



Book of Abstracts
SIG Writing Conference 2026

Writing research for writing practice

Writing matters. With mnemotechnical writing, we jot down notes and have extended our memories; with communicative writing, we share thoughts and have built knowledge societies; with epistemic writing, we engage in mental dialogues and have boosted our reflective capacity; with fragmented and ubiquitous "by-the-way" writing, we synchronize communities and have made writing the default mode of communication; and with regulative writing in technical environments, we program algorithms and have got AI off the ground.

And now, AI is here, stopping people from taking writing classes. Journalists have only ceased claiming that translators and programmes were being made redundant by DeepL and alike when they started to realize that they could be next in line. Medical doctors and lawyers might follow. On the horizon, robots stand up to take on working-class jobs. Of course, this could bring people back to writing classes, albeit therapeutic instead of professional writing. But why bother anyway? Isn't this conference about writing research?

Yes and no. Yes, because our special interest lies in investigating writing, not necessarily doing so – which tends to become tangible in missed deadlines for contributions to journals in our field. No, because we know better. Human writing is at the core of thinking, decision-making, and joy of life. Who else if not writing researchers can provide evidence that writing, once developed, has become a substantial part of human existence. With AI, writing matters even more, but differently. Writing research for writing practice shows how and why.

Welcome to the 21st SIG Writing Conference ... and welcome to the Zurich University of Applied Sciences.

Prof. Dr. Daniel Perrin
Dean, School of Applied Linguistics

Welcome to SIG Writing 2026

It is a great pleasure to welcome you to the 21st biennial SIG Writing conference, hosted here at ZHAW in Winterthur. Every second year, EARLI SIG Writing brings together a vibrant community from all over the world to explore how empirical findings and theoretical innovations can transform real-world writing contexts, to meet old friends and make new ones, to share data and discuss methodological issues.

The success of this event is the result of dedicated teamwork. I would like to thank my fellow conference chairs, Liana Konstantinidou and Daniel Perrin, and our tireless Local Organizing Committee: Renate Balogh, Maren Runte, Nadja Spillmann, and Margo Ulasik. The conference and research school would not have been possible without you. We are also deeply grateful for the invaluable support of our Organizing Committee partners: Sibylle Hurschler Lichtsteiner (PH Luzern), Stefan Daniel Keller (PH Zurich), Afra Sturm (FHNW), and Mirjam Weder (University of Basel).

Special thanks go to our students from the BA Multilingual Communication and BA Language and Integration programs, for their work on the Book of Abstracts and the program website, and for conference support.

We would also like to acknowledge the generous support of the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF), CLARIN-CH, ZHAW digital, ZHAW Sustainable, the ZHAW University Library, FHNW, EARLI, and VALS-ASLA.

We hope this conference inspires fruitful discussions and lasting connections. Enjoy the conference and the beautiful city of Winterthur.

Prof. Dr. Cerstin Mahlow
Conference Chair, SIG Writing 2026
Coordinator SIG Writing
Professor of Writing Research, School of Applied Linguistics

Programme note

This Book of Abstracts reflects the programme status as of **May 29, 2026**. Further changes will be communicated on site.

This Book of Abstracts was produced by students of the Zurich University of Applied Sciences for the course Project Technical Documentation: Tabbea Aires Santana, Marie Jetzer, Alina Reusch, Andrea Ruchti, Tamara Rügger, and Tanya Schnyder.

Tuesday June 2, 2026

Time	Session	Type	Room
08:00 - 09:00	Registration	Registration	
09:00 - 09:30	Opening Ceremony Chair: Liana Konstantinidou	Ceremony	Aula
09:30 - 10:30	Bridging Research and Classroom Practice: Improving Writing in Diverse Primary Classrooms	Keynote Presentation	Aula
10:30 - 11:00	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG
11:00 - 12:30	Accessing the Epistemological Side of Writing: A Prolegomenon to the Era of AI	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Roundtable 3	Roundtable	SM O4.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Roundtable 6	Roundtable	SM O2.24/29 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 12	Single Paper	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 14	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 27	Single Paper	SM O1.08 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 6	Single Paper	SM O3.05 (Computer Room)
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Grüner Saal
14:00 - 15:30	IN RESPECT OF WRITING: ETHICAL AND LEGAL CHALLENGES ACROSS WRITING SUPPORTS	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Roundtable 2	Roundtable	SM O2.24/29 (Lecture Room)
	Roundtable 7	Roundtable	SM O4.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 10	Single Paper	SM O3.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 13	Single Paper	SM O1.08 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 22	Single Paper	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 23	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
Single Paper Session 33	Single Paper	SM O1.20 (Lecture Room)	
15:30 - 16:00	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG

Time	Session	Type	Room
16:00 - 17:30	Demonstration Session 2	Demonstration Session	SM O2.17 (Lecture Room)
	Poster Presentation 2	Poster Presentation	SM O1 (Hallway)
	Poster Presentation 3	Poster Presentation	SM O3 (Hallway)
	Poster Presentation 5	Poster Presentation	SM O2 (Hallway)
17:45 - 18:45	SIG Writing Business Meeting	Business Meeting	SMO4.01
19:00	Welcome reception	Social Event	ZHAW

Wednesday June 3, 2026

Time	Session	Type	Room
08:30 - 09:00	Registration	Registration	
09:00 - 10:30	Roundtable 1	Roundtable	SM O4.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Roundtable 5	Roundtable	SM O2.24/29 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 19	Single Paper	SM O3.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 21	Single Paper	SM O3.05 (Computer Room)
	Single Paper Session 34	Single Paper	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 5	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 9	Single Paper	SM O1.13 (Lecture Room)
	Writing process feedback	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
10:30 - 11:00	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG
11:00 - 12:30	Approaches to Writing Instruction Around the World	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Cooperative Writing: Perspectives from Three Intervention Studies	Symposium	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Poster Presentation 1	Poster Presentation	SM O1 (Hallway)
	Poster Presentation 4	Poster Presentation	SM O2 (Hallway)
	Roundtable 8	Roundtable	SM O1.24/29
	Single Paper Session 15	Single Paper	SM O3.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 2	Single Paper	SM O3.05 (Computer Room)
	Single Paper Session 26	Single Paper	SM O1.13 (Lecture Room)
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Grüner Saal
14:00 - 15:00	Hayes Award 2024 Lecture – Writing Fluency in the Perspective of Fluency Research	Keynote Presentation	Aula
15:00 - 15:30	SIG Writing Publications – Journal of Writing Research (JoWR) and Book Series Studies in Writing	Publication Session	Aula
15:30 - 16:00	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG

Time	Session	Type	Room
17:00 - 18:30	Guided Tours	Social Event	Meeting point at the entrance of the SM building
20:00	Conference dinner	Social Event	Restaurant Concordia, Feldstrasse 2, 8400 Winterthur

Thursday June 4, 2026

Time	Session	Type	Room
08:30 - 09:00	Registration, Participation Certificates	Registration	
09:00 - 10:30	Demonstration Session 1	Demonstration Session	SM O2.17 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 1	Single Paper	SM O3.05 (Computer Room)
	Single Paper Session 16	Single Paper	SM O1.13 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 20	Single Paper	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 32	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 4	Single Paper	SM O1.08 (Lecture Room)
	The future of writing education	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
10:30 - 11:00	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG
11:00 - 12:00	Cognitive and Ethical Alignment of LLMs with Humans for Writing Research and Instruction	Keynote Presentation	Aula
12:00 - 13:30	Lunch	Lunch	Grüner Saal
13:30 - 15:00	Roundtable 4	Roundtable	SM O1.24/29 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 11	Single Paper	SM O1.17 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 25	Single Paper	SM O1.20 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 29	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
	University students' reflections on academic writing with genAI	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
15:00 - 15:30	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG
15:30 - 17:00	Single Paper Session 17	Single Paper	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 18	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 28	Single Paper	SM O1.13 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 30	Single Paper	SM O1.08 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 31	Single Paper	SM O3.05 (Computer Room)
	Single Paper Session 35	Single Paper	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 8	Single Paper	SM O3.01 (Lecture Hall)

Time	Session	Type	Room
17:00 - 17:30	Closing ceremony Chair: Daniel Perrin	Ceremony	Aula

Index

Sessions

Tuesday June 2, 2026

- 09:30 - 10:30 – Bridging Research and Classroom Practice: Improving Writing in Diverse Primary Classrooms **14**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Accessing the Epistemological Side of Writing: A Prolegomenon to the Era of AI **15**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Roundtable 3 **19**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Roundtable 6 **20**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Single Paper Session 12 **21**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Single Paper Session 14 **24**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Single Paper Session 27 **26**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Single Paper Session 6 **29**
- 14:00 - 15:30 – IN RESPECT OF WRITING: ETHICAL AND LEGAL CHALLENGES ACROSS WRITING SUPPORTS **32**
- 14:00 - 15:30 – Roundtable 2 **36**
- 14:00 - 15:30 – Roundtable 7 **37**
- 14:00 - 15:30 – Single Paper Session 10 **38**
- 14:00 - 15:30 – Single Paper Session 13 **41**
- 14:00 - 15:30 – Single Paper Session 22 **44**
- 14:00 - 15:30 – Single Paper Session 23 **47**
- 14:00 - 15:30 – Single Paper Session 33 **50**
- 16:00 - 17:30 – Demonstration Session 2 **53**
- 16:00 - 17:30 – Poster Presentation 2 **57**
- 16:00 - 17:30 – Poster Presentation 3 **65**
- 16:00 - 17:30 – Poster Presentation 5 **73**
- 17:45 - 18:45 – SIG Writing Business Meeting **81**

Wednesday June 3, 2026

- 09:00 - 10:30 – Roundtable 1 **84**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Roundtable 5 **85**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Single Paper Session 19 **86**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Single Paper Session 21 **89**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Single Paper Session 34 **92**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Single Paper Session 5 **95**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Single Paper Session 9 **98**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Writing process feedback **101**

- 11:00 - 12:30 – Approaches to Writing Instruction Around the World **105**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Cooperative Writing: Perspectives from Three Intervention Studies **109**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Poster Presentation 1 **113**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Poster Presentation 4 **122**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Roundtable 8 **130**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Single Paper Session 15 **131**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Single Paper Session 2 **134**
- 11:00 - 12:30 – Single Paper Session 26 **137**
- 14:00 - 15:00 – Hayes Award 2024 Lecture – Writing Fluency in the Perspective of Fluency Research **140**

Thursday June 4, 2026

- 09:00 - 10:30 – Demonstration Session 1 **144**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Single Paper Session 1 **148**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Single Paper Session 16 **151**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Single Paper Session 20 **154**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Single Paper Session 32 **157**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – Single Paper Session 4 **160**
- 09:00 - 10:30 – The future of writing education **163**
- 11:00 - 12:00 – Cognitive and Ethical Alignment of LLMs with Humans for Writing Research and Instruction **167**
- 13:30 - 15:00 – Roundtable 4 **168**
- 13:30 - 15:00 – Single Paper Session 11 **169**
- 13:30 - 15:00 – Single Paper Session 25 **172**
- 13:30 - 15:00 – Single Paper Session 29 **175**
- 13:30 - 15:00 – University students' reflections on academic writing with genAI **177**
- 15:30 - 17:00 – Single Paper Session 17 **181**
- 15:30 - 17:00 – Single Paper Session 18 **184**
- 15:30 - 17:00 – Single Paper Session 28 **187**
- 15:30 - 17:00 – Single Paper Session 30 **190**
- 15:30 - 17:00 – Single Paper Session 31 **193**
- 15:30 - 17:00 – Single Paper Session 35 **196**
- 15:30 - 17:00 – Single Paper Session 8 **199**

Author Index

201

Tuesday June 2, 2026 Schedule

Time	Session	Type	Room
08:00 - 09:00	Registration	Registration	
09:00 - 09:30	Opening Ceremony Chair: Liana Konstantinidou	Ceremony	Aula
09:30 - 10:30	Bridging Research and Classroom Practice: Improving Writing in Diverse Primary Classrooms	Keynote Presentation	Aula
10:30 - 11:00	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG
11:00 - 12:30	Accessing the Epistemological Side of Writing: A Prolegomenon to the Era of AI	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Roundtable 3	Roundtable	SM O4.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Roundtable 6	Roundtable	SM O2.24/29 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 12	Single Paper	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 14	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 27	Single Paper	SM O1.08 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 6	Single Paper	SM O3.05 (Computer Room)
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Grüner Saal
14:00 - 15:30	IN RESPECT OF WRITING: ETHICAL AND LEGAL CHALLENGES ACROSS WRITING SUPPORTS	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Roundtable 2	Roundtable	SM O2.24/29 (Lecture Room)
	Roundtable 7	Roundtable	SM O4.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 10	Single Paper	SM O3.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 13	Single Paper	SM O1.08 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 22	Single Paper	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 23	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
Single Paper Session 33	Single Paper	SM O1.20 (Lecture Room)	
15:30 - 16:00	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG

Time	Session	Type	Room
16:00 - 17:30	Demonstration Session 2	Demonstration Session	SM O2.17 (Lecture Room)
	Poster Presentation 2	Poster Presentation	SM O1 (Hallway)
	Poster Presentation 3	Poster Presentation	SM O3 (Hallway)
	Poster Presentation 5	Poster Presentation	SM O2 (Hallway)
17:45 - 18:45	SIG Writing Business Meeting	Business Meeting	SMO4.01
19:00	Welcome reception	Social Event	ZHAW

Bridging Research and Classroom Practice: Improving Writing in Diverse Primary Classrooms

Presenting author: Busse, Vera ; University of Münster; Germany.

Chair: Konstantinidou, Liana ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Primary school lays the foundation for writing development, where teachers should help students acquire strategies to produce texts independently and foster confidence and motivation in their writing. However, many teachers feel underprepared to support children's writing beyond spelling, and evidence-based practices often fail to reach the classroom. At the same time, research has shown that many primary children—particularly boys and students whose family language differs from that of instruction—struggle with text production, and writing motivation tends to decline toward the end of primary school. The keynote presents the project KommSchreib! ('Let's Write'), funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, which aimed to address these challenges by bringing evidence-based writing practices into upper primary schools (Grades 3-4). We conducted a two-group quasi-experimental study comparing a business-as-usual control group with an experimental group whose teachers participated in a multi-component professional learning intervention. The intervention focused on evidence-based writing instruction and included teaching materials designed to support student motivation and address diversity. In total, 58 teachers and their 1174 students participated. In addition to the teacher-led intervention in regular classes, project members conducted small-group afternoon writing workshops for at-risk writers with extra practice at tablets, embedded in activities connected to students' lives. We assessed writing and motivational outcomes, examined treatment fidelity measures, and conducted interviews with participating teachers. The keynote will highlight key findings, including positive effects on students' writing, explore motivational trajectories, and discuss teacher-related and institutional factors influencing the implementation of evidence-based practices in classrooms.

✉ vbusse@uni-muenster.de

Tuesday June 2, 2026 | 11:00 - 12:30

Accessing the Epistemological Side of Writing:
A Prolegomenon to the Era of AI

Symposium



Accessing the Epistemological Side of Writing: A Prolegomenon to the Era of AI

Chair: Kruse, Otto ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Organiser: Milićević, Dejana ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Discussant: Schnatz, Nina Isabella ; Zurich University of Applied Sciences (ZHAW); Switzerland.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;AI writing;corpus linguistics;Generative AI

Traditionally, the study of writing has focused on rhetorical, linguistic, cultural, social, and process-related dimensions. The epistemological side of writing, however, has been left to the disciplines as they oversee their respective fields of knowledge. Rarely do we directly consider students' conceptions of truth and their understanding of knowledge or knowing in the way William Perry (1970) has addressed it. Even if academic writing may be seen as the best way of developing epistemic consciousness, the term itself not often the focus of research, and the broad range of intellectual skills behind it remains hidden. We are aware, however, that every topical sentence demands complex judgements about its appropriateness and needs justification of its assumed truth. Such epistemic activities demand understanding of what is considered valid knowledge, how it is produced, what epistemic conventions exist, and how epistemic authority is built in a certain discipline. Beyond all this, the conception of truth is a nut that is hard to crack, not only for our students but also for philosophy. We are used to confusing our students by insisting that they rely on facts but should not believe in absolute truth. How do these two demands go together?With the inclusion of generative AI in writing processes, a new algorithmic "voice" enters the field that also requires epistemic framing. However, this voice has different qualities and shortcomings compared to human epistemological consciousness during writing. Writers must evaluate their own thoughts against the AI-generated content, which presents new challenges, particularly for beginners.This symposium introduces the concept of epistemic consciousness in writing. It presents several methodological approaches, manifested in four specific research projects, to bring to the surface epistemic processes involved in academic writing. Presenters will explain the logic of the enquiry in each project along with some initial results. We intend for the symposium to stimulate new avenues for research, contributing to the exploration of human–AI interaction in writing and thinking.
Project 1: Qualitative Interviews
Project 2: How Expert and Novice Academics Write with GenAI: Think-Aloud Protocols
Project 3: Corpus Linguistic Methods



A Direct Approach to the Study of Epistemic Decisions: Students Using AI for Thesis Writing

Presenting author: Kruse, Otto ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Miličević, Dejana ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Rapp, Christian ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;AI writing;cognitive processes;Generative AI

Understanding how students make epistemic decisions when using AI technologies for academic writing requires methodological approaches that can capture the nuanced intellectual and rhetorical processes underlying their choices. While existing research has documented patterns of AI adoption and usage frequencies, there remains a significant gap in our understanding of the detailed thinking processes that guide students' decisions about when, how, and why to incorporate AI-generated content into their scholarly work. This study addresses this methodological challenge through a qualitative interview-based approach designed to access students' reflective accounts of their AI use experiences during thesis writing. As a contribution to get methodological access to AI use, this contribution reports from a larger study including three countries (Switzerland, Romania, Bulgaria) to interview students about their experiences with AI. The cross-national design allows for comparative insights into how different educational contexts and cultural backgrounds may shape students' approaches to AI integration in academic writing. The background problem of this is that we currently have many surface descriptions about AI use, but little understanding of the finer-grained thinking moves involved. Existing survey and usage data tell us what students do with AI, but not how they think through the complex decisions about knowledge construction, source integration, and authorial voice that AI use entails. Pilot interviews have been conducted with undergraduate and graduate students currently writing their theses. The interview protocol focuses on eliciting detailed narratives about specific instances of AI use, prompting students to articulate their decision-making processes, and exploring their conceptions of authorship, originality, and epistemic development in AI-assisted writing contexts. We will describe the questions that proved to be useful and summarize our experiences with this direct way of questioning students. Key results will be presented along with recommendations for interview strategies that successfully access students' epistemic reasoning in AI-assisted thesis writing.

✉ kreo@zhaw.ch

Tuesday June 2, 2026 | 11:00 - 12:30

**Accessing the Epistemological Side of Writing:
A Prolegomenon to the Era of AI**

Single Paper

Part of the symposium: Accessing the
Epistemological Side of Writing: A Prolegomenon to
the Era of AI



Corpus Linguistic Methods

Presenting author: Osenova, Petya ; Institute of Information and Communication Technologies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences; Bulgaria.

Co-author: Chitez, Madalina ; West University of Timisoara; Romania.

Co-author: Paev, Nikolay ; Institute of Information and Communication Technologies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences; Bulgaria.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: academic writing; corpus linguistics; reading and writing; writing and linguistics

This study employs corpus linguistic methods to systematically investigate the linguistic and epistemic dimensions of academic thesis writing. Through the compilation and analysis of a specialized corpus of BA theses, the research seeks to identify patterns in how students construct knowledge claims and position themselves within their academic field. The epistemic profiles of the students will be assessed through these focused corpora of BA theses. The corpora will be compiled from successfully defended theses across pre-selected disciplines, providing a representative sample of academic writing practices. The fact that the thesis writing has been guided by academic tutors in the respective area, ensures that the analyzed texts have undergone rigorous evaluation and represent successful models of scholarly argumentation as well as sufficient knowledge presentation of the topic from a BA-level perspective. On the one hand, various linguistic indicators will be discussed with respect to their frequency, variance, and syntagmatic adequacy, such as hedges, modal expressions, markers of cohesion and coherence, linking words, references to reviewed literature, etc. The analysis will examine how these features pattern across different texts and authors, revealing underlying epistemic orientations and rhetorical strategies. Hedges and modal expressions, for instance, indicate how writers negotiate certainty and manage knowledge claims, while cohesion and coherence markers demonstrate how arguments are structured and connected throughout the overall thesis text. By analyzing frequency distributions and contextual deployment of these features, the study will identify the academic conventions and the individual variation in the epistemic positioning of the student. On the other hand, the role of language corpora will be considered for ensuring better data extraction and observation in the analytical part of the thesis. Here also the inclusion of AI as a stand-alone tool, or in combined architectures with corpus search engines will be presented. This methodological approach explores how AI technologies can enhance traditional corpus linguistic methods, potentially offering new possibilities for pattern recognition and analytical depth in examining academic discourse.

✉ petya@bultreebank.org



How Expert and Novice Academics Write with GenAI: Think-Aloud Protocols

Presenting author: Kessler, Karyn ; University of California Santa Barbara; United States.

Co-author: Anson, Chris ; North Carolina State University; United States.

Co-author: Michiels, Paul ; Carnegie Mellon University; United States.

Co-author: Rogers, Paul ; University of California, Santa Barbara; United States.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: cognitive processes;Generative AI;metacognition;protocol analysis

Two related studies aim to track the infusion of GenAI into knowledge generation and diffusion processes among expert and novice academic writers across disciplines working on authentic revision tasks in writing. The first study examines experienced academic researchers and writers from diverse disciplinary backgrounds, including humanities, social sciences, and STEM fields. Using Zoom-based think-aloud methods along with keyboard tracking, the study captures real-time data on writers' cognitive processes and writing behaviors as they interact with GenAI systems. The think-aloud protocols highlight the ways in which and the degrees to which GenAI influences experienced writers' metacognitive and revision processes, epistemic development, and agency across domains of knowledge (Tardy, 2009; Kessler et al., 2026). By focusing on authentic revision tasks rather than artificial laboratory settings, the research ensures ecological validity and provides insights into actual scholarly practices. Results indicate the ways in which today's highly effective thinkers and knowledge producers incorporate (or don't) GenAI into their research and research writing practices. In the second study, undergraduate students used ChatGPT to assist them in writing 100-word literacy narratives focusing on a specific moment in their literate history. They then revised the output based on how effectively it captured their rhetorical, stylistic, and content-related intentions. Their entire process was recorded using screencast technology as they spoke their processes aloud. After finalizing their texts, they wrote a brief reflection on the experience. This contribution will present a thematic and code-based analysis of the epistemic decisions students made in their revisions of the outputs, with implications for reforming methods for supporting writing in the age of generative AI. Taken together, the two studies reveal differences between the epistemic processes of experienced and novice writers and suggest a developmental continuum for instruction in the use of generative AI in writing tasks.

✉ kessler@linguistics.ucsb.edu

Tuesday June 2, 2026 | 11:00 - 12:30

Roundtable 3

Roundtable



Make Writing Great: Why Writing Still Matters in the Age of AI

Presenting author: Baaijen, Veerle ; CLCG University of Groningen; Netherlands.

Presenting author: Johansson, Victoria ; Kristianstad University; Sweden.

Presenting author: Van Steendam, Elke ; KU Leuven; Belgium.

Presenting author: Wengelin, Åsa ; University of Gothenburg; Sweden.

Co-author: Young, Justin ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;cognitive processes;Generative AI;writing theory

In an era dominated by artificial intelligence, the act of writing is often perceived as a skill that can be delegated to large language models (Pack & Maloney, 2023). Yet, writing remains essential for literacy development, cognitive development, and active participation in society. This roundtable invites researchers to explore why writing—also in times of generative AI – remains indispensable for fostering critical thinking, creativity, learning, and communication skills (Chang & Lee, 2025), while also discussing how writing with AI can shape our understanding of what writing is and can be, and how AI-supported writing may help struggling writers express their views in linguistic forms that would otherwise be inaccessible to them (Kasneci et al., 2023). We will discuss how writing cultivates deeper cognitive processes, such as reflection, revision, and synthesis – skills which are essential for participation in our complex literate societies. Writing empowers individuals to articulate ideas, engage in meaningful dialogue, and contribute to societal discourse. Hence, while AI tools can assist in generating and revising text, they should not replace the cognitive work of writing. Finally, this roundtable will examine the role of writing in promoting digital literacy and responsible use of AI, and suggest how writing with AI may change our theoretical descriptions of writing. Participants will share strategies for integrating writing into educational and professional settings, ensuring it remains a vital tool for cognitive and personal development. By highlighting the unique value of human writing, we aim to inspire a renewed commitment to nurturing writing as a fundamental skill in the AI age.

✉ V.M.Baaijen@rug.nl; victoria.johansson@hkr.se; elke.vansteendam@kuleuven.be; asa.wengelin@gu.se



Encoding the Writing Process: TEI Between Research and Computational Use

Presenting author: Ammari, Emna ; Aix-Marseille Université; France.

Presenting author: Bekius, Lamyk ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Presenting author: Darrak, Zahra Ed ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Presenting author: Quaranta, Jean-Marc ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: cognitive processes;Generative AI;keystroke logging data processing and analysis;writing process data collections

The Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) has long been used in digital humanities to encode manuscripts and historical documents, primarily focusing on textual products. More recently, TEI has been applied to the encoding of the writing process itself (Bekius, 2023), opening new possibilities for integrating genetic criticism, writing studies, and process-oriented research. As an open and extensible XML-based markup language, TEI is a promising candidate for encoding not only manuscripts, but also born-digital writing processes, shifting the focus from documents to writing sessions and dynamic trajectories of text production. Such an approach enables new and potential applications, including the visualization of writing dynamics (e.g. through tools such as Keystroke Loxensis (Bekius 2024) as part of the eXtant toolkit) or the creation of structured datasets for computational analysis and artificial intelligence systems. Even though TEI could ensure interoperability across projects and disciplines, its complexity and verbosity raise concerns when applied to large-scale or fine-grained writing process data, such as keystroke logs. Encoding long writing sessions at a micro-level can present problems related to elements over-lapping, as well as being time-consuming and cognitively demanding. This roundtable explores this tension by asking whether TEI can realistically function as a standard for writing process research, and under what conditions. Key questions for discussion include: Is TEI suited to represent writing dynamics captured through log files? What alternatives or hybrid solutions might exist? Can parts of the encoding process be automated? A central focus will be the selection problem: which process data is actually relevant to encode, particularly when studying creativity in writing? An additional perspective from computer science will consider whether TEI-based representations of writing processes can function as inputs for artificial agents designed to reproduce an author's writing style and creative dynamics. Bekius, Lamyk. (2023). Behind the Computer Screens: The use of keystroke logging for genetic criticism applied to born-digital works of literature. [PhD Dissertation Antwerp University & University of Amsterdam]. <https://pure.uva.nl/ws/files/139150661/thesis.pdf>. Bekius, Lamyk. (2024). 'Nanogenetic econarratology : where narratology meets keystroke logging data', in Van Hulle, Dirk (éd.), Genetic Narratology: Analysing Narrative Across Versions, Cambridge, Open book publishers, 2024. Workgroup on Genetic Editions. (2010). 'An Encoding Model for Genetic Editions'. <https://tei-c.org/Vault/TC/tcw19.html>.

✉ lamyk.bekius@uantwerpen.be; jean-marc.quaranta@univ-amu.fr; zahra.ED-DARRAK@etu.univ-amu.fr; emna.ammari@lis-lab.fr



Can Algorithm-based Feedback Help Students to Write Better? A Meta-analysis

Presenting author: Scherer, Sina Verena ; University of Münster; Germany.

Co-author: Busse, Vera ; University of Münster; Germany.

Co-author: Graham, Steve ; Arizona State University; United States.

Chair: Weth, Constanze ; Institute for Research on Multilingualism, University of Luxembourg; France.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;EFL and ESL writing;L1;meta-analysis

Against the backdrop of rapid developments of algorithm-based feedback tools - from older tools mainly providing feedback on grammar and spelling to more advanced tools based on generative artificial intelligence offering more comprehensive writing support - our meta-analysis examines to what extent algorithm-based feedback improves not only surface- (e.g., grammar and spelling) but also deep-level (e.g., structure, content, coherence) writing outcomes for different (language) learners (first, second, and foreign language learners) at secondary school and university. Algorithm-based feedback tools may be very useful for language learners as they can provide timely feedback and help with revision (Escalante et al., 2023), which can be particularly relevant for foreign language (FL) learners who often have limited contact with first language (L1) speakers outside the language classroom, as opposed to second language (L2) learners. For this meta-analysis, we reviewed experimental and quasi-experimental studies published between 2011 and the end of 2024, covering five European languages in four different databases. Results from the 33 included studies indicated that algorithm-based feedback was beneficial for improving writing in general ($g = 0.36$). Specifically, positive effects were observed for surface-level outcomes at post-test ($g = 0.31$), though no lasting effects were found at maintenance ($g = -0.02$). In contrast, deep-level writing outcomes showed sustained improvement, with positive effects both at post-test ($g = 0.31$) and maintenance ($g = 0.54$). No significant differences between secondary and university students were observed. However, L2 learners, in general, seemed to profit most from algorithm-based feedback, showing gains in surface- ($g = 0.77$, bordering on significance), and deep-level outcomes ($g = 0.46$). While no significant differences were found between the effects of specific types of algorithm-based feedback tools in moderator analyses, feedback from Grammarly and Pigai statistically enhanced students' writing but effects of ChatGPT feedback were non-significant. We discuss implications for future research and educational practice, also in light of the small transfer of learning from algorithm-based feedback to new writing tasks. References Escalante, J., Pack, A., & Barrett, A. (2023). AI-generated feedback on writing: insights into efficacy and ENL student preference. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00425-2>

✉ s_sche26@uni-muenster.de



Strong but Not Static: Reading-Writing Connections in Primary Grades

Presenting author: Kim, Young-Suk ; University of California Irvine; United States.

Chair: Weth, Constanze ; Institute for Research on Multilingualism, University of Luxembourg; France.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: developmental aspects of writing ability;L1;reading and writing;writing models

Strong but Not Static: Reading-Writing Connections in Primary Grades Aim: This study examines the relations between reading comprehension and written composition and the predictors of these relations, using longitudinal data from U.S. primary grade children. Theoretical Framework: The Interactive Literacy Model (Kim, 2020, 2025) posits that reading and writing are related through shared underlying skills (shared skills hypothesis). However, the magnitude of this relation is not fixed; rather, it varies as a function of multiple factors (dynamic relations hypothesis). We investigated three research questions: (1) What is the relation between reading comprehension and writing quality? (2) Does this relation vary by grade level (a proxy for development)? (3) What shared predictors explain reading comprehension and writing quality? Methods: We analyzed longitudinal data from 263 children across grades 1 and 2. Reading comprehension and written composition were assessed using multiple tasks. Shared predictors included oral discourse skills and lexical literacy skills (word reading and spelling), also measured by multiple tasks. Findings: Reading comprehension and writing quality were strongly related across grade levels, though the correlation was stronger in grade 1 (.81) than grade 2 (.70), supporting the dynamic relations hypothesis. Both oral discourse skills and lexical literacy skills explained the reading-writing relation. Furthermore, the relative contributions of these predictors to reading comprehension and writing quality differed between grades 1 and 2. Relevance: Writing is not an isolated skill. Many writing tasks involve reading source materials, and effective revision requires reading proficiency. Understanding the nature of reading-writing relations has important implications for both writing theory development and instructional practice. This study contributes empirical evidence for the dynamic nature of literacy connections during early development. Keywords: Reading-writing relations, shared skills, dynamic relations, interactive dynamic literacy model. References Kim, Y.-S. G. (2020). Interactive dynamic literacy model: An integrative theoretical framework for reading and writing relations. In R. Alves, T. Limpo, & M. Joshi (Eds.), *Reading-writing connections: Towards integrative literacy science* (pp. 11-34). Springer. Kim, Y.-S. G. (2025). The science of reading-writing connections. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *The Handbook of Writing Research*, 3rd Edition (pp. 109-124). Guilford Press.

✉ youngsk7@uci.edu



The linguistic impacts of generative AI on L2 writing output

Presenting author: Meier, Ramona ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Co-author: De Wilde, Vanessa ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Co-author: Macken, Lieve ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Chair: Weth, Constanze ; Institute for Research on Multilingualism, University of Luxembourg; France.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: acquisition;EFL and ESL writing;Generative AI;writing and linguistics

In recent years, research on generative AI (GenAI) and its use for language learning has proliferated, highlighting affordances of the tools, while remaining conscious of potential limitations (Warschauer et al., 2023). Previous work on the use of GenAI tools for L2 English writing has explored the roles ChatGPT can fulfil by employing mainly (quasi-)experimental designs where AI training was provided (e.g. Fang & Han, 2025). However, there is a lack of work focusing on preexisting GenAI usage patterns in EFL students and their effect on L2 writing outcomes. While previous studies focus on the role of GenAI and its potentials, the impacts of such tools on linguistic factors, specifically in synthesis writing, remain underexplored (Yoo, 2025). This study aims to broaden our understanding of students' preexisting GenAI practices and their impacts on synthesis writing. Participants in this cross-sectional study will complete a synthesis writing task twice (with and without GenAI). Screen recordings, semi-structured interviews, and measures of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) will be used to analyze their practices, engagement, and language. We expect to find improved performance on the GenAI-assisted task, potentially dependent on the methodical use of GenAI throughout the process, leading to more complex, accurate, and fluent texts. Theoretical and pedagogical implications of the study will also be discussed during the presentation. Keywords: GenAI, EFL learning, L2 writing development, CAF References Fang, S., & Han, Z. H. (2025). On the nascency of ChatGPT in foreign language teaching and learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 45, 253-273. Warschauer, M., Tseng, W., Yim, S., Webster, T., Jacob, S, Du, Q., Tate, T. (2023). The affordances and contradictions of AI-generated text for writers of English as a second or foreign language. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 62, Article 101071. Yoo J. (2025). Reading-Writing Connections: A Systematic Review of Second Language Synthesis Writing. *L2 Journal: An Open Access refereed Journal for World Language Educators*, 17(1), 1-55.

✉ Ramona.Meier@UGent.be



Evaluating Writing Quality of Engineering Student Reports using Natural Language Processing Tools

Presenting author: Rybicki, Jan-Mikael ; Aalto University; Finland.

Co-author: Mendoza, Laura ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Chair: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;assessment;EFL and ESL writing;natural language processing (NLP)

Research topic, area of investigation and aim
In higher education, writing instructors evaluate the quality of student texts and provide formative feedback on their writing. This laborious work could be supported using automatic Natural Language Processing (NLP) tools. Much research on the indices produced by NLP tools and the quality of writing has focused on essay writing. However, little research has explored report writing in science and engineering domains. To address this gap, this study investigates the association between the NLP indices and holistic human ratings of academic reports written by English as a Second Language (ESL) students in a master's level computer science course. Methodological design
Data consists of 100+ academic reports (average length approx. 2800 words, excluding references), which were evaluated by writing instructors. Multiple regression analyses were conducted to identify NLP indices that predict the holistic instructor ratings of student reports. Findings
The preliminary findings indicate that a regression model combining TAACO (Crossley et al., 2019), TAALED (Kyle et al., 2021), TAALES (Kyle et al., 2018) and TAASSC (Kyle, 2016) indices predicts nearly 45% of variance in holistic ratings. Relevance to domain of writing
The findings of this study extend earlier writing research to a new context and genre, i.e., longer engineering texts, and offers insights into the usability of NLP tools in writing instruction. References
Crossley, S. A., Kyle, K., & Dascalu, M. (2019). The Tool for the Automatic Analysis of Cohesion 2.0: Integrating Semantic Similarity and Text Overlap. *Behavioral Research Methods* 51(1), pp. 14-27. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-1142-4>
Kyle, Kristopher, "Measuring Syntactic Development in L2 Writing: Fine Grained Indices of Syntactic Complexity and Usage-Based Indices of Syntactic Sophistication." Dissertation, Georgia State University, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.57709/8501051>
Kyle, K., Crossley, S. A., & Berger, C. (2018). The Tool for the Analysis of Lexical Sophistication (TAALES): Version 2.0. *Behavior Research Methods* 50(3), pp. 1030-1046. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-017-0924-4>
Kyle, K., Crossley, S. A., & Jarvis, S. (2021). Assessing the Validity of Lexical Diversity using Direct Judgements. *Language Assessment Quarterly* 18(2), pp. 154-170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2020.1844205>

✉ jan-mikael.rybicki@aalto.fi



RATE THE RATER - Rater Agreement in English and German Text Assessments

Presenting author: Karl, Kristina ; IQS - Institut des Bundes für Qualitätssicherung im österreichischen Schulwesen; Austria.

Presenting author: Speyer, Lydia ; Institut des Bundes für Qualitätssicherung im österreichischen Schulwesen; Austria.

Co-author: Winter, Sabrina ; IQS; Austria.

Chair: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: assessment;education;EFL and ESL writing;evaluation and assessment of writing competence

Grades play a crucial role in shaping students' academic paths, influencing their self-confidence, future educational opportunities, and career prospects. Given this significance, it is essential to ensure that marking practices are fair, consistent, and reliable (Grausam, 2018; McNamara, Knoch, & Fan, 2019; Kunnan, 2000; Xi, 2010). This article investigates rater behaviour in the context of standardized competence assessment conducted by the Federal Institute for Quality Assurance in the Austrian School System (IQS) in Austrian secondary schools, focusing on the evaluation of written texts in English and German collected as part of the 2025 IKMPLUS assessments. The analysis combines evaluations of percentage agreement on multiply rated texts with statistical indices such as Cohen's Kappa and intraclass correlation to quantify consistency and detect systematic rater effects. Additionally, the study explores how demographic and professional characteristics relate to rating accuracy and rater effects. Preliminary findings reveal that rater agreement on assigned marks falls below 80% for some texts, even with structured training, detailed rating guides, and expert support. While this may appear concerning, it reflects a well-documented international challenge: writing tasks are inherently complex to assess, and inter-rater reliability often remains problematic despite analytic or holistic scoring systems (Schipolowski & Böhme, 2016; Bouwer et al., 2024). Many-facet Rasch analyses confirm persistent rater effects such as severity, leniency, and central tendency bias, which can compromise fairness (Wind & Guo, 2021; Li, 2022). Importantly, the IQS addresses these challenges proactively. The IKMPLUS framework incorporates rigorous quality assurance measures and applies statistical scaling to compensate for rater variability, ensuring that reported results remain fair and comparable across students. These high standards position Austria among systems that prioritize equity and validity in large-scale assessments. Nevertheless, the findings have implications for classroom practice. Teachers often rely on non-standardized criteria and diverse training backgrounds, which may lead to inconsistencies in everyday grading. In subjects like German and English, where written performance is central, this raises questions about the validity of marks used for high-stakes decisions. Aligning classroom assessment practices more closely with standardized approaches – through updated training, clearer rubrics, and collaborative moderation – could strengthen fairness and transparency.

✉ lydia.speyer@iqs.gv.at; kristina.karl@iqs.gv.at



Implementing AI in a multilingual newsroom: The role of ethics and creativity

Presenting author: Perrin, Daniel ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Chair: Van Waes, Luuk ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Keywords: AI writing professional writing text analysis writing in workplace settings

Based on research with Laura Delaloye, University of Lausanne & Yulia Kukles, University of Fribourg Writing tools and practices have developed together, influencing each other on material, cognitive, and social levels. In this co-evolution, the latest landmark is artificial intelligence (AI). AI has disrupted the professions focussing on text mediation, such as translation and interpreting. Now, AI is about to disrupt the professions focused on authoring text, such as journalism (Haapanen & Perrin 2024). In my presentation, I look into how a media company tackles this challenge, with a particular focus on ethics and creativity. Drawing on document analyses of guidelines for the use of AI in newsrooms and on exploratory findings from progression analyses (Perrin, 2026), I identify and systematize ethical concerns raised and creative solutions explored. Comparing our findings with those from meta-analyses of studies on AI in the newsroom (e.g., Schaetz & Schjott 2025), I locate white spots and avenues of research-based organizational development of media which aim at navigating the storm in ways considered responsible and creative by themselves and their stakeholders. Findings include a landscape of to-dos, organized into four layers of tools environments (Wasserman et al. 2009): a) instrumental – handling and understanding AI tools; b) operational – using the tools to get and have things done; c) economical – following and setting pace in competition; and d) societal – respecting and developing norms and ethics at the interfaces of the profession of journalism, text production research, and society-at-large. I conclude by highlighting some parallels between doing journalistic writing and doing research on it in an AI-shaped world. Haapanen, Lauri, & Perrin, Daniel. (2024). Embracing the unexpected. Exploring the role of serendipity in newswriting. *Discourse & Communication*, 19(1), 25–45. Perrin, Daniel. (2026). Visualising real-world writing processes with Progression Analysis. In Christophe Leblay, Gilles Caporossi, & Hakim A. Usoof (Eds.), *An introduction to data visualisation of the writing process* (pp. 178–192): Brill. Schaetz, Nadja, & Schjott, Anna. (2026). AI hype and its function. An ethnographic study of the local news AI initiative of the Associated Press. *Digital Journalism*, 14(2), 220–237. Wasserman, Jason Adam, Clair, Jeffrey Michael, & Wilson, Kenneth L. (2009). Problematics of grounded theory. *Innovations for developing an increasingly rigorous qualitative method. Qualitative Research*, 9(3), 355–381.

✉ daniel.perrin@bluewin.ch



Intercultural encounters in supervising Master Thesis Writing at a Danish Business University

Presenting author: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Co-author: Ankersborg, Vibeke ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Chair: Van Waes, Luuk ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy;
Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: academic writing;literacy;social and cultural aspects of writing;text genre

Based on hermeneutic analyses (Gadamer 1989) of 30 semi-structured qualitative research interviews with supervisors (Ankersborg 2022) and Master Thesis students (Ankersborg & Pogner 2022) we have developed a three-dimensional "vejledningsmatrix" with the interrelated dimensions of supervision models, supervisor roles, and functions of texts (Ankersborg & Pogner 2026 in prep.). This matrix serves as analytical framework for our investigation of student-centered supervision in inter-cultural encounters at a Danish Business University by focusing on experiences and expectations, which stem from non-Scandinavian educational backgrounds, in a Danish educational context. We are exploring how novices(students and/or supervisors) in the Danish educational culture (i.e., with non-Scandinavian educational backgrounds) manage student-centered supervision ('vejledning') in the context of the local Danish educational culture, when different supervision models are enacted. How do supervisors' and students' understandings of supervision enable and constrain supervision spaces when they come from different education-cultural backgrounds? Our analyses show that Danish teaching and learning philosophies are based on dialogue and equality between student/s and supervisor emphasizing student autonomy. International students' and supervisors' ability to adopt this philosophy is essential for students' learning outcome. Otherwise, differences in education-cultural backgrounds lead to misperceptions of expected behavior in the supervision spaces. Thus, the enacted supervision model has a direct impact on the role of students' texts in supervision and their ability to acquire academic literacies. Ankersborg, V. (2022). Specialevejledning fra studenter selvstændighed til vejleder diktat, Dansk Universitetspædagogisk Tidsskrift 17, 37-52. Ankersborg, V. & Pogner, K.-H. (2022). Conform, transform, resist: The Scandinavian way of Master's Thesis supervision and its contribution to acquiring research literacy and practice. In Gustafsson M. & Eriksson. A. (Eds.). Negotiating the Intersections of writing and writing Instruction (pp. 95-231). The WAC Clearinghouse / University Press of Colorado. Dysthe, O. (2006): Rettleiaren som lærar, partner eller meister? In Dysthe, O. & Samara, A. (red.): Forskningsveiledning på master- og doktorgradsnivå. Abstrakt: 228-248. Gadamer, H.-G. (1989). Truth and method. 2nd edition. London. Pogner, K.-H. & Ankersborg, V. (2014). Master's thesis students' approaches to writing at Copenhagen Business School. EARLI SIG Writing 2014 Amsterdam, research meeting presentation. Wirenfeldt Jensen, T. (2018): Det danske universitetsspeciale, Aarhus Universitetsforlag

✉ kp.msc@cbs.dk



Negotiating Authority through “Standard English”: Ideology and Voice in Multilingual Writing

Presenting author: Ansah, Alberta Dansoah Nyarko ; University of Energy and Natural Resources; Ghana.

Co-author: Giera, Winnie-Karen ; University of Potsdam; Germany.

Co-author: Lomotey, Charlotte Fofu ; University of Education Winneba; Ghana.

Chair: Van Waes, Luuk ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: academic writing;EFL and ESL writing;social and cultural aspects of writing;text analysis

The discussion section of a postgraduate thesis represents a critical rhetorical space where multilingual writers assert authority while conforming to institutional norms of “Standard English”. In spite of the increasing recognition of multilingualism in academia, multilingual postgraduate writers tend to face pressure to conform to “Standard English” norms in their theses, especially the discussion chapters as they must balance objectivity with personal voice. This constrains their ability to express authority and identity in their writing. Prior research has examined the structural and functional roles of lexical bundles; however, little attention has been paid to how these bundles reflect students’ language ideology and how such insights can inform more inclusive identity-affirming academic writing pedagogy. Through the integration of identity theory (Ivanič, 1998), translingual practice (Canagarajah, 2013), and corpus linguistic perspectives, this study examines how recurrent lexical bundles reveal the ideological pressures that shape multilingual writers’ construction of academic voice and identity. A corpus of 30 discussion chapters from postgraduate theses in social sciences was analyzed using AntConc, identifying three-to five-word bundles occurring at least five times per 100,000 words. Findings show a dominant use of impersonal and cautious bundles such as “It was found that” and “The results suggest that,” contrasted with limited but meaningful use of evaluative bundles like “In this study, we argue that.” These patterns foreground objectivity and deference to disciplinary norms, reflecting internalized ideological expectations of “Standard English” but also subtle acts of resistance where students make deliberate efforts to assert authorial stance and intellectual ownership, illustrating a complex negotiation between conformity and resistance. This study concludes that by translating these insights into supervision and writing-instruction practices, corpus-based training can incorporate into supervisor training and writing instruction to promote critical awareness of language ideology and empower students to claim voice and agency without compromising language.

✉ alberta.nyarkoansah@uenr.edu.gh



Emotions During Writing: A novel approach for understanding pausing during writing

Presenting author: Schneier, Joel ; University of Central Florida; United States.

Co-author: Myrick, Caroline ; Independent Researcher; United States.

Co-author: Outerbridge, Sierra ; University of Central Florida; United States.

Co-author: Taub, Michelle ; University of Central Florida; United States.

Co-author: Walker, LaVonda ; University of Central Florida; United States.

Chair: Jusslin, Sofia ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: keystroke logging; motivational and emotional factors in writing; pause analysis; writing processes

This study explores a novel method for understanding a writer's writing process when they are not writing through their expressions of emotion. As evidenced by keystroke log-file data (Leijten & Van Waes, 2013), writers frequently pause during writing, and the duration of these pauses may reflect linguistic and compositional fluency, as well as cognitive and/or metacognitive processes (Leijten et al., 2014). While keystroke log-file analysis offers an unobtrusive manner to collect data (Leijten & Van Waes, 2013), it is a single data channel for a multimodal phenomenon, and therefore lacks data for what happens during pausing. Combining keystroke data with other multimodal/multichannel data, i.e., think aloud protocols or eye tracking, are therefore valuable for understanding a richer picture of writing (Leijten & Van Waes, 2013). Our study suggests an additional data channel: facial expression of emotion. Per Graham (2018), emotion plays a moderating role throughout the writing process, as emotional states impact writing and writers experience emotion during writing. This study therefore examines how college-level writing students ($n=60$) expressed emotion during pauses while completing a 30-minute reflective writing task. We collected keystroke data via Inputlog and analyzed facial expression of emotion via Affectiva (iMotions, 2018). We present ongoing analyses and visualizations (e.g., see Figure 1) to demonstrate how emotions modulate writing (Graham, 2018) and evidence metacognition during writing (Hacker et al., 2009). References Graham, S. (2018). A revised writer(s)-within-community model of writing. *Educational Psychologist*, 53(4), 258-279. DOI: 10.1080/00461520.2018.1481406. Hacker, D. J., Keener, M. C. & Kircher, J. (2009). Writing Is applied metacognition. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Handbook of metacognition in education*, (pp. 154-172). Taylor & Francis. iMotions. (2018). Attention Tool (Version 7.1) [Computer software]. Boston, MA: iMotions Inc. Leijten, M., & Van Waes, L. (2013). Keystroke logging in writing research: Using Inputlog to analyze and visualize writing processes. *Written Communication*, 30(3), 358-392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088313491692>. Leijten, M., Van Waes, L., Schriver, K., & Hayes, J. R. (2014). Writing in the workplace: Constructing documents using multiple digital sources. *Journal of Writing Research*, 5(3), 285.

✉ joel.schneier@ucf.edu



Investigating Emotional Trajectories of Undergraduate Writing Students via Dynamic Time Warping

Presenting author: Outerbridge, Sierra ; University of Central Florida; United States.

Co-author: Schneier, Joel ; University of Central Florida; United States.

Co-author: Taub, Michelle ; University of Central Florida; United States.

Chair: Jusslin, Sofia ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: data visualisation;education;metacognition;motivational and emotional factors in writing

Students' emotions while writing are considered modulators of the process according to Graham's (2018) Writer(s)-within-Communities model. This model inherently addresses the community aspect of writing, as writing is impossible to enact in a vacuum, even if you are writing alone. In a study conducted in a lab setting in the United States, 60 (n=60) students spent a 30-minute session writing about their writing process, a tool utilized to help undergraduate students reflect on their writing (Downs & Wardle, 2007). To capture their emotions, we used the Affectiva module in iMotions, a software comparing their facial expressions to their own baseline at 30Hz. To investigate students' expressed emotions during their 30-minute session, we asked two research questions: (1) What are students' emotion intensities over time? (2) Do students demonstrate similar emotional trajectories during writing, even if those emotional experiences occur at different moments or rates? After averaging emotion intensities per second, we visualized emotional trajectories across and by participant(s) (Figures 1-2). Our findings demonstrate contempt with fairly high intensity when expressed, whereas anger and disgust have lower intensities, though expressed throughout the 30-minute session. Joy seems to have peaks for some participants, while fear seems to decrease in intensity over time. To analyze our second question, we utilized dynamic time warping (DTW) to investigate where the shapes of students' emotions while writing were similar across participants. The DTW-matrix suggests some participants hold similar trajectories, where the same emotions are unfolding in a similar order, but at different times or where they are unfolding in a different order, but at similar times. Exploring the shape of the temporal behavior provides insights regarding how students' emotions might be unfolding over time, while also helping us interpret how writing and emotions might occur within a particular learning community. References Downs, D., & Wardle, E. (2007). Teaching about writing, righting misconceptions: (Re)envisioning "first-year composition" as "introduction to writing studies." *College Composition & Communication*, 58(4), 552–584. Graham, S. (2018). A revised Writer(s)-Within-Community model of writing. *Educational Psychologist*, 53(4), 258–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2018.1481406>

✉ sierra.outerbridge@ucf.edu



The role of motivation on acquisition of writing competence on Primary Education.

Presenting author: Díaz-Burgos, Alberto ; University of León, Spain; Spain.

Co-author: Cao, Yucheng ; Middle Tennessee State University; United States.

Co-author: Diez, Laura Algorri ; Universidad de Leon; Spain.

Co-author: Fidalgo, Raquel ; University of León, Spain; Spain.

Co-author: Graham, Steve ; Arizona State University; United States.

Co-author: Robledo, Patricia ; University of León; Spain.

Chair: Jusslin, Sofia ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: evaluation and assessment of writing competence;handwriting;motivational and emotional factors in writing;spelling issues

Theoretical models of writing identify motivation as a key component in learning to write. Within this framework, motives for writing constitute a central motivational belief, as they reflect the reasons that drive students to engage in writing tasks and have been linked to text quality and productivity. However, compared to other motivational constructs more extensively examined in writing research such as attitudes, self-efficacy, or goal orientations, motives for writing remain a relatively underexplored dimension, particularly in primary education (Camacho et al., 2021). This study examines developmental changes in motives for writing among 844 Spanish students from Grades 3 to 6 (8–13 years old) and explores the relationship between writing motives and writing performance. Participants completed the Writing Motivation Questionnaire (Graham et al., 2022), which assesses intrinsic motives (curiosity, involvement), extrinsic motives (grades, competence, social recognition), and self-regulation motives (emotional regulation, boredom relief). Writing performance was evaluated through a narrative task scored in terms of text quality, structure, productivity, spelling, and handwriting. Data coding and analysis are currently in progress, and the results will be presented at the conference. The study is expected to contribute to a better understanding of how motives for writing relate to students' written performance in upper primary education, helping to identify potential critical periods in the development of writing motivation and to explore gender differences, with implications for writing instruction. This research is part of a project funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation and the European Union (ref. PID2021-124011NB-I00).Camacho, A., Alves, R. A., & Boscolo, P. (2021). Writing motivation in school: A systematic review of empirical research in the early twenty-first century. *Educational psychology review*, 33(1), 213-247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09530-4> Graham, S., Harbaugh-Schattenkirk, A. G., Aitken, A., Harris, K. R., Ng, C., Ray, A., Wilson, J. M., Wdowin, J. (2022). Writing motivation questionnaire: validation and application as a formative assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 29(2), 238–261.<https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2022.2080178>

✉ adiab@unileon.es



In Respect of Writing: Ethical and Legal Challenges Across Writing Supports

Chair: Leblay, Christophe ; University of Turku, School of Languages and Translation studies; Finland.

Organiser: Delannoy, Léa ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Discussant: Barbier, Marie-Laure ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: handwriting;keystroke logging data processing and analysis;open source and open access;writing and literature

Ethical and legal questions related to writing have gained renewed importance in contemporary context. As writing supports diversify, from traditional handwriting to the latest digital environments, the conditions under which texts are produced, shared and interpreted are also profoundly transformed. The symposium In Respect of Writing: Ethical and Legal Challenges Across Writing Supports invites reflection on how each writing supports engages specific forms of responsibility, protection and respect toward writers and their texts. This symposium brings these issues into perspective by bringing four proposals from three different countries: France Belgium and Finland, each with own legal framework, thus opening up a space for comparative and international analysis of the ethical and legal challenges that currently shape writing practices. The presentation address respectively, the relationship between authors and artificial intelligence through the analysis of writing processes (Author and artificial intelligence: The challenges of process analysis for ai-assisted writing support), the identification of privacy-sensitive content in born-digital archival materials in Flanders (How many needles are there in the haystack? Identifying privacy-sensitive content in born-digital archival materials in Flanders), issues of digital forensics and research permissions in the study of born-digital manuscripts (Digital forensics and research permissions in the study of born-digital manuscripts), and the ethical and legal questions raised by the study of writing processes in analogue manuscripts in Finland (Ethical and legal questions and the study of the writing processes of analogue manuscripts in Finland).ReferencesBekius, L. 2023. 'Behind the computer screens': the use of keystroke logging for genetic criticism applied to born-digital works of literature. University of Amsterdam and University of Antwerp. Thesis,330 p.<https://repository.uantwerpen.be/docstore/d:irua:19149Buschenhenke>, Floor, Rianne Conijn and Luuk Van Waes. "Measuring non-linearity of multi-session writing processes". Reading and Writing. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-023-10449-9>Karhu, Hanna (Accepted/In press): Use of Folklore in a Writing Process of Poetry: Rewritings of Folk Songs and References to Oral Poetry in Otto Manninen's Early Manuscripts. In Genetic Criticism in Motion: New Perspectives on Manuscript Studies. Edited by Sakari Katajamäki and Veijo Pulkkinen. Associate Editor, Tommi Dunderlin. Studia Fennica Litteraria. Finnish Literature Society, Helsinki, 155-174.Pulkkinen, V. (2020). The Diary, the Typewriter and Representative Reality in the Genesis of Juha Mannerkorpi's Päivänsinet. European Journal of Life Writing, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.21827/ejw.9.35712>

Tuesday June 2, 2026 | 14:00 - 15:30

**IN RESPECT OF WRITING: ETHICAL AND
LEGAL CHALLENGES ACROSS WRITING
SUPPORTS**

Single Paper

Part of the symposium: In Respect of Writing: Ethical
and Legal Challenges Across Writing Supports



Authors and AI: the challenges of process analysis for AI- assisted writing support

Presenting author: Quaranta, Jean-Marc ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Co-author: Darrak, Zahra Ed ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Co-author: Delannoy, Léa ; Aix Marseille University; France.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language
Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: creative writing;handwriting;L1;writing and literature

In a context where the figure of the writer seems to be increasingly challenged by the expansion of artificial intelligence, the Cré@lame projet aims to draw on the study of writers' draft (Proust, Fournier, Rivière, Giono, etc.) and contemporary writing practices. To this end, it aims to collect data and will enable language models to be supplemented with real writing models based on the creative processes themselves. The aim is to model these processes in order to increase the creative potential of generative artificial intelligence (Quaranta, 2025). This paper will analyse the various problems raised by such research, based on the reactions and authors' responses to the proposal to participate. The first is consent of authors or their rights holders to the recorded processes, an issue already addressed by Buschenhenke (2025). However, the use of processes by LLMs raises this question in a new and more urgent way. In a context where LLMs are rightly accused of plundering texts in disregard of copyright law, this paper will examine the ethical issues confronting researchers and professionals, particularly those related to the RGPD and moral rights, which are particularly important in French copyright law. Based on a qualitative approach drawing on feedback and concrete cases, it will propose ways of developing writing systems that integrate artificial intelligence in a respectful and transparent way that meets authors' expectations. RéférencesBuschenhenke, F. (2025). Entering stories. Decoding born-digital fiction writing through keystroke logging. [Thèse de Doctorat Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis (ASCA)] Quaranta, J-M. 2025, « Intelligence artificielle et création littéraire : expériences et perspectives », Interfaces numériques, 14, <https://doi.org/10.25965/interfaces-numeriques.5440>.

✉ jean-marc.quaranta@univ-amu.fr



Ethics and Access: Investigating Writing Processes from Manuscripts in Finland

Presenting author: Karhu, Hanna ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Presenting author: Pulkkinen, Veijo ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: handwriting;keystroke logging data processing and analysis;open source and open access;writing and literature

Although not always immediately visible in research, ethical and legal challenges have long shaped genetic criticism in relation to the use of archival materials. In Finland, different memory organizations have followed varying practices regarding what must be considered when providing source materials for genetic research. Ethical issues are intrinsic to archival research (McKee & Porter 2012), as scholars may sometimes need to work with materials in ways that do not fully align with an author's expressed wishes or that reveal aspects of the writing process not originally intended for public view, even though research needs do not always align clearly with the author's or donor's intentions. Born-digital materials, such as authors' floppy disks and hard drives, have brought these questions into focus in new ways. In particular, the use of digital forensic methods and tools that allow the recovery of deleted files and file fragments raises issues of privacy, consent, and legality, which can complicate research. Archives thus play a crucial gatekeeping role, balancing donor privacy with scholarly accessibility. This makes it essential that archiving practices are grounded in a nuanced understanding of the specific nature of born-digital materials. At the same time, it is not always obvious how research needs relate to the wishes and intentions of donors or creators, or how these relationships should be interpreted in different research contexts. (Carroll et al., 2011, 67–68; Kirschenbaum, Ovenden and Redwine 2010, 46–47, 51, 56.) In our presentation, we examine ethical and legal issues related to the study of both archival and born-digital writing processes in the Finnish context. We ask to what extent ethical considerations have been systematically addressed by researchers and memory organizations in relation to archival materials, and how gaps or inconsistencies in these practices may partly shape the challenges now encountered in research on born-digital materials. Carroll, Laura, Erika Farr, Peter Hornsby and Ben Ranker. 2011. A comprehensive approach to born-digital archives. *Archivaria* 72: 61–92. <https://archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/13360> Kirschenbaum, Matthew, Richard Ovenden and Gabriela Redwine. 2010. Digital Forensics and Born-Digital Content in Cultural Heritage Collections. Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) Reports 149. <https://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub149>

✉ veijo.pulkkinen@helsinki.fi; hanna.karhu@helsinki.fi

Tuesday June 2, 2026 | 14:00 - 15:30

**IN RESPECT OF WRITING: ETHICAL AND
LEGAL CHALLENGES ACROSS WRITING
SUPPORTS**

Single Paper

Part of the symposium: In Respect of Writing: Ethical
and Legal Challenges Across Writing Supports



How many needles are in the haystack? Privacy-sensitive content in born-digital archives in Flanders

Presenting author: Bekius, Lamyk ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Co-author: Van Ongeval, Isabelle ; Letterenhuis; Belgium.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods,
Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: creative writing;keystroke logging data processing and analysis;L1;writing and literature

Computers have been a widespread writing technology since the popularisation of the word processor in the early 1980s, and digital materiality is now entering (literary) archival institutions, through donations or pre-custodial cloud-based preservation. This is also reflected in the collection of the Letterenhuis in Antwerp, Belgium, which preserves the literary heritage of Flanders. Its born-digital collection has grown to include 1643 3" and 3.5" disks, 369 5.25" disks, 1600 CDs and DVDs, 4 lomega disks, 22 hard disks, and 30 digital, cloudbased transfers, including websites and socials. In addition, the poet Maud Vanhauwaert logged the writing process of a poem with a keystroke logger for one of the Letterenhuis' exhibitions. These born-digital collections, including the keystroke logging data, offer many opportunities for analysing writing processes – such as within the field of genetic criticism – but also pose challenges as the contents conflate the professional and personal sphere, such as password information or private communication within the keystroke data, or private files saved among different versions of a text. This means that private and sensitive information has to be identified to prevent unethical violations of privacy (Jaillant 2022). While this is also true for paper archives, the nature of the digital content makes it harder to identify and makes the risk of (ab)use of data outside of a research context less manageable. In this presentation, we will reflect on managing privacy concerns in born-digital archives, considering both archival and research perspectives. This includes the efforts done by the Letterenhuis to make the born-digital collection available for researchers while ensuring the privacy of the creator, the researchers' experience of working with the born-digital material and keystroke logging data, and how the collaboration between archivists and researchers – and to some extent the creator – can enhance archival workflows for acquiring, describing and unlocking born-digital archives for research. References Jaillant, L. "How can we make born-digital and digitised archives more accessible? Identifying obstacles and solutions." Arch Sci 22 (2022): 417-36.

