

1 The development of handwriting speed and its relationship with graphic speed and spelling

2 Olivia Afonso^{a*}, Cristina Martínez-García^b, Fernando Cuetos^b, and Paz Suárez-Coalla^b,

3 ^aDepartment of Psychology, Health, & Professional Development, Faculty of
4 Health & Life Sciences, Oxford Brookes University, Gypsy Lane, OX3 0BP, Headington,
5 Oxfordshire, United Kingdom

6 ^bDepartment of Psychology, Universidad de Oviedo, Plaza Feijóo, 33003,
7 Oviedo, Spain

8

9 *** Corresponding Author Contact Information**

10 Olivia Afonso

11 Department of Psychology, Health, & Professional Development

12 Oxford Brookes University

13 Gypsy Lane OX3 0BP

14 Headington, Oxfordshire, United Kingdom

15 afonso.o@brookes.ac.uk

16

17 **Acknowledgments**

18 This study was funded by grant PSI2015-64174P from the Ministry of Economy and
19 Competitiveness, Spanish Government to Fernando Cuetos and Paz Suárez-Coalla;
20 Santander Research scholarship scheme awarded by Oxford Brookes University to fund
21 international collaborations to Olivia Afonso, and Santander Research scholarship
22 scheme awarded by University of Oviedo to support international collaborations to Paz
23 Suárez-Coalla.

24 **Declarations of interest**

25 None to declare.

26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Abstract

The present study addresses how handwriting speed increases with age among Spanish 8-, 10- and 12-year-old children ($n = 60$), and how this progression is related to spelling and more general graphic skills. Handwriting speed was measured in a spelling-to-dictation and a copying task, and graphic speed was measured in a trail tracing task. Results revealed that handwriting speed significantly increased from age 8 to 10 and remained stable up to 12 years of age, while graphic speed substantially increased only between 10 and 12 years of age. Thus, handwriting speed and graphic speed do not seem to follow the same pattern of development. Moreover, the relationship between linguistic processes and graphic skills with handwriting speed was not the same for all the groups. In the younger group, a different speed profile was obtained for each task, while in the groups of 10- and 12-year-olds, speed was similar in all the linguistic tasks. Graphic speed was positively correlated with speed in the spelling task only around the age of 10, and by age of 12 graphic speed correlated negatively when handwriting neatness was prioritized. Altogether, these results show that handwriting speed becomes consistent around the age of 10, when it is mostly affected by spelling ability and, in some circumstances, by graphic speed. By the age of 12, speed in linguistic tasks becomes decoupled from graphic speed and it is adapted depending on the relative importance of neatness and speed for the task.

Keywords: handwriting speed; spelling; graphic skills; handwriting development.

1 From primary school to higher education, students are expected to progress to be
2 able to quickly produce written language. Particularly from secondary school, slow
3 writers may struggle to record all relevant information during note taking or produce
4 shorter texts than their peers in timed conditions such as exams (Connelly, Dockrell, &
5 Barnett, 2005). Moreover, handwriting speed seems to affect not only the amount of
6 text produced, but also its quality (Connelly et al., 2005; Connelly, Dockrell, Walter, &
7 Critten, 2012; Graham, Berninger, Abbott, & Whitaker, 1997; Limpo, Alves, &
8 Connelly, 2017; Puranik & Al Otaiba, 2012). This is thought to be especially true in the
9 case of young children who have not yet automatized handwriting. For these children,
10 the motors aspects of handwriting still exert considerable demands on working memory,
11 leaving limited resources available to be devoted to higher-order levels of processing
12 (Cameron, Cottone, Murrah, & Grissmer, 2016), such as planning or idea generation
13 (Berninger & Amtmann, 2003). Thus, understanding how handwriting speed increases
14 with age and the factors contributing to its development is of key importance to support
15 the enhancement of writing skills in students of all ages.

16 One of the main difficulties in investigating the development of handwriting
17 speed resides in the multidimensional nature of handwriting, which requires the
18 integration of multiple cognitive and motor processes. Handwriting is a language skill,
19 in part reliant on the acquisition and fast retrieval of accurate orthographic information.
20 At the same time, it is a perceptual-motor ability, requiring the execution of precise
21 hand-movements guided by the visual input provided by the produced letter shapes. In
22 this sense, some of the abilities required to develop handwriting are shared with
23 linguistic tasks such as reading (e.g., letter-sound knowledge), and some abilities are
24 shared with other graphomotor skills without a linguistic component (e.g., painting and
25 drawing; henceforth, graphic skills). This means that improvements in handwriting

1 speed are likely to be linked not solely to the amount of handwriting practice, but also to
2 the level of development of other abilities such as spelling or fine motor skills.
3 Moreover, the integration of these different processes imposes considerable cognitive
4 demands, especially before handwriting automaticity has been achieved and motor
5 execution still requires considerable attentional resources (Cameron et al., 2016). In the
6 present cross-sectional study, we explore the progression of handwriting speed between
7 8 to 12 years of age and the relationship between this evolution and the development of
8 other relevant skills, namely spelling and graphic speed.

9 The existence of a close relationship between handwriting and spelling is
10 explicitly recognized by the most influential models of handwriting (Kandel, Peereman,
11 Grosjacques, & Fayol, 2011; Van Galen, 1991). Effects of spelling processes on the
12 duration of handwriting movements have been reported in children as young as 5 years
13 old (Fears & Lockman, 2018; Maldarelli, Kahrs, Hunt, & Lockman, 2015) and in adults
14 beyond the age of 70 (Afonso, Álvarez, Martínez, & Cuetos, 2019). Spelling itself is a
15 complex skill, including knowledge of the phonology-to-orthography conversion rules
16 accepted in the language (referred to as the sublexical route) as well as the ability to
17 store and retrieve from long-term memory whole-word orthographic representations
18 (the lexical route). Recent experimental evidence has revealed that both spelling routes
19 affect not only the ability to access or generate the orthographic form, but also the
20 dynamics of the unfolding of the handwritten response (Afonso, Álvarez, & Kandel,
21 2015; Afonso, Suárez-Coalla, & Cuetos, 2015; 2020; Afonso, Suárez-Coalla, González-
22 Martín, & Cuetos, 2018; Delattre, Bonin, & Barry, 2006; Kandel & Perret, 2015;
23 Lambert, Alamargot, Larocque, & Caporossi, 2011; Roux, McKeeff, Grosjacques,
24 Afonso, & Kandel, 2013; Sumner, Connelly, & Barnett, 2013; 2014). However, some

1 evidence suggests that the impact of spelling on the mechanical aspects of handwriting
2 may change throughout development.

3 Among the most studied sublexical variables, phonology-to-orthography
4 consistency has been reported to affect writing durations in a group of 8-year-old
5 Spanish children, but not in 10- or 12-year-olds (Suárez-Coalla, González-Martín, &
6 Cuetos, 2018). The effect of word length on writing durations has also been observed to
7 be stronger for 8-year-old than for 10-year-old children (Afonso et al., 2020). The
8 impact of lexical variables on handwriting has also been reported to reduce throughout
9 development. Afonso et al. (2018) reported that 8-year-old children produced the same
10 sequence faster when it appeared in a high-frequency than in a low-frequency word. The
11 effect was only marginally significant by the age of 10 and it was completely absent in a
12 group of 12-year-olds. These authors proposed that spelling might reduce its impact on
13 writing durations after the age of 10, once handwriting has become automatic. In line
14 with the idea that a high degree of handwriting automaticity is achieved around this age,
15 handwriting speed has been seen to increase from 8 to 10 years of age (Afonso et al.,
16 2015; Afonso et al., 2020, González-Martín, Suárez-Coalla, Afonso, & Cuetos, 2017;
17 Suárez-Coalla et al., 2018; Séraphin Thibon, Gerber, & Kandel, 2018) and to remain
18 constant (Afonso et al., 2018; González-Martín et al., 2017; Pontart, Bidet-Ildei,
19 Lambert, Morisset, Flouret, & Alamargot, 2013) or to reduce its increment (Graham,
20 Weintraub, Berninger, & Schafer (1998) in older age groups. Although increases in
21 handwriting speed have been reported after the age of 10 (Alves & Limpo, 2015;
22 Chartrel & Vinter, 2006), it seems that around this point in development handwriting
23 becomes an autonomous skill, relatively independent of spelling ability (Bosga-Stork,
24 Bosga, Ellis, & Meulenbroek, 2016; Palmis, Danna, Velay, & Longcamp, 2017).

