2.1 - D3. Collaborative writing (<i>Elke Van Steendam and Fien De Smedt</i>): room 2.2
17u-17u45	Poster session B: Feedback from junior and senior researchers (poster room on the second floor)	14u45-16u	What after a PhD in writing research? (<i>Jessie De Naeghel, Monica Koster, and Emmelien Merchie</i>): room 1.2	14u45-15u45	Closing: Key issues discussed during the Research School: Summary and elaboration (<i>David Galbraith</i>): room 1.2

17u45-19u15	Networking event: beer reception (Second floor)	16u-16u30	Break (Restaurant ground floor)	15u45-16u15	Break (Restaurant ground floor)
		16u30-17u30	Meet the editors (<i>Gert Rijlaarsdam</i>): room 1.2	16u15-17u	Wrap up: Evaluation of the Research School: room 1.2

DAY 1 – Sunday August 26

Kick-off Training School

David Galbraith

This introductory session will provide a broad, and relatively personal, overview of some of the key issues in writing research today, and relate these to the topics to be covered in the research school. This will include discussion of the tension between cognitive and social approaches to writing theory and research, focusing on the conflicting accounts they provide of the cognitive processes involved in writing, and how they are situated in social contexts. I will use some of my own recent research to illustrate these themes. I will then discuss how these issues and themes relate to the program for the research school.

Poster sessions A and B

Two poster sessions will be organized to enable/encourage participants to get to know each other's research (interests), exchange ideas and experiences, and provide peer feedback to one another. Trainers of the Training School will be present during the poster sessions to provide expert feedback on the participants' research.

Poster session A

Sunday August, 26: 15u45-16u30

Poster number	Title poster	Presenter
1	Cochrane Plain Language Summaries: a study of authors' satisfaction and users' comprehension	Allessandra Rossetti
3	The Adaptation of Interactive Writing as an Instructional Tool with Tunisian Learners of English and its Impact on their Writing Skill Development	Mouna Ayadi
5	Writing practices in Chilean public secondary classrooms: a National survey of L1 teachers	Magdalena Flores Ferres
7	Remedial instruction for young struggling writers: feasibility of a Response to Intervention approach	Maria Arrimada Garcia
9	Digital sexual assault and shame – A participatory writing experiment	Signe Uldbjerg Mortsenen
11	Responding to Writing: The Power of Conferencing in the ELA Classroom	Michelle Spears
14	Effects of strategy instruction on students' metacognitive representations of the writing process	Paula Lòpez
16	Higher Education Students Tackling a Synchronous Online Collaborative Writing Task: Exploring the Relation Between Writing Process and Product	Nore De Grez
18	The Cognitive Processes of Literary Writing	Anne-Marie Butzek
20	Something different!' Does creative writing instruction influence students' writing performance?	Anouk ten Peze

22	Craft Criticism: Towards a Methodology of Writerly Reading	Hans Lind
25	All possible worlds: Content-Thematic Space in early school writing	Oscar Björk
32	The Key(strokes) to Writing: identifying patterns in students' writing processes	Rianne Conijn
36	The influence of cognitive processes in writing impairments: children at risk of writing difficulties	Mariona Pascual Peñas
40	Investigating the L2 Writing Processes and Real-time Fluency of Saudi Female EFL Students on Two Task Types Using Keystroke Logging	Meshail Almasri
42	Differences in executive function abilities in low-, mid- and high- bilingual children: impact on code-mixing during writing	Sara Silvente i Font
46	Framing the Discussion: Understanding resources elementary writing teachers use to inform writing instruction	Christine Rosalia
48	Validating a Critical Thinking Performance Assessment – Scoring Argumentation and Creativity	Dimitri Molerov
51	“Not writing from the heart”: exploring the relationship between students’ beliefs about academic writing and the approaches they adopt	Celia Hewitt
53	Exploring correlates of handwriting ability at school entry	Camilla Fitjar
65	Writing in L1 Norwegian and EFL in the Norwegian school context	Anne Myklestad