✉ lamyk.bekius@uantwerpen.be



Tracing Reading–Writing Processes in Swedish and Math Classrooms; a longitudinal study

Presenting author: Johansson, Baran ; Lund University; Sweden.

Co-author: Rijlaarsdam, Gert ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition

Keywords: cognitive processes;L1;L2;reading and writing

Tracing Reading–Writing Processes in Swedish and Math Classrooms; a longitudinal study The project intends to study the reading and writing processes that underpin academic success in two core subjects: Swedish and mathematics. In a longitudinal design it investigates (a) to what extent these processes are subject-specific or shared across subjects, (b) how they develop from Grades 7–9 among L1 and L2 students, and (c) which process characteristics best predict performance within and across subjects over time. We use Hayes' model (2012) as a cross-domain problem-solving framework to compare Swedish reading–writing tasks and mathematical reasoning in writing. Drawing on a sample of 150 students followed from Grade 7 to Grade 9, the study combines six waves of curriculum-aligned tasks in Swedish and mathematics with fine-grained process data. Keystroke logging (Inputlog) is used to capture pausing, revision, source use and text production dynamics as students read, plan, write and solve problems on computer-based tasks (Vandermeulen et al., 2023). These traces are linked to concurrent and later measures of task performance and school achievement to model growth and change. The roundtable invites participants to think with us about issues on task design and measurement questions that are crucial for moving the study forward: (1) which framework(s) for task classification are suitable for selecting and structuring tasks in Swedish and mathematics in terms of constituting processes following Hayes 2012? (2) provided the tasks we will bring to the round table and show for mathematics, to what extent do you think these articulate writing; do we need to re-vise these? (3) which process indicators (number and distribution of pauses, revision, switches between reading and writing, fluency) would you propose for capturing the process of mathematical reasoning in writing? References Hayes, J. R. (2012). Modeling and remodeling writing. *Written communication*, 29(3), 369–388. Vandermeulen, N., Van Steendam, E., De Maeyer, S., & Rijlaarsdam, G. (2023). Writing process feedback based on keystroke logging and comparison with examples: Effects on the quality and process of synthesis texts. *Written Communication*, 40(1), 90–144.

✉ baran.johansson@gmail.com

Tuesday June 2, 2026 | 14:00 - 15:30

Roundtable 7

Roundtable



AI and Students' Academic Writing of Theses – Independent Work in Teacher Education

Presenting author: Blomqvist, Per ; Stockholm University; Sweden.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;assessment;Generative AI;writing processes

AI and Students' Academic Writing of Theses – Independent Work in Teacher Education Generative AI is transforming the conditions for teaching and assessing students' academic writing. This is particularly relevant for various types of theses that are written over extended periods, where students are expected to develop independence as well as abilities in analytical, creative, and critical thinking (Magnusson & Zackariasson, 2019). Since the spring of 2025, a research and development project has been underway at Stockholm University within the primary teacher education program. The project aims to test and evaluate new methods and approaches for mentoring, teaching, and assessing students' academic writing in the course on Independent Work, with regard to the use of generative AI. The questions that the project seeks to answer are: How and in which parts of the writing process can AI tools be beneficial in developing students' independence and capacities for analytical, creative, and critical thinking? How and in which parts of the writing process can AI tools pose obstacles to developing these abilities? How does students' use of AI affect the ability of supervisors, teachers, and examiners to assess students' knowledge and skills in relation to the expected learning outcomes of the courses? The project involves five researchers from the Department of Teaching and Learning, along with approximately 120 students who are writing their theses in pairs over a ten-week period. In the project, teacher-produced educational materials, such as lesson plans and instructions, as well as students' formal and informal writing, including work logs, drafts, and evaluations, are documented. This documentation is utilized to illuminate changes in writing assignments, namely teachers' planning, implementation, and evaluation of teaching and assessment, in relation to students' opportunities to develop their academic writing, focusing on their ability for independent analytical and critical thinking in the context of generative AI use. During the roundtable discussions, I aim to explore these questions with other researchers and educators. The roundtable will begin with a presentation of the questions posed by the project and the actions taken in relation to them.

✉ per.blomqvist@su.se



Effort, Agency, and Authorship in AI-Assisted Writing: Revisiting Flower & Hayes' Model

Presenting author: Büttgen, Katrin ; Zuyd University of Applied Sciences; Netherlands.

Co-author: Gruwel, Saskia Brand - ; Maastricht University; Netherlands.

Co-author: Pluymaekers, Mark ; Zuyd University of Applied Sciences; Netherlands.

Chair: Conijn, Rianne ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;cognitive processes;pedagogy and instruction;writing tools and writing technology

Effort, Agency, and Authorship in AI-Assisted Writing: Revisiting Flower & Hayes' Model
Generative AI tools are reshaping the cognitive and rhetorical processes of writing. This study re-examines Flower and Hayes' (1980) model of planning, translating, and revising through the lens of AI-assisted composition. Drawing on Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller et al., 2011) and frameworks of writer identity (Ivanič, 1998; Hyland, 2002), it investigates how AI intervention influences students' perceived effort, agency, and authorship during academic writing. Unlike earlier work that conceptualised human–AI co-writing in general terms, this study provides phase-specific, empirical evidence of how effort, agency, and authorship shift across planning, translating, and revising – linking perceived ease to observed shifts in germane effort and agency. Eighty student reflections formed the primary dataset. From these, fifteen students were purposively sampled for semi-structured interviews, with a pre-specified saturation stopping rule. A small exploratory sub-sample will complete concurrent think-alouds to trace process-level decisions. This triangulation captured cognitive, experiential, and interpretive dimensions of the writing process. Thematic analysis traces how students negotiate agency and authorship across recursive phases of writing – delegating cognitive effort to the tool in some moments while reclaiming control over content and phrasing in others. Preliminary findings suggest that perceived ease may conceal a shift in cognitive engagement: when writing feels effortless, germane effort in idea development and revision is displaced to the tool. This cognitive offloading alters agency, shifting it from intentional decision-making to editorial supervision, while moments of reflective intervention reveal emerging co-agency and rhetorical awareness. The paper argues that AI does not erase authorship but redistributes it across human–machine collaboration, offering phase-specific insights to inform pedagogy that maintains germane effort and cultivates deliberate authorial agency.

✉ katrin.buttgen@zuyd.nl



Navigating the double bind: how AI reshapes financial analysts' writing practices

Presenting author: Whitehouse, Marlies ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Chair: Conijn, Rianne ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;professional writing;text analysis;writing in workplace settings

Financial analysts are hired and paid to develop, explain and publish a point of view and a stance on matters in the financial markets. In doing so, financial analysts are in a double-bind situation: on the one hand, their forecast accuracy is factored into their financial compensation; on the other hand, reliable forecasts are never possible given the volatility and unpredictability of the financial markets (Arnold et al., 2025; Whitehouse, 2023). These circumstances encourage strategic recommendations that are written in such a way that they are always somehow true (Palmieri & Mazzali-Lurati, 2021). The double-bind situation of financial analysts is one of the main reasons why investment recommendations are difficult to understand by the addressees. With the emergence of AI, financial analysts are increasingly using AI tools to write their investment recommendations. This raises questions about the role of these emerging technologies in financial communication in general and, more specifically, how they affect the intelligibility of financial analysts' text products. In my presentation, I introduce the double-bind situation of financial analysts and its implications for financial communication (part 1). Based on interviews with financial analysts and a corpus of investment recommendations from Swiss banks (part 2), I use pragmatic text analysis (part 3) to examine how the use of AI writing tools in financial communication affects the strategic recommendations in financial analysts' text products (part 4). Finally, I discuss the implications of this development for the double-bind situation of financial analysts, for financial communication in general, and for society at large (part 5). Arnold, T., Roth, S., & Kleve, H. (2025). Double binds in dialogue: unraveling paradoxical communication in business families and family businesses. *Management Review*(36). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31083/MRev39358>Palmieri, R., & Mazzali-Lurati, S. (2021). Strategic communication with multiple audiences: polyphony, text stakeholders and argumentation. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2021.1887873>Whitehouse, M. (2023). Transdisciplinarity in Financial Communication. Palgrave MacMillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-29115-9>

✉ marlies.whitehouse@bluewin.ch



Writing with AI in Multilingual Classrooms: Translanguaging and Teacher–Student Perspectives

Presenting author: Rakedzon, Tzipora ; Technion - Israel Institute of Technology; Israel.

Co-author: Jaber, Amani ; Technion - Israel Institute of Technology; Israel.

Chair: Conijn, Rianne ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;case study;pedagogy and instruction;social and cultural aspects of writing

Writing with AI in Multilingual Classrooms: Translanguaging and Teacher–Student PerspectivesThe rapid integration of generative AI tools into classrooms is transforming how students search, learn, and write in the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom, particularly in multilingual contexts where language choice shapes access and outcomes (Moorhouse et al., 2024; Yang & Lin, 2025). Yet little is known about how AI-mediated writing practices unfold in multilingual, multicultural school settings, or how such practices should inform writing pedagogy and assessment. This study investigates how Arab and Jewish Israeli secondary-school English teachers and their students use generative AI in English-language classroom writing tasks, and how multilingual language practices shape this use. We examine how learners draw on Hebrew, Arabic, and English when prompting AI, and how teachers and students perceive the usefulness and limitations of AI tools for writing. By analyzing language choice, perceptions, and writing in AI-mediated tasks, the study explores the intersection of translanguaging in EFL classrooms and critical digital literacy (Canagarajah, 2013; Pangrazio & Sefton-Green, 2021; Tzirides, 2024).Situated within a larger mixed-methods project in EFL classrooms in 6 Arab and Jewish high schools, the presentation reports on: (1) patterns of students' translanguaging and multilingual prompting; (2) students' AI-supported writing products, and (3) teachers' and students' perceptions of AI's role and limitations in EFL learning and writing (Wang, 2024; Xiao, Yi, & Akhter, 2024). The research design includes the analysis of teacher and student surveys and semi-structured interviews; students' AI-mediated writing tasks; students' reflection writing tasks on insights into AI-mediated writing; and the collection of prompts and writing artifacts. A central focus of the study is how generative AI reshapes learning and writing processes and influences students' experiences, strategies, and language choice. The analysis also investigates teachers' perspectives and decisions regarding AI-mediated classroom use and identifies their professional development needs in integrating AI ethically and pedagogically. The study further explores how AI-supported writing tasks shift classroom norms of drafting, revision, and the use of multilingual resources, and offers recommendations for AI-integrated writing instruction and assessment.

✉ hutzipi@technion.ac.il



Development and Initial Validation of the Word-Processing Assessment for Elementary-School

Presenting author: Weintraub, Naomi ; Hebrew University of Jerusalem; Israel.

Co-author: Gahshan, Nagham ; The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.; Israel.

Chair: Rønneberg, Vibeke ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: assessment;education;writing instruction;writing skills

This presentation describes the development and initial validation of the Word-Processing Assessment for Elementary-School (WoPA-E)- Grades 2-4. Theoretical framework Although word-processing (WP) is commonly required in elementary-schools¹, structured instruction in WP skills is frequently absent, which may impact writing performance. Moreover, no valid assessments targeting WP skills in elementary-school students appear to exist. The WoPA-E was developed to fill this gap, drawing on the International Study of Computer and Information Literacy¹, and the digital-literacy curriculum of the Israeli Ministry of Education². Methodology and Results The WoPA-E was designed as both diagnostic- and formative-type assessments for Grades 2-4. A list of 25 commands was generated, encompassing two components: Document Management (e.g., open/save a document), and Editing (e.g., change font/size). Commands are scored as '0'-unable, or '1'-able to perform. Ethical approval and participants' consent were obtained. Content validity was assessed by 9 experts/judges using a Table of Specification. Each command achieved over 70% agreement on classification (Management or Editing). Internal consistency (n=51, Grade 4 students) indicated medium-high reliability. Construct validity was established through known-group (Gender) differences, showing, as expected³, no significant differences. Additionally, the WoPA-E demonstrated sensitivity to change; participants showed a significant improvement from pre- to posttest following instruction. Conclusions and relevance The WopA-E shows promise as a tool for assessing WP skills among elementary-school students, offering valuable insight for designing WP targeted instruction. However, these results are preliminary, warranting further research. Keywords Computer literacy, Computer skills, Elementary school, Word processing References 1. Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Schulz, W., Friedman, T., & Gebhardt, E. (2014). Preparing for life in a digital age: The IEA International Computer and Information Literacy Study international report (p. 308). Springer Nature. 2. Ministry of Education, Israel. (2017). ICILS in prompting language objectives, <https://meyda.education.gov.il/files/Yesodi/ivrit/meyomanot.pdf> <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904116672468> 3. Qazi, A., Hasan, N., Abayomi-Alli, O., Hardaker, G., Scherer, R., Sarker, Y., Kumar, S.K., & Maitama, J.Z. (2022). Gender differences in information and communication technology use & skills: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Education and Information Technologies, 27(3), 4225-4258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10775-x>

✉ naomiweintraub@gmail.com



Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write: What have we learned from 20 years of research?

Presenting author: Jeffery, Jill ; Leiden University Centre for Linguistics; Netherlands.

Co-author: Sturk, Erika ; Umeå University; Sweden.

Chair: Rønneberg, Vibeke ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: education; pedagogy and instruction; writing instruction; writing theory

Ivanič's discourses of writing and learning to write (DoW) (2004; 2017) framework proposes seven categories representing how writing has been conceptualised in composition theory and research. The framework, which Ivanič conceived of as an analytic tool, has been applied over the past two decades to analyses of writing curricula and pedagogy across educational levels and geographic regions. Given its broad applicability as a coherent framework that encompasses diverse perspectives on writing as well as its adaptability to unique educational contexts (e.g., in Canada, Peterson, 2012), DoW has been particularly useful as a conceptual basis for comparative research in writing curriculum studies (e.g., for cross-national comparison, Peterson et al., 2018). To provide an overview of the outcomes of this research and to propose how the framework might be modified for writing studies moving forward, we present a systematic, comparative review of DoW literature published in English or Scandinavian languages since the framework's initial publication in 2004 (N=46 studies). We asked: 1) What is the focus of this research in terms of geographic region, education level, and educational perspective? 2) Which DoWs are most and least represented in research findings, and 3) Which DoWs are not included in the framework but are identified as possible additions or adaptations? Results show that the bulk of corpus studies were situated in North America and Europe; and that the research most often focussed on the written curriculum (e.g., official curriculum documents) followed by the planned and/or enacted curriculum (classroom instruction), while the curriculum as experienced by students was the focus of only one study. We found that genre, process, and skills discourses were most strongly represented in findings, while sociopolitical and thinking discourses were rarely identified as prominent. Results further suggest the influence of standards-based global policy shifts in candidates for additional DoWs, including a "market discourse" (Pulls, 2019), a "compliance discourse" (Lambirth, 2016), and a discourse positioning writing as a forced activity (Norberg, 2021). We conclude by discussing implications for the impact of writing scholarship moving forward into an age of technological disruption.

✉ j.v.jeffery@hum.leidenuniv.nl



Foundations of Early Writing: Measuring Classroom Practices that Support Writing Development

Presenting author: Bingham, Gary ; Georgia State University; United States.

Co-author: Gerde, Hope ; Texas A&M University; United States.

Chair: Rønneberg, Vibeke ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: assessment;education;pedagogy and instruction;writing instruction

Few observational measures exist for measuring how preschool teachers' instructional practices promote children's handwriting, spelling, and composing skills (Berninger & Winn, 2006). This gap may contribute to educators spending limited time writing with young children (Gerde et al., 2015) or in providing limited composing supports (Bingham et al., 2017). This study draws on cognitive early writing theoretical models (Puranik & Lonigan, 2014) and sociocultural learning theory (Vygotsky, 1985) to examine how teachers enact a variety of practices that could support children's early writing development. We employ a new observational measure to address two research questions. RQ1 = What types of writing experiences do preschool children experience? RQ2 = How are preschool writing practices predict children's early writing skills? Method A total of 723 preschool aged children (ages 3 to 5 years) from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds (55% Black, 32% Latine, 13% White), across three US states, and 198 preschool teachers participated in this study. Teachers' writing practices and supports were assessed using Writing Resources and Interactions in Teaching Environments-tWRITE (Bingham, Gerde, Bowles, 2025) in the fall and spring of the preschool year. Preschoolers early writing skills were measured by the Test of Early Written Language (Hresko et al., 2012). Descriptive and multivariate analyses were used to understand the predictive value of teacher writing practices on preschoolers' writing achievement, while controlling for child age and gender. Results Descriptive statistics (RQ1) reveal that preschool teachers primarily supported handwriting and spelling skills. Composing interactions supporting children's ideation and language construction attempts were infrequent. Hierarchical Linear Modeling revealed that teachers writing practices, particularly composing supports, were related to children's scores on the TEWL-3. Conclusions The TWRITE is a valid measure of preschool writing practices. Findings yield actionable insights into how teachers' writing practices shape children's early writing development. References

✉ gbingham@gsu.edu



Can coherence formation and perspective-taking in writing be promoted separately and successfully?

Presenting author: Grabowski, Joachim ; Leibniz University; Germany.

Chair: Vandermeulen, Nina ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: cognitive processes;instructional design in writing;intervention study;pedagogy and instruction

In addition to general cognitive and linguistic abilities (such as working memory capacity, vocabulary and reading fluency), it has been shown that the components of coherence management (understanding and linguistic organization of contextual structures) and perspective-taking (being able to adopt and consider perspectives other than one's own) predict the quality of written texts (of different genres) and should therefore be taken into account accordingly when promoting writing skills (Grabowski et al., 2018). The present intervention study (pre-post design) aimed at determining whether the skill components of coherence management and perspective taking can be separately supported through special didactic units in fifth graders, with respect to text quality, and whether the respective focus is discriminatively reflected in the associated characteristics of the written texts. To this end, five teaching units were designed for each of the two skill components and carried out in fifth-grade secondary school classes ($n = 56$). The decisive writing task was designed and implemented in such a way that it is particularly suitable for testing the correspondence between the content to be tested and the resulting aspects of text quality. A magic trick, in which a can appears to stand on a playing card without swaying or falling, is shown on film from two perspectives: First, the trick is seen from the spectator's perspective, i.e. unexplained. The corresponding writing task is a description of the trick. Then the trick is shown from "backstage", so you can see how the trick works. The writing task corresponding to this perspective is an explanation of the trick. In addition to the basic empirical report of the study and its results (including further more direct measures of coherence and perspective-taking abilities), the presentation will primarily explain and discuss the implementation of the psychological constructs in didactic materials and the development of suitable diagnostic tasks. Grabowski, J., Mathiebe, M. Hachmeister, S. & Becker-Mrotzek, M. (2018). Teaching perspective taking and coherence generation to improve cross-genre writing skills in secondary grades: A detailed explanation of an intervention. *Journal of Writing Research*, 10, 331–356.

✉ grabowski@psychologie.uni-hannover.de



Changes in writing instruction based on a professional community: voices of Chilean teachers

Presenting author: Martínez Arce, Marcia Elena ; Universidad San Sebastián; Chile.

Co-author: Banales, Gerardo ; Universidad Andres Bello; Chile.

Co-author: Ortiz, Marcelo ; Universidad Andrés Bello; Chile.

Co-author: Torres, Maria Lidia ; Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación; Chile.

Chair: Vandermeulen, Nina ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: instructional design in writing;intervention study;pedagogy and instruction;writing instruction

This research reports on changes in narrative writing teaching practices expressed by Chilean elementary school teachers who participated in a Professional Learning Community during one school year. Theoretically, our study understands writing teaching practices situated in specific educational communities, based on the Writers in Community Model (Graham & Aitken, 2025). As an area of research, the qualitative study of changes in teaching practices in a Professional Learning Community is in line with previous research on professional development based on teaching practice (Camping, et al., 2025). A methodological design based on a case study with nine elementary school teachers who participated weekly in the professional community was adopted. To analyze changes in practices, longitudinal qualitative interviews were conducted at two points in time: during the formation of the community and at the end (Vogl, et al., 2018). The data were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clark, 2021). The results show changes in practices related to greater use of evidence-based writing teaching models, the type of activities proposed, the resources used, and the time devoted to teaching and narrative writing skills. Teachers also mention positive assessments of the Learning Community as a professional development strategy that facilitates teacher practice change. The paper concludes by mentioning implications, limitations and recommendations for future studies.

References
Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. Sage.
Camping, A., McKeown, D., Williams, M., & Harris, K. R. (2025). Professional Development in Writing Instruction. Handbook of Writing Research, (pp.340-354). Guilford.
Graham, S. & Aitken, A. (2025). The writer(s) within community model. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerlad (Eds.), Handbook of writing research (pp. 11–31). Guilford.
Vogl, S., Zartler, U., Schmidt, E.M., & Rieder, I. (2018). Developing an analytical framework for multiple perspective, qualitative longitudinal interviews (MPQLI). International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 21(2), 177-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2017.1345149>

✉ mmartinezarce@gmail.com



The Limits of Generic Academic Writing Instruction in Technical Universities

Presenting author: Addo-Danquah, Rosemary gifty ; Kumasi Technical University; Ghana.

Co-author: Giera, Winnie-Karen ; Universität Potsdam; Germany.

Co-author: Lomotey, Charlotte Fofu ; university of Education Winneba; Ghana.

Chair: Vandermeulen, Nina ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: instructional design in writing;pedagogy and instruction;text analysis;writing for specific needs

The Limits of Generic Academic Writing Instruction in Technical Universities Abstract Generic approaches to academic writing instruction continue to dominate technical universities, even though writing is increasingly recognized as a discipline-specific act of meaning-making. Although writing as a discipline-specific activity has received growing recognition, technical universities continue to rely on generic instruction that neglects the linguistic and epistemological foundations of disciplinary reasoning. As a result, students struggle to construct credible arguments and disciplinary voice within technical communication. Using a qualitative, SFL-informed genre analysis of forty undergraduate engineering and applied-science texts, the study examined how students deploy ideational, interpersonal, and textual resources to construct disciplinary meaning. The analysis examined how students organize information flow, manage stance, and deploy lexico-grammatical resources to achieve rhetorical purposes within disciplinary genres such as reports and design proposals. Attention was also given to how these linguistic choices reflect students' developing disciplinary identities. Findings reveal systematic mismatches between students' language patterns and the expected schematic structures of technical genres, revealing that generic writing instruction fails to adequately support the acquisition of discipline-specific reasoning. These results confirm that writing development is inseparable from learning to participate in disciplinary discourse communities. In response, the study designed and implemented pedagogical interventions grounded in the Teaching–Learning Cycle, emphasizing explicit modelling of disciplinary genres, collaborative text construction, and scaffolded practice integrated into content courses. Evaluation of pilot implementations through text analysis and feedback indicate improvements in students' control of genre structure and argument coherence. Based on the findings, the study advances on-going efforts to reconceptualise writing development as an integral part of the disciplinary knowledge making rather than a transferable generic skill. Keywords: SFL, Genre, Pedagogy, Disciplinary

✉ romayadan@yahoo.com



Learning to write in grade 4: Support with didactic writing tasks

Presenting author: Neumann, Astrid ; Institute for German Language and Literature Education; Germany.

Co-author: Rodust, Sönke ; Leuphana University Lueneburg; Germany.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: learning to write;speaking and writing;text linguistics;writing at school

Tasks are the didactic core of learning arrangements. For written assignments in primary school, it is particularly important to discuss solutions and approaches to solving them (Vode 2023). In written argumentation, this allows peers to be brought into the writing situation, which would otherwise be missing in a monological structure in written instruction. This makes the content and linguistic expectations transparent for all learners, which is necessary for effective feedback (Busse, V., Graham, S. & van Keer, H. 2024). School writing requires academic language which in turn must be learned in all areas. Cohesive devices are particularly challenging in this regard, as they clarify and unambiguise logical relationships within and between parts of sentences in texts (Domenech, M. & Mundt, E. 2024). These are special learning tasks for primary school students. As part of this elaboration project, the influence of oral task introduction on cohesion building in fourth-grade pupils' texts ($n = 38$) was investigated. For this purpose, the learning groups were given oral task introductions of varying scope and length for an otherwise uniform argumentative writing task. The design of the task and the task introductions were based on the principles of the task profile concept, scaffolding (Gibbons 2002) and the SRSD approach (Harris & Graham 1996). The text products were analyzed offline using a custom-made script and natural language processing via the Stanza Library of the Stanford NLP Group with regard to their cohesion devices. The evaluation of the categories (connectors; subordinate clauses per sentence; number of repeated lemmas and pronouns; overall cohesion), it was observed that students with the more comprehensive task introduction wrote significantly longer texts (mean number of words = 79.23 vs. mean number of words = 106.06 with $p = 0.022$) and, overall, used more cohesive devices per word ($p = 0.032$; Cohen's $d = -0.648$ ($H_a: \mu_1 < \mu_2$)). It is noteworthy that subordinate conjunctions and comparative particles were used more frequently by students who received the shorter introduction. For teaching practice, this means that even a structured introduction to a writing task lasting 5 to 10 minutes can have a measurable effect on students' texts.

✉ astrid.neumann@leuphana.de



The influence of early oral language on later narrative and expository writing in primary school

Presenting author: Dockrell, Julie ; Institute of Education; United Kingdom.

Co-author: Sumner, Emma ; Liverpool John Moores University; United Kingdom.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: developmental aspects of writing ability;literacy;writing at school;written language competence

Oral language underpins the development of subsequent literacy skills, yet longitudinal studies that investigate how children's oral language contributes to later writing performance are rare. Further, it remains unclear whether the influence of oral language is uniform across writing genres. The aim of this study was to examine how vocabulary, grammar, and narrative skills shape later writing development, and specifically whether oral language exerts distinct effects on narrative and expository writing. We report data following a cohort of monolingual English-speaking children (N = 62; 24 males) for four years from school entry. Oral language skills (vocabulary, grammar and narrative skills) were initially assessed at school entry (authors published). Spelling, handwriting, reading and writing were assessed 18 months later (Time 2) (authors in press). In this presentation we report on participants' writing skills assessed a further 30 months later (Time 3: final age of participants 8-10 years) using two writing tasks - one narrative and one expository prompt. Writing products were assessed for productivity, accuracy and text quality. The impact of predictive and concurrent dimensions of oral language on written compositions were examined for both writing genres. Productivity and scores of text quality were significantly higher for the narrative writing task, with large effect sizes. By contrast, no differences were found for spelling accuracy and handwriting legibility in the two writing genres. Associations between oral language measures and writing productivity and quality also differed by writing task. Clarifying the mechanisms linking early oral language to later written expression in different genres is critical for theory development and has practical relevance for classroom instruction.

✉ j.dockrell@ucl.ac.uk



Writing Quality on a LEGO-Based Procedural Writing Task: Gender Differences in Analytic Traits

Presenting author: Knoph, Rebecca ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Co-author: Hagelund, Silje ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Co-author: Torkildsen, Janne von Koss ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: education;text composition;writing at school;writing tasks

INTRODUCTION: Young writers demonstrate substantial potential for composing texts, and measures of cognitive capacity related to writing show no gender differences (Bourke & Adams, 2012). Despite this, boys often report lower motivation for school-based writing and greater difficulty with transcription and text production (Olinghouse, 2008), and girls consistently outperform boys on writing assessments (Kim, 2017). These differences may be partly genre- and topic-related, as girls more often prefer narrative texts and boys factual or expository materials (McGeown, 2016). This study therefore examined gender differences in writing quality on a hands-on procedural task designed to broaden engagement and explicitly specify audience and purpose.**METHODS:** Seventy Norwegian sixth-grade students viewed an image of a six-piece LEGO figure and wrote instructions so a peer could rebuild the figure without the image. Texts were then rated using the six subdimensions of the 6+1 Traits framework (Culham, 2003).**RESULTS:** Girls outperformed boys on all dimensions except Word Choice, with the most robust gender difference observed for Voice (Hedges' $g=0.83$). Smaller but underpowered gender differences were observed for remaining traits (0.15-0.48). All subscores were strongly correlated with total score ($rs=.67-.94$), and the correlational structure was equivalent between genders. Girls produced longer texts than boys ($d = 0.48$), and word count was moderately related to writing quality ($rs=.38-.64$). Adjusting for word count partially attenuated gender differences (38-71%), though controlling for word count may remove substantively meaningful variance, as word count likely reflects underlying differences in fluency and task engagement.**CONCLUSIONS:** Overall, gender differences in writing persisted even on the hands-on task designed to broaden engagement. Specifically, girls continued to outperform boys in expressive voice even after adjusting for word count, suggesting that while engaging task design is important, it may be insufficient to reduce gender differences in writing quality and potentially a focus on expressive voice for instruction, particularly for boys.**REFERENCES:**Bourke, L., & Adams, A.-M. (2012). *Educational and Child Psychology*, <https://doi.org/10.53841/bpsecp.2003.20.3.19>.Culham, R. (2003). Scholastic Publishing, ISBN-10: 0439280389Kim, Y.-S. G. (2017). *Reading and Writing*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-016-9719-6>.McGeown, S. P. (2016). *Journal of Research in Reading*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12055>. Olinghouse, N. G. (2008). *Reading and Writing*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-007-9062-1>.

✉ rebecca.knoph@create.uio.no



Digital writing and writing motivation

Presenting author: Keller, Franziska ; PH FHNW; Switzerland.

Presenting author: Sturm, Afra ; University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland PH (FHNW); Switzerland.

Chair: Haake, Lisa ; Institute of Educational Science, University of Münster; Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: fluency;motivational and emotional factors in writing;text composition;writing tools and writing technology

Writing is more than the ability to write a text: writing is embedded in a literacy practice, writers are part of a writing or literacy community (Graham, 2018). Digital writing platforms like myMoment (designed for grade 3 to 6) can provide students with a broader audience, strengthen their sense of ownership over their writing and increase their writing motivation. In our study, we examine how the communicative function as one form of writing motivation can be assessed, how this relates to writing competencies, and how writing motivation changes over the course of writing with myMoment. In our baseline survey with 157 students, we were able to replicate Graham et al.'s (2019) scale measuring students' attitudes toward writing, as well as seven of the eight subscales of writing motivation from Graham et al. (2022). We complemented these scales with a communication-as-writing-motivation scale, as no such measurement has yet been suggested in the research literature. Our newly developed writing motivation subscale demonstrates an internal consistency of $\alpha = 0.78$ ($n = 148$), and it correlates significantly and (predominantly) positively with writing fluency ($p < 0.001$, $r = 0.272$), as well as with narrative text quality ($p = 0.032$, non-linear relationship). The other writing motivation subscales we tested also correlate significantly with our writing performance data, but with either only writing fluency or only narrative text quality. Furthermore, we will present results on the development of this relationship between writing motivation and writing performance during the use of the digital writing platform myMoment, with a focus on struggling and advanced writers. Graham, S. (2018). A Revised Writer(s)-Within-Community Model of Writing. *Educational Psychologist*, 53(4), 258–279. Graham, S., Harris, K. R., Fishman, E. et al. (2019). Writing Skills, Knowledge, Motivation, and Strategic Behavior Predict Students' Persuasive Writing Performance in the Context of Robust Writing Instruction. *knowledge*, 24. Graham, S., Harbaugh-Schattenkirk, A. G., Aitken, A. et al. (2022). Writing motivation questionnaire: validation and application as a formative assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 29(2), 238–261.

✉ franziska.keller@fhnw.ch; afra.sturm@fhnw.ch



Speech-to-Text for Students with Dyslexia - Implications from Studies in Sweden and Switzerland

Presenting author: Bäck, Gunilla Almgren ; Linnaeus University; Sweden.

Presenting author: Keravec, Silvana Flütsch ; University of Fribourg; Switzerland.

Chair: Haake, Lisa ; University of Münster; Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: speaking and writing;text composition;writing impairment;writing tools and writing technology

Research aim Writing is a key competence for academic and professional success. However, students with dyslexia face considerable barriers in text production, as their lower-order writing skills are insufficiently automated. This paper explores whether speech-to-text technology (STT) assists students with dyslexia in text production and whether there is a transfer to other modalities. Findings from complementary studies conducted in Sweden and Switzerland are synthesized to outline benefits and challenges for educational practice. Theoretical framework The theoretical approach draws on Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 1994) and Bandura's (1997) concept of self-efficacy. STT may reduce cognitive load from lower-order writing processes, freeing resources for higher-order ones, and may strengthen self-efficacy compared to demanding writing tasks. Thus, STT may assist students with dyslexia in processes and products of text production. Methods Gunilla conducted a counterbalanced within-group study with typically developing middle school students and a multiple-baseline single-case study with students with dyslexia using STT. She also conducted a five-year follow-up interview study on experiences with assistive technologies used by students with dyslexia. Silvana conducted a quasi-experimental mixed-methods study with Grade 5 students with dyslexia. She investigated the effects of STT on text production and writing motivation and conducted interviews with teachers and specialists. Findings The present results confirm former mixed findings on the effectiveness of STT. While STT can be a helpful tool for students with dyslexia, comorbidities may require additional adjustments. Monitoring progress and providing targeted scaffolding are essential and appreciated by students and professionals. The school environment also influences successful use. Keywords Speech-to-Text; Assistive Technology; dyslexia; text production 1. References Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control. W.H. Freeman/Times Books/Henry Holt & Co. Sweller, J. (1994). Cognitive Load Theory, Learning Difficulty, and Instructional Design. *Learning and Instruction*, 4, 295–312. PII: 0959-4752(94)90003-5

✉ silvana.fluetschkeravec@unifr.ch; gunilla.almgrenback@lnu.se



Who benefits from using speech-to-text as their writing tool?

Presenting author: Wengelin, Åsa ; University of Gothenburg; Sweden.

Co-author: Kraft, Sanna ; Linnaeus University; Sweden.

Chair: Haake, Lisa ; Institute of Educational Science, University of Münster; Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: spelling issues;text composition;writing impairment;writing tools and writing technology

Writing presents significant challenges for many children, particularly those with reading and writing difficulties such as dyslexia. In addition to spelling problems, these children often produce texts of lower quality than their peers (Berninger et al., 2008; Connelly et al., 2006). These difficulties are commonly explained by cognitive bottlenecks during transcription, which place heavy demands on working memory and limit the resources available for higher-level writing processes (Berninger et al., 2002). One potential way to reduce transcription demands is the use of speech-to-text (STT) technology (Kraft, 2023; MacArthur & Cavalier, 2004; Quinlan, 2004). However, empirical knowledge of STT's effects on children's writing remains limited, particularly for languages other than English (Matre & Cameron, 2022), and it is still unclear for whom STT is most beneficial. This study examined the effects of built-in STT on writing among 57 children aged 10–12 and addressed two research questions: (a) which individual characteristics predict text quality in texts produced using STT, and (b) which children benefit most from using STT compared with typing. To address the first question, linear regression analyses examined whether working memory, reading skills, spelling skills, and expressive language skills predicted text quality in STT-produced texts. Although STT can reduce spelling demands, it may also introduce semantic inaccuracies due to misrecognition, placing additional demands on monitoring and revision. The results showed that neither working memory nor reading skills predicted text quality; only spelling and expressive language skills were significant predictors. To address the second question, participants were divided into three groups: children with both reading and spelling difficulties ($n = 15$), children with primarily spelling difficulties ($n = 16$), and children without reading and writing difficulties ($n = 16$). Texts produced using STT were compared with typed texts. Linear mixed models indicated that children with both decoding and spelling difficulties—but not those with only spelling difficulties—produced longer and higher-quality texts when using STT, even after minimal instruction. Overall, the findings suggest that STT, when combined with appropriate instructional support, can benefit some children with reading and writing difficulties, underscoring the need for further research investigating for whom it is most effective.

✉ asa.wengelin@gu.se



From Ratings to Formative Feedback: An AI-Based System for Automated Essay Scoring

Presenting author: König, Nina ; Institut für Bildungsevaluation; Switzerland.

Co-author: Berger, Stéphanie ; Institut für Bildungsevaluation; Switzerland.

Co-author: Debelak, Rudolf ; Universität Zürich; Switzerland.

Co-author: Stahlhut, Laura ; Institut für Bildungsevaluation; Switzerland.

Chair: Rybicki, Jan-Mikael ; Aalto University; Finland.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: evaluation and assessment of writing competence; feedback; Generative AI; natural language processing (NLP)

Feedback is widely recognised as one of the most powerful influences on learning, particularly in the development of writing competence. However, in everyday classroom practice, the provision of detailed and timely feedback on student texts is constrained by limited time resources. Automated essay scoring (AES) has the potential to mitigate this tension, provided that it is pedagogically sound and sensitive to the complexity of writing. This demonstration introduces an AI-based AES system developed for primary and lower secondary education. The system generates structured feedback within seconds, addressing four core dimensions of writing: content quality, coherence and cohesion, language accuracy, and stylistic appropriateness. In addition to score-based ratings across eight criteria, the system provides qualitative, dimension-specific feedback designed to support formative learning processes. The development of the system builds on a large empirical foundation of 36,739 digitised student essays that were evaluated by trained human raters. By combining large language models with targeted natural language processing techniques and educational assessment frameworks, the system aims to produce automated feedback that is more consistent, transparent, and pedagogically grounded than that of general-purpose AI applications. The demonstration briefly outlines these design principles and explains the rationale underlying the selected feedback dimensions. The demonstration then focuses on how these principles are operationalised in practice. Participants are shown how the system structures multi-dimensional feedback, generates qualitative comments from textual features, and presents feedback in an interpretable manner for educational use. Particular attention is given to interface and feedback design choices that support formative use in the classroom and clearly differentiate the system from generic AI-based writing tools. Overall, the demonstration contributes to current discussions on AI in writing education by illustrating how automated feedback systems can be designed to augment instructional practice and support learning in classroom contexts.

✉ nina.koenig@ibe-edu.ch



Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Formative Thesis Writing Assessment

Presenting author: Gautschi, Curtis ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Heierli, Jasmin ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Miličević, Dejana ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Ott, Jakob ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Rapp, Christian ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Chair: Rybicki, Jan-Mikael ; Aalto University; Finland.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;AI writing;assessment;evaluation and assessment of writing competence

The development of academic writing skills in higher education presents numerous challenges. Instructors face high workloads alongside the ongoing need to provide focused and pedagogically sound feedback. While AI tools can assist in this area, current solutions show limitations. Automated writing assessment tools tend to focus on surface-level language features (Zhao, 2025), and generative AI feedback may suffer from hallucinations, fail to address specific criteria, or lack alignment with teaching content (Gautschi, 2025). In addition, fine-tuning large language models for specialized purposes—and many paid solutions—may be cost-prohibitive. Recent developments in GenAI, particularly retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) systems, offer a promising alternative (Li et al., 2025; Swacha & Gracel, 2025). Although RAG-based architectures have been applied to academic writing support, to date they have not been applied to the specific problem of academic writing assessment for thesis writing. Existing tools such as CorpusChat (see Cheung & Crosthwaite, 2025) demonstrate RAG-based support for student writers but do not include an assessment component. To our knowledge, no existing tool integrates RAG for assessment with the goal of providing feedback aligned with instructor or writing program specifications. To address these issues, we have developed a RAG-based system for generating formative feedback. This approach allows for reduced hallucination, greater focus, and improved flexibility and control over generated feedback. Our SaaS-independent multi-chat, multi-context RAG application (Node.js server, React frontend) incorporates user and persistence management, full handling of multiple RAG document contexts, recursive splitting, vector storage (Qdrant), and query rewriting to optimize similarity searches. Local context folders include target structures for feedback, target criteria, and samples of evaluated texts. The system provides feedback based on a modified IMRD-based structure model for thesis writing. This demonstration session showcases the system's potential to promote academic writing skills in higher education, benefiting both students and lecturers through a flexible, pedagogically grounded formative feedback ecosystem.

✉ gaut@zhaw.ch



Studying writing dynamics of students of dyslexia: the DYSTRACKER setup

Presenting author: Mazur, Audrey ; Université de Lyon; France.

Co-author: Bigarnet-Bucher, Luce ; Université Lumière Lyon 2; France.

Co-author: Evain, Simon ; Sierra Neurovision Company; France.

Co-author: Moiroud, Lionel ; Sierra Neurovision Company; France.

Co-author: Quignard, Matthieu ; CNRS; France.

Co-author: Rouillard, Michaël ; Sierra Neurovision Company; France.

Chair: Rybicki, Jan-Mikael ; Aalto University; Finland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: eye tracking;handwriting;writing and linguistics;writing impairment

During this demonstration, we aim to present an innovative experimental setup for collecting both offline (linguistic choices) and real-time (online, pauses, speed, duration, etc.) data, including eye-tracking data, for the same individual during both reading and writing tasks: DYSTRACKER device (Anonymisation). This device linked to a research project with the same name is the result of a transdisciplinary collaboration implying several disciplines (psycholinguistic, linguistic, speech therapy, neuroscience, computer science and orthoptics) and a company (Sierra Neurovision, France). Sierra Neurovision designs and develops eye-trackers to improve screening for neurovisual disorders in adolescents and young adults. Obtaining all these indicators for the same person in both reading and writing was a technical and scientific challenge. Data were collected using this innovative setup, which integrates a pen tablet, an eye-tracker, and their associated software. The written data will be collected using high-resolution pen tablets (Wacom One or similar) with Eye and Pen© software (Chesnet and Alamargot, 2005). This software records writing and eye activity. For eye activity, we will use the Eya S360 eye-tracker (SIERRA Neurovision, CE standard - ISO 62471), which records and displays eye movements. We will obtain data (enabling us to analyze lexical choices (off-line analysis), real-time processes (on-line analysis - pauses, flow, revisions, etc.), including ocular data (saccades, rhythms, etc.)) from written texts and readings. As said before, the device was developed for a previous project (a pilot study funded by a laboratory of excellence and the École Normale Supérieure of Lyon). It is also fully operational and has enabled the collection of these types of data for 44 students with and without dyslexia (Mazur, Quignard and Bigarnet, accepted). This setup indeed was therefore implemented to study the impact of dyslexia/dysorthographie on the reading and writing processes of students, contributing to a better understanding of this disorder and its impact. Chesnet, D. & Alamargot, D. (2005). Analyses en temps réel des activités oculaires et graphomotrices du scripteur : intérêt du dispositif 'Eye and Pen'. *L'Année Psychologique*, 105, 477-520. This demonstration is combined with a paper submission (30645).

✉ audrey.mazur@ens-lyon.fr



The challenge of creating a coherent text: A Coherence-Focused AI Chatbot for Academic Writing

Presenting author: Rakedzon, Tzipora ; Technion - Israel Institute of Technology; Israel.

Co-author: Haddad-Najjar, Laila ; Technion - Israel Institute of Technology; Israel.

Chair: Rybicki, Jan-Mikael ; Aalto University; Finland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;AI writing;EFL and ESL writing;writing tools and writing technology

The challenge of creating a coherent text: A Coherence-Focused AI Chatbot for Academic Writing Despite growing interest in AI-supported writing instruction, relatively little is known about how interactive AI tools affect higher-order writing skills, such as textual coherence. To address this gap, we present the development of a coherence-focused feedback chatbot designed explicitly for research-based writing. The tool aims to translate writing research on cohesion and coherence into practical, real-time guidance in academic writing for students and early career academics. The tool is grounded in cohesion theory, which explains how linguistic features create unity and continuity across a text (Crossley et al., 2016; Halliday & Hasan, 2014; Morris et al., 2025). The coherence-focused chatbot was developed focusing on these cohesion theory frameworks, through iterative prompt engineering, and integrated into the free, online De-jargonizer platform (Rakedzon et al., 2017). The chatbot provides individualized, question-driven prompts that guide students in identifying aspects of coherence, such as lexical overlap across sentences/paragraphs, semantic similarity between ideas, and use of transitions. At each stage, they receive AI-generated suggestions and revise their texts across iterations. A reflection and a questionnaire on the process follow this. During the demonstration, attendees will receive an overview of the pedagogical rationale, tool development, and use in research design, followed by a demonstration of the chatbot. Participants will be invited to test the tool on their own writing samples and explore how coherence indices are employed to generate tailored feedback. The project demonstrates how research can be translated into classroom-ready practice, advancing understanding of AI's potential to support higher-order writing skills in multilingual contexts. More broadly, it highlights how coherence-aware AI tools can contribute to more inclusive, adaptive, and discipline-responsive academic writing instruction.

✉ hutzipi@technion.ac.il



Assessing Digital Multimodal Composing in L2 Writing: A Scoping Review

Presenting author: Yu, Nan ; Beijing Normal University; China.

Co-author: Lin, Dunlai ; Beijing Normal University; China.

Chair: Fürstenberg, Maurice ; Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU); Germany.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: assessment;evaluation and assessment of writing competence;multimodality;writing in a foreign or second language

AbstractThe continuous advancement of educational technologies has made digital multimodal composing (DMC) a burgeoning area of research in L2 writing. DMC refers to the design of a digital genre with the integration of multiple modes, such as text, image, sound, and gesture (Kessler, 2024). Instead of the traditional view of writing as monomodal written texts, DMC highlights the semiotic richness and technological affordance of contemporary writing practices. Despite growing pedagogical interest and positive evidence from L2 classrooms, appropriately assessing DMC products and composing processes remains a major challenge for writing teachers and researchers. While empirical and synthesis studies on DMC have proliferated within second language acquisition, the overall research landscape of DMC assessment remains underexplored. As a research synthesis approach, a scoping review can outline the status quo of an emergent topic and identify potential gaps for future research (Chong, 2025). Therefore, adopting the scoping review method and following the PRISMA guidelines, this paper selects and analyzes 30 research articles from 2005 to 2024 to map theoretical foundations, methodological approaches, and thematic trends in current DMC assessment research. Theoretically, current research mainly draws on three theories: systemic functional linguistics, multimodality theory, and multiliteracies theory. Methodologically, existing studies primarily employ the etic approach to explore key dimensions of DMC competence, as well as the data-driven approach to develop analytic rubrics for DMC products. Thematically, current scholarship focuses on construct definition and operationalization, teacher feedback literacy, and assessment tool development. Based on the identified limitations and gaps, corresponding directions for future research are put forward. This review contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of DMC assessment by synthesizing existing studies and offering practical implications for writing pedagogy and assessment. ReferencesChong, S. W. (2025). Synthesis Methods and Reporting Tool (SMART) for research syntheses in applied linguistics. *Research Synthesis in Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-22.Kessler, M. (2024). Digital multimodal composing: Connecting theory, research and practice in second language acquisition. *Multilingual Matters*.

✉ 202321100032@mail.bnu.edu.cn



Development and standardisation of a writing fluency test for grades 2 to 4

Presenting author: Linnemann, Markus ; University of Koblenz; Germany.

Presenting author: Stephany, Sabine ; Universität zu Köln; Germany.

Co-author: Griepentrog, Anne ; Mercator Institute for Literacy and Language Education, University of Cologne; Germany.

Co-author: Koch, Alina Marlene ; University of Cologne; Germany.

Co-author: Springstein, Sander ; University of Cologne; Germany.

Co-author: Vogt, Birgit ; University of Koblenz; Germany.

Chair: Fürstenberg, Maurice ; Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU); Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: evaluation and assessment of writing competence; fluency; handwriting; writing at school

An important prerequisite for developing writing competence is mastering lower-level skills, particularly writing fluency. Writing fluency comprises the automatized ability to produce legible letters, correct words, and grammatically correct sentences (transcription fluency) and locally coherent text (text generation fluency) at a reasonable pace with sustained attention (Linnemann et al. 2022). If these skills are not yet automatized, there are not enough cognitive resources available for higher order processes, such as planning the text (McCutchen 1996). Therefore, fluent writing has a negative impact on text quality. Since writing fluency is not sufficiently mastered by all students in primary and secondary education, structured and targeted promotion is particularly necessary in primary school. Such promotion and the identification of children at risk require evidence-based, standardised diagnostics. However, there is currently no standardised instrument for measuring writing fluency in German-speaking countries. Teachers are therefore largely reliant on observation. Therefore, a writing fluency test was developed that includes the sub-skills of transcription fluency and text generation fluency. The test consists of four subtasks (alphabet task, word production, sentence production, text writing about a picture story). All tasks are performed against the clock. The test measures letters and words per minute and sentences per three minutes. Item analysis of 160 subjects revealed the following reliability statistics: alphabet task ICC=.98; word production=.88; split half=.98; sentence production=.75; split half=.84. The validity was confirmed in a structural equation model (Linnemann et al. 2022). Furthermore, it was demonstrated that the resulting writing fluency dimensions correlate with construct-related variables, such as text quality ($r=.40$) or reading fluency ($r=.40$). In an ongoing study, which will complete data collection in January, the test is being standardised for primary schools with 2500 students. The poster provides insights into the theoretical background, the test tasks, and the results of the standardisation study, including cut off points for students at risk, considering variables such as multilingualism, learning disabilities and dyslexia. Linnemann, M. et al. (2022). The dimensionality of writing and reading fluency and its impact on and comprehension and composition. *JoWR*, 14(2), 185–227. McCutchen, D. (1996). A capacity theory of writing: Working memory in composition. *Educational Psychology Review*, 8, 299–325.

✉ sabine.stephany@uni-koeln.de; mlinnemann@uni-koblenz.de



Do Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency Compete? Within-Person Evidence From CBM Writing

Presenting author: Winkes, Julia ; University of Fribourg; Switzerland.

Co-author: Schaller, Pascale ; PHBern, University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Chair: Fürstenberg, Maurice ; Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU); Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: developmental aspects of writing ability;evaluation and assessment of writing competence;fluency;writing processes

Understanding how different dimensions of writing performance interact is essential for modelling developing writers' abilities. Within Curriculum-Based Measurement of Writing (CBM-W), the Complexity–Accuracy–Fluency (CAF) framework provides a multidimensional perspective on text production (Wagner et al., 2019). Building on limited-capacity views of attention, it has been argued that attention is a finite resource and that the three dimensions of CAF may compete for these resources during composition (Housen & Kuiken, 2009). Consequently, writers may allocate attention to one dimension (e.g., accuracy) at the expense of others (e.g., fluency or complexity), resulting in trade-offs in performance rather than balanced expression of all dimensions within a given writing episode (Smith et al., 2023). Such trade-offs may help explain the substantial intraindividual performance fluctuations observed across short, closely spaced writing tasks. The present study addresses this hypothesis by analyzing the dynamic interplay among the three CAF dimensions in children's CBM-writing performance. Data have been collected from students in Grade 3 and Grade 6 (N =296), who each produced five 5-minute CBM writing probes within one week. Fluency was operationalised as Total Words Written (TWW), Accuracy as the percentage of Correct Word Sequences (%CWS), and Complexity as orthographic complexity, reflecting the occurrence of advanced orthographic patterns in the child's intended text. Because each child produced several texts, observations are nested within students (Level 1: texts; Level 2: student). The planned analyses involve a multivariate multilevel path model, enabling the investigation of within-person associations among the CAF dimensions and potential variability in these relationships across students and grade levels. Central to this analysis is the question of whether changes in one dimension systematically relate to changes in the others, thereby indicating trade-offs in writers' allocation of cognitive and linguistic resources. References Housen, A., & Kuiken, F. (2009). Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency in Second Language Acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 461–473. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp048> Smith, A. R., Allen, A. A., & Alley, J. (2023). A literature synthesis of curriculum-based measurement in writing for English learners. *Psychology in the Schools*, Article pits.23121. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.23121> Wagner, K., Smith, A., Allen, A. A., McMaster, K. L., Poch, A., & Lembke, E. S. (2019). Exploration of New Complexity Metrics for Curriculum-Based Measures of Writing. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 44(4), 256–266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534508418773448>

✉ julia.winkes@unifr.ch



From fluency to quality: language proficiency and task genre in L2 process-product relations

Presenting author: Haake, Lisa ; Institute of Educational Science, University of Münster; Germany.

Chair: Fürstenberg, Maurice ; Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU); Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: fluency;keystroke logging;proficiency;writing in a foreign or second language

Writing fluency in a second language (L2) is a crucial competence in both educational and professional contexts. Yet, how language proficiency and task complexity influence the relationship between writing processes and products remains to be fully elucidated. Writing fluency describes the skill of rapidly and seamlessly converting conceptual ideas into written language, with minimal hesitation or interruption. Fluent writing skills free up cognitive resources, which can then be allocated to other attention-binding tasks within the writing process, a prerequisite for composing a high-quality text. However, disfluency can also enhance text quality, as pauses and revisions may be used to refine its language, structure, and content. Existing evidence suggests that writers' ability to produce text fluently depends on both their language proficiency and the cognitive demands of the writing task. To examine these effects, 60 students composed two texts – counterbalanced a description and an argumentation – both in English as their L2, while their writing process was recorded via keystroke logging. Participants also completed a cloze test to assess L2 proficiency and a copy task to control for typing skills. The log files were analyzed for various fluency parameters, including production rates, bursts, pauses, and revisions. The resulting texts were evaluated for overall quality, linguistic complexity, and accuracy. Multiple regression analyses revealed that writing fluency, linguistic complexity, and accuracy each significantly predicted text quality across both genres, and writing was overall more fluent in the argumentation than in the description. Moderation analyses partly supported the initial hypotheses: only among highly proficient writers did greater fluency correspond to greater lexical complexity in the argumentation. Less experienced writers had to slow down and interrupt their writing more frequently to express themselves in a lexically complex manner. In all other aspects of writing performance, higher fluency was consistently associated with better outcomes, regardless of task genre or proficiency level. Overall, the findings demonstrate that writing fluency is a key indicator of L2 writing competence, contributing to better performance across proficiency levels and task types. These results highlight the need to afford greater attention to fluency in both L2 writing research and pedagogy.

✉ lisa.haake@uni-muenster.de



Perspective taking and writing motivation on argumentative writing quality

Presenting author: Hagelund, Silje ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Co-author: Lervåg, Arne ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Co-author: Torkildsen, Janne von Koss ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Chair: Fürstenberg, Maurice ; Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU); Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: evaluation and assessment of writing competence; motivational and emotional factors in writing; writing at school; writing skills

Purpose: Argumentative writing requires writers to generate linguistically complex text while simultaneously coordinating claims and reasons to convince their audience. This coordination may depend not only on foundational reading and writing skills but also on socio-cognitive factors such as perspective-taking and writing motivation. This study examined whether writing motivation and perspective-taking predict 7th-grade argumentative writing quality after accounting for foundational language skills. Method: Participants were 200 7th-grade students participating in a longitudinal study in Norway. Measures included an argumentative writing task, self-reported perspective-taking (a subscale of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index), writing motivation (five subscales), listening comprehension (NARA-II), vocabulary (WPPSI), reading comprehension (NARA-II), word decoding (TOWRE), an adapted spelling test (Staveprøven), and a short transcription task. Argumentative texts were scored on dimensions of writing quality, namely writing conventions (WC), language complexity (LC), and argumentative skills and audience awareness (AAW). Structural equation modeling with latent variables was used to analyze the data. Results: Perspective-taking significantly predicted AAW when accounting for reading- and writing-related skills, while writing motivation showed a marginally significant association ($p = 0.050$). However, the high correlation between perspective-taking and writing motivation might indicate collinearity, which may limit estimation of each predictor's unique contribution to argumentative skills and audience awareness in argumentative writing. In addition, reading comprehension significantly predicted LC and AAW and mediated the effects of oral language on these writing outcomes. Word decoding was not a significant predictor in the full model after controlling for spelling. Spelling was positively associated with WC and LC, while transcription fluency was not a significant predictor in the model. Conclusion: These findings highlight the roles of student's capacity for perspective-taking and writing motivation in students' ability to consider an audience when writing, beyond the influence of reading- and writing-related skills. At the same time, our results underscore the central role of reading skills and spelling as a foundation for argumentative writing quality.

✉ silje.hagelund@create.uio.no



What linguistic changes occur in texts after an SRSD intervention?

Presenting author: Cutillas, Laia ; Universitat de Lleida; Spain.

Co-author: Cuberos-Vicente, Rocio ; Universidad Complutense de Madrid; Spain.

Co-author: Lamas, Elsa Liste ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Mañas-Navarrete, Iban ; Universitat de Barcelona; Spain.

Co-author: Salas, Naymé ; Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona; Spain.

Chair: Fürstenberg, Maurice ; Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU); Germany.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: evaluation and assessment of writing competence;instructional design in writing;text analysis;writing models

Teaching children to become proficient writers is a central goal of education. However, students at all educational levels often struggle with effective expression, particularly in argumentative writing (Crowhurst, 1990). Analytical genres are at the core of school and academic experiences, yet they are one of the most protracted accomplishments in text production (Berman, 2008). In the last few decades, the focus on writing instruction has shifted toward strategies that support the writing process (Salas et al., 2023). One such approach, Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD), emphasises teaching specific strategies for different stages of the writing process (Graham & Harris, 2018). Developmental studies have identified several text characteristics, such as text-embedded lexicon (lexical diversity, lexical density, word length, adjectives) and syntactic complexity (clause length, relative pronouns, discourse markers), as indicators of development and genre accuracy. This presentation outlines findings from an intervention study that taught argumentative text production, examining whether an SRSD writing intervention focused on the planning process can induce linguistic changes in argumentative texts written in Catalan by 1,021 participants from 2nd- and 4th-grade. There were two conditions: a business-as-usual control group or an SRSD opinion-essay planning intervention experimental group. Specifically, we compare seven linguistic features of a total of 1,702 texts, 888 written before (pretest) and 814 produced after (posttest) an SRSD writing intervention, to assess its short-term effectiveness. Results show significant linguistic improvements in the experimental group, including richer lexical choices and greater syntactic complexity. In contrast, the control group's texts show no such changes. These findings suggest that targeted instruction in writing processes can lead to improvements in students' language use and writing practices. References Berman, R. A. (2008). The psycholinguistics of developing text construction. *Journal of Child Language*, 35, 735-771. Crowhurst, M. (1990). Teaching and Learning the Writing of Persuasive/Argumentative Discourse. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 15(4), 348-359. Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2018). An Examination of the Design Principles Underlying a Self-Regulated Strategy Development Study. *Journal of Writing Research*, 10(2), 137-187. Salas, N., Pascual, M., Birello, M., & Cros, A. (2023). Embedding Explicit Linguistic Instruction in an SRSD Writing Intervention. *Written Communication*, 40(3), 857-891.

✉ laia.cutillas@udl.cat



Writing Fluency Always Matters, No Matter the Writing Technology

Presenting author: Furer, Yves ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Co-author: Berger, Stéphanie ; Institute for Educational Evaluation; Switzerland.

Co-author: Kolovou, Dimitra ; University of Teacher Education of the Grisons; Switzerland.

Co-author: Philipp, Maik ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Chair: Fürstenberg, Maurice ; Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU); Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: errors and error correction;fluency;handwriting;writing tools and writing technology

According to the Not-so-Simple View of Writing, transcription is a central component of writing (Ahmed et al., 2022). While the mechanical component of transcription (handwriting/typing) must be learned separately, the spelling component can be transferred from one writing technology to another. Additionally, computers offer additional support with spell checkers. However, there is a lack of studies that have examined the influence of different writing technologies in connection with spell checkers on secondary school students using a large sample size (Feng et al., 2019). The present study therefore investigates: Does the quality and fluency of students' texts differ when they write using different writing technology (handwriting / typing with and without spell checking)? Does the fluency of students' writing with different writing technologies explain differences in the quality of their texts? To answer these questions, 912 students (M = 14 years; 51% female) completed three writing tasks. The first writing task measured writing fluency. Text quality was measured with the second and third tasks (two different text types). Roughly one-third of the students wrote by hand (364), one-third wrote on a computer without spell check (301), and one-third wrote on a computer with spell check (277). Human raters and GPT-4o were used to determine text quality based on a rating scheme with four dimensions: content, coherence & consistency, language, and style. By running analyses of variance, groups differed significantly in writing fluency with less text produced by both computer groups, but not in their text quality (RQ 1). We employed regression analysis and found that writing fluency was a strong predictor of text quality irrespective of writing technology (RQ 2). Overall, our results emphasize the importance of writing fluency for writing practice in schools. Students need sufficient exercise with all writing technologies. References: Ahmed, Y., Kent, S., Cirino, P. T., & Keller-Margulis, M. (2022). The Not-So-Simple View of Writing in Struggling Readers/Writers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 38(3), 272–296. Feng, L., Lindner, A., Ji, X. R., & Malatesha Joshi, R. (2019). The roles of handwriting and keyboarding in writing: a meta-analytic review. *Reading and Writing*, 32(1), 33–63.

✉ yves.furer@phzh.ch



Writing Profiles of German-Speaking Children: A Latent Profile Analysis in Grades Three and Five

Presenting author: Berner-Nayer, Simone ; University of Fribourg; Switzerland.

Chair: Fürstenberg, Maurice ; Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU); Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: acquisition; fluency; speaking and writing; writing skills

Writing Profiles of German-Speaking Children: A Latent Profile Analysis in Grades Three and Five Children's writing performance is based on a complex interplay of cognitive, linguistic, and written language components (Philipp, 2020). Therefore it is expected that children differ in their writing skills, and no uniform construct of writing performance exists. Studies addressing these questions often group participants' performances using cluster or latent profile analyses. However, only a few such studies exist for writing, mainly from English-speaking countries, indicating that no universal writing profile exists and multiple profiles can be identified (e.g., Sandler et al., 1992; Troia et al., 2022). Compared to other domains, such as reading, research on writing remains limited (Troia et al., 2022). The present study addresses this gap in the German-speaking context. The sample comprised 514 children from Swiss German schools in grades three and five. Latent profile analyses were conducted separately for each grade to examine how many writing profiles could be identified based on phonological working memory, handwriting, spelling, linguistic knowledge, basic reading skills, writing fluency, and text quality. Four profiles emerged in both grades: weak, below-average, above-average, and competent writers. Components were aligned within profiles, with the weakest and most competent showing greater variability. These results contribute to a better understanding of individual differences in writing and provide implications for assessment and targeted support. Philipp, M. (2020). Grundlagen der effektiven Schreibdidaktik: Und der systematischen schulischen Schreibförderung (8. erweiterte Aufl.). Schneider Verlag Hohengehren GmbH. Sandler, A. D., Watson, T. E., Footo, M., Levine, M. D., Coleman, W. L. & Hooper, S. R. (1992). Neurodevelopmental Study of Writing Disorders in Middle Childhood. *Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, 13(1), 17–23. Troia, G. A., Wang, H. & Lawrence, F. R. (2022). Latent profiles of writing-related skills, knowledge, and motivation for elementary students and their relations to writing performance across multiple genres. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 71, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2022.102100>

✉ simone.berner-nayer@unifr.ch



AI and I: A rhizomatic analysis of writing processes with AI tools

Presenting author: Silverdal, Sara ; Umeå University; Sweden.