1 It is worth noting that the evidence summarized here has been obtained in
2 languages with a variable degree of orthographic transparency. Spanish is a language
3 with relatively consistent relations between phonemes and graphemes, while the French
4 orthography is, in comparison, rather opaque. It seems that the effects of both lexical
5 and sublexical variables on handwriting movements can be observed even in languages
6 in which the high reliability of the sublexical route it is assumed to minimize the use
7 that writers make of lexical spelling procedures (Jiménez & Muñetón-Ayala, 2002).

8 Comparatively less is known about the relationship that handwriting speed has
9 with other graphomotor skills. It seems reasonable to assume that handwriting and
10 graphic skills (such as painting, tracing or drawing) will affect each other throughout
11 development, if only because they partially draw upon a similar set of abilities such as
12 fine motor skills. Fine motor skills are known to contribute to handwriting skill
13 (Hamstra-Bletz & Blöte, 1993; Tseng & Chow, 2000), and handwriting difficulties
14 including poor legibility and increased writing times (Barnett, Henderson, Scheib, &
15 Schulz, 2011; Prunty, Barnett, Wilmut, & Plumb, 2013; 2014), are frequent in children
16 with Developmental Coordination Disorder. It is thus widely accepted by researchers
17 and teachers that activities such as drawing, coloring or copying shapes are valuable in
18 order to develop prerequisite skills for handwriting such as the ability to manipulate
19 tools or basic stroke formation (Khalid, Yunus & Adnan, 2010). In line with this idea,
20 common strategies are used in drawing and handwriting in children 6-7 years old
21 (Tabatabaey-Mashadi, Sudirman, Khalid, & Lange-Küttner, 2015), and handwriting and
22 drawing skills seem to be related in this age group (Khalid et al., 2010) and in older
23 children (Bonoti, Vlachos, & Metallidou, 2005).

24 Moreover, drawing symbols has been reported to have some of the beneficial
25 effects that have been associated with handwriting (Longcamp, Zerbato-Poudou, &

1 Velay, 2005). A body of behavioral and neuroscientific evidence suggests that from 4 to
2 6 years of age handwriting experience contributes to the ability to link visual processing
3 and motor processes (James, 2010; 2017; James & Engelhardt, 2012; Vinci-Booher,
4 James, & James, 2016), which would have a positive impact on reading development.
5 Interestingly, it seems that visual-motor practice with any symbol (such as shapes or
6 digits) may improve letter recognition (Zemlock, Vinci-Booher, & James, 2018) and
7 increase handwriting speed (Vinter & Chartrel, 2010). This evidence has been
8 interpreted to indicate that the production of other symbols leads to changes in the
9 ability to integrate information from the visual and the motor systems similar to those
10 associated to letter production. Thus, producing letters by hand and producing other
11 graphic elements seem to share at least some underlying processes.

12 However, other findings suggest that handwriting speed may develop relatively
13 independently from other hand skills, including graphic skills. Although differences
14 were found in manual dexterity between a group of children with DCD and a group of
15 children with dysgraphia, these were not associated to differences in handwriting speed
16 (Prunty & Barnett, 2017). Several studies indicate that, although related, drawing
17 practice and handwriting practice are not completely interchangeable. Limpo, Vigário,
18 Rocha, and Graham (2020) recently reported that a transcription intervention improved
19 handwriting fluency more than a drawing intervention in a group of children between 8-
20 9 years of age. Reybroek & Michiels (2018) found that handwriting fluency but not the
21 ability to draw loops and lines improved after a brief finger-writing treatment in a small
22 group of children with Developmental Language Disorder. Adi-Japha and Freeman
23 (2001) reported similarities between writing and drawing fluency until the age of 6, but
24 kinematic differences between tasks were apparent from the age of 9. Thus, the
25 relationship between handwriting and other motor skills might be restricted to specific

1 tasks or might not be consistent throughout the development (Thomassen & Teulings,
2 1983).

3 In a study conducted with French children attending Grade 2 (around 8 years of
4 age) and Grade 9 (around 15 years of age), Pontart et al. (2013) obtained evidence that
5 suggests that the relevance for handwriting speed may shift from basic graphomotor
6 skills to spelling knowledge at some point of development. In their study, children
7 performed a spelling task, an alphabet writing task and a name writing task.

8 Handwriting durations produced in name writing (a task assumed to assess low-level
9 graphomotor skills) were correlated with handwriting durations in the spelling task in
10 primary school children, but not in secondary school children. It was concluded that in
11 the older group handwriting durations were mainly related to spelling processes, while
12 in the younger group they were affected by both graphomotor constraints and reduced
13 orthographic knowledge. Pontart et al. suggested that this change in the importance of
14 graphomotor skills could be related to the automatization of handwriting. However, it is
15 worth noting that in this study, when pen movement speed (instead of writing durations)
16 was considered, a significant correlation between name writing and the spelling task
17 was found also in secondary school pupils. Pauses during handwriting have been
18 proposed to be greatly affected by linguistic processes (Afonso & Álvarez, 2019), so
19 pen movement speed might be a more appropriate measure to investigate the
20 relationship between graphic skills and handwriting speed than total writing durations.

21 In sum, it is still unclear to what extent changes in handwriting speed are
22 associated to changes in graphic speed. It also remains to be seen if the importance of
23 graphic skills for handwriting reduces to the benefit of spelling ability or if handwriting,
24 once automatized, becomes relatively independent of other systems, including spelling
25 and more general motor processes.

1

2 The present study

3 In this study, we assessed how handwriting speed evolves among a sample of
4 Spanish children, aged 8, 10 and 12 years, and explored whether this evolution is related
5 to changes in the influence of spelling processes and/or graphic speed. To investigate
6 this issue, pen movement speed was measured in a spelling-to-dictation task, a copying
7 tasks and a trail tracing task. The trail tracing task used here was introduced in a recent
8 study exploring the relationship between handwriting speed and graphic motor skills in
9 children with dyslexia (Martínez-García, Afonso, Cuetos, & Suárez-Coalla, 2020). In
10 this previous study, children with dyslexia were slower than their peers of the same
11 chronological age in this task, but equally fast than younger children with the same level
12 of reading and spelling ability. Thus, this task seems to be suitable to detect
13 developmental differences in graphic speed. The impact of both the lexical and the
14 sublexical spelling routes on handwriting speed was assessed by manipulating,
15 respectively, the lexicality (words, pseudowords) and the length of stimuli included in a
16 spelling-to-dictation task. Although these variables are known to affect spelling
17 processes (Henry, Beeson, Stark, & Rapcsak, 2007; Juul & Petersen, 2017), evidence
18 for their influence on kinematic measures of handwriting is more reduced than that
19 obtained for other psycholinguistic variables such as word frequency or phonology-to-
20 orthography regularity. Based on previous evidence suggesting that sublexical variables
21 affect handwriting movements more consistently than lexical variables (Afonso et al.,
22 2018), we expect to find significant effects of word length on handwriting speed in this
23 task, but it is less clear if lexicality will affect writing durations.

24 The sentence copying task and the trail tracing task (Martínez-García, et al.,
25 2020) do not require the retrieval or generation of orthographic forms, so these tasks

1 should provide measures of speed relatively unaffected by spelling knowledge.
2 However, sentence copying, as the spelling-to-dictation task, demands the efficient
3 retrieval and execution of letter shapes. This linguistic component is absent in the trail
4 tracing task. If changes in handwriting speed in the dictation task are mainly related to
5 the influence of spelling ability, speed in the copying tasks might follow a different
6 pattern of development. By comparing the evolution of handwriting speed in the
7 copying task and graphic speed in the trail tracing task we expected to determine the
8 extent to which handwriting and graphic skills are related between 8-12 years of age. If
9 there are developmental changes in the strength of the association between handwriting
10 speed, spelling ability and graphic skills in this age range, correlations between pen
11 speed among the different tasks should not be the same for the three groups. Namely,
12 based on the limited evidence on this issue (Pontart et al., 2013), we expected graphic
13 speed to be more related to handwriting speed in the younger groups (Age 8 and Age 10
14 group) than in the older group (Age 12).

