

---

## Plan Overview

*A Data Management Plan created using DMPonline*

**Title:** Developing a ready-made pedagogical framework to support the long-term academic writing skills of university students in Estonia and the US

**Creator:** Roger Yallop

**Principal Investigator:** Roger Yallop

**Project Administrator:** Djuddah Leijen

**Affiliation:** University of Tartu

**Funder:** European Research Council (ERC)

**Template:** ERC DMP

**ORCID iD:** 0000-0003-2240-894X

### Project abstract:

This project develops a model of the peer feedback process (*'PFP Model'*) to support the long-term writing skills of university students in both Estonian and USA contexts. The framework originates from socio-cultural theory and describes how students can more effectively give and receive feedback in their writing groups as they develop a deeper sense of community. Naturalistic learning data (e.g., student and lecturer written and aural artefacts), and the reasons for the participants producing their data, were obtained from academic and creative writing courses at undergraduate and graduate levels from both the University of Tartu (UT), Estonia and The Ohio State University (OSU, the USA over four teaching semesters. The data is analysed within a grounded theory tradition using a mixed-methods approach. The findings identify (i) beneficial feedback elicitation practices through the concept of a *'cover letter'*, (ii) beneficial written feedback practices, and (iii) beneficial oral feedback practices mediated by synchronous writing group meetings. These three research strands when combined together (*'beneficial peer feedback practices'*) constitute *the PFP Model*. Within the PFP Model, *feedback elicitation practices* influence *feedback practices*, and *feedback practices* result in authorial textual revision and improvement of long-term writing and reviewing skills. Consequently, this deeper understanding of beneficial *peer feedback practices* improve writing instruction. The PFP model is applicable, at least partially, to improving writing, reviewing, and feedback practices at any study level and writing genre.

### In total there are seven studies

- Study 1. Cover letters as a tool to elicit peer feedback within doctoral writing groups.
- Study 2. A Rhetorical Model to Inject Student Agency into the Writing Process.
- Study 3. The proportion and nature of desirable feedback features within doctoral peer reviews, a longitudinal study.
- Study 4. Developing a flexible writing pedagogical framework to promote the peer feedback process in writing groups.
- Study 5. The affect and effect of oral interactions within synchronous writing group meetings throughout a creative writing course
- Study 6.. A comparison of expert writing practitioner and content instructor

asynchronous written feedback on a collaboratively taught STEM doctoral scientific writing course.

- Study 7. A critical analysis of written peer feedback pedagogy within a large online asynchronous STEM undergraduate writing course.

Studies 1-4 collect data from participants at Tartu University (TU). Studies 5-7 collect data from participants at the Ohio State University (OSU).

As such, this Data Management Plan (DMP) addresses how data obtained from two different countries (Estonia and the USA) is managed, and how the ethical and legal issues will be addressed.

**ID:** 100796

**Start date:** 01-07-2022

**End date:** 30-06-2024

**Last modified:** 02-11-2024

**Grant number / URL:** PUTJD1121/Estonian Research Council Funder

**Copyright information:**

The above plan creator(s) have agreed that others may use as much of the text of this plan as they would like in their own plans, and customise it as necessary. You do not need to credit the creator(s) as the source of the language used, but using any of the plan's text does not imply that the creator(s) endorse, or have any relationship to, your project or proposal

# Developing a ready-made pedagogical framework to support the long-term academic writing skills of university students in Estonia and the US