Co-author: Hermansson, Carina ; Stockholm University; Sweden.

Chair: Grabowski, Joachim ; Leibniz University; Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: creative writing;education;Generative AI;writing processes

AI and I: A rhizomatic analysis of writing processes with AI tools Sara Silverdal, Umeå University and Carina Hermansson, Stockholm University As writing practices continually co-evolve with societal and technological change, the emergence of generative AI poses new challenges and opportunities for schools and students. This paper investigates how relationships between student writers and AI technologies are enacted during the writing process, and how these relationships reshape notions of authorship, agency, and textual production. Drawing on a socio-material framework and specifically employing a rhizomatic analytic approach (Mac Lure, 2013; Alvermann 2000), the study maps the assemblages that emerge when upper-secondary students in Sweden compose short stories with access to AI tools. The empirical material consists of 24 filmed writing sessions capturing students' screens, facial expressions, and part of their intra-actions in the room. In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted with six students - one group interview with four participants and two individual interviews. The paper focuses in depth on three exemplifying student cases to trace divergent pathways of becoming-with AI during writing. Initial findings reveal markedly different orientations toward AI: one student delegates much of the writing to the AI; another engages in iterative, reciprocal intra-actions with AI; and a third takes a critical stance refusing to use AI at all. Across these cases, authorship emerges as fluid and negotiable, shaped by the dynamic entanglements between students, tools, and texts. The analysis also highlights how critical thinking and reading of the AI generated products appears as a valuable asset to be able to work with these tools and interpret their responses. The study contributes to writing research by providing an empirically grounded account of how generative AI reshapes writing processes and writer identities. For pedagogy, the findings highlight the need to equip both teachers and students with critical, transparent, and equitable practices for working with AI tools. Such preparation is essential to ensure that AI becomes a resource for inclusive learning rather than a source of stratification in students' writing development. Keywords: Writing process, creative writing, generative AI, upper secondary education

✉ sara.silverdal@umu.se



Genre awareness in Dutch L1 writing education

Presenting author: van Gulik, Jan ; University Utrecht; Netherlands.

Co-author: Bouwer, Renske ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Co-author: Evers-Vermeul, Jacqueline ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Co-author: Mantingh, Erwin ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Co-author: Stukker, Ninke ; Rijksuniversiteit Groningen; Netherlands.

Chair: Grabowski, Joachim ; Leibniz University; Germany.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: acquisition;education;L1;text genre

Genre awareness in Dutch L1 writing education Jan van Gulik, Renske Bouwer, Jacqueline Evers-Vermeul, Erwin Mantingh & Ninke Stukker Contemporary approaches to genre education often put an emphasis on genre-specific writing schemes, lists of rules that texts from a specific genre adhere to (Devitt, 2004; Johns, 2008). However, such schemes suggest to students that there is only one way to write a text. Another limitation of implementing genre education through prescriptive schemes is that students only learn to write in a limited number of genres. An alternative approach is to invest in a more general genre awareness. This provides students with a metalanguage for interpreting unfamiliar genres and variations of familiar genres (Devitt, 2004; Tardy et al., 2020). However, we know little about the extent to which genre awareness is already addressed in the current Dutch L1 curriculum. The new core objectives for Dutch, for example, seem to require more genre knowledge than before. Therefore, we examine how these core objectives and Dutch course materials for pre-vocational secondary education address genres. In this material analysis, we examined for each language domain (reading, speaking, and writing):

- which terms are used for genres (e.g., text forms and text types)
- which specific example genres (e.g., reviews) are mentioned
- which genre characteristics (e.g., content) are addressed.

Results show that both materials contain useful ingredients for fostering students' genre awareness, but that a more integrative approach is needed, as different aspects of genre theory are scattered across language domains. In the writing domain, connections between the communicative purpose and conventions of genres are addressed. However, a discussion of the communicative context of genres (e.g. relationship between language users) remains underexposed. Furthermore, the core objectives address both common, popular genres and macro-genres (such as persuasive texts), while course materials focus on the latter in the writing domain. We discuss implications for improving course materials, and for successful implementation of genre pedagogy in the Dutch context.

Bibliography
 Devitt, A. (2004). Writing Genres. Southern Illinois University Press.
 Johns, A. (2008). Genre awareness for the novice academic student: An ongoing quest. *Language Teaching*, 41(2), 235-252.
 Tardy, C. et al. (2020). Teaching and researching genre knowledge. *Written Communication*, 37(3), 287-321.

✉ j.b.vangulik@uu.nl

Tuesday June 2, 2026 | 16:00 - 17:30

Poster Presentation 3

Poster Presentation



Institutional policies on generative AI in BA thesis writing: Evidence from Romanian universities

Presenting author: Baniceru, Ana Cristina ; West University of Timisoara; Romania.

Presenting author: Doroholschi, Claudia Ioana ; West University of Timisoara, Romania; Romania.

Co-author: Chitez, Madalina ; West University of Timisoara; Romania.

Co-author: Dinca, Andreea ; West University of Timisoara; Romania.

Co-author: Rogobete, Roxana ; West University of Timisoara; Romania.

Chair: Grabowski, Joachim ; Leibniz University; Germany.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy;
Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;education;Generative AI;pedagogy and instruction

LLMs have changed educational practices in universities across the world. This impact might be even greater in the case of bachelor theses, often written by less experienced students who might need more support with writing and might resort to LLMs to provide it. Universities have responded by creating policy frameworks that set the limits of permitted and disallowed uses of generative AI (e.g., Jin et al., 2025). Not all institutions, however, have been equally quick to respond to these challenges. In Romania, many universities have preferred to wait for models of action to become available from leading international institutions or official boards and have not yet articulated clear AI-related policies, which often leaves students and supervisors without clear guidance about how AI may be used in bachelor theses. In the present study, we analyse data from questionnaires and interviews, as well as publicly available policy documents from universities in the country to answer the following questions: Do Romanian higher education institutions have AI-related policies, and when were they implemented? Do these policies include specific provisions regarding Bachelor theses? Are students and supervisors aware of the existence of such policies, and do they integrate them in their work? Our findings show that, to date, not many Romanian universities have explicit policies regarding the use of AI. When they do exist, these often include only limited sections dedicated to the use of AI and few offer practical guidance on how to use AI in an ethical manner. By contrast, respondents to the interviews and questionnaires emphasize the need for institutional policies and for a consistent approach to the use of AI tools. Finally, we problematize this tension between the expressed needs of the academic communities and what the educational system currently provides, and make recommendations for the development of practical, discipline-sensitive guidance to support students' responsible use of AI in university contexts. Jin, Y., Yan, L., Echeverria, V., Gašević, D., & Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: A global perspective of institutional adoption policies and guidelines. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100348>

✉ claudia.doroholschi@e-uvt.ro; cristina.baniceru@e-uvt.ro



Negotiating Rhetorical Traditions in Post-Communist Romania: A Collaborative Autoethnography

Presenting author: Baniceru, Ana Cristina ; West University of Timisoara; Romania.

Presenting author: Doroholschi, Claudia Ioana ; West University of Timisoara, Romania; Romania.

Presenting author: Ene, Estela ; Indiana University; United States.

Co-author: Chitez, Madalina ; West University of Timisoara; Romania.

Co-author: Dinca, Andreea ; West University of Timisoara; Romania.

Chair: Grabowski, Joachim ; Leibniz University; Germany.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: academic writing;education;EFL and ESL writing;social and cultural aspects of writing

Teaching and researching writing are situated within specific socio-economical contexts, and pedagogical decisions made by writing teachers are embedded both in diverse rhetorical traditions and broader historical, ideological and institutional structures (Street, 1995). Teachers' own literacy trajectories move across institutional, discursive and power structures, and, like their students, teachers have developed as writers by using a varied repertoire of strategies and discourses to negotiate different contexts and identities. In this study, we use collaborative autoethnography to investigate the literacy trajectories of five writing teacher-researchers. Collaborative autoethnography brings researchers together to generate, interpret, and analyze autoethnographic data (Chang et al., 2004) and thus helps access the relationship between individual experience and the broader socio-historical contexts in more depth. The participants are five Romanian-born academics with very different professional trajectories who have all studied in Romania but then worked and researched across different contexts. We worked collaboratively to generate autoethnographic data, reflecting on the most important turning points in our evolution as academic writers, researchers and teachers, and on our understanding of our positions as writing teachers and researchers within our institutions, but also within the broader international context. We next analysed the autoethnographic data, first individually and then in collective meetings, identifying commonalities and contrasts across our trajectories and identifying common themes. The themes identified speak to how we see ourselves as Romanian academics researching and teaching English in an Anglo-Centric environment, how we have adapted, adopted or transcended the multiple rhetorical traditions we have been exposed to, and how the way we negotiated these tensions shapes our teaching. Finally, we consider the broader implications of these examples of researcher-teachers' trajectories and their impact on pedagogical practice. Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F. W., & Hernandez, K.-A. C. (2016). Collaborative autoethnography. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315432137> Street, B. V. (1995). Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315844282>

✉ eene@iu.edu; claudia.doroholschi@e-uvt.ro; cristina.baniceru@e-uvt.ro



Understanding and Assessing Effective Note-Taking with a Digital Pen in Middle School

Presenting author: Gerth, Sabrina ; University College of Teacher Education Tyrol; Austria.

Chair: Grabowski, Joachim ; Leibniz University; Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: education;handwriting;pedagogy and instruction;writing skills

Handwriting requires the interaction of language, cognition, and motor skills (Odersky, 2018). Once motor skills as a lower-level process have been acquired, additional resources become available in the areas of cognition and language (Speck-Hamdan et al., 2016). These higher-level processes are for instance reflected in the quality of handwritten notes and personal thoughts. Note-taking is an effective strategy to support learning in the classroom. Different forms of handwritten notes exist: Linear notes include outlining and the sentence method (writing one sentence for each topic). Non-linear forms of notes include tables, mind maps, Cornell notes, SQ3R (Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review), and guided notes, in which students are provided with an external framework with headings, guiding questions, or important key terms. Not only is note-taking an important skill, but reviewing and learning with notes also correlates with test performance (Kiewra et al., 1991). Studies in secondary education revealed that writing speed correlates with the quality of notes (Graham et al., 1997). Writing instruction in primary education (legibility) is related to the length and quality of notes in advanced school careers (Berninger et al., 1997; Graham et al., 2000). Peverly et al. (2007) investigated which cognitive skills contribute to high-quality note-taking. The results show that writing fluency was the only predictor of the quality of the notes. We will present a project in one middle school class (n=25) over three years (start October 2025). The students use a digital pen during note-taking. The teachers will instruct different types of note-taking in class, while the researchers will evaluate the quality of notes, legibility and the performance correlation. The teachers involved in the project can enhance their professional skills by reflecting on their instructional methods in a cooperative team with the researchers. This leads to transparent lesson planning and didactic self-reflection. Additionally, we will annually conduct partially structured interviews with the students. The poster will present the research design and preliminary results of the first year.

✉ sabrina.gerth@ph-tirol.ac.at



What Does My Reader Need? Audience Awareness in Sixth-Graders' Written LEGO Instructions

Presenting author: Knoph, Rebecca ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Co-author: Hagelund, Silje ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Co-author: Torkildsen, Janne von Koss ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Chair: Grabowski, Joachim ; Leibniz University; Germany.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: education;writing at school;writing skills;writing tasks

Purpose: Audience awareness is central to effective writing, requiring writers to anticipate readers' needs and misunderstandings (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Hayes, 2012). Failures to support and consider readers have contributed to catastrophic consequences, including fatal radiation explosions linked to technical instructions that failed to anticipate user interpretation (Leveson & Turner, 1993). This study examines how Norwegian sixth-grade students demonstrate audience awareness through reader supports when writing LEGO-based procedural texts for real readers (though low-stakes), and whether these demonstrations differ by writer gender. Method: Seventy sixth-grade students wrote instructions for a specific peer to build a six-piece LEGO figure using only the written instructions, ensuring genuine communication. Three researchers independently coded texts for reader supports indicating audience awareness using a deductively-developed, inductively-refined rubric with seven categories: reader connection, adaptation, emphasis, sequential markers, figurative language, goals, and action support. Patterns of reader support use were compared by author gender using frequency counts and qualitative examples. Results: Sixth-grade writers demonstrated audience awareness in procedural writing. Sequence markers were almost always present, and action support appeared in over half of essays, whereas reader-oriented supports (e.g., reader connection and goal orientation) appeared in only about one third. Girls produced substantially more reader supports than boys, with more than four times as many reader connection instances and twice as many adaptation, action support, and goal orientation instances. Discussion: Authentic, hands-on writing tasks can elicit clear demonstrations of audience awareness through reader supports, even in relatively short procedural texts (approximately 100 words). Despite the task being designed to align with boys' LEGO-building interests and spatial reasoning strengths, girls more consistently and flexibly supported their readers. These findings suggest gender differences in how young writers conceptualize and enact audience awareness, underscoring the need for instructional approaches that explicitly support students in anticipating and responding to readers' needs. References Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Hayes, J. R. (2012). Modeling and remodeling writing. *Written Communication*, 29(3), 369–388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088312451260> Leveson, N. G., & Turner, C. S. (1993). An investigation of the Therac-25 accidents. *Computer*, 26(7), 18–41. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.1993.274940>

✉ rebecca.knoph@create.uio.no



Writing Assessment in Primary Education in Spanish-Speaking Contexts

Presenting author: Real, Sara ; Universidad de Leon; Spain.

Co-author: Arias-Gundín, Olga ; Universidad de Leon; Spain.

Co-author: Loja Tacuri, Héctor ; Universidad de Leon; Spain.

Chair: Grabowski, Joachim ; Leibniz University; Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: assessment;education;evaluation and assessment of writing competence;handwriting

Writing Assessment in Primary Education in Spanish-Speaking Contexts: A Systematic Review of Instruments and Tasks Writing is a core component of school literacy and a strong predictor of academic success; however, its assessment has traditionally received less attention than reading. International research emphasises that effective writing assessment is essential for informing instruction and supporting the development of competent writers, particularly when it is grounded in authentic text production tasks (Graham et al., 2011). In Latin America, the SERCE regional study provided early evidence of the value of assessing writing through complete texts, taking into account both written products and the processes involved (Atorresi, 2010). This study reports the results of a systematic review of empirical studies published between 2010 and 2025 on literacy assessment in primary education (approximately ages 6–12) in Spanish-speaking countries. Twenty-eight studies met the inclusion criteria. Each study was coded according to country, educational level, assessed skills (reading and/or writing), types of writing tasks used, and the availability of reliability and validity evidence. The findings reveal a clear dominance of reading-focused assessment. Only 8 of the 28 studies (28.6%) included an explicit evaluation of writing. When writing was assessed, it was mainly operationalised through transcription tasks, such as dictation and spelling, whereas text production and composition were addressed infrequently and in an unsystematic manner. This pattern contrasts with approaches that advocate formative writing assessment as a key mechanism for improving teaching and learning (Graham et al., 2011). Overall, the results point to a gap between the theoretical conceptualisation of writing as a complex, multidimensional skill and its assessment in applied research. The study highlights the need to strengthen writing assessment in primary education by incorporating text production tasks and explicit assessment criteria. Such advances are essential for the early identification of writing difficulties and for supporting evidence-based educational intervention in Spanish-speaking contexts. References Atorresi, A. (2010). Escritura: un estudio de las habilidades de los estudiantes de América Latina y el Caribe. OREALC/UNESCO Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Hebert, M. (2011). Informing writing: The benefits of formative assessment. Alliance for Excellent Education.

✉ sarreal@ponferrada.uned.es



Writing to learn in the new A(I)ge

Presenting author: Staats, Julia ; University Utrecht; Netherlands.

Chair: Grabowski, Joachim ; Leibniz University; Germany.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;education;Generative AI;writing to learn

Writing-to-learn (WTL) can increase students' understanding of disciplinary content (Armstrong et al., 2008; Bangert-Drowns et al., 2004). However, since generative artificial intelligence (genAI) was made freely available, we observe in our courses (Utrecht University, Bachelor Biology) that students use genAI during their thinking and writing processes for writing assignments. When genAI helps with or even takes over processes in the students' writing process, the question arises whether WTL is still relevant as learning approach in future education. This study aimed to gain insight into how third-year university students perceive writing assignments and use genAI. Students from the final bachelor thesis course were invited to fill in an anonymous survey on genAI-use, self-efficacy for academic writing, writing beliefs, and how they experience academic writing in general. Results from close ended questions showed that students ($n = 29$) generally report that writing helps them understand content better, with no significant difference between students who do use genAI ($n = 19$) and students who do not use genAI ($n = 10$), $t(26,637) = 1,75$, $p = 0,093$. We also found no significant difference in how they experience academic writing ($t(19,056) = -0,29$, $p = 0,774$) and writing self-efficacy ($H(1) = 0,544$, $p = 0,461$) between these groups. Students who use genAI for writing assignments mostly use it as a brainstorm partner and to improve self-written texts and spelling. They least use it to generate texts, to compare literature, and to verify if their own text corresponds to the content of the source. Students give different reasons not to use genAI. Mainly low reliability and quality of AI-generated texts and it's negative influence on learning were mentioned. This study forms a basis for a follow-up study across our whole student population to see if and how genAI-use poses a risk on the WTL-process throughout the bachelor.

✉ j.c.staats@uu.nl



Effects of oral language instruction on children's writing

Presenting author: Díaz-Tejedor, Rubén ; University of León, Spain; Spain.

Co-author: Arias-Gundín, Olga ; University of León; Spain.

Chair: Whitehouse, Marlies ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: L1;learning to write;meta-analysis;written language competence

Writing and reading, together with mathematical competence, are fundamental pillars for students' overall development. Despite the importance of writing, early instruction in it often focuses primarily on mechanical skills, delaying the introduction of more complex or abstract content. In response to this, contemporary models of writing such as DIEW (Kim & Schatschneider, 2017) propose both direct and indirect contributors to writing, including oral language at the discourse level. Bearing that in mind, the objective of the present study is to analyze the effect of interventions focused on developing oral skills on early writing performance in preschool and primary education students. The study consisted of a meta-analysis of instructional studies addressing oral language and its impact on early writing competence. The process was conducted following the PRISMA guidelines throughout. Studies published between 2015 and 2025 were included if they were available in full text, in English or Spanish, and analyzed instructional programs targeting oral language and early writing. Studies were excluded involving students from fourth grade or above, clinical or special education samples, or foreign language contexts. The meta-analysis included 16 studies covering a total of 11,823 participants. The combined correlation between oral skills and early writing competence was moderate and significant ($r = .45$, 95% CI [.33, .55], $Z = 7.53$, $p < .001$), although heterogeneity was high ($I^2 = 91.54\%$). The results provide evidence of a moderate, positive relationship between oral language instruction and writing competence, both in lower-level and higher-level writing skills. Subgroup analysis showed stronger effects in primary education than in preschool, suggesting that oral language interventions can enhance writing performance as learning progresses, thereby opening up paths for tiered instructional strategies. This work was co-financed by the Department of Education of CyL and the European Social Fund Plus under the framework of the Predoctoral PR 2023 Call, a grant awarded to the first author. This work was created under a project (PID2021-124011NB-I00) financed by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and "ERDF A way of making Europe" Kim, Y. G., & Schatschneider, C. (2017). Expanding the developmental models of writing: A direct and indirect effects model of developmental writing (DIEW). *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 109(1), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000129>

✉ rdiaz01@estudiantes.unileon.es



Emergent Literacy Development: A Socio-Constructivist Program in Preschool

Presenting author: Salvador, Liliana ; ISPA - University Institute; Portugal.

Co-author: Laranjeira, Ricardo ; ISPA - University Institute; Portugal.

Co-author: Martins, Margarida Alves ; ISPA-Instituto Universitário EDUNOVA.ISPA; Portugal.

Co-author: Maruta, Filipa ; ISPA - University Institute; Portugal.

Chair: Whitehouse, Marlies ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: collaborative writing;experimental approaches;intervention study;learning to write

Emergent literacy refers to the foundational skills, knowledge, and behaviours that precede formal reading and writing instruction. It encompasses the natural development of literacy as children interact with their environment. These early literacy skills, as letter knowledge, phonological awareness invented spelling and early reading are crucial for successful reading and writing development, influencing long-term academic outcomes. The socio-constructive approach to literacy development considers that children build knowledge through meaningful interactions with peers and educators which role is to provide guidance, scaffolding and minimal intervention to support children's discoveries. In this context our aim was to evaluate the effectiveness of a socio-constructivist emergent literacy programme in preschool designated to develop key literacy skills. Four classes from 2 schools in the Lisbon area attended by 88 5-year-olds participated in this study. The emergent literacy program was developed with 49 children attending two of these classes (experimental group). In the other 2 classes comprising 39 children, traditional literacy activities were developed (control group). In both classes the activities were developed by the educators during their classes. Children's phonological awareness, letter knowledge, reading and spelling were assessed at the beginning and end of the school year. The emergent literacy program comprised 12 sessions, each beginning with contextualized activities (e.g., storytelling, singing a song, watching a short film) that provided a framework for subsequent learning. This was followed by activities addressing several emergent literacy skills (e.g., phonological awareness, letter knowledge, vocabulary, early interaction with print, invented spelling). All sessions began with a large group activity, followed by a small group activity, and finished with an individual activity. The control group activities consisted, mainly, of traditional tasks such as rhyming, singing songs, storytelling, and copying letters and words, in groups or individually, with low levels of interaction between the children. The study results demonstrated statistically significant differences between the groups, with the experimental group showing substantial improvements in letter knowledge, phonological awareness, spelling, and reading compared to the control group. These findings suggest that emergent literacy programs incorporating socio-constructivist and naturalistic practices can be highly effective in developing fundamental skills in preschool children.

✉ lsalvador@ispa.pt



How generative AI reshapes students' writing practices at a French university writing center

Presenting author: Miftah, Hamza ; Université Clermont Auvergne; France.

Chair: Whitehouse, Marlies ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;Generative AI;writing processes;writing tools and writing technology

This paper examines how academic writing in higher education is transformed when writing is learned, regulated, and evaluated in interaction with generative artificial intelligence (GAI) tools. Focusing on master's students' learning of academic writing at a French university writing center, the study considers academic writing as an activity system (Engeström, 2014) and as a situated literacy practice (Lea & Street, 1998), in a context where students are typically confronted with the task of writing a master's thesis without prior instruction in academic writing. From an activity theory standpoint, academic writing is seen as a goal-directed activity in which subjects, tools, and communities interact over time (Russell, 1997). From an academic literacies perspective, what is considered a valued text is embedded in broader relations of position and identity (Lillis & Tuck, 2016). This double lens allows us to examine not only what students do with GAI, but also how it positions them within communities of practice. The data combine a survey on rhetorical awareness, self-regulation, and GAI-related practices with semi-structured interviews conducted with master's students attending the writing center. This work is drawn from an ongoing doctoral project on students' learning of academic writing. Expected findings include differentiated profiles of learners according to how they mobilize GAI, genre knowledge and self-regulatory strategies to align their texts with perceived expectations. These profiles are expected to support the view that academic writing increasingly involves the use of GAI tools, not simply to offload writing tasks, but to mediate academic genres for novice writers whose disciplinary identities are still under construction, by making certain norms and expectations more explicit to them. This paper argues that studying writing through the lens of activity theory and academic literacies offers an understanding of GAI as a structuring component in the broader system of writing, as it reconfigures access to norms, resources, and legitimate participation in academic communities (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The needs revealed by students' use of GAI tools offer research-informed directions for writing support that focuses on agency and rhetorical awareness in the use of tools, rather than on the technical regulation of GAI use.

✉ hsh.miftah@gmail.com



Impact of home literacy practices on elementary students' writing performance and motivation

Presenting author: Arrimada, María ; University of León; Spain.

Co-author: Algorri Diez, Laura ; University of León; Spain.

Co-author: Díaz-Burgos, Alberto ; University of León, Spain; Spain.

Co-author: Robledo, Patricia ; University of León; Spain.

Chair: Whitehouse, Marlies ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition

Keywords: developmental aspects of writing ability; learning to write; motivational and emotional factors in writing; writing processes

Current developmental models of writing assume a sociocultural perspective where the mastery of writing is explained by a set of internal and external processes (Graham, 2018). Writing acquisition is, therefore, the result of continuous formal and informal interactions between the writer and the context. Among these external and informal learning environments, families become a keystone. Literature confirms the relationship between home literacy practices, students' transcription skills (Guo et al., 2021) and motivation towards writing (Sparks & Reese, 2013). Research, however, has been conducted almost exclusively in preschool and very early elementary stages and it is not extended to high-level cognitive and motivational processes involved in writing. This study analyses the impact of home literacy practices and writing supports in both writing performance and motivation towards writing across elementary grades. 1464 Spanish students from 1st to 6th grade distributed in 9 schools participated in the study. Their families completed the Home Writing Practices and Support Questionnaire, which explores types of home writing practices (formal vs. informal) and kinds of support (content, motivational, procedural). Students' handwriting and spelling skills were assessed respectively through sentence-copy and spelling-to-dictation tasks. Participants wrote a narrative to assess their planning and composing skills. A mandatory revision exercise was completed after the composition task. The students also completed three questionnaires on motivation, attitudes towards writing and writing self-efficacy. Assessments were delivered by researchers over two sessions. Data is under analysis and results will be presented and discussed at the conference. Our findings might contribute to reshape sociocognitive conceptions of writing development. This work is part of a project funded by the Ministry of Science and Innovation and the European Union (ref. PID2021-124011NB-I00). Graham, S. (2018). A Revised Writer(s)-Within-Community Model of Writing. *Educational Psychologist*, 53(4), 258–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2018.1481406> Guo, Y., Puranik, C., Dinnesen, M. S., & Hall, A. H. (2021). Exploring kindergarten teachers' classroom practices and beliefs in writing. *Reading and Writing*, 35(2), 457–478. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-021-10193-y> Sparks, A., & Reese, E. (2013). From reminiscing to reading: Home contributions to children's developing language and literacy in low-income families. *First Language*, 33(1), 89-109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014272371143358>

✉ marrg@unileon.es



In search of Proust's creative writing process : genetics, textometrics and cognitive psychology

Presenting author: Darrak, Zahra Ed ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Co-author: Bouzereau, Camille ; Université côte d'Azur; France.

Chair: Whitehouse, Marlies ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: creative writing;text analysis;writing process data collections;writing processes

This study is part of the ANR Cré@Lame project, which is developing several tools adapted to the recording, dynamic visual reproduction and analysis of the writing and creativity processes observed in the drafts of heritage writers and contemporary writers (Quaranta et al. 2023). Methodologically, the research project combines data from textual genetics (Quaranta, 2004) with quantitative textual data processing developed in textometrics on literary texts (Brunet, 1982). The poster will present our corpus composed of the different manuscript versions of the incipit of the Recherche (Lavault 2013), with the aim of describing, from a genetic and stylistic point of view, the construction of the incipit of the Recherche and considering their contributions to psycholinguistics and the psychology of creativity. The combination of genetic and textometric studies will allow for a detailed examination of the macrostructural and microstructural changes in the successive rewritings of the incipit. References Brunet E. (1982). Le style de Proust dans la Recherche du temps perdu. Étude quantitative. VII International Symposium of the Association for Literacy and Linguistic Computing, p. 51-76. Lavault M. (2013) Du côté de l'incipit de la Recherche : la genèse de la fiction selon Proust. Genesis (Manuscrits-Recherche-Invention), 36, 91-104. Bonnardel, N. (2012). Créativité et conception. Approches cognitives et ergonomiques, De Boeck. Quaranta J-M. (2004). Proust "débutant" : la dynamique de l'écriture dans les premiers textes. Bulletin d'informations proustiennes, 34, 73-88. Quaranta, J.-M., Barbier, M-L, & Butzek, A.-M. (2023). écriture créative et formation, In N. Bonnardel, F. Girandola, E. Bonetto & T. Lubart (Eds.). La Créativité en Situations : Théories et applications (pp. 285-294). Paris : Dunod. Wallas, G. (1926). The Art of Thought. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.

✉ zahra.ED-DARRAK@etu.univ-amu.fr



Making Writing Processes Visible: Sentence-Level Visualizations of Keystroke Logging Data

Presenting author: Mahlow, Cerstin ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Chair: Whitehouse, Marlies ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: data visualisation;keystroke logging data processing and analysis;research methodology;writing processes

Understanding how texts are produced is crucial for developing theoretical models, evaluating writing strategies, and enhancing practical applications in writing instruction. Current keystroke logging analysis (e.g., THEtool <https://github.com/mulasik/wta>, analyses integrated in Inputlog <https://www.inputlog.net>) provides aggregated information to be interpreted by researchers, but only rudimentary visualization. These visualizations are mostly aimed at researchers, not at writers themselves. Visualizations as static graphics pose a challenge to cover highly dynamic processes as writing. We address this gap by designing and implementing novel visualizations that effectively display writing actions on sentence level by using output from THEtool. Our work is situated at the intersection of writing research and visual analytics, using raw keystroke logging data in XML-format processed by THEtool as input. The primary challenge is the meaningful integration of the static writing product and the temporal process using the notion of "version" by Mahlow (2015) into a single, comprehensive representation understandable by writers and researchers, being both aesthetically attractive and suitable for research purposes (e.g., for hypothesis building). We designed 8 new visualization models and implemented them as custom JavaScript visualizations based on syntactically processed keystroke logging data. The data is aggregated into sentence histories, classifying transformations (e.g., append, insert, delete, replace) to map actions to the sentences they affect. We demonstrate the feasibility with a pilot study of university students who wrote under identical conditions. The developed visualizations include a new model for product-process combination graphs and detailed sentence histories. (Mahlow 2015) The results reveal diverse and significantly non-linear writing strategies among participants. The novel visualizations successfully integrate the process and product dimensions in a meaningful way. These individualized process visualizations hold significant potential for bridging empirical research with aesthetically appealing display of processes to writers for reflection on their own writing strategies and challenges as well as allowing researchers to formulate research hypotheses. C. Mahlow (2015). A Definition of "Version" for Text Production Data and Natural Language Document Drafts. In: Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on (Document) Changes: Modeling, Detection, Storage and Visualization ACM, New York, pp. 27-32. doi:10.1145/2881631.2881638C. Mahlow (2025). Die meisten schreiben das Ende zuerst. Oder nicht? Schreibprozesse sichtbar machen. 24 pages. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.15667692

✉ cerstin.mahlow@zhaw.ch



The Emergence of Orthographic Revision in Early Writing

Presenting author: Lopez, Paula ; University of León; Spain.

Presenting author: Álvarez-Moreno, Carmen ; Universidad de Leon; Spain.

Co-author: Arias-Gundín, Olga ; University of León; Spain.

Co-author: Fernández, Sandra ; Universidad de Leon; Spain.

Co-author: Peña, Lorena ; Universidad de Leon; Spain.

Chair: Whitehouse, Marlies ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: developmental aspects of writing ability;errors and error correction;L1;writing processes

Research on writing revision has traditionally focused on older students, while studies examining revision processes in the early years of primary education remain scarce. During these initial stages, revision is typically limited and mainly focused on orthographic aspects, which receive strong instructional emphasis and are more accessible than higher-level textual features. From this perspective, orthography provides a particularly informative domain for analysing early revision processes, as it lies at the intersection of transcription skills and emerging metacognitive control. Accordingly, the present study examines how orthographic revision emerges and develops from Grade 1 to 3. Participants were 247 Spanish primary school students (Grade 1: $n = 75$; Grade 2: $n = 89$; Grade 3: $n = 83$). All students completed the same two-session narrative writing task following an identical procedure across grades. In Session 1, students produced an initial narrative text. In Session 2, one week later, they revised their text in two phases: explicit detection of orthographic errors and subsequent rewriting. Orthographic revision was analysed using a fine-grained coding scheme distinguishing letter-level errors (incorrect use of upper- and lower-case letters, omission or addition of letters), rule-based errors (accentuation and violations of orthographic rules), and word-level errors (incorrect word segmentation). Measures captured the number and type of errors, as well as the quantity and accuracy of error detection and revision. Although analyses are still ongoing, preliminary findings indicate clear developmental trends. From Grade 1 to 3, letter-level and word-segmentation errors decrease, whereas rule-based errors increase, possibly reflecting growing linguistic complexity. Error detection remains limited overall but improves with grade level. Importantly, when errors are detected, both detection and correction tend to be accurate, even in the earliest grades. These findings suggest that early constraints on revision are more strongly related to limitations in revision than to orthographic knowledge itself, highlighting the need for early instructional support targeting revision strategies. Final analyses will be completed and presented at the conference. This communication is part of the I+D+i PID2021-124011NB-I00 project funded by MCIN/ AEI/10.13039/501100011033/ and "FEDER Una manera de hacer Europa"

✉ malvam@unileon.es; plopg@unileon.es



The importance of the imagined figure of the reader to children's writing achievement

Presenting author: Newton, Moira ; University of Auckland and Papatoetoe West School; New Zealand.

Chair: Whitehouse, Marlies ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition

Keywords: attention;cognitive processes;learning to write;writing processes

This poster presents an investigation of the relationship between children's awareness of the reader, their metapragmatic awareness (MPRA), as they write and their writing achievement. The questions asked are what is the nature of children's MPRA and what is the relationship of MPRA to children's writing achievement? A focus on MPRA is part of a larger mixed methods study of the relationship between children's metalinguistic awareness (MLA) and their writing achievement. Audience awareness is known to be related to writing achievement and quality (Graham et al., 2018; Holdstock, 2024). The imagined figure of the reader is an important part of the model of the writing process in cognitive writing theory (Flower & Hayes, 1981). The way MPRA shapes linguistic choices and thus influences writing achievement merits investigation. Method: the sample was a group of 31 children aged seven to eleven years from an inner city, multi-ethnic Auckland primary school. The children completed a writing test, New Zealand e asTTle: writing and a metalinguistic test, the Verbal Fluency test. These results enabled establishment of profile groups at four levels of attainment: high writing and high metalinguistic; high writing, low metalinguistic; low writing, high metalinguistic; low writing, low metalinguistic. All the children wrote a paragraph about an e asTTle prompt: "Recount an experience with extended family and friends". They thought aloud as they wrote in a modified think aloud protocol termed a verbalisation. Immediately after writing the children completed a semi structured interview. The resulting qualitative data was transcribed and analysed by the researcher into seven categories including MPRA in which sentences or phrases referring to the category were recorded as mentions. Results showed that thinking about the reader shaped children's metalinguistic choices. Children of all levels of achievement expressed their ability to think about their reader as they wrote. Thinking about the reader in a differentiated and detailed manner was related to writing achievement. Some children displayed more sophisticated MPRA than others, thus it seemed there was evidence that the awareness of one's reader developed in ways that in some way related to their writing achievement.

✉ moira.newton.mn@gmail.com

Tuesday June 2, 2026 | 17:45 - 18:45
SIG Writing Business Meeting
Business Meeting

SIG Writing Business Meeting

Chair: Mahlow, Cerstin ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Chair: Newton, Moira ; University of Auckland and Papatoetoe West School; New Zealand.

Chair: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Wednesday June 3, 2026 Schedule

Time	Session	Type	Room
08:30 - 09:00	Registration	Registration	
09:00 - 10:30	Roundtable 1	Roundtable	SM O4.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Roundtable 5	Roundtable	SM O2.24/29 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 19	Single Paper	SM O3.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 21	Single Paper	SM O3.05 (Computer Room)
	Single Paper Session 34	Single Paper	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 5	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 9	Single Paper	SM O1.13 (Lecture Room)
	Writing process feedback	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
10:30 - 11:00	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG
11:00 - 12:30	Approaches to Writing Instruction Around the World	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Cooperative Writing: Perspectives from Three Intervention Studies	Symposium	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Poster Presentation 1	Poster Presentation	SM O1 (Hallway)
	Poster Presentation 4	Poster Presentation	SM O2 (Hallway)
	Roundtable 8	Roundtable	SM O1.24/29
	Single Paper Session 15	Single Paper	SM O3.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 2	Single Paper	SM O3.05 (Computer Room)
	Single Paper Session 26	Single Paper	SM O1.13 (Lecture Room)
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Grüner Saal
14:00 - 15:00	Hayes Award 2024 Lecture – Writing Fluency in the Perspective of Fluency Research	Keynote Presentation	Aula
15:00 - 15:30	SIG Writing Publications – Journal of Writing Research (JoWR) and Book Series Studies in Writing	Publication Session	Aula
15:30 - 16:00	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG

Time	Session	Type	Room
17:00 - 18:30	Guided Tours	Social Event	Meeting point at the entrance of the SM building
20:00	Conference dinner	Social Event	Restaurant Concordia, Feldstrasse 2, 8400 Winterthur



Trusting the Process? Cognitive Writing Models into the classroom through Process-Aware Feedback

Presenting author: Barbier, Marie-Laure ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Presenting author: Darrak, Zahra Ed ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Presenting author: Quaranta, Jean-Marc ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Presenting author: Ricart, Thomas ; Écrivor; France.

Presenting author: Zafar, Samra ; Independent Researcher; Pakistan.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: cognitive processes;creative writing;education;keystroke logging

The study of written composition focuses increasingly on the study of the process, instead of the product. Yet, the translation of process-based knowledge into pedagogical practice remains fragmented and uneven across instructional contexts (D'Souza, 2021). Bringing three complementary perspectives, this roundtable seeks to examine what a process-aware pedagogy of writing might entail, as well as the trade-offs of using digital technologies to provide students and pupils with feedback suited to their individual needs. Insights around the development of the writing-assistant for primary and secondary education *Ecrivor* will help identify which traces of the writing process are pedagogically meaningful and how teachers interpret—or misinterpret—these indicators. Moving to academic writing, we will examine the methodological and cognitive limits of AI systems that generate feedback from keystroke logs (Zafar, 2025). Finally, the creative writing perspective will show how dimensions such as originality, narrative strategy, and emotion expose the gaps in current models of writing process and the requirements for AI to support creativity and authorial development in a sensitive and reliable way (Quaranta, 2025). This roundtable is an invitation for participants and audience to debate around key questions: What parts of the process should become feedback, and what risks emerge when process data is misinterpreted by both humans and AI systems? Can cognitive models of writing be operationalized in the classroom without becoming reductive? How can AI tools support, rather than constrain, learners' composing processes? Drawing on three areas of interest, the discussion will converge on the central question of how research insights and classroom needs can inform one another, and what a genuinely dynamic relationship between research and practice might look like in a future where process data becomes increasingly accessible. D'Souza, Richard. (2021). What characterises creativity in narrative writing, and how do we assess it? Research findings from a systematic literature search', *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, Volume 42, 100949, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2021.100949>. Quaranta, J.-M. (2025). « Intelligence artificielle et création littéraire : expériences et perspectives », *Interfaces numériques*, 14, <https://doi.org/10.25965/interfaces-numeriques.5440>. Zafar, S. et al. (2025). 'I Wrote, I Paused, I Rewrote' Teaching LLMs to Read Between the Lines of Student Writing., arXiv preprint, arXiv:2506.08221.

✉ jean-marc.quaranta@univ-amu.fr; zahra.ED-DARRAK@etu.univ-amu.fr; thomasricart@ecrivor.com; samrazafar003@gmail.com; marie-laure.barbier@univ-amu.fr



Reading and writing in flow

Presenting author: Peze, Anouk ten ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Co-author: Rijlaarsdam, Gert ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Co-author: van Weijen, Daphne ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: creative writing;education;instructional design in writing;reading and writing

The recently revised Dutch secondary school curriculum focuses more clearly on creative language use, positioning both literary reading and creative writing within the creative-literary domain (Rijlaarsdam, 2024). Reading and writing share several characteristics such as experiencing flow and developing one's imagination. When experiencing flow, the writer becomes part of the story (Doyle, 1998). In literary reading, flow predicts reading enjoyment and relates to text comprehension (Thissen et al., 2021). Furthermore, generative thinking processes play an important role in both fiction reading and writing (Finke et al., 1992; Koek et al., 2016). Given these potential overlaps and their mutual support, integrated instruction in literary reading and creative writing seems promising. This study proposal aims to develop integrated teaching materials for lower secondary education (ages 12-15). A key design question is which subject matter best supports meaningful integration. We propose that literary text analysis could function as a bridging component, helping students understand how literary features operate in texts they read and providing tools they can apply in their own writing. In this round table, we look forward to exploring two issues: 1. To what extent is integrating literary text analysis with creative writing and literary reading a productive choice for lower secondary education? 2. Which literary features (e.g., narrative perspective, voice, characterization, time structure, setting, imagery, style) are most suitable as shared focal points for integrated reading-writing units at ages 12-15? Literature Doyle, C. L. (1998). The writer tells: The creative process in the writing of literary fiction. *Creativity Research Journal*, 11(1), 29-37. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1101_4 Finke, R. A., Ward, T. B., & Smith, S. M. (1992). *Creative cognition: Theory, research, and applications*. MIT Press. Koek, M., Janssen, T., Hakemulder, F., & Rijlaarsdam, G. (2016). Literary reading and critical thinking: Measuring students' critical literary understanding in secondary education. *Scientific Study of Literature*, 6(2), 243-277. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ssol.6.2.04koe> Rijlaarsdam, G. (2024). Understanding and being understood. *Levende Talen Nederlands*. Thissen, B. A., Menninghaus, W., & Schlotz, W. (2021). The pleasures of reading fiction explained by flow, presence, identification, suspense, and cognitive involvement. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 15(4), 710-724. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000367>

✉ anouktenpeze@live.nl



ChatGPT as a writing coach: A mixed-methods study in higher education

Presenting author: Baaijen, Veerle ; CLCG University of Groningen; Netherlands.

Co-author: Hrib, Iulia ; Faculty of Arts, University of Groningen; Netherlands.

Chair: Galbraith, David ; University of Southampton; United Kingdom.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;AI writing;education;feedback

The role of ChatGPT in education has been a widely discussed topic, considering its ability to provide immediate feedback and personalised guidance to users (Lo, 2023). This mixed-methods study investigates ChatGPT's role in enhancing text quality through feedback in higher education, focusing on its potential to support argumentative writing. The research comprises two within-participant design studies (N=16) and a qualitative analysis of student interactions with ChatGPT. Study 1 examined the impact of structured, task-level ChatGPT feedback on text revisions, with participants revising their drafts without direct interaction with the chatbot. Study 2 allowed free interaction with ChatGPT, supplemented by stimulated recall interviews to explore students' perceptions of its utility. In both studies, text quality was assessed across organization, understanding, argument quality, and mechanics, while qualitative data, including chatbot interactions and revisions, were analyzed using Strobl et al.'s (2024) adapted framework and inductive coding. Results revealed significant improvements in text quality in both studies (Study 1: $t(7) = -3.69$, p

✉ V.M.Baaijen@rug.nl



Unpacking Academic Writing as a multidimensional concept through a systematic literature review

Presenting author: van der Scheer, Mylene ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Co-author: Bouwer, Renske ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Co-author: Quené, Hugo ; University Utrecht; Netherlands.

Co-author: van Rijt, Jimmy ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Chair: Galbraith, David ; University of Southampton; United Kingdom.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: academic writing;research methodology;writing models;writing theory

(see file)The rise of generative AI highlights the need for a clear conceptualization of writing and its role in knowledge development, particularly within university contexts. The concept of academic writing often remains implicit and poorly understood. Students associate academic writing primarily with formal language and disciplinary jargon, whereas teachers place greater emphasis on knowledge construction, textual organization, and integration of sources. Given that academic writing functions as a key indicator of students' progress, clarification of the concept academic writing is necessary. Given its complex, implicit, and multidimensional nature, academic writing can be approached from multiple perspectives, conceptualized through four interrelated dimensions: product, process, person, and practice. Academic writing as a product emphasizes textual features of a 'good' academic texts.[1] The process dimension frames academic writing as a goal-directed, and cognitively demanding activity that goes beyond producing text, involving planning, revising, source-synthesis and knowledge crafting.[2] This complex process is shaped by writers' personal characteristics, including motivation and affect. Writing also occurs within specific social contexts[3], such as disciplinary- or institutional communities[4]. This review addresses the conceptualization of academic writing from these four dimensions of academic writing. This review was conducted using Scopus, ERIC, and Web of Science. After screening and quality assessment, 651 studies were included, which were thematically coded. The results underscore academic writing as a multidimensional and transformative practice. Studies adopting a product perspective emphasize precision, conciseness, and writer-reader relationships, particularly through discipline-specific language, stance, and Voice. Process-oriented studies conceptualize academic writing as recursive and complex, emphasizing source integration. Person-focused research foregrounds writer identity and writing beliefs, while practice-oriented studies stress the role of disciplinary and institutional contexts in defining "good writing." Concomitantly, the review reveals systematic biases, including the predominance of writing in English. In the context of generative AI, this underscores the need to reconceptualize academic writing in universities, with greater emphasis on creativity and knowledge-crafting rather than formulaic text production. [1] Aull & Lancaster, 2014; Biber et al., 2020; Staples et al., 2016 [2] Badley, 2009; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Chau et al., 2022; Kellogg, 2008. [3] Canagarajah, 2002; Graham, 2018 [4] Durrant, 2015; Hyland, 2008

✉ m.vanderscheer@uu.nl



“Writing in Spanish: Research, Practice, and the Generative AI Challenge”

Presenting author: Galan, Rosa M ; ITAM; Mexico.

Chair: Galbraith, David ; University of Southampton; United Kingdom.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: academic writing;education;evaluation and assessment of writing competence;professional writing

What happens when thirty years of teaching writing in Spanish meet the disruptive force of generative AI? The relationship between research and teaching in an institutional writing program in the disciplines — serving hundreds of students — is undeniable. On the one hand, the program’s design and its specific interventions are expected to be grounded in theory and evidence. On the other hand, students’ texts, opinions, and evaluations constitute a valuable source of research. However, this relationship does not remain static: it evolves over time, shaped by generational and technological changes, by new research, and, most notably, by the emergence of generative artificial intelligence since 2022. This presentation will share the 30-year experience of Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM), a Mexican university, in teaching academic and professional writing. Mainly, it will describe Es ITAM, a tiered scaffolding institutional writing program at the undergraduate level spanning 14 disciplines and based on research, in which all students participate from entry to graduation. Its main purpose is to help university students develop solid written communication skills, both in the academic and professional fields. The program consists of four moments of systematic intervention distributed in semesters 1, 3, 5 and 7, in which writing in traditional and digital formats is worked on. The program is based on three main functions: writing to learn, writing to argue and writing to disseminate specialized knowledge. In 2025, Es ITAM comprises a total of 34 subjects, 32 of which are taken together with other curricular subjects, taught by professors with specific training in 16 different university disciplines, such as Economics, Applied Mathematics, Political Science, Law, Data Science and various engineering disciplines, among others. The theoretical frameworks that informed its design and those currently under review will be discussed. Furthermore, the presentation will reflect on moments of disruption and uncertainty the program has faced and will outline the research it has generated.

✉ mgalan@itam.mx



Academic style instruction with U SPArC: findings from two cycles of design research

Presenting author: Glasbergen-Plas, Aliza ; Delft University of Technology; Netherlands.

Co-author: Grijns, Tyche ; Delft University of Technology; Netherlands.

Chair: Maurer, Michelle N. ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: academic writing;design-based research;instructional design in writing;writing instruction

Mastering academic writing style can be a challenge for students (Herelixa & Verhulst, 2014). Although the literature extensively describes the hallmarks of academic literacies (Biber & Conrad, 2019; Hyland, 2009), guidance on how to help students acquire an effective style is scarce. This study makes recommendations for university level style instruction upon evaluating the U SPArC style tutorial. This tutorial introduces five style principles captured in the mnemonic U SPArC, using video-based strategy instruction. Short videos model applying a principle to example sentences, followed by gradually built-up exercises ('guided practice'). In two cycles of design research, we designed and assessed a first version of the tutorial (cycle 1), refined it based on our findings, and evaluated a second version (cycle 2). 62 and 78 master's students participated in the two cycles at Delft University of Technology. Results show that students responded positively to the tutorial. They found the five style principles helpful for their writing, though not all principles equally so. Students particularly valued the modelling with examples. Although examples were drawn from diverse technical fields, 75% of students also found them 'relevant for the writing we do in our study program'. Students preferred video-based instruction supplemented by written materials; few favoured in-class delivery. Finally, we avoided grammar terms in the tutorial's first version to aid comprehension, but this seems to have unwittingly clouded the instruction. We included basic grammar terms (e.g., 'subject') in the second version, and almost all students preferred this. Based on our results, we recommend trying out U SPArC's style principles, pedagogy of strategy instruction, and video-format at a larger scale. Beyond U SPArC, we recommend pairing example-rich videos with written resources, without eschewing key grammar terms. The study offers practical guidance to instructors and course developers. Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2019). *Register, Genre, and Style* (2de editie). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511814358> Herelixa, C., & Verhulst, S. (2014). *Nederlands in het hoger onderwijs—Taalunie: Een verkennende literatuurstudie naar taalvaardigheid en taalbeleid*. Nederlandse Taalunie. Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context* (1st ed.). Continuum. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474211673>

✉ a.glasbergen-plas@tudelft.nl



From Higher Education to Secondary Schools: Developing an OER for genAI-Supported Scientific Writing

Presenting author: Schnatz, Nina Isabella ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Bieri, Aline ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Chair: Maurer, Michelle N. ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing; design-based research; text genre; writing instruction

Writing is widely recognised as an epistemic tool in higher education: it structures inquiry, supports knowledge creation, and enables students to participate in disciplinary discourse. These epistemic demands also shape Swiss secondary education, where learners in Berufs-/Maturitätsschulen must produce a propaedeutic research paper as part of their final examinations. The increasing presence of generative AI (genAI) in academic writing introduces challenges across educational levels. While genAI can support idea generation, structuring, and revision, research shows that students often struggle to integrate AI outputs into coherent, genre-appropriate, and epistemically responsible writing processes. This highlights the need for pedagogical designs that scaffold reflective and transparent genAI use throughout the writing process. This paper presents the development of an open educational resource (OER) designed to support genAI-assisted scientific writing in Swiss secondary schools. The OER is part of a broader design-based research (DBR) programme on genAI-integrated writing in higher education but is not itself an iterative DBR cycle. Instead, it represents a transfer of design principles and scaffolding mechanisms from two higher-education DBR iterations of a genAI-supported scientific writing course at the Zurich University of Applied Sciences (ZHAW). The resulting OER includes prompting activities, genre-focused self-study units, and reflective tasks adapted to the BM-/Matura-Arbeit context. It will be introduced to teachers in May 2026 to support implementation in the 2026/27 school year. The theoretical framework draws on writing-process models and genre approaches, conceptualising genAI as a tool to be critically evaluated within the epistemic aims of scientific writing. Methodologically, the OER design draws on analysis of course artifacts (prompting journals, student texts, writing tasks, scaffolds), student surveys from FS24 and FS25, and instructor feedback. Additional insights stem from workshops in 2025, which indicated strong demand for guidance on genAI use, authorship, and academic integrity. Expected outcomes include a modular OER that supports key writing stages while fostering genre knowledge, reflective practice, and epistemic responsibility. The paper contributes to writing research by showing how DBR-informed cross-level transfer can strengthen scientific writing pedagogy and support a smoother transition from secondary to tertiary education. Keywords: genAI-supported writing, scientific writing, writing pedagogy, epistemic practices

✉ scnz@zhaw.ch



Making Research Understandable: Teaching Undergraduates to Communicate Research to Non-Experts

Presenting author: Gomez Laich, Maria Pia ; Carnegie Mellon University; Qatar.

Co-author: Dreher, Kira ; Carnegie Mellon University; Qatar.

Co-author: Mitchell, Thomas ; Carnegie Mellon University; Qatar.

Co-author: Pessoa, Silvia ; Carnegie Mellon University; Qatar.

Chair: Maurer, Michelle N. ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: academic writing; design-based research; writing across disciplines or across the curriculum; writing in the disciplines

This presentation reports on a design-based intervention to help undergraduates communicate research to non-specialists through two coupled genres: the Plain-Language Summary (PLS) and the research poster. At an English-medium U.S. branch campus in the Middle East, for the past two years we helped prepare students for the university's undergraduate poster symposium. In Year 1, we introduced a five-move PLS (teaching statement, problem, methods, findings, takeaway) alongside core poster design principles. In Year 2, we refined the timing by scheduling sessions closer to the event, added assertion-based poster headings (Wolfe & Reineke, 2024), and incorporated a formative feedback session two weeks before the presentations. Our dataset includes 58 PLSs and 58 posters, presentation recordings, and reflective interviews. We evaluated all PLSs and posters using rubrics targeting clarity, coherence, audience-fit, visual hierarchy, and explicit takeaways; all items were double-rated with reconciliation. Our presentation focuses mainly on Year 2, where there were clear improvements. Students produced more coherent PLSs and posters, used plain language more effectively for non-expert audiences, and presented their findings through cleaner, visually accessible layouts. The logistical adjustments to our intervention proved critical, as students had a more developed understanding of their research and were able to successfully leverage the PLS as the basis assertion-based poster headings. As the reflective interviews with students and our analysis of the posters show, this integration strengthened the link between written and visual communication, improving both students' ability to make sense of their research as they crafted the moves of the PLS and the communicative effectiveness of their posters. We close by outlining adaptable teaching materials, such as PLS models, annotated examples, and poster design guides, that can support programs seeking to help students communicate research effectively to broad audiences. The project demonstrates how writing research can inform practical, scalable strategies for undergraduate research communication. References Wolfe, J., & Reineke, K. (2024). Assertion-based poster headings. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*.

✉ mgomezla@andrew.cmu.edu



Dynamics of writing of students with dyslexia: relating writing online indicators with eye movements

Presenting author: Mazur, Audrey ; Université de Lyon; France.

Co-author: Quignard, Matthieu ; CNRS; France.

Chair: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: experimental approaches;eye tracking;handwriting;writing impairment

In France, the number of students with disabilities who report having a language disorder increases every year. Among them, students with dyslexia-dysorthographia seem to be the most represented. Beyond 18 y.o., these individuals still have difficulties with reading and writing. When reading, they make many mistakes and take longer than control groups (Elbro, et al., 1994). When writing, they continue to have difficulties with spelling, syntax, vocabulary, and identifying and correcting errors (among others, Farmer et al., 2002; Hatcher et al., 2002). International literature also points to their atypical writing dynamics, for example, making more long pauses and more intra-word pauses (among others, Sumner and Connelly, 2020). The aim of this presentation is to present the preliminary results of a pilot study focusing on the impact of dyslexia-dysorthography on the reading and writing processes of young adults, taking into account two types of analysis based on: on-line (including eye movement, pauses, duration, etc.) and off-line (word choice, errors, etc.) indicators. Twenty-two students with dyslexia (DD) and 22 controls matched for age and academic level took part in a reading and writing experiment. Data was collected using an innovative device incorporating a graphics tablet, an eye tracker and associated software. We propose to present and discuss preliminary results concerning the dynamics of writing, and more specifically pauses during written production associated to eye movements: are the indicators of atypical writing dynamics associated with atypical eye movements as well? Are both atypical phenomena correlated? Do they occur with the same words? This could make it possible to target specific difficulties during the writing process. This presentation could be combined to a demonstration. Farmer, M., Riddick, B., and Sterling, C. (2002). *Dyslexia and inclusion: assessment and support in higher education*. London and Philadelphia: Whurr Publishers. Hatcher, J., Snowling, M., and Griffiths, Y. (2002). Cognitive assessment of dyslexic students in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72, 119–133. Sumner, E. and Connelly, V. (2020). *Writing and Revision Strategies of Students With and Without Dyslexia*. Special Series: The Interaction of Reading, Spelling and Handwriting Difficulties with Writing Development–Part 2, 189-198.

✉ audrey.mazur@ens-lyon.fr



Synergies between languages at school: learning to write persuasive texts in several languages

Presenting author: Peyer, Elisabeth ; University of Fribourg; Switzerland.

Co-author: Hicks, Nina ; University of Fribourg; Switzerland.

Chair: Pagner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: corpus linguistics; language-specific and cross-linguistic studies; writing at school; writing in a foreign or second language

Calls for a stronger pedagogical connection between teaching the languages taught at school have been made for years due to potential benefits from synergies. Despite extensive research on transfer, however, the core question of which conditions affect transfer remains, particularly in written productions. This project therefore examines if and under which conditions lower secondary school learners can transfer their knowledge to facilitate writing persuasive texts in the L1 and L2/L3. The focus lies on conceptual aspects of texts, so-called text procedures, i.e., text type specific patterns that consist of a language-specific expression (e.g. "because") which are linked to a cross-linguistic schema (e.g. reasoning) (Marx/Steinhoff, 2021). The first phase of the project sought to determine to what extent knowledge of text procedures is transferred prior to explicit instruction. To answer this question, 265 persuasive texts by lower-secondary school pupils based on the same task from the SWIKO corpus were annotated using EXMARaLDA and analyzed regarding similarities and differences across the three languages (German, French, English), two learning contexts (language of schooling and foreign languages), and two regions (German- and French-speaking Switzerland). Results suggest that learners indeed started to exploit synergies between their languages, with similar patterns across all texts. Regional differences were evident with French-speaking learners arguing more explicitly than German-speaking learners across all languages. Proficiency played a crucial role: learners used a wider variety of and more cognitively challenging procedures with increasing linguistic proficiency, in line with age-related acquisition trajectories observed in the L1. Furthermore, learners used more implicit reasoning in their weak as opposed to their strong foreign languages, suggesting that cross-linguistic schemata can be transferred even before a corresponding language-specific expression is learned. Our presentation concludes with an outlook on the second phase of the project (intervention study), which will examine a) whether explicit instruction can enhance transfer, and b) whether transfer can be promoted from L2 to L1 and/or vice versa. Marx, N., & Steinhoff, T. (2021). Können einzelsprachliche Interventionen sprachübergreifende Effekte haben? Wie die schulische Majoritätssprache Herkunftssprachen fördern kann. Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, 24(4), 819–839.

✉ elisabeth.peyer@unifr.ch



The functional use of graphematic forms in German–French biliterate writing

Presenting author: Weth, Constanze ; Institute for Research on Multilingualism, University of Luxembourg; France.

Chair: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: corpus linguistics; learning and learner characteristics; writing in a foreign or second language; writing models

Studies have shown that children use the resources of their first written language when writing a language with which they have had less experience (Sürig et al., 2016). While some studies have measured text skills in two languages using global metrics (Usanova & Schnoor, 2021), only a few have examined specific language and graphematic resources of writing in multiple languages (Díez-Bedmar & Papp, 2008; Weth & Wollschläger, 2020). This paper presents analyses of writing (narratives, dictations) in German and French produced by 273 biliterate students (Grades 5–6) with various language backgrounds. The analyses focus on the differentiation of graphematic resources, including cross-linguistic transfer, using methods from usage-based approaches (Verspoor et al., 2012). Graphematic forms are examined at the levels of types and tokens as well as sub-lexical units, including grapheme-phoneme correspondences, syllables, and morphemes. By focusing on these fine-grained patterns, the study provides insights into the dynamic use of graphematic resources within students' multilingual repertoires at the transition from primary to secondary education. Díez-Bedmar, M. B., & Papp, S. (2008). The use of the English article system by Chinese and Spanish learners. *Language and Computers Studies in Practical Linguistics*, 66. [https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2021.1890649](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401206204Sürig, I., Şimşek, Y., Schroeder, C., & Boneß, A. (2016). Literacy Acquisition in School in the Context of Migration and Multilingualism. John Benjamins. Usanova, I., & Schnoor, B. (2021). Exploring multiliteracies in multilingual students: Profiles of multilingual writing skills. <i>Bilingual Research Journal</i>, 44(1), 56–73. <a href=) Verspoor, M., Schmid, M. S., & Xu, X. (2012). A dynamic usage based perspective on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(3), 239–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.007> Weth, C., & Wollschläger, R. (2020). Spelling patterns of German 4th graders in French vowels: Insights into spelling solutions within and across two alphabetic writing systems. *Writing Systems Research*, 11(2), 124–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17586801.2020.1754997>

✉ constanze.weth@uni.lu



#Diff2Score - Identifying textual characteristics of "Difficult-to-Score texts"

Presenting author: Hoffmann, Lea ; Universität zu Köln; Germany.

Co-author: Ferencik-Lehmkuhl, Daria ; University of Cologne; Germany.

Co-author: Fladung, Ilka ; Universität Duisburg-Essen; Germany.

Co-author: Jost, Joerg ; Universität zu Köln/ University of Cologne; Germany.

Co-author: Karl, Kristina ; Federal Institute for Quality Assurance of the Austrian School System; Austria.

Chair: Johansson, Victoria ; Kristianstad University; Sweden.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: assessment;evaluation and assessment of writing competence;L1;text linguistics

Difficult-to-score texts are texts that reduce inter-rater agreement (Wolfe et al., 2016) or have poor model-fit-statistics on the essay level (Wind et al., 2017). In this study, we follow the second approach, and ask: To which degree are textual characteristics of L1 German texts associated with poor rating quality? To investigate textual characteristics, we measure, for example, text length and lexical diversity (Wolfe et al. 2016; Freundberger et al., 2018). To investigate rating quality, we use a variation of a Many-Facet-Rasch model (MFRM) by Eckes (2005), integrating raters, criteria, prompts, and text types as facets into the model. The model-fit-statistics are interpreted as indices for rating quality and used in a correlational analysis with the measures of essay characteristics. All analyses are run in R. Data stem from an Austrian-nationwide writing assessment. As all fourth graders produced handwritten texts in their L1 (Austrian German), all texts had to be digitized. In this study, 186 student texts responding to eight prompts across four text types (e. g., descriptive texts) were scored by a panel of 161 trained raters. Each rater scored three texts with a text-type specific rating scale covering criteria in four dimensions (e. g., structure). To date, a manual error correction has been conducted and textual characteristics were measured. Preliminary results indicate substantial variation in text length among the texts, with an average length of 105 words and a range of 41-336 words; our presentation will report further results. Findings may improve criteria-based feedback in schools and inform the design of future rater training programs in assessments. Eckes, T. (2005). Evaluation von Beurteilungen. Psychometrische Qualitätssicherung mit dem Multifacetten-Rasch-Modell. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 213 (2), 77–96. Freundberger, R., Breit, S. & Illetschko, M. (2018). Beurteiler-übereinstimmung und schwer zu beurteilende Texte im Vergleich. In G. Sigott (Ed.), *Language Testing in Austria taking Stock*. Lang, 373–388. Wind, S. A., Stager, C., & Patil, Y. J. (2017). Exploring the relationship between textual characteristics and rating quality in rater-mediated writing assessments. *AW*, 34, 1–15. Wolfe, E.W.; Song, T. & Jiao, H. (2016). Features of difficult-to-score essays. In *AW*, 27, 1–10.

