The Reading Wars Revisited: A Linguistic and Psycholinguistic Analysis of Instructional Debates in Global Literacy Education

Seungwoo Lee[1]

[1]Chadwick International School

Abstract: The paper reconsiders the "Reading War" in detail, analysing the evolution of literacy instruction through a psycholinguistic and linguistic lens. It examines the historical development of whole-language and phonics approaches, explores their effectiveness for diverse learners, and evaluates their effectiveness. The paper argues that the context-sensitive, linguistically informed, and equity-driven model of reading instructions effectively links clear phonics instructions with critical thinking and strategies that promote comprehension. This paper also discusses sociolinguistic and equity dimensions by providing details regarding language variations, the role of literacy, and how equity arguments are effective for students during studies, with some case studies. Some recommendations include continued research, policy reforms, and teacher training aligned with evidence-based practices to ensure equitable literacy for all students.

Keywords: *Whole Language, Reading Wars, Equity, Structured Literacy, Linguistics, Teacher Training, Psycholinguistics, Educational Policy.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Literacy involves understanding, interpreting, and creating written and visual text. Moreover, literacy is not merely a skill but a huge gateway to opportunity, equity, and full participation in society (Bosnes and Ole Bosnes). Literacy can easily increase the ability to read, and it can shape economic mobility, educational attainment, and civic engagement, which makes literacy instruction a main concern for policymakers, educators, and communities around the world. This is the reason why the way reading must be taught has been one of the most persistent and polarised debates in education, that is, "Reading Wars". Through a research lens, literacy debates reveal tensions between evidence, ideology, and pedagogical practice, shaping outcomes for marginalized learners (DeLuca and Jill Willis).

Moreover, Reading War relates to the longstanding conflict between proponents of phonics-based instruction who focus on systematic teaching of the relationship between letters and sounds. Overall, it supports the whole-language approach that promotes immersion in meaningful texts and encourages students to infer patterns naturally (Yin and Ahmad). In the last few decades, some intermediate models like balanced literacy and, more recently, structured literacy have emerged to reconcile or reframe the debate. Besides these shifts, tensions were still shaped as much by politics,

ideology, and cultural values as by empirical evidence (Okur and Aksoy).

In this paper, there is comprehensive information regarding the historical trajectory of these debates and examines how shifts in practice and policy have impacted literacy instruction across various educational contexts (Kostewicz and Jr.). Based on the findings gained from linguistics, including morphology, orthography, and phonology, and psycholinguistics, researchers are considering cognitive models of reading acquisition that can easily access the strengths and limitations of competing approaches (Bowman-Perrott and Sharon deMarín). Therefore, the analysis will explore in detail how literacy policy has adapted in response to evidence with comprehensive attention to implications for students with English language learners, learning disabilities, and marginalised communities whose educational opportunities are shaped through systemic inequalities (Al-Shidhani and Arora). After gaining a comparative perspective from cultural settings and diverse linguistics, the paper will situate the reading wars within a global frame (Zou and Zhihao Zhang).

➤ *Thesis Statement:*
Although the Reading Wars have been outlined as a binary choice between whole language and phonics, evidence gained from psycholinguistics and linguistics shows that effective literacy instruction must be scientifically grounded,

contextually adaptive, and culturally responsive, and it moves beyond entrenched divides towards a highly integrated and equity-focused approach to global literacy education. Effective literacy instruction integrates language science for equitable, diverse learning.

➢ Historical and Policy Context

In the last few decades, the phonics vs. whole-language debate has started. Phonics is related to the systematic decoding of sounds and letters. This approach was considered highly dominant throughout the 19th century. Some figures like William Holmes McGuffey (he created the McGuffey Readers in the 1830s) championed bottom-up instruction by focusing on sound-letter correspondences (Lexialearning). On the other hand, the whole-word or "look-and-say" method gained attention in the middle of the 1800s. This approach was enhanced by the influential position of Horace Mann in 1841 (Cothran). The phonics approach was considered reductive by Mann, and he preferred to present words as a whole to engage learners more naturally (Cothran).

➢ Key Turning Points

In 1997, a pivotal movement came with the National Reading Panel (NRP) in the USA, which was commissioned and reported in 2000. After reviewing all studies, the NRP concluded that systematic phonics was started in kindergarten and it made a lot of gains in fluency, decoding, and comprehension across socio-economic groups (Kostewicz and Jr.). However, it is less so for older struggling readers. Secondly, the panel has specified five vital pillars of reading instructions. These pillars include phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and comprehension. Moreover, these pillars called for balanced integration of these components rather than phonics alone (George).