---

## Summary

### Project Acronym

DWPF

### Project Number

PUTJD1121

### Provide a dataset summary

#### 1. Data Collection

##### What data will you collect or create?

##### Background

The project collected primary data from human adult participants. The participants were predominantly students participating on academic writing courses at universities in both Estonia (mainly the University of Tartu) and the USA (mainly the Ohio State University). These students produced written artefacts (e.g., draft texts, feedback cover letters, and feedback comments) as a natural consequence of their participation on the course. This study collected such student-produced artefacts and the participant perceptions on why they produced their artefacts through interviewing. Expert assessors within the research project aural and written artifacts on their perceptions of the student produced artifacts were also collected. As human participants were involved in this study, there were additional data sets created in obtaining their intention to participate through an online survey (University of Tartu), and then obtaining their signed informed consent and in the subsequent pseudonymising of their data (University of Tartu and the Ohio State University). Datasets collected from students at the University of Tartu were subject to the conditions of the ethical approval granted to this research project as stipulated by the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Tartu. Similarly, datasets collected from students at the Ohio State University were subject to the conditions of the ethical approval granted to this research project as stipulated by the Internal Revenue Board of the Ohio State University (OSU).

There were differences between the two ethical committees on how informed consent was allowed to be obtained from the participants, and this results in different datasets. As stipulated by the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Tartu, potential participants cannot be approached directly by their responsible lecturers and/or the principal investigators and project collaborators as this may be considered undue force to participate in this 'clinical trial' as stated on the ethical approval form. As such, potential participants were invited to complete an online survey to signal their intention to participate. If the potential participant signaled their intention to participate in this research project, then they were invited to sign (either by hand or digitally) an informed consent form to participate in this research, or as advised by UT data protection specialists later in the project, participants gave their informed consent to use their written artifacts through a closed UT survey through their UT email address. Thus, this resulted in four datasets: (i) the potential participants' intention to participate through an online survey, (ii) hand-written informed consent forms, (iii) digitally signed informed consent forms and scanned hand-signed informed consent forms, and (iv) informed consent on UT's 'LimeWire' through a closed survey. Conversely, and under the rules of the US Internal Review Board (IRB), it was allowed to approach the students directly to participate in this research project. Furthermore, and when reporting in the aggregate, the IRB allowed collection of naturalistic student data without having to obtain participant informed consent as the research is intended to improve pedagogical practices that benefit US society.

In addition, the project collaborating researcher outside the University of Tartu ('External Researcher') signed a 'Researcher Authorization to Use Data form' before analyzing pseudonymized data obtained from the participants from the University of Tartu. This requirement was not needed from the Internal Revenue Board of OSU. All participant original personal data is pseudonymized. This pseudonymisation process results in further datasets that were deleted after use. Finally, the datasets that were obtained directly from the participants (e.g., student-produced written artifacts) constituted the instruments for analysis for this research project.

##### Data Generation

All e-datasets generated in Estonia is stored on UT's server (for electronic documents) and all hardcopies are stored in the office shared by the principal investigator (Roger Yallop) and the main collaborator (Djuddah Leijen) in a locked drawer (Lossi 3- 306, Tartu, Estonia). Similarly, all e-datasets generated in the USA is stored on OSU's server (for electronic documents) and all hardcopies are stored in the office of Roger's postdoctoral supervisor (Susan Lang) in a locked drawer (4132 C 108 Bricker Hall, 190 North Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210).