✉ lea.hoffmann@uni-koeln.de



How context and purpose shape assessment: methodological considerations for measuring text quality

Presenting author: Konstantinidou, Liana ; Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Lamas, Elsa Liste ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Chair: Johansson, Victoria ; Kristianstad University; Sweden.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: assessment;corpus linguistics;education;evaluation and assessment of writing competence

This paper argues that methods for measuring text quality in writing research should be anchored in the specific context and intended purpose of the stakeholders participating in the respective project. Project context and purpose can lead to different priorities and weightings for aspects such as construct validity, efficiency, and the amount of pedagogical information gained (Knoch, 2021; Weigle, 2002). We will show how we designed assessments for three projects, discussing the advantages and disadvantages of the methods in relation to the context, the stakeholders' goals, and the effect of the studies on writing practices. In the first project, we combined human rating and corpus-based assessment to create writing ability profiles in vocational schools, providing teachers with data-informed pedagogical recommendations (Konstantinidou & Liste Lamas, 2023). In the second study, we conducted an intervention to measure the effectiveness of scenario-based reading and writing education in vocational schools. Text quality was assessed using human rating and consensus scoring (Konstantinidou et al., 2022). In the third project, we developed a diagnostic writing test for engineering students. Based on the results, students with weak written communication skills are recommended additional communication courses. Assessment relied on machine-learning methods using linguistic features from corpora and AI-applications that explain human ratings. While the first study prioritised the quantity of information obtained, the second prioritised validity. The third project focused on efficiency, as more than 700 students are tested twice a year. Reflecting the assessment methods in their specific contexts should contribute to the design of text quality assessments that are informed by context and purpose, especially in research projects with implications for writing practice. Konstantinidou, L. & Liste Lamas, E. (2023). Schreibkompetenz-Profile in der beruflichen Bildung: heterogen, individuell und schwer interpretierbar?. Osnabrücker Beiträge zur Sprachtheorie, 101, 133-150. Konstantinidou, L., Madlener-Charpentier, K., Opacic, A., Gautschi, C. & Hoefele, J. (2022). Literacy in vocational education and training: scenario-based reading and writing education. Reading and Writing, 36(4), 1025-1052. Knoch, U. (2021). Assessing writing. In G. Fulcher & L. Harding (Eds.), The Routledge handbook of language testing (2nd ed., pp. 236-253). Routledge. Weigle, S. C. (2002). Assessing Writing. Cambridge University Press.

✉ kons@zhaw.ch



Monitoring Rater-reliability in Decentralized Organizations

Presenting author: Neumann, Astrid ; Institute for German Language and Literature Education; Germany.

Presenting author: Stoffers-Lang, Michaela ; Leuphana University Lueneburg; Germany.

Chair: Johansson, Victoria ; Kristianstad University; Sweden.

Theme: Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: assessment;evaluation and assessment of writing competence;research methodology;written language competence

Reliability relates to the fairness and consistency of assessment. With 158 Goethe Institutes in 98 countries worldwide and 390 exam partners for the exam administration, the question of a suitable Human Resource Development Program for raters and quality management concerning rating and grading of the test section "Writing" in a decentralized system with its approximately 5,000 trained raters worldwide arises. As each test taker's performance is rated by two raters individually in situ, the inter-rater reliability, respectively the consistency between the two raters needs to be ensured. Without training, rating and grading of the same students' performances lead to a great variety and variance in grades (Weiss 1965, Birkel and Birkel 2002). Lumley (2005) even claims that not the rating criteria are at the heart of the correct assessment, but the rater training as the rater is crucial and central to the rating process. Whether the rating scale or the criteria are adequate, respectively the fair grade was given, is not at issue. Rather, the issue is: How reliable do the raters apply a given rating scale? As a measure of agreement for a same sample with different raters different concordance coefficients can be determined. To exemplify the methodology, the following null hypothesis can be deduced: H_0 : The inter-rater reliability of two trained raters for each exam administration is insufficient if the respective value is equal to or smaller than a pre-determined threshold value. As the Goethe-Institut's rating scales are criterion-based and either ordinal or interval scales, the Null Hypothesis is tested and checked for robustness by analyzing five concordance coefficients with the aim of a generalizability theory. The study was conducted by means of the example of the Goethe-Zertifikats B1 at selected test centres. The initial results are very satisfactory: Inter-rater reliability was substantial, as evidenced by Krippendorff's alpha ($\alpha = .848$), Intra-Class-Correlation (ICC(2) = .83), and Spearman's rank correlation ($\rho = .85$). Cohen's kappa indicated moderate agreement ($\kappa = .527$), whereas Gwet's AC2 suggested almost perfect agreement (AC2 = .90). Further specifications will be provided within the detailed analysis.

✉ astrid.neumann@leuphana.de; miastoffers@hotmail.com



Examining Stakeholders' Perspectives on Literacy Plan Development

Presenting author: Johansen, Marita Byberg ; NTNU - Norwegian University of Science and Technology; Norway.

Presenting author: Lorentzen, Vibeke ; NTNU - Norwegian University of Science and Technology; Norway.

Chair: Arrimada, María ; University of León; Spain.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: case study;education;literacy;pedagogy and instruction

Examining Stakeholders' Perspectives on Literacy Plan Development
Research topic / aim This study explores how different stakeholders in a Norwegian municipality experience the process of developing a local literacy plan. A literacy plan is understood as a locally developed document that specifies how early childhood education and schools work with language, reading, and writing in accordance with national curriculum guidelines. The aim is to understand how such collaborative processes influence professional practice and organizational development, and to identify factors that promote sustainable development of such plans.
Theoretical framework / area of investigation The study draws on perspectives from organizational development and professional learning communities, emphasizing the interplay between local ownership and external expertise. It situates literacy plan work within the broader field of writing education and literacy development.
Methodological design The study is a case study conducted in a municipality that developed a joint literacy plan for two schools. Data include a focus group interview with the literacy plan team, individual interviews with the head of childhood and youth services and County Governor representatives, and a teacher survey. The analysis combines descriptive statistics with thematic analysis.
Conclusions / findings The analysis identifies four key themes: (1) The process is as important as the product, (2) Internal and external support is crucial for confidence and progress, (3) Plan work builds culture and shared understandings, and (4) A common plan provides direction and supports pedagogical coherence. Findings indicate that teacher involvement is essential for ownership and for embedding the work in practice, and that the literacy plan functions as a tool for professional learning, culture building, and systematic practice. Challenges include uneven involvement, dependency on individuals, and weak institutional embedding. The study highlights the need for robust structures that ensure continuity while balancing local ownership with external expertise.
Relevance to domain of writing and other forms of text production Developing a literacy plan emerges as both a professional and organizational development project with potential to strengthen professional communities and assessment competence. It illustrates how policy texts can serve as catalysts for collaborative learning and coherent literacy practices. Keywords: literacy development plan, professional learning, organizational development, institutional embedding

✉ marita.b.johansen@ntnu.no; vibeke.lorentzen@ntnu.no



Integrating writing in content-lessons: Effects of a professional development program.

Presenting author: van Drie, Jannet ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Co-author: Holdinga, Lieke ; Rijksuniversiteit Groningen; Netherlands.

Chair: Arrimada, María ; University of León; Spain.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: L1;literacy;writing across disciplines or across the curriculum;writing in the disciplines

This study evaluated a professional development (PD) program for teachers (lower vocational education, 7-8 grade) on integrating language and writing instruction in content lessons. To improve literacy in Dutch secondary education, all subject teachers are encouraged to integrate language into content teaching (Dutch Ministry of Education, 2022). Language-Oriented Content Teaching (LOCT) is promising because it integrates content learning and disciplinary language skills (cf. Moje, 2008). Its implementation is however challenging and requires teacher awareness of disciplinary language and knowledge of pedagogical approaches (Wildeman, 2022). More insights into effective PD is needed. We evaluated a PD (seven meetings), which was based on principles of effective PD (i.e., active learning, collective participation). Topics included disciplinary literacy, approaches to stimulating language production (speech and writing) and supporting disciplinary writing (cf. Graham & Perin, 2007). 44 Teachers from eight schools participated. The research question was: What are effects of the PD about LOCT on teachers' knowledge, attitude and teaching practices? Pre-post questionnaires were used to measure knowledge and attitudes. Teaching practices were measured using self-efficacy questionnaires, observations and lesson plans. Multi-level analyses revealed a significant increase in knowledge and more positive attitudes after PD. Teachers reported to implement LOCT-pedagogy more frequently and with better quality. Outcomes of observations and analyses of lesson plans confirmed these self-reports. We will illustrate outcomes with examples of learning activities two teachers developed to support students' writing short-answer questions (Biology) and business letters (Economics). Despite its limitations, this study identifies key features of effective PD for integrating writing instruction across school subjects and highlights challenges to wider school implementation. References Dutch Ministry of Education (2022). Masterplan basisvaardigheden. [Basic skills master plan.] <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/kamerstukken/2022/05/12/kamerbrief-masterplan-basisvaardigheden> Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 445-476. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.445> Moje, E. B. (2008). Fore-grounding the disciplines in secondary teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52, 97-107. <https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.52.2.1> Wildeman, E. (2022). Vocational teachers' integrated language teaching: On the role of language awareness and related teaching behaviour. Phd Thesis, Eindhoven School of Education/Eindhoven University of Technology.

✉ j.p.vandrie@uva.nl



Studying writing practices and ideologies in multiple research sites: the literagram method

Presenting author: Turai, Rahel K. ; Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary; Hungary.

Co-author: Bodó, Csanád ; Eötvös Loránd University; Hungary.

Co-author: Deme, Andrea ; Eötvös Lorand University; Hungary.

Co-author: Jenei, Kamilla ; Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary; Hungary.

Co-author: Krizsai, Fruzsina ; Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary; Hungary.

Co-author: Lexander, Kristin Vold ; University of Inland Norway; Norway.

Co-author: Szabó, Gergely ; Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary; Hungary.

Co-author: Szánthó, Zsuzsa ; Eötvös Lorand University; Hungary.

Chair: Arrimada, María ; University of León; Spain.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: literacy;research methodology;social and cultural aspects of writing;writing and linguistics

Whereas mass literacy is a defining feature of modern societies (Coulmas 2013), writing continues to be consequential to how societies are structured. Information technology revolution has been creating novel practices of writing, and consequently, novel inequalities. To capture these novel literacy practices (and the ideologies connected to them), we developed a method called 'literagram'. Our recently launched four-year long project (The sociolinguistics of writing: Literacy practices and ideologies in flux, 2025–2028) aims at a situated, in-depth, and systematic exploration of literacies in a post-digital era. The SLoW project focuses on three different arenas of writing and changes in literacies: dialect writing on social media platforms (entextualization); multi-authored writing in higher education (collaboration); and written interactions among diasporic speakers (digitalization). In addition to separate studies of these phenomena, our comparative study will apply the literagram method in each research site to make the findings comparable. Inspired by the 'mediagram' (Lexander & Androutsopoulos 2021), literagrams are visualizations of participants' writing habits: mind maps consisting of writing channels and modes drawn by the participants themselves. In this sense, the literagram method approaches literacy as social practice, instead of solely focusing on writing and reading skills. As participants recreate and interpret their literagrams through interviews with fieldworkers, the literagram method aligns with the principles of citizen science, involving non-professionals in the research process and increasing sociolinguistic awareness among participants (Molek-Kozakowska & Laihonen 2025). In this talk, we present our methods, preliminary findings, and discuss our ideas on the comparability of findings from different research sites. References: Coulmas, Florian. 2013. *Writing and Society: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Lexander, Kristin Vold & Jannis Androutsopoulos. 2021. Working with mediagrams: A methodology for collaborative research on mediational repertoires in multilingual families. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 42(1). 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1667363> Molek-Kozakowska, Katarzyna & Petteri Laihonen. 2025. Fostering language awareness through Citizen Science: Results and implications of a project with Polish teenagers doing language-related research. *Language Awareness*. 34(2). 476–494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2024.2428184>

✉ turai.katalin.rahel@kre.hu

Wednesday June 3, 2026 | 09:00 - 10:30

Writing process feedback

Symposium



Writing process feedback

Chair: Vandermeulen, Nina ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Organiser: Vandermeulen, Nina ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Discussant: Speltz, Emily Dux ; Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University; United States.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: feedback;Generative AI;writing processes;writing tools and writing technology

This symposium continues the growing conversation on process-focused writing feedback, extending work presented at SIG Writing 2024 (Paris). Building on earlier work using process data and real-time analytics to inform pedagogy, the 2026 session turns toward the next frontier: advancing writing process feedback through AI-integrated and other technology-rich environments that foreground writers' intentions and decision-making. Across three empirical projects, contributors examine how fine-grained writing-process data—from keystroke logs to GenAI interaction data—can be translated into actionable feedback for both researchers and educators. Together, the presentations explore how writers at different levels of expertise use and reflect on their writing processes: from expert and student integration of GenAI tools, to students' alignment of intentions and actions during complex source-based writing, to the pedagogical value of process reports and exemplars (grounded in keystroke logging data) combined with dialogic peer feedback. We consider how process-focused feedback can foster aspects of learning such as self-awareness and reflection, regulation, and agency across learning contexts. By bringing these strands together, the symposium invites discussion on methodological innovation, data ethics, and pedagogical design in the next generation of process-focused writing research. It also aims to bridge insights from different methodologies (such as qualitative case studies, process-tracing technologies, and classroom interventions) to envision how process-focused feedback can most effectively be provided to student writers. The symposium on writing process feedback will consist of three paper presentations followed by the discussant's response, with time for Q&A among presenters and an open, structured discussion with participants to identify future directions for process-focused feedback research.



Beyond Text-Focused Feedback: The Added Value of Keystroke Logging Feedback & Dialogic Peer Feedback

Presenting author: Leijten, Mariëlle ; Universiteit Antwerpen; Netherlands.

Presenting author: Vandermeulen, Nina ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: feedback;Generative AI;keystroke logging;writing processes

Master's students in Professional Communication & Management revise their texts several times before submitting a final version, guided by feedback. In addition to traditional, text-focused feedback, we introduced a combination of technologically supported process feedback (based on keystroke logging data) and a human-centred approach in which teachers supported students in reflecting on their writing processes. This process-oriented feedback was complemented by dialogic peer feedback, prompting students to engage in dialogue about their texts and underlying writing strategies. A total of 126 students wrote a bad-news email. Their writing processes were logged with Inputlog. After submitting a first draft, 57 students received an individual process report based on KSL data (Vandermeulen et al., 2020). Reflection was stimulated through comparisons with exemplar processes, some of which illustrated diverse ways of integrating GenAI tools into the writing process. A new KSL-based visualisation, the dynamic source network graph, was also piloted, mapping all consulted sources and their interconnections. Students subsequently clustered these sources into meaningful categories (e.g., GenAI tools, theory on bad-news emails, internet searches on content or formulation). All students then received text-focused feedback and revised their texts. Results showed that students exposed to both process- and text-focused feedback achieved significantly higher scores on their second drafts than those receiving text-focused feedback only. Subsequently, 53 students attended a session on requesting, giving, and processing feedback (De Kleijn, 2022; Tielemans et al., 2021), and were provided with tools to foster peer feedback dialogue (Bouwer et al., 2024; Landrieu et al., 2024). Analyses of third and final versions are underway to assess the added value of this dialogic peer exchange. Questionnaires and focus group discussions showed that students found the process reports clear and the exemplar comparisons insightful. Students emphasised, however, the need for teacher support in interpreting process data. Overall, 75% considered dialogic peer feedback useful, with more than half rating it more valuable than traditional peer feedback. Future research should further explore how combining KSL-based insights with teacher-guided reflection and dialogic peer feedback might foster students' writing development and help them navigate GenAI tools more deliberately.

✉ nina.vandermeulen@uantwerpen.be; marielle.leijten@uantwerpen.be

Wednesday June 3, 2026 | 09:00 - 10:30

Writing process feedback

Single Paper

Part of the symposium: Writing process feedback



Designing Intention and Process-Informed Strategies for Self-Regulation of Writing

Presenting author: Bouwman, Wren ; Iowa State University; United States.

Co-author: Anders, Abram ; Iowa State University; United States.

Co-author: Chukharev, Evgeny ; Iowa State University; United States.

Co-author: Conijn, Rianne ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Co-author: Roeser, Jens ; Nottingham Trent University; United Kingdom.

Co-author: Torrance, Mark ; Nottingham Trent University; United Kingdom.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: feedback;reading and writing;writing instruction;writing processes

Writing from sources requires students to coordinate complex reading and writing processes, yet many struggle to connect their intentions with their actions during composition. This presentation reports on a three-part research project that explores how students' mental representations, process behaviors, and self-regulatory strategies interact during source-based writing. The first study examines intermediate composition students' behaviors, their actions, while reading-to-write using qualitative coding of process measures. First, a corpus of student syntheses and source texts are diagrammed using Rhetorical Structure Theory (Mann & Thompson, 1988). Then, spans of students' syntheses are matched to source texts using semantic similarity measures and qualitatively coded to describe how students adapt source material, considering rhetorical relations, hierarchical depth, and reading history. Students next write new syntheses, which are analyzed using the same RST-based coding scheme, but here the coding is applied to their real-time composing process rather than to a pre-existing corpus. After writing, the students are shown playback segments of their writing session and are asked, through stimulated recall, what they intended to do with the sentence they were writing and why they chose to write it. These student interviews are then coded with the same scheme as the corpus to allow for direct comparison to their coded writing session. By comparing students' stated intentions to their observed behaviors, this study identifies moments where writers' actions diverge from their goals — what might be called “regulatory blind spots.” Early pilot work in this project has already shown some mismatches between what students believe they are doing during synthesis and what their writing processes reveal. These regulatory blind spots are then targeted through short, pre-writing instruction in setting intentions, monitoring their reading and writing coordination, and adapting strategies in real time. A second phase of this research will evaluate to what extent the targeted instruction on regulation of writing better aligns writers' intentions with behaviors. Together, these studies argue for intention-informed process pedagogy: instruction that helps students notice, align, and adjust their writing processes to match their communicative goals. The study will be completed before the symposium, with full results ready for presentation.

✉ bouwman.wren@gmail.com



From Expert Habits to Student Support: Using Process-Tracing to Build GenAI Writing Guidance

Presenting author: Speltz, Emily Dux ; Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University; United States.

Co-author: Aik, Maissane ; Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University; United States.

Co-author: Blood, Beata ; Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University; United States.

Co-author: Chamberlain, Darryl ; Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University; United States.

Co-author: Zaldivar, Zoe ; Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University; United States.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;feedback;Generative AI;writing processes

This presentation introduces an exploratory study that investigates how expert and student writers integrate generative AI (GenAI) into their writing processes and how we might translate expert strategies into meaningful process-focused guidance for students. Motivated by the need for more situated support for GenAI-assisted writing, this research combines qualitative case studies with process-tracing technologies to uncover patterns in writers' use of GenAI tools. The study proceeded in three phases. First, we observed eight self-identified "expert" users: professionals across industry and academia who use GenAI regularly in communication-centric work. These participants engaged in an authentic writing task while using GenAI tools. Through screen capture, keystroke logging (via Grammarly Authorship), think-aloud and stimulated recall protocols, and retrospective interviews, we documented how these experts strategically incorporated AI assistance into drafting, revising, and decision-making processes. Second, we conducted parallel sessions with ten novice student writers to capture how less-experienced users navigated similar GenAI-supported tasks. In both of these phases, we extracted observable patterns across sessions by inductively developing a codebook of actions throughout the writing process. In the third phase, we compared expert and student process behaviors to identify key differences in GenAI usage, such as when writers pause to reflect, reject, or revise AI-generated suggestions, or engage in iterative prompting. Using our codebook of process actions, we developed a set of process-focused GenAI writing strategies based on expert behaviors, which we then used to systematically develop feedback for students displaying certain patterns of actions. This phase of data collection is ongoing but will be completed prior to the conference; we will describe how students responded to the scaffolded feedback provided to them on the basis of their process behaviors. This presentation will highlight preliminary findings from both expert and student process behaviors, share insights on integrating consumer-facing tools like Grammarly Authorship into writing research, and discuss the process-focused feedback developed for GenAI-integrated writing. We argue that pairing process-tracing data with qualitative case study methods enables more nuanced, scalable observations of GenAI-integrated writing, which can advance both writing process research and pedagogical design for AI-assisted composition.

✉ duxspele@erau.edu



Approaches to Writing Instruction Around the World

Chair: Early, Jessica ; Arizona State University; United States.

Discussant: Early, Jessica ; Arizona State University; United States.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: learning to write;meta-analysis;pedagogy and instruction;writing instruction

Bringing together writing researchers from multiple countries and methodological traditions, this symposium examines how writing instruction is shaped by local systems, resources, and sociocultural conditions, offering insights into what enables teachers, curricula, and writers to thrive in varied global contexts. Writing instruction is profoundly shaped by the affordances and constraints of the contexts in which it occurs. Teachers across different national education systems experience varied forms of pre-service preparation, each reflecting the theoretical frameworks, curricular priorities, and research evidence emphasized at the time of their training. Access to professional development is itself uneven, influenced by financial resources, district policy, institutional cultures, and teachers' own interests. Material and technological resources further shape what writing instruction looks like in particular contexts. Some teachers work in classrooms where digital tools and emerging forms of artificial intelligence can be integrated into writing instruction; others rely primarily on pen-and-paper or work within hybrid or fully online environments. Students themselves bring diverse experiences and needs such as linguistic backgrounds, neurodiversity, or challenges like dysgraphia. These factors shape both the goals of instruction and the strategies teachers employ. At the same time, textual norms and expectations vary across cultural and educational contexts, influencing how students are taught to construct texts. In some systems, for example, high-stakes writing assessments exert pressure on instructional content, narrowing pedagogical focus or shifting attention from writing practice to performance on tests. In short, writing instruction is never context-neutral. It is shaped by intersecting pedagogical, institutional, technological, and sociocultural forces that vary across classrooms, districts, and nations. This symposium brings together writing researchers from four countries who use diverse methodological and theoretical approaches to examine writing and writing instruction within their respective contexts. The symposium is organized around three central questions: What do we know about effective writing instruction? What conditions help writers thrive? How is writing curriculum and instruction being implemented across contexts? Together, these international perspectives highlight how writing instruction is enacted within—and transformed by—the complex realities of educational systems. By foregrounding contextual variation, the symposium advances a more nuanced understanding of what supports writing pedagogy and thriving writers across countries.



A pedagogy for writing enjoyment. Inspiration from free-time author schools for children

Presenting author: Heger, Stine ; Aarhus University; Denmark.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: education;writing instruction;writing processes;writing to learn

This paper presents findings from a study of children's experiences with free-time writing in so-called author schools for children in Denmark. The study is guided by two research questions: 1) What characterizes writing enjoyment in the context of free-time author schools for children, based on children's own experiences? and 2) How can insights from children's writing experiences in author schools inform broader pedagogical considerations about writing in formal school settings? The aim of the paper is to contribute empirically grounded knowledge about writing enjoyment in an out-of-school teaching context and to explore how such knowledge might inspire broader considerations about a pedagogy for enjoyable writing experiences. The study is based on a rhetorical view of writing and teaching (Fleming, 2016; Kock, 2013; Matthiesen, 2013) and on an anthropological take on studying children's perspectives (Spyrou, 2018; Warming, 2019). The empirical material is produced during extended ethnographic fieldwork in three different author schools (Bundgaard et al., 2018; Emerson et al., 2011; Spradley, 2016a and b). During this fieldwork, a kinship-based researcher position is developed, inspired by Gubar (2013). This method includes writing alongside the children as a way to understand their writing experiences. The empirical material is analyzed through ethnographic thematic readings (Cerwonka & Malkki, 2007; O'Reilly, 2012). Findings point to four core dimensions of writing enjoyment as expressed by the children: 1) writing together with others in a community of writing, 2) being free in writing and experiencing agency, 3) using imagination in writing to explore ideas and stories, and 4) being taught by an author, someone who is herself a writer. These insights are considered in relation to existing understandings of writing enjoyment (e.g. Myhill et al., 2023) and discussed as inspiration for a writing pedagogy that is experience-centered rather than performance-centered

✉ stine.heger@edu.au.dk

Wednesday June 3, 2026 | 11:00 - 12:30

Approaches to Writing Instruction Around the World

Single Paper

Part of the symposium: Approaches to Writing Instruction Around the World



Perspectives on writing curricula implementation: Insights from an international survey

Presenting author: Jeffery, Jill ; Leiden University Centre for Linguistics; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: academic writing; pedagogy and instruction; writing at school; writing instruction

Curricula are, arguably, an important but neglected part of the context in which writing instruction takes place. They are an intermediary between policies, instructional practices, and student learning but have not figured strongly in empirical research on writing instruction. Acknowledging the key role of teachers in interpreting and implementing curricula, the authors examine the structural and contextual conditions that impact their agency in the 'curriculum work' they do. Drawing on our international online survey of experts' (N=46) views of writing curriculum, we explore teachers' role in development; the content of writing curricula as this enables and constrains; the reported agency teachers have; the support they receive for interpretation and implementation; and the resulting perceived degree of alignment of enactment with the official curriculum. Responses show curricula to be overwhelmingly mandatory (>80%) and writing to be located mostly in L1 (93%). Responses suggest that writing curricula are relatively rich in terms of the theoretical perspectives they represent, but with formalist, process and genre frameworks strongly represented in the nomination of the top three. Teachers' role in the development of writing curricula is largely indirect, through consultation with groups and individuals or the participation of a small, selected number. Teachers are seen, potentially, to have considerable agency in implementation; more than half of our respondents considered teachers to have a fair amount or a great deal of autonomy. However, teachers receive limited support for implementation and two-thirds of our respondents considered teachers received only a small amount of preparation to teach writing.

✉ j.v.jeffery@hum.leidenuniv.nl



Trends in writing intervention research: 1930s and onwards

Presenting author: Skar, Gustaf ; Norwegian University of Science and Technology; Norway.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: intervention study;meta-analysis;writing at school;writing instruction

"Trends in writing intervention research: 1930s and onwards" for Symposium "Approaches to Writing Instruction Around the World" This systematic historical descriptive review was conducted to determine the trends and status of research using true and quasi-experiments (with pretests) to test the effectiveness of writing practices with students in kindergarten to grade 12. The analyses included 859 writing treatment/control comparisons, which were included in two previous meta-analyses (Collins et al., 2025; Graham et al., 2023). The search for studies in these two reviews ended in December 2022 and September 2021, respectively. The use of true and quasi-experiments (with pretests) to test writing practices increased dramatically across the decades from the 1930s onwards, with 290 treatment/control comparisons conducted in the 2010s. The expansion in the number of studies conducted was accompanied by an increase in study quality as measured by internal/external research design indicators. Research in this area moved from an exclusive study of teaching spelling and handwriting in the 1930s through the 1950s to the study of a diverse array of writing practices in the preceding decades. As the number of writing practices tested increased, so did the number of measures used to assess the effects of these instructional methods. Most of the writing treatment/control comparisons originated in the United States/Canada, but starting in the 1970s, European researchers began to make significant contributions to testing the effectiveness of writing practices. The most prolific researchers from 1931 and onwards were Steve Graham, Karen Harris, Gert Rijlaarsdam, and Sue Del La Paz. Limitations and suggestions for future research are provided.

✉ gustaf.b.skar@ntnu.no



Cooperative Writing: Perspectives from Three Intervention Studies

Chair: Philipp, Maik ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Organiser: Philipp, Maik ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Discussant: De Smedt, Fien ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: collaborative writing;education;intervention study;writing processes

Writing, as a cognitively demanding skill, can be improved through various intervention approaches (Graham, 2025). One of these is cooperative writing, in which peers carry out various cognitive processes together in social contexts. Cooperative writing can be conceptualized as an umbrella term describing a process in which peers work together and serve different roles in the three main processes of writing: planning, drafting, and revising (Alamargot & Chanquoy, 2001; Svenlin & Sørhaug, 2023). The contributions of the symposium focus on these three main processes from three current intervention studies in primary and secondary schools. They show how writing research contributes to the improvement and better understanding of school writing practices. Contribution 1 combines generative artificial intelligence with cooperative planning dialogues among 8th grade students. The students write arguments, with AI supporting content generation and the students being responsible for selection and organization. The dependent measures concern writing motivation. Contribution 2 focuses on the interactive negotiation processes involved in science learning within a writing-to-learn setting. It supports cooperative formulation of 5th grade students with scaffolds and shifts the focus of analysis and evaluation to both writing and learning aspects. Contribution 3 deals with the effectiveness of three different revision approaches that are compared against each other with secondary school students. The effects of the interventions are scrutinized with a new task that captures evaluation with special emphasis on higher order concerns. References Alamargot, D. & Chanquoy, L. (2001). *Through the Models of Writing*. Springer. Graham, S. (2025). What Do Meta-Analyses Tell Us about the Teaching of Writing? In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of Writing Research* (3. Aufl., S. 181–202). Guilford. Svenlin, M. & Sørhaug, J. O. (2023). Collaborative Writing in L1 School Contexts: A Scoping Review. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 67(6), 980–996. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2022.2115128>



Collaborative Writing Processes in Science Education

Presenting author: Bleiker, Johanna ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Co-author: Arnold, Julia ; Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz; Switzerland.

Co-author: Brüttsch, Angela ; Pädagogische Hochschule Zürich; Switzerland.

Co-author: Neugebauer, Claudia ; Pädagogische Hochschule Zürich; Switzerland.

Co-author: Schneider, Charlotte ; Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: cognitive processes;intervention study;speaking and writing;writing processes

The research project Collaborative Writing in Science Education (KoSNaWi) examines how collaborative writing can serve as an effective tool for promoting both linguistic and conceptual learning in science classrooms. Background: In current science curricula, competency descriptions such as “describing processes” or “explaining relationships” illustrate the interdependence of linguistic and scientific competencies. Transforming immediate observations into explicit, decontextualized, and (typically) written representations is a demanding task. To support this process, students in primary schools are frequently asked to write collaboratively and are provided with scaffolds for text structure and linguistic formulations. KoSNaWi investigates such scaffolded collaborative formulation processes. Located at the intersection of language education and science education research, the project draws on theories of scaffolding (Gibbons, 2015), conceptual change (Möller, 2015), and writing-to-learn frameworks (Graham, 2019). KoSNaWi addresses a research gap by shifting the analytical focus from written products to the process of collaborative writing. It investigates the oral interactions accompanying pair-writing activities during the formulation phase, asking what learning potential lies in the co-constructively developed formulations emerging in these dialogues. Methodologically, the study follows a qualitatively oriented mixed-methods design (Qualitative Content Analysis, Interactional Linguistics) within an experimental intervention comparing three conditions: (1) writing without support (control group), (2) writing with a fixed “writing plan”, and (3) writing with an adaptive, on-demand writing plan. The sample comprises 120 fifth-grade students from 10 classes. The writing dialogues are video-recorded, transcribed, and analysed by an interdisciplinary research team. Preliminary findings: KoSNaWi analyses process data. We reconstruct how scientific concepts are modified during collaborative formulation processes. The writing dialogues are co-shaped by the different scaffolding measures. We examine the epistemic potential of these dialogues as a function of the scaffolding conditions under which they occur. References Gibbons, P. (2015). Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning. Heinemann. Graham, S. (2019). Writers in Community Model: 15 Recommendations for Future Research in Using Writing to Promote Science Learning. In V. Prain & B. Hand (Eds.). Theorizing the Future of Science Education Research (pp. 43–60). Springer. Möller, K. (2015). Genetisches Lernen und Conceptual Change. In J. Kahlert et al. (Hrsg.). Handbuch Didaktik des Sachunterrichts (S. 243–249). Klinkhardt.

✉ johanna.bleiker@phzh.ch



Peer Feedback and Text Evaluation

Presenting author: Sturm, Afra ; University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland PH (FHNW); Switzerland.

Co-author: Hirt, Carmen Nadja ; University of Zurich; Switzerland.

Co-author: Karlen, Yves ; University of Zurich; Switzerland.

Co-author: Morre, Gabriel ; University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland PH (FHNW); Switzerland.

Co-author: Nyffeler, Angela ; Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: cognitive processes;collaborative writing;intervention study;writing instruction

The process of text revision is understood by cognitively oriented approaches as a sequence of activities that include reading through, evaluating, and revising the text (MacArthur, 2012). Effective peer feedback approaches address all three activities and support learners in different ways. The following questions can be used to guide these three activities: a) Reading through: How do I understand a text written by someone else? What is its overall idea? b) Evaluating: Can the author achieve the intended effect with the text? Does the text correspond to the respective genre? What should they change? c) Revising: How could the author implement these changes? In our intervention study regarding writing argumentative texts in grade 7 (N = 363), three peer feedback approaches are examined in comparison to a control group: LUPA: an adaptation of CDO (De La Paz, Swanson & Graham, 1998). SMABUSCH: explicit instruction of a revision strategy combined with teaching an argumentative text structure (Sturm, 2022). REDIT: an editorial group discusses several texts and is observed by the audience (Amir, Atkin & Rijlaarsdam, 2021). While LUPA and SMABUSCH were implemented in pairs, REDIT was implemented in groups of up to eight students. Among other instruments, we used a task for evaluating a foreign text (analogous to López et al., 2021, but with authentic student texts), an argumentative writing task, and a reading comprehension test (Schneider, Schlagmüller & Ennemoser, 2017). Initial results of the evaluation task at t0 show that 33% of students failed to identify any higher order concerns (HOC), while another 29% identified only one out of six HOC passages. Students experienced even greater difficulty identifying underlying problems or proposing solutions. We will present first results on how evaluation skills develop across five measurement points, whether differences emerge depending on the peer feedback procedure, and the role of reading skills.

✉ afra.sturm@fhnw.ch



We, Myself and AI: On the Benefits of Combining AI and Cooperative Planning for Writing Motivation

Presenting author: Philipp, Maik ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Co-author: Glaser, Cornelia ; Pädagogische Hochschule Heidelberg; Germany.

Co-author: Unger, Valentin ; St.Gallen University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Co-author: Wolfangel, Mirjam ; Pädagogische Hochschule Zürich; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: collaborative writing;Generative AI;writing beliefs;writing instruction

Background: Generative artificial intelligence (genAI) is currently disrupting writing practices in schools and raises the question of how writing can be used meaningfully in the classroom. Against this background, we designed an intervention with adolescents that uses ChatGPT to generate arguments, which are then further developed during collaborative planning discussions. Many of the intervention features directly address motivational mechanisms from self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2017) and social cognitive learning theory (Bandura, 1997) but require empirical testing and generally remain in need of further research in the field of writing. Methodological design: We expect to see increases in autonomous writing motivation (H1) and declines in controlled writing motivation (H2). We will measure these changes using validated scales (Smedt et al., 2022). We also hypothesize improvements in self-efficacy in planning arguments (H3; scale by Smedt et al., 2022) and in self-regulated argumentative writing (H4, scale by Wang et al., in press). We will test the hypotheses using repeated-measurement variance analysis in a pre-post design with three randomly assigned groups of 389 eighth-grade students stemming from 23 intact classes: a genAI group, an alternative treatment, and a pure control group. Expected results: At the time of submission, the intervention study is still ongoing. We will present preliminary results at the conference and provide a more detailed introduction to the intervention. From an instructional design perspective, the project with its focus on the motivation and use of genAI for planning represents important work in writing research for the further development of writing practice. References Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. Freeman. Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2017). Self-Determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness. Guilford. Smedt, F. de, Landrieu, Y., Wever, B. de & van Keer, H. (2022). Do Cognitive Processes and Motives for Argumentative Writing Converge in Writer Profiles? Journal of Educational Research, 115(4), 258–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2022.2122020> Wang, J., Graham, S., Kim, Y.-S. G. & Steiss, J. (in press). Zooming into Two Measurement Issues in Writing Self-Efficacy: Revision as a Distinct Dimension and the Generality Hypothesis in Argumentative Writing. Reading and Writing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-025-10679-z>

✉ maik.philipp@phzh.ch

Wednesday June 3, 2026 | 11:00 - 12:30

Poster Presentation 1

Poster Presentation



Development of advanced written discourse in linguistically diverse students

Presenting author: Bachmann, Alina ; Osnabrueck University; Germany.

Chair: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: developmental aspects of writing ability;evaluation and assessment of writing competence;language-specific and cross-linguistic studies;literacy

Part of the literacy competence is being able to write texts according to (communicative) goals (Berman, 2016). Governed by school-taught structural norms (Tolchinsky, 2020), this is essential for academic success. While lower secondary students are still acquiring these norms, they already have informal experience with various text types. Prior research shows multilingual pupils often lag behind monolingual peers in school-language literacy (Busse & Hardy, 2023), but most studies focus on primary education and use simple binary (monolingual-multilingual) comparisons leaving the lower-secondary phase and the nuanced impact of language background under-explored. As part of a PHD project this study asks:How do lower secondary students show literacy competence in written texts? How does language background affect these texts?Narrative and argumentative essays from 11 fifth-graders and 12 ninth-graders in Germany are analysed for macro-structure, reader orientation, cohesion, and orthography. Student's language background is assessed using a questionnaire. Findings reveal that although fifth-graders employ many textual elements, they frequently deviate from school-norms; ninth-graders produce texts with more normative structures. Thus, students entering high school already have a functional notion of how to achieve narrating or arguing goals, even if they do not fully apply canonical devices. Moreover, family language use loses influence on text production when students have had sufficient schooling in the test language. The results have didactic implications towards a more communicative approach of writing instruction. Berman, R. A. (2016). Linguistic Literacy and Later Language Development. In J. Perera, M. Aparici, E. Rosado, & N. Salas (Eds.), *Written and Spoken Language Development across the Lifespan: Essays in Honour of Liliana Tolchinsky* (pp. 181-200). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21136-7_12 Busse, V., & Hardy, I. (2023). Literalität und Mehrsprachigkeit: Begriffsklärungen, Förderansätze und Forschungsbefunde. *Unterrichtswissenschaft*, 51(2), 149-168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42010-023-00175-0> Tolchinsky, L. (2020). Text Writing at the Core of Literacy Discourse. In R. A. Alves, T. Limpo, & R. M. Joshi (Eds.), *Reading-Writing Connections: Towards Integrative Literacy Science* (pp. 163-168). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38811-9_10

✉ abachmann@uos.de



Does hybrid feedback foster L2 writing development?

Presenting author: De Clercq, Orphee ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Presenting author: Özturan, Tuba ; Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University; Türkiye.

Chair: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: EFL and ESL writing;feedback;Generative AI;natural language processing (NLP)

Feedback is a pivotal component of both L1 and L2 students' writing development (McCarthy et al., 2022), but providing in-depth feedback is a labour-intensive process (Godwin-Jones, 2022). Recent developments in generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) have increased interest in its use for providing personalized and real-time feedback in second language (L2) writing instruction. However, there is limited research on how GenAI-feedback combined with teacher mediation/control may support L2 writers' development over time. Therefore, this study aims to investigate whether such hybrid feedback triggers the development of linguistic complexity in L2 writing. The study was conducted in a 15-week undergraduate Writing Skills course at a medium-sized university in Türkiye. Participants were 19 native Turkish students from the Department of English Translation and Interpretation with A2-level English proficiency. During the course, they completed eight timed, paragraph-level writing tasks across multiple genres, such as opinion, definition, process, and narrative, without technological support. After each task, students typed their drafts into shared Google Docs. They then received hybrid feedback: First, the course lecturer used GenAI (ChatGPT) to receive structured feedback focusing on the quality of the topic sentence, three common linguistic errors, three common global errors, and a fully revised version of the paragraph. Second, the course lecturer reviewed the GenAI-generated feedback and selected only accurate and appropriate responses, which were then shared with the students. Also, students wrote short reflection reports explaining how they engaged with the feedback and which suggestions they focused on. The dataset includes students' original writing tasks, the hybrid feedback, and the reflection reports. The data analysis is still ongoing and focuses on analysing the linguistic complexity, considering both lexical and grammatical aspects (Bulté & Housen, 2012). To this purpose all text versions have been processed with the NLP tools for the Social Sciences (<https://www.linguisticanalysistools.org/>) and by selecting only those measures which are theoretically relevant (Bulté et al., 2025). By adopting a longitudinal perspective, this study aims to examine patterns of development rather than one-time improvements. Overall, this study contributes to discussions on the pedagogical efficiency of hybrid feedback in L2 writing instruction.

✉ orphee.declercq@ugent.be; tbozturan@gmail.com



From Ratings to Formative Feedback: An AI-Based System for Automated Essay Scoring

Presenting author: König, Nina ; Institut für Bildungsevaluation; Switzerland.

Co-author: Berger, Stéphanie ; Institut für Bildungsevaluation; Switzerland.

Co-author: Debelak, Rudolf ; Universität Zürich; Switzerland.

Co-author: Stahlhut, Laura ; Institut für Bildungsevaluation; Switzerland.

Chair: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: evaluation and assessment of writing competence;feedback;Generative AI;natural language processing (NLP)

Feedback is widely recognised as one of the most powerful influences on learning, particularly in the development of writing competence. However, in everyday classroom practice, the provision of detailed and timely feedback on student texts is constrained by limited time resources. Automated essay scoring (AES) has the potential to mitigate this tension, provided that it is pedagogically sound and sensitive to the complexity of writing. This poster presents the design and underlying architecture of an AI-based AES system developed for primary and lower secondary education. The system generates structured feedback within seconds, addressing four core dimensions of writing: content quality, coherence and cohesion, language accuracy, and stylistic appropriateness. In addition to score-based ratings across eight criteria, the system provides qualitative, dimension-specific feedback designed to support formative learning processes. The development of the system builds on a large empirical foundation of 36,739 digitised student essays that were evaluated by trained human raters. By combining large language models with targeted natural language processing techniques and educational assessment frameworks, the system aims to produce automated feedback that is more consistent, transparent, and pedagogically grounded than that of general-purpose AI applications. The poster outlines these design principles and explains the rationale underlying the selected feedback dimensions. The poster then focuses on how these principles are operationalised in practice. It is shown how the system structures multi-dimensional feedback, generates qualitative comments from textual features, and presents feedback in an interpretable manner for educational use. Particular attention is given to interface and feedback design choices that support formative use in the classroom and clearly differentiate the system from generic AI-based writing tools. Overall, the poster contributes to current discussions on AI in writing education by illustrating how automated feedback systems can be designed to augment instructional practice and support learning in classroom contexts.

✉ nina.koenig@ibe-edu.ch



Genre blending in contemporary Finnish essays

Presenting author: Lowndes, Ida ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Chair: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Theme: Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: creative writing;text genre;text linguistics;writing and literature

Genre blending in contemporary Finnish essays This study examines Finnish essays from the point of view of genre blending and hybridity (Mäntynen & Shore 2014). The theoretical framework of the study is based on linguistic genre studies and the idea of genre as sociocultural action (e.g. Devitt 2004). The aim of the study is to explore the genre of recent essays published in Finland and the linguistic traits that potentially produce its hybridity. The essay is usually described as creative nonfiction; it blends the techniques of fiction and nonfiction (e.g. Lopate 2013). Mixing different genres comes naturally to the essay, and this makes it a very diverse group of texts. The idea of the essay as a genre has been challenged because of this. This study is based on the idea of the essay as a transgressive genre (see Bahtin 1981). The data consists of three contemporary Finnish essay collections discussing environmental topics. The texts draw on the writer's personal experiences and knowledge based on other texts and research. The analysis shows that the essays are hybrids blending for example pamphlet, memoir, general nonfiction and narrative nonfiction. References Bahtin M. 1981. Discourse in the novel. – Holquist M. (ed.) *The Dialogic imagination. Four essays*, 259–422. Austin: University of Texas Press. Devitt A. 2004. *Writing genres*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. Lopate P. 2013. *To show and to tell. The craft of literary nonfiction*. New York: Free Press. Mäntynen A. – Shore S. 2014. What is meant by hybridity? An investigation of hybridity and related terms in genre studies. – *Text & Talk* 6, 737–758.

✉ ida.lowndes@helsinki.fi



Oral language and emergent literacy: Early childhood educators' beliefs and practices

Presenting author: Vettori, Giulia ; University of Florence; Italy.

Co-author: Dockrell, Julie ; Institute of Education; United Kingdom.

Chair: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: developmental aspects of writing ability;literacy;pedagogy and instruction;reading and writing

Literacy skills (reading and writing) are fundamental for academic success, employment, and social participation (OECD, 2023). Prior research identified early oral language and emergent literacy skills as key factors for later reading and writing (Mercugliano et al., 2025). Early childhood educators have a key role in providing language learning opportunities and interactions to enhance children's language and emergent literacy skills. In this study the opportunities afforded in these early educational settings are profiled to contribute to our understanding of effective classroom practice, specifically in closing the gap created by social or language disadvantages. Early childhood educators' self-reported beliefs and practices in relation to oral language and emergent literacy in Italian settings are examined across four domains: (1) beliefs about their role in promoting emergent literacy including the role of preschools in preparing children to learn to read and write (Beliefs); (2) capture the ways in which early oral language (receptive and expressive language) and emergent literacy (phonological awareness, letter knowledge and sound-signs integration, narrative awareness) are included in preschool education (Practices); (3) identify the time spent on oral language and literacy activities across the day (Quantity of Time) and (4) finally elucidate challenges, resources and barriers related to teacher and class-level variables (Teacher and class factors). The participants are early childhood educators working in Italian settings from both nursery schools (nidi d'infanzia, 0–3 years) and preschools (scuole dell'infanzia, 3–6 years). The teachers completed a literacy beliefs questionnaire adapted from published works (i.e., Besser-Biron et al., 2025; Dockrell et al., 2012; Sandvik et al., 2014; Weadman et al., 2022) which included national educational policies and objectives. Data collection is scheduled for completion by the end of March, with an anticipated sample size of approximately 60 participants. Given previous studies in English contexts we anticipate a positive relationship between beliefs and practices with evidence in how these practices evolve and adapt in response to challenging classroom environments. Ultimately, this study aims to inform the development of targeted professional development programs and evidence-based interventions.

✉ giulia.vettori@unifi.it



Using writing for memorising: pen vs. mobile phone

Presenting author: Breuer, Esther ; Universität zu Köln; Germany.

Chair: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: acquisition;cognitive processes;EFL and ESL writing;writing to learn

Previous research has shown that using (hand) writing for memorising and for language learning is a very effective method, especially for abstract lexical items. Neurocognitive studies have shown that word representations are closely connected to motor areas in the brain that control the writing hand. At the same time, writing practices have changed considerably due to the widespread use of digital devices. This raises the question of whether the relationship between writing movements and memorisation is affected by the use of new technologies. This study examines the influence of different writing tools on the memorisation of words in a first and a foreign language. German students copy words in German (first language) and English (foreign language) using either pen and paper or a mobile phone. The word material includes established, well-known words as well as neologisms that are unfamiliar to the participants. Neologisms are used in order to investigate how new lexical items are encoded and stored under different writing conditions. Participants are divided into two groups according to the writing tool. After the copying task, memory is tested immediately to measure short-term retention. A second memory test is conducted one week later to assess longer-term retention. This design allows for a comparison of memorisation effects depending on the writing tool, the language, and the degree of lexical familiarity. At the time of the conference, results will be available and will be presented and discussed in detail. The study aims to show whether handwriting and mobile phone input lead to different memory outcomes, particularly for neologisms and foreign-language words. By combining insights from embodied cognition research and language learning, this presentation will hopefully contribute to a better understanding of how changing writing technologies may influence lexical processing and memory in educational contexts.

✉ esther.barnaul@gmx.de



VALIDATION OF WRITING MODELS IN TRANSPARENT ORTHOGRAPHIES: WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?

Presenting author: Jozipović, Marija ; Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences; Croatia.

Co-author: Lenček, Mirjana ; Faculty of Education and rehabilitation Sciences (University of Zagreb); Croatia.

Chair: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: acquisition;cognitive processes;developmental aspects of writing ability;language-specific and cross-linguistic studies

Most writing models have been developed and validated in opaque (deep) orthographies such as English. However, language activities like writing are influenced by the specific characteristics of a language and its script. Unlike deep orthographies, transparent (shallow) orthographies (e.g., Croatian, Finnish) are characterised by highly consistent and predictable phoneme–grapheme correspondences, approaching a 1:1 relationship (Lenček & Anđel, 2011). Consequently, both literacy acquisition (Kuvač Kraljević et al., 2024) and the nature of reading and writing difficulties differ from those in English (e.g., Lenček, 2012; Reis et al., 2020). Compared to widely studied languages such as English, writing in transparent orthographies has been less extensively researched, and studies validating existing models in these languages are scarce. Writing models provide theoretical frameworks for understanding the (meta)cognitive, (meta)linguistic, and (grapho)motor processes involved in writing, as well as the factors that determine the quality of the final product. To claim universal applicability, writing models must be applicable across diverse linguistic and orthographic contexts. One of the main challenges in validating writing models concerns the role of orthographic transparency, for which research remains limited. This paper aims to present key developments and shifts in writing models that have emerged from critiques of earlier models, highlights persisting gaps in understanding the components and relationships within writing models, and examines their generalisability across different scripts, orthographies, and languages, with particular attention to transparent languages such as Croatian (Kuvač Kraljević et al., 2024; Olujić Tomazin et al., 2023). Current literature indicates a lack of studies validating writing models in transparent orthographies, where features facilitating literacy acquisition reduce the influence of transcription on the quality and fluency of written discourse. Finally, interdisciplinary and longitudinal research across languages and populations, including multilingual speakers, is essential to test the validity of existing models and to identify both universal and context-specific components.

✉ marija.jozipovic@erf.unizg.hr



Writing workshop in classrooms, what for ?

Presenting author: Keller, Lorenzo Dubois ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Co-author: Barbier, Marie-Laure ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Co-author: Quaranta, Jean-Marc ; Aix-Marseille University; France.

Chair: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: cognitive processes;creative writing;literacy;writing at school

Writing workshops in classrooms, what for ? Dubois-Keller, L., Quaranta, J.M., Barbier, M.L. Creative writing workshops are, in principle, suitable and adaptable to all school levels (Butzek, Barbier & Quaranta, 2023). They are based on a didactic model of "spiral reading, writing, rereading, rewriting" (Oriol-Boyer, 2013), and teachers who use them report numerous cognitive and conative benefits for students, including improved writing skills, motivation, and literacy skills. However, little scientific research has been conducted on the effects of creative writing workshops in schools. This study presents a systematic literature review conducted using the PRISMA method, with the aim of identifying the possible impacts of creative writing training in a secondary school context. 681 articles were identified across eight databases in social sciences. 23 were selected for this review based on exclusion and inclusion criteria. The following were excluded: articles not dealing with the teaching of creative writing; or on its effects on cognitive, conative, or literacy skills; theoretical studies and studies dating from before 2005. The following were included: articles that offered participants, high school students, a creative writing intervention; open access articles; articles in English or French. The results showed that creative writing in general is used almost worldwide and could have beneficial effects on the cognitive skills (creativity, problem solving), conative skills (motivation, self-efficacy, agency), and literacy skills (reading, writing) of high school students. However, these effects were not always similar across the studies analyzed. It seems that creative writing is a concept that needs to be adapted to the school setting according to teachers' objectives and class level. However, studies show that the skills developed during creative writing activities are transferable to other academic texts expected in the school context. Oriol-Boyer, C. (2013). Ateliers d'écriture, quarante ans d'élaboration, Mémoires d'un parcours entre théorie et pratiques. Dans C. Oriol-Boyer & D. Bilous (dir.), Ateliers d'écriture littéraire (pp. 25-89). Paris : Hermann. Quaranta, J.-M., Barbier, M-L, & Butzek, A.-M. (2023). écriture créative et formation, In N. Bonnardel, F. Girandola, E. Bonetto & T. Lubart (Eds.). La Créativité en Situations : Théories et applications (pp. 285-294). Paris : Dunod.

✉ lorenzo.dubois-keller@etu.univ-amu.fr



Written Language Production in Children with Developmental Language Disorder: Evidence from Arabic

Presenting author: Taha, Juhayna ; University College London; United Kingdom.

Co-author: Dockrell, Julie ; Institute of Education; United Kingdom.

Co-author: Salloum, Shada ; Birzeit University; Palestine.

Chair: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: language-specific and cross-linguistic studies; spelling issues; writing for specific needs; writing impairment

Written Language Production in Children with Developmental Language Disorder: Evidence from Arabic Writing systems vary in their orthographic depth and in the linguistic units they encode, leading to crosslinguistic variations in writing development. This necessitates language-specific frameworks for writing assessments. This study focuses on Arabic, where data on writing development and difficulties is scarce. The Arabic script has distinctive features, including the similarity of basic letter forms, ligature, allography, and nonlinearity. These properties place unique demands on writing development, especially for children with Developmental Language Disorder (DLD), who are at heightened risk for persistent writing difficulties. This study compares the written language production of Arabic-speaking children with DLD to that of typically developing (TD) children. It also explores the relationship between spoken and written language production. We assessed Arabic writing using a word dictation task (spelling) and picture-elicited written texts (written narratives). We measured spoken language through expressive vocabulary, expressive grammar, nonword repetition, and oral narratives. Sixty Arabic-speaking children in Ramallah, Palestine, aged 8 to 12 years, participated across three groups: children with DLD, age-matched TD children, and language-matched TD children. This design allows us to determine whether writing profiles in DLD reflect developmental delay or qualitatively distinct writing patterns. Data collection will be completed by mid-February. Planned analyses will examine written texts across key dimensions (productivity, complexity, accuracy, and overall writing quality), including accuracy and the frequency and nature of spelling, morphological and syntactic errors. Regression analyses will identify the extent to which spoken language predicts the different dimensions of children's writing. Implications for research and practice will be outlined.

✉ j.taha@ucl.ac.uk



A Pilot Study of Expressive Writing in Educational Rehabilitation for Neurodegenerative Diseases

Presenting author: Pintér, Henriett ; Semmelweis University; Hungary.

Co-author: Albert, Csilla ; Cultural Journal of Székelyföld; Romania.

Co-author: Molnar, Pal ; Semmelweis University; Hungary.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: case study;intervention study;motivational and emotional factors in writing;therapeutic writing

The aim of the study was to examine the applicability of expressive writing among neurodegenerative patients in the form of an intervention implemented as a supplementary writing task performed at home in connection with institutional, guided educational rehabilitation sessions. In the rehabilitation of neurodegenerative patients, cost-effective interventions that can be integrated into everyday life and can have beneficial effects on emotional well-being are increasingly gaining attention. Expressive writing has been used in learning situations, among other things, to improve well-being (Park et al., 2014), to increase working memory (Farhoukh & Chanquoy, 2020), and to reduce anxiety and caregiver burden in patients with neurodegenerative diseases (Cash & Lagerman, 2015) and stroke survivors and their relatives (Beauchamp et al., 2023). Educational rehabilitation based on the Petó method provides complex support for the physical, emotional, and social functioning of people with neurodegenerative diseases within an institutional setting, promoting their learning processes and well-being. Expressive writing has not yet been used among such patients in the Central European region. Eleven people engaged in a 20-minute writing task on four consecutive days to disclose their experiences, followed by reflections on each session (Pennebaker & Evans, 2018). We examined whether there were differences in self-reflections after writing on consecutive days and what linguistic patterns emerged in the self-reflections. Quantitative analysis using the Friedman test revealed a significant difference between the first and third days in the expression of deep thoughts and feelings, while qualitative content analysis identified seven recurring linguistic patterns in the participants' reflections, such as: "It gives me strength," "It helps me organize my thoughts," and "I was able to express myself." These results illustrate how writing serves as a cognitive and emotional tool for organizing experiences, developing self-awareness, and supporting psychological well-being. The results suggest that expressive writing may be a feasible and cost-effective complementary practice in educational rehabilitation. It appears to support participants' engagement, motivation, and sense of coherence within learning-based therapeutic activities.

✉ pinter.henriett@semmelweis.hu



Corpus Insights for Teaching Case Analysis Recommendation Writing

Presenting author: Gomez Laich, Maria Pia ; Carnegie Mellon University; Qatar.

Co-author: Maune, Michael ; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; United States.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: academic writing;case study;corpus linguistics;professional writing

The case analysis is a central genre in business and information systems programs, requiring students to apply disciplinary knowledge to identify issues and propose recommendations (Nathan, 2013). Effective recommendation writing demands that students adopt an argumentative stance, justify their preferred option, and demonstrate evaluative reasoning. Yet many students struggle to argue clearly for one option over others or to evaluate their proposed solution by comparing it to alternatives or addressing limitations. In this presentation, we examine how students construct the Advisory move in case analysis writing, the stage where analysis is transformed into persuasive recommendations. Drawing on Swalesian move analysis (Swales, 1990) and Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014), we analyzed two corpora: (1) the British Academic Written English corpus and (2) the Information Systems Writing in Qatar corpus, which comprises 98 undergraduate case analyses (381,824 tokens) produced at an American branch campus in the Middle East. From these corpora, we built a specialized subcorpus of 70 recommendation-driven texts (256,385 tokens) to examine how the Advisory move is realized. This subcorpus was annotated in UAM CorpusTool (O'Donnell, 2023) to develop a scheme of rhetorical sub-moves: Orientation (framing, theoretical grounding), Argument (reasons for/against options), and Recommendation (endorsement, implementation, rejection). Complementary n-gram analysis identified recurrent lexical, modal, and evaluative strategies students use to calibrate obligation, contingency, and certainty. By making visible the rhetorical sub-moves and linguistic resources that underpin effective recommendations, we argue that explicit teaching of these patterns is essential for strengthening students' recommendation writing. Linking corpus analysis to pedagogical practice, we show how writing research can inform instructional interventions that improve the quality of student arguments in case analysis genres. References Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge. Nathan, P. (2013). Academic writing in the business school: The genre of the business case report. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(1), 57–68. O'Donnell, M. (2023). *UAM CorpusTool 3.3*. Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

✉ mgomezla@andrew.cmu.edu



Examining Writing and Reasoning in Dutch History Textbook Questions

Presenting author: Menke, Remco ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Co-author: Van Boxtel, Carla ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Co-author: van Drie, Jannet ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Co-author: van Weijen, Daphne ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Chair: Grabowski, Joachim ; Leibniz University; Germany.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: education;literacy;writing in the disciplines;writing tasks

Examining Writing and Reasoning in Dutch History Textbook Questions One of the main challenges in history education is students' difficulty in applying abstract historical concepts in writing. Knowledge of substantive concepts is essential for understanding the past and contributes significantly to the quality of historical reasoning (van Boxtel & van Drie, 2018). However, students particularly struggle with using historical concepts in their written responses (van Boxtel et al., 2024). Additionally, their answers often lack structure and coherence (van Drie et al., 2014) as well as explicit use of historical concepts. The study's main research question is: What are the language and discipline-specific demands of written answers to textbook questions with substantive historical concepts in 8th grade? Little is known about these discipline-specific literacy requirements for answering questions, even though textbooks are widely used in history education (Bernhard, 2018). We selected textbooks from four different publishers. For four topics, we analysed what is expected from students by examining textbook questions (n = 361). Among other aspects, we examined which historical concepts are required in written responses, as well as what forms of language support are provided, such as writing frames. We also considered requirements for students to incorporate specific concepts and express ideas in their own words. In addition, written answers on these assignments were analysed (n = 50), with four students completing the tasks while thinking aloud. Preliminary findings show that history textbook questions offer students little opportunity to practice reasoning and writing with substantive concepts. Furthermore, our analysis indicates that many students struggle with questions that require historical reasoning with these concepts. Overall, this study identifies the domain-specific demands associated with writing in history education and emphasises their significance. The main findings of this study form the foundation for a lesson design to be developed in a follow-up study. During the poster presentation, we hope to receive feedback on the findings, the analysis, and how the lesson design builds on these results.

✉ r.a.menke@uva.nl



From research to classroom: Implementing evidence-based writing practices

Presenting author: Sieveke, Pia ; University of Münster; Germany.

Co-author: Busse, Vera ; University of Münster; Germany.

Co-author: Graham, Steve ; Arizona State University; United States.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: intervention study; pedagogy and instruction; writing at school; writing instruction

Strengthening students' writing is essential for long-term academic success (Cutler & Graham, 2008). Despite substantial research on effective writing instruction, evidence-based writing practices are still implemented inconsistently, and research linking professional development (PD), instructional practice, and student outcomes remains limited (Camping et al., 2025). As part of a (quasi-)experimental intervention project conducted in eleven German primary schools (Grades 3 and 4), this explanatory sequential mixed-methods study examined changes in teachers' writing-related knowledge and practices following PD, their acceptance of the approaches, and the relationship between implementation fidelity and students' writing outcomes. Quantitative data included pre-post assessments of writing knowledge, perceived feedback effectiveness, and feedback frequency among EG ($n = 21$) and CG teachers ($n = 17$). Logbooks from eleven EG teachers were used to classify implementation fidelity (high vs. low) and relate implementation to student writing outcomes ($n = 177$). Qualitative interviews with the same teachers were analyzed using qualitative content analysis to identify factors that supported or hindered implementation. EG teachers reported significantly higher writing knowledge following PD compared to the CG (ANCOVA: $F(1, 35) = 9.91$, $\eta^2_p = .22$, $p = .003$), while no group differences emerged for perceived feedback effectiveness or feedback frequency. Implementation fidelity varied substantially: six teachers showed high adherence to key components of the intervention, whereas five demonstrated low adherence. Interview data highlighted acceptance, perceived fit, and feasibility as key factors shaping instructional decisions. Multilevel analyses revealed a significant time \times implementation interaction, showing that students taught by high implementers achieved greater gains in text quality ($\beta = 0.22$, $p < .001$; ICC = .33). The discussion considers factors supporting successful implementation and implications for designing PD, with attention to teacher perceptions and contextual factors that influence the uptake of evidence-based practices. Camping, A., McKeown, D., Williams, M., & Harris, K. R. (2025). Professional development in writing instruction. In J. Fitzgerald, C. A. MacArthur, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of Writing Research* (3rd ed., pp. 340–354). Guildford Press. Cutler, L. & Graham, S. (2008). Primary grade writing instruction: A national survey. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(4), 907–919.