15

16

Method

17 Participants

18 Sixty children (30 boys and 30 girls) were recruited from two primary schools in
19 Asturias, Spain, to take part in the study. Twenty children were around 8 years old (M_{age}
20 = 8;3, SD = 3 months), twenty were around 10 years old (M_{age} = 9;9, SD = 3 months)
21 and twenty were around 12 years old (M_{age} = 11;9, SD = 3 months). In each age group,
22 half of the children were boys and half were girls. The children 8-, 10-, and 12 years old
23 attended Grade 2, Grade 4 and Grade 6, respectively. All were native Spanish speakers
24 and attended schools located in areas of middle socio-economic status. All the

1 participants had normal or corrected-to-normal vision and they did not have any known
 2 cognitive or motor impairment.

3

4 **Materials and apparatus**

5 For all the responses, the software Ductus (Guinet & Kandel, 2010) controlled
 6 stimuli presentation and digital recording of the handwritten responses. The three tasks
 7 were run on a HP Mini laptop. Participants were asked to perform each task with an
 8 Intuos Inking Pen on a piece of paper stuck to a WACOM Intuos 5 graphic tablet
 9 connected to the laptop.

10

11 **Spelling-to-dictation task.** A total of 48 stimuli, 24 words and 24 pseudowords,
 12 were selected to be included in the spelling-to-dictation task. For both words and
 13 pseudowords, half of the stimuli were short (two syllables, four letters) and half were
 14 long (3 syllables, 6-7 letters). Across short and long words, word frequency according
 15 to the values provided by ONESC (Martínez & García, 2008) was controlled (for short
 16 words, $M = 131.96$ and $SD = 72.54$; for long words, $M = 134.37$ and $SD = 88.95$).
 17 Pseudowords were created by swapping the first syllable of two experimental words of
 18 the same length¹. For example, the pseudowords '*destaña*' and '*montino*' were created
 19 based on the target words '*destino*' (destiny) and '*montaña*' (mountain). Thus, the mean
 20 syllable frequency and length (in number of letters and syllables) were controlled across
 21 conditions. The full list of experimental stimuli is given in Appendix A. In addition,
 22 four stimuli (two words and two pseudowords) were used to serve as practice. Auditory

¹ In one pair of words (*manzana* – *sistema*), the two first syllables were swapped to create the pseudowords (*manzama* – *sistena*). This exception did not affect the relevant controls (mean syllable frequency and length).

1 stimuli for words and pseudowords were recorded by a female speaker using an H4n
2 voice recorder with a microphone Ht2-P Audix and edited with Praat software.

3

4 **Sentence copying task.** A sentence including all the letters of the Spanish
5 alphabet was selected to be copied in both versions (copy fast and copy best) of the
6 task: *El niño exclama de alegría viendo al fabuloso periquito comer jugosos kiwis y*
7 *zanahorias (The boy exclaims with joy watching how the fabulous parakeet eats juicy*
8 *kiwis and carrots).*

9

10 **Trail tracing task.** Three different trail patterns (wave, loop and zigzag) were
11 used in this task (Martínez-García et al., 2020). Two line-drawing pictures were placed
12 at either end of each trail so they could be connected by drawing a continuous line
13 within the trail boundaries, which were 1 centimeter apart (see Appendix B).

14

15 **Procedure**

16 The study design and procedure were approved by the Ethics Committee for
17 Research of the Principality of Asturias, Spain. It was developed in accordance with the
18 Declaration of Helsinki and the Spanish Law of Personal Data Protection (15/1999 and
19 3/2018) principles, and the data collection was covered by a written informed parental
20 consent, obtained for all participants.

21 Children were tested individually in a quiet room at their school. All the
22 participants performed the three tasks in the same order: spelling-to-dictation task, the
23 tracing task and the sentence copying task. A whole experimental session lasted around
24 30 minutes.

25

1 **Spelling-to-dictation task.** In the spelling-to-dictation task, words and
2 pseudowords were presented in different blocks via headphones. Half of the participants
3 in each group started with the block of words and half started with the block of
4 pseudowords. To counteract potential effects of the order in which stimuli were
5 presented, four different lists per block were created. Children were asked to write each
6 stimulus in lower case as quickly and accurately as possible on a different line on a
7 lined sheet of paper placed over the digitizing tablet. Each trial started with the
8 presentation of an auditory signal and a fixation point that remained on the screen for
9 500 milliseconds followed by the auditory presentation of the to-be-written stimulus.
10 During the practice, children were instructed to hover the pen above the following line
11 (i.e., the line placed just below their previous response). Then, the experimenter clicked
12 on the left button of the mouse to present a new stimulus.

13

14 **Sentence copying task.** In this task, participants copied twice a sentence
15 presented on a piece of paper situated above the right upper end of the tablet. Half of the
16 participants of each group performed first the copy best task, while the other half
17 performed the copy fast task first. Before starting each copy, the experimenter read the
18 sentence aloud. In the copy best task, participants were instructed to copy the sentence
19 in their best handwriting. In the copy fast task, they were asked to write as quickly as
20 possible and accurately, but without worrying about the neatness of the handwriting.

21

22 **Trail tracing task.** The trails were printed on a sheet of paper and stuck on top
23 of the digitizing tablet. Each child was instructed to follow each path with the pencil so
24 as to join the two pictures presented at both ends of it. They were asked to do this as
25 quickly as possible, without lifting the pen or pausing and without touching the

1 boundaries of the path with the pencil. Recording of the response started as soon as the
2 auditory signal was presented. Cronbach's alpha coefficient across the three trails was
3 .83 (Martínez et al., 2020).

4

5 **Statistical analysis**

6 Analyses were conducted using R software (RStudio Team, 2015). For the
7 analysis of accuracy in the spelling task, generalized mixed-effect model with a
8 binomial distribution were used. A measure of pen movement speed (measured as the
9 distance advanced by the pen divided by the time spent, expressed in cm/sec) was
10 obtained for the spelling task, the sentence copying tasks, and the graphic task. In the
11 spelling task, writing latencies (the time between the onset of the stimulus and the first
12 contact of the pen with the digitizer) and accuracy were also analyzed. For kinematic
13 measures obtained in the spelling and the copying tasks, ANOVAs were performed with
14 mixed-effects analyses (Baayen, 2008). For each measure, stepwise model comparisons
15 were conducted, and the one with the most complex adjustment but the lowest Bayesian
16 information criterion (BIC) and significant χ^2 test for the log-likelihood was retained
17 (Schwarz, 1978). F values from the ANOVAs of type III, with Satterthwaite
18 approximation for degrees of freedom, are reported for fixed-effects and interactions. In
19 the spelling task, ANOVAs on writing latencies and writing speed were performed with
20 random intercepts for items and by-participants random slopes for the effect of
21 lexicality, and age group (Age 8, Age 10, and Age 12), lexicality (words and
22 pseudowords), and length (short and long) were fixed factors. Only correct responses
23 were included in the analyses conducted on kinematic measures, so responses with
24 misspellings, self-corrections or missing data were removed from these analyses (4.5%).
25 For the sentence copying task, participants were introduced as a random-effect variable

1 and age group and the type of task (copy fast and copy best) were fixed factors. For the
 2 graphic task, an ANOVA was conducted with age group and sex as between-subjects
 3 variables. For all the ANOVAs, if the main effect of age group or any of the interactions
 4 were significant, t-tests were performed, and the p-values were adjusted via the *Tukey*
 5 method. A p-value below .05 was adopted as a level of significance.

6 To further explore if the relationship between handwriting speed (as measured in
 7 in the spelling and the copying tasks) and graphic speed (as measured in the trail tracing
 8 task) changes throughout development, Pearson correlation coefficients among the
 9 measures of speed obtained in the different tasks were calculated separately for each age
 10 group.