##### The following data was generated during the project:

1. **Participant Intention to Participate Surveys.** Potential participants (the University of Tartu only) signaled their intention to participate through an online survey (LimeSurvey). The resulting data are available on the survey's database. As such, no identifying features are assigned to this dataset.
2. **Participant Informed Consent Forms and Researcher Authorisation to use Data Forms.** These forms were digitally or hand signed by the Participant or External Collaborator and the Principal Investigator (Roger Yallop), the main Collaborating Researcher (Djuddah Leijen), or the main external collaborator (Susan Lang), or stored online on UT's LimeSurvey in later cohorts as advised by UT data specialists. All hand-signed informed consent forms were scanned as PDF documents. All digitally signed informed consent forms were created as PDFs and digitally signed using appropriate software as according to the requirements of UT or OSU. The resulting digitally signed e-documents are password-protected and stored on UT or OSU's server, and the resulting hand-signed paper PDF documents are secured in a locked drawer in the Principal Investigator (PI) and Main Internal or External Collaborator's office at UT or OSU. All informed consent forms as e-documents are stored under the Master Folder entitled 'ICForms\_Est' for all data collected in Estonia and stored on UT's server, and similarly the master folder is entitled 'ICForms\_USA' for all data collected in the USA and stored on OSU's server. All subfolders contain an abbreviation of the course and date, and Study number (e.g., S1, S2, etc.) from which the data was obtained (e.g., 'ComSci2022'). Each participant informed consent forms stored in each subfolder using a string of numbers and/or letters (see below identification code lists) to protect the participants' anonymity. The one electronic Researcher Authorisation to use Data Forms are stored in one folder entitled 'RADForms' on UT's server only, and the electronic Researcher Authorisation to use Data Form contains a string of numbers and/or letters (see below identification code lists).
3. **Identification Code Lists.** In the pseudonymisation of data, all interim drafts (mainly as MS Word and MS Excel documents) are password-protected and stored on UT's server or OSU's server depending on whether the dataset was obtained in Estonia or the USA. So that the data can be connected to the same participant's artefacts, and to the applicable course, each participant's data is given an identification code as a string of letters and numbers. The identification code to all the Participants' written and aural artefacts is compiled electronically as an MS Word and/or MS Excel document, and stored on the UT or OSU's server, and a back-up copy on a hard disk is stored in a locked drawer in the Researcher(s) office (Lossi 3-306) at UT for Estonian data, or in the Researcher's other office at OSU for US data. The main folder is entitled 'ICL\_Est' or 'ICL\_USA' for Estonian and USA data respectively (and also stored on UT or OSU's server). All subfolders contain an abbreviation of the course and date from which the data was obtained (e.g., 'ComSci2022'). Each subfolder contains, as a Word document, the participant's name and corresponding pseudonymisation code as a string of letters and numbers that connect the participant to all their generated artefacts (e.g., draft texts) as well as to their course. The only personal data collected were participants' names and university contact details for the informed consent procedure (see subsection below).
4. **Participant Background Detail Forms.** For simplicity, no personal details were asked about the participants except name and email address for the informed consent process.
5. **Student-produced written artefacts** (mainly participant draft texts, feedback comment letters, feedback cover letters, and revision plans). Depending on the course design and student preferences, these documents were mainly produced as MS Word files or PDFs. The written artefacts produced by the participants as a natural consequence of their participation on the course was uploaded to UT's server (e.g., 'Nextcloud') or OSU's server (e.g., 'OneDrive' or 'CarmenCanvas'). For the analysis, these written artefacts were pseudonymised and converted into suitable file forms for analysis (e.g., as MS Excel files, Word files, or Text Files as appropriate). The Master Folder is entitled 'StArt\_Est' for all data collected in Estonia and stored on UT's server, and similarly the master folder is entitled 'StArt\_USA' for all data collected in the USA and stored on OSU's server. The subfolders are entitled with the study number 'StArt\_CourseYear\_Country', the subsubfolders are entitled by each applicable writing group within the course, and then the student artifacts are stored within these subsubfolders entitled by feedback round according to type of artifact (submitted draft text, feedback cover letter, reviewer cover letter, revision plan, and any other artifact produced as to the course design).
6. **Online surveys.** Surveys were conducted online using UT's LimeSurvey.
7. **Participant interviews and writing group meetings** Interviews and writing group meetings were conducted face-to-face and/or online, and captured as audio-recordings using a suitable recording device (e.g., Zoom and CarmenCanvas) and uploaded to UT's (e.g., Nextcloud) or OSU's server (MSOneDrive). Once uploaded, all copies of the earlier audio-recordings were deleted from whatever source they were recorded from. This aural data was transcribed into written documents (mainly as MS Word and MS Excel documents). The resulting aural transcripts were converted into suitable file forms for analysis (e.g., as MS Excel files). A similar nomenclature for the master folders and subsequent subfolders as for the data pseudonymisation was followed.

### Size of datasets

Due to challenges of the data-collection (particularly at UT), the number of participants was much smaller than anticipated. Data-collection from writing courses that produced insufficient data to conduct a feasible study was deleted.