Poster session B

Sunday August, 26: 17u-17u45

Poster number	Title poster	Presenter
2	Designing an evidence-based module for synthesis writing in secondary education	Liselore van Ockenburg
4	Beginning teachers' reading attitude and motivation: A study into the evolution throughout teacher education and the first years of teaching and into the impact of a continuous professional development program	Iris Vansteelandt
6	Teaching Through a Writer's Lens: An Exploration of a Pre-service Teacher-Writer's Developing Practice	Kate Hope
8	Making the invisible visible – the linguistic content of writing bursts	Stefanie Wyss
10	Pluralization patterns and learning trajectories of pupils with French as a second written language	Natalia Bilici
13	The influence of participation in oral discussion contexts on the writing of argumentative syntheses: design and evaluation of an intervention to improve argumentative competence and the ability to take perspective in secondary school students	Lidia Casado
15	Analysis of Spanish teachers' use of evidence-based practices and beliefs in writing	Rut Sánchez-Rivero
17	The use of direct quotes in L2 master's theses	Romana Hinton
19	Machine Translation-Assisted Scientific Publication	Carla Parra Escartín
21	Exploring Effect and Transfer on a Componential Analysis of Strategy-focused Instruction	Lucía Rodríguez Málaga
23	How and how well do Dutch secondary students write? A national baseline study on synthesis writing	Nina Vandermeulen
26	The effect of a multisensory learning tool on fifth graders' spelling of intra-sentential capitalization in German	Linda Brucher
35	Metacognitive regulation strategies in delayed revision of essay writing by pre-service teachers and expert writers in L1 and EFL	Abraham Cerveró-Carrascosa
37	Academic writing in English: Experiences and issues of Indonesian lecturers	Nova Ariani
38	Copy task? On struggling academic writers	Camilla Grönvall

41	Cognitive processes in text composing in adults with dyslexia: The Inputlog process analysis	Marina Olujic
43	Factors Impeding or Promoting Success in Master's Thesis Writing	Laura Mendoza
47	CARS Moves in the Humanities? A Corpus Study of Research Article Introductions in American History, American Studies, and American Literary Journals	Phillip Troutman
49	The longitudinal contribution of executive functions to writing quality in Grade 2	Carolina Cordeiro
52	Textmachines in Mother Tongue (L1) Teaching – Three Types of Mimesis in Writing Pedagogy	Jan Fogt
64	Finding the correct form for corrective written digital feedback in asynchronous writing appointments	Falina Norred

Introduction A: Assessing writing

Renske Bower and Elke Van Steendam

A lot of research is being carried out on effective writing instruction and/or effective writing processes. In order to make claims about 'effectiveness', it is necessary to relate these instructions or processes to a measure of writing quality, usually text quality measures. These measures of writing quality are crucial in determining the outcomes of such studies (e.g. whether or not a particular writing strategy is found to be effective). The way in which writing quality is operationalized and measured reflects a certain conception of the construct of writing quality, and also has implications for design, methodology and data-analysis. It is imperative that writing quality is validly and reliably established. However, the development of writing quality measures, and underlying assumptions, are not in all cases discussed in great detail.

In this introduction we will discuss several possible approaches to the operationalization of writing quality, often (implicitly) reflecting different definitions of the writing construct. We will shed light on the many factors that should be considered when developing a scoring rubric or using a different assessment procedure. For example:

- * What can be the impact of rater effects?
- * Is writing a general (broadly defined) construct or a context-, genre-, or language- specific (narrowly defined) construct?
- * To what extent should the reader response be involved in quality measures, in order to do justice to the communicative act that is writing?
- * Which kind of conceptions of writing are implicated by analytic or holistic measures of writing?

Introduction B: Writing processes

Thierry Olive

Since the publication of Hayes and Flower's writing process model, a main goal of cognitive research on writing has been to define the cognitive mechanisms necessary for composing a text. Several models have been published proposing different points of view on the cognitive mechanisms of writing. Another goal of writing research was to describe how writers juggle with different writing processes. In this introductory session, I will first present a comprehensive view of writing processes from a cognitive and psycholinguistic point of view, that is, by describing the levels of treatment and the units of representation involved in the composition of a text. Second, I will address the issue of real-time management of writing processes by focusing on how these levels of processing are coordinated.

Suggested readings:

- Alves, R. A., Castro, S. L., & Olive, T. (2008). Execution and pauses in writing narratives: Processing time, cognitive effort and typing skill. *International Journal of Psychology*, 43, 469-479.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365.
- Hayes, J. R. (2012). Modeling and Remodeling Writing. *Written Communication*, 29(3), 369–388.
- Olive, T. (2014). Toward an Incremental and Cascading Model of Writing: A review of research on writing processes coordination. *Journal of Writing Research*, 6, 173-194.
- Olive, T., Alves, R. A., & Castro, S. L. (2009). Cognitive processes in writing during pauses and execution periods. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 21, 758-785.
- Olive, T. & Kellogg, R.T. (2002). Concurrent activation of high- and low-level production processes in written composition. *Memory and Cognition*, 30, 594-600.