11

12

Results

Spelling task

14 **Accuracy analysis.** A total of 134 errors were made in this task (49 in the Age 8
 15 group, 43 in the Age 10 group, and 42 in the Age 12 group), which represents 4.5 % of
 16 all the responses. Across lexicality conditions, the errors were distributed as follows: 23
 17 (.84 %) were made in words and 111 (4.06%) occurred in pseudowords. Across length
 18 conditions, 55 errors (2.01%) occurred in short stimuli and 79 (2.89%) occurred in long
 19 words. The analysis showed a significant effect of lexicality ($p < .001$; $Estimate^2 =$
 20 1.83, $SE = 0.430$; $OR = 0.16$, $CI = .07-.37$), with fewer errors made in words than in
 21 pseudowords. The effects of length and age group were not significant, $ts < 1$.

22

² The estimates indicate differences in mean between groups or conditions compared in each contrast.

1 **Writing latencies.** Latencies referred to the time between the onset of the
 2 stimulus and the first contact of the pen with the digitizer and were measure in
 3 milliseconds. Means and standard deviations for writing latencies in each condition for
 4 each group are shown in Table 1. Means revealed that writing latencies decreased with
 5 age. They also showed that words were initiated faster than pseudowords and that short
 6 stimuli were initiated faster than long stimuli. Using the linear mixed-effects model fit
 7 by REML, we found that the best model (or lowest BIC) was: latencies ~ age group *
 8 lexicality * length + (1|lexicality|participant) + (1|item), $\chi^2(1) = 82.38, p < .001$. The
 9 main effect of age group was significant, $F(2, 57.02) = 12.05, p < 0.001$. Pairwise
 10 comparisons were significant between Age 8 and Age 10, $t(57) = 3.02, p = .010$,
 11 *Estimate* = 285, *SE* = 94.4, between Age 8 and Age 12, $t(57) = 4.86, p < .001$, *Estimate*
 12 = 459, *SE* = 94.4, but not between Age 10 and Age 12, $t(57) = 1.84, p = .165$, *Estimate*
 13 = 174, *SE* = 94.4. The lexicality effect, $F(1, 76.26) = 16.10, p < .001$, *Estimate* = 137,
 14 *SE* = 34.1, and the effect of length, $F(1, 43.48) = 5.52, p = .023$, *Estimate* = 59.2, *SE* =
 15 25.2, were also significant. No other effects reached significance.

16
 17 **Table 1.** Mean writing latencies (in ms) and standard deviations (in parentheses) in the
 18 spelling-to-dictation task for each type of stimuli and for each age group.

Lexicality	Length	Age 8	Age 10	Age 12
Words	Short	1445 (552)	1213 (383)	1018 (279)
	Long	1547 (634)	1214 (324)	1062 (289)
Pseudowords	Short	1575 (565)	1306 (428)	1147 (317)

	1686	1383	1183
Long	(628)	(478)	(372)

1

2 **Writing speed.** In this task, writing speed was measured as the distance
3 advanced by the pen divided by the time spent in each word, expressed in cm/sec.
4 Means and standard deviations for writing speed for each condition and group, as
5 shown in Table 2, suggest that writing speed increased mainly between Age 8 and Age
6 10, but it was very similar for Age 10 and Age 12. The best model (or lowest BIC) was:
7 speed ~ age group * lexicality * length + (1+lexicality|participant) + (1|item), ($\chi^2(1) =$
8 544.22, $p < .001$). The effect of age group was significant, $F(2, 56.97) = 7.15$; $p = .002$.
9 Children in Age 8 showed slower writing speed than children in Age 10, $t(57) = 3.47$, p
10 $= .003$, *Estimate* = .76, *SE* = .22, and Age 12, $t(57) = 3.03$, $p = .010$, *Estimate* = .66, *SE*
11 $= .22$. There was not a significant difference between the Age 10 and Age 12 groups,
12 $t(57) = 0.44$, $p = .898$, *Estimate* = .10, *SE* = .22. No other effect was significant, but the
13 interaction between word length and age group approached significance, $F(2, 2565.86)$
14 $= 2.96$, $p = .052$. Pairwise comparisons conducted to explore this trend showed that
15 differences in speed observed in long stimuli between Age 8 and Age 10, $t(58.2) = 3.70$,
16 $p = .006$, *Estimate* = .81, *SE* = .22, and Age 8 and Age 12, $t(58.2) = 3.17$, $p = .028$,
17 *Estimate* = .70, *SE* = .22, were larger than differences obtained in short stimuli between
18 Age 8 and Age 10, $t(58.1) = 3.21$, $p = .006$, *Estimate* = .71, *SE* = .22, and between Age
19 8 and Age 12, $t(58.2) = 2.87$, $p = .061$, *Estimate* = .63, *SE* = .22.

20

21 **Table 2.** Mean writing speed (in cm/sec) and standard deviations (in parentheses) in
22 the spelling-to-dictation task of each type of stimuli and for each age group.

Lexicality	Length	Age 8	Age 10	Age 12
------------	--------	-------	--------	--------

Words	Short	2.71 (.63)	3.43 (1.14)	3.38 (.71)
	Long	2.68 (.57)	3.47 (1.11)	3.38 (.68)
Pseudowords	Short	2.65 (.55)	3.32 (1.08)	3.31 (.77)
	Long	2.55 (.47)	3.43 (1.05)	3.28 (.72)

1

2 **Sentence copying task**

3 **Writing speed.** In the copying task, writing speed was measured as the distance
4 advanced by the pen divided by the time spent in each sentence, expressed in cm/sec.

5 Means and standard deviations for writing speed in each type of task and group are
6 shown in Table 3, revealing again an increase between Age 8 and 10 and a stabilization
7 in Age 12. The best model (or lowest BIC) was: speed ~ age group * task +

8 (1|participant), ($\chi^2(1) = 31.60, p < .001$). The main effect of age group was significant,
9 $F(2, 56.85) = 11.66; p < .001$. Pairwise comparisons confirmed slower writing speed in

10 the Age 8 group than in the Age 10 group, $t(57.1) = 4.33, p < .001, Estimate = .857, SE$
11 $= .20$, and the Age 12 group, $t(56.7) = 4.01, p < .001, Estimate = .79, SE = .20$. The

12 difference in speed between Age 10 ad Age 12 was not significant, $t(57.1) = .33, p =$
13 $.940, Estimate = .066, SE = .20$. The effect of the type of copy task was also significant,

14 $F(1, 94.24) = 45.76; p < .001, Estimate = .821, SE = .07$, with speed being higher in
15 copy fast than in copy best.

16

17 **Table 3.** Mean writing speed (in cm/sec) and standard deviations (in parentheses) in
18 the sentence copying task for each type of task and each age group.

Task	Age 8	Age 10	Age 12
Copy best	1.95	2.81	2.72
	(.46)	(.78)	(.66)
Copy fast	2.76	3.58	3.57
	(.49)	(.90)	(.74)

1

2 **Trail tracing task**

3 **Writing speed.** In the tracing task, writing speed was determined by measuring
 4 the distance advanced by the pen divided by the time spent in each trail (expressed in
 5 cm/sec). Separate ANOVAs were conducted for each tracing pattern (waves, loops and
 6 zigzag). The three ANOVAs showed the same pattern of results. Thus, only the results
 7 of analysis conducted on the average speed obtained across the three trails are discussed
 8 here. Means and standard deviations for speed in each group are shown in Table 4. We
 9 found a significant effect of age group, $F(2, 54) = 15.12; p < .001, MSE = 26.20; \eta_p^2 =$
 10 $.36$. Children in the Age 12 group were faster than children in Age 8, $t(19) = 4.96, p <$
 11 $.001$, and Age 10, $t(19) = 4.33, p < .001$. Speed was not significantly different between
 12 the Age 8 and Age 10 groups in this task, $t < 2$. The effect of sex was not significant.

13

14 **Table 4.** Mean writing speed (in cm/sec) and standard deviations (in parentheses) in
 15 the trail tracing task for each grade.