### UT (collected for whole course duration over four consecutive PhD writing courses)

- 63 Participant Informed Consent (for permission to use their written artifacts) over four cohorts
- 63 Student written artifacts (draft texts, feedback letters, written course reflections) (permission to reproduce pseudonymised artifacts (34 participants); only to report their data in the aggregate (29 participants))
- 20 Participant Informed Consent (for permission to interview)
- 20 Interview aural files and their respective 20 transcriptions.
- 3 Online surveys.
- 4 Project collaborators' Rating task transcriptions and 12 written rating task artifacts (from project collaborators)
- 4 Student writing tasks stored on UT;s LimeSurvey

### OSU (collected for two courses over one course duration with permission to use participant pseudonymised quotations)

- 45 Participant Informed Consent (for permission to use their written and aural, where applicable, artifacts)
- 45 Student written artifacts (draft texts, feedback letters, written course reflections )
- 5 Instructor (study collaborators) written instructional artifacts (all artifacts relating to course design and student assessment)
- 3 Participant Informed Consent (for permission to interview)
- 3 Interview aural files and their corresponding 3 transcriptions
- 23 Aural files of synchronous writing groups and their 23 corresponding transcripts
- 2 Instructor (PI and study collaborator) written writing group perceptions

**OSU (collected for one courses over one course duration with permission to use participant data in the aggregate)**

- 97 Student written artifacts (draft texts, feedback letters, written course reflections )
- 5 Instructor and facilitator written instructional artifacts (all artifacts relating to course design and student assessment)

**(ii) How will the data be collected or created?**

The primary datasets were mainly created by students and (where applicable) also by their instructors and/or facilitators (including myself as PI in ethnographic research designs) on academic or creative writing courses at both UT and OSU. The different datasets that were collected throughout the study were further categorised into two main types of datasets:

**Datasets 1-3.** These datasets are related to obtaining participant informed consent and external researcher authorisation to use data agreement, and for the creation of the participant personal identification code during the pseudonymisation of personal data.

**Datasets 4-7.** These datasets are analytical datasets produced by the study participants after having obtained both their informed consent and a participant personal identifier code to ensure that no parts of their data can be traced back to the participant during the analysis and publication phases of the research.

*As stated above, data collected from participants at UT will be stored and accessed only on UT's server, and data collected from participants at OSU will be stored and accessed only on OSU's server.*

**(iii) Documentation and Metadata. What documentation and metadata will accompany the data?**

As the vast majority of the data is obtained from students on academic writing courses at either UT or OSU, the documentation and metadata accompanying the data are mainly related to the pseudonymisation key identifying string to determine the following:

*(1) Type of student artefact.* This denotes the type of artefact produced by the participant during the study. Each participant can produce multiple artefacts that include the following:

- Draft text, feedback cover letter, feedback review letter, audio of synchronous writing group meeting online survey, individual interview, focus group meeting, other

*(2) Source of artefact.* This denotes where and which participant the artefact was produced by and include the following variables:

- Location (UT, OSU, or other)
- Course or Writing Group (Name and year of course)
- Writing Group Number (Number as applicable to the course)
- Participant unique identifier (Pseudonymised number and letter string)

*(3) Instructor identifier.* For Study 4 only, expert writing assessors (i.e., writing instructors) will be the main participants of the study. Metadata linking this dataset will be formulated using a similar system. as in (1) and (2) above.

Ethics and Legal Compliance

**How will you manage any ethical issues?**

Ethical clearance is obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Tartu to obtain data as to the datasets described previously from participants on academic writing courses and/or writing groups for the duration of the research project (see *kooskolastus\_368T-18*). Ethical clearance is obtained from the Internal Revenue Board of OSU to obtain data as to the datasets described previously from participants on academic and creative writing courses over the duration of the research project.

**Ethical issues (abridged)**

For a comprehensive account for how this research project complies with all ethical and legal issues from an Estonian perspective, please refer to *kooskolastus\_368T-18* (added as an appendix to this DMP).