In the middle of the 20th century, this class became mainstream because Rudolf Flesch's 1955 bestseller, "Why Johnny Can't Read, lambasted word-memorised methods and argued that phonics was considered vital to prepare students to handle complex tasks (Cave). According to Carnegie-funded studies, these systematic phonics instructions led to better comprehension and faster word recognition, which relates to the results given in Learning to Read: The Great Debate by Jeanne Chall (Ehri and Simone R. Nunes).

Furthermore, these findings informed the Reading First initiative under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, channelling US$5 billion into evidence-based reading instruction (Gamse and Robin Tepper Jacob). Besides this, some critics like panel members Joanne Yatvin argued that the NRP is not reliable because it ignored broader classroom motivations and marginalised learners, and it summarises the NRP's warning against phonics dominance (NIH).

➢ International Shifts

A similar shift occurred globally, too, like in Australia, where a government inquiry endorsed synthetic phonics over whole language in 2005. Based on the Rose Report in 2006 from the UK and subsequent policy white papers, systematic synthetic phonics is favoured in early education. Most recently, the Australian state of Victoria introduced a

structured literacy mandate, and its aim is to supplant less evidence-grounded balanced literacy practices (Fathimath Shaheema).

Moreover, in the USA, the pendulum swing continues because a recent literacy plan in Illinois focuses on phonics and contributes to a 16%-point rise in proficiency from 19% to 35% in 2023 (Eng). In the 1960s-70s, an experiment was conducted based on the Initial Teaching Alphabet (ITA) in which the British pushed a new phonetic alphabet to simplify the reading process, but failed. Hence, a lot of students struggled to transition back to the standard alphabet. Secondly, this project lacks longitudinal follow-up (Gardner).

➢ Rise and Critique of Balanced Literacy

The concept of balanced literacy was introduced to reconcile phonics with whole language by combining meaningful texts and explicit instructions in the late 20th century. Balanced literacy emphasizes flexible, student-centered instruction, blending phonics mini-lessons, guided reading, and independent writing that aims to tailor methods to individual needs. In the USA, a leading voice named Lucy Calkins has promoted balanced literacy widely in different parts of the country, like New York (Schwartz). However, a mounting criticism arose, and it showed anecdotal and research-based accounts suggested this approach is allowing excessive guessing over decoding, and affecting poorer readers badly. In 2022, a New York Feature described how balanced literacy faltered for disadvantaged students and only promoted curriculum revisions linked with daily phonics (Winter).

II. LINGUISTIC AND PSYCHOLINGUISTIC FOUNDATIONS

This section provides details regarding phonemic awareness, Syntax, Orthography, Morphology, and Semantics. Also, discusses reading as decoding vs. meaning-making with theories. Moreover, some information regarding the role of Working Memory, Cognitive load, and processing speed. Lastly, the effect of neurological and developmental perspectives on early reading and dyslexia is explained in detail (Antvorskov).

➢ Phonemic Awareness, Orthography, Morphology, Syntax, and Semantics

The reading acquisition process starts with phonemic awareness. A person can hear and manipulate sounds in words. Such learners who gained a master's level in phonemic segmentation typically develop decoding skills more effectively, especially in alphabetic systems (Carol Moxam). Such complexity in language's orthography relates to Shallow (like Finnish or Italian) or deep like French or English), which puts a huge influence on how readily children enhance their skills to read. However, shallower orthographies are enabling highly consistent letter-sound mapping that creates ease for reading acquisition compared with irregular and deep systems (Giazitzidou and Angeliki Mouzaki).

Furthermore, Morphological awareness is about understanding suffixes, prefixes, and roots that support

vocabulary development and decoding of other multisyllabic words (Meaux and Emily Diehm). Both semantics and syntax contribute to meaning-making for giving morphological awareness. Therefore, readers are required to comprehend sentence structure and interpret its contextual and literal meaning. Effective learners are integrating all these linguistic dimensions by enabling deeper understanding and accurate decoding (Meaux and Emily Diehm).