Workshop A1: Benchmarking and comparative judgment

Renske Bouwer and Marije Lesterhuis

To provide students, teachers, researchers and policy-makers with insights in students' writing ability, the quality of writing should be assessed in a reliable and valid way. Previous research has established that assessors face difficulties when they have to assess writing quality in an absolute way, even when they are supported with analytic rubrics. Recently, a new and promising comparative approach has been introduced to the assessment of writing, which makes the assessment of writing quality much easier and more reliable. Benchmark rating and Comparative Judgment (CJ) are both based on this comparative approach. For benchmark rating, writing quality is determined by comparing students' texts to benchmarks representing the different levels of writing quality, ranging from very poor to very good. For CJ, writing quality is determined through a series of pairwise comparisons. Based upon the probability that a text is selected as the best in each pair, texts can be ranked on a scale from low to high quality.

In this workshop participants will experience themselves how it is to assess writing products in a comparative way. Based on own experiences, as well as on recent research findings, we will compare and discuss the reliability, validity, efficiency and usability of these two comparative assessment methods, both to each other as well as to other assessment methods. We will also discuss the potential of integrating the benchmarking and comparative judgment method in order to get the best of both worlds.

Workshop B1: Analyzing writing processes: dual and triple task

Thierry Olive

In cognitive psychology, dual tasks are mainly used to understand how the processing limits of the human cognitive system constraint unfolding of the cognitive activities. In the same perspective, the use of dual tasks in writing research has allowed to better understand how working memory is involved in writing. Nevertheless, this technique is methodologically complex and raises many questions about its reactivity and its intrusiveness with the task under scrutiny. In this workshop, I will first present the methodological criteria that need to be met when implementing a dual task experiment in writing research. Second, I will present the triple task method, a variant of the dual-task technique that combines a verbalization task with a reaction time one while addressing some of the issues related to its validity.

Suggested readings:

- Janssen, D., van Waes L., & van den Bergh, H. (1996). Effects of thinking aloud on writing processes. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing. Theories, methods, individual differences and applications* (pp. 233-250). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Olive, T. (2010). Methods, tools and techniques for the on-line study of the writing process. In N. L. Mertens (Ed.), *Writing: Processes, Tools and Techniques* (pp. 1-18). NY : Nova Publishers.
- Levy, C. M. (1997). The « R » that psychology forgot: Research on writing processes. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 29, 137-145.
- Levy, C. M. & Ransdell, S. (2001). Writing with concurrent memory loads. In T. Olive & C. M. Levy (Eds), *Contemporary tools and techniques for studying writing* (pp. 9-30). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Olive, T. (2004). Working memory in writing: Empirical evidences from the dual-task technique. *European Psychologist*, 9, 32-42.
- Olive, T., Kellogg, R.T., & Piolat, A. (2002). Studying text production with the triple task technique: Why and how ? In T. Olive & C.M. Levy, C.M. (Eds.), *Contemporary tools and techniques for studying writing* (pp. 31-58). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.
- Piolat, A., Olive, T., Roussey, J.Y., Thunin, O., & Ziegler, J.C. (1999). ScriptKell: A computer assisted tool for measuring the distribution of time and cognitive effort in writing and other complex cognitive activities. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 31, 113-121.

Workshop A2: Automated essay scoring

Scott Crossley

This workshop will focus on how freely available natural language processing (NLP) tools can be used to measure aspects of writing including writing quality, genre, domain, and register differences, source integration, and text creativity. The workshop will introduce participants to the field of NLP, NLP tools, and methods for employing the tools in writing analytic research. Participants will learn how to operate NLP tools and understand how NLP indices related to lexical sophistication, syntactic complexity, text cohesion, and sentiment analysis are calculated. Participants will work with provided data sets to analyze writing samples in order to develop models of text complexity. The workshop will focus on increasing participants' understanding of NLP tools and their application in writing contexts.

Workshop B2: Think-aloud measures and analyzing pen movements and traces

Emmelien Merchie

In this workshop, participants will acquire hands-on knowledge and experience with applying the think aloud, writing pen and trace methodology when investigating fifth and sixth graders' informative text processing and learning. In this interactive session, participants will have the opportunity to view and practice with think-aloud videos and study trace material, accompanied with specific coding instruments used in previous studies. Furthermore, participants will learn how to apply digital pens (recording, uploading, replaying) for visualizing and analyzing dynamic writing and schematizing processes. The benefits, complementarities and constraints of these three different methodologies will be discussed.

What after a PhD in writing research?

Jessie de Naeghel, Monica Koster and Emmelien Merchie

In this interactive workshop, we give the floor to researchers who finished their PhD in writing or reading research and we go into their career after the PhD. More particularly, we will focus on their current jobs and on how they build on their experiences and competences developed during their PhD research.

