

Tracing spontaneous spatial text-learning strategies in late elementary education: comparing trace data, digital writing pen data and eye tracking data dr. Emmelien Merchie & Prof dr. Hilde Van Keer Emmelien.Merchie@UGent.be - (+32) 9 331 03 17

Introduction

Spontaneous spatial text-learning strategies are associated with better learning outcomes (Fiorella & Mayer, 2017).

- Less is known about this strategy use in late **elementary education** \Leftrightarrow increasing academic demands for independent text study \bullet (Duchesne, Ratelle & Roy, 2011).
- How can we capture these strategies in detail at this age?

 \implies The present study compares **three different methodologies** to investigate these strategies in fifth and sixth grade.



STUDY 2:



Offline trace data

Online trace data



644 students from 17 classes



Students studied a 500-word informative text. They were allowed to use scratch paper.



Scratch papers were analyzed with a detailed scoring rubric (e.g., scoring structure, color use, integrating key words, content etc.).







 \triangleright

Students schematized a 300word informative text with a Livescribe[®] digital writing pen.

Pencast analyses (e.g., writing periods, elaboration approaches, construction steps)

Eye tracking data



44 students from 4 classes



Students studied a digital mind map of an informative text. The SR Eyelink Portable duo[®] was used for eyetracking.



Area of interest (AOI) and scan path analyses (ongoing).

- Straightforward data gathering
- Permits assigning overall quality scores of (spatial) text-learning strategy use

ADVANTAGES

- Uncovers (meta-)cognitive strategies such as planful approach and evaluating
- Applicable during regular classroom tasks
- Uncovers (meta-)cognitive strategies such as planful approach, rereading, monitoring
- Collecting \neq processing measures (e.g., what they looked at, how long, sequences, etc..).

CONCERNS		
 Some (meta-)cognitive strategies are not revealed (e.g., planful approach, monitoring, reviewing) 	 Interpretation of students' strategic actions during pre- and post writing Technical errors = data loss 	 Expensive technology Students cannot interact with the material Brief materials studied for a short period
CONCLUSION & IMPLICATIONS for research and practice		QUESTIONS
 Time and labor intensive though promising methodologies Substantiate measures with concurrent think aloud or retrospective interviews Possible correlations with self-report measures? 		 Suggestions for the efficient analysis of eye tracking data?

- Promising for (online) modeling explicit strategy instruction by means of pencasts or EMME (eye movement modeling examples).
- (How) can we attune tasks and measures to study multiple document literacy?



MORE INFORMATION

Study 3: manuscript in preparation.

FACULTY OF PSYCHOLOGY



STUDY 1



STUDY 2