➢ *Reading as Decoding vs. Meaning-Making: Dual-Route Theory, Word Recognition and Comprehension*

It can be noted that the dual-route model of word recognition suggests two processing pathways. The first one is the lexical route (recognising familiar words by sight), and the non-lexical route (decoding through phonological rules). Although it is simple for skilled readers to use both routes that include irregular or high-frequency words often leverage the lexical routes. However, phonetically or novel regular words depend on the non-lexical phonics-based approach (Kuhlmann and Conrad).

From the psycholinguistic grain-size theory, readers are adjusting processing grain size by including phonemes, whole words, or rhymes based on the linguistic and orthographic context (Bowman-Perrott and Sharon deMarín). For effective comprehension, there is a need for accurate word recognition with higher-order processes. Hence, it will become simple to understand syntax, integrating semantic knowledge, and making inferences (Pae).

➢ *Role of Working Memory, Processing Speed, and Cognitive Load*

Baddeley's framework has modelled the working memory, and it consists of the central executive, the phonological loop, and the visuospatial sketchpad. Moreover, working memory capacity is strongly correlated with reading comprehension, academic achievement, and reasoning (Yin and Ahmad).

Secondly, cognitive load theory shows how intrinsic (task complexity), germane (schema-building), and extraneous (presentation inefficiencies) loads compete for limited working memory resources. Also, excessive load impairs learning and reading, especially in children (Zou and Zhihao Zhang).

The importance of processing speed is also important, and one study found that speed alone is unable to fully explain working memory differences in certain populations. Moreover, other evidence mentioned that such tasks that demand rapid decoding can overload working memory and minimise comprehension (Bosnes and Ole Bosnes).

Some interventions used to train working memory have mixed outcomes. It means that for children with specific learning disabilities, a 4-week verbal WM intervention with n=14 significantly enhances WM capacity by (t (24)=3.39, p<0.05 and d=1.48). Hence, comprehension is improved (p=0.04, d=0.92), but is unable to affect reading speed or accuracy (Okur and Aksoy). On the other side, children struggling with developmental dyslexia (aged 8-11) showed a high improvement rate in working memory, and reading fluency increased after 5 weeks of WM training. It suggests that a WM is considered a pivotal factor in increasing reading skills (Okur and Aksoy).

➢ *Neurological and Developmental Perspective on Early Reading and Dyslexia*

Due to developmental dyslexia, approximately 5-10% of the population is divided into various subtypes. It includes rapid-naming, surface, phonological, double-deficit, deep dyslexia, and visual dyslexia, which create various challenges in recognition or decoding (Al-Shidhani and Arora).

Neuroimaging has mentioned minimised activation in the left hemisphere reading network by including the inferior parietal lobule, inferior frontal gyrus, and temporal cortex in such individuals struggling with dyslexia (Fabio Richlan). Based on functional and structural neuroimaging studies, further altered connectivity is achieved by involving cortico-thalamic pathways by decreasing structural connectivity between the planum temporale and left auditory thalamus (MGB). Also, between the area V5/MT and the left visual thalamus (LGN), both are critically linked with reading proficiency and rapid naming (Fabio Richlan).

Some executive functional deficits present in attention, working memory, inhibition, and cognitive shifting are observed in children with dyslexia aged 6 to 12 and teenagers up to 21. It can be measured by applying tasks like reaction-time experiments and the Wisconsin Card Sorting Task (Feizpour and Helena C. Parkington).

On the other hand, brain plasticity differences played a main role because MIT-led research showed that dyslexic individuals showed minimised adaptive learning across visual and auditory tasks. Hence, it suggests dyslexia may reflect broader neurological divergence, and it is not limited to language processing (neurosciencenews).

III. INSTRUCTIONAL MODELS

➢ *Comparative Evaluation*

In this section, comprehensive information regarding the main reading instructional models is provided. These models include Whole Language, Phonics-first (Direct Instruction), and Structured Literacy (Kostewicz and Jr.). Moreover, the section will evaluate effectiveness through longitudinal studies and meta-analyses. Also, it considers how reliable each model is for neurodivergent learners and English Language Learners (Ehri and Simone R. Nunes).

➢ *Instructional Approaches*

• *Phonics-First/Direct Instruction:*

Direct instructions focus on systematic teaching and mastery. Secondly, it ensures that only 10% of the material is novel and 90% is review, and instructions are linked with the skill level of students (Mason and Otero). Based on meta-analysis, direct instructions are producing robust outcomes, and the average effect size ranges from 0.6 to 0.75 standard deviations (Mason and Otero).