Age 8	Age 10	Age 12
3.13	3.61	5.31
(1.09)	(1.02)	(1.75)

16

17

1 **Correlations among measures of writing speed**

2 Correlation coefficients among the pen movement speed measured in the
 3 different tasks for the Age 8 group are shown in Table 5. For these children, the only
 4 significant correlation was between the copy best and the copy fast tasks. For the Age
 5 10 group (see Table 6), writing speed in the spelling task was strongly and positively
 6 correlated with speed in both the copy best and the copy fast tasks, and moderately and
 7 positively correlated with speed in the graphic task. There was also a significant strong,
 8 positive correlation between both copying tasks. For the Age 12 group (see Table 7), the
 9 speed in the spelling task was strongly and positively correlated with speed in the copy
 10 fast task, and moderately and positively correlated with speed in the copy best task.
 11 Speed in the copy best task was moderately and negatively correlated with speed in the
 12 graphic task. No other correlation reached significance.

13
 14 **Table 5.** *Pearson correlations among speed in writing tasks for Age 8.*

Tasks	1.	2.	3.	4.
1. Spelling	—			
2. Copy fast	.39	—		
3. Copy best	.25	.62**	—	
4. Trails	.20	.19	.09	—

15 *Note.* * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

16
 17 **Table 6.** *Pearson correlations among speed in writing tasks for Age 10.*

Tasks	1.	2.	3.	4.
1. Spelling	—			
2. Copy fast	.88***	—		
3. Copy best	.84***	.86***	—	

4. Trails	.51*	.41	.42	—
-----------	------	-----	-----	---

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 7. Pearson correlations among speed in writing tasks for Age 12.

Tasks	1.	2.	3.	4.
1. Spelling	—			
2. Copy fast	.75***	—		
3. Copy best	.52*	.38	—	
4. Trails	.37	-.37	-.63**	—

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Comparisons of the correlations found to be significant in more than one age group were calculated to establish if the strength of the correlations in speed across the different tasks was similar across groups. The positive correlation between the copy best and the copy task in Age 8 and Age 10 was significantly stronger in the older group, $Z = 1.66, p = .049$. The correlation between the speed in the spelling task and the copy best task was significantly stronger in Age 10 than in Age 12, $Z = 1.88, p = .030$. However, the correlations between the spelling task and the copy fast task in the two older age groups were not statistically different, $Z = 1.17, p = .120$.

Discussion

In the present study, we investigated if the relationship of handwriting speed with spelling processes and graphic skills changes throughout the course of development. Pen movement speed produced by typically developing Spanish children 8, 10, and 12 years of age was measured in three tasks which varied in their demands on linguistic processes. The spelling-to-dictation task required the explicit retrieval or

1 generation of orthographic representations. The copy fast and the copy best tasks,
2 respectively, also assessed the ability to quickly and accurately retrieve stored motor
3 patterns for letters/graphemes but imposing a lesser burden on the spelling system.
4 Speed in a simple graphic task (without any linguistic component) was measured in a
5 trail tracing task. These sets of tasks allowed to obtain valuable information about the
6 development of spelling, handwriting speed and graphic speed and the evolution of the
7 interrelation between these skills between 8-12 years of age.

8

9 **Development of spelling ability and its influence on handwriting speed**

10 Results obtained in the spelling task revealed that 8-year-old children initiated
11 and produced the written response more slowly than 10- and 12-year-old, which did not
12 differ from each other. However, all children displayed similar levels of spelling
13 accuracy. Altogether, this pattern of results seems to suggest that differences between
14 second age groups and older children are linked to the ability to quickly start and
15 execute the hand movements associated with writing, rather than to the ability to
16 generate a correct orthographic form for the stimuli. This is in line with the fact that
17 both lexicality and length affected latencies to a similar extent in the three age groups.
18 Thus, participants seem to have used both lexical and sublexical spelling procedures to
19 solve the task and, importantly, this was made in a similar fashion regardless of age.
20 Interestingly, neither lexicality nor length affected writing speed. Thus, these variables
21 do not seem to have a substantial impact on motor processes.

22 The absence of a lexicality effect coincides with previous observations
23 suggesting that effects associated to the use of the lexical route on handwriting
24 movements are limited, at least from the age of 9 or 10 (Afonso et al., 2018). Previous
25 studies have reported significant effects on total writing durations of word frequency

1 (Afonso et al., 2018) and word length (Afonso, Suárez-Coalla, et al., 2015) in 8-year-
2 old children and in adults, and of lexicality in adults (Roux et al., 2013). However,
3 lexicality does not seem to affect durations when only on-paper handwriting speed
4 (excluding pauses) are considered. It has been recently suggested that spelling processes
5 affect writing durations not by directly affecting handwriting movements, but by
6 increasing the duration of pauses (either between- or within-letter) between movement
7 periods (Afonso & Álvarez, 2019). Thus, rather than occurring simultaneously, spelling
8 and writing motor processes could alternate during production, at least in some
9 circumstances (Olive, 2014). This would explain the pattern of results obtained in
10 different studies, but more research needs to be conducted in order to clarify how
11 linguistic and motor processes affect each other during writing. Further research should
12 also clarify whether the substantial transparency of the relationship between phonemes
13 and graphemes in Spanish might have led to an overreliance on the sublexical route for
14 spelling and a reduction of the impact of lexical variables for children in the age groups
15 tested here. Although lexicality did affect written latencies in our study, this variable
16 might also affect writing durations in languages in which lexical processes have a
17 stronger influence. Systematic crosslinguistic comparisons are needed to elucidate this
18 issue.

19 Writing speed in the sentence copying task showed a similar pattern of
20 development as that observed in the spelling task. Speed increased between age 8 and
21 age 10 and remained stable between 10 and 12 years of age. This pattern replicates
22 previous findings showing that Spanish children substantially increase their handwriting
23 speed between 8 and 10 years of age, which then remains stable at least up to the age of
24 12 (Afonso, et al., 2018). This pattern was present whether children wrote as fast as
25 possible or as neatly as possible.

1

2 Development of graphic speed

3 When graphic abilities aside from letter production were considered, a slightly
4 different pattern of development was observed. Speed did not change between 8 and 10
5 years of age, but it dramatically increased between 10 and 12 years. It is unclear from
6 our results to what extent improvements in graphomotor skills occur earlier than 8 years
7 of age as well. Adi-Japha and Freeman (2001) found that the time that English children
8 required to complete a drawing task decreased between ages 6 and 9, but Meulenbroek
9 and van Galen (1986) did not find velocity to increase between children attending first
10 and second grade in a task similar to that used in the present study. However, findings
11 from the latter study cannot be easily generalized to the population to which children
12 taking part in the present study belong. Children may have more experience nowadays
13 with activities similar to the trail tracing task both at school and at home (e.g., in
14 activity books) than they had 30 years ago. Differences in the amount of practice with
15 this activity might also exist across countries. Thus, it is possible that children in our
16 sample had experienced a period of substantial improvement of their graphic skills
17 before the age of 8. In any case, our findings confirm that a reliable increase in graphic
18 speed exists between 10 and 11 years of age. Thus, graphic speed and handwriting
19 speed do not follow the same pattern of development.

20

**21 Developmental changes in the importance of linguistic and graphic skills for
22 handwriting speed**

23 One of the most interesting findings of the present study is probably that
24 handwriting speed seemed to have a different relationship with spelling processes and
25 graphic skills in each group. For the younger group of children, pen movement speed

1 was only significantly correlated between both versions of the copying task, suggesting
2 that handwriting is not yet automatized in this group and that handwriting speed is
3 strongly dependent on the specific conditions imposed by the task. However, for 10-
4 year-old children, less variability in their performance across different writing tasks was
5 found. This pattern is in line with the interpretation that the stabilization of speed
6 between Age 10 and Age 12 in these tasks reflects the automatization of handwriting.
7 By the age of 10, children were able to maintain a consistent speed profile across
8 handwriting tasks. Interestingly, handwriting speed in the spelling task was also
9 positively correlated with graphic speed at age 10. This may indicate that at this age
10 handwriting draws upon spelling processes, but it also depends on more basic
11 graphomotor skills (Pontart et al. 2013). However, it is important to note that
12 handwriting speed measured in the copy tasks was not correlated with speed in the
13 graphic task. More evidence is necessary to fully understand the significance of this
14 pattern, but it might indicate that children in this age group only resort to a less
15 automatic, more “drawing-like” way of writing when the task imposes significant
16 demands in terms of spelling, such as in the dictation task. With less challenging tasks,
17 such as copying a text, sufficient cognitive resources would be available and the
18 handwriting system would not be affected by other related processes (Cameron et al.,
19 2016).