✉ psieveke@uni-muenster.de



Reciprocal peer feedback with argumentative text structure

Presenting author: Morre, Gabriel ; University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland PH (FHNW); Switzerland.

Chair: Fürstenberg, Maurice ; Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU); Germany.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: collaborative writing; evaluation and assessment of writing competence; intervention study; writing instruction

Reciprocal peer feedback with argumentative text structure Text revision is understood as a sub-competence that enables students to distance themselves from their own text, allowing them to identify inconsistencies and develop alternatives (Baurmann & Pohl, 2009). Cognitively oriented approaches consider revision as a sequence of activities that involve reading, evaluating, and revising the text (MacArthur, 2012). As part of an intervention study on revising argumentative texts in 7th grade, one of three experimental groups used the peer feedback approach Smabusch (N = 106 students). This approach combines the explicit teaching of a text-pattern-based revision strategy (Sturm, 2022) with reciprocal feedback (according to MacArthur, Schwartz & Graham, 1991). The acronym Smabusch focuses on an argumentative text structure (situation, opinion, argument, reasoning and examples to support it, and smash as the “winning argument”). Initial analyses indicate that Smabusch results in a positive change in strategy efficiency. This raises the question of how students in the experimental group use Smabusch to evaluate texts and how they proceed when implementing the strategy. The poster presentation will present further results also focusing on setting a writing goal and evaluating a text. Baurmann, Jürgen; Pohl, Thorsten (2009): Schreiben – Texte verfassen. [Writing – Composing Texts] In: Bremerich-Vos, Albert; Granzer, Dietlinde; Behrens, Ulrike und Köller, Olaf (Hrsg.): Bildungsstandards für die Grundschule. Deutsch konkret. [Educational standards for elementary school. German in concrete terms] Berlin: Cornelsen Verlag Scriptor. S. 75–103. MacArthur, Charles A.; Graham, Steve; Schwartz, Shirley (1991): Knowledge of Revision and Revising Behavior among Students with Learning Disabilities. In: Learning Disability Quarterly 14/1. S. 61–73. MacArthur, C. A. (2012). Evaluation and Revision. In V.W. Berninger (Ed.), Past, present, and future contributions of cognitive writing research to cognitiv psychology (pp. 461–483). Psychology Press. Sturm, A. (2022). Prozess- und produktorientierte Schreibförderung in Kombination [Process- and product-oriented writing instruction combined]. In V. Busse, N. Müller & L. Siekmann (Hrsg.), Schreiben fachübergreifend fördern. Theoretische Grundlagen und Praxisanregungen für Schule, Unterricht und Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung [Promoting interdisciplinary writing. Theoretical foundations and practical recommendations for schools, instruction and teacher education] (S. 96–113). Klett Kallmeyer.

✉ gabriel.morre@fhnw.ch

Wednesday June 3, 2026 | 11:00 - 12:30

Poster Presentation 4

Poster Presentation



Scaffolding Multilingual Writers in Source-Based Argumentative Writing: An Intervention Study

Presenting author: Debrah, Cecilia Owusu ; University of Energy and Natural Resources; Ghana.

Co-author: Yegblemenawo, Stella Afi Makafui ; Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi; Ghana.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;AI writing;intervention study;L2

Source-based argumentative writing remains a demanding task, especially for multilingual writers in higher education, as they are expected to interpret diverse texts, synthesize multiple perspectives, and develop coherent arguments in a second language (Chuang & Yan, 2023). This study draws on a Vygotskian sociocultural perspective on mediated learning to explore how a scaffolded instructional intervention enhances students' engagement with sources in their argumentative writing, particularly given the growing influence of digitally mediated tools on students' academic literacy skills. Conducted over fourteen weeks, the qualitative study involved 60 undergraduate civil engineering students enrolled in the second part of a two-semester academic writing course. The intervention was based on five scaffolded phases: analyzing sources, summarizing, synthesizing, planning, and drafting, designed to make the process manageable and transparent. To reflect authentic writing practices in digitally mediated contexts, students recorded any AI tools they used during task completion. Data sources included 10 semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, instructional materials, and drafts of students' writing assignments. Braun and Clark's (2019) reflexive thematic analysis was used to examine how students navigated each stage, the challenges encountered, and the strategies employed to integrate sources into coherent written arguments. Findings show that scaffolded sequences helped students break down complex tasks, identify connections between texts, and build confidence in developing arguments. While AI-assisted tools provided localized support, the scaffolded activities remained the primary guide for deeper interpretive and rhetorical choices essential for effective academic writing. This research offers valuable insights into how structured scaffolding can aid L2 writers' growth in source-based argumentative writing.

✉ cecilia.owusudebrah@uenr.edu.gh



Task Specification and Adaptation in Primary Grade Writing Instruction

Presenting author: Springstein, Sander ; Universität zu Köln; Germany.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: assessment;writing at school;writing instruction;writing tasks

Writing tasks play a crucial role in the development of writing competence, as they initiate, guide, and support writing processes. Therefore, recent writing research has placed increasing emphasis on the conceptualization of good writing tasks. In German-speaking countries, the concept of task specification (in German: Profilierung) by Bachmann and Becker-Mrotzek (2010) has gained particular prominence within the field of task-based research. According to this concept, a writing task is considered "good" when it is embedded in an authentic and social context which (1) defines a clear writing purpose, (2) activates or provides the necessary knowledge to complete the task, (3) facilitates social interaction within the writing process, and (4) offers opportunities to observe the effect the text has on its readers. Despite recent progress in task-based research, it remains largely unexplored which writing tasks are implemented in actual classroom practice and to what extent they meet established criteria for good writing tasks. Therefore, as part of a national survey, the current study aims to compile a representative corpus of writing tasks used by primary school teachers in the writing classroom. The corpus will then be evaluated using a newly developed rating scale: Following the concept of task specification (cf. Bachmann & Becker-Mrotzek, 2010), the proposed rating scale is structured around four subscales (i.e., purpose, knowledge, interaction, and effect). Furthermore, the rating scale includes an additional subscale (adaptation) that examines how primary school teachers adapt existing writing tasks to meet the needs of struggling writers (e.g., Graham & Harris, 2005; Grünke & Leonard-Zabel, 2015). References: Bachmann, T. & Becker-Mrotzek, M. (2010): Schreibaufgaben situieren und profilieren. In: T. Pohl & T. Steinhoff (Eds.): Textformen als Lernformen. Duisburg: Gilles & Francke, 191-210. Graham, S. & Harris, K. R. (2005): Improving the Writing Performance of Young Struggling Writers: Theoretical and Programmatic Research From the Center on Accelerating Student Learning. In: Journal of Special Education, 39(1), 19-33. Grünke, M. & Leonard-Zabel, A. M. (2015): How to support struggling writers: What the research stipulates. In: International Journal of Special Education, 30(3), 137-149.

✉ sander.springstein@uni-koeln.de



Teaching writing in primary school: Future teachers' conceptions

Presenting author: Gil, Maria Beatriz ; EDUNOVA.ISPA; Portugal.

Co-author: Alves Martins, Margarida ; ISPA-Instituto Universitário EDUNOVA.ISPA; Portugal.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: pedagogy and instruction;writing at school;writing beliefs;writing instruction

Writing is a fundamental skill for students' success throughout their schooling, as it is relevant to various school subjects. Graham and Alves (2021) argue that it is necessary to understand the needs of teachers and future teachers so that resources and materials can be developed that enable them to implement teaching activities for written production in an explicit and continuous manner since primary school. In this context, our aim was to analyse future teachers' conceptions regarding the teaching of writing in primary school and the confidence they feel in teaching different types of texts. The participants were 97 master's students at the end of their initial training for teaching in primary school. They attended 4 higher education institutions in Portugal. They answered a questionnaire at the end of their training. In it, they were asked about: their level of confidence in teaching writing when compared to other areas, such as oracy and reading, and the weekly time they considered necessary to devote to teaching it; their level of confidence and perceived relevance regarding the teaching of different types of texts and different components of writing; the relevance they attributed to planning and revising and to various assessment parameters; their knowledge of the teaching resources available to support the teaching of writing; and their perceived training needs. The results revealed that future teachers feel less confident about teaching writing when compared to oracy and reading, despite considering that the same amount of time should be devoted to teaching writing and reading. There was a significant discrepancy between the degree of confidence and the relevance attributed to different components of writing, with the former clearly lower. Regarding text genres, they show more confidence in teaching narrative and descriptive texts than other types of texts. Finally, they demonstrated very limited knowledge of the teaching resources available to support the teaching of writing and highlighted the need for training in planning, writing and revising texts. These results contribute to reflect on the role of initial training in the development of skills for teaching written production and in designing teaching resources to support teaching practices.

✉ mariabeatriz.mgil@gmail.com



Career Development for Early Career Researchers

Presenting author: Aramayo, Hairenik .

Presenting author: Elf, Nicolaj .

Presenting author: Konstantinidou, Liana ; Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Presenting author: Newton, Moira ; University of Auckland and Papatoetoe West School; New Zealand.

Presenting author: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Presenting author: Vandermeulen, Nina ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Keywords: researcher; research; academic; publish; teach; volunteer; network; outside academia

An OECD (2023) report identified a number of factors influencing the career choices of early career researchers. The report offered eight recommendations for supporting the careers of post docs. Recommendation 4 emphasised the importance of mentoring. The purpose of this round table is to address mentoring and to enable early career researchers to discuss career progress and development with experienced researchers and academics. Career development inside and outside academia will be discussed. There will be five presenters: Hairenik Aramayo, Dr Nina Vandermeulen, Professor Liana Konstantinidou, Professor Nicolaj Elf, Associate Professor Emeritus Karl-Heinz Pogner. Each presenter will talk for ten minutes about how they developed or followed their career trajectory inside or outside academia. The skills and abilities which facilitated successful career development will be a focus. The talks will be followed by forty minutes allowed for questions and discussion. The importance of publishing and the rigours of getting an article published will be considered. The value of participating in a variety of research opportunities will be addressed. The importance of tertiary teaching experience and developing supervision expertise will be discussed. Presenters will talk about engaging in voluntary opportunities on committees, organising conferences or research groups to enhance employability. The presenters will advise about careful networking. The advisability of conference attendance will be discussed. The skills and knowledge developed in the PhD which are transferable to settings outside academia and are also valuable in academia will be a focus. Early career researchers should find this session most beneficial in deciding and developing their career trajectories and realising multiple options which are available to them.

✉ kons@zhaw.ch; kp.msc@cbs.dk; nina.vandermeulen@uantwerpen.be; moira.newton.mn@gmail.com



Enhancing Automated Essay Scoring by Integrating Rule-Based Language Checking with Generative Models

Presenting author: Berger, Stéphanie ; Institut für Bildungsevaluation; Switzerland.

Presenting author: Stahlhut, Laura ; Institut für Bildungsevaluation; Switzerland.

Co-author: Debelak, Rudolf ; Institut für Erziehungswissenschaften, Universität Zürich; Switzerland.

Co-author: König, Nina ; Institut für Bildungsevaluation; Switzerland.

Chair: Perrin, Daniel ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: evaluation and assessment of writing competence;feedback;Generative AI;writing at school

Recent advances in generative artificial intelligence (AI) have enabled automated feedback systems that offer scalable support for writing instruction in classroom settings. While large language models (LLMs) can generate formative feedback efficiently, prior research indicates that such feedback often contains hallucinations or lacks linguistic precision, thereby limiting its pedagogical usefulness (Jia et al., 2024; Cheng & Amiri, 2025). This study investigates whether integrating rule-based language-checking methods into a generative AI feedback system improves the accuracy and instructional value of automated feedback for student essays in primary and lower secondary education. To this end, we developed an AI-based feedback system that generates (1) ratings of spelling and grammar on separate four-point scales and (2) written feedback summarizing linguistic quality and listing detected errors with suggested corrections. Using this system, feedback was generated for 100 student essays under two conditions: generative AI augmented with rule-based methods and generative AI only. To evaluate the quality of both the ratings and the written feedback, linguistic experts independently scored the essays and reviewed the AI-generated feedback regarding hallucinations and inaccurate corrections. Preliminary results show that the correlation between human and AI spelling ratings increases from $r = 0.608$ to $r = 0.713$ when rule-based methods are integrated, while the correlation for grammar remained comparable ($r = 0.607$ vs. $r = 0.576$). To contextualize these findings, we present qualitative examples illustrating how the integration of rule-based checks corrected specific linguistic inaccuracies in the generative output. These findings suggest that hybrid systems can improve the accuracy of automated writing feedback, particularly for spelling. References Cheng, J., & Amiri, H. (2025). Linguistic blind spots of large language models. In NAACL 2025 Cognitive Modeling and Computational Linguistics Workshop. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.19260> Jia, Q., Cui, J., Du, H., Rashid, P., Xi, R., Li, R., & Gehringer, E. (2024). LLM-generated feedback in real classes and beyond: Perspectives from students and instructors. In D. A. Joyner, B. Paaßen, & C. Demmans Epp (Eds.), Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Educational Data Mining (pp. 862–867). International Educational Data Mining Society. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12729974>

✉ laura.stahlhut@ibe-edu.ch; stephanie.berger@ibe-edu.ch



Social Regulation in AI-Supported Feedback Ecologies: Disciplinary vs Non-Disciplinary Peers

Presenting author: Khuder, Baraa ; Chalmers University of Technology; Sweden.

Chair: Perrin, Daniel ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;feedback;Generative AI;writing processes

Research on feedback literacy and social regulation of learning increasingly acknowledges the importance of multiple feedback sources; however, we still know relatively little about how regulation unfolds across different feedback ecologies, particularly in varied human–AI configurations. Drawing on models of self-, co-, and socially shared regulation of learning, this study examines how doctoral students regulate their writing when revising with (a) AI plus disciplinary peers and (b) AI plus non-disciplinary peers. Fifty-five PhD students were allocated to two conditions: one in which they received AI feedback and discussed their texts with disciplinary peers in groups of four, and another in which they received AI feedback and discussed their texts with non-disciplinary peers in groups of four. Data comprised (1) AI interaction histories, (2) 14 audio-recorded “listening room” discussions, and (3) ~300-word individual reflections comparing AI and peer feedback. Transcripts were segmented into episodes and coded for forms of regulation (self-, co-, and socially shared regulation) and functions of regulation (planning, monitoring, evaluating, adapting). Across ecologies, AI never participated in genuinely socially shared regulation; episodes of shared regulation emerged only in human–human negotiation. In AI + disciplinary peer groups, AI most often functioned as a co-regulator: students tended to follow AI suggestions when a disciplinary peer could “watch over”, with regulation distributed between AI guidance and expert peer oversight. In AI + non-disciplinary peer groups, AI was more often recruited as a resource for self-regulation: students critically evaluated and selectively adapted AI feedback in the absence of disciplinary authority. The study offers a nuanced account of how different actors in feedback ecologies shape regulatory processes, and the presentation will discuss pedagogical implications for designing feedback from multiple resources in doctoral writing courses.

✉ khuder@chalmers.se



The Effects of ChatGPT Feedback on Student Engagement: A Longitudinal Study

Presenting author: Katanneck, Stanislav ; Université catholique de Louvain (UCL); Belgium.

Chair: Perrin, Daniel ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;feedback;Generative AI;L2

ChatGPT can provide timely, personalized and informative feedback to improve text quality and learning success. It can thus mitigate teachers' workload, particularly in writing-intensive courses. Despite these advantages, it remains unclear to what extent L2 learners engage with and incorporate feedback in the revision process for the improvement of text quality, as feedback uptake depends on several external and internal factors (Liu & Storch 2010). Furthermore, recent studies emphasize that students' engagement with written corrective feedback changes over time, and that these dynamics of students' engagement with feedback have not been explored yet (Mao & Icy 2024: 815). Therefore, the present study analyzes the impact of GenAI-assisted feedback (exemplified by ChatGPT-4) in combination with teacher feedback in extensive university German as a foreign language courses (CEFR, B2/ C1). The study focuses on the following research questions: RQ1: To what extent can the combination of GenAI-assisted feedback and teacher feedback support the revision phase in the writing process? RQ2: Which dynamics can be identified in the learner profiles based on the engagement with ChatGPT-based feedback? This longitudinal study with international students of German as a foreign language adopts a sequential explanatory mixed-methods research design (QUAN @ qual) to answer the research questions. For the quantitative analysis (QUAN) learners' engagement (including all subtypes: behavioral, emotional, cognitive and social) is measured by using a standardized questionnaire with closed items in 13-week courses. This data (n=74) is used to carry out a hierarchical cluster analysis with Ward-Linkage to identify latent learner profiles and to assess the dynamics of engagement over time. The qualitative component (qual) of the study comprises the analysis of open-ended questions in reflection sheets as well as interviews in focus groups to get a holistic view of the feedback uptake and students' engagement. Preliminary findings indicate that ChatGPT feedback on syntactic complexity is effective in improving linguistic accuracy and syntactic range, while teacher feedback is beneficial for fostering self-reflection, strategic revision, and writing motivation. The results are transferable to other L2 contexts, in particular for general language courses and academic writing and thus offers a replicable framework for integrating GenAI feedback into writing pedagogy.

✉ stanislav.katanneck@rub.de



Literary Writing Process Modeling: across manuscript drafts and digital traces

Presenting author: Ammari, Emna ; Aix-Marseille Université; France.

Co-author: Bellot, Patrice ; Aix Marseille Université CNRS; France.

Co-author: Leblay, Christophe ; University of Turku, School of Languages and Translation studies; Finland.

Chair: Chanquoy, Lucile ; Université Nice Sophia Antipolis; France.

Theme: Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;creative writing;keystroke logging data processing and analysis;writing models

Investigating literary writing dynamics and authors' revision signatures is increasingly recognized as a crucial field, drawing on both genetic criticism and psycholinguistics, as well as advanced generative AI systems. Despite this growing interest, a combined analysis of heritage manuscripts alongside contemporary keystroke logging data remains largely uncharted. Therefore, this proposal aims to bridge this gap by proposing a fine-grained modeling of literary writing and revision processes, developed within the Cré@LAME project (Literary Cre@tion and Author Manuscript Analysis), supporting an interactive assisted rewriting system, attuned to the author's profile and revision strategies. The approach relies on a set of LLM-based agents specialized in context-aware rewriting, each performing a specific editorial role aligned with distinct revision intentions. These agents are coordinated by a multi-layer, multi-view Graph Neural Network (GNN) that models the evolution of textual states across heterogeneous materials, from linear manuscript transcriptions to digital writing traces. This network captures both linguistic (lexical, syntactic, semantic) and revision-oriented dimensions, reflecting editing operations and authorial intentions, across multiple levels, while guiding the agents' rewriting operations according to learned patterns of textual evolution. This GNN thereby maintains coherence in editing operations while tracking author-specific revision practices. Accordingly, this work introduces a novel computational framework for textual genesis that addresses key aspects, including multi-granular data heterogeneity across manuscripts and digital log files, the inference of relevant indicators of authorial revision trajectories, and unified hierarchical representations formats of revision processes, integrating cross-source materials, suitable for multi-level graph modeling. Overall, this contribution advances research on textual genesis by highlighting how the integrated modeling of manuscript materials and digital traces provides deeper insights into authorial practices and the dynamics of literary creation.

✉ emna.ammari@lis-lab.fr



Teenagers writing expository texts with and without gen-AI

Presenting author: Johansson, Victoria ; Kristianstad University; Sweden.

Co-author: Hermansson, Carina ; Department of Language Studies, Umeå University; Sweden.

Co-author: Lindgren, Eva ; Umeå University; Sweden.

Co-author: Silverdal, Sara ; Department of language studies; Sweden.

Co-author: Sturk, Erika ; Umeå University; Sweden.

Co-author: Wengelin, Åsa ; University of Gothenburg; Sweden.

Chair: Chanquoy, Lucile ; Université Nice Sophia Antipolis; France.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;writing models;writing process data collections;written language competence

Writing with generative AI (gen-AI) introduces new affordances and constraints that invite reconsideration of long-standing writing models, such as Hayes and Flower's (1980) framework and Kellogg's (1996) model of working memory in writing. This study examines how key writing processes—planning, translating, and revising—and related subprocesses such as goal setting, audience adaptation, reading, and evaluation unfold when students write with gen-AI. Adopting a developmental perspective, it qualitatively compares writing with and without AI support in a cross-sectional design involving students ($n = 52$) aged 13, 15, and 18. In a classroom setting, the students produced comparable expository texts first without and then with a gen-AI tool of their choice, while their writing was captured through screen recordings. Post-task interviews probed their strategies and reflections on differences between the modes. These questions guide the study: (1) How do writing processes unfold with and without using gen-AI, and are there age-related differences? (2) How do writers interact with the gen-AI tool (e.g., prompting), and how do they make use of the generated text? Initial results show that all students produce coherent and linguistically appropriate expository texts without AI, consistent with earlier descriptions of developmental writing (e.g., Johansson, 2009; Wengelin et al., 2014). In contrast, age-related patterns emerge when AI is introduced. The 13-year-olds often use gen-AI to produce full texts based on task prompts and report valuing the tool's ability to generate lengthy responses. The 15-year-olds tend to use gen-AI primarily for idea generation, rewriting the AI-generated material to align with their own voice. The 18-year-olds more often use gen-AI to refine their existing ideas and strengthen the logic of their texts. This developmental trend demonstrates that the youngest writers rely on gen-AI mainly to support translating processes, the middle group for planning processes, and the oldest group for revising processes. The findings are discussed in relation to how gen-AI may differentially support components of the writing process depending on writers' developmental needs and strategic awareness, and how the use of gen-AI during writing can reshape existing writing models. Understanding these evolving practices is also essential for instructional approaches including assessment.

✉ victoria.johansson@hkr.se



What Can Sentence-Centric Writing Models Reveal about the Writing Process?

Presenting author: Ulasik, Margo ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Mahlow, Cerstin ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Piotrowski, Michael ; University of Lausanne; Switzerland.

Chair: Chanquoy, Lucile ; Université Nice Sophia Antipolis; France.

Theme: Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: keystroke logging data processing and analysis;natural language processing (NLP);writing and linguistics;writing models

Sentences are fundamental communicative units (Bühler 1918), and written texts are generally understood to consist of these units, but research on how writers produce sentences remains limited. Although linguistic modeling of the writing process has gathered interest in recent years, existing approaches, whether grounded in linguistic theory or in writing research, remain insufficient to explain how writers actually produce and revise text at a linguistic level. Prior work has investigated correspondences between writing bursts and linguistic structure (e.g., Kaufer et al. 1986; Cislaru and Olive 2018; Feltgen et al. 2023), examined revisions from a linguistic perspective (e.g., Manseri and Jouvenel 2025), proposed methods for transforming writing-process data into linguistic units (e.g., Leijten et al. 2019), and provided initial contributions to sentence-level analyses of the writing process (Miletic et al. 2022; Mahlow et al. 2024; Ulasik and Miletic 2024). We advance the state of the art by building on these developments and on the theoretical framework for sentence-centric modeling introduced by Ulasik et al. (2025). Our approach enables detailed tracking of sentence production through the analysis of sentence transformations and the detection of pauses at sentence boundaries. It supports systematic identification of bursts within sentence production and offers a method for characterizing the scope of transformations and bursts with respect to individual sentences. To investigate the potential of the model, we apply our software tool for sentence-centric modeling of writing, THEtool (<https://github.com/mulasik/wta>), to real-world data from the KLiCKe corpus (Yu Tian et al. 2025). This demonstrates the potential insights that emerge when shifting the analytical perspective from bursts or revisions to a sentence-centric view.

✉ margo.ulasik@zhaw.ch



Secondary Students' Decision-Making Processes Underlying L1 Writing Processes with GenAI

Presenting author: Sliepenbeek, Leonie ; Tilburg University; Netherlands.

Co-author: van der Loo, Janneke ; Tilburg University; Netherlands.

Chair: Álvarez-Moreno, Carmen ; Universidad de Leon; Spain.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: Generative AI; L1; writing beliefs; writing processes

Since the emergence of ChatGPT, generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has been widely adopted by students in secondary and higher education for different tasks, such as writing. Yet empirical evidence how usage of GenAI affects writing processes has been scarce. In this qualitative pilot study we investigated how (Dutch) secondary school students' L1 writing processes unfold when allowed to write with unguided support of GenAI when taking individual factors (self-efficacy and writing beliefs) into account. Three participants from grade 10 of pre-university secondary education were selected upon their scores on a Self-Efficacy for Writing Scale with statements regarding both writing with pen and paper and with support of GenAI. They were asked to write a synthesis text based on three sources, which meant they had to select relevant information, organize this and integrate these ideas into a new argumentative text. They were instructed to use GenAI as seen fit and their writing process was captured with both screen recording and keylogging software. To understand their decision-making process an additional questionnaire about their writing beliefs was filled out and semi-structured interviews were held afterwards. During our presentation we will demonstrate our findings about the interplay between individual factors and participants' writing behaviour, as seen in the following example. One participant scored relatively high on both dimensions of self-efficacy, indicating they felt rather confident about their writing. Accordingly, this participant used GenAI only once (to ask for a definition) and wrote his text without returning to this output. The assessment of their own decision-making process during the interview showed that they explicitly refrained from using GenAI due to their beliefs about the value of learning to write for themselves. Early analyses of the other participants' decision-making processes also suggest that the degree and type of GenAI usage may be closely linked to both self-efficacy and writing beliefs. We believe this study contributes to our understanding of how LLMs may be situated within theoretical models of writing and may provide a valuable starting point for effective writing interventions, as findings show which challenges and opportunities GenAI brings to writing classrooms.

✉ l.j.c.sliepenbeek@tilburguniversity.edu



Thesis Writing with Generative AI: A Multi-Session Process Analysis

Presenting author: Conijn, Rianne ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Co-author: Van Waes, Luuk ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Chair: Álvarez-Moreno, Carmen ; Universidad de Leon; Spain.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;Generative AI;keystroke logging;writing processes

The use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (genAI) in education has had a substantial influence on the way students write. Given the rapid adoption genAI across higher education, it is important to ensure that its use does not compromise learning. However, to make informed pedagogical decisions on how to (or not to) use genAI in academic writing, teaching and assessment, we must first understand how students - and in the next stage also experts - interact with these tools. Previous studies have shown that genAI affects students' writing processes in different ways. For example, some students use genAI more instrumentally, whereas others use it more reflectively, leading to distinct patterns in how their writing develops. However, prior studies have primarily relied on single-session writing processes. In the present paper, we extend this line of research by analyzing multi-session writing processes in the context of writing a master's thesis. Specifically, we followed the writing process of three master theses students in Cognitive Psychology and Social Sciences over a period of 20 weeks. The number of writing sessions varied substantially among the three students, with totals ranging from 42 to 78 and 110 sessions. Their writing processes were collected using keystroke logging and complemented with students' interactions with genAI. Inspired by recent writing research, we analyze the keystroke and genAI-interaction data from three perspectives: (1) macro level: examining overarching process management and identifying the intensity of genAI use throughout the full thesis trajectory; (2) meso level: characterizing the individual writing sessions based on revision strategies, writing fluency, and interactions with external sources, including genAI; (3) micro level: identifying how specific genAI interactions influenced moment-to-moment revising and pausing behavior. Preliminary results show that the participants' use of genAI differed considerably: one participant relied heavily on genAI in the early stages for searching and summarizing sources; another used it moderately in the middle stages to gain an understanding of theories, methodologies, and analytical approaches; and the third interacted with genAI primarily towards the end, using it as a conversational partner to discuss results. Further macro-, meso- and micro-level analyses are currently underway.

✉ m.a.conijn@tue.nl



Typing Instruction: Teachers' Professional Competence and Instructional Practices

Presenting author: Lindauer, Nadja ; School for Teacher Education, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland; Switzerland.

Presenting author: Schüler, Lisa ; Universität Bielefeld; Germany.

Chair: Álvarez-Moreno, Carmen ; Universidad de Leon; Spain.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: proficiency;writing across disciplines or across the curriculum;writing instruction;writing tools and writing technology

Typing is a fundamental skill for producing written texts and participating in digital communication. For these reasons, many countries have included typing in their curricula, thereby assigning schools an important role in developing these skills (e.g., KMK, 2022). However, because the curricular integration often remains unspecific, typing is rarely taught systematically in schools (Pinet et al., 2025). In addition, there is a lack of basic training in teacher education. As a result, teachers feel inadequately prepared to teach typing (Donne, 2012). Research on the teachers' professional competences in typing instruction is limited (Schüler & Lindauer, 2025). The project TasDi (Didaktik des Tastaturschreibens und der Textverarbeitung) addresses this research gap: In one sub-study, the teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and teaching practices were examined in order to derive implications for teacher training and the development of teaching materials. Expert interviews were conducted with 23 teachers involved in typing instruction in the German-speaking countries (Germany, Switzerland, Austria), including, for example, German and computer science teachers. The interviews were semi-structured, audio-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed using content analysis (Kuckartz & Rädiker, 2024). The presentation provides insight into selected findings on teachers' prerequisites and teaching routines. The interviews show, for example, that teachers enter the profession via significantly different training paths. With regard to teaching practices, it becomes clear that typing instruction is not uniformly integrated into specific subjects and that different approaches are used for guiding learners (e.g., collaborative vs. individual work). Further differences can be seen in the role of teachers when working with digital learning programs. Donne, V. (2012). Keyboard Instruction for Students with a Disability. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 85(5), 201–206. KMK. (2022). *Bildungsstandards für das Fach Deutsch. Primarbereich i.d.F.v. 23.06.2022*. Kuckartz, U., & Rädiker, S. (2024). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Methoden, Praxis, Umsetzung mit Software und künstlicher Intelligenz*. Beltz Juventa. Pinet, S., Zielinski, C., Alario, F.-X., & Longcamp, M. (2025). On the acquisition of typing skills without formal training by school-aged children. *Reading and Writing*. Schüler, L., & Lindauer, N. (2025). Die Rolle der Lehrperson im (digitalen) Tastaturschreibunterricht. In L. Schüler & N. Lindauer (Hrsg.), *Didaktik des Tastaturschreibens* (S. 147–182). Ruhr-Universität Bochum.

✉ nadja.lindauer@fhnw.ch; lisa.schueler@uni-bielefeld.de

Hayes Award 2024 Lecture – Writing Fluency in the Perspective of Fluency Research

Presenting author: Linnemann, Markus ; University of Koblenz; Germany.

Writing fluency is a fundamental aspect of writing development and is closely related to other 'fluencies', such as reading and speaking fluency. Research on fluency highlights that proficient performance relies on the interaction of automatised, low-level processes, such as transcription in writing or word recognition in reading, and controlled, attention-demanding processes like translating ideas into text or reading with prosody. Over time, writing fluency develops as these fundamental processes become more automated, freeing up cognitive resources for higher-order writing skills such as planning, revising, and producing text strategically. While training programmes targeting fluency can improve these fundamental processes, evidence suggests that isolated practice often has limited impact. Integration into broader literacy instruction is therefore essential for achieving long-lasting results. This keynote will discuss theoretical and developmental perspectives on writing fluency, its connections to reading, speaking and listening fluency, and the implications for designing effective, integrated instructional approaches.

✉ mlinnemann@uni-koblenz.de

Thursday June 4, 2026 Schedule

Time	Session	Type	Room
08:30 - 09:00	Registration, Participation Certificates	Registration	
09:00 - 10:30	Demonstration Session 1	Demonstration Session	SM O2.17 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 1	Single Paper	SM O3.05 (Computer Room)
	Single Paper Session 16	Single Paper	SM O1.13 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 20	Single Paper	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 32	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 4	Single Paper	SM O1.08 (Lecture Room)
	The future of writing education	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
10:30 - 11:00	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG
11:00 - 12:00	Cognitive and Ethical Alignment of LLMs with Humans for Writing Research and Instruction	Keynote Presentation	Aula
12:00 - 13:30	Lunch	Lunch	Grüner Saal
13:30 - 15:00	Roundtable 4	Roundtable	SM O1.24/29 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 11	Single Paper	SM O1.17 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 25	Single Paper	SM O1.20 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 29	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
	University students' reflections on academic writing with genAI	Symposium	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
15:00 - 15:30	Coffee Break	Break	UG, EG
15:30 - 17:00	Single Paper Session 17	Single Paper	SM O2.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 18	Single Paper	SM O1.11 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 28	Single Paper	SM O1.13 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 30	Single Paper	SM O1.08 (Lecture Room)
	Single Paper Session 31	Single Paper	SM O3.05 (Computer Room)
	Single Paper Session 35	Single Paper	SM O1.01 (Lecture Hall)
	Single Paper Session 8	Single Paper	SM O3.01 (Lecture Hall)

Time	Session	Type	Room
17:00 - 17:30	Closing ceremony Chair: Daniel Perrin	Ceremony	Aula



Bursted! A tool for extracting bursts of writing from keystrokes logging "idfx" files

Presenting author: Bordes, Caroline ; CNRS/Université de Poitiers; France.

Co-author: Cislaru, Georgeta ; Université Sorbonne Nouvelle; France.

Co-author: Olive, Thierry ; CNRS & Université de Poitiers; France.

Chair: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: cognitive processes;keystroke logging;keystroke logging data processing and analysis;writing processes

We present Bursted!, an application that facilitates the extraction of bursts of writing from keystroke logging files when writing (Bordes, Olive & Cislaru, 2025). Keystroke recording is a widespread technique for studying computer writing and its dynamics. Keylogging applications record all keystrokes and mouse movements as well as their chronology. In addition, they often offer pre-analyses of raw data. However, few options to analyse bursts of writing are available. In this framework, Bursted! is designed to automate the extraction of bursts of writing, according to either a fixed or individualized threshold, with associated variables (pause duration before each burst, duration of burst, number of characters...) from "idfx" format keystrokes logs. The processing of a writing session log is divided into two modules: the first module cleans up and prepares the keylogs while the second aggregates the stored events into writing bursts. Each module creates a "csv" output file. Bursted! categorizes the bursts of writing according to their textual function: production bursts increment the text on its right edge, and revision bursts intervene on the text already produced. It distinguishes two types of revision bursts: immediate revision bursts that revise the latest production burst, and delayed revision bursts, which require a return to the text beyond said burst. Bursted! therefore facilitates the analysis of keystroke logging files when writing texts by providing a file of bursts and associated variables ready to be used for visualization, to calculate secondary variables, to prepare statistical processing, or for the automatic analysis of the content of text streams.

✉ caroline.bordes@univ-poitiers.fr



Inputlog: New perspectives on keystroke logging

Presenting author: Van Waes, Luuk ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Co-author: Van Horenbeeck, Eric ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Chair: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Theme: Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;keystroke logging;keystroke logging data processing and analysis;on-line writing and digital media

Inputlog is a widely used keystroke logging tool for observing and analyzing writing processes. This demo introduces the major new features of Inputlog 9.6.0 and outlines planned future developments. Versioning and Diary Function A new automatic versioning option allows users to save intermediate Word document versions at fixed intervals (e.g., every three minutes). Researchers can compare these versions to track document changes throughout the writing session. An optional diary prompt in the closing wizard invites writers to comment on their session, facilitating the combination of process data and self-report. Expanded Logging Environments Because writing increasingly takes place outside MS Word, the logging environment has been expanded. Inputlog now offers dedicated logging modules for Google Docs and LibreOffice, broadening the range of authentic writing contexts that can be captured. Feedback Reports Inputlog generates student-centered feedback reports that visualize key process indicators, including process graphs and source interaction. Users may rely on the default template or customize report formats to meet instructional or research needs, such as the use of AI. Multilingual Logging New beta versions introduce preliminary support for logging Korean and Chinese script (via Pinyin). This extends Inputlog's previous focus on Latin-based scripts and broadens its applicability in multilingual writing research. Copy-Task Dashboard Inputlog includes a standardized copy task designed to assess typing skills in thirteen languages using sentences, word triplets, and letter clusters. We also present a corpus of more than 5,000 anonymized copy-task recordings, accompanied by an interactive R-Shiny dashboard that allows researchers to explore the corpus, download data, and benchmark their own results.

✉ luuk.vanwaes@uantwerpen.be



Learning to write: Toy examples using the progressive graph tool.

Presenting author: Leblay, Christophe ; University of Turku, School of Languages and Translation studies; Finland.

Co-author: Caporossi, Gilles ; HEC Montréal; Canada.

Co-author: Usoof, Hakim ; University of Peradeniya/ Dept. Statistics & Computer Sciences; Sri Lanka.

Chair: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: data visualisation;keystroke logging data processing and analysis;learning to write;writing at school

Approaches to writing based on keystroke logging are becoming increasingly prevalent and are contributing to a more profound understanding of the writing process. A plethora of software programs facilitate the recording of keystrokes, thereby enabling the analysis of both the temporal and spatial dimensions of writing, from a recording file called a log. However, the interpretation of the information contained within these logs is challenging, due to the atypical nature of the data. The GIS representation has been utilised extensively (Becotte et al. 2019). Ggxlog is a recently developed software program that aims to combine text genetics (Leblay & Leblay 2019) and graph theory with keystroke logging (Caporossi & Leblay 2011; Doquet & Leblay 2014). This ggxlog software offers a specific feature, designated 'progressive graph', which enables researchers or educators to visualise the various stages of a writing session that has taken place (Usoof et al. 2020). This innovative feature enables the text being written to be displayed simultaneously, as in a word processor, alongside the real-time construction of the corresponding graph. The objective of this study is to collect a common pilot corpus between Finland, France and Quebec in a school context, with a focus on brief pieces of writing, referred to as 'toy examples'. This study will examine how young learners use keyboards to facilitate their acquisition of writing skills, thereby marking a pivotal transition from the conventional paper-and-pencil medium (Auriac-Slusarczyk et al., 2013; Cogis & Leblay, 2010). This would facilitate a more profound understanding of the utilisation of technological resources in the acquisition of written French and written Finnish as first languages.

✉ christophe.leblay@utu.fi



THEtool: A software application for linguistic modeling of writing

Presenting author: Ulasik, Margo ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Co-author: Mahlow, Cerstin ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Chair: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: keystroke logging data processing and analysis;natural language processing (NLP);writing models;writing processes

We present an open-source tool for analyzing writing process data in relation to linguistic structures: THEtool(<https://github.com/mulasik/wta>; Mahlow 2024; Ulasik and Miletic 2024; Ulasik et al. 2025). Although linguistic modeling of the writing process has gained importance in recent years, existing approaches, whether rooted in linguistic theory or writing research, remain insufficient to explain how writers actually produce and revise text at a linguistic level. THEtool enables writing researchers to investigate the writing process with a particular focus on sentences and their interaction with writing bursts and revisions. Because the software operates fully automatically and requires no manual intervention, it facilitates the efficient processing of large datasets. THEtool processes keystroke logging data in the XML-based IDFX format generated by Inputlog and ScriptLog, the de facto standard for storing and exchanging writing process data, thereby ensuring seamless integration with existing tools and workflows. To support a wide range of research applications, THEtool offers configurable key features, including language selection (currently German, Greek, French, and English, with straightforward extensibility to additional languages), the minimum pause duration that triggers the extraction of text and sentence versions within a writing burst, and relevance parameters for filtering text versions. THEtool is a fully functioning implementation of a model of text production based on the concept of layers: writing bursts, revisions, and sentence production are conceptualized as three distinct yet interacting layers that share a common timeline. Bursts may be interrupted by revision episodes or, in an abstract sense, by final punctuation marks signaling sentence completion. Revision processes can be interrupted by pauses or segmented by final punctuation. Likewise, sentence production may be interrupted by pauses or revisions. Projecting these layers onto one another enables new insights into the writing process from a linguistic perspective. We conducted exploratory studies in German, Greek, French, and English using THEtool. The results demonstrate both the feasibility and the analytical potential of the proposed approach.

✉ margo.ulasik@zhaw.ch



Measuring the Quality of AI-generated Feedback? From Theoretical Modelling to Empirical Evidence

Presenting author: Fürstenberg, Maurice ; Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU); Germany.

Chair: Gerth, Sabrina ; University College of Teacher Education Tyrol; Austria.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing; evaluation and assessment of writing competence; research methodology; writing at school

AI-generated feedback is widely used in schools without sufficient research having been conducted into its quality, particularly with regard to German students. This study therefore examines the quality of AI-generated feedback on German student texts, as well as how this quality is measured, from both theoretical and empirical perspectives. First, a theoretical model is developed based on international research (e.g. Fong, 2025; Jansen et al., 2025; Weidlich et al., 2025) which includes different producers and products. This model establishes the terminology used throughout the paper and illustrates that operationalising feedback quality poses a methodological challenge for empirical studies. Subsequently, a study compared feedback on three student texts in the form of a criteria-based assessment, an overall grade, and a short comment. This feedback was provided by 75 highly experienced Bavarian teachers and four AI systems. Finally, eight trained meta-reviewers assessed the quality of the human and machine feedback. In terms of overall grades, there was high inter-rater reliability ($ICC = 0.7-0.9$) between teachers and AI systems (with ten iterations). On average, AI models graded texts more leniently, but in the same order of ranking. The criterion-based assessment differed significantly. Regarding meta-feedback, an ordinal logistic model identified three criteria (explanation, concreteness and accuracy) as the strongest predictors of perceived usefulness, with the source (AI vs. teacher) having no significant influence. The results of the empirical study expand the area of research on real German pupils. The theoretical model helps to better systematise future studies and demonstrates the complexity of operationalising the central phenomenon of interest: the quality of AI-generated feedback. The many challenges involved in operationalising feedback quality are relevant for future studies. Fong, C. J. (2025). A renaissance in feedback science? Reviewing and reimagining feedback research methods. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 83, 102414. Jansen, T., Horbach, A., & Meyer, J. (2025). Feedback from Generative AI: Correlates of Student Engagement in Text Revision from 655 Classes from Primary and Secondary School Proceedings of the 15th LAK. Weidlich, J., et al. (2025). Teacher, peer, or AI? Comparing effects of feedback sources in higher education. *Computers and Education Open*, 9, 100300.

✉ m.fuerstenberg@lmu.de



Promoting digital text production competences in primary education

Presenting author: Heller, Kathrin ; University of Education Karlsruhe; Germany.

Co-author: Anskait, Nadine ; University of Education Karlsruhe; Germany.

Chair: Gerth, Sabrina ; University College of Teacher Education Tyrol; Austria.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: instructional design in writing;intervention study;on-line writing and digital media;writing at school

The digital production of texts is considered a key competence in today's information and communication society (Frederking & Krommer, 2019). Familiarity with the writing medium is of great importance here, as it systematically influences text quality: fast typists produce better texts (Connelly et al., 2007; Gong et al., 2022). Initial pilot studies show that, in addition to keyboard typing, digital text production skills (e.g. simple word processing functions, navigation) are fundamental prerequisites to produce digital texts (Anskait, 2022). Nevertheless, there is still a lack of comprehensive studies on the development of digital writing skills, especially in German-speaking countries and for primary school pupils (Gahshan & Weintraub, 2024; Schneider & Anskait, 2017; Schüler et al., 2023). Addressing this gap, the project aims to develop instructional measures for digital writing and examine their effects on third-grade students' text production. Building on a diagnostic laboratory study (n=16) using keystroke logging, the intervention study (n=121) investigates the effectiveness of a specially developed interactive learning pathway for promoting digital text production competences (keyboarding and word-processing functions) and compares it with a touch-typing course (focus on keyboarding). To evaluate both support measures, the typing behaviour (including speed and skills in simple word processing functions) of the learners will be assessed in a pre-post-test design using a procedure developed in the diagnostic study. In addition, effects on text quality (Lindauer, 2024) and text revision (Held, 2006) are analysed based on students' independently written texts responding to a profiled writing task (Bachmann & Becker-Mrotzek, 2010). Initial results show that learners benefit from even short training sessions in terms of typing behaviour (see also Grabowski et al. 2007, Anskait, 2022) and that the promotion of digital text production skills enables learners to utilise word processing functions. The extent to which this influences text quality and text revisions in the production of their own texts is determined using variance analyses (ANOVA with repeated measures) including covariates as reading comprehension and previous digital experience. The presentation will outline key findings from the diagnostic study, provide insights into the support material, and discuss the results of the intervention study.

✉ kathrin.heller@ph-karlsruhe.de



Teaching narrative writing in grade 2: first findings from FiSBY

Presenting author: Schilcher, Anita ; University of Regensburg; Germany.

Co-author: Dick, Mirjam ; University of Regensburg; Germany.

Co-author: Knott, Christina ; University Regensburg; Germany.

Co-author: Nöske, Lea ; University of Regensburg; Germany.

Co-author: Pronold-Günthner, Friederike ; University of Regensburg; Germany.

Co-author: Wild, Johannes ; Universität Regensburg; Germany.

Chair: Gerth, Sabrina ; University College of Teacher Education Tyrol; Austria.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: design-based research;instructional design in writing;intervention study;writing at school

Meta-analyses indicate that young writers benefit when strategies are taught explicitly, modelled, practised with scaffolding, and linked to transparent quality criteria (Graham & Harris, 2017; Graham, Harris, & Santangelo, 2015). However, translating these findings into everyday classroom routines remains challenging (Darling-Hammond, Hyster, & Gardner, 2017; Wild, in press). This contribution reports early findings from FiSBY-2-narrative, a narrative strategy module embedded in the multi-genre writing strategy project FiSBY (www.fisby.de). In FiSBY over 2 400 elementary students take part in a longitudinal survey from grade 2 to 4. The FiSBY-2-narrative module operationalizes narrative strategies and is compared with business-as-usual writing instruction. The present study analyses a random subsample in grade 2 ($n = 87$; 173 texts). Children were on average 8.36 years old ($SD = 0.48$). About 82% reported German as their first language. The business-as-usual group included slightly more boys than the training group (33% vs. 18%). For writing assessment, we used a standardized story-starter at the beginning and end of the school year. The narratives were rated with RANT (Wild, 2020) for genre-specific elements (event representation, character description, situational description) and more general stylistic features (vocabulary and figurative language). Analyses were conducted in R (R Core Team, 2025) using linear mixed-effects models appropriate for longitudinal intervention studies (Hilbert et al., 2019). Models included time (pre/post), group (training vs. business-as-usual), and their interaction, controlling for gender, German language background, and socioeconomic status (questionnaire-based). Random intercepts accounted for repeated measures within students. Results show a selective intervention effect: the training group demonstrated significantly stronger gains in character description (time \times group: $\beta = .55$, $p = .026$). In this small subsample, no reliable differential change emerged for event ($p = .232$), situational description ($p = .123$), or figurative language ($p = .338$). Vocabulary increased from pre to post across both groups ($\beta = .31$, $p = .033$). Socioeconomic status was positively associated with event ($\beta = .26$, $p = .002$). In sum, FiSBY-2-narrative appears to accelerate a specific, teachable narrative dimension in Grade 2. For the conference presentation, these patterns will be re-analysed in the large FiSBY cohort to obtain more robust estimates.

✉ anita.schilcher@ur.de



Long-Term Memory Resources and Essay Quality in ESL Ghanaian Students' Writing

Presenting author: Oblie, Emmanuel Lauren ; University of Education, Winneba; Ghana.

Co-author: Lomotey, Charlotte ; University of Education, Winneba; Ghana.

Chair: Nottbusch, Guido ; University of Potsdam; Germany.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: assessment;EFL and ESL writing;writing skills;writing theory

While existing literature establishes some relationships between language proficiency and the linguistic dimensions of essay quality, there is a dearth of research on the links between long-term memory resources as a whole and the non-linguistic aspects of essay quality. The current research, therefore, examined the influence of linguistic, genre and topic knowledge on the content and organisation quality of students' essays in senior high schools in Ghana, from the lenses of a conceptual framework primarily drawn from Flower and Hayes (1981) and Hayes (1996). The study used a convergent parallel mixed-methods design, and was based on 262 randomly sampled students, who took a pre-writing test of linguistic knowledge, wrote an argumentative essay, and responded to a post-writing questionnaire for genre and topic knowledge. Data were analysed using regression analyses and comparative content analysis procedures. The findings show that the three resources jointly made statistically significant positive contributions to both content and organisation quality of the essays. Among them, linguistic knowledge emerged as the strongest positive predictor of content quality, while genre knowledge made the strongest contribution to organisation quality. The qualitative findings also substantiated the quantitative results, showing marked differences between essays written by high- and low-resource participants across introductions, body paragraphs, and conclusions. The overall convergence of the qualitative and quantitative results confirms that students' content and organisational performance in ESL writing is strongly shaped by the interaction of linguistic, genre, and topic knowledge resources. These results extend L2 writing theory by foregrounding the crucial role played by long-term memory in L2 writing performance. The findings also call for pedagogical approaches that simultaneously scaffold language use, model genre-specific rhetorical structures, and support learners' access to relevant content knowledge before and during writing.

✉ eloblie@uew.edu.gh



Strategies for Open Writing Tasks in the fide Test at CEFR Levels A2 and B1

Presenting author: Kowalska, Emilia Anna ; UZH/UniFr; Switzerland.

Chair: Nottbusch, Guido ; University of Potsdam; Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: assessment;cognitive processes;education;L2

“Strategies for Open Writing Tasks in the fide Test at CEFR Levels A2 and B1: An Exploratory Study”The goal of this study is to reconstruct the writing process in German as a second language and to analyse which goal-directed cognitive and procedural operations are activated. It includes a process-oriented approach to writing in the L2 – a perspective that is underrepresented in writing research (Arras 2013: 75, Heine 2014: 123). The research question is, “What strategies are elicited by the specific requirements/demands of the three open writing tasks in the high stakes fide model test (CEFR A2/B1)?” Three hypotheses were formulated:the type of writing task influences the use of specific strategies;individual differences emerge in the breadth and configuration of strategy use;construct-irrelevant strategies are activated during writing.A between-method triangulation (Denzin 1970: 308–309) was used to answer the research questions, combining the think-aloud method during task performance with retrospective interviews to get a holistic view of the writing process and strategies. Transcripts with six participants (out of a total of thirteen) with Polish as their L1 were analyzed using qualitative content analysis (Kuckartz & Rädiker 2022: 129). The dataset consisted of 18 think-aloud protocols and 6 interview transcripts. The analysis revealed a repertoire of four strategies that predominated across all open writing tasks: a) formulating or translating from the L1, b) detailed reading of task instructions, generating detailed plans, and c) paraphrasing (H1). The study revealed inter- and intra-individual variation in the scope, configuration, and sequencing of strategies (H2). Moreover, the results indicated that participants incorporated extended verbatim passages from input texts and task instructions into their own texts to improve their text quality. This led to a reduction of their own formulations, and to an increasingly reproductive character (Peresisch 2025: 224) (H3). The results provide possible implications for writing pedagogy in L2 contexts. These include fostering learners’ orientation towards the task environment, fostering process awareness, and promoting a learning-supportive integration of artificial intelligence into the writing process. The results also include a critical reflection on the construct and test validity of the fide test.

✉ emiliakovalska@gmail.com



The Working Memory-Writing Connection: Meta-Analytic Evidence

Presenting author: Kim, Young-Suk ; University of California Irvine; United States.

Co-author: Cao, Yucheng ; Middle Tennessee State University; United States.

Chair: Nottbusch, Guido ; University of Potsdam; Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: cognitive processes;meta-analysis;writing skills;writing theory

The Working Memory-Writing Connection: Meta-Analytic Evidence
Aim: This meta-analysis examined the relation between working memory and written composition and whether this relation is moderated by several factors.
Theoretical Framework: Writing requires simultaneous management of idea generation, organization, sentence construction, word selection, transcription, and evaluation. Theoretical models—including the cognitive model of writing (Hayes & Flower, 1981), the not-so-simple view of writing (Berninger & Winn, 2006), and the Direct and Indirect Effects Model of Writing (Kim, 2020)—consistently identify working memory as critical for writing. However, the magnitude of this relation and potential moderators remain unclear.
Method: We searched five electronic databases (e.g., APA PsycInfo, Academic Search Ultimate, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global). Inclusion criteria: (1) participants aged 5+ years without severe sensory, behavioral, cognitive, or intellectual disabilities; (2) assessment of both working memory and written composition at sentence and/or paragraph level; (3) zero-order correlations, standardized regression coefficients, or sufficient data to compute effect sizes; (4) published in English.
Findings: We analyzed 84 studies with 975 effect sizes from 16,747 participants. The overall weighted correlation between working memory and written composition was .27. Two key moderators emerged: (1) the relation was significantly stronger in secondary schools than elementary schools, and (2) verbal working memory showed stronger relations than visuospatial working memory with writing outcomes.
Relevance: Although working memory's theoretical importance for writing is widely recognized, this is the first comprehensive meta-analysis quantifying this relation and identifying moderators. Findings have implications for writing theory and instruction.
References
Berninger, V. W., & Winn, W. D. (2006). Implications of advancements in brain research and technology for writing development, writing instruction, and educational evolution. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 96–114). Guilford Press.
Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
Kim, Y.-S. G. (2020). Structural relations of language, cognitive skills, and topic knowledge to written composition: A test of the direct and indirect effects model of writing (DIEW). *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 910-932.

✉ youngsk7@uci.edu



Explicit instruction and rubrics for argumentative synthesis writing: Effect of Collaboration

Presenting author: Gutiérrez-Bermejo, Eugenia ; Universidad Autónoma de Madrid; Spain.

Co-author: Cuevas, Isabel ; Universidad Autonoma de Madrid; Spain.

Co-author: Luna, Maria ; Universidad a Distancia de Madrid (UDIMA); Spain.

Co-author: Martín, Ana ; Universidad Autonoma de Madrid; Spain.

Co-author: Martínez-Álvarez, Isabel ; Madrid Open University; Spain.

Co-author: Mateos, Mar ; Universidad Autónoma de Madrid; Spain.

Chair: Stukker, Ninke ; Groningen University; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: collaborative writing;instructional design in writing;intervention study;reading and writing

Explicit instruction and rubrics for argumentative synthesis writing in Secondary Education: The effect of CollaborationGutiérrez-Bermejo, E.*, Cuevas, I.*, Mateos, M.*, Martín, A.* Luna, M** & Martínez, I**UAM*, UDIMA**Secondary education students must develop key competences to address current challenges, such as critical thinking and argumentative skills (European Commission, 2019). Writing an argumentative synthesis based on different texts presenting opposing perspectives on a topic is a complex task with great potential for promoting the development of these competences (Mateos et al.,2018). However, students struggle with identifying, contrasting, and integrating opposing perspectives, especially through weighing and synthesizing strategies, thus they require specific instructional support (Casado-Ledesma et al., 2021). The aim of this study is to compare the effectiveness of an instructional program for learning to write argumentative syntheses in the first year of secondary education, across different task settings (individual vs. collaborative writing). Instructional program includes learning activities based on explicit instruction (EI) and practice using an instructional rubric (PR), each adapted from Cuevas et al. (2024). Forty-nine students were assigned to two conditions (EI+PR vs EI+PR+C) and wrote three argumentative syntheses (pretest/mid-test/posttest syntheses). Results show that both conditions were effective in improving students' synthesis quality. Additionally, in the practice session, students who wrote collaboratively achieved better results, although these differences were attenuated in the posttest. Findings are discussed, and we conclude with educational implications regarding the adaptation of task settings based on students' profiles.Keywords: Argumentative Synthesis, Explicit Instruction, Rubric, Collaborative Writing.References.Casado-Ledesma, L., Cuevas, I., Van den Bergh, H., Rijlaarsdam, G.,Mateos, M., Granado-Peinado, M.,& Martín, E. (2021). Teaching argumentative synthesis writing through deliberative dialogues: Instructional practices in secondary education. *Instructional Science*, 49(4), 515-559. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-021-09548-3>Cuevas, I. Mateos, M., Casado-Ledesma, L.,Olmos, R., Granado-Peinado, M.,Luna, M., Núñez, J.A. & Martín, E. (2024). How to improve argumentative syntheses written by undergraduates using guides and instructional rubrics. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 39, 4573–4596. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-024-00890-x>Mateos, M., Martín, E., Cuevas, I.,Villalón, R., Martínez, I., & González-Lamas, J. (2018). Improving written argumentative synthesis by teaching the integration of conflicting information from multiple sources. *Cognition and Instruction*, 36, 119–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2018.1425300>

✉ eugenia.gutierrez@estudiante.uam.es



Rubrics for Planning and Revising Argumentative Syntheses in Collaborative and Individual Settings

Presenting author: Medina-Gutiérrez, María ; Universidad Autonoma de Madrid; Spain.

Co-author: Cuevas, Isabel ; Universidad Autonoma de Madrid; Spain.

Co-author: Mateos, Mar ; Universidad Autónoma de Madrid; Spain.

Co-author: Olmos, Ricardo ; Universidad Autonoma de Madrid; Spain.

Co-author: Rijlaarsdam, Gert ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Co-author: Van Steendam, Elke ; KU Leuven; Belgium.

Chair: Stukker, Ninke ; Groningen University; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: collaborative writing;intervention study;reading and writing;writing processes

Using Instructional Rubrics for Planning and Revising Argumentative Syntheses in Collaborative and Individual Settings: Effects on Text Quality Medina-Gutiérrez, M.*, Cuevas, I.*, Olmos, R*, van Steendam, E.**, Rijlaarsdam, G.*** & Mateos, M.*UAM*, KULeuven**, UvA***Integrating sources to write argumentative syntheses is a key academic skill, yet many undergraduates struggle, particularly during planning and revision (Vandermeulen et al., 2024). The current study examines the impact of an instructional rubric on the quality of students' argumentative synthesis tasks, with a special focus on reaching integrative conclusions, given their difficulties in integrating opposing perspectives through synthesizing strategies (Cuevas et al., 2024; Mateos et al, 2018). The effect of the rubric was analyzed after its use in two learning sessions focused on different stages of the writing process (planning and drafting and reviewing and revising) and delivered either individual (R+I) or collaborative (R+C) settings. A total of 101 undergraduates were assigned to three conditions (R+I, R+C, control) and wrote three argumentative syntheses, each based on two texts presenting opposing views on a topic (pretest-synthesis, intermedia-synthesis' draft, revised intermediate-synthesis, and posttest-synthesis.). The rubric improved students' learning, and these effects were already evident in the drafting phase and increasing marginally during the revision phase in individual settings. However, these effects were not greater under collaborative learning. Findings are discussed, and we conclude with recommendations for future research and educational implications. Keywords: argumentative synthesis, instructive rubric, collaborative setting, writing processes. References Cuevas, I. Mateos, M., Casado-Ledesma, L., Olmos, R., Granada-Peinado, M., Luna, M., Núñez, J.A. y Martín, E. (2024). How to improve argumentative syntheses written by undergraduates using guides and instructional rubrics. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 39, 4573–4596. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-024-00890-x> Mateos, M., Martín, E., Cuevas, I., Villalón, R., Martínez, I., & González-Lamas, J. (2018). Improving written argumentative synthesis by teaching the integration of conflicting information from multiple sources. *Cognition and Instruction*, 36, 119–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2018.1425300> Vandermeulen, N., Van Steendam, E., De Maeyer, S., Lesterhuis, M & Rijlaarsdam, G (2024). Learning to write syntheses: the effect of process feedback and of observing models on performance and process behaviors. *Reading and Writing* 37, 1375–1405. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-023-10483-7>

✉ maria.medinag@uam.es



Supporting peer feedback conversations during argumentative writing: rubric vs. conversation chart

Presenting author: Landrieu, Yana ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Co-author: Bouwer, Renske ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Co-author: De Smedt, Fien ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Co-author: De Wever, Bram ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Co-author: Van Keer, Hilde ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Chair: Stukker, Ninke ; Groningen University; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: collaborative writing;intervention study;speaking and writing;writing tools and writing technology

Research topic/aim This dialogic writing study investigates how students' peer feedback conversations can be supported during the revision phase of the collaborative writing process. Our research questions focus on whether providing students with a rubric or a conversation chart stimulates dialogic interaction and how these conversations relate to subsequent text revisions. **Theoretical framework** Grounded in Mercer and Wegerif's (2002) and Bouwer's and colleagues (2024) frameworks on exploratory talk, the study builds on research highlighting the collaborative potential of peer feedback during argumentative writing. While guidance is widely acknowledged as essential for effective peer feedback, little is known about which forms of support work best. This study examines the transition from oral peer feedback to written text revisions and explores whether provided peer feedback is (or is not) actually reflected in the subsequent text revisions. **Methodology** An intervention study was conducted with 102 students (aged 16–18) across eight lessons on argumentative writing. Using a pre-test post-test design, two conditions were compared: a rubric and a conversation chart condition. Data included peer feedback conversations analysed through content analysis and statistical tests: ANOVA, MANOVA, chi-square, and binary logistic regressions. **Findings** During peer feedback conversations, students primarily discussed quality of (counter)arguments and rebuttals. The conversation chart appeared to be most effective in fostering exploratory talk, particularly when combined with teacher intervention. However, transfer from dialogue to text revision was limited, indicating that peer feedback alone does not guarantee effective text revisions. **Relevance** This research addresses underexplored dimensions of writing: the collaborative nature of peer feedback and its connection to subsequent text revisions. Findings offer practical guidelines for integrating scaffolds and teacher support to enhance dialogic interaction and improve writing outcomes. **References** Mercer, N., & Wegerif, R. (2002). Is exploratory talk productive talk? In K. Littleton & P. Light (Eds.), *Learning with computers: analysing productive interaction* (pp. 79–101). Bouwer, R., van Braak, M., & van der Veen, C. (2024). Dialogic writing in the upper grades of primary school: How to support peer feedback conversations that promote meaningful revisions. *Learning and Instruction*, 93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101965>

✉ yana.landrieu@ugent.be



Differential Effects of a Tablet-Based Writing Intervention on Text Quality: An Intervention Study

Presenting author: Michels, Viktoria ; TU Chemnitz; Germany.