- Jessie De Naeghel is working for the Ghent Education Centre, since September 2016. She coordinates the implementation of the Ghent plan on Early School Leaving. Jessie has a doctoral degree of educational sciences. Her PhD-work focused on enhancing motivation in learning contexts and is grounded in self-determination theory. Prior to her job at the Education Centre, she worked for the Flemish Community Commission as a policy advisor. More specifically, Jessie developed and initiated a new framework for the professional development of child care workers, staff members, and volunteers in Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC).
- Monica Koster is founder at Tekster, which is an evidence-based instructional writing program.
- Emmelien Merchie is a postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Educational Studies.

Meet the editors

The participants get the opportunity to meet renowned editors in the field (e.g., Journal of Writing Research)

Gert Rijlaarsdam



Introduction C: Writing and motivation/Qualitative Linguistic Analysis

Maarten Vansteenkiste

While some people write easily, thereby smoothly building a coherent narrative, others experience writing as a daunting duty that requires considerable effort from their side. They feel discouraged, lack creativity and tend to postpone the writing. The question addressed in this talk is whether individuals' motives for writing may account for such variation between but also within a person's writing efforts and style. While several motivational frameworks (e.g., expectancy-valence accounts) consider motivation from a quantitative viewpoint, suggesting that being more strongly motivated will yield more positive outcomes, from the perspective of Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2017; Vansteenkiste, Niemiec, & Soenens, 2010), quality of motivation matters as well. Within SDT, two broader types of motivation are distinguished, that is, autonomous motivation (i.e., "wantivation") which refers to a willing and psychologically free engagement in a learning activity and controlled motivation ("mustivation") which refers to a pressured and conflicted engagement in a learning activity. In addition, some learners are lowly motivated or amotivated, which involves a sense of helplessness and discouragement. Correlational and experimental research will be reviewed suggesting that dynamics of autonomy versus control are paramount and critical for learners' performance, persistence, and well-being across ages and cultures. Further, it is maintained that a need-supportive teaching style, involving the combination of high autonomy support and structure, is critical to foster high quality motivation, while a need-thwarting style, involving the combination of control with chaos, can better be avoided as it relates to poor motivation and disengagement. Specifically, a newly developed circumplex model will be introduced, which differentiates the teaching styles of autonomy support, structure, control and chaos into two subareas each and orders these eight subareas along a circumplex. The circumplex provides more nuanced and richer insights in the teaching practices that are most motivating and demotivating and that may foster high quality and high quantity motivation for writing.

At the heart of Basic Psychological Need Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2002; Vansteenkiste & Ryan, 2013) is the postulation of three basic and universally critical psychological needs, that is, the needs for autonomy (i.e., experiencing a sense of volition and ownership), competence (i.e., experiencing a sense of effectiveness) and relatedness (i.e., experiencing a sense of connection), the satisfaction of which is conducive to individuals' thriving and growth. The aim of the present contribution is to address several emerging trends in this rapidly growing literature, including the question (a) whether need frustration plays a unique role in the prediction of maladjustment beyond the mere deprivation of one's psychological needs; (b) whether the effect of need satisfaction would be constrained to individuals who desire or highly value these needs (cfr. Motive Disposition Theory); (c) whether the effect of need satisfaction would be cancelled out if one the role of the need for physical safety is taken into account (cfr. Maslow); (d) whether need satisfaction is implicated in the satisfaction of people's physical need for rest (i.e., sleep) and vice versa; (e) how different need supportive and need thwarting socialization practices, as assessed among youth sport coaches and teachers, stand in relation to each other; (f) and whether need-supportive and need-thwarting practices can better be conceived as static, thereby primarily differing between persons, or instead are more dynamic in nature, thereby varying considerably from day-to-day. In doing so, a new instrument, the Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction and Need Frustration scale (BPNSF; Chen et al., 2015) is presented. Overall, the presented research, conducted among multiple cross-culturally diverse samples (i.e., South-Africa, China, Peru, Belgium, US), relying on explicit and implicit measures of need strength as well as subjective and objective indicators of sleep (e.g., PSG), making use of both cross-sectional, diary and experimental designs, involving both non-clinical (e.g., students, teachers, prisoners) and clinical populations (e.g., HIV- and CVS-patients), and making use of more deductive (e.g., CFA) and inductive (e.g., multidimensional scaling) analytical techniques, provide evidence for the robustness of the role of psychological need satisfaction and frustration and generates more refined insights in how need support and need thwarting manifests in diverse situations.