- *Whole Language (Literature, Student Choice, and Immersion):*

Whole language links with immersion in meaningful text with self-directed reading. It is also considering phonics as incidental, that is, one of three cueing strategies, like phonetic, syntactic, and semantic, rather than foundational (Hansford and Scott A. Dueker). Based on longitudinal facts, these approaches often led to weaker outcomes compared with systematic phonics. According to Reading Recovery, a whole-language aligned intervention shows some inconsistent or negligible long-term effects (Feizpour and Helena C. Parkington). Furthermore, if these effect sizes are low or even negative for fluency, with some moderate gains achieved in reading levels (approx. 0.50), but decreased fluency by approx. -0.64 (Hansford and Scott A. Dueker).

- *Structured Literacy (Evidence-Based, Multisensory):*

Structured literacy is grounded in the Science of Reading, and it includes phonology and phonemic awareness, sound-symbol relationships, systematic, cumulative, multisensory, diagnostic, and explicit instruction, and syllables, morphology, semantics, and syntax (Graham and Hebert). From meta-analysis, strong support is gained because structural literacy is showing a mean unweighted effect size of 0.47 with a weighted mean of 0.44 by comparing it with balanced literacy, weaker effect sizes with a weighted 0.33 and unweighted 0.21 (Graham and Hebert). Secondly, by comparing systematic phonics vs. whole language, it can be observed that the mean effect sizes are 0.31 (phonics vs. whole language with phonics) and 0.51 (phonics vs. no phonics). Moreover, additional analysis reports consistent phonics benefits gained from post-2000, with mean effect sizes around 0.55 from 12 more meta-analyses (Hansford and Scott A. Dueker).

- *Effectiveness:* Longitudinal Studies and Meta-Analysis.

Table 1 Longitudinal Studies and Meta-Analysis

Instructional Model	Outcome/ Effect Size	Results
Direction Instruction	0.6 to 0.75 SDs	Strong empirical support, highly effective with comprehensive meta-analysis, and project follow-through.
Whole Language/ Reading Recovery	Mixed with 0.50 in reading levels and -0.64 in fluency, or negligible overall	Showed weak long-term outcomes and were less robust than phonics-based methods.
Structured Literacy	Shows an unweighted effect size of approximately 0.47 and a weighted effect size of only 0.44. It provides phonics superiority effects between 0.31 and 0.51, and further meta-analysis approx. 0.55	The system consistently outperforms balanced literacy and whole language approaches.

Furthermore, longitudinal research verifies these findings by using a four-year intervention combining phonics, phonemic awareness, syntax, semantics, and metacognitive strategies. All these strategies led towards a huge improvement in word reading, comprehension, and spelling sustained through follow-up years.

> *Accessibility for ELLs and Neurodivergent Learners*

- *English Language Learners (ELLs):*

for multilingual learners, structured literacy (SL) played a main role. One 1:1 tutoring study showed ELLs increased five additional months of learning in a year by comparing with national averages that achieved partial results with native speakers (Bowman-Perrott and Sharon deMarín). It shows that pure decoding is not enough, and it is reliable for effective ELLs and SL to include meaningful language use, cultural relevance, and language development. When these are not present, then SL risks becoming highly decontextualised and mechanical (Bowman-Perrott and Sharon deMarín).

- *Neurodivergent Learners like Reading Disabilities and Dyslexia:*

The role of Structural Literacy is extremely impactful for learners with dyslexia, and is estimated at 10 to 20% of the population (Antvorskov). All these students are gaining one to two grade levels within a single academic year when it is exposed to sustained, and highly intensive SL-based interventions. Some multisensory instructions, like kinaesthetic, visual, and auditory, are highly beneficial for those who are facing auditory or visual processing and reinforcing retention through multiple sensory inputs (Antvorskov).

Based on these facts, both structured literacy and direct instructions focuses on systematic phonics. Hence, it shows a strong effectiveness level with robust and consistent effect sizes and lasting improvements. However, various whole language approaches like Reading Recovery generally yield weaker and less reliable outcomes in fluency.

Finally, for ELLs, structured literacy is considered a highly promising method when it is paired with intentional adaptation for cultural inclusivity and language development. For the neurodivergent learners who struggled with dyslexia, SL's diagnostic, explicit, and multisensory approach is reliable because it provides critical support and allows measurable and rapid gains in literacy. Structured literacy boosts ELLs through language adaptations and aids neurodivergent learners via explicit, multisensory methods, ensuring equitable access to foundational reading skills.