**(i) Participants**

Participating in this research is not harmful to the Participants either physically or mentally. Furthermore, Participants were informed that their participation in this research is entirely voluntary, that their participation (or non-participation) had no effect on their course assessment whatsoever, they could withdraw their participation at any stage with no questions asked, and that they were free to examine their data at any time during and after the study. Although participation in certain aspects of the applicable research instrument (surveys, interviews, and/or focus group meetings) may have caused a minor inconvenience with regards to the Participant's time, it is envisaged that their participation in such activities may have indirectly helped support their writing and feedback practices. The guiding principle is that the Participant will never be manipulated for research purposes. This means that any artefacts produced by the Participants of this study was given the same amount of feedback and the same assessment criteria (if applicable according to the course design) as any other student on the same course not participating in this study (and vice-versa). Before participation, the Participant was given an overview and data management of the postdoctoral research project and the study

in question either orally and/or in writing. Participants who did not wish (or were not selected) to participate in the applicable study could give their informed consent for their pseudonymised written artefacts that they produced as a natural consequence of their participation on the course for use in later studies. They were further informed that only the principal investigator and collaborating researchers were the only persons to have access to their data. The Participant has the right to interrupt their participation for any reason and without giving reasons. The Participant also has the right to request the deletion of any of their collected data at any time without any explanation although no changes can be made to already published data. The Participant, after having been informed of all the facts, gave their informed consent to participate through signing an informed consent form with the Principal Investigator or applicable main collaborating researcher (Djuddah Leijen at UT or Susan Lang at OSU).

### **(ii) Legal Aspects**

As the project involves collecting data from human participants from both Estonia and the USA, there are laws governing the safeguarding and transfer of data from Estonia and the USA, and vice-versa. As the general principal, all e-data and their resulting e-documents (i.e., from the pseudonymisation and then analysis of such documents) collected from participants from UT will be stored on UT's servers only, and all e-data and their resulting e-documents (i.e., from the pseudonymisation and then analysis of such documents) collected from participants from OSU will be stored on OSU's servers only. There are also provisions in the informed consent forms at UT whereby the participants gave their consent (or did not give their consent) to the transfer of their pseudonymised personal data to the USA (if applicable) as well as that their data is protected in accordance to the GDPR regulations. I abide by the laws and regulations for safeguarding and the transferring of data collected from participants at OSU according to the instructions of the Internal Review Board of OSU.

### **(iii) Storage of data**

- All electronic data created by both the Participants and the Researcher(s) was collected using an appropriate and University approved software tool for the applicable *Study* (e.g., LimeSurvey for UT and Qualtrics for OSU), and all electronic data obtained from UT will be stored securely on the UT's server (e.g., Nextcloud) and from OSU on OSU's server (One Drive).
- Only the Principal investigator (Roger Yallop) and internal collaborators from the UT (e.g., Djuddah Leijen, Piia Taremaa, Helen Hint, and Helena Lemendik), have access to the Participants' original data collected at UT on a needs-to-know basis only, and they are the only researchers involved in the pseudonymisation process and storage of all intermediate electronic drafts created as a consequence of this pseudonymisation process.
- Similarly, only the PI (Roger Yallop) and main external collaborator (Susan Lang) have access to the Participants' original data collected at OSU on a needs-to-know basis only, and they are the only researchers involved in the pseudonymisation process and storage of all intermediate electronic drafts created as a consequence of this pseudonymisation process.
- All intermediate draft electronic data is password-protected and stored on the appropriate University's (UT or OSU) server for the purposes of their pseudonymisation and analysis, and this draft data is deleted permanently after the corresponding data has been fully pseudonymised (i.e., after all intermediate draft electronic documents of the Participants' data required in the pseudonymisation process have no further useful purpose, these draft documents will be deleted).
- All hard data created by both the Participants and the Researcher(s) (mainly Participant Informed Consent and Researcher Authorisation to use Data Forms (if completed in writing), and the Researcher's written notes, and a back-up copy of the data on a password-protected hard drive are stored in a locked drawer in the Researcher(s) office at UT for data obtained at UT (Lossi 3-306) and at OSU for data obtained at OSU (4132 C 108 Bricker Hall, 190 North Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210) for a period of five years after the applicable Study commences.
- All external researchers (e.g., Prof. Susan Lang from the OSU) only have access to the pseudonymised data collected from UT, and only with the pseudonymised data they need for their tasked research purpose (e.g., cleaning already pseudonymised data, data validation through second coding, etc.) and they will adhere to the Code of Conduct (see subsection below) to ensure Participant data protection;
- To access the data, the external researcher signed, either in writing, an *Authorisation to use Data Agreement* with the Principal Investigator from AVOK (Roger Yallop).
- Any pseudonymised data from UT provided to the external researchers are stored securely according to the data protection principles of the University of Tartu and GDPR (especially Articles 46.1 and 46.2(e); all data will remain on the University's server, and this data will be password-protected and stored thereafter according to the data protection principles of the University of Tartu;
- The Principal Investigator will destroy all the Participant original data (including their consent forms) and the Researcher Authorisation to use Data Forms no later than five years after the start of this research project (i.e., by 1st October 2027 at the latest).
- All Researcher written notes will also be destroyed after they have no further practical use and no later than five years after the start of this research project (i.e., by 1st October 2027 at the latest).