<https://www.vopspsy.ugent.be/nl/ontwikkelingspsychologie/maarten-vansteenkiste.html>

Introduction B: Writing interventions

Gert Rijlaarsdam and Huub van den Bergh

In our contribution, we intend to present a selective overview of issues in designing intervention studies (experimental, quasi-experimental), and statistical issues related to design options. The basic model we propose is that interventions studies aim at unraveling the effect of a learning arrangement on an outcome measure (in writing-to-learn studies: conceptual knowledge; in learning-to-write studies: text quality, writing skill), by including process measures and learner variables.

Issues we want to deal with are in three clusters:

- (1) Policy trends: relations between research and practice, with consequences for research design and data-analysis;
- (2) Research trends: (a) including learner and task variables, (b) adding other outcome variables (writing and/or learning processes, knowledge gains (in cases of writing-to-learn studies), (c) indices of learning/implementation), (d) empowering research designs (generalizability), with switching replications, or time lagged experimental groups.
- (3) Measurement trends: multiple measures per individual (generalizability), multilevel models.

Workshop C1: Measuring writing motivation

Hilde Van Keer

Taking into account the research evidence specifying writing motivation as an important predictor of students' writing performance, literacy researchers increasingly emphasize the key role of writing motivation in fostering students' writing skills. In view of assessing students' motives to write and consequently in gaining in-depth understanding in students' writing motivation and the actual interplay with performance, a coherent and sound underlying motivation theory is needed. Taking Self-Determination Theory as the theoretical base in the present workshop, we fit in with the introductory talk of Maarten Vansteenkiste "Discouragement, Mustivation or Wantivation for Writing: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective on Writing Motivation". More specifically, we go into the importance of distinguishing different types of motivation (i.e., reflecting different motives underlying one's behavior) when measuring students' writing motivation instead of focusing solely on the quantity our amount of someone's motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In this respect, we go into the development of the SRQ-writing motivation, distinguishing between autonomous and controlled motivation, and we discuss the item construction starting from SDT as the theoretical framework, the structure, the invariance, and internal consistency of the questionnaire. Further, we explore alternative options for mapping students' different motives for writing and discuss benefits and limitations of the different methodological approaches and choices. Finally, we link writing motivation with other motivational constructs, such as self-efficacy and interest, and how these can be operationalized. Throughout the workshop, we aim at stimulating active engagement and debate with the participants by applying interactive approaches and hands-on exercises.

Workshop D1: Reporting writing interventions

Raquel Fidalgo

In this workshop we will present and exemplify a reporting system for interventions in writing research. This is an extremely useful tool for researchers on the writing instruction field. At the beginning of the research, the reporting system can be a key tool for designing and ensuring construct validity of writing interventions. Additionally, it makes it possible to report interventions analytically in research papers, promoting replication and theory building in the scientific field of writing and learning to write.

Workshop D2: Fidelity of implementation

Monica Koster and Daphne Van Weijen

Many writing interventions are examined in natural classroom settings. While this enhances the ecological validity of writing intervention studies, it poses a threat to their internal validity, especially when interventions are implemented by teachers themselves. Many different treatment fidelity measures can be used to monitor if the implementation of an intervention is carried out as planned. Such measures can help determine to what extent teachers' practices matched the design principles of the intervention. In this workshop we will focus on which fidelity measures you can use to check the validity of the intervention, and how you can use them to explain possible effects on outcome measures. Furthermore, we will demonstrate how fidelity measures can be collected and analyzed efficiently and we will provide examples of how you can report on them in research papers and presentations.

Workshop D3: Collaborative writing

Elke Van Steendam and Fien De Smedt

Peer collaboration in writing has been shown to be effective for Writing to Learn and for Learning to Write (Graham, McKeown, Kihara, & Harris, 2012; MacArthur, Schwartz, & Graham, 1991; Onrubia & Engel, 2009; Storch, 2005). That is why collaborative writing is often implemented in educational contexts. Also in professional contexts (academia, policy making, administration, journalism), quite often written documents are the end-product of a collaborative process involving multiple actors, writers and readers (Perrin, 2011; Lowry, Albrecht, Nunanmaker, & Lee, 2003). An increasingly growing body of research is published on collaborative writing in different educational contexts (cf. Van Steendam, 2016). In this introductory (interactive) lecture we will hone in on this body of research and discuss a number of studies on peer collaboration in primary, secondary and higher education. Drawing on our own and other researchers' work we will study the interplay of individual, collaborative and contextual factors in collaboration. Together we will draw conclusions with regard to parameters for effective collaboration and identify both opportunities and pitfalls in studying (and analyzing) collaborative writing.

Closing

David Galbraith

Key issues discussed during the training School: Summary and elaboration