20 In the Age 12 group, children who were faster in the graphic task took more
21 time to complete the copy best task. This result suggests that graphic skills are
22 becoming increasingly dissociated from handwriting skills. Graphic tasks may be
23 relevant to develop visual-motor integration skills that would be fundamental during
24 early handwriting acquisition (James, 2017). However, once automatized, handwriting
25 speed seems to become uncoupled from more basic graphic skills. This result might be

1 related to the absence of a significant correlation between both copying tasks in this
2 group. It seems that by the age of 12 children do not perform the copy best task in the
3 same way as they do the copy fast task. Although speed in the copy best and the
4 spelling task were still correlated in this group, this correlation was stronger in Age 10.
5 In contrast, the relationship between the copy fast and the spelling-to-dictation task
6 remained similar across both age groups. Thus, there seems to be a change in the way
7 that 12-year-old children perform the copy best task. This result warrants further
8 investigation, but a tentative explanation for this pattern could be that, by this age,
9 children with better graphic skills might be more aware of the trade-off between speed
10 and accuracy in graphomotor tasks, so they might be better at prioritizing neatness over
11 speed when they receive this instruction in the copy best task. The effective use of
12 metacognitive strategies is known enhance writing skills (Cer, 2019), and this might be
13 the case for handwriting ability as well. More evidence is necessary to assess this
14 intriguing possibility.

15

16 **Limitations**

17 It is necessary to call attention to some limitations that may restrict the strength
18 of the conclusions that can be extracted from the present findings. It is also possible that
19 other variables not measured in the present study had a mediating role in the
20 relationship between handwriting speed and graphic and spelling skills. For example, it
21 has been proposed that reading ability could mediate the relationship between
22 handwriting and motor abilities (Berninger, 2009; Julius, Meir, Shechter-Nissim, &
23 Adi-Japha, 2016). A thorough cognitive profile of the children included in this study
24 was not obtained, but children deemed by the teacher to have cognitive, motor or
25 literacy difficulties were not included. In any case, all children attended school in the

1 same region, with instructional practices and attainment criteria being the same in all of
2 them. In fact, all children were recruited from only two different schools, so many
3 attended the same class. Thus, we think that the variability that can be naturally
4 expected in this age range in term of other skills is unlikely to have produced the
5 specific pattern of results reported here.

6 The sample size of this study may be too small to have captured some true
7 differences between groups in some of the tasks. This means that there may be
8 differences in handwriting speed between Age 10 and Age 12, or in graphic speed
9 between Age 8 and Age 10. However, our results confirm that the pattern of
10 development of speed in these two types of tasks is not the same throughout childhood.
11 Even if potential additional differences have not been detected, it is clear from our
12 findings that the most striking increases in speed in the performance of linguistic and
13 non-linguistic graphomotor tasks do not coincide in time. In the same vein, although
14 some correlations could have reached significance with a larger sample size, the
15 changes across groups in the relationship among tasks provide interesting information
16 for future research and instructional practice.

17

18 **Implications**

19 The findings reported here have important implications for the development of
20 cognitive models of handwriting. Although most models assume the multidimensional
21 nature of the skill, little effort has been made to incorporate a developmental perspective
22 to better describe the relationship between the different processes involved (linguistic,
23 motor and attentional). The present study suggests that the importance of the association
24 between these processes changes as a function of age, and this fact must be incorporated
25 by future theoretical models. Implications can also be highlighted for how to enhance

1 handwriting speed more effectively in different age groups. Practicing simple graphic
2 tasks might be useful in early stages of the acquisition of the skill, but handwriting
3 speed seems to evolve to become relatively independently of other graphomotor
4 abilities. By the age of 10, a good level of graphic speed can contribute to increase
5 handwriting speed in tasks that are particularly challenging in terms of linguistic
6 processes (e.g., when spelling difficult words). But by the age of 12, handwriting speed
7 seems to become considerably task-specific. Thus, for those children who, at this age,
8 need to increase their handwriting speed to perform at the expected level, it might be
9 advisable to use training activities as similar as possible as those in which they will be
10 required to write at speed for academic progression.

11

12 **Conclusion**

13 In sum, the present findings show that Spanish children 8-12-year-old use both
14 the lexical and the sublexical route to access orthographic representations in a spelling-
15 to-dictation task, but that word length and lexical status have no influence on the speed
16 of handwriting movements. Handwriting speed increases from 8 years of age, when it
17 would still be considerably variable and dependent on the nature of the task, to around
18 10 years of age, when handwriting automaticity is achieved and a coherent profile of
19 speed can be identified across different handwriting tasks. This profile seems to be
20 relatively independent from more general graphic speed, although this seems to have
21 some impact on tasks that impose higher cognitive demands in terms of spelling. By age
22 12, the handwriting speed profile becomes more nuanced and largely uncoupled from
23 graphic skills. However, handwriting speed is still fairly stable within linguistic tasks
24 requiring speeded production.

25

References

- 1
2 Adi-Japha, E., & Freeman, N. H. (2001). Development of differentiation between
3 writing and drawing systems. *Developmental Psychology*, *37*(1), 101–114. DOI:
4 10.1037/0012-1649.37.1.101
- 5 Afonso, O., & Álvarez, C. J. (2019). Measuring writing durations in handwriting
6 research: What do they tell us about the spelling process? In C. Perret & T.
7 Olive (Eds.), *Spelling and Writing Words: Theoretical and Methodological*
8 *Advances* (pp. 151-162). Boston: Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004394988>
- 9 Afonso, O., Álvarez, C. J., & Kandel, S. (2015). Effects of grapheme-to-phoneme
10 probability on writing durations. *Memory & Cognition*, *43*, 579-592. DOI:
11 10.3758/s13421-014-0489-8.
- 12 Afonso, O., Álvarez, C. J., Martínez, C., & Cuetos, F. (2019). Writing difficulties in
13 Alzheimer’s disease and Mild Cognitive Impairment. *Reading and Writing*,
14 *32*(1), 217-233. doi: 10.1007/s11145-017-9813-6
- 15 Afonso, O., Suárez-Coalla, P., & Cuetos, F. (2015). Spelling impairments in Spanish
16 dyslexic adults. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*. DOI: 0.3389/fpsyg.2015.00466.
- 17 Afonso, O., Suárez-Coalla, P., & Cuetos, F. (2020). Writing impairments in Spanish
18 children with developmental dyslexia. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *53*(2),
19 109-119. DOI: 10.1177/0022219419876255
- 20 Afonso, O., Suárez-Coalla, P., González-Martín, N., & Cuetos, F. (2018). The impact of
21 word frequency on peripheral processes during handwriting: A matter of age.
22 *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *71*(3), 695–703. DOI:
23 10.1080/17470218.2016.1275713

- 1 Alves, R. A., & Limpo, T. (2015). Progress in written language bursts, pauses,
2 transcription, and written composition across schooling. *Scientific Studies of*
3 *Reading, 19*, 374-391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2015.1059838>
- 4 Baayen, R. H. (2008). *Analyzing linguistic data: A practical introduction to statistics*.
5 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801686>
- 7 Barnett, A., Henderson, S., Scheib, B., & Schulz, J. (2011). Handwriting difficulties and
8 their assessment in young adults with DCD: Extension of the DASH for 17-to
9 25-Year-Olds. *Journal of Adult Development, 18*, 114-121. DOI:
10 [10.1007/s10804-011-9121-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-011-9121-3)
- 11 Berninger, V. W. (2009). Highlights of programmatic, interdisciplinary research on
12 writing. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 24*, 69–80.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2009.00281.x>
- 14 Berninger, V., & Amtmann, D. (2003). Preventing written expression disabilities
15 through early and continuing assessment and intervention for handwriting and/or
16 spelling problems: Research into practice. In H. Swanson, K. Harris, & S.
17 Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of Learning Disabilities* (pp 323- 344). New York:
18 Guilford Press. ISBN 9781462518685
- 19 Bonoti, F., Vlachos, F., & Metallidou, P. (2005). Writing and Drawing Performance of
20 School Age Children Is There Any Relationship? *School Psychology*
21 *International, 26*, 243-255. DOI: 10.1177/0143034305052916.
- 22 Bosga-Stork, I., Bosga, J., Ellis, J. L., & Meulenbroek, R. G. J. (2016). Developing
23 interactions between language and motor skills in the first three years of formal
24 handwriting education. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural*
25 *Science, 12*, 1-13. DOI: 10.9734/BJESBS/2016/20703