### **(iv) Safeguards in transferring data from Estonia to the USA**

As a general principal, the principal investigator (Roger Yallop) whilst physically located in the USA and any external collaborator regardless of their present geographical location only accesses data obtained from UT participants on UT's server. Similarly, the principal investigator (Roger Yallop) whilst physically located in Estonia or elsewhere outside the USA only accesses data obtained from OSU participants on OSU's server. As extra precautionary measures to safeguard any possible transfer of EU personal data to the USA, I devised the following additional safeguards.

**Code of Conduct.** I devised a Code of Conduct to ensure appropriate safeguards for the protection of the transfer of personal data from the Participants at the University of Tartu to countries outside the EU in compliance with GDPR Articles 46.1 and 46.2(e) (see notes (i) and (ii) below). To further ensure the protection of data, this Code of Conduct applies to all collaborating researchers who do not work at the University of Tartu (i.e., external collaborators) regardless of whether their institution is based in the EU or outside the EU. The Code of Conduct for external collaborators are as follows:

1. The principal investigator will brief all collaborating researchers about the scope and nature of the research project, and their role within this research project, and how they must store any supplied and generated research data generated in compliance with GDPR Articles 46.1 and 46.2(e) as stipulated in the steps below.
2. There will be no transfer of Participant original data between the University of Tartu and the Host's Institution.
3. All supplied pseudonymised data, the subsequent data editing, and the resulting documents will be password-protected and conducted only on the University of Tartu's server (e.g., Next Cloud).
4. To ensure compliance, the external researcher will be given viewing and editing permissions, but they will be denied permission to download data from the University of Tartu's server.
5. External collaborators will only be supplied with the pseudonymised Participant data on a needs-to-know basis, and their permissions to access this data and the resulting documents within the University of Tartu's server will be withdrawn after completion of their tasks no later than 30th June 2024 (the end date of this project).
6. Any handwritten notes made by the external collaborators must be kept in a locked drawer in their workplace, and destroyed after their practical use no later than 30th June 2024
7. In addition to the safeguards above, the external collaborator will also observe good research practices as according to their own Host Institution's guidelines to good research practices
8. The external collaborator will have to sign an Authorisation to use Data Agreement, stating that they both understand and they will adhere to this Code of Conduct before being supplied with any pseudonymised Participant Personal data.
9. This Authorisation to use EU Agreement will also be counter-signed by the Principal Investigator (Roger Yallop) or the main collaborator from AVOK (Djuddah Leijen).
10. If practically possible, this agreement can be signed digitally by both Parties where it will be password-protected and then stored on the University of Tartu's server.
11. If obtaining a digital signature from both parties is impractical, then the external collaborator will sign the agreement by hand and send the hand-signed agreement to the Principal Investigator or the main collaborator to their following work address: University of Tartu, College of Foreign languages and Cultures, Lossi 3- 306, 51003 Tartu.
12. On receipt of this agreement, the Principal Investigator or the main collaborator will counter-sign the agreement, and then store this agreement in a locked drawer in their office at the University of Tartu (Lossi 3- 306)
13. All Authorisation to Use EU Agreements will be destroyed no later than five years after the start of the data collection for this project by 1st October 2027 at the latest.