Chair: Fitjar, Camilla ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: intervention study;text composition;writing instruction;writing tools and writing technology

Differential Effects of a Tablet-Based Writing Intervention on Text Quality: An Intervention Study Students with weak writing skills struggle with text production and content learning, underscoring the need for early support (Becker-Mrotzek et al., 2014). Digital writing environments, such as those offering spell-checking and text-to-speech functions, may provide such support, particularly for weak writers (Graham & Harris, 2018). Yet despite their growing use in schools, little is known about which learners benefit most and how digital tools differentially affect the development of text quality. This study, conducted within the BMBF-funded EdToolS project, examines differential effects of a tablet-based writing intervention on text quality among 7th-grade students (N = 153) using a pre–post–follow-up design with a control group. Text quality was assessed using keyboard-written texts. The intervention comprised strategy instruction and training in the use of a word processor (spell-checking in EG1/EG2; text-to-speech in EG2), followed by a practice phase in which students wrote multiple texts (EG1/EG2: using tablet and tools, CG: handwritten). A language competence score derived via PCA was used to classify students into high- and low-performance groups. Linear regression models revealed that low performers in EG1 showed significantly greater short-term gains in text quality (pre–post) compared to the control group, whereas no differential effect emerged for EG2. Among high performers, text quality in EG2 remained more stable from pre to follow-up than in the control group. These findings provide insights into learner-specific benefits and limitations of digital writing tools. Given the increasing role of digital literacy, the study highlights the urgent need to align digital tools with differentiated writing instruction. Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2018). Evidence-Based Writing Practices: A Meta-Analysis of Existing Meta-Analyses. In R. Fidalgo, Raquel, Harris, Karen R., & Braaksma, Martine (Hrsg.), Design Principles for Teaching Effective Writing (S. 13–37). Brill. https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004270480/B9789004270480_003.xml Becker-Mrotzek, Michael, Joachim Grabowski, Jörg Jost, Matthias Knopp, und Markus Linnemann. „Adressatenorientierung und Kohärenzherstellung im Text -Zum Zusammenhang kognitiver und sprachlich realisierter Teilkomponenten von Sprachkompetenz“. Didaktik Deutsch, Nr. Jg. 19. (2014): 21–43.

✉ viktoria.michels@uni-hamburg.de



Writing Fluency in Primary School: An Evaluation of a Training Programme in Challenging Contexts

Presenting author: Michels, Viktoria ; TU Chemnitz; Germany.

Presenting author: Wanka, Rebekka ; Mercator-Institut (Universität zu Köln); Germany.

Co-author: Kaplan, Ina ; Mercator-Institut für Sprachförderung und Deutsch als Zweitsprache; Germany.

Chair: Fitjar, Camilla ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: evaluation and assessment of writing competence; intervention study; writing at school; written language competence

Writing fluency is understood as the coordinated interaction of graphomotor automatization, rapid retrieval of phonographic and orthographic patterns, and the formulation of coherent linguistic units (Stephany et al., 2020). Automatization is central, as it reduces demands on working memory and enables learners to engage more deeply with higher-level planning and revising processes (Hayes & Flower, 1980; Hayes, 2012). The present study therefore investigates the effectiveness of a structured, training-based writing-fluency programme for mono- and multilingual primary school students, comparing its impact to regular instruction within the German federal initiative Schule macht stark (SchuMaS). All participating schools (N = 3) were SchuMaS schools in challenging contexts and voluntarily joined the study following data-protection approval and parental consent. The sample comprised pupils in primary grades three and four (N = 151) in 2023–2024 from two German federal states: North Rhine–Westphalia and Rhineland–Palatinate. The intervention followed a quasi-experimental pre–post design with a control-group. During seven to eight weeks, students in the experimental classes (n = 105) engaged in daily 15–20-minute sessions using a training booklet focusing on routine, time-limited repetition of hierarchically lower writing processes, consistent with principles for effective fluency training (Sturm, 2017). Participating teachers completed a fourteen-hour blended-learning qualification to implement the training independently. Pupils in the control classes (n = 46) continued regular writing instruction without additional training. To evaluate training effects, three short performance-based tests were administered immediately before and two to three weeks after the intervention: an Alphabet Task, a word-writing task, and a picture-based writing prompt, capturing multiple dimensions of writing fluency (speed, accuracy, productive output). Additionally, a C-Test assessed lexical–grammatical competence at pretest, and a questionnaire gathered background information (language acquisition history, grade repetition). Linear mixed-effects models are being implemented for the statistical analyses, which are currently in progress. By linking a theoretically grounded fluency model with a scalable, teacher-delivered programme, the study provides empirical evidence on how automated writing routines develop in primary school children. The results will inform instructional design for heterogeneous classrooms and support writing development in socially challenging educational contexts.

✉ viktoria.michels@uni-hamburg.de; rebekka.wanka@mercator.uni-koeln.de



Writing on Paper or on Tablet? Error Patterns and Processing Time in Digital and Hybrid Formats

Presenting author: Wörfel, Seda Yilmaz ; Universität Hamburg; Germany.

Co-author: Krelle, Michael ; Universität Hamburg; Germany.

Chair: Fitjar, Camilla ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: evaluation and assessment of writing competence; spelling issues; writing at school; writing tools and writing technology

Writing on Paper or on Tablet? Error Patterns and Processing Time in Digital and Hybrid Formats Revised educational standards in Germany highlight the increasing relevance of digital competencies in school learning. The planned transition of standardized comparison tests to technology-based assessment (TBA) raises the question of how shifts from paper-and-pencil to digital formats affect orthographic performance. Given that handwriting and typing engage different cognitive and motor processes, digital formats may elicit distinct error types and correction strategies (Frahm, 2012; Jung et al., 2021). This underscores the need to examine how students adapt to these demands and how performance is influenced. To address this, two complementary studies were conducted. The first (HYBRID) investigated third- and fourth-grade students' processing of orthographic tasks in a combined tablet–paper format. The second (DIGITAL) analyzed fully technology-based cloze tasks completed on tablets, with a focus on error patterns and processing time. Data from 100 primary school students were collected, drawing on synchronized screen and overhead video recordings to capture processing behavior. The comparison reveals systematic differences across formats. In the digital condition, students exhibited more comprehension-related hesitations and engaged in more orthographic correction attempts, whereas in the hybrid condition they more frequently undertook retrospective review of their written responses. Error frequency in the digital mode showed a positive correlation with processing time ($r_s = .33$, $p = .029$), while no significant association emerged in the hybrid condition ($r_s = .14$, $p = .339$). Quantitative analyses further indicate a higher overall error count in the hybrid mode. These findings underscore the need for closer examination of digital test formats. Beyond ensuring technological accessibility, schools must ensure didactic and diagnostic compatibility when integrating digital procedures into teaching and assessment. Literatur: Frahm, Sarah. 2012. Computerbasierte Testung der Rechtschreibleistung in Klasse Fünf - eine Empirische Studie Zu Mode-Effekten Im Kontext des Nationalen Bildungspanels. Berlin: Logos Verlag Berlin. Jung, Stefanie, Korbinian Moeller, Elise Klein, und Juergen Heller. 2021. «Mode Effect: An Issue of Perspective? Writing Mode Differences in a Spelling Assessment in German Children with and without Developmental Dyslexia». *Dyslexia* 27 (3): 373–410. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.1675>.

✉ seda.yilmaz-woerfel@uni-hamburg.de



A Hero's Journey? Advancing Expressive Writing and Literacy Development in Middle School

Presenting author: Adin-Surkis, Abigail ; Atid Network of Schools; Israel.

Presenting author: Harush, Yamit Tarin ; Haifa University; Israel.

Co-author: Barak, Matan ; The Hebrew University of Jerusalem; Israel.

Co-author: Katzir, Tami ; University of Haifa; Israel.

Chair: Newton, Moira ; University of Auckland and Papatoetoe West School; New Zealand.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: motivational and emotional factors in writing; writing and linguistics; writing at school; writing skills

Middle school students frequently disengage from literacy instruction when pedagogical approaches emphasize technical skills while marginalizing emotional engagement (Eccles & Roeser, 2011). This intervention study examines whether integrating the Hero's Journey narrative structure (Campbell, 1949) with dialogic teaching can simultaneously foster literacy skills, writing quality, and writing identity. The framework positions the Hero's Journey as eliciting emotional investment in characters' transformative journeys. When engaging authentically in dialogic pedagogy (Nystrand, 1997; Alexander, 2020), students can connect the archetypal patterns of the Hero's Journey to their developmental experiences (Erikson, 1968). The framework distinguishes between writing-to-learn—analytical writing regarding textual meaning—and writing-to-express—reflective writing exploring students' own transformative experiences—integrating academic writing development with identity construction (Graham & Perin, 2007; Pennebaker & Seagal, 1999). Following year-long teacher professional development, the "Journey Through Words" intervention was implemented across 13 classrooms in four Israeli middle schools (N = 240). Pre-post assessments measured writing quality using benchmark rating procedures and reading comprehension through text-based tasks. Students reported writer self-efficacy, achievement emotions, and teacher-student relationship quality. In-depth interviews with nine teachers provided implementation insights. Response-to-intervention analyses demonstrated significant improvements across all writing dimensions—content, organization, and linguistic expression—as well as in reading comprehension. Baseline performance negatively predicted improvement trajectories ($\beta = -.48$ for writing; $\beta = -.54$ for reading), indicating that initially lower-performing students achieved the largest gains. Relational-emotional analyses showed that positive teacher-student relationships predicted elevated pride, which significantly enhanced both writing and reading performance, with indirect effects through pride (95% CIs excluding zero). Despite these performance improvements, students' writing self-efficacy did not significantly change, suggesting a divergence between skill growth and self-perceptions as writers. Teacher interviews confirmed that integrating analytical and reflective writing around the Hero's Journey enabled simultaneous development of critical writing skills and authentic personal expression. Grounding writing instruction in emotionally resonant narratives, combined with dialogic teaching, advances writing competencies and writer identity, with particularly robust effects for struggling learners. Positive teacher-student relationships operate through pride as an emotional pathway supporting literacy growth.

✉ yamitharush@gmail.com; abigaila@atid.org.il



A systematic review of the role of motivation in digital multimodal composing

Presenting author: Yu, Nan ; Beijing Normal University; China.

Chair: Newton, Moira ; University of Auckland and Papatoetoe West School; New Zealand.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: learning and learner characteristics; meta-analysis; motivational and emotional factors in writing; multimodality

Abstract Individual differences (IDs) have been shown to account for a substantial proportion of variation in learning outcomes in second language acquisition (SLA). Specifically, as L2 writing is a cognitively complex and challenging endeavor, it is imperative to explore the role of IDs in this domain. Among them, motivation has received particular attention, since “L2 learning is fundamentally a motivational pursuit” (Li et al., 2022, p. 113). Digital multimodal composing (DMC) has emerged as a popular pedagogical practice in SLA, offering learners and teachers new opportunities for engagement and meaning-making. Among the IDs mediating L2 students’ participation and success in DMC, motivation plays a crucial role. Understanding how motivation is conceptualized and measured, and how DMC shapes or is shaped by students’ motivational states, can provide deeper insights into how DMC tasks could be better designed and integrated to facilitate L2 writing development. Following the PRISMA guidelines, this systematic review investigates how motivation has been conceptualized, measured, and influenced in DMC research. Drawing on 30 empirical studies, this review addresses three research questions: (1) What constructs of motivation in DMC research are examined? (2) What effects of DMC on L2 students’ motivation are found? (3) What influencing factors of motivation in DMC are identified? Thematic synthesis revealed that (1) most studies focused on a limited set of motivational constructs, namely, intrinsic/extrinsic motivation, task value, and self-efficacy, often measured by general educational instruments without clear theoretical justification or task-specific adaptation; (2) DMC tasks, particularly digital storytelling, were generally found to enhance motivation, although the effects varied in magnitude and durability by learner profiles, task designs, and learning contexts; (3) a combination of intertwined factors were identified: learner-related features (e.g., curiosity, identity), task-related conditions (e.g., genre, duration), and context-related factors (e.g., audience, collaboration). Taken together, these findings underscore the potential and complexity of integrating DMC in a meaningful way to support and sustain learner motivation. This paper calls for more theoretically-grounded, task-specific, and context-sensitive future research on this line of inquiry. Reference: Li, S., Hiver, P., & Papi, M. (2022). The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and individual differences. Routledge.

✉ 202321100032@mail.bnu.edu.cn



Motivational Beliefs and Writing Achievement in Peruvian Secondary Students: Latent Profile Analysis

Presenting author: Villegas, Frank ; Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú; Peru.

Chair: Newton, Moira ; University of Auckland and Papatoetoe West School; New Zealand.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition

Keywords: learning and learner characteristics;motivational and emotional factors in writing;writing at school;writing beliefs

Writing motivation is based on a set of beliefs that individuals develop from their diverse experiences with writing and that, in turn, influence how they initiate, sustain, and complete a writing task. Drawing on the Writer(s)-within-Community model, which conceives writing as a practice situated in writing communities, this study focuses on three motivational beliefs: self-efficacy, achievement goals, and writing malleability beliefs. In this way, the study seeks to deepen our understanding of beliefs that play a key role in the interaction between writers and the communities in which they participate. The study has two aims: (1) to identify motivational profiles of students based on specific patterns in these three beliefs and (2) to examine differences in writing achievement across the identified profiles. To this end, we analyzed data from 5,968 second-grade secondary students in Peru, who completed a constructed-response writing test and motivational scales as part of a large-scale assessment implemented by the Ministry of Education. Using latent profile analysis, five groups were identified, ranging from a highly adaptive profile (high sense of efficacy, predominance of mastery goals and a growth mindset) to a clearly less adaptive profile (low sense of efficacy, predominance of performance goals and a fixed mindset), along with three intermediate profiles. The most adaptive profile obtained the highest mean score in writing (577.5), whereas the least adaptive profile showed the lowest mean score (473.8). Overall, more adaptive profiles were systematically associated with higher levels of writing achievement. This trend was consistently observed across different strata (boys and girls, public and private schools, urban and rural schools). The findings highlight the importance of motivational beliefs for students' writing achievement and the need to implement intentional efforts to foster adaptive beliefs with the aim of developing motivated writers. The study of profiles in writing is an emerging field that has gained prominence in recent years. In this context, the results of this research constitute a contribution by drawing on a large sample from a country that has not previously been represented in the field of writing motivation.

✉ fvillegas@pucp.edu.pe



The future of writing education

Chair: De Smedt, Fien ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Organiser: Skar, Gustaf ; Norwegian University of Science and Technology; Norway.

Organiser: Vereecke, Alix ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Discussant: Bouwer, Renske ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;assessment;Generative AI;writing instruction

Writing has long been a cornerstone of education, serving both as a means of learning and as a key indicator of students' understanding, reasoning, and communicative competence. Today, this foundational role is being challenged by the rapid emergence of generative artificial intelligence. From compulsory education to higher education, generative AI tools are increasingly influencing how learners engage with writing tasks, raising fundamental questions about authorship, originality, assessment, and the purposes of writing instruction itself. Rather than signaling the end of writing education, these developments invite a critical rethinking of writing education in an AI-rich educational landscape. This symposium brings together three research studies that collectively examine current developments in writing education in contexts where generative AI is increasingly embedded in educational practice. The first paper examines teachers' detection of AI-generated text by exploring which textual features teachers associate with students' use of generative AI. Drawing on survey data from Norwegian teachers, the study analyses how teachers interpret student writing and make judgments about authorship in contexts where generative AI is increasingly present. The second paper shifts attention from writing products to writing processes by examining how students' interactions with generative AI can be used to inform the assessment of argumentative writing. It explores the potential of process data, such as prompts, revisions, and AI-mediated decision-making, as complementary evidence in writing assessment. The third paper focuses on higher education and investigates how generative AI can be integrated responsibly into students' writing processes. It examines students' existing uses of these tools and the role of instructional guidance in supporting critical, reflective, and autonomous writing practices. Taken together, the symposium offers a coherent and forward-looking view on the future of writing education, positioning generative AI not merely as a challenge, but as a resource that can inform and support writing processes.



Assessing argumentative writing through students' interactions with generative AI

Presenting author: Conijn, Rianne ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Co-author: Bombaerts, Gunter ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Co-author: Oliveira, Manuel ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Co-author: Sadowski, Bert ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Co-author: Zednik, Carlos ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;assessment;Generative AI;writing processes

As generative artificial intelligence (genAI) increasingly produces text that is indistinguishable from human work, conventional assessments that focus solely on the written product are becoming an unreliable measure of student learning. In this presentation, we therefore introduce an assessment method that focuses on the writing process. We focus on two components of student–genAI interaction during argumentative writing. First, directive reasoning interaction, which captures how purposefully students steer the AI. This is important because passive acceptance of AI output is often associated with lower-quality writing. Second, visible expertise, which reflects the extent to which course-related conceptual knowledge becomes apparent in the interactions. Student–genAI interaction data and final essay grades were collected from 70 graduate students who wrote argumentative essays using a self-chosen genAI tool. All 1,450 prompts were annotated using our taxonomy, developed from the course learning objectives combined with indicators of directive reasoning interaction and visible expertise. The taxonomy contains three main categories: writing, content, and argument, and 35 subcategories. The results showed that students most often prompted genAI to improve or evaluate their writing, such as grammar and style (41%). GenAI was used less frequently to evaluate or improve content (29%) or argumentation (22%). Interactions indicative of high directive reasoning interaction and visible expertise were positively related to performance. For example, prompts asking genAI to revise a specific argument, based on a clear, conceptual critique; or to integrate information from a source into a premise, were associated with higher essay grades. In contrast, interactions showing low directive reasoning or low visible expertise, such as “write an essay on topic X” or requesting a summary to be inserted into the essay, were related to below-average essay grades. To conclude, evaluating the writing process through student–genAI interactions may be used to complement and even replace traditional essay assessment methods. Future work should examine the generalizability of our findings to other argumentative writing assignments and explore how the assessment approach might apply to other types of written assessment. Finally, as genAI evolves, it needs to be considered whether any interactions from our taxonomy might become obsolete.

✉ m.a.conijn@tue.nl

Thursday June 4, 2026 | 09:00 - 10:30

The future of writing education

Single Paper

Part of the symposium: The future of writing education



Text Features Associated with Students' Generative AI Use: Norwegian Teachers' Assessments

Presenting author: Skar, Gustaf ; Norwegian University of Science and Technology; Norway.

Co-author: Graham, Steve ; Arizona State University; United States.

Co-author: Jeffery, Jill ; Leiden University Centre for Linguistics; Netherlands.

Co-author: Kvistad, Anne Holten ; Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU); Norway.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: AI writing;assessment;Generative AI;writing instruction

The release of generative AI (genAI) tools has changed the way that many educators interact with student writing, as they grapple with assessing how students use this technology for writing and how their uses may support or detract from learning. This paper draws from a survey of 530 Norwegian teachers designed to examine teachers' perspectives on genAI, including their uses of AI to teach writing, their beliefs and ethical concerns about students' AI use for writing, their preparedness to use AI, and, the focus of the current paper, the text features they associate with students' AI use. GenAI presents new challenges for teachers' writing assessment practice as it complicates their construction of the student author. Although written communication as academic assignment is skewed toward language performance to be assessed (Smagorinsky et al., 2010), a key aspect of the assessment process involves teachers' interpretations of what a student is working to express in writing. Given that human communication is co-constructed, "it must follow that even when we don't know the person who generated the language we are interpreting, we build a partial model of who they are and what common ground we think they share with us, and use this in interpreting their words" (Bender et al., 2021, p. 616). Many teachers are compelled to consider the extent to which their model of "the person who generated the language" is genAI-mediated. This paper focusses on a qualitative content analysis of an open survey item in which a subset of 129 teachers shared their perceptions of the text features that signal students' use of generative AI and their stances toward these text features. We analysed teachers' responses to investigate how they adapt their writing assessment practices in the context of students' genAI use. We found that teachers viewed AI-associated text characteristics negatively, and they focused on language features indicative of voice and style when identifying aspects of student text that suggested AI use. Our results suggest that teachers' individualized knowledge of students' development vis-a-vis academic writing tasks and subject-matter learning factors into their judgments of whether a text is student-composed or AI-generated.

✉ gustaf.b.skar@ntnu.no



Using Generative AI for Academic Writing: Students' Practices and the Role of Explicit Instruction

Presenting author: Vereecke, Alix ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Co-author: Bouwer, Renske ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Co-author: De Smedt, Fien ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Co-author: De Wever, Bram ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Co-author: Van Keer, Hilde ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;AI writing;Generative AI;writing instruction

Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT are now widespread in higher education and are often presented as promising forms of support for academic writing, a complex skill that many students find challenging. While concerns about misuse and authorship persist, considerably less is known about how students actually use generative AI during the writing process, or about whether instructional guidance can support more responsible and effective use. This study adopts a two-phase design. In the first phase, a questionnaire study with 170 higher education students examined whether and how students use generative AI during writing, focusing on self-reported moments of use and the specific aspects of the writing process targeted. In the second phase, a pilot intervention study with 20 students explored students' actual AI use in greater depth by comparing writing processes with and without explicit instruction on responsible AI use and prompting. Data sources included students' prompts, generative AI conversations, and final texts, which were analysed using quantitative content analysis and comparative judgement to assess changes in prompt quality, revision practices, and overall text quality. Results from the questionnaire show that the vast majority of students (92%) report using generative AI during the writing process. However, students tend to use these tools in a limited manner, primarily for relatively straightforward tasks such as correcting language and spelling or reformulating existing text, rather than for more substantive support throughout the writing process. Moreover, self-report data provided only limited insight into students' responsible use of AI. Findings from the pilot intervention study suggest that, in the absence of instruction, students do not consistently engage with generative AI in a responsible manner. Following explicit instruction, students formulated significantly higher-quality prompts and interacted more critically with AI-generated output. Although text quality improved for all students, no significant difference was found between students who did and did not receive instruction. Overall, the findings suggest that although generative AI is already widely used in academic writing, responsible and effective use cannot be assumed. Brief, targeted instruction on prompting and responsible AI use may therefore play a key role in supporting more meaningful integration of generative AI into students' writing processes.

✉ alix.vereecke@ugent.be

Cognitive and Ethical Alignment of LLMs with Humans for Writing Research and Instruction

Presenting author: Chukharev, Evgeny ; Iowa State University; USA.

Chair: Mahlow, Cerstin ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Large language models (LLMs) have transformed the study of writing. In linguistics, they catalyzed a shift from the generative grammar paradigm that dominated the latter half of the 20th century. Beyond their practical utility, LLMs provide strong empirical support for connectionist theories of human language processing, showing that complex linguistic behavior can emerge from statistical learning and distributed representations rather than relying solely on (innate) symbolic rules. At the same time, LLMs raise serious questions about alignment with human values, interpretability, and their impact on writing instruction and assessment. Constructing AI systems that simulate human linguistic behavior while aligning with human intentions, reasoning, and values offers both practical and research advantages. This keynote presents two projects that illustrate how LLMs can be aligned with human cognition and ethical principles in writing research and instruction. The first project leverages eye-tracking data, specifically writers' lookback fixations on text produced so far, to guide sentence completions in the emerging text. This approach operationalizes a long-standing hypothesis that writers look back at the text they have produced to support planning of what to say next. By conditioning LLM-based sentence completions on lookback fixation patterns, LLMs produce text that is more closely aligned with a writer's evolving intentions. This work provides empirical evidence for the cognitive function of lookback behavior and establishes a foundation for AI systems for writing support that operate in alignment with human cognitive processes. The second project introduces a hybrid neurosymbolic AI framework for evaluating student argumentative writing. In this framework, LLM-driven inferences from source texts and student essays are constrained by symbolic reasoning that captures ethical norms, logical standards, and pedagogical criteria. By integrating the transparency and reliability of symbolic AI with the flexibility of LLMs in natural language understanding, this approach produces interpretable, robust evaluations of student writing that align with human ethical values. Together, these projects demonstrate that aligning LLM behavior with human cognition and ethical principles can advance both the science of writing and instructional practice. By incorporating cognitive signals and symbolic constraints, AI systems can support and evaluate writing in ways that reflect human intentions, uphold reasoning standards, and promote responsible, interpretable applications of technology.

✉ evgeny@iastate.edu



Building bridges between subjects: Using genre pedagogy for writing across the curriculum

Presenting author: Bouwer, Renske ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Presenting author: Stukker, Ninke ; Groningen University; Netherlands.

Presenting author: van Drie, Jannet ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Co-author: Evers-Vermeul, Jacqueline ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Co-author: Oudheusden, Emma ; University of Amsterdam; Netherlands.

Co-author: van Gulik, Jan ; Utrecht University; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: design-based research;L1;text genre;writing across disciplines or across the curriculum

Reading and writing instruction in secondary education is often highly fragmented, and does not always generate the desired results (OECD, 2023). Opportunities for turning the tide lie with language arts and language-rich subjects such as history and biology. Although benefits of a cross-curricular approach to reading and writing instruction are widely recognized, teachers struggle to put this into practice. Transfer between subjects is minimal, and teachers lack instructional materials and pedagogical content knowledge to promote it (Penuel et al., 2007). Based on a literature review and other insights from our educational design research project on Dutch language arts and History in Dutch secondary education, we propose that genre pedagogy offers a solution, as it provides a common language for discussing and working with genres across subjects (Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010). We will start this Roundtable Session by sharing design principles and learning materials aimed at fostering students' understanding and use of language as a strategic communicative and social tool in various subject contexts through reading and writing. Based on this, we will start a discussion about the role of genre pedagogy in promoting students' writing skills and writing across the curriculum, and about ways of bringing genre pedagogy into classroom, raising the following questions: Regarding instructional focus: What knowledge about genre do secondary students need to foster transfer of writing skills across subjects? Regarding instructional mode: Which teaching and learning activities are suitable in a cross-curricular genre pedagogy for writing? What methods can be used to assess the effectiveness of a cross-curricular genre pedagogy for writing? References Bawarshi, A. S., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. Parlor Press. OECD (2023). *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The state of learning and equity in education*. PISA, OECD Publishing. Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 921–958.

✉ N.M.Stukker@RUG.nl; j.p.vandrie@uva.nl; r.bouwer@uu.nl



Enhancing academic writing through Systemic Functional Genre Pedagogy in Higher Education

Presenting author: Yegblemenawo, Stella Afi Makafui ; Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi; Ghana.

Co-author: DEBRAH, CECILIA OWUSU ; University of Energy and Natural Resources; Ghana.

Co-author: ISSAKA, MOHAMMED ; UVIVERSITY OF ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES; Ghana.

Chair: Torkildsen, Janne von Koss ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: academic writing;L2;pedagogy and instruction;writing instruction

Academic writing remains a persistent challenge in Ghanaian higher education, particularly for first-year students transitioning from secondary to tertiary education. This paper examines how Systemic Functional Genre Pedagogy (SFGP) can enhance academic literacy by explicitly teaching the genres through which disciplinary knowledge is constructed and communicated. Grounded in Systemic Functional Linguistics, the study conceptualizes academic writing as a socially situated and meaning-making practice rather than a set of decontextualized skills. The study reports on a six-week classroom-based writing workshop implemented at an African university. Using a pre–post intervention design, student texts produced before and after the workshop were analyzed to trace changes in discourse-level control, with particular attention to Theme–Rheme organization, transitivity patterns, and cohesive resources. Classroom observations and lecturer reflections complemented the textual analysis, offering insight into pedagogical processes and shifts in instructional assumptions. Findings indicate noticeable improvements in students' organization, thematic development, argumentation, and textual cohesion. Students reported increased awareness of academic conventions and greater confidence in structuring disciplinary texts. Lecturer reflections further reveal a shift from deficit-oriented explanations of student writing difficulties toward more scaffolded and explicit teaching approaches informed by genre awareness. By situating SFGP within multilingual higher education context, the study demonstrates how genre-based pedagogy can function as a developmental rather than remedial approach to academic writing instruction. The findings have implications for communication skills curricula, lecturer professional development, and ongoing debates on academic literacies in Global South higher education. Overall, the paper illustrates how writing research can be translated into reflective and scaffolded writing practice in higher education, aligning empirical inquiry with pedagogical innovation.

✉ samyegblemenawo.cass@knust.edu.gh



Multi-genre pedagogy: fostering transfer, metacognition, and rhetorical agility in doctoral writing

Presenting author: Negretti, Raffaella ; Chalmers University of Technology; Sweden.

Co-author: Feak, Christine ; University of Michigan-Ann Arbor; United States.

Co-author: McGrath, Lisa ; Sheffield Hallam University; United Kingdom.

Co-author: Wingrove, Peter ; Chalmers University of Technology; Sweden.

Chair: Torkildsen, Janne von Koss ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: academic writing;metacognition;writing instruction;writing skills

As scientists and academics increasingly communicate beyond academic contexts, adapting writing to diverse audiences and genres has become crucial (Negretti et al., 2023). This project addresses how writing pedagogy can promote such adaptability by designing and evaluating a multi-genre pedagogy approach for doctoral writing instruction. Theoretically, the study builds on Swales' (1990) question of whether and how skills acquired from one genre transfer to another. Tardy et al.'s (2020) framework conceptualizes genre knowledge and metacognition as key to effective recontextualization: genre-specific knowledge relates to genre awareness, interacting with metacognitive processes when writers face unfamiliar communicative demands—a relationship that remains underexplored in research. Methodologically, we adopt Swales and Feak (2023) to design in-class task sequences combining academic and popularization genres. Qualitative data were collected in Scandinavia and the UK through students' written texts and interviews and analysed to explore students' strategies for transfer and recontextualization. Preliminary findings show that students recontextualize knowledge for different audiences by engaging in reformulation—shifting register through lexical and grammatical choices—but also in more complex adaptations such as rhetorical adjustments, storytelling, and unpacking. Interviews indicate that these shifts are metacognitive and deliberate, linking genre-specific knowledge, broader genre awareness, and metacognitive awareness of themselves as researchers and writers. We provide evidence of the interaction between genre-specific knowledge and genre awareness in students' metacognitive decisions about rhetorical and linguistic features across genres. Our study pushes the boundaries of genre-based instruction beyond reproducing traditional academic genres, to include tasks that emphasize rhetorical adaptability and transfer. Negretti, R., Sjöberg-Hawke, C., Persson, M., & Cervin-Ellqvist, M. (2023). Thinking outside the box: senior scientists' metacognitive strategy knowledge (MSK) and self-regulation of writing for science communication. *Journal of Writing Research*, 15(2), 333–361. Tardy, C. M., Sommer-Farias, B., & Gevers, J. (2020). Teaching and researching genre knowledge: toward an enhanced theoretical framework. *Written Communication*, 37(3), 287–321. Swales, J. M. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. CUP. Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2023). Task evolution in English for Academic Purposes writing materials: The case of "Information Transfer" to "Critical Commentary". *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 61(101017).

✉ negretti@chalmers.se



Teaching Reasoning in Argumentative Writing through Explicit Heuristics

Presenting author: Mitchell, Thomas D. ; Carnegie Mellon University Qatar; Qatar.

Co-author: Laich, Maria Pia Gomez ; Carnegie Mellon University; Qatar.

Co-author: Pessoa, Silvia ; Carnegie Mellon University Qatar; Qatar.

Chair: Torkildsen, Janne von Koss ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: academic writing; pedagogy and instruction; writing instruction; writing skills

This presentation explores how a linguistically informed reasoning heuristic can enhance the teaching and learning of argumentative writing in multilingual higher education. We focus on a first-year writing (FYW) course at an American university in the Middle East, where most students write in English as an additional language. Drawing on systemic functional linguistics (SFL) genre-based pedagogy (e.g., Dreyfus et al., 2016; Authors, 2024), we investigate how the heuristic I know, I see, I conclude (adapted from Hao, 2020) helps students connect conceptual knowledge, textual evidence, and evaluative reasoning. The research centers on a Case Analysis assignment in which students analyze a real-world case related to taste and distinction through the lens of Bourdieu's (1984) theory. To scaffold the assignment, we used the I know, I see, I conclude heuristic to make explicit how writers move between reasoning positions: drawing on disciplinary frameworks (I know), applying them to case details (I see), and developing interpretive claims (I conclude). To document student uptake of the heuristic, we coded paragraphs for reasoning positions and logical relations to examine how novice writers connect ideas. Findings indicate that explicit reasoning instruction helps students balance theoretical abstraction and contextual specificity, leading to more effective analytical writing. However, many struggle to sustain logical coherence when shifting between reasoning positions. We discuss how these findings inform refinements to instructional materials that explicitly teach common effective patterns that successful students use to structure their paragraphs and logically connect their ideas as they move between the reasoning positions. By linking linguistic analysis to pedagogical design, we show how SFL-based frameworks can enhance writing instruction in multilingual higher education. **Keywords:** academic writing; argumentative writing; reasoning; systemic functional linguistics **References** Authors. (2024). Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard University Press. Dreyfus, S. J., Humphrey, S., Mahboob, A., & Martin, J. R. (2016). *Genre pedagogy in higher education: The SLATE project*. Palgrave Macmillan. Hao, J. (2020). *Analysing scientific discourse from a systemic functional linguistic perspective: A framework for exploring knowledge building in biology*. Routledge.

✉ tmitchel@qatar.cmu.edu



Chinese Students' Implicit Beliefs about Writing

Presenting author: Galbraith, David ; University of Southampton; United Kingdom.

Co-author: Hao, Jiachen ; University of Southampton; China.

Chair: Knoph, Rebecca ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: education;L1;writing beliefs;writing to learn

The way in which an individual approaches writing and prioritises goals influences the cognitive processes involved in writing. Five writing beliefs have been identified--transmissional, transactional, revision, audience, and planning--and have been found to contribute, to varying extents, to the development of ideas and content, as well as to the overall quality of the text (White and Bruning, 2005; Sander-Reio et al., 2014). This research employed Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Exploratory Structural Equation Modelling (ESEM) to evaluate the goodness of fit of three hypothesized models (five-factor model, two-factor model, and high-order factor model) based on these beliefs when applied to Chinese students writing in Mandarin Chinese. The participants were 312 international students aged 18 or over, whose native language is Chinese, and who are accustomed to studying in Chinese educational settings. The results show that ESEM is a more substantive method of interpreting students' beliefs about writing. Chinese students hold all five of these beliefs, which are distinct from one another. However, the strongest correlation was found between revision and planning, which differs from the Transmissional-Planning (TMP) and Transactional-Revision (TARA) structures (the high-order factors model) suggested by Baaijen and Galbraith (2025). This study suggests that writing belief models could be developed by introducing types of revision (Galbraith & Torrance, 2004, p. 65): (i) reactive revision (or editing), which relates to planning and involves refining the text to align with pre-established goals, and (ii) proactive revision, which the TARA model assumes involves identifying potential ideas in the initial draft and developing them in later iterations.

✉ d.w.galbraith@soton.ac.uk



Language choice in master's thesis writing: a motivational perspective

Presenting author: Mendoza, Laura ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Co-author: Kleemola, Katri ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Chair: Knoph, Rebecca ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: academic writing;L1;L2;motivational and emotional factors in writing

Research topic / aim and theoretical framework Academic writing in English is increasingly common in master's theses in non-anglophone countries. This dominance of English has raised research concerns about preserving local languages as languages of science, while the student perspective within these multilingual tensions has been limited. In this scope, it is important to investigate students' motivational rationales for choosing the language of their master's thesis where a genuine choice exists. This study investigates master's thesis writers' motivational rationales for language choice in a Finnish multilingual university context. Methodological design We conducted qualitative content analysis of open-ended survey responses gathered from 213 master's students of engineering with Finnish or Swedish as their native language (language of thesis n=154 English n=62 Finnish). In the first, data-driven analysis phase, we focused on identifying common categories in the motivational rationales provided for their thesis language choice. In the second phase, guided by self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2020), the identified categories were linked to the motivational spectrum, ranging from external to introjection to integration/identification. The purely intrinsic motivational category was not identified in the present research. Findings Preliminary findings indicate that language choice is shaped by a multifaceted mix of (1) external motivation (supervisor preferences, perceived institutional norms or company needs); (2) introjected motives (anticipated visibility, career benefits, wider audience); (3) integrated/identified motives (attachment to language, ease of writing, proficiency). The choice of language (English / Finnish) is encountered across categories. We aim to provide crosstabulation and frequencies of the categories and choice of language to indicate group level and individual level variation. Relevance to domain of writing The study offers new understanding of the qualitative variation within motivational rationales for language choice of multilingual thesis writers from a self-determination theory perspective. These findings have implications for thesis supervision practices, higher education policies, academic writing instruction and motivational research on writing in multilingual university contexts. References Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective : Definitions , theory , practices , and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61(April), 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>

✉ laura.mendoza@helsinki.fi



Student teachers' self efficacy for academic writing

Presenting author: Johansson, Victoria ; Kristianstad University; Sweden.

Co-author: Magnusson, Petra ; Kristianstad University; Sweden.

Co-author: Persson, Jenny ; Kristianstad University; Sweden.

Chair: Knoph, Rebecca ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: academic writing;motivational and emotional factors in writing;proficiency;writing skills

University students need to develop their academic writing skills to enhance success in their studies and future professional lives. Confidence in one's own writing ability, self-efficacy, has proven to be an important factor both for writing individual texts and for developing general writing skills (Bruning & Kauffmann, 2016), and studies have shown that self-efficacy can vary depending on the task and area (Bandura, 1997) and that writers who demonstrate stronger self-efficacy are more likely to complete their tasks and increase their text quality, regardless of how good their actual skills are (Grenner et al., 2021; Raedts et al., 2007; Sehlström et al., 2023; Schunk, 1991). This study aims to investigate how student teachers' confidence in coping with the task of writing academic text develops during their studies, and is guided by these questions: 1. Which skills do student teachers rate as high and low? 2. How does the estimation develop during the study period? In a cross-sectional study, student teachers (n≈100) from different semesters of the Primary School Teacher Programme answered 19 statements in a self-assessment scale developed for academic writing. The assessment responses were analyzed based on the engagement in planning, translation, and revision processes (drawing on the Hayes and Flower (1980) model). Initial results indicate that student teachers have a high level of self-efficacy for aspects of writing related to translating (e.g., good skills in transcription, grammar and spelling), slightly lower self-efficacy for revision aspects (e.g., reading and revising the text, identifying what works, and determining what help is needed). Student teachers report the lowest self-efficacy for aspects related to planning (e.g., identifying goals before writing, drafting, or coming up with ideas) and motivational aspects (e.g., continuing to work on the text even if you get stuck). In the next step, the results will be differentiated between the student teachers in different semesters. The study contributes to an understanding of how writing develops in young adults, and how teaching about academic writing at university level can be conducted.

✉ victoria.johansson@hkr.se



Bilingualism modulates the relationship between spelling skills, grade and handwriting kinematics

Presenting author: Zuo, Yitong ; Aix-Marseille Université; France.

Co-author: Alhaddad, Gaëlle ; Aix-Marseille Université; France.

Co-author: Frey, Aline ; Aix-Marseille Université; France.

Co-author: Longcamp, Marieke ; Aix-Marseille Université; France.

Co-author: Mirault, Jonathan ; Aix-Marseille Université; France.

Co-author: Spieser, Laure ; Aix-Marseille Université; France.

Chair: Linnemann, Markus ; University of Koblenz; Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: acquisition;fluency;handwriting;spelling issues

Learning to handwrite remains a crucial and laborious process for children, especially considering the challenge of simultaneously managing its spelling and graphomotor demands. Previous research has well established that spelling skills impact handwriting performance. However, most studies have focused on global parameters such as legibility and average speed, without disentangling the impact of spelling skills on fine-tuned kinematics, in age groups often limited to primary school. Additionally, how bilingualism modulates these effects has never been examined. To address these gaps, we collected data from 234 French-speaking children from grade 3 to 8, who performed various handwriting tasks from word to text levels on a digitizing tablet. We extracted multiple kinematic indexes reflecting velocity, fluency, numbers of pen lifts and stops, as well as pen holding and its variability. Spelling proficiency was assessed with a standardized dictation test, and participants were categorized as mono- or bilingual. We then used general linear mixed models (GLMM) to assess the effects of grade and spelling skills. Preliminary results show that grade has significant effects on most parameters, with the average velocity and pen holding parameters only modulated by grade, whereas spelling skills selectively impact the number of pen lifts and stops and fluency. We further examined the role of bilingualism by including linguistic profiles in GLMM. We found significant interaction effects of grade, spelling skills and bilingualism for several parameters, notably the number of stops and fluency. Higher spelling errors accompanied higher numbers of stops and higher dysfluency, indicating less optimal performance. This impact of spelling difficulties on handwriting decreased with grade, suggesting increasing automatization of graphomotor processes in older children. Finally, bilingual children are more sensitive to spelling errors at younger ages but showed higher writing fluency in later stages, suggesting the potential conflicts between linguistic systems may temporarily affect handwriting kinematics when they are not yet stably consolidated, but these effects progressively resolve with development. Altogether, our results suggest that spelling difficulties impact various handwriting kinematics differentially, and that these effects are magnified for younger bilingual children.

✉ yitong.zuo@univ-amu.fr



The handwriting movement: Linking motor processes and mastery

Presenting author: Fitjar, Camilla ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Presenting author: Maurer, Michelle N. ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Presenting author: Rønneberg, Vibeke ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Chair: Linnemann, Markus ; University of Koblenz; Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: fluency;handwriting;writing processes;writing skills

Learning to write can be considered a gatekeeper skill to academic achievement. Being able to express one's thoughts and opinions in writing requires generating ideas, finding words to communicate those ideas, structuring them, and expressing the ideas through transcription (Berninger & Amtmann, 2003). For years, handwriting was the primary mode of transcription in schools. Today, despite increasing digitalization, and keyboarding is emerging as the dominant modality for transcription, handwriting still holds a strong position in education. In this presentation, we address three questions: 1) What role does handwriting play in learning to write? 2) Why is handwriting more challenging for some students? 3) Is handwriting merely a motor task? We synthesize findings from studies we conducted with Norwegian and Swiss children. Study one draws on a sample of 572 Norwegian first graders learning to write by hand, typing on a computer, or a combination of both. We performed linear mixed-effects analysis of the relationship between instructional modality and performance in spelling, narrative text production, and handwriting. Results indicate that it is possible to learn to write without handwriting, but that handwriting plays a role in gaining knowledge of written letters. Study two draws on a Swiss sample of primary school children to examine individual differences in handwriting skills. Girls outperformed boys in fine motor skills, visuomotor integration, and handwriting legibility, but not in fluency. Furthermore, cross-sectional analyses showed a steep increase in fluency across Grades 1–6, while legibility plateaued earlier. Study three draws on a sub-sample from study one: 176 Norwegian first graders completed letter and symbol copying tasks, selected pen-control tasks, and letter-knowledge tasks. Results from a linear mixed-effects analysis showed that pen-movement fluency in the copy task was associated with letter knowledge. To our surprise, good letter knowledge was also associated with better fluency in copying unfamiliar symbols. Synthesizing findings from several recent studies, we critically address these questions. A solid understanding of handwriting as a skill is essential for designing effective instruction. Our results offer insights for researchers and teachers seeking to support children who struggle with handwriting.

✉ michelle.n.maurer@uis.no; camilla.l.fitjar@uis.no; vibeke.ronneberg@uis.no



University students' reflections on academic writing with genAI

Chair: Jusslin, Sofia ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Organiser: Jusslin, Sofia ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Discussant: Van Steendam, Elke ; KU Leuven; Belgium.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;AI writing;Generative AI;writing tools and writing technology

The aim of this symposium is to address and discuss undergraduate students' reflections on academic writing with generative artificial intelligence (GenAI). Academic writing is central to studies in higher education, and since OpenAI's launch of ChatGPT in November 2022, the possible potentials and challenges of using generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) technologies in writing have been increasingly discussed and explored across scientific fields (e.g., Khalifa & Albadawy, 2024; Nguyen, 2024). Previous research has shown that GenAI has been described in different ways; in addition to a text generator, also as an assistant, tutor, teacher, and conversation partner, which makes a difference for students' performance and constitutes an affective support (Kim et al., 2025; Ou et al., 2024). Several studies have explored undergraduate students' perceptions on GenAI in writing, soliciting responses through interviews and surveys (e.g., Kim et al., 2025; Ou et al., 2024). Adding to this body of work, the presentations in this symposium offer other perspectives on undergraduate students' academic writing with GenAI, using various theoretical perspectives, research designs, and methods. First, focus lies on students' peer-reflections on academic writing, where they discussed GenAI as part of their academic writing without being specifically asked about GenAI. Second, focus lies on students' reflections on engaging in academic writing tasks using GenAI, more specifically, self-feedback scaffolding through GenAI in online writing tasks and GenAI as a tool for cognition when writing argumentative texts. Thus, the symposium adds to ongoing discussions of potentials, challenges, and dilemmas that GenAI technologies present for academic writing in higher education. ReferencesKhalifa, M., & Albadawy, M. (2024). Using artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: An essential productivity tool. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine Update*, 5, 100145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpbup.2024.100145>Kim, J., Yu, S., Detrick, R., & Li, N. (2025). Exploring students' perspectives on Generative AI-assisted academic writing. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(1), 1265–1300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12878-7>Nguyen, A., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Huang, X. (2024). Human-AI collaboration patterns in AI-assisted academic writing. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(5), 847–864. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2323593>Ou, A. W., Stöhr, C., & Malmström, H. (2024). Academic communication with AI-powered language tools in higher education: From a post-humanist perspective. *System*, 121, 103225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103225>



Self-feedback scaffolding through AI in online writing tasks

Presenting author: Luna, Jose ; University of Barcelona; Spain.

Co-author: Espasa, Anna ; Universitat Oberta de Catalunya; Spain.

Co-author: Guasch, Teresa ; Open University of Catalonia (UOC); Spain.

Co-author: Martínez Melo, Montserrat ; Fundació per a la Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (FUOC); Spain.

Co-author: Mayordomo, Rosa M ; Open University of Catalonia (UOC); Spain.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;feedback;Generative AI;writing tools and writing technology

Students need to critically assess AI-generated feedback to avoid superficial learning (Bearman et al., 2024), particularly in writing processes where writing plays an epistemic role. A promising solution to enhance feedback practices with AI is to promote self-feedback processes. This is a process of cognitive change in which students generate new knowledge through comparing their current understanding or performance with external references, and its effectiveness relies on structured activities and scaffolding (Nicol, 2021). This study explores to what extent AI-supported self-feedback can effectively scaffold students' writing in asynchronous environments. A total of 107 online students participated in a quasi-experiment. Students first completed an assignment. Immediately after submission, they accessed a timed online space. Following a reflective scaffolded process, students generated self-feedback while revising their initial assignment with AI insights. The quantitative analysis showed a significant improvement in students' scores from the first to the second submission ($Z = -6.804$; $p < .001$). Qualitative analyses of both students' interviews and writing reflections during the scaffolded process show that GenAI-mediated self-feedback is enacted through a set of recurrent actions. The reported self-feedback actions by students were: students primarily use GenAI to identify areas for improvement, revisit their understanding of key concepts, detect aspects they had overlooked, and connect their revisions to new knowledge. Interviews additionally reveal emergent topics that help to explain how students use GenAI. These include experimenting with prompting strategies to obtain more relevant feedback; directing corrections purposefully depending on their objectives; questioning GenAI's reliability; experiencing uncertainty; and showing different levels of GenAI literacy. These results offer insights into the concrete mechanisms through which teachers can scaffold self-feedback process with GenAI in academic writing and contribute to the ongoing discussion on the potentials and dilemmas of GenAI in higher education. Bibliography Bearman, M., Tai, J., Dawson, P., Boud, D., & Ajjawi, R. (2024). Developing evaluative judgement for a time of generative artificial intelligence. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(6), 893–905. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2335321> Nicol, D. (2021). The power of internal feedback: Exploiting natural comparison processes. *Assessment & Evaluation in higher education*, 46(5), 756-778. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1823314>

✉ jluna@ub.edu

Thursday June 4, 2026 | 13:30 - 15:00

University students' reflections on academic writing with genAI

Single Paper

Part of the symposium: University students' reflections on academic writing with genAI



Students' reflections on using GenAI as a tool for cognition when writing an argumentative text

Presenting author: Luna, Jose ; University of Barcelona; Spain.

Co-author: Alcaraz, Silvia ; Universitat de Barcelona; Institut de Recerca en Educació (IREUB); Spain.

Co-author: Castells, Núria ; Faculty of Psychology, University of Barcelona; Spain.

Co-author: Fuertes-Alpiste, Marc ; Universitat de Barcelona; Spain.

Co-author: Lozano, Paula ; Universitat de Barcelona; Institut de Recerca en Educació (IREUB); Spain.

Co-author: Miño, Raquel ; Universitat de Barcelona; Institut de Recerca en Educació (IREUB); Spain.

Co-author: Molas-Castells, Nuria ; Universitat de Barcelona; Institut de Recerca en Educació (IREUB); Spain.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;AI writing;Generative AI;writing tools and writing technology

This study aimed to analyze undergraduate students' perceptions of the usefulness of Copilot as a tool for cognition (Fuertes-Alpiste, 2024) when writing argumentative texts. From this perspective, students are encouraged to use it as a mediational tool that supports problem solving in writing, to find new ideas, reviewing their texts in terms of content and language conventions, or helping them check citation formats when writing an argumentative text based on sources. A total of 152 undergraduate students from two education-related degree programs participated in a didactic sequence that included reading multiple texts, whole-group discussions, and the use of instructional guides with examples on how to write an argumentative text and how to employ different prompts with Copilot for this purpose. Students completed a questionnaire both before and after the didactic sequence. In the final questionnaire, students responded to Likert-scale items addressing the perceived usefulness and limitations of Copilot in supporting task completion, as well as items related to potential technical issues encountered when using the tool. Students were also asked open-ended questions about how using Copilot influenced their writing process, including ways in which it was helpful, unhelpful, or may have affected their autonomy, and were invited to provide examples. Preliminary results indicate that students value Copilot primarily as a tool for identifying ideas, revising their written texts, and including references. However, they also acknowledge the risk of becoming overly dependent on the tool when producing written documents, which they perceive as a potential threat to their creativity. These results can shed light on how generative AI tools can afford writing processes when used as tools for cognition and not as a substitute of students' cognition, eliciting their writing affordances and associated critical thinking skills. Reference Fuertes-Alpiste, M. (2024). Framing Generative AI applications as tools for cognition in education. Pixel-Bit. Revista De Medios Y Educación, 71, 42–57. <https://doi.org/10.12795/pixelbit.107697>

✉ jluna@ub.edu



Students' reflections on academic writing in higher education: GenAI as sociomaterial actor

Presenting author: Jusslin, Sofia ; University of Helsinki; Finland.

Co-author: Hort, Sofia ; Mälardalen University; Abo Akademi University; Sweden.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;AI writing;Generative AI;writing tools and writing technology

This presentation addresses undergraduate students' reflections on GenAI technologies and their role(s) in their academic writing, drawing from data from workshops with undergraduate students across scientific disciplines at a university in Finland. The study aims to explore how students conceptualize their academic writing in relation to GenAI technologies, drawing theoretically on sociomaterial frameworks using, for example, actor-network theory to understand writing as a process in which both human and non-human actors participate in shaping it (e.g., Clarke, 2002; Gourlay, 2015). The data encompasses audio-recorded conversations and mindmaps from four workshops (2,5 h each) with a total of 30 students in educational sciences, political science, and caring sciences. During the workshops, the students were tasked with mapping and discussing what they use in their academic writing, how, when, and why. No question was asked explicitly about GenAI. Nevertheless, the students discussed GenAI technologies in all workshops, sharing that they use various AI technologies, such as ChatGPT, co-pilot, and Gemini. Preliminary analyses indicate that the students use them, for example, as support when their writing processes become stalled, when needing to expand the amount of text or generate new perspectives, and to orient themselves in relevant literature. A prominent use of GenAI technologies is that they, in similar manners as for example dictionaries and thesauruses, can be used in the writing to adapt the text to the linguistic and stylistic norms that apply within their disciplines. As such, GenAI technologies often have, according to the students, other, more central functions than merely a text generator. This presentation will unfold the results of the study and discuss implications for writing with GenAI in higher education. References Clarke, J. (2002). A new kind of symmetry: Actor-network theories and the new literacy studies. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 34(2), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2002.11661465>Gourlay, L. (2015). Posthuman texts: Nonhuman actors, mediators and the digital university. *Social Semiotics*, 25(4), 484–500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2015.1059578>

✉ sofia.jusslin@helsinki.fi



Becoming Writers, Becoming Teachers: Student Teachers' Literacy Attitudes Across Contexts

Presenting author: Aptoula, Nur Yigitoglu ; Bogazici University; Türkiye.

Presenting author: Johansson, Victoria ; Kristianstad University; Sweden.

Presenting author: Lindgren, Eva ; Umeå University; Sweden.

Presenting author: Sturk, Erika ; University of Gothenburg; Sweden.

Presenting author: Vandermeulen, Nina ; University of Antwerp; Belgium.

Chair: Wanka, Rebekka ; Mercator-Institut (Universität zu Köln); Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: reading and writing;writing beliefs;writing processes;writing skills

This study explored how student teachers in their first semester of teacher education conceptualized writing and broader literacy practices. The aim was to identify the attitudes, beliefs, and orientations that future teachers bring to writing before receiving formal instruction in teaching writing. Understanding these early conceptualizations is essential for informing the design of effective writing pedagogy within teacher education programs. The study was grounded in research on writing attitudes and writer identity, particularly work emphasizing the multifaceted nature of writing as an affective, cognitive, and socially situated activity (Ivanič, 2004). This framework guided our investigation of how student teachers position themselves as writers and how these orientations vary across educational contexts. We employed a questionnaire-based design using the Writing Attitude Survey for Teachers and Pupils (WASP), complemented by additional items targeting broader literacy practices. Participants were drawn from multiple universities in Türkiye and Sweden, ensuring diversity not only across countries but also across institutional contexts. Factor analyses were conducted to identify underlying dimensions of writing attitudes and to generate profiles of student teachers' orientations toward writing. We identified four factors: creativity in writing, digital tools, personal writing and writing for school. There was a cross-country difference regarding creativity and digital tools. These profiles point to differing levels of confidence and investment in writing, highlighting the need for teacher education programs to address variation in incoming literacy attitudes. The study contributes to the writing research domain by offering cross-national evidence on how student teachers conceptualize writing at the outset of their training. These insights can inform curriculum design, support the development of writer identity in teacher education, and contribute to a broader comparative framework for studying writing-related attitudes across educational systems.

✉ erika.sturk@gu.se; nuryigitoglu@gmail.com; eva.lindgren@umu.se; victoria.johansson@hkr.se; nina.vandermeulen@uantwerpen.be



Bursts of writing and their relation to text quality in children's writing

Presenting author: Houssein, Tatiana ; CNRS/Université de Poitiers; France.

Co-author: Bordes, Caroline ; CNRS - Université de Poitiers; France.

Co-author: Olive, Thierry ; CNRS & Université de Poitiers; France.

Chair: Wanka, Rebekka ; Mercator-Institut (Universität zu Köln); Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: acquisition;text composition;writing at school;writing processes

Writing acquisition requires the progressive coordination of transcription, linguistic formulation, and monitoring processes. Burst-based analyses offer a fine-grained approach to capture how children temporally organize their writing across learning (e.g., Alves et al., ; Cislaru & Olive, 2018 ; Olive, 2014). Process coordination indeed develops through the progressive automatization of transcription simultaneously to growing skills in higher-level processes such as planning and revision. In this framework, we examined how the duration and length of production and revision bursts change across 3rd, 5th, and 6th graders who typed narrative and expository texts. We also analyzed the relations between process and product measures. Grade differences appeared in both process and product measures. Younger students produced longer-duration bursts but shorter texts, whereas older students showed shorter bursts and produced richer written products. Burst dynamic was only marginally influenced by text type, suggesting that the temporal organization of transcription and higher-level processes remains relatively stable across genres. Narratives were longer in size and syntactically more complex than expository texts. Orthographic spelling, however, did not follow a linear pattern: 5th graders made the most errors overall, and narratives elicited more errors than expository texts, with this genre difference being strongest among younger writers. Correlations indicated that short duration and larger bursts were associated with higher writers' productivity and higher syntactic complexity, particularly among younger students, supporting the view that gains in lower-level fluency contribute to more developed written products. Together, these findings show how improvements in fluency facilitate the emergence of more complex and productive writing, illustrating how temporal and textual dimensions of writing evolve during learning to facilitate the emergence of more complex and productive writing.

✉ tatiana.houssein@univ-poitiers.fr



Effective Revision in Upper-Primary Writing: Strategy Use and Text Quality

Presenting author: Arias-Gundín, Olga ; University of León; Spain.

Presenting author: Lopez, Paula ; University of León; Spain.

Presenting author: Álvarez-Moreno, Carmen ; Universidad de Leon; Spain.

Co-author: Limpo, Teresa ; University of Porto; Portugal.

Chair: Wanka, Rebekka ; Mercator-Institut (Universität zu Köln); Germany.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: L1;writing at school;writing processes;writing skills

Producing written texts that meet genre conventions and readers' expectations is a cognitively demanding activity, particularly for developing writers. Revision plays a central role in improving text quality, as it allows writers to evaluate and modify their texts beyond initial formulation. However, revision effectiveness depends not only on detecting problems, but also on the strategic operations used to address them. Despite its importance, less is known about how specific revision strategies contribute to text quality during the later years of primary education. The present study examines the use of revision strategies in upper-primary students and analyses how different strategies relate to writing quality. Participants were 834 typically developing students from Grades 4 to 6 (10-12 years old). Students completed two tasks: (a) writing a narrative text, and (b) revising a researcher-created narrative text containing six mechanical and six substantive problems. Writing quality was assessed using anchor texts, considering textual structure, lexical diversity, coherence, and overall discourse quality. Revision strategies were identified by analyzing the changes made by students and classifying them into eight categories: edit, add, delete, transform, replace, permute, distribute, and consolidate according to previous studies (e.g., Chanquoy et al., 2009). Results showed that students relied predominantly on editing and permutation strategies, being the most frequently used across grades. A clear developmental trend was observed, with older students employing a greater variety of strategies than younger students. Importantly, strategies involving the addition and reorganisation of information emerged as the strongest predictors of text quality, regardless of grade level. These findings highlight the functional value of specific revision strategies in writing development and suggest that instructional practices should move beyond error correction to explicitly support more substantive forms of revision. Implications for models of writing development and educational practice will be discussed. This work is part of a project funded by the Ministry of Science and Innovation and the European Union (ref. PID2021-124011NB-I00).

✉ plogp@unileon.es; malvam@unileon.es; o.arias.gundin@unileon.es



Effects of removing visual feedback on writing to learn

Presenting author: Galbraith, David ; University of Southampton; United Kingdom.

Co-author: Baaijen, Veerle ; CLCG University of Groningen; Netherlands.

Co-author: Peters, Amy ; University of Southampton; United Kingdom.

Co-author: Prentice, Olivia ; University of Southampton; United Kingdom.

Chair: Mahlow, Cerstin ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: academic writing;cognitive processes;speaking and writing;writing to learn

This study examined the effect of removing visual feedback while writing summaries of source texts on participants' subsequent recognition memory for words contained in the source texts. Previous research has established a consistent writing superiority effect whereby words from the original text are recognised faster following a written summary compared to a spoken summary. The present study examined whether this advantage persists when visual feedback is removed during the production of a written summary. In a within subjects' design, 32 university students were asked to read and then summarise text under three different conditions: (i) written summaries; (ii) spoken summaries and (iii) invisibly written summaries. Each condition contained 4 texts about randomly varying topics so that performance in the 3 different conditions was based on performance across 4 trials. In each trial, participants were asked to: (i) read a brief text; (ii) rate their understanding of the text; (iii) summarize the text; (iv) rate their understanding of the text again, before; (v) responding true / false to a recognition test of 30 words, 15 of which were taken from the original text and 15 of which had not been present in the text. The results showed that the writing superiority effect was preserved even when visual feedback was removed during writing. Participants in both writing conditions responded equally faster to words from the original texts compared to the participants in the spoken condition ($F(2, 277) = 2.65, p$

✉ d.w.galbraith@soton.ac.uk



Exploring Keystroke Logging Behavior to Investigate Self-Regulated Writing of Undergraduate Students

Presenting author: Outerbridge, Sierra ; University of Central Florida; United States.

Co-author: Schneier, Joel ; University of Central Florida; United States.

Co-author: Taub, Michelle ; University of Central Florida; United States.

Chair: Mahlow, Cerstin ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: academic writing;cognitive processes;keystroke logging data processing and analysis;metacognition

When supporting undergraduate students in a first-year writing course, we utilized Downs & Wardle's (2007) evidenced-based model of writing-about-writing (WaW) to foster metacognitive monitoring and self-regulated writing (SRW) practices. After gaining IRB approval, 62 student volunteers (n=62) from a first-year writing course spent a 30-minute writing session in a lab setting. Students were asked to write about their writing process, and keystroke logging behavior (production, deletion, insertion, and pause time) was captured at the millisecond-level via InputLog (Leijten & Van Waes, 2013). Since the prompt is reflective in nature, we deductively coded participants' sentences through the lens of self-regulated learning (SRL): planning, performance, and reflection (Zimmerman, 1998). Through the lens of Graham's (2018) Writer(s)-Within-Community Model of Writing, a model that utilizes Zimmerman's (1998) interpretation of SRL, we investigate how students may engage in keystroke logging behavior to investigate SRW strategies concurrently with behaviors enacted during the writing session by asking two research questions: (1) Are there distinct keystroke logging behavior patterns when responding to a self-reflective writing prompt? (2) Does the frequency of coded SRL sentences relate to the patterns that emerge? We investigated these research questions via Markov Chain Analysis to analyze the nominal keystroke logging behavior to identify patterns students enacted while writing; 6 common patterns suggested students engaged in metacognitive monitoring or revision behavior (e.g., delete → insert → insert). For the second question, we anticipate a logistic regression will demonstrate that students with a higher frequency of reflection codes will have a positive likelihood of enacting a pattern of metacognitive monitoring and/or revision. These results inform how students are engaging with the writing process when reflecting on their writing, a tool that might help us better understand students' writing behaviors towards adapting pedagogical practices. Selected References Downs, D., & Wardle, E. (2007). Teaching about writing, righting misconceptions: (Re)envisioning "first-year composition" as "introduction to writing studies." *College Composition & Communication*, 58(4), 552–584. Graham, S. (2018). A revised Writer(s)-Within-Community model of writing. *Educational Psychologist*, 53(4), 258–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2018.1481406>

✉ sierra.outerbridge@ucf.edu



Prompt – write – revise – repeat: a writing-process study of AI-assisted writing in higher education

Presenting author: Weder, Mirjam ; University of Basel; Switzerland.