- 1 Cameron, C. E., Cottone, E. A., Murrah, W. M., & Grissmer, D. W. (2016). How Are
2 Motor Skills Linked to Children's School Performance and Academic
3 Achievement? *Child Development Perspectives, 10*, 93-98.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12168>
- 5 Cer, E. (2019). The instruction of writing strategies: the effect of the metacognitive
6 strategy on the writing skills of pupils in secondary education. *SAGE Open*.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019842681>
- 8 Chartrel, E., & Vinter, A. (2006). Rôle des informations visuelles dans la production de
9 lettres cursives chez l'enfant et l'adulte. *L'Année Psychologique, 106*, 43-64.
10 [http:// dx.doi.org/10.4074/S0003503306001047](http://dx.doi.org/10.4074/S0003503306001047)
- 11 Connelly, V., Dockrell, J. E., & Barnett, J. (2005). The slow handwriting of
12 undergraduate students constrains overall performance in exam essays.
13 *Educational Psychology, 25*, 99-107. DOI: 10.1080/0144341042000294912
- 14 Connelly, V., Dockrell, J. E., Walter, K., & Critten, S. (2012). Predicting the quality of
15 composition and written language bursts from oral language, spelling, and
16 handwriting skills in children with and without Specific Language Impairment.
17 *Written Communication, 29*, 278–302. DOI: 10.1177/0741088312451109
- 18 Delattre, M., Bonin, P., & Barry, C. (2006). Written Spelling to Dictation: Sound-to-
19 spelling regularity affects both writing latencies and durations. *Journal of*
20 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 32*, 1330-1340.
21 DOI: 10.1037/0278-7393.32.6.1330
- 22 Fears, N. E., & Lockman, J. J. (2018). How beginning handwriting is influenced by
23 letter knowledge: Visual-motor coordination during children's form copying.
24 *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 171*, 55-70.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2018.04.004>

- 1 González-Martín, N., Suárez-Coalla, P., Afonso, O., & Cuetos, F. (2017). Estudio de los
2 mecanismos de escritura en niños españoles de educación primaria. *Infancia y*
3 *Aprendizaje*, 40, 88-119. DOI: 10.1080/02103702.2016.1263448
- 4 Graham, S., Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R., Abbott, S., & Whitaker, D. (1997). Role of
5 mechanics in composing of elementary school students: A new methodological
6 approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 170–182. DOI:
7 [10.1037/0022-0663.89.1.170](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.89.1.170)
- 8 Graham, S., Weintraub, N., Berninger, V. W., & Schafer, W. (1998). Development of
9 handwriting speed and legibility in grades 1-9. *The Journal of Educational Research*,
10 92, 42-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220679809597574>.
- 11 Guinet, E., and Kandel, S. (2010). Ductus: a software package for the study of
12 handwriting production. *Behavior Research Methods* 42, 326–332. DOI:
13 [10.3758/BRM.42.1.326](https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.42.1.326)
- 14 Hamstra-Bletz, L., & Blöte, A. W. (1993). A longitudinal study on dysgraphic
15 handwriting in 1 primary school. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 26, 689-699.
16 DOI: [10.1177/002221949302601007](https://doi.org/10.1177/002221949302601007)
- 17 Henry, M. L., Beeson, P. M., Stark, A. J., & Rapcsak, S. Z. (2007). The role of left
18 perisylvian cortical regions in spelling. *Brain and Language*, 100, 44-52.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2006.06.011>
- 20 James, K. H. (2010). Sensori-motor experience leads to changes in visual processing in
21 the developing brain. *Developmental Science*, 13, 279–288.
22 DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00883.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00883.x)
- 23 James, K. H., & Engelhardt, L. (2012). The effects of handwriting experience on
24 functional brain development in pre-literate children. *Trends in Neuroscience &*
25 *Education*, 1, 32–42. DOI: [10.1016/j.tine.2012.08.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tine.2012.08.001)

- 1 James, K. H. (2017). The importance of handwriting experience on the development of
2 the literate brain. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26, 502-508.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417709821>
- 4 Jiménez, J. E., & Muñetón-Ayala, M. (2002). *Dificultades de aprendizaje en escritura.*
5 *Aplicaciones de la psicolingüística y de las nuevas tecnologías [Writing*
6 *learning difficulties. Psycholinguistics and new technologies applications]*.
7 Madrid, Spain: Trotta. ISBN: 8481645699
- 8 Julius, M. S., Meir, R., Shechter-Nissim, Z., & Adi-Japha, E. (2016). Children's ability
9 to learn a motor skill is related to handwriting and reading proficiency. *Learning*
10 *and Individual Differences*, 51, 265-272. DOI: 10.1016/j.lindif.2016.08.034.
- 11 Juul, H., & Petersen, D.K. (2017). Length effects in pseudo-word spelling: stronger in
12 dyslexic than in non-dyslexic students. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 67, 369-382. DOI:
13 [10.1007/s11881-017-0149-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-017-0149-3)
- 14 Kandel, S., Peereman, R., Grosjacques, G., & Fayol, M. (2011). For a psycholinguistic
15 model of handwriting production: Testing the syllable-bigram controversy.
16 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 37,
17 1310-1322. DOI: 10.1037/a0023094
- 18 Kandel, S., & Perret, C. (2015). How does the interaction between spelling and motor
19 processes build up during writing acquisition? *Cognition*, 136, 325-336. DOI:
20 10.1016/j.cognition.2014.11.014
- 21 Khalid, P. I., Yunus, J., & Adnan R. (2010). Extraction of dynamic features from hand
22 drawn data for the identification of children with handwriting difficulty.
23 *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 31, 256–262. DOI:
24 10.1016/j.ridd.2009.09.009.

- 1 Lambert, E., Alamargot, D., Larocque, D., & Caporossi, G. (2011). Dynamics of the
2 spelling process during a copy task: Effects of regularity and frequency.
3 *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 65(3), 141-150. DOI:
4 10.1037/a0022538
- 5 Limpo, T., Alves, R. A., Connelly, V. (2017). Examining the transcription-writing link:
6 effects of handwriting fluency and spelling accuracy on writing performance via
7 planning and translating in middle grades. *Learning and Individual Differences*,
8 53, 26-36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2016.11.004>
- 9 Limpo, T., Vigário, V., Rocha, R., & Graham, S. (2020). Promoting transcription in
10 third-grade classrooms: Effects on handwriting and spelling skills, composing,
11 and motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101856. DOI:
12 [10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101856](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101856)
- 13 Longcamp, M., Zerbato-Poudou, M., Velay, J. (2005). The influence of writing practice
14 on letter recognition in preschool children: A comparison between handwriting
15 and typing. *Acta Psychologica*, 119, 67-79. DOI: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2004.10.019.
- 16 Maldarelli, J. E., Kahrs, B. A., Hunt, S. C., & Lockman, J. J. (2015). Development of
17 early handwriting: Visual-motor control during letter copying. *Developmental*
18 *Psychology*, 51(7), 879–888. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039424>
- 19 Martínez, J. A., & García, M. E. (2008). ONESC: A database of orthographic neighbors
20 for Spanish read by children. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 191–197.
21 DOI:10.3758/BRM.40.1.191.
- 22 Martínez-García, C., Afonso, O., Cuetos, F., & Suárez-Coalla, P. (2020). Handwriting
23 production in Spanish children with dyslexia: Spelling or motor difficulties?
24 *Reading and Writing*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-020-10082-w>