*Notes (i) and (ii)*

**Article 46.1.** "In the absence of a decision pursuant to Article 45(3), a controller or processor may transfer personal data to a third country or an international organisation only if the controller or processor has provided appropriate safeguards, and on condition that enforceable data subject rights and effective legal remedies for data subjects are available.

**Article 46.2(e).** "The appropriate safeguards referred to in paragraph 1 may be provided for, without requiring any specific authorisation from a supervisory authority, by:

(e) An approved code of conduct pursuant to Article 40 together with binding and enforceable commitments of the controller or processor in the third country to apply the appropriate safeguards, including as regards data subjects' rights."

*Extra Safeguards for Principal Investigator.* To further safeguard the protection of Participant personal data, when conducting research in the USA (or outside an EU Member State), the Principal Investigator (Roger Yallop) will adhere to steps 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 of the Code of Practice for external collaborators as outlined in subsection 9.8. above. However, and unlike the external collaborators, Roger Yallop has access to the Participants' original data. He will also pseudonymise the Participants' original data whilst in the USA, As such, the Principal Investigator will also adhere to the following extra precautionary steps in addition to the Code of Conduct that the external collaborators have to observe:

1. When accessing the Participant's personal data outside the EU, the Principal Investigator (Roger Yallop) will be connected to the University of Tartu's VPN.
2. Roger Yallop will use a separate computer to the one he has been supplied with by Ohio State University to ensure further data security, and this computer will be password-protected.
3. Roger Yallop has made provisions in his Postdoctoral Research Plan to conduct regular research visits back to his secondary place of work at the University of Tartu (Lossi 3- 306, Tartu) to collect, pseudonymise, and analysis Participant personal data , and conduct all other required tasks related to his research project whilst on the territory of Estonia.
4. As such Roger has scheduled the following research visits: (i) 08/12/2022 - 15/01/23 (one month); (ii) 23/02/23 - 10/03/23 (two weeks), (iii) 22/05/23 - 13/06/23 (three weeks), (iv) 4/9/2023 - 18/9/23 (two weeks), and (v) 11/12/23 - 14/01/24 (one month).

Thus, the guiding principle to ensure further safeguards for the protection of personal data, Roger will conduct research on the data collected from the Participants from the University of Tartu in Estonia where possible. Conversely, Roger will conduct research on the data collected from the Participants from Ohio State University in the USA where possible.

## **FAIR data and resources**

### **1. Making data findable**

I have obtained ethical clearance from the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Tartu to collect data from participants on academic writing courses and/or groups at the University of Tartu (Kooskolastus\_36 8T-18) for the duration of this research project. As it has been deemed that the data collected from the human participants is both personal and sensitive, all data collected is only accessible to the principal Investigator (Roger Yallop) and the named collaborating researchers as to the terms and conditions of the ethical clearance. Therefore, this research project will not participate in FAIR data.

### **2. Making data openly accessible**

Due to the stipulation of the ethical clearance protocol, all collected datasets will only be accessible to the PI and collaborating researchers. No data will be made readily available to researchers from outside this research project.

### **3. Making data interoperable**

As all the datasets are closed, there will be no interoperability for this study.

### **4. Increase data reuse**

All original data will be destroyed no later than five years after the start of this project. Also, as only the PI and project collaborators have access to the datasets, this question is not relevant.

### **5. Allocation of resources and data security**

There will be no open access of data for this project. As such, this question is not relevant.