Chair: Mahlow, Cerstin ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing; AI writing; cognitive processes; writing processes

With the widespread adoption of generative AI for (academic) writing, established models of the writing process such as Hayes (2012) need to be re-conceptualized. It has been suggested that writing could be viewed as a “co-activity of humans and machines” (Steinhoff 2023, Brommer & Rezat in print). To date, extensive survey-based research documents students’ AI use in higher education based on self-reports (cf. Ravšelj et al. 2025), whereas observational studies examining how students shape and appropriate human-AI co-activity in writing processes remain scarce (cf., however, Jelson et al. 2025). This study aimed to investigate writing strategies students use in AI-assisted writing, in particular, how students adapt and combine sub-processes, such as prompting, treatment of the AI output, AI-assistant revision, and their own revisions, and how different strategies impact the characteristics and quality of texts. To this end, several data-collection instruments were used: screen capture (OBS Studio) and keystroke logging (Leijten & Van Waes 2013) to record text production processes and the interaction between human input and AI output; stimulated recall (Gass 2000) to capture (meta-)cognitive processes; and a short questionnaire on AI-supported writing strategies and participants’ self-efficacy beliefs. The paper reports on a study comprising 12 writing sessions with students of German studies who varied in their experience with academic writing and AI use, testing the combination of methods and exploring writing processes and strategies with the aim of developing a category system for their description and analysis. References Brommer, S., Rezat, S. (pre-print). Mensch-KI-Interaktion beim Schreiben – Theoretische Überlegungen zur Modellierung des Schreibprozesses. In: Weder, M., Bubenhofer, N. (eds.): Schreiben mit KI. transcript. Hayes, J. R. (2012). Modeling and Remodeling Writing. In: Written Communication 29, 369–388. Leijten, M., Van Waes, L. (2013). Keystroke Logging in Writing Research: Using Inputlog to Analyze Writing Processes. Written Communication 30(3), 358-392. Ravšelj, D., et al. (2025). Higher education students’ perceptions of ChatGPT: A global study of early reactions. In: PLOS ONE, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0315011>. Steinhoff, T. (2023): Der Computer schreibt (mit). Digitales Schreiben mit Word, Whatsapp, ChatGPT & Co. als Koaktivität von Mensch und Maschine. In: MiDU-Medien im Deutschunterricht, IDSL II. (1), 1–16.

✉ mirjam.weder@unibas.ch



An Innovative Strategy for Improving Undergraduate Low Writing Fluency

Presenting author: Long, Goldberry ; University of California, Riverside; United States.

Presenting author: Lussier, Catherine ; University of California, Riverside; United States.

Co-author: Atit, Kinnari ; University of California, Riverside; United States.

Chair: Conijn, Rianne ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy

Keywords: cognitive processes;fluency;intervention study;writing instruction

Low writing fluency, or writer's block (WB) is common among all students from all backgrounds, and is often experienced when generating first drafts. Students experiencing WB may turn to AI to write their draft for them as a solution. This raises concerns about academic dishonesty and more importantly may undermine the development of students' writing skills and writing self-efficacy. Thus, in the growing age of AI, identifying evidence-based cognitive strategies to help students manage WB should be a critical priority. However, most writing interventions often focus on planning and revising, offering few self-regulation strategies for starting and continuing to generate ideas when writing a first draft. This pre-post quantitative study examines the efficacy of Powerwriting, an instructional intervention for improving writing fluency in undergraduates. This intervention involves students answering an open-ended backbone question scaffolded by three cognitively supporting sub-strategies (e.g., use linking words, allow tangents, and type questions/type answers) aimed at enhancing word generation and writing self-efficacy. Students ($n = 100$) generated weekly ten-minute Powerwriting samples across a ten-week creative writing course. Writing fluency, self-efficacy, and writing apprehension were measured pre- and post- instruction. Results from Wilcoxon-Signed Rank tests comparing pre- and post- assessment outcomes show that fluency ($V = 4517$, $p < .001$; $rw = .83$) and self-efficacy ($V = 3433$, $p < .001$, $rw=0.40$) increased, but writing apprehension did not change ($V = 1921.50$, $p = .73$, $rw=0.03$). Moreover, students showed large gains for writing fluency and moderately large gains in self-efficacy, as indicated by their Wilcoxon effect sizes (rw). These findings demonstrate that Powerwriting can support students in overcoming WB, even when they are apprehensive about starting a first draft. They further suggest that providing students with effective strategies for managing WB may reduce the likelihood of AI misuse as a workaround for early drafting difficulties.

✉ goldl@ucr.edu; cathy.lussier@ucr.edu



Does seeing writing as changeable matter?

Presenting author: Kraft, Sanna ; Linnaeus University; Sweden.

Co-author: Rack, John ; Linnaeus University; Sweden.

Co-author: Thurfjell, Fredrik ; Habiliteringen Stockholm; Sweden.

Co-author: Wengelin, Åsa ; University of Gothenburg; Sweden.

Chair: Conijn, Rianne ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: cognitive processes;experimental approaches;keystroke logging;writing beliefs

Students' beliefs about writing ability—whether they view it as changeable or fixed—affect how they engage with writing instruction (Limpo & Alves, 2014). Those believing that writing ability can improve are better positioned to develop their skills, whereas seeing it as fixed may be problematic, especially for those who struggle (e.g., those with dyslexia), as this perspective risks placing all blame on their own competence. Beliefs about competence have also been linked to text quality (Grenner et al., 2021), and students with low self-efficacy in relation to writing tend to write less frequently (Waldmann et al., 2022). However, the link between viewing writing ability as changeable and actual performance remains unclear. In school, where writing serves both as an assessment tool and a means of learning, understanding how perceptions differ between students with and without writing difficulties is crucial. Such knowledge can inform instruction that supports writing. This quasi-experimental study examines the relationship between middle school students' beliefs about writing ability and their text production. The study includes 58 students (ages 10–13), of whom 38 have reading and writing difficulties. Participants completed a questionnaire on writing habits and beliefs about writing and wrote descriptive texts. Both writing processes and final texts were collected and analysed linguistically. Comparisons between students' beliefs, writing processes, and texts will be presented. The study contributes knowledge to inform teaching practices that support writing—particularly for students needing additional support. Limpo, T., & Alves, R. A. (2014). Implicit theories of writing and their impact on students' response to a SRSD intervention. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(4), 571-590. Grenner, E., Johansson, V., van de Weijer, J., & Sahlén, B. (2021). Effects of intervention on self-efficacy and text quality in elementary school students' narrative writing. *Logopedics Phoniatrics Vocology*, 46(1), 1-10. Waldmann, C., Ranjesh, R. Malmström, A., Lindgren E. & Levlin, M. (2022). Ungdomars skrivpraktiker på fritiden. In: P. Sundqvist, C. Waldmann, B. Straszer and B. Ljung Egeland (Eds.) *Språk i skola, på fritid och i arbetsliv*. ASLA:s skriftserie 29, 187–212.

✉ sanna.kraft@lnu.se



Writing deceit: The influence of veracity on writing processes in personal narratives

Presenting author: Johansson, Victoria ; Kristianstad University; Sweden.

Co-author: Frid, Johan ; Lund University; Sweden.

Co-author: Gullberg, Kajsa ; Lund University; Sweden.

Co-author: Johansson, Roger ; Lund University; Sweden.

Chair: Conijn, Rianne ; Eindhoven University of Technology; Netherlands.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: cognitive processes;eye tracking;keystroke logging;writing and linguistics

Distinguishing lies from truths has long been of interest across psychology, linguistics, and forensic research. Studies of written deception have traditionally focused on finished texts, examining lexical or stylistic features associated with veracity (e.g., Newman et al., 2003; Johansson et al., 2025). These studies have identified systematic differences between truthful and deceptive texts but fail to describe how writing processes unfold during deceitful writing. More recently, process-oriented methods such as keystroke logging have shown that deception affects writing behaviour – particularly pausing and revision – but that these effects depend on task characteristics and the demands imposed on the writer (Banerjee et al., 2014; Gullberg et al., 2025). The present study extends this line of research by examining how deceptive modifications of personal narratives based on autobiographical memories shape the writing process. Rather than relying on experimentally provided material, the design targets a situation common in everyday and forensic contexts: altering a well-established, personally meaningful narrative. This allows explorations of how deception unfolds when writers must modify a stable memory representation while maintaining coherence. The study addresses two questions: (1) How does altering elements of a personal experience influence narrative production? (2) How does deceptive intent affect planning, revision, and monitoring processes during writing? Participants (n = 18) wrote personal narratives both truthfully and deceitfully in an experiment using ScriptLog combined with eye-tracking. Results showed that deceptive narratives were characterized by significantly longer initial pauses, more frequent pausing, a higher proportion pause time, and more extensive deletions than truthful narratives, indicating increased processing demands both before writing begins and throughout text production. By contrast, no clear differences were observed between conditions in global measures of reading and visual processing of the emerging text. Overall, the findings suggest that deception in personal narratives primarily manifests in temporal and revision-related aspects of writing. They highlight the importance of narrative familiarity and personal relevance for understanding cognitive demands in writing processes and point to the potential value of process-based measures for identifying deceptive production in applied and forensic contexts. It also furthers our understanding of how potentially cognitively demanding tasks impact the writing processes.

✉ victoria.johansson@hkr.se



Integrating ChatGPT into EFL Writing Instruction: Effects of Teacher Modelling and Autonomous Use

Presenting author: Van Steendam, Elke ; KU Leuven; Belgium.

Co-author:), Yen Phuong Hoang (Phuong Hoang Yen (CTU) ; Can Tho University Vietnam; Vietnam.

Co-author: Le Thanh, Thao ; KU LEUVEN; Belgium.

Co-author: Sercu, Lies ; Katholieke Universiteit Leuven; Belgium.

Chair: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Theme: Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Digital Writing Technologies & AI

Keywords: academic writing;AI writing;intervention study;writing instruction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is no longer peripheral to writing education; it is embedded in learners' everyday composing practices, yet a key question remains: how should AI be effectively integrated to support complex genres such as argumentative writing? While prior research highlights AI's potential for localized feedback and revision, intervention studies comparing integration designs for producing full essays within established instructional frameworks are scarce. In EFL contexts, where linguistic and rhetorical demands compound cognitive load (Hyland, 2019), teacher modelling, making expert strategies visible across planning, drafting, revising, and self-regulation (Graham & Perin, 2007; Schunk & Zimmerman, 1998), offers a benchmark for evaluating AI-supported instruction. What remains unclear is whether AI can serve as a productive modelling partner, how it compares to modelling without AI, and whether autonomous AI use fosters sustained gains in text quality. To address this question, we set up a pretest-posttest experimental study with 130 Vietnamese EFL undergraduates completing a four-lesson sequence on argumentative writing aligned with Schunk and Zimmerman's (1998) self-regulated skill acquisition model. Three conditions were implemented: (1) Teacher Modelling + ChatGPT (TM+GPT), where the teacher thought aloud while prompting and critiquing ChatGPT output; (2) Teacher Modelling only (TM), replicating strategy instruction without AI; and (3) Autonomous Learning + ChatGPT (AL+GPT), where students engaged ChatGPT independently as a writing coach. A mixed-method design captured (a) screen-capture and keystroke logs for processes, (b) writing products for text quality, and (c) questionnaires on perceptions. This paper focuses on the product-level question: What is the effect of ChatGPT-integrated instruction on text quality? Results show that TM+GPT produced the highest text-quality scores, outperforming both AL+GPT and TM. These findings suggest that AI yields the greatest benefit when embedded within explicit teacher modelling that scaffolds prompt design, critical evaluation of AI output, and alignment with rhetorical goals, rather than when students use AI autonomously or when instruction excludes AI. implications for integrating AI as a mediated modelling partner in EFL writing curricula will be discussed.

✉ elke.vansteendam@kuleuven.be



Morpheme and syllable boundaries in adult handwriting

Presenting author: Nottbusch, Guido ; University of Potsdam; Germany.

Chair: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: cognitive processes;handwriting;keystroke logging;writing processes

Studies of handwriting movements (as well as keyboard logging studies) have shown that writers consistently pause at syllable and morpheme boundaries when writing words in different languages/writing systems. Syllabic processing in particular has been the subject of a considerable amount of research. Several studies (e.g. Kandel et al., 2011) have shown that adult writers slow down at syllable onsets. Regarding the impact of morphological structure on handwriting processes, the existing empirical evidence is rather limited. To fill this gap, we replicate various unpublished studies on keyboard logging using adult handwriting (collected with GetWrite on iPads) and then compare both results. The stimuli consist of words in which different linguistic boundaries occur in a bigram, e.g. for the bigram : Verkäuferin (saleswoman; prefix/stem, high frequency),verklingen (fade away; prefix/stem, low frequency)Wunderkind (child genius; stem/stem, hf),Sauberkeit (cleanliness; stem/suffix, hf),Biederkeit (conservatism, stem/suffix, lf)Kaiserkult (emperor worship; stem/stem, lf), Gurke (cucumber; syllable, hf), Forke (rake; syllable, lf),Werk (works; letter, hf),Quark (curd cheese; lf) All morphological boundaries are syllable boundaries as well. The data of approximately 100 adults are not analysed yet, be we expect longer pauses for the morpheme/syllable boundaries compared to the syllable boundaries and the letter boundaries (shortes pauses), if the pen is lifted between the two letters of interest. In addition, we compare velocity, duration and fluency of the first, the second and, if present, the connecting strokes, taking the frequency of the whole words and, if applicable, the second morpheme alone into account. References Kandel, S., Peereman, R., Grosjacques, G., & Fayol, M. L. (2011). For a psycholinguistic model of handwriting production: Testing the syllable-bigram controversy. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 37, 1310–1322. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023094>

✉ gnott@uni-potsdam.de



The Use of Gender-Inclusive Writing : Insights from Writing Process Models

Presenting author: Girard, Gabrielle ; Université du Québec à Montréal; Canada.

Co-author: Foucambert, Denis ; Université du Québec à Montréal; Canada.

Chair: Pogner, Karl-Heinz ; Copenhagen Business School; Denmark.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: cognitive processes;keystroke logging data processing and analysis;writing models;writing processes

This study investigates how and when gender-inclusive writing (IW) (écriture inclusive) is used during text production in French and how it affects writing processes. IW refers to strategies that make a greater number of gender identities visible in French, as opposed to the so-called “generic” masculine used as the default for describing mixed-gender groups. Practices include composite forms (e.g. les lecteur-trices, ‘the reader-sMASC·FEM’), epicene writing (words without gender variation, e.g. le lectorat, ‘the readership’, les spécialistes, ‘the specialists’), and rephrasing to eliminate gender markings. While IW is increasingly observed in educational and professional contexts, its integration into writing may impose additional cognitive demands and often appear through revisions rather than during initial burst – or not at all. Grounded in psycholinguistic models of writing, such as Flower and Hayes’ (1981) cognitive process theory, and Alamargot and Fayol’s (2009) work, this study examines how different stages of writing are affected by IW. IW may require writers to allocate additional resources between conceptual content and linguistic formulation, which could translate to longer pauses and revisions of the first burst (Alamargot et al., 2007; Cislaru & Olive, 2018). Our methodological design combines two phases of an image-description task. In the first phase, participants (N = 15) describe an image depicting a mixed-gender group without specific instruction. In the second, they describe additional images with explicit instruction to use IW strategies. Texts are typed in Genographix, enabling observation of real-time writing processes such as pauses, revisions, and reformulations. The resulting texts are analyzed using mixed models for IW presence or absence and process indicators of a higher cognitive cost (e.g., pauses, revisions). Early findings suggest IW is rarely used spontaneously. When required, writers exhibit longer pauses and more revisions, indicating increased cognitive effort and monitoring. These results suggest that IW is not yet automated and remains a controlled process requiring conscious attention. This study provides insight into how a relatively new linguistic resource affects writing processes. It also informs writing pedagogy and professional practice by highlighting the cognitive challenges that need to be addressed to make IW use more spontaneous and integrated into writing.

✉ girard.gabrielle.4@courrier.uqam.ca



A Systematic Review of Qualitative Studies on Secondary Writing Instruction from 1968-2023

Presenting author: Buenker, Joe ; Arizona State University, ASU Library; United States.

Presenting author: Early, Jessica ; Arizona State University; United States.

Presenting author: Jeffery, Jill ; Leiden University Centre for Linguistics; Netherlands.

Chair: Sturm, Afra ; University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland PH (FHNW); Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: meta-analysis; pedagogy and instruction; writing at school; writing instruction

This paper examines fifty five years of qualitative research in English on teaching writing in secondary (6–12) classrooms to address a critical gap in the field. Although scholarship on writing instruction has expanded across disciplinary, methodological, and geographical boundaries, the last review (Hillocks, 2008) focused specifically on qualitative studies of secondary writing and was not empirically grounded. The aim of this study is to provide a systematic, empirical synthesis of qualitative research on secondary writing instruction published between 1968 and 2023, offering historical and contemporary insights into how writing is taught, supported, and conceptualized in classroom contexts across the globe. Guided by a sociocultural theoretical framework, we investigate how writing instruction is shaped through social relationships, disciplinary expectations, and the contexts in which literacy practices occur (Bazerman, 2000; Brandt, 2001; Early, 2010). From this perspective, writing is contextual, purpose-driven, and developed through sustained practice and guided participation (Bazerman & Bonini, 2009). We conducted a systematic review in collaboration with content specialists and a research librarian. Using a three-part search strategy within a comprehensive academic database, we generated a keyword search aligned with our research questions and thereby identified studies published from 1968–2023. We developed screening criteria, established interrater reliability procedures, and completed three iterative rounds of analysis to examine theoretical orientations, methodological approaches, data collection practices, and reported findings. Through this process we reduced our initial result set from 1,471 publications by 86% to just 201 journal articles, dissertations, ERIC documents, etc. Our findings highlight major shifts in the theoretical and methodological landscape of secondary writing research, recurrent themes in effective writing instruction, and trends in how classroom writing has been conceptualized over time. The review also identifies persistent methodological challenges, including issues of discoverability, keywording, and documentation of research contexts. This paper contributes to the field by offering a descriptive overview of best practices in both the study and teaching of secondary writing and by outlining recommendations for conducting systematic reviews in writing research, particularly when constructing historical corpora.

✉ Jessica.early@asu.edu; joe.buenker@asu.edu; j.v.jeffery@hum.leidenuniv.nl



Gender differences in self-reported audience awareness in middle schoolers' argumentative writing

Presenting author: Torkildsen, Janne von Koss ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Co-author: Hagelund, Silje ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Co-author: Jerijærvi, Camilla Bøen ; CREATE, centre for research on equality in education, University of Oslo; Norway.

Co-author: Knoph, Rebecca ; University of Oslo; Norway.

Co-author: Lervåg, Arne ; University of Oslo, CREATE Centre for research on equality in education; Norway.

Chair: Sturm, Afra ; University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland PH (FHNW); Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies

Keywords: developmental aspects of writing ability;proficiency;social and cultural aspects of writing;writing processes

Purpose:Girls consistently outperform boys on writing assessments (e.g. Reilly et al. 2019), yet the sources of these differences are not fully understood. One potential contributor is audience awareness during writing, a construct closely related to perspective-taking and theory of mind, where gender differences have been documented (e.g. Van der Graaff et al. 2014). However, few studies have examined students' own judgements of audience awareness during the writing process. This study investigated gender differences in self-reported audience awareness among middle school students writing argumentative texts.Method:Participants were 137 sixth- and seventh-grade students (69 girls, 68 boys) in Norway. Students read a short dilemma involving a sustainability issue relevant to their age group and were asked to write an argumentative text advising the protagonist on what stance to take. Immediately after writing, students completed an online questionnaire assessing their thoughts about the audience at different stages during the writing process, as well as specific dimensions of audience awareness.Results:Fifty-five percent of girls, compared to 29% of boys, reported thinking about the audience often or very often while writing. In contrast, 49% of boys reported that they did so rarely, never, or did not know, compared to 22% of girls. These gender differences were consistent across pre-planning, drafting, and revision phases. When specific dimensions of audience awareness were examined, boys more often than girls reported focusing on making the language easy to understand for the audience. Conversely, more than twice as many girls as boys reported considering whether the content and arguments were appropriate for their audience.Conclusion:Substantial gender differences in self-reported audience awareness suggest that this construct may potentially be a meaningful factor in explaining gender gaps in writing performance. The findings also point to the importance of differentiating between surface-level (e.g. linguistic) and content-related audience awareness when designing writing interventions.References: Reilly, D., Neumann, D. L., & Andrews, G. (2019). *American Psychologist*, 74(4), 445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000356> Van der Graaff et al. (2014). *Developmental psychology*, 50(3), 881. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034325>

✉ janneto@isp.uio.no



On-line spelling revision in elementary and middle school children: a focus on revision time

Presenting author: Chanquoy, Lucile ; Université Nice Sophia Antipolis; France.

Chair: Sturm, Afra ; University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland PH (FHNW); Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: developmental aspects of writing ability; errors and error correction; experimental approaches; writing processes

This research focuses on on-line detection and correction of lexical and grammatical spelling errors inserted in written sentences performed by primary and secondary school students. The objective was to determine, from temporal measures and revision scores, which errors produced the biggest difficulties for participants and, from a developmental point of view, how the revision process evolved with grade level. This study was based on the postulate that time taken for revising should be a good indicator of the difficulty encountered by participants to detect and to correct spelling errors. Thus, not only detected and revised errors were considered, but also the time needed by students to revise each sentence and the nature of the correction. Several types of surface spelling errors were introduced in 24 experimental sentences: (1) 10 sentences each containing a lexical error (consistent vs. inconsistent word, derivable finale letter vs. non derivable, contextual graphemes); (2) 14 sentences each containing a grammatical error (number and gender agreement errors on verbs, adjectives, nouns). There were equally 10 training and distractive (without error) sentences. The experiment took place online. We measured the number of errors detected, the number of errors detected and correctly (vs. incorrectly) and the number of non-corrected errors. We also measured the time taken by the participants to detect and correct the different types of errors. In a first analysis (e.g., Chanquoy, 2023, 2024), we only analyzed the various possible corrections (as mentioned above) based on the nature of the errors presented. In this second part, we want to compare the nature of correctly corrected errors with the time taken to make these corrections. Here only sentences whose errors have been both detected and correctly corrected are considered. Results showed that participants, regardless of their grades, took significantly less time to correct lexical than grammatical errors. There was an expected effect of school level: older children detected and corrected more rapidly than younger ones. As large inter-error and inter-individual differences had been highlighted, several analyses involving revising times and nature of revised errors are currently in progress.

✉ lucile.chanquoy@unice.fr



Assessing Higher-Order Writing Skills: Development and Validation of a Diagnostic Instrument

Presenting author: Hennes, Ann-Kathrin ; Universität Kassel; Germany.

Presenting author: Linnemann, Markus ; University of Koblenz; Germany.

Presenting author: Thamm, Alexander ; Universität zu Köln; Germany.

Co-author: Jost, Joerg ; Universität zu Köln/ University of Cologne; Germany.

Co-author: Schabmann, Alfred ; University of Cologne; Germany.

Co-author: Schmidt, Barbara ; University of Cologne; Germany.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: evaluation and assessment of writing competence;text composition;writing at school;writing skills

Writing competence is central to academic success and participation beyond school. (Becker-Mrotzek, 2014). Current models conceptualize text production as a multilevel process, with higher-order composing skills—such as coherence and cohesion, audience awareness, and information management—being particularly important for text quality (Hennes, 2020). To support individualized instruction, teachers must accurately assess these subskills and identify student’s strengths and weaknesses (Graham et al., 2012). However, existing diagnostic instruments rarely target these higher-order composing competences in a differentiated way (Hennes, 2020). This study presents the development and validation of a writing test designed to assess four key dimensions of composing: global coherence, local cohesion, audience awareness, and information management. The instrument was developed for students in grades 4 to 9 and comprises ten tasks, each targeting one dimension. An extended text production task served as the criterion variable, with text quality evaluated globally using comparative judgments. Validation data were collected from students in grades 4 (N = 91), 6 (N = 135), and 9 (N = 65) in Germany; grade 9 was excluded from the analysis due to ceiling effects. For grades 4 and 6, regression analyses identified tasks that significantly predicted text quality; together, these explained substantial variance. Subsequent exploratory factor analyses – conducted to examine whether the remaining tasks reflected the hypothesized multidimensional structure – yielded a single-factor solution for both grade levels. These findings raise important questions regarding the relationship between statistical dimensionality and diagnostic utility, particularly as current models of text production assume a multidimensional structure. Implications for educational practice and theoretical models of text composition will be discussed. References Becker-Mrotzek, M. (2014). Schreibkompetenz. In J. Grabowski (Hrsg.), *Sinn und Unsinn von Kompetenzen: Fähigkeitskonzepte im Bereich von Sprache, Medien und Kultur* (1. Aufl., S. 51–72). Verlag Barbara Budrich. Graham, S., McKeown, D., Kiuahara, S., & Harris, K. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for students in the elementary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 879–896. Hennes, A.-K. (2020). Schreibprodukte bewerten: Die Rolle der Expertise bei der Bewertung der Textproduktionskompetenz [KUPS (Kölner UniversitätsPublikationsServer)].

✉ athamm2@uni-koeln.de; mlinnemann@uni-koblenz.de; ann-kathrin.hennes@uni-kassel.de



Effectiveness of single-case writing interventions (2008-2025): Preliminary meta-analysis findings

Presenting author: Rønneberg, Vibeke ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Co-author: Alves, Rui Alexandre ; University of Porto; Portugal.

Co-author: Alves-Wold, Aline ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Co-author: Camacho, Ana ; University of Porto; Portugal.

Co-author: De Smedt, Fien ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Co-author: McTigue, Erin ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Co-author: Moeyaert, Mariola ; University at Albany, State University of New York; United States.

Co-author: Solheim, Oddny Judith ; University of Stavanger; Norway.

Co-author: Van Keer, Hilde ; Ghent University; Belgium.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: intervention study;meta-analysis;writing at school;writing instruction

Research Topic and Aim This presentation introduces a pre-registered meta-analysis examining the effectiveness of writing interventions tested through single-case experimental designs from 2008 to 2025. This work is being conducted under an EARLI-funded network composed of writing researchers from three countries. Theoretical Framework Building on Rogers and Graham's (2008) and Casola's (2023) works, the meta-analysis targets school-based writing interventions for Grade 1-12 students to estimate their impact on writing performance while identifying student- and intervention-level moderators of effectiveness. Methodological Design Database searches conducted in June 2025 using PsycINFO, Education Source Ultimate, and Web of Science initially yielded 4,753 records. Four raters screened the abstracts of these records (95-96% of interrater agreement) and retained 198 papers for full-text screening. Of these, 135 fulfilled the following inclusion criteria: single-case experimental design, grades 1-12 students, included a baseline with at least three data points, reported at least one quantitative writing or motivational outcome, and provided sufficient information to compute effect sizes. Once the database searches are complemented with hand searches, the raw single-case data of the selected studies will be extracted using WebPlotDigitizer 4.6 and coded for key moderators at the student (e.g., grade level, educational status) and intervention levels (e.g., type of writing intervention, provider). Multilevel modeling will be used to estimate intervention effects. Preliminary Findings Preliminary coding of the 135 studies identified so far indicated a predominance of primary-school and special education samples; frequent use of multiple-baseline and multiple-probe designs; researchers as the main intervention providers; and a firm reliance on writing quality, length, and genre elements as outcome measures, with relatively few studies including objective motivational measures. Preliminary statistical results will be presented at the conference. Relevance to the Writing Domain This work will provide updated guidance for evidence-based writing instruction in Grades 1-12 and inform the design of single-case literacy interventions across three countries. References Casola, M. A. (2023). Single-subject writing strategy instruction: A meta-analysis. [Unpublished master's dissertation]. The University of Western Ontario, Canada. Rogers, L. A., & Graham, S. (2008). A meta-analysis of single subject design writing intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(4), 879–906. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.100.4.879>



Modelling the Subskills of Writing in Instructional Texts

Presenting author: Kreutz, Rebecca Maria ; Universität zu Köln; Germany.

Co-author: Schabmann, Alfred ; University of Cologne; Germany.

Co-author: Wolf, Julie ; Universität zu Köln/ University of Cologne; Germany.

Chair: Keller, Stefan ; Zurich University of Teacher Education; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Text, Language & Genre Studies; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: evaluation and assessment of writing competence;writing at school;writing models;writing skills

The Cascaded Model of Writing (CASMOV) – a current writing model – shows that in lower secondary school, where lower-level skills are largely automated, these skills only contribute indirectly to text quality via higher-level writing skills such as cohesion and lexical diversity, which in turn have a direct impact on text quality. To date, CASMOV has only been validated for narrative texts (Philippek et al., 2025). However, studies examining individual writing skills independently of the model suggest that their influence vary depending on the text genre (Beers & Naggy, 2009). The present study therefore investigated the applicability of CASMOV to instructional texts. The sample comprised 150 students in grades 5 to 7, aged ten to thirteen ($M(\text{age}) = 11.21$, $SD = 0.93$; 67 girls). Participants wrote an instructional text, which was analysed for lexical diversity and text quality. Executive functions, handwriting fluency, spelling, grammatical skills and cohesion were assessed using standardised tests. All variables were transferred to a structural equation model according to the CASMOV structure. Preliminary results showed that lower-level skills mainly influenced text quality indirectly, which is consistent with the results for narrative texts. In contrast to Philippek et al. (2025), however, spelling had a direct influence on text quality. Higher-level skills also showed a different pattern: lexical diversity only indirectly influenced text quality via text length, while cohesion had no influence. Overall, the model explained 35% of the variance in text quality. Since a large part of the variance remains unexplained, there must be other higher-level writing skills that are more relevant to writing instructions and should be added to the model. Furthermore, the results emphasise that effective writing instruction should be genre-specific and not generalised across all text types. References Beers, S. F., & Naggy, W. E. (2009). Syntactic complexity as a predictor of adolescent writing quality: Which measures? *Reading and Writing*, 22(2), 185–200. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-007-9107-5>. Philippek, J., Kreutz, R. M., Hennes, A.-K., Schmidt, B. M. & Schabmann, A. (2025). The contributions of executive functions, transcription skills and text-specific skills to text quality in narratives. *Reading and Writing* (38), 651–670. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-024-10528-5>

✉ rebecca.kreutz@uni-koeln.de



Eye-tracking recursivity in reading-writing integrated continuation tasks

Presenting author: Yan, Xiaomeng ; South China University of Technology; University of Groningen; China.

Co-author: Liu, Xiqin ; South China University of Technology; China.

Co-author: Michel, Marije ; University of Groningen; Netherlands.

Co-author: Yang, Mei ; South China University of Technology; China.

Chair: Konstantinidou, Liana ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Teaching, Instruction & Writing Pedagogy; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: academic writing;EFL and ESL writing;eye tracking;L2

Source-based writing is characterized by writers' switches between reading source texts and producing their own texts, a self-regulatory process termed recursivity. The reading-writing integrated continuation task (RWICT), requiring learners to read and extend an incomplete text logically and coherently, naturally elicits recursivity. Such recursivity may foster intensive interaction with the authentic input and facilitate alignment with the source text, thereby enhancing textual cohesion and writing quality. Despite increasing attention to recursivity in L1 writing, its contribution to L2 writing and its relationship with working memory (WM) remain insufficiently researched. The present study adopts an eye-tracking methodology and addresses the following research questions: 1) What are the temporal and attentional patterns of learners' recursivity in completing the RWICT? 2) What strategic functions underlie recursivity? 3) To what extent is WM related to the recursivity? 4) To what extent is recursivity related to the writing cohesion and quality? 61 Chinese EFL undergraduates completed an RWICT, a reading-span WM test. A focus group of 14 participants took part in a stimulated recall. Three sources of data were analyzed: 1) writing outcomes, assessed via a holistic rubric and 8 cohesion indices; 2) fixation duration and visit count on the source text and paragraph prompts during writing as indicators of recursivity; 3) strategic functions underlying recursivity, captured through qualitative analysis of stimulated recall. Results showed that: 1) all participants engaged in recursive behaviors while writing, with the majority occurring in the source text, followed by paragraph 2 and 1 prompts; 2) recursivity served multiple functions, such as maintaining cohesion, planning content, reusing linguistic forms; 3) recursivity positively predicted both connective-based and semantic cohesion, though it didn't predict writing quality; 4) no significant effects of WM on recursivity were observed. The findings are discussed in light of previous research on recursivity and continuation tasks.

✉ xiaomeng.yan@rug.nl



Monitoring Strategies in ESL Timed Essay Writing: Insights from Ghana

Presenting author: Obolie, Emmanuel Lauren ; University of Education, Winneba; Ghana.

Co-author: Lomotey, Charlotte ; University of Education, Winneba; Ghana.

Chair: Konstantinidou, Liana ; ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences; Switzerland.

Theme: Writing Processes, Cognition & Psychology; Writing Development, Learners & Language Acquisition; Methods, Data & Empirical Research

Keywords: assessment;EFL and ESL writing;metacognition;writing processes

Monitoring has a central place in global models of writing; yet, its specific manifestation, particularly in Ghanaian ESL pre-university pen-and-paper writing contexts, has not received adequate published attention. As such, as part of a larger study employing a convergent parallel design, the current research used a conceptual framework derived from Abdel Latif's (2021) model of writing to explore the monitoring strategies of 85 randomly sampled Ghanaian senior high school students who wrote an argumentative essay under think-aloud conditions. Data were analysed using protocol and descriptive analysis procedures. Quantitative results indicated that task management was the most common strategy, followed by evaluation and reasoning, whereas motivation regulation was the least frequent. Additionally, high variability across all strategies indicated considerable individual differences in strategy deployment. On the other hand, qualitative findings revealed that task management facilitated goal setting, organising the writing process, and monitoring time, although most participants did not strategically allocate time across different writing phases. Again, evaluation served to check appropriateness and review decisions, but was often shallow, reactive, and tentative, which signaled limited procedural knowledge for self-assessment. Reasoning contributed to task interpretation, idea development, rhetorical positioning, and metalinguistic awareness; however, its inconsistent and inefficient application led to a fragmented understanding of the task and poor rhetorical control. Motivation regulation appeared in forms of self-encouragement, emotional control, and sustaining effort, yet its sparse use suggests underdeveloped strategies for managing affect and perseverance. The findings validate aspects of Abdel Latif's (2021) model and accentuate the need for explicit metacognitive instruction to strengthen strategic control and text quality in ESL timed writing contexts.

✉ eloblie@uew.edu.gh

Author Index

<

), Yen Phuong Hoang (Phuong Hoang Yen (CTU)

Institution: Can Tho University Vietnam

Country: Vietnam

Contributions

- **Integrating ChatGPT into EFL Writing Instruction: Effects of Teacher Modelling and Autonomous Use**

A

Addo-Danquah, Rosemary gifty

Institution: Kumasi Technical University

Country: Ghana

Email: romayadan@yahoo.com

Contributions

- **The Limits of Generic Academic Writing Instruction in Technical Universities**

Adin-Surkis, Abigail

Institution: Atid Network of Schools

Country: Israel

Email: abigaila@atid.org.il

Contributions

- **A Hero's Journey? Advancing Expressive Writing and Literacy Development in Middle School**

Aik, Maissane

Institution: Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Country: United States

Email: maissane.aik@erau.edu

Contributions

- **From Expert Habits to Student Support: Using Process-Tracing to Build GenAI Writing Guidance**

Albert, Csilla

Institution: Cultural Journal of Székelyföld

Country: Romania

Email: achilla76@gmail.com

Contributions

- **A Pilot Study of Expressive Writing in Educational Rehabilitation for Neurodegenerative Diseases**

Alcaraz, Silvia

Institution: Universitat de Barcelona; Institut de Recerca en Educació (IREUB)

Country: Spain

Email: silvia.alcaraz@ub.edu

Contributions

- **Students' reflections on using GenAI as a tool for cognition when writing an argumentative text**

Algorri Diez, Laura

Institution: University of León

Country: Spain

Email: lalgod00@estudiantes.unileon.es

Contributions

- **Impact of home literacy practices on elementary students' writing performance and motivation**
- **The role of motivation on acquisition of writing competence on Primary Education.**

Alhaddad, Gaëlle

Institution: Aix-Marseille Université

Country: France

Email: gaelle.alhaddad@univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- **Bilingualism modulates the relationship between spelling skills, grade and handwriting kinematics**

Alves, Rui Alexandre

Institution: University of Porto

Country: Portugal

Email: ralves@fpce.up.pt

Contributions

- **Effectiveness of single-case writing interventions (2008-2025): Preliminary meta-analysis findings**

Alves-Wold, Aline

Institution: University of Stavanger

Country: Norway

Email: aline.alves-wold@uis.no

Contributions

- **Effectiveness of single-case writing interventions (2008-2025): Preliminary meta-analysis findings**

Alves Martins, Margarida

Institution: ISPA-Instituto Universitário
EDUNOVA.ISPA

Country: Portugal

Email: mmartins@ispa.pt

Contributions

- **Emergent Literacy Development: A Socio-Constructivist Program in Preschool**
- **Teaching writing in primary school: Future teachers' conceptions**

Ammari, Emna

Institution: Aix-Marseille Université

Country: France

Email: emna.ammari@lis-lab.fr

Contributions

- **Encoding the Writing Process: TEI Between Research and Computational Use**
- **Literary Writing Process Modeling: across manuscript drafts and digital traces**

Anders, Abram

Institution: Iowa State University

Country: United States

Email: adanders@iastate.edu

Contributions

- **Designing Intention and Process-Informed Strategies for Self-Regulation of Writing**

Ankersborg, Vibeke

Institution: Copenhagen Business School

Country: Denmark

Email: vs@stu@cbs.dk

Contributions

- **Intercultural encounters in supervising Master Thesis Writing at a Danish Business University**

Ansah, Alberta Dansoah Nyarko

Institution: University of Energy and Natural Resources

Country: Ghana

Email: alberta.nyarkoansah@uenr.edu.gh

Contributions

- **Negotiating Authority through "Standard English": Ideology and Voice in Multilingual Writing**

Anskeit, Nadine

Institution: University of Education Karlsruhe

Country: Germany

Email: nadine.anskeit@ph-karlsruhe.de

Contributions

- **Promoting digital text production competences in primary education**

Anson, Chris

Institution: North Carolina State University

Country: United States

Email: canson@ncsu.edu

Contributions

- **How Expert and Novice Academics Write with GenAI: Think-Aloud Protocols**

Antalek, Catherine

Institution: University College London, Institute of Education

Country: United Kingdom

Email: c.antalek@ucl.ac.uk

Contributions

- **Writing by Hand vs Typing: Effects on the Written Performance of Students with Literacy Difficulties**

Aptoula, Nur Yigitoglu

Institution: Bogazici University

Country: Türkiye

Email: nuryigitoglu@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Becoming Writers, Becoming Teachers: Student Teachers' Literacy Attitudes Across Contexts**

Aramayo, Hairenik

Contributions

- **Career Development for Early Career Researchers**

Arias-Gundín, Olga

Institution: University of León

Country: Spain

Email: o.arias.gundin@unileon.es

Contributions

- **Effective Revision in Upper-Primary Writing: Strategy Use and Text Quality**
- **Writing Assessment in Primary Education in Spanish-Speaking Contexts**

- Effects of oral language instruction on children's writing
- The Emergence of Orthographic Revision in Early Writing

Arnold, Julia

Institution: Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz

Country: Switzerland

Email: julia.arnold@fhnw.ch

Contributions

- Collaborative Writing Processes in Science Education

Arrimada, María

Institution: University of León

Country: Spain

Email: marr@unileon.es

Contributions

- Impact of home literacy practices on elementary students' writing performance and motivation

Atit, Kinnari

Institution: University of California, Riverside

Country: United States

Email: kinnari@ucr.edu

Contributions

- An Innovative Strategy for Improving Undergraduate Low Writing Fluency

B

Baaijen, Veerle

Institution: CLCG University of Groningen

Country: Netherlands

Email: V.M.Baaijen@rug.nl

Contributions

- Effects of removing visual feedback on writing to learn
- Make Writing Great: Why Writing Still Matters in the Age of AI
- ChatGPT as a writing coach: A mixed-methods study in higher education

Bachmann, Alina

Institution: Osnabrueck University

Country: Germany

Email: abachmann@uos.de

Contributions

- Development of advanced written discourse in linguistically diverse students

Banales, Gerardo

Institution: Universidad Andres Bello

Country: Chile

Email: gerardo.banales@unab.cl

Contributions

- Changes in writing instruction based on a professional community: voices of Chilean teachers

Baniceru, Ana Cristina

Institution: West University of Timisoara

Country: Romania

Email: cristina.baniceru@e-uvt.ro

Contributions

- Institutional policies on generative AI in BA thesis writing: Evidence from Romanian universities
- Negotiating Rhetorical Traditions in Post-Communist Romania: A Collaborative Autoethnography

Barak, Matan

Institution: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Country: Israel

Email: barakmatan@gmail.com

Contributions

- A Hero's Journey? Advancing Expressive Writing and Literacy Development in Middle School

Barbier, Marie-Laure

Institution: Aix-Marseille University

Country: France

Email: marie-laure.barbier@univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- In Respect of Writing: Ethical and Legal Challenges Across Writing Supports
- Writing workshop in classrooms, what for ?
- Trusting the Process? Cognitive Writing Models into the classroom through Process-Aware Feedback

Bekius, Lamyk

Institution: University of Antwerp

Country: Belgium

Email: lamyk.bekius@uantwerpen.be

Contributions

- **How many needles are in the haystack? Privacy-sensitive content in born-digital archives in Flanders**
- **Encoding the Writing Process: TEI Between Research and Computational Use**

Bellot, Patrice

Institution: Aix Marseille Université CNRS

Country: France

Email: patrice.bellot@univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- **Literary Writing Process Modeling: across manuscript drafts and digital traces**

Berger, Stéphanie

Institution: Institute for Educational Evaluation

Country: Switzerland

Email: stephanie.berger@ibe-edu.ch

Contributions

- **From Ratings to Formative Feedback: An AI-Based System for Automated Essay Scoring**
- **Writing Fluency Always Matters, No Matter the Writing Technology**
- **From Ratings to Formative Feedback: An AI-Based System for Automated Essay Scoring**
- **Enhancing Automated Essay Scoring by Integrating Rule-Based Language Checking with Generative Models**

Berner-Nayer, Simone

Institution: University of Fribourg

Country: Switzerland

Email: simone.berner-nayer@unifr.ch

Contributions

- **Writing Profiles of German-Speaking Children: A Latent Profile Analysis in Grades Three and Five**

Bieri, Aline

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: bira@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- **From Higher Education to Secondary Schools: Developing an OER for genAI-Supported Scientific Writing**

Bigarnet-Bucher, Lucre

Institution: Université Lumière Lyon 2

Country: France

Email: lucre.bigarnet@ens-lyon.fr

Contributions

- **Studying writing dynamics of students of dyslexia: the DYSTRACKER setup**

Bingham, Gary

Institution: Georgia State University

Country: United States

Email: gbingham@gsu.edu

Contributions

- **Foundations of Early Writing: Measuring Classroom Practices that Support Writing Development**

Bleiker, Johanna

Institution: Zurich University of Teacher Education

Country: Switzerland

Email: johanna.bleiker@phzh.ch

Contributions

- **Collaborative Writing Processes in Science Education**

Blomqvist, Per

Institution: Stockholm University

Country: Sweden

Email: per.blomqvist@su.se

Contributions

- **AI and Students' Academic Writing of Theses – Independent Work in Teacher Education**

Blood, Beata

Institution: Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Country: United States

Email: beata.blood@erau.edu

Contributions

- **From Expert Habits to Student Support: Using Process-Tracing to Build GenAI Writing Guidance**

Bodó, Csanád

Institution: Eötvös Loránd University

Country: Hungary

Email: bodo.csanad@btk.elte.hu

Contributions

- **Studying writing practices and ideologies in multiple research sites: the literagram method**

Bombaerts, Gunter

Institution: Eindhoven University of Technology

Country: Netherlands

Email: g.bombaerts@tue.nl

Contributions

- **Assessing argumentative writing through students' interactions with generative AI**

Bordes, Caroline

Institution: CNRS - Université de Poitiers

Country: France

Email: caroline.bordes@univ-poitiers.fr

Contributions

- **Bursted! A tool for extracting bursts of writing from keystrokes logging "idfx" files**
- **Bursts of writing and their relation to text quality in children's writing**

Bouwer, Renske

Institution: Utrecht University

Country: Netherlands

Email: r.bouwer@uu.nl

Contributions

- **Building bridges between subjects: Using genre pedagogy for writing across the curriculum**
- **Supporting peer feedback conversations during argumentative writing: rubric vs. conversation chart**
- **The future of writing education**
- **Using Generative AI for Academic Writing: Students' Practices and the Role of Explicit Instruction**
- **Unpacking Academic Writing as a multidimensional concept through a systematic literature review**

Bouwer, Renske

Institution: Utrecht University

Country: Netherlands

Email: r.bouwer@rug.nl

Contributions

- **Genre awareness in Dutch L1 writing education**

Bouwman, Wren

Institution: Iowa State University

Country: United States

Email: bouwman.wren@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Designing Intention and Process-Informed Strategies for Self-Regulation of Writing**

Bouzereau, Camille

Institution: Université côte d'Azur

Country: France

Email: camille.b@parisnanterre.fr

Contributions

- **In search of Proust's creative writing process : genetics, textometrics and cognitive psychology**

Breuer, Esther

Institution: Universität zu Köln

Country: Germany

Email: esther.barnaul@gmx.de

Contributions

- **Using writing for memorising: pen vs. mobile phone**

Brütsch, Angela

Institution: Pädagogische Hochschule Zürich

Country: Switzerland

Email: angela.bruetsch@phzh.ch

Contributions

- **Collaborative Writing Processes in Science Education**

Buenker, Joe

Institution: Arizona State University, ASU Library

Country: United States

Email: joe.buenker@asu.edu

Contributions

- **A Systematic Review of Qualitative Studies on Secondary Writing Instruction from 1968-2023**

Busse, Vera

Institution: University of Münster

Country: Germany

Email: vbusse@uni-muenster.de

Contributions

- **Bridging Research and Classroom Practice: Improving Writing in Diverse Primary Classrooms**
- **Can Algorithm-based Feedback Help Students to Write Better? A Meta-analysis**
- **From research to classroom: Implementing evidence-based writing practices**

Bäck, Gunilla Almgren

Institution: Linnaeus University

Country: Sweden

Email: gunilla.almgrenback@lnu.se

Contributions

- **Speech-to-Text for Students with Dyslexia - Implications from Studies in Sweden and Switzerland**

Büttgen, Katrin

Institution: Zuyd University of Applied Sciences

Country: Netherlands

Email: katrin.buttgen@zuyd.nl

Contributions

- **Effort, Agency, and Authorship in AI-Assisted Writing: Revisiting Flower & Hayes' Model**

C

Camacho, Ana

Institution: University of Porto

Country: Portugal

Email: anacamacho@fpce.up.pt

Contributions

- **Effectiveness of single-case writing interventions (2008-2025): Preliminary meta-analysis findings**

Cao, Yucheng

Institution: Middle Tennessee State University

Country: United States

Email: Yucheng.Cao@mtsu.edu

Contributions

- **The Working Memory-Writing Connection: Meta-Analytic Evidence**
- **The role of motivation on acquisition of writing competence on Primary Education.**

Caporossi, Gilles

Institution: HEC Montréal

Country: Canada

Email: gilles.caporossi@hec.ca

Contributions

- **Learning to write: Toy examples using the progressive graph tool.**

Castells, Núria

Institution: Faculty of Psychology, University of Barcelona

Country: Spain

Email: nuria.castells@ub.edu

Contributions

- **Students' reflections on using GenAI as a tool for cognition when writing an argumentative text**

Chamberlain, Darryl

Institution: Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Country: United States

Email: Darryl.Chamberlain@erau.edu

Contributions

- **From Expert Habits to Student Support: Using Process-Tracing to Build GenAI Writing Guidance**

Chanquoy, Lucile

Institution: Université Nice Sophia Antipolis

Country: France

Email: lucile.chanquoy@unice.fr

Contributions

- **On-line spelling revision in elementary and middle school children: a focus on revision time**

Chitez, Madalina

Institution: West University of Timisoara

Country: Romania

Email: madalina.chitez@e-uvt.ro

Contributions

- **Corpus Linguistic Methods**
- **Institutional policies on generative AI in BA thesis writing: Evidence from Romanian universities**
- **Negotiating Rhetorical Traditions in Post-Communist Romania: A Collaborative Autoethnography**

Chukharev, Evgeny

Institution: Iowa State University

Country: United States

Email: evgeny@iastate.edu

Contributions

- **Cognitive and Ethical Alignment of LLMs with Humans for Writing Research and Instruction**
- **Designing Intention and Process-Informed Strategies for Self-Regulation of Writing**

Cislaru, Georgeta

Institution: Université Sorbonne Nouvelle

Country: France

Email: georgeta.cislaru@sorbonne-nouvelle.fr

Contributions

- **Bursted! A tool for extracting bursts of writing from keystrokes logging "idfx" files**

Conijn, Rianne

Institution: Eindhoven University of Technology

Country: Netherlands

Email: m.a.conijn@tue.nl

Contributions

- **Assessing argumentative writing through students' interactions with generative AI**
- **Thesis Writing with Generative AI: A Multi-Session Process Analysis**
- **Designing Intention and Process-Informed Strategies for Self-Regulation of Writing**

Cuberos-Vicente, Rocío

Institution: Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Country: Spain

Email: marcuber@ucm.es

Contributions

- **What linguistic changes occur in texts after an SRSD intervention?**

Cuevas, Isabel

Institution: Universidad Autonoma de Madrid

Country: Spain

Email: isabel.cuevas@uam.es

Contributions

- **Explicit instruction and rubrics for argumentative synthesis writing: Effect of Collaboration**
- **Rubrics for Planning and Revising Argumentative Syntheses in Collaborative and Individual Settings**

Cutillas, Laia

Institution: Universitat de Lleida

Country: Spain

Email: laia.cutillas@udl.cat

Contributions

- **What linguistic changes occur in texts after an SRSD intervention?**

D

Darrak, Zahra Ed

Institution: Aix-Marseille University

Country: France

Email: zahra.ED-DARRAK@etu.univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- **Authors and AI: the challenges of process analysis for AI-assisted writing support**
- **In search of Proust's creative writing process : genetics, textometrics and cognitive psychology**
- **Encoding the Writing Process: TEI Between Research and Computational Use**
- **Trusting the Process? Cognitive Writing Models into the classroom through Process-Aware Feedback**

De Clercq, Orphee

Institution: Ghent University

Country: Belgium

Email: orphee.declercq@ugent.be

Contributions

- **Does hybrid feedback foster L2 writing development?**

De Smedt, Fien

Institution: Ghent University

Country: Belgium

Email: Fien.DeSmedt@UGent.be

Contributions

- **Supporting peer feedback conversations during argumentative writing: rubric vs. conversation chart**
- **Effectiveness of single-case writing interventions (2008-2025): Preliminary meta-analysis findings**
- **The future of writing education**
- **Using Generative AI for Academic Writing: Students' Practices and the Role of Explicit Instruction**
- **Cooperative Writing: Perspectives from Three Intervention Studies**

De Wever, Bram

Institution: Ghent University

Country: Belgium

Email: Bram.DeWever@UGent.be

Contributions

- **Supporting peer feedback conversations during argumentative writing: rubric vs. conversation chart**
- **Using Generative AI for Academic Writing: Students' Practices and the Role of Explicit Instruction**

De Wilde, Vanessa

Institution: Ghent University

Country: Belgium

Email: Vanessa.DeWilde@UGent.be

Contributions

- **The linguistic impacts of generative AI on L2 writing output**

Debelak, Rudolf

Institution: Institut für

Erziehungswissenschaften, Universität Zürich

Country: Switzerland

Email: rudolf.debelak@ife.uzh.ch

Contributions

- **From Ratings to Formative Feedback: An AI-Based System for Automated Essay Scoring**
- **From Ratings to Formative Feedback: An AI-Based System for Automated Essay Scoring**
- **Enhancing Automated Essay Scoring by Integrating Rule-Based Language Checking with Generative Models**

Debrah, Cecilia Owusu

Institution: University of Energy and Natural Resources

Country: Ghana

Email: cecilia.owusudebrah@uenr.edu.gh

Contributions

- **Enhancing academic writing through Systemic Functional Genre Pedagogy in Higher Education**
- **Scaffolding Multilingual Writers in Source-Based Argumentative Writing: An Intervention Study**

Delannoy, Léa

Institution: Aix-Marseille University

Country: France

Email: lea.delannoy@univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- **Authors and AI: the challenges of process analysis for AI-assisted writing support**
- **In Respect of Writing: Ethical and Legal Challenges Across Writing Supports**

Deme, Andrea

Institution: Eötvös Lorand University

Country: Hungary

Email: deme.andrea@btk.elte.hu

Contributions

- **Studying writing practices and ideologies in multiple research sites: the literagram method**

Dick, Mirjam

Institution: University of Regensburg

Country: Germany

Email: Mirjam.Dick@ur.de

Contributions

- **Teaching narrative writing in grade 2: first findings from FiSBY**

Dinca, Andreea

Institution: West University of Timisoara

Country: Romania

Email: andreea.dinca@e-uvv.ro

Contributions

- **Institutional policies on generative AI in BA thesis writing: Evidence from Romanian universities**
- **Negotiating Rhetorical Traditions in Post-Communist Romania: A Collaborative Autoethnography**

Dockrell, Julie

Institution: Institute of Education

Country: United Kingdom

Email: j.dockrell@ucl.ac.uk

Contributions

- **The influence of early oral language on later narrative and expository writing in primary school**
- **Oral language and emergent literacy: Early childhood educators' beliefs and practices**

- **Written Language Production in Children with Developmental Language Disorder: Evidence from Arabic**

Doroholschi, Claudia Ioana

Institution: West University of Timisoara, Romania

Country: Romania

Email: claudia.doroholschi@e-uvt.ro

Contributions

- **Institutional policies on generative AI in BA thesis writing: Evidence from Romanian universities**
- **Negotiating Rhetorical Traditions in Post-Communist Romania: A Collaborative Autoethnography**

Dreher, Kira

Institution: Carnegie Mellon University

Country: Qatar

Email: kadreher@andrew.cmu.edu

Contributions

- **Making Research Understandable: Teaching Undergraduates to Communicate Research to Non-Experts**

Díaz-Burgos, Alberto

Institution: University of León, Spain

Country: Spain

Email: adiab@unileon.es

Contributions

- **Impact of home literacy practices on elementary students' writing performance and motivation**
- **The role of motivation on acquisition of writing competence on Primary Education.**

Díaz-Tejedor, Rubén

Institution: University of León, Spain

Country: Spain

Email: rdiaz01@estudiantes.unileon.es

Contributions

- **Effects of oral language instruction on children's writing**

E

Early, Jessica

Institution: Arizona State University

Country: United States

Email: Jessica.early@asu.edu

Contributions

- **A Systematic Review of Qualitative Studies on Secondary Writing Instruction from 1968-2023**
- **Approaches to Writing Instruction Around the World**
- **Approaches to Writing Instruction Around the World**

Elf, Nicolaj

Contributions

- **Career Development for Early Career Researchers**

Ene, Estela

Institution: Indiana University

Country: United States

Email: eene@iu.edu

Contributions

- **Negotiating Rhetorical Traditions in Post-Communist Romania: A Collaborative Autoethnography**

Espasa, Anna

Institution: Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Country: Spain

Email: aespasa@uoc.edu

Contributions

- **Self-feedback scaffolding through AI in online writing tasks**

Evain, Simon

Institution: Sierra Neurovision Company

Country: France

Email: simon.evain@sierra-neurovision.com

Contributions

- **Studying writing dynamics of students of dyslexia: the DYSTRACKER setup**

Evers-Vermeul, Jacqueline

Institution: Utrecht University

Country: Netherlands

Email: j.evers@uu.nl

Contributions

- **Building bridges between subjects: Using genre pedagogy for writing across the curriculum**
- **Genre awareness in Dutch L1 writing education**

F

Feak, Christine

Institution: University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Country: United States

Email: cfeak@umich.edu

Contributions

- **Multi-genre pedagogy: fostering transfer, metacognition, and rhetorical agility in doctoral writing**

Ferencik-Lehmkuhl, Daria

Institution: University of Cologne

Country: Germany

Email: daria.ferencik-lehmkuhl@uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- **#Diff2Score - Identifying textual characteristics of "Difficult-to-Score texts"**

Fernández, Sandra

Institution: Universidad de Leon

Country: Spain

Email: sferrn16@estudiantes.unileon.es

Contributions

- **The Emergence of Orthographic Revision in Early Writing**

Fidalgo, Raquel

Institution: University of León, Spain

Country: Spain

Email: rfidr@unileon.es

Contributions

- **The role of motivation on acquisition of writing competence on Primary Education.**

Fitjar, Camilla

Institution: University of Stavanger

Country: Norway

Email: camilla.l.fitjar@uis.no

Contributions

- **The handwriting movement: Linking motor processes and mastery**

Fladung, Ilka

Institution: Universität Duisburg-Essen

Country: Germany

Email: i.fladung@posteo.de

Contributions

- **#Diff2Score - Identifying textual characteristics of "Difficult-to-Score texts"**

Foucambert, Denis

Institution: Université du Québec à Montréal

Country: Canada

Email: focambert.denis@uqam.ca

Contributions

- **The Use of Gender-Inclusive Writing : Insights from Writing Process Models**

Frey, Aline

Institution: Aix-Marseille Université

Country: France

Email: aline.frey@univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- **Bilingualism modulates the relationship between spelling skills, grade and handwriting kinematics**

Frid, Johan

Institution: Lund University

Country: Sweden

Email: johan.frid@humlab.lu.se

Contributions

- **Writing deceit: The influence of veracity on writing processes in personal narratives**

Fuertes-Alpiste, Marc

Institution: Universitat de Barcelona

Country: Spain

Email: marcfortes@ub.edu

Contributions

- **Students' reflections on using GenAI as a tool for cognition when writing an argumentative text**

Furer, Yves

Institution: Zurich University of Teacher Education

Country: Switzerland

Email: yves.furer@phzh.ch

Contributions

- **Writing Fluency Always Matters, No Matter the Writing Technology**

Fürstenberg, Maurice

Institution: Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU)

Country: Germany

Email: m.fuerstenberg@lmu.de

Contributions

- **Measuring the Quality of AI-generated Feedback? From Theoretical Modelling to Empirical Evidence**

G

Gahshan, Nagham

Institution: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Country: Israel

Email: gahshan_n1@hotmail.com

Contributions

- **Development and Initial Validation of the Word-Processing Assessment for Elementary-School**

Galan, Rosa M

Institution: ITAM

Country: Mexico

Email: mgalan@itam.mx

Contributions

- **“Writing in Spanish: Research, Practice, and the Generative AI Challenge”**

Galbraith, David

Institution: University of Southampton

Country: United Kingdom

Email: d.w.galbraith@soton.ac.uk

Contributions

- **Effects of removing visual feedback on writing to learn**
- **Chinese Students' Implicit Beliefs about Writing**

Gautschi, Curtis

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: gaut@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- **Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Formative Thesis Writing Assessment**

Gerde, Hope

Institution: Texas A&M University

Country: United States

Email: hgerde@tamu.edu

Contributions

- **Foundations of Early Writing: Measuring Classroom Practices that Support Writing Development**

Gerth, Sabrina

Institution: University College of Teacher Education Tyrol

Country: Austria

Email: sabrina.gerth@ph-tirol.ac.at

Contributions

- **Understanding and Assessing Effective Note-Taking with a Digital Pen in Middle School**

Giera, Winnie-Karen

Institution: Universität Potsdam

Country: Germany

Email: winnie-karen.giera@uni-potsdam.de

Contributions

- **The Limits of Generic Academic Writing Instruction in Technical Universities**
- **Negotiating Authority through “Standard English”: Ideology and Voice in Multilingual Writing**

Gil, Maria Beatriz

Institution: EDUNOVA.ISPA

Country: Portugal

Email: mariabeatriz.mgil@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Teaching writing in primary school: Future teachers' conceptions**

Girard, Gabrielle

Institution: Université du Québec à Montréal

Country: Canada

Email: girard.gabrielle.4@courrier.uqam.ca

Contributions

- **The Use of Gender-Inclusive Writing : Insights from Writing Process Models**

Glasbergen-Plas, Aliza

Institution: Delft University of Technology

Country: Netherlands

Email: a.glasbergen-plas@tudelft.nl

Contributions

- **Academic style instruction with U SPARc: findings from two cycles of design research**

Glaser, Cornelia

Institution: Pädagogische Hochschule Heidelberg

Country: Germany

Email: glaser1@ph-heidelberg.de

Contributions

- **We, Myself and AI: On the Benefits of Combining AI and Cooperative Planning for Writing Motivation**

Gomez Laich, Maria Pia

Institution: Carnegie Mellon University

Country: Qatar

Email: mgomezla@andrew.cmu.edu

Contributions

- **Teaching Reasoning in Argumentative Writing through Explicit Heuristics**
- **Corpus Insights for Teaching Case Analysis Recommendation Writing**
- **Making Research Understandable: Teaching Undergraduates to Communicate Research to Non-Experts**

Grabowski, Joachim

Institution: Leibniz University

Country: Germany

Email: grabowski@psychologie.uni-hannover.de

Contributions

- **Can coherence formation and perspective-taking in writing be promoted separately and successfully?**