- 1 Meulenbroek, R. G., & Van Galen, G. P. (1986). Movement analysis of repetitive
2 writing behaviour of first, second and third grade primary school children. In
3 *Advances in Psychology* (Vol. 37, pp. 71-92). North-Holland.
4 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115\(09\)60073-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(09)60073-X)
- 5 Olive, T. (2014). Toward a parallel and cascading model of the writing system: A
6 review of research on writing processes coordination. *Journal of Writing*
7 *Research, 6*, 173-194. DOI: [10.17239/jowr-2014.06.02.4](https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2014.06.02.4)
- 8 Palmis, S., Danna, J., Velay, J., & Longcamp, M. (2017). Motor control of handwriting
9 in the developing brain: A review. *Cognitive Neuropsychology, 34*, 187 - 204.
10 DOI:10.1080/02643294.2017.1367654
- 11 Pontart, V., Bidet-Ildei, C., Lambert, E., Morisset, P., Flouret, L., & Alamargot, D.
12 (2013). Influence of handwriting skills during spelling in primary and lower
13 secondary grades. *Frontiers in Psychology, 4*, 818. DOI:
14 [10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00818](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00818)
- 15 Prunty, M., & Barnett, A. L (2017). Understanding handwriting difficulties: A
16 comparison of children with and without motor impairment. *Cognitive*
17 *Neuropsychology, 34*, 205-218.
- 18 Prunty, M., Barnett, A. L., Wilmut, K., & Plumb, M. S. (2013). Handwriting speed in
19 children with Developmental Coordination Disorder: are they really slower?
20 *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 34*, 2927-36.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643294.2017.1376630>
- 22 Prunty, M. M., Barnett, A. L., Wilmut, K., & Plumb, M. S. (2014). An examination of
23 writing pauses in the handwriting of children with Developmental Coordination
24 Disorder. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 35*, 2894-2905. DOI:
25 [10.1016/j.ridd.2013.06.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2013.06.005)

- 1 Puranik, C. S., & Al Otaiba, S. (2012). Examining the contribution of handwriting and
2 spelling to written expression in kindergarten children. *Reading and Writing, 25*,
3 1523–1546. DOI: 10.1007/s11145-011-9331-x
- 4 Reybroeck, M. V., & Michiels, N. (2018). Finger-writing intervention impacts the
5 spelling and handwriting skills of children with developmental language
6 disorder: a multiple single-case study. *Reading and Writing, 31*, 1319-1341.
7 DOI:10.1007/S11145-018-9845-6
- 8 Roux, J. S., McKeeff, T. J., Grosjacques, G., Afonso, O., & Kandel, S. (2013). The
9 interaction between central and peripheral processes in handwriting production.
10 *Cognition, 127*, 235-241. DOI: 10.1016/j.cognition.2012.12.009.
- 11 RStudio Team (2015). *RStudio: Integrated Development for R*. RStudio, Inc., Boston,
12 MA. <http://www.rstudio.com/>
- 13 Schwarz, G. E. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *Annals of Statistics, 6*,
14 461–464. doi:10.1214/aos/117634413
- 15 Séraphin Thibon, L., Gerber, S., & Kandel, S. (2018). The elaboration of motor
16 programs for the automation of letter production. *Acta Psychologica, 182*, 200-
17 211. DOI: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2017.12.001
- 18 Suárez-Coalla, P., González-Martín, N., & Cuetos, F. (2018). Word writing in Spanish-
19 speaking children: Central and peripheral processes. *Acta psychologica, 191*,
20 201-209. DOI: [10.1016/j.actpsy.2018.10.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2018.10.001)
- 21 Sumner, E., Connelly, V., & Barnett, A. L. (2013). Children with dyslexia are slow
22 writers because they pause more often and not because they are slow at
23 handwriting execution. *Reading and Writing, 26*, 991-1008. DOI:
24 10.1007/s11145-012-9403-6

- 1 Sumner, E., Connelly, V., & Barnett, A. L. (2014). The influence of spelling ability on
2 handwriting production: Children with and without dyslexia. *Journal of*
3 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 40, 1441.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035785>
- 5 Tabatabaey-Mashadi, N., Sudirman, R., Khalid, P. I., & Lange-Küttner, C. (2015).
6 Automated Syntax Analyses of Drawing Two Tangent Patterns in Children with
7 Low and Average Handwriting Ability. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 120(3),
8 865–894. <https://doi.org/10.2466/24.10.PMS.120v15x1>
- 9 Thomassen, A. J. W. M., & Teulings, H.L. (1983). The development of handwriting. In
10 M. Martlew (Ed.), *The psychology of written language: Developmental and*
11 *educational perspectives* (pp. 179-213). New York: Wiley. ISBN: 0471102911
- 12 Tseng, M. H., & Chow, S. M. K. (2000). Perceptual-motor function of school-age
13 children 10 with slow handwriting speed. *American Journal of Occupational*
14 *Therapy*, 54(1), 83-11 88. DOI: [10.5014/ajot.54.1.83](https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.54.1.83)
- 15 Van Galen, G. P. (1991). Handwriting: Issues for a psychomotor theory. *Human*
16 *Movement Science*, 10 (2-3), 165-191. DOI:10.1016/0167-9457(91)90003-G.
- 17 Van Reybroeck, M., & Michiels, N. (2018). Finger-writing intervention impacts the
18 spelling and handwriting skills of children with developmental language
19 disorder: a multiple single-case study. *Reading and Writing*, 31, 1319–134.
20 <https://doi-org.oxfordbrookes.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9845-6>
- 21 Vinci-Booher, S., James, T. W., & James, K. H. (2016). Visual-motor functional
22 connectivity in preschool children emerges after handwriting experience. *Trends*
23 *in Neuroscience & Education*, 5(3), 107–120. DOI:[10.1016/j.tine.2016.07.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tine.2016.07.006)

1 Vinter, A., & Chartrel, E. (2010). Effects of different types of learning on handwriting
2 movements in young children. *Learning and Instruction, 20*, 476-486. DOI:
3 10.1016/J.LEARNINSTRUC.2009.07.001

4 Zemlock, D., Vinci-Booher, S., & James, K. H. (2018). Visual-motor symbol
5 production facilitates letter recognition in young children. *Reading and Writing,*
6 *31*, 1255–1271. DOI: 10.1007/s11145-018-9831-z

7
8
9
10

1

Appendix A

2 Table A1. Stimuli used in the spelling-to-dictation task with English translations (in
3 brackets) and lexical frequency for words.

Short			Long		
Pseudowords	Words	Word frequency	Pseudowords	Words	Word frequency
Dazo	Daño (<i>harm</i>)	211.17	Delanca	Defensa (<i>defense</i>)	66.19
Poño	Pozo (<i>well – water source</i>)	132.53	Pafensa	Palanca (<i>lever</i>)	49.96
Deña	Dedo (<i>finger</i>)	260.90	Destaña	Destino (<i>destiny</i>)	97.97
Ledo	Leña (<i>wood</i>)	71.81	Montino	Montaña (<i>mountain</i>)	377.15
Goro	Gota (<i>drop</i>)	79.60	Manzama	Manzana (<i>apple</i>)	102.54
Lota	Loro (<i>parrot</i>)	77.49	Sistena	Sistema (<i>system</i>)	188.64
Laza	Lana (<i>wool</i>)	108.05	Merdado	Mercado (<i>market</i>)	11.32
Tana	Taza (<i>cup</i>)	92.50	Solcado	Soldado (<i>soldier</i>)	72.83
Nuna	Nudo	79.40	Naquete	Naranja	105.84

SPELLING, WRITING AND GRAPHIC SPEED DEVELOPMENT

	<i>(knot)</i>			<i>(orange)</i>	
Rado	Rana	132.27	Paranja	Paquete	164.45
	<i>(frog)</i>			<i>(package)</i>	
Pina	Pila	73.95	Pemate	Pelota	187.76
	<i>(battery)</i>			<i>(ball)</i>	
Zola	Zona	263.87	Tolota	Tomate	87.86
	<i>(zone)</i>			<i>(tomato)</i>	
	Mean	131.96		Mean	134.38

1

2

1

Appendix B

2

Trail tracing task

3