Graham, Steve

Institution: Arizona State University

Country: United States

Email: steve.graham@asu.edu

Contributions

- **Text Features Associated with Students' Generative AI Use: Norwegian Teachers' Assessments**
- **Can Algorithm-based Feedback Help Students to Write Better? A Meta-analysis**
- **The role of motivation on acquisition of writing competence on Primary Education.**
- **From research to classroom: Implementing evidence-based writing practices**

Griepentrog, Anne

Institution: Mercator Institute for Literacy and Language Education, University of Cologne

Country: Germany

Email: anne.griepentrog@mercator.uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- **Development and standardisation of a writing fluency test for grades 2 to 4**

Grijns, Tyche

Institution: Delft University of Technology

Country: Netherlands

Email: t.a.grijns@tudelft.nl

Contributions

- **Academic style instruction with U SPARc: findings from two cycles of design research**

Gruwel, Saskia Brand -

Institution: Maastricht University

Country: Netherlands

Email: saskia.brand@zuyd.nl

Contributions

- **Effort, Agency, and Authorship in AI-Assisted Writing: Revisiting Flower & Hayes' Model**

Guasch, Teresa

Institution: Open University of Catalonia (UOC)

Country: Spain

Email: tguaschp@uoc.edu

Contributions

- **Self-feedback scaffolding through AI in online writing tasks**

Gullberg, Kajsa

Institution: Lund University

Country: Sweden

Email: kajsa.gullberg@ling.lu.se

Contributions

- **Writing deceit: The influence of veracity on writing processes in personal narratives**

Gutiérrez-Bermejo, Eugenia

Institution: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Country: Spain

Email: eugenia.gutierrez@estudiante.uam.es

Contributions

- **Explicit instruction and rubrics for argumentative synthesis writing: Effect of Collaboration**

H

Haake, Lisa

Institution: Institute of Educational Science, University of Münster

Country: Germany

Email: lisa.haake@uni-muenster.de

Contributions

- **From fluency to quality: language proficiency and task genre in L2 process-product relations**

Haddad-Najjar, Laila

Institution: Technion - Israel Institute of Technology

Country: Israel

Email: lailah@campus.technion.ac.il

Contributions

- **The challenge of creating a coherent text: A Coherence-Focused AI Chatbot for Academic Writing**

Hagelund, Silje

Institution: University of Oslo

Country: Norway

Email: silje.hagelund@create.uio.no

Contributions

- **Gender differences in self-reported audience awareness in middle schoolers' argumentative writing**
- **Perspective taking and writing motivation on argumentative writing quality**
- **What Does My Reader Need? Audience Awareness in Sixth-Graders' Written LEGO Instructions**
- **Writing Quality on a LEGO-Based Procedural Writing Task: Gender Differences in Analytic Traits**

Hao, Jiachen

Institution: University of Southampton

Country: China

Email: J.Hao@soton.ac.uk

Contributions

- **Chinese Students' Implicit Beliefs about Writing**

Harush, Yamit Tarin

Institution: Haifa University

Country: Israel

Email: yamitharush@gmail.com

Contributions

- **A Hero's Journey? Advancing Expressive Writing and Literacy Development in Middle School**

Heger, Stine

Institution: Aarhus University

Country: Denmark

Email: stine.heger@edu.au.dk

Contributions

- **A pedagogy for writing enjoyment. Inspiration from free-time author schools for children**

Heierli, Jasmin

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: heej@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- **Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Formative Thesis Writing Assessment**

Heller, Kathrin

Institution: University of Education Karlsruhe

Country: Germany

Email: kathrin.heller@ph-karlsruhe.de

Contributions

- **Promoting digital text production competences in primary education**

Hennes, Ann-Kathrin

Institution: Universität Kassel

Country: Germany

Email: ann-kathrin.hennes@uni-kassel.de

Contributions

- **Assessing Higher-Order Writing Skills: Development and Validation of a Diagnostic Instrument**

Hermansson, Carina

Institution: Stockholm University

Country: Sweden

Email: carina.hermansson@su.se

Contributions

- **AI and I: A rhizomatic analysis of writing processes with AI tools**
- **Teenagers writing expository texts with and without gen-AI**

Hicks, Nina

Institution: University of Fribourg

Country: Switzerland

Email: nina.hicks@unifr.ch

Contributions

- **Synergies between languages at school: learning to write persuasive texts in several languages**

Hirt, Carmen Nadja

Institution: University of Zurich

Country: Switzerland

Email: carmen.hirt@ife.uzh.ch

Contributions

- **Peer Feedback and Text Evaluation**

Hoffmann, Lea

Institution: Universität zu Köln

Country: Germany

Email: lea.hoffmann@uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- **#Diff2Score - Identifying textual characteristics of "Difficult-to-Score texts"**

Holdinga, Lieke

Institution: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

Country: Netherlands

Email: c.c.holdinga@rug.nl

Contributions

- **Integrating writing in content-lessons: Effects of a professional development program.**

Hort, Sofia

Institution: Mälardalen University; Åbo Akademi University

Country: Sweden

Email: sofia.hort@mdu.se

Contributions

- **Students' reflections on academic writing in higher education: GenAI as sociomaterial actor**

Houssein, Tatiana

Institution: CNRS/Université de Poitiers

Country: France

Email: tatiana.houssein@univ-poitiers.fr

Contributions

- **Bursts of writing and their relation to text quality in children's writing**

Hrib, Iulia

Institution: Faculty of Arts, University of Groningen

Country: Netherlands

Email: iuliaahriba@gmail.com

Contributions

- **ChatGPT as a writing coach: A mixed-methods study in higher education**

I

ISSAKA, MOHAMMED

Institution: UNIVERSITY OF ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Country: Ghana

Email: mohammed.issaka@uenr.edu.gh

Contributions

- **Enhancing academic writing through Systemic Functional Genre Pedagogy in Higher Education**

J

Jaber, Amani

Institution: Technion - Israel Institute of Technology

Country: Israel

Email: jamani@technion.ac.il

Contributions

- **Writing with AI in Multilingual Classrooms: Translanguaging and Teacher-Student Perspectives**

Jeffery, Jill

Institution: Leiden University Centre for Linguistics

Country: Netherlands

Email: j.v.jeffery@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Contributions

- **A Systematic Review of Qualitative Studies on Secondary Writing Instruction from 1968-2023**
- **Text Features Associated with Students' Generative AI Use: Norwegian Teachers' Assessments**
- **Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write: What have we learned from 20 years of research?**
- **Perspectives on writing curricula implementation: Insights from an international survey**

Jenei, Kamilla

Institution: Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary

Country: Hungary

Email: jenei.kamilla@kre.hu

Contributions

- **Studying writing practices and ideologies in multiple research sites: the literagram method**

Jerijærvi, Camilla Bøen

Institution: CREATE, centre for research on equality in education, University of Oslo

Country: Norway

Email: c.b.jerjarvi@create.uio.no

Contributions

- **Gender differences in self-reported audience awareness in middle schoolers' argumentative writing**

Johansen, Marita Byberg

Institution: NTNU - Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Country: Norway

Email: marita.b.johansen@ntnu.no

Contributions

- **Examining Stakeholders' Perspectives on Literacy Plan Development**

Johansson, Baran

Institution: Lund University

Country: Sweden

Email: baran.johansson@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Tracing Reading–Writing Processes in Swedish and Math Classrooms; a longitudinal study**

Johansson, Roger

Institution: Lund University

Country: Sweden

Email: roger.johansson@psy.lu.se

Contributions

- **Writing deceit: The influence of veracity on writing processes in personal narratives**

Johansson, Victoria

Institution: Kristianstad University

Country: Sweden

Email: victoria.johansson@hkr.se

Contributions

- **Becoming Writers, Becoming Teachers: Student Teachers' Literacy Attitudes Across Contexts**
- **Student teachers' self efficacy for academic writing**
- **Writing deceit: The influence of veracity on writing processes in personal narratives**
- **Make Writing Great: Why Writing Still Matters in the Age of AI**
- **Teenagers writing expository texts with and without gen-AI**

Jost, Joerg

Institution: Universität zu Köln/ University of Cologne

Country: Germany

Email: Joerg.Jost@uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- **Assessing Higher-Order Writing Skills: Development and Validation of a Diagnostic Instrument**
- **#Diff2Score - Identifying textual characteristics of "Difficult-to-Score texts"**

Jozipović, Marija

Institution: Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences

Country: Croatia

Email: marija.jozipovic@erf.unizg.hr

Contributions

- **VALIDATION OF WRITING MODELS IN TRANSPARENT ORTHOGRAPHIES: WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?**

Jusslin, Sofia

Institution: University of Helsinki

Country: Finland

Email: sofia.jusslin@helsinki.fi

Contributions

- **Students' reflections on academic writing in higher education: GenAI as sociomaterial actor**
- **University students' reflections on academic writing with genAI**
- **University students' reflections on academic writing with genAI**

K

Kaplan, Ina

Institution: Mercator-Institut für Sprachförderung und Deutsch als Zweitsprache

Country: Germany

Email: ina.kaplan@mercator.uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- **Writing Fluency in Primary School: An Evaluation of a Training Programme in Challenging Contexts**

Karhu, Hanna

Institution: University of Helsinki

Country: Finland

Email: hanna.karhu@helsinki.fi

Contributions

- **Ethics and Access: Investigating Writing Processes from Manuscripts in Finland**

Karl, Kristina

Institution: Federal Institute for Quality Assurance of the Austrian School System

Country: Austria

Email: Kristina.Karl@iqs.gv.at

Contributions

- **RATE THE RATER - Rater Agreement in English and German Text Assessments**
- **#Diff2Score - Identifying textual characteristics of "Difficult-to-Score texts"**

Karlen, Yves

Institution: University of Zurich

Country: Switzerland

Email: yves.karlen@ife.uzh.ch

Contributions

- **Peer Feedback and Text Evaluation**

Katanneck, Stanislav

Institution: Université catholique de Louvain (UCL)

Country: Belgium

Email: stanislav.katanneck@rub.de

Contributions

- **The Effects of ChatGPT Feedback on Student Engagement: A Longitudinal Study**

Katzir, Tami

Institution: University of Haifa

Country: Israel

Email: katzirta@gmail.com

Contributions

- **A Hero's Journey? Advancing Expressive Writing and Literacy Development in Middle School**

Keller, Franziska

Institution: PH FHNW

Country: Switzerland

Email: franziska.keller@fhnw.ch

Contributions

- **Digital writing and writing motivation**

Keller, Lorenzo Dubois

Institution: Aix-Marseille University

Country: France

Email: lorenzo.dubois-keller@etu.univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- **Writing workshop in classrooms, what for ?**

Keravec, Silvana Flütsch

Institution: University of Fribourg

Country: Switzerland

Email: silvana.fluetschkeravec@unifr.ch

Contributions

- **Speech-to-Text for Students with Dyslexia - Implications from Studies in Sweden and Switzerland**

Kessler, Karyn

Institution: University of California Santa Barbara

Country: United States

Email: kessler@linguistics.ucsb.edu

Contributions

- **How Expert and Novice Academics Write with GenAI: Think-Aloud Protocols**

Khuder, Baraa

Institution: Chalmers University of Technology

Country: Sweden

Email: khuder@chalmers.se

Contributions

- **Social Regulation in AI-Supported Feedback Ecologies: Disciplinary vs Non-Disciplinary Peers**

Kim, Young-Suk

Institution: University of California Irvine

Country: United States

Email: youngsk7@uci.edu

Contributions

- **The Working Memory-Writing Connection: Meta-Analytic Evidence**
- **Strong but Not Static: Reading-Writing Connections in Primary Grades**

Kleemola, Katri

Institution: University of Helsinki

Country: Finland

Email: katri.kleemola@helsinki.fi

Contributions

- **Language choice in master's thesis writing: a motivational perspective**

Knoph, Rebecca

Institution: University of Oslo

Country: Norway

Email: rebecca.knoph@create.uio.no

Contributions

- **Gender differences in self-reported audience awareness in middle schoolers' argumentative writing**
- **What Does My Reader Need? Audience Awareness in Sixth-Graders' Written LEGO Instructions**

- **Writing Quality on a LEGO-Based Procedural Writing Task: Gender Differences in Analytic Traits**

Knott, Christina

Institution: University Regensburg

Country: Germany

Email: christina.knott@ur.de

Contributions

- **Teaching narrative writing in grade 2: first findings from FISBY**

Koch, Alina Marlene

Institution: University of Cologne

Country: Germany

Email: alinamarlenekoch@outlook.de

Contributions

- **Development and standardisation of a writing fluency test for grades 2 to 4**

Kolovou, Dimitra

Institution: University of Teacher Education of the Grisons

Country: Switzerland

Email: dimitra.kolovou@phgr.ch

Contributions

- **Writing Fluency Always Matters, No Matter the Writing Technology**

Konstantinidou, Liana

Institution: Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: kons@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- **Bridging Research and Classroom Practice: Improving Writing in Diverse Primary Classrooms**
- **Career Development for Early Career Researchers**
- **How context and purpose shape assessment: methodological considerations for measuring text quality**

Kowalska, Emilia Anna

Institution: UZH/UniFr

Country: Switzerland

Email: emiliakowalska@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Strategies for Open Writing Tasks in the fide Test at CEFR Levels A2 and B1**

Kraft, Sanna

Institution: Linnæus University

Country: Sweden

Email: sanna.kraft@lnu.se

Contributions

- Does seeing writing as changeable matter?
- Who benefits from using speech-to-text as their writing tool?

Krelle, Michael

Institution: Universität Hamburg

Country: Germany

Email: michael.krelle@uni-hamburg.de

Contributions

- Writing on Paper or on Tablet? Error Patterns and Processing Time in Digital and Hybrid Formats

Kreutz, Rebecca Maria

Institution: Universität zu Köln

Country: Germany

Email: rebecca.kreutz@uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- Modelling the Subskills of Writing in Instructional Texts

Krizsai, Fruzsina

Institution: Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary

Country: Hungary

Email: krizsai.fruzsina@kre.hu

Contributions

- Studying writing practices and ideologies in multiple research sites: the literagram method

Kruse, Otto

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: kreo@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- A Direct Approach to the Study of Epistemic Decisions: Students Using AI for Thesis Writing
- Accessing the Epistemological Side of Writing: A Prolegomenon to the Era of AI

Kvistad, Anne Holten

Institution: Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)

Country: Norway

Email: anne.h.kvistad@ntnu.no

Contributions

- Text Features Associated with Students' Generative AI Use: Norwegian Teachers' Assessments

König, Nina

Institution: Institut für Bildungsevaluation

Country: Switzerland

Email: Nina.Koenig@ibe-edu.ch

Contributions

- From Ratings to Formative Feedback: An AI-Based System for Automated Essay Scoring
- From Ratings to Formative Feedback: An AI-Based System for Automated Essay Scoring
- Enhancing Automated Essay Scoring by Integrating Rule-Based Language Checking with Generative Models

L

Lamas, Elsa Liste

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: elsa.liste@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- What linguistic changes occur in texts after an SRSD intervention?

Lamas, Elsa Liste

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: elsa.listelamas@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- How context and purpose shape assessment: methodological considerations for measuring text quality

Landrieu, Yana

Institution: Ghent University

Country: Belgium

Email: yana.landrieu@ugent.be

Contributions

- **Supporting peer feedback conversations during argumentative writing: rubric vs. conversation chart**

Laranjeira, Ricardo

Institution: ISPA - University Institute

Country: Portugal

Email: rlaranjeira@ispa.pt

Contributions

- **Emergent Literacy Development: A Socio-Constructivist Program in Preschool**

Le Thanh, Thao

Institution: KU LEUVEN

Country: Belgium

Email: Thanh Thao Lê

Contributions

- **Integrating ChatGPT into EFL Writing Instruction: Effects of Teacher Modelling and Autonomous Use**

Leblay, Christophe

Institution: University of Turku, School of Languages and Translation studies

Country: Finland

Email: christophe.leblay@utu.fi

Contributions

- **Learning to write: Toy examples using the progressive graph tool.**
- **In Respect of Writing: Ethical and Legal Challenges Across Writing Supports**
- **Literary Writing Process Modeling: across manuscript drafts and digital traces**

Leijten, Mariëlle

Institution: Universiteit Antwerpen

Country: Netherlands

Email: marielle.leijten@uantwerpen.be

Contributions

- **Beyond Text-Focused Feedback: The Added Value of Keystroke Logging Feedback & Dialogic Peer Feedback**

Lenčec, Mirjana

Institution: Faculty of Education and rehabilitation Sciences (University of Zagreb)

Country: Croatia

Email: mirjana.lencek@erf.unizg.hr

Contributions

- **VALIDATION OF WRITING MODELS IN TRANSPARENT ORTHOGRAPHIES: WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?**

Lervåg, Arne

Institution: University of Oslo, CREATE Centre for research on equality in education

Country: Norway

Email: a.o.lervag@create.uio.no

Contributions

- **Gender differences in self-reported audience awareness in middle schoolers' argumentative writing**
- **Perspective taking and writing motivation on argumentative writing quality**

Lexander, Kristin Vold

Institution: University of Inland Norway

Country: Norway

Email: kristin.lexander@inn.no

Contributions

- **Studying writing practices and ideologies in multiple research sites: the literagram method**

Limpo, Teresa

Institution: University of Porto

Country: Portugal

Email: tlimpo@fpce.up.pt

Contributions

- **Effective Revision in Upper-Primary Writing: Strategy Use and Text Quality**

Lin, Dunlai

Institution: Beijing Normal University

Country: China

Email: lindunlai@bnu.edu.cn

Contributions

- **Assessing Digital Multimodal Composing in L2 Writing: A Scoping Review**

Lindauer, Nadja

Institution: School for Teacher Education, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland

Country: Switzerland

Email: nadja.lindauer@fhnw.ch

Contributions

- **Typing Instruction: Teachers' Professional Competence and Instructional Practices**

Lindgren, Eva

Institution: Umeå University

Country: Sweden

Email: eva.lindgren@umu.se

Contributions

- **Becoming Writers, Becoming Teachers: Student Teachers' Literacy Attitudes Across Contexts**
- **Teenagers writing expository texts with and without gen-AI**

Linnemann, Markus

Institution: University of Koblenz

Country: Germany

Email: mlinnemann@uni-koblenz.de

Contributions

- **Assessing Higher-Order Writing Skills: Development and Validation of a Diagnostic Instrument**
- **Development and standardisation of a writing fluency test for grades 2 to 4**
- **Hayes Award 2024 Lecture – Writing Fluency in the Perspective of Fluency Research**

Liu, Xiqin

Institution: South China University of Technology

Country: China

Email: fixqliu@scut.edu.cn

Contributions

- **Eye-tracking recursivity in reading-writing integrated continuation tasks**

Loja Tacuri, Héctor

Institution: Universidad de León

Country: Spain

Email: hlojat00@estudiantes.unileon.es

Contributions

- **Writing Assessment in Primary Education in Spanish-Speaking Contexts**

Lomotey, Charlotte

Institution: University of Education, Winneba

Country: Ghana

Email: cefolately@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Long-Term Memory Resources and Essay Quality in ESL Ghanaian Students' Writing**
- **Monitoring Strategies in ESL Timed Essay Writing: Insights from Ghana**

Lomotey, Charlotte Fofu

Institution: university of Education Winneba

Country: Ghana

Email: cflomotey@uew.edu.gh

Contributions

- **The Limits of Generic Academic Writing Instruction in Technical Universities**
- **Negotiating Authority through "Standard English": Ideology and Voice in Multilingual Writing**

Long, Goldberry

Institution: University of California, Riverside

Country: United States

Email: goldl@ucr.edu

Contributions

- **An Innovative Strategy for Improving Undergraduate Low Writing Fluency**

Longcamp, Marieke

Institution: Aix-Marseille Université

Country: France

Email: marieke.longcamp@univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- **Bilingualism modulates the relationship between spelling skills, grade and handwriting kinematics**

Lopez, Paula

Institution: University of León

Country: Spain

Email: plopg@unileon.es

Contributions

- **Effective Revision in Upper-Primary Writing: Strategy Use and Text Quality**
- **The Emergence of Orthographic Revision in Early Writing**

Lorentzen, Vibeke

Institution: NTNU - Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Country: Norway

Email: vibeke.lorentzen@ntnu.no

Contributions

- **Examining Stakeholders' Perspectives on Literacy Plan Development**

Lowndes, Ida

Institution: University of Helsinki

Country: Finland

Email: ida.lowndes@helsinki.fi

Contributions

- **Genre blending in contemporary Finnish essays**

Lozano, Paula

Institution: Universitat de Barcelona; Institut de Recerca en Educació (IREUB)

Country: Spain

Email: paulalozanomulet@ub.edu

Contributions

- **Students' reflections on using GenAI as a tool for cognition when writing an argumentative text**

Luna, Jose

Institution: University of Barcelona

Country: Spain

Email: jluna@ub.edu

Contributions

- **Self-feedback scaffolding through AI in online writing tasks**
- **Students' reflections on using GenAI as a tool for cognition when writing an argumentative text**

Luna, Maria

Institution: Universidad a Distancia de Madrid (UDIMA)

Country: Spain

Email: maria.luna@udima.es

Contributions

- **Explicit instruction and rubrics for argumentative synthesis writing: Effect of Collaboration**

Lussier, Catherine

Institution: University of California, Riverside

Country: United States

Email: cathy.lussier@ucr.edu

Contributions

- **An Innovative Strategy for Improving Undergraduate Low Writing Fluency**

M

Macken, Lieve

Institution: Ghent University

Country: Belgium

Email: Lieve.Macken@UGent.be

Contributions

- **The linguistic impacts of generative AI on L2 writing output**

Magnusson, Petra

Institution: Kristianstad University

Country: Sweden

Email: petra.magnusson@hkr.se

Contributions

- **Student teachers' self efficacy for academic writing**

Mahlow, Cerstin

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: cerstin.mahlow@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- **Cognitive and Ethical Alignment of LLMs with Humans for Writing Research and Instruction**
- **THEtool: A software application for linguistic modeling of writing**
- **Making Writing Processes Visible: Sentence-Level Visualizations of Keystroke Logging Data**
- **SIG Writing Business Meeting**
- **What Can Sentence-Centric Writing Models Reveal about the Writing Process?**

Mantingh, Erwin

Institution: Utrecht University

Country: Netherlands

Email: e.mantingh@uu.nl

Contributions

- **Genre awareness in Dutch L1 writing education**

Martinez Melo, Montserrat

Institution: Fundació per a la Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (FUOC)

Country: Spain

Email: mmmartinezmelo@uoc.edu

Contributions

- **Self-feedback scaffolding through AI in online writing tasks**

Martín, Ana

Institution: Universidad Autonoma de Madrid

Country: Spain

Email: ana.martinmoreno@uam.es

Contributions

- **Explicit instruction and rubrics for argumentative synthesis writing: Effect of Collaboration**

Martínez-Álvarez, Isabel

Institution: Madrid Open University

Country: Spain

Email: isabel.martinez.al@udima.es

Contributions

- **Explicit instruction and rubrics for argumentative synthesis writing: Effect of Collaboration**

Martínez Arce, Marcia Elena

Institution: Universidad San Sebastián

Country: Chile

Email: mmartinezarce@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Changes in writing instruction based on a professional community: voices of Chilean teachers**

Maruta, Filipa

Institution: ISPA - University Institute

Country: Portugal

Email: fmaruta@ispa.pt

Contributions

- **Emergent Literacy Development: A Socio-Constructivist Program in Preschool**

Mateos, Mar

Institution: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Country: Spain

Email: mar.mateos@uam.es

Contributions

- **Explicit instruction and rubrics for argumentative synthesis writing: Effect of Collaboration**
- **Rubrics for Planning and Revising Argumentative Syntheses in Collaborative and Individual Settings**

Maune, Michael

Institution: Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Country: United States

Email: mjmaune@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Corpus Insights for Teaching Case Analysis Recommendation Writing**

Maurer, Michelle N.

Institution: University of Stavanger

Country: Norway

Email: michelle.n.maurer@uis.no

Contributions

- **The handwriting movement: Linking motor processes and mastery**

Mayordomo, Rosa M

Institution: Open University of Catalonia (UOC)

Country: Spain

Email: mmayordomo@uoc.edu

Contributions

- **Self-feedback scaffolding through AI in online writing tasks**

Mazur, Audrey

Institution: Université de Lyon

Country: France

Email: audrey.mazur@ens-lyon.fr

Contributions

- **Studying writing dynamics of students of dyslexia: the DYSTRACKER setup**
- **Dynamics of writing of students with dyslexia: relating writing online indicators with eye movements**

Mañas-Navarrete, Iban

Institution: Universitat de Barcelona

Country: Spain

Email: iban.manas@ub.edu

Contributions

- **What linguistic changes occur in texts after an SRSD intervention?**

McGrath, Lisa

Institution: Sheffield Hallam University

Country: United Kingdom

Email: L.McGrath@shu.ac.uk

Contributions

- **Multi-genre pedagogy: fostering transfer, metacognition, and rhetorical agility in doctoral writing**

McTigue, Erin

Institution: University of Stavanger

Country: Norway

Email: emmctigue@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Effectiveness of single-case writing interventions (2008-2025): Preliminary meta-analysis findings**

Medina-Gutiérrez, María

Institution: Universidad Autonoma de Madrid

Country: Spain

Email: maria.medinag@uam.es

Contributions

- **Rubrics for Planning and Revising Argumentative Syntheses in Collaborative and Individual Settings**

Meier, Ramona

Institution: Ghent University

Country: Belgium

Email: Ramona.Meier@UGent.be

Contributions

- **The linguistic impacts of generative AI on L2 writing output**

Mendoza, Laura

Institution: University of Helsinki

Country: Finland

Email: laura.mendoza@helsinki.fi

Contributions

- **Language choice in master's thesis writing: a motivational perspective**
- **Evaluating Writing Quality of Engineering Student Reports using Natural Language Processing Tools**

Menke, Remco

Institution: University of Amsterdam

Country: Netherlands

Email: r.a.menke@uva.nl

Contributions

- **Examining Writing and Reasoning in Dutch History Textbook Questions**

Michel, Marije

Institution: University of Groningen

Country: Netherlands

Email: m.c.michel@rug.nl

Contributions

- **Eye-tracking recursivity in reading-writing integrated continuation tasks**

Michels, Viktoria

Institution: TU Chemnitz

Country: Germany

Email: viktoria.michels@uni-hamburg.de

Contributions

- **Differential Effects of a Tablet-Based Writing Intervention on Text Quality: An Intervention Study**
- **Writing Fluency in Primary School: An Evaluation of a Training Programme in Challenging Contexts**

Michiels, Paul

Institution: Carnegie Mellon University

Country: United States

Email: pmichiel@andrew.cmu.edu

Contributions

- **How Expert and Novice Academics Write with GenAI: Think-Aloud Protocols**

Miftah, Hamza

Institution: Université Clermont Auvergne

Country: France

Email: hsh.miftah@gmail.com

Contributions

- **How generative AI reshapes students' writing practices at a French university writing center**

Milićević, Dejana

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: milc@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- **A Direct Approach to the Study of Epistemic Decisions: Students Using AI for Thesis Writing**
- **Accessing the Epistemological Side of Writing: A Prolegomenon to the Era of AI**

- Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Formative Thesis Writing Assessment

Mirault, Jonathan

Institution: Aix-Marseille Université

Country: France

Email: jonathan.mirault@univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- Bilingualism modulates the relationship between spelling skills, grade and handwriting kinematics

Mitchell, Thomas

Institution: Carnegie Mellon University

Country: Qatar

Email: tmitchel@andrew.cmu.edu

Contributions

- Making Research Understandable: Teaching Undergraduates to Communicate Research to Non-Experts

Mitchell, Thomas D.

Institution: Carnegie Mellon University Qatar

Country: Qatar

Email: tmitchel@qatar.cmu.edu

Contributions

- Teaching Reasoning in Argumentative Writing through Explicit Heuristics

Miño, Raquel

Institution: Universitat de Barcelona; Institut de Recerca en Educació (IREUB)

Country: Spain

Email: rmino@ub.edu

Contributions

- Students' reflections on using GenAI as a tool for cognition when writing an argumentative text

Moeyaert, Mariola

Institution: University at Albany, State University of New York

Country: United States

Email: mmoeyaert@albany.edu

Contributions

- Effectiveness of single-case writing interventions (2008-2025): Preliminary meta-analysis findings

Moiroud, Lionel

Institution: Sierra Neurovision Company

Country: France

Email: lionel.moiroud@sierra-neurovision.com

Contributions

- Studying writing dynamics of students of dyslexia: the DYSTRACKER setup

Molas-Castells, Nuria

Institution: Universitat de Barcelona; Institut de Recerca en Educació (IREUB)

Country: Spain

Email: nmolascastells@ub.edu

Contributions

- Students' reflections on using GenAI as a tool for cognition when writing an argumentative text

Molnar, Pal

Institution: Semmelweis University

Country: Hungary

Email: molnar.pal@icloud.com

Contributions

- A Pilot Study of Expressive Writing in Educational Rehabilitation for Neurodegenerative Diseases

Morre, Gabriel

Institution: University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland PH (FHNW)

Country: Switzerland

Email: gabriel.morre@fhnw.ch

Contributions

- Peer Feedback and Text Evaluation
- Reciprocal peer feedback with argumentative text structure

Myrick, Caroline

Institution: Independent Researcher

Country: United States

Email: carolinemyrick@gmail.com

Contributions

- Emotions During Writing: A novel approach for understanding pausing during writing

N

Negretti, Raffaella

Institution: Chalmers University of Technology

Country: Sweden

Email: negretti@chalmers.se

Contributions

- **Multi-genre pedagogy: fostering transfer, metacognition, and rhetorical agility in doctoral writing**

Neugebauer, Claudia

Institution: Pädagogische Hochschule Zürich

Country: Switzerland

Email: claudia.neugebauer@phzh.ch

Contributions

- **Collaborative Writing Processes in Science Education**

Neumann, Astrid

Institution: Institute for German Language and Literature Education

Country: Germany

Email: astrid.neumann@leuphana.de

Contributions

- **Learning to write in grade 4: Support with didactic writing tasks**
- **Monitoring Rater-reliability in Decentralized Organizations**

Newton, Moira

Institution: University of Auckland and Papatoetoe West School

Country: New Zealand

Email: moira.newton.mn@gmail.com

Contributions

- **The importance of the imagined figure of the reader to children's writing achievement**
- **SIG Writing Business Meeting**
- **Career Development for Early Career Researchers**

Nottbusch, Guido

Institution: University of Potsdam

Country: Germany

Email: gnott@uni-potsdam.de

Contributions

- **Morpheme and syllable boundaries in adult handwriting**

Nyffeler, Angela

Institution: Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz

Country: Switzerland

Email: angela.nyffeler@fhnw.ch

Contributions

- **Peer Feedback and Text Evaluation**

Nöske, Lea

Institution: University of Regensburg

Country: Germany

Email: Lea.Noeske@ur.de

Contributions

- **Teaching narrative writing in grade 2: first findings from FiSBY**

O

Oblie, Emmanuel Lauren

Institution: University of Education, Winneba

Country: Ghana

Email: eloblie@uew.edu.gh

Contributions

- **Long-Term Memory Resources and Essay Quality in ESL Ghanaian Students' Writing**
- **Monitoring Strategies in ESL Timed Essay Writing: Insights from Ghana**

Olive, Thierry

Institution: CNRS & Université de Poitiers

Country: France

Email: Thierry.olive@univ-poitiers.fr

Contributions

- **Bursted! A tool for extracting bursts of writing from keystrokes logging "idfx" files**
- **Bursts of writing and their relation to text quality in children's writing**

Oliveira, Manuel

Institution: Eindhoven University of Technology

Country: Netherlands

Email: m.j.barbosa.de.oliveira@tue.nl

Contributions

- **Assessing argumentative writing through students' interactions with generative AI**

Olmos, Ricardo

Institution: Universidad Autonoma de Madrid

Country: Spain

Email: ricardo.olmos@uam.es

Contributions

- **Rubrics for Planning and Revising Argumentative Syntheses in Collaborative and Individual Settings**

Ortiz, Marcelo

Institution: Universidad Andrés Bello

Country: Chile

Email: profesor.marcelo.ortiz1@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Changes in writing instruction based on a professional community: voices of Chilean teachers**

Osenova, Petya

Institution: Institute of Information and Communication Technologies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Country: Bulgaria

Email: petya@bultreebank.org

Contributions

- **Corpus Linguistic Methods**

Ott, Jakob

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: ottj@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- **Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Formative Thesis Writing Assessment**

Oudheusden, Emma

Institution: University of Amsterdam

Country: Netherlands

Email: e.oudheusden@uva.nl

Contributions

- **Building bridges between subjects: Using genre pedagogy for writing across the curriculum**

Outerbridge, Sierra

Institution: University of Central Florida

Country: United States

Email: sierra.outerbridge@ucf.edu

Contributions

- **Exploring Keystroke Logging Behavior to Investigate Self-Regulated Writing of Undergraduate Students**

- **Emotions During Writing: A novel approach for understanding pausing during writing**
- **Investigating Emotional Trajectories of Undergraduate Writing Students via Dynamic Time Warping**

P

Paev, Nikolay

Institution: Institute of Information and Communication Technologies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Country: Bulgaria

Email: niki.paev@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Corpus Linguistic Methods**

Perrin, Daniel

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: daniel.perrin@bluewin.ch

Contributions

- **Implementing AI in a multilingual newsroom: The role of ethics and creativity**

Persson, Jenny

Institution: Kristianstad University

Country: Sweden

Email: jenny.persson@hkr.se

Contributions

- **Student teachers' self efficacy for academic writing**

Pessoa, Silvia

Institution: Carnegie Mellon University Qatar

Country: Qatar

Email: spessoa@cmu.edu

Contributions

- **Teaching Reasoning in Argumentative Writing through Explicit Heuristics**

Pessoa, Silvia

Institution: Carnegie Mellon University

Country: Qatar

Email: spessoa@andrew.cmu.edu

Contributions

- **Making Research Understandable: Teaching Undergraduates to Communicate Research to Non-Experts**

Peters, Amy

Institution: University of Southampton

Country: United Kingdom

Email: amy.peters@soton.ac.uk

Contributions

- **Effects of removing visual feedback on writing to learn**

Peyer, Elisabeth

Institution: University of Fribourg

Country: Switzerland

Email: elisabeth.peyer@unifr.ch

Contributions

- **Synergies between languages at school: learning to write persuasive texts in several languages**

Peze, Anouk ten

Institution: University of Amsterdam

Country: Netherlands

Email: anouktenpeze@live.nl

Contributions

- **Reading and writing in flow**

Peña, Lorena

Institution: Universidad de Leon

Country: Spain

Email: lpenap02@estudiantes.unileon.es

Contributions

- **The Emergence of Orthographic Revision in Early Writing**

Philipp, Maik

Institution: Zurich University of Teacher Education

Country: Switzerland

Email: maik.philipp@phzh.ch

Contributions

- **Writing Fluency Always Matters, No Matter the Writing Technology**
- **Cooperative Writing: Perspectives from Three Intervention Studies**
- **Cooperative Writing: Perspectives from Three Intervention Studies**
- **We, Myself and AI: On the Benefits of Combining AI and Cooperative Planning for Writing Motivation**

Pintér, Henriett

Institution: Semmelweis University

Country: Hungary

Email: pinter.henriett@semmelweis.hu

Contributions

- **A Pilot Study of Expressive Writing in Educational Rehabilitation for Neurodegenerative Diseases**

Piotrowski, Michael

Institution: University of Lausanne

Country: Switzerland

Email: michael.piotrowski@unil.ch

Contributions

- **What Can Sentence-Centric Writing Models Reveal about the Writing Process?**

Pluymaekers, Mark

Institution: Zuyd University of Applied Sciences

Country: Netherlands

Email: mark.pluymaekers@zuyd.nl

Contributions

- **Effort, Agency, and Authorship in AI-Assisted Writing: Revisiting Flower & Hayes' Model**

Pogner, Karl-Heinz

Institution: Copenhagen Business School

Country: Denmark

Email: kp.msc@cbs.dk

Contributions

- **Intercultural encounters in supervising Master Thesis Writing at a Danish Business University**
- **Career Development for Early Career Researchers**

Pogner, Karl-Heinz

Institution: Copenhagen Business School

Country: Denmark

Contributions

- **SIG Writing Business Meeting**

Prentice, Olivia

Institution: University of Southampton

Country: United Kingdom

Email: op1g22@southamptonalumni.ac.uk

Contributions

- **Effects of removing visual feedback on writing to learn**

Pronold-Günthner, Friederike

Institution: University of Regensburg

Country: Germany

Email: Friederike.Pronold-Guenthner@ur.de

Contributions

- **Teaching narrative writing in grade 2: first findings from FiSBY**

Pulkkinen, Veijo

Institution: University of Helsinki

Country: Finland

Email: veijo.pulkkinen@helsinki.fi

Contributions

- **Ethics and Access: Investigating Writing Processes from Manuscripts in Finland**

Q

Quaranta, Jean-Marc

Institution: Aix-Marseille University

Country: France

Email: jean-marc.quaranta@univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- **Authors and AI: the challenges of process analysis for AI-assisted writing support**
- **Encoding the Writing Process: TEI Between Research and Computational Use**
- **Writing workshop in classrooms, what for ?**
- **Trusting the Process? Cognitive Writing Models into the classroom through Process-Aware Feedback**

Quené, Hugo

Institution: University Utrecht

Country: Netherlands

Email: h.quene@uu.nl

Contributions

- **Unpacking Academic Writing as a multidimensional concept through a systematic literature review**

Quignard, Matthieu

Institution: CNRS

Country: France

Email: matthieu.quignard@ens-lyon.fr

Contributions

- **Studying writing dynamics of students of dyslexia: the DYSTRACKER setup**
- **Dynamics of writing of students with dyslexia: relating writing online indicators with eye movements**

R

Rack, John

Institution: Linnaeus University

Country: Sweden

Email: john.rack@lnu.se

Contributions

- **Does seeing writing as changeable matter?**

Rakedzon, Tzipora

Institution: Technion - Israel Institute of Technology

Country: Israel

Email: hutzipi@technion.ac.il

Contributions

- **The challenge of creating a coherent text: A Coherence-Focused AI Chatbot for Academic Writing**
- **Writing with AI in Multilingual Classrooms: Translanguaging and Teacher–Student Perspectives**

Rapp, Christian

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: rapp@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- **A Direct Approach to the Study of Epistemic Decisions: Students Using AI for Thesis Writing**
- **Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Formative Thesis Writing Assessment**

Real, Sara

Institution: Universidad de Leon

Country: Spain

Email: sarreal@ponferrada.uned.es

Contributions

- **Writing Assessment in Primary Education in Spanish-Speaking Contexts**

Ricart, Thomas

Institution: Écrivor

Country: France

Email: thomasricart@ecrivor.com

Contributions

- **Trusting the Process? Cognitive Writing Models into the classroom through Process-Aware Feedback**

Rijlaarsdam, Gert

Institution: University of Amsterdam

Country: Netherlands

Email: G.C.W.Rijlaarsdam@uva.nl

Contributions

- **Rubrics for Planning and Revising Argumentative Syntheses in Collaborative and Individual Settings**
- **Tracing Reading–Writing Processes in Swedish and Math Classrooms; a longitudinal study**
- **Reading and writing in flow**

Robledo, Patricia

Institution: University of León

Country: Spain

Email: probr@unileon.es

Contributions

- **Impact of home literacy practices on elementary students' writing performance and motivation**
- **The role of motivation on acquisition of writing competence on Primary Education.**

Rodust, Söntke

Institution: Leuphana University Lueneburg

Country: Germany

Email: rodust.s@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Learning to write in grade 4: Support with didactic writing tasks**

Roeser, Jens

Institution: Nottingham Trent University

Country: United Kingdom

Email: jens.roeser@ntu.ac.uk

Contributions

- **Designing Intention and Process-Informed Strategies for Self-Regulation of Writing**

Rogers, Paul

Institution: University of California, Santa Barbara

Country: United States

Email: paulrogers@writing.ucsb.edu

Contributions

- **How Expert and Novice Academics Write with GenAI: Think-Aloud Protocols**

Rogobete, Roxana

Institution: West University of Timisoara

Country: Romania

Email: roxana.rogobete@e-uvt.ro

Contributions

- **Institutional policies on generative AI in BA thesis writing: Evidence from Romanian universities**

Rouillard, Michaël

Institution: Sierra Neurovision Company

Country: France

Email: michael.rouillard@sierra-neurovision.com

Contributions

- **Studying writing dynamics of students of dyslexia: the DYSTRACKER setup**

Rybicki, Jan-Mikael

Institution: Aalto University

Country: Finland

Email: jan-mikael.rybicki@aalto.fi

Contributions

- **Evaluating Writing Quality of Engineering Student Reports using Natural Language Processing Tools**

Rønneberg, Vibeke

Institution: University of Stavanger

Country: Norway

Email: vibeke.ronneberg@uis.no

Contributions

- **The handwriting movement: Linking motor processes and mastery**
- **Effectiveness of single-case writing interventions (2008-2025): Preliminary meta-analysis findings**

S

Sadowski, Bert

Institution: Eindhoven University of Technology

Country: Netherlands

Email: b.m.sadowski@tue.nl

Contributions

- **Assessing argumentative writing through students' interactions with generative AI**

Salas, Naymé

Institution: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Country: Spain

Email: nayme.salas@uab.cat

Contributions

- **What linguistic changes occur in texts after an SRSD intervention?**

Salloum, Shada

Institution: Birzeit University

Country: Palestine

Email: ssalloum.2004@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Written Language Production in Children with Developmental Language Disorder: Evidence from Arabic**

Salvador, Liliana

Institution: ISPA - University Institute

Country: Portugal

Email: lsalvador@ispa.pt

Contributions

- **Emergent Literacy Development: A Socio-Constructivist Program in Preschool**

Saricaoglu, Aysel

Institution: Social Sciences University of Ankara

Country: Türkiye

Email: saricaogluaysel@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Prompt effects on L2 writing performance: Insights from CEFR-informed prompt design**
- **The Potential of ChatGPT to Identify the Syntactic Features of Written Explanations**

Schabmann, Alfred

Institution: University of Cologne

Country: Germany

Email: alfred.schabmann@uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- **Assessing Higher-Order Writing Skills: Development and Validation of a Diagnostic Instrument**
- **Modelling the Subskills of Writing in Instructional Texts**

Schaller, Pascale

Institution: PHBern, University of Teacher Education

Country: Switzerland

Email: pascale.schaller@phbern.ch

Contributions

- **Do Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency Compete? Within-Person Evidence From CBM Writing**

Scherer, Sina Verena

Institution: University of Münster

Country: Germany

Email: s_sche26@uni-muenster.de

Contributions

- **Can Algorithm-based Feedback Help Students to Write Better? A Meta-analysis**

Schilcher, Anita

Institution: University of Regensburg

Country: Germany

Email: anita.schilcher@ur.de

Contributions

- **Teaching narrative writing in grade 2: first findings from FiSBY**

Schmidt, Barbara

Institution: University of Cologne

Country: Germany

Email: barbara.schmidt@uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- **Assessing Higher-Order Writing Skills: Development and Validation of a Diagnostic Instrument**

Schnatz, Nina Isabella

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: scnz@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- **Assessing the Epistemological Side of Writing: A Prolegomenon to the Era of AI**

- **From Higher Education to Secondary Schools: Developing an OER for genAI-Supported Scientific Writing**

Schneider, Charlotte

Institution: Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz

Country: Switzerland

Email: charlotte.schneider@fhnw.ch

Contributions

- **Collaborative Writing Processes in Science Education**

Schneier, Joel

Institution: University of Central Florida

Country: United States

Email: joel.schneier@ucf.edu

Contributions

- **Exploring Keystroke Logging Behavior to Investigate Self-Regulated Writing of Undergraduate Students**
- **Emotions During Writing: A novel approach for understanding pausing during writing**
- **Investigating Emotional Trajectories of Undergraduate Writing Students via Dynamic Time Warping**

Schüler, Lisa

Institution: Universität Bielefeld

Country: Germany

Email: lisa.schueler@uni-bielefeld.de

Contributions

- **Typing Instruction: Teachers' Professional Competence and Instructional Practices**

Sercu, Lies

Institution: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Country: Belgium

Email: lies.sercu@kuleuven.be

Contributions

- **Integrating ChatGPT into EFL Writing Instruction: Effects of Teacher Modelling and Autonomous Use**

Sieveke, Pia

Institution: University of Münster

Country: Germany

Email: psieveke@uni-muenster.de

Contributions

- **From research to classroom: Implementing evidence-based writing practices**

Silverdal, Sara

Institution: Umeå University

Country: Sweden

Email: sara.silverdal@umu.se

Contributions

- **AI and I: A rhizomatic analysis of writing processes with AI tools**
- **Teenagers writing expository texts with and without gen-AI**

Skar, Gustaf

Institution: Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Country: Norway

Email: gustaf.b.skar@ntnu.no

Contributions

- **Text Features Associated with Students' Generative AI Use: Norwegian Teachers' Assessments**
- **The future of writing education**
- **Trends in writing intervention research: 1930s and onwards**

Sliepenbeek, Leonie

Institution: Tilburg University

Country: Netherlands

Email: l.j.c.sliepenbeek@tilburguniversity.edu

Contributions

- **Secondary Students' Decision-Making Processes Underlying L1 Writing Processes with GenAI**

Solheim, Oddny Judith

Institution: University of Stavanger

Country: Norway

Email: oddny.j.solheim@uis.no

Contributions

- **Effectiveness of single-case writing interventions (2008-2025): Preliminary meta-analysis findings**

Speltz, Emily Dux

Institution: Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Country: United States

Email: duxspele@erau.edu

Contributions

- **From Expert Habits to Student Support: Using Process-Tracing to Build GenAI Writing Guidance**

- Writing process feedback

Speyer, Lydia

Institution: Institut des Bundes für Qualitätssicherung im österreichischen Schulwesen

Country: Austria

Email: lydia.speyer@iqs.gv.at

Contributions

- RATE THE RATER - Rater Agreement in English and German Text Assessments

Spieser, Laure

Institution: Aix-Marseille Université

Country: France

Email: laure.spieser@univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- Bilingualism modulates the relationship between spelling skills, grade and handwriting kinematics

Springstein, Sander

Institution: University of Cologne

Country: Germany

Email: sander.springstein@uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- Development and standardisation of a writing fluency test for grades 2 to 4
- Task Specification and Adaptation in Primary Grade Writing Instruction

Staats, Julia

Institution: University Utrecht

Country: Netherlands

Email: j.c.staats@uu.nl

Contributions

- Writing to learn in the new A(l)ge

Stahlhut, Laura

Institution: Institut für Bildungsevaluation

Country: Switzerland

Email: laura.stahlhut@ibe-edu.ch

Contributions

- From Ratings to Formative Feedback: An AI-Based System for Automated Essay Scoring
- From Ratings to Formative Feedback: An AI-Based System for Automated Essay Scoring

- Enhancing Automated Essay Scoring by Integrating Rule-Based Language Checking with Generative Models

Stephany, Sabine

Institution: Universität zu Köln

Country: Germany

Email: sabine.stephany@uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- Development and standardisation of a writing fluency test for grades 2 to 4

Stoffers-Lang, Michaela

Institution: Leuphana University Lueneburg

Country: Germany

Email: miastoffers@hotmail.com

Contributions

- Monitoring Rater-reliability in Decentralized Organizations

Stukker, Ninke

Institution: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

Country: Netherlands

Email: n.m.stukker@rug.nl

Contributions

- Building bridges between subjects: Using genre pedagogy for writing across the curriculum
- Genre awareness in Dutch L1 writing education

Sturk, Erika

Institution: University of Gothenburg

Country: Sweden

Email: erika.sturk@gu.se

Contributions

- Becoming Writers, Becoming Teachers: Student Teachers' Literacy Attitudes Across Contexts

Sturk, Erika

Institution: Umeå University

Country: Sweden

Email: erika.sturk@umu.se

Contributions

- Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write: What have we learned from 20 years of research?
- Teenagers writing expository texts with and without gen-AI

Sturm, Afra

Institution: University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland PH (FHNW)

Country: Switzerland

Email: afra.sturm@fhnw.ch

Contributions

- Digital writing and writing motivation
- Peer Feedback and Text Evaluation

Sumner, Emma

Institution: Liverpool John Moores University

Country: United Kingdom

Email: e.j.sumner@ljmu.ac.uk

Contributions

- Writing by Hand vs Typing: Effects on the Written Performance of Students with Literacy Difficulties
- The influence of early oral language on later narrative and expository writing in primary school

Szabó, Gergely

Institution: Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary

Country: Hungary

Email: szabo.gergely@kre.hu

Contributions

- Studying writing practices and ideologies in multiple research sites: the literagram method

Szánthó, Zsuzsa

Institution: Eötvös Lorand University

Country: Hungary

Email: szantho.zsuzsa@btk.elte.hu

Contributions

- Studying writing practices and ideologies in multiple research sites: the literagram method

T

Taha, Juhayna

Institution: University College London

Country: United Kingdom

Email: j.taha@ucl.ac.uk

Contributions

- Written Language Production in Children with Developmental Language Disorder: Evidence from Arabic

Taub, Michelle

Institution: University of Central Florida

Country: United States

Email: michelle.taub@ucf.edu

Contributions

- Exploring Keystroke Logging Behavior to Investigate Self-Regulated Writing of Undergraduate Students
- Emotions During Writing: A novel approach for understanding pausing during writing
- Investigating Emotional Trajectories of Undergraduate Writing Students via Dynamic Time Warping

Thamm, Alexander

Institution: Universität zu Köln

Country: Germany

Email: athamm2@uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- Assessing Higher-Order Writing Skills: Development and Validation of a Diagnostic Instrument

Thurfjell, Fredrik

Institution: Habiliteringen Stockholm

Country: Sweden

Email: fthurfjell@gmail.com

Contributions

- Does seeing writing as changeable matter?

Torkildsen, Janne von Koss

Institution: University of Oslo

Country: Norway

Email: janneto@isp.uio.no

Contributions

- Gender differences in self-reported audience awareness in middle schoolers' argumentative writing

Torkildsen, Janne von Koss

Institution: University of Oslo

Country: Norway

Email: j.von.k.torkildsen@isp.uio.no

Contributions

- **Perspective taking and writing motivation on argumentative writing quality**
- **What Does My Reader Need? Audience Awareness in Sixth-Graders' Written LEGO Instructions**
- **Writing Quality on a LEGO-Based Procedural Writing Task: Gender Differences in Analytic Traits**

Torrance, Mark

Institution: Nottingham Trent University

Country: United Kingdom

Email: mark.torrance@ntu.ac.uk

Contributions

- **Designing Intention and Process-Informed Strategies for Self-Regulation of Writing**

Torres, Maria Lidia

Institution: Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación

Country: Chile

Email: m.lidia.torres@umce.cl

Contributions

- **Changes in writing instruction based on a professional community: voices of Chilean teachers**

Turai, Rahel K.

Institution: Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary

Country: Hungary

Email: turai.katalin.rahel@kre.hu

Contributions

- **Studying writing practices and ideologies in multiple research sites: the literagram method**

U

Ulasik, Margo

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: margo.ulasik@zhaw.ch

Contributions

- **THEtool: A software application for linguistic modeling of writing**
- **What Can Sentence-Centric Writing Models Reveal about the Writing Process?**

Unger, Valentin

Institution: St.Gallen University of Teacher Education

Country: Switzerland

Email: valentin.unger@phsg.ch

Contributions

- **We, Myself and AI: On the Benefits of Combining AI and Cooperative Planning for Writing Motivation**

Ussof, Hakim

Institution: University of Peradeniya/ Dept. Statistics & Computer Sciences

Country: Sri Lanka

Email: hau@sci.pdn.ac.lk

Contributions

- **Learning to write: Toy examples using the progressive graph tool.**

V

Van Boxtel, Carla

Institution: University of Amsterdam

Country: Netherlands

Email: c.a.m.vanboxtel@uva.nl

Contributions

- **Examining Writing and Reasoning in Dutch History Textbook Questions**

van der Loo, Janneke

Institution: Tilburg University

Country: Netherlands

Email: J.M.vdLoo@tilburguniversity.edu

Contributions

- **Secondary Students' Decision-Making Processes Underlying L1 Writing Processes with GenAI**

van der Scheer, Mylene

Institution: Utrecht University

Country: Netherlands

Email: m.vanderscheer@uu.nl

Contributions

- **Unpacking Academic Writing as a multidimensional concept through a systematic literature review**

van Drie, Jannet

Institution: University of Amsterdam

Country: Netherlands

Email: j.p.vandrie@uva.nl

Contributions

- **Building bridges between subjects: Using genre pedagogy for writing across the curriculum**
- **Examining Writing and Reasoning in Dutch History Textbook Questions**
- **Integrating writing in content-lessons: Effects of a professional development program.**

van Gulik, Jan

Institution: University Utrecht

Country: Netherlands

Email: j.b.vangulik@uu.nl

Contributions

- **Genre awareness in Dutch L1 writing education**

van Gulik, Jan

Institution: Utrecht University

Country: Netherlands

Email: J.van.Gulik@UU.nl

Contributions

- **Building bridges between subjects: Using genre pedagogy for writing across the curriculum**

Van Horenbeek, Eric

Institution: University of Antwerp

Country: Belgium

Email: eric.vanhorenbeek@uantwerpen.be

Contributions

- **Inputlog: New perspectives on keystroke logging**

Van Keer, Hilde

Institution: Ghent University

Country: Belgium

Email: Hilde.VanKeer@UGent.be

Contributions

- **Supporting peer feedback conversations during argumentative writing: rubric vs. conversation chart**
- **Effectiveness of single-case writing interventions (2008-2025): Preliminary meta-analysis findings**

- **Using Generative AI for Academic Writing: Students' Practices and the Role of Explicit Instruction**

Van Ongeval, Isabelle

Institution: Letterenhuis

Country: Belgium

Email: isabelle.vanongeval@antwerpen.be

Contributions

- **How many needles are in the haystack? Privacy-sensitive content in born-digital archives in Flanders**

van Rijt, Jimmy

Institution: Utrecht University

Country: Netherlands

Email: j.h.m.vanrijt@uu.nl

Contributions

- **Unpacking Academic Writing as a multidimensional concept through a systematic literature review**

Van Steendam, Elke

Institution: KU Leuven

Country: Belgium

Email: elke.vansteendam@kuleuven.be

Contributions

- **Rubrics for Planning and Revising Argumentative Syntheses in Collaborative and Individual Settings**
- **Integrating ChatGPT into EFL Writing Instruction: Effects of Teacher Modelling and Autonomous Use**
- **University students' reflections on academic writing with genAI**
- **Make Writing Great: Why Writing Still Matters in the Age of AI**

Van Waes, Luuk

Institution: University of Antwerp

Country: Belgium

Email: luuk.vanwaes@uantwerpen.be

Contributions

- **Inputlog: New perspectives on keystroke logging**
- **Thesis Writing with Generative AI: A Multi-Session Process Analysis**

van Weijen, Daphne

Institution: University of Amsterdam

Country: Netherlands

Email: d.vanweijen@uva.nl

Contributions

- **Examining Writing and Reasoning in Dutch History Textbook Questions**
- **Reading and writing in flow**

Vandermeulen, Nina

Institution: University of Antwerp

Country: Belgium

Email: nina.vandermeulen@uantwerpen.be

Contributions

- **Becoming Writers, Becoming Teachers: Student Teachers' Literacy Attitudes Across Contexts**
- **Career Development for Early Career Researchers**
- **Beyond Text-Focused Feedback: The Added Value of Keystroke Logging Feedback & Dialogic Peer Feedback**
- **Writing process feedback**
- **Writing process feedback**

Vereecke, Alix

Institution: Ghent University

Country: Belgium

Email: alix.vereecke@ugent.be

Contributions

- **The future of writing education**
- **Using Generative AI for Academic Writing: Students' Practices and the Role of Explicit Instruction**

Vettori, Giulia

Institution: University of Florence

Country: Italy

Email: giulia.vettori@unifi.it

Contributions

- **Oral language and emergent literacy: Early childhood educators' beliefs and practices**

Villegas, Frank

Institution: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú

Country: Peru

Email: fvillegas@pucp.edu.pe

Contributions

- **Motivational Beliefs and Writing Achievement in Peruvian Secondary Students: Latent Profile Analysis**

Vogt, Birgit

Institution: University of Koblenz

Country: Germany

Email: bvogt@uni-koblenz.de

Contributions

- **Development and standardisation of a writing fluency test for grades 2 to 4**

W

Walker, LaVonda

Institution: University of Central Florida

Country: United States

Email: lwalker@ucf.edu

Contributions

- **Emotions During Writing: A novel approach for understanding pausing during writing**

Wanka, Rebekka

Institution: Mercator-Institut (Universität zu Köln)

Country: Germany

Email: rebekka.wanka@mercator.uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- **Writing Fluency in Primary School: An Evaluation of a Training Programme in Challenging Contexts**

Weder, Mirjam

Institution: University of Basel

Country: Switzerland

Email: mirjam.weder@unibas.ch

Contributions

- **Prompt – write – revise – repeat: a writing-process study of AI-assisted writing in higher education**

Weintraub, Naomi

Institution: Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Country: Israel

Email: naomiweintraub@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Development and Initial Validation of the Word-Processing Assessment for Elementary-School**

Wengelin, Åsa

Institution: University of Gothenburg

Country: Sweden

Email: asa.wengelin@gu.se

Contributions

- **Does seeing writing as changeable matter?**
- **Make Writing Great: Why Writing Still Matters in the Age of AI**
- **Who benefits from using speech-to-text as their writing tool?**
- **Teenagers writing expository texts with and without gen-AI**

Weth, Constanze

Institution: Institute for Research on Multilingualism, University of Luxembourg

Country: France

Email: constanze.weth@uni.lu

Contributions

- **The functional use of graphematic forms in German–French biliterate writing**

Whitehouse, Marlies

Institution: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences

Country: Switzerland

Email: marlies.whitehouse@bluewin.ch

Contributions

- **Navigating the double bind: how AI reshapes financial analysts' writing practices**

Wild, Johannes

Institution: Universität Regensburg

Country: Germany

Email: Johannes.Wild@ur.de

Contributions

- **Teaching narrative writing in grade 2: first findings from FiSBY**

Wingrove, Peter

Institution: Chalmers University of Technology

Country: Sweden

Email: wingrove@chalmers.se

Contributions

- **Multi-genre pedagogy: fostering transfer, metacognition, and rhetorical agility in doctoral writing**

Winkes, Julia

Institution: University of Fribourg

Country: Switzerland

Email: julia.winkes@unifr.ch

Contributions

- **Do Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency Compete? Within-Person Evidence From CBM Writing**

Winter, Sabrina

Institution: IQS

Country: Austria

Email: sabrina.winter@iqs.gv.at

Contributions

- **RATE THE RATER - Rater Agreement in English and German Text Assessments**

Wolf, Julie

Institution: Universität zu Köln/ University of Cologne

Country: Germany

Email: julie.wolf@uni-koeln.de

Contributions

- **Modelling the Subskills of Writing in Instructional Texts**

Wolfangel, Mirjam

Institution: Pädagogische Hochschule Zürich

Country: Switzerland

Email: mirjam.wolfangel@phzh.ch

Contributions

- **We, Myself and AI: On the Benefits of Combining AI and Cooperative Planning for Writing Motivation**

Wölfel, Seda Yilmaz

Institution: Universität Hamburg

Country: Germany

Email: seda.yilmaz-woerfel@uni-hamburg.de

Contributions

- **Writing on Paper or on Tablet? Error Patterns and Processing Time in Digital and Hybrid Formats**

Y

Yan, Xiaomeng

Institution: South China University of Technology; University of Groningen

Country: China

Email: xiaomeng.yan@rug.nl

Contributions

- **Eye-tracking recursivity in reading-writing integrated continuation tasks**

Yang, Mei

Institution: South China University of Technology

Country: China

Email: flmyang@scut.edu.cn

Contributions

- **Eye-tracking recursivity in reading-writing integrated continuation tasks**

Yegblemenawo, Stella Afi Makafui

Institution: Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi

Country: Ghana

Email: samyegblemenawo.cass@knust.edu.gh

Contributions

- **Enhancing academic writing through Systemic Functional Genre Pedagogy in Higher Education**
- **Scaffolding Multilingual Writers in Source-Based Argumentative Writing: An Intervention Study**

Young, Justin

Institution: University of Antwerp

Country: Belgium

Email: Justin.Young@uantwerpen.be

Contributions

- **Make Writing Great: Why Writing Still Matters in the Age of AI**

Yu, Nan

Institution: Beijing Normal University

Country: China

Email: 202321100032@mail.bnu.edu.cn

Contributions

- **A systematic review of the role of motivation in digital multimodal composing**
- **Assessing Digital Multimodal Composing in L2 Writing: A Scoping Review**

Z

Zafar, Samra

Institution: Independent Researcher

Country: Pakistan

Email: samrazafar003@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Trusting the Process? Cognitive Writing Models into the classroom through Process-Aware Feedback**

Zaldivar, Zoe

Institution: Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Country: United States

Email: zoe.zaldivar@erau.edu

Contributions

- **From Expert Habits to Student Support: Using Process-Tracing to Build GenAI Writing Guidance**

Zednik, Carlos

Institution: Eindhoven University of Technology

Country: Netherlands

Email: c.a.zednik@tue.nl

Contributions

- **Assessing argumentative writing through students' interactions with generative AI**

Zuo, Yitong

Institution: Aix-Marseille Université

Country: France

Email: yitong.zuo@univ-amu.fr

Contributions

- **Bilingualism modulates the relationship between spelling skills, grade and handwriting kinematics**

Á

Álvarez-Moreno, Carmen

Institution: Universidad de León

Country: Spain

Email: malvam@unileon.es

Contributions

- **Effective Revision in Upper-Primary Writing: Strategy Use and Text Quality**
- **The Emergence of Orthographic Revision in Early Writing**

Ö

Özturan, Tuba

Institution: Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University

Country: Türkiye

Email: tbozturan@gmail.com

Contributions

- **Does hybrid feedback foster L2 writing development?**