IV. SOCIOLINGUISTIC AND EQUITY DIMENSIONS

➢ *Language Variation, Classroom Mismatch, and Dialects*

Based on the research, such students from diverse linguistic backgrounds often faced various problems when standard literacy instructions are not applicable to regional dialects, cultural contexts, and colloquial expressions (Antvorskov). Such a mismatch can be dangerous, and it can hinder engagement and comprehension, particularly for students whose home language is different from the standard academic language used in academic institutions. For example, if a student came from Japan, then his home language is Japanese, and he faced various problems in such schools where English is the academic language. Also, African American Vernacular English speakers may face problems with reading materials that do not reflect the linguistic patterns, leading to misinterpretation and disengagement (Antvorskov).

➢ *Literacy Instruction with Its Interaction with Class, Race, Linguistic Background, and Disability*

The approach used for literacy instruction can either perpetuate or resolve educational inequalities. Those students who come from socioeconomic and marginalised racial backgrounds often receive literacy instructions that lack cultural relevance (Carol Moxam). Therefore, they are unable to address their specific learning requirements. This disparity can be observed in the historical preference for whole language approaches that do not properly support students with English Language Learners and dyslexia. Structured literacy is linked with the Science of Reading (Bradbury). Therefore, it offers a huge inclusive framework by providing systematic and explicit instructions that provide benefits to all learners, including those with ELLS and disabilities (Bowman-Perrott and Sharon deMarín).

➢ *Equity Argument: Effective Literacy Teaching Distributes Opportunity*

To promote equity, effective literacy instruction is considered a vital tool. When literacy teaching is connected with evidence-based practices, then it ensures that all students, regardless of their background, will gain equal opportunity to gain success (DeLuca and Jill Willis). Implementing structured literacy in New York City schools has shown a promising start in improving reading outcomes for students from diverse socioeconomic and linguistic backgrounds. Hence, if schools and other educational institutions adopt a systematic approach to reading instruction, then they can easily bridge the achievement gap and provide all students with the required skills important for life and academic success for the future (Ehri and Simone R. Nunes).

V. POLICY CASE STUDIES

➢ *New York City's Shift from Balanced Literacy*

In 2023, New York City has taken a huge initiative to change its reading curriculum by moving away from the balanced literacy model developed by Lucy Calkins (Pondiscio). However, this decision was highly influenced by decades of stagnant literacy outcomes and a growing body of evidence that supports phonics-based instruction. Hence, the new initiative taken by NYC Reads is following the adoption of phonics-driven and evidence-based reading programs across all public elementary schools (Gamse and Robin Tepper Jacob). Based on the April 2025, the program has expanded towards middle schools that aim to serve over 350,000 students (Pondiscio). However, some challenges are still present. From this, the first challenge is linked with retaining educators and aligning curricula. However, this initiative represents a commitment of the brand towards improving literacy outcomes and resolving educational inequities (Luscombe).

➢ *The United Kingdom's National Phonics Screening Check*

The National Phonics Screening check was introduced by the UK in 2012. By using this screening check, the phonics knowledge of children can be assessed easily at the end of year 1. Secondly, this check includes 40 words, and both are related to pseudo and real words used to evaluate the ability of students to decode unfamiliar words (Gov.uk). Through implementing this check, it is possible to gain significant improvements in early reading skills with a comprehensive increment in the student's percentage that meets the expected standard. On the other side, some educators also raised various concerns regarding the pressure placed by this test on young learners and the potential narrowing of the curriculum (Bradbury).

➢ *Structured Literacy Mandates in Australia*

To improve reading instructions, Australia has recognised that there is a need for a systemic approach. The state of Victoria in Australia is going to implement a structured literacy approach in government primary schools by 2027 (Arc.educationapps.vic.gov). In this approach, they will also allow a minimum of 25 minutes of daily phonics instruction. This policy aligns perfectly with the Big 6 elements of reading instructions, and it aims to resolve the main reading challenges faced by students, particularly from disadvantaged backgrounds. Furthermore, the mandate reflects a commitment towards evidence-based practices and the improvement of literacy outcomes around the nation (Gawne).

➢ *Teacher Training and Assessment Policies*

The ability to give effective literacy instructions to students completely depends on well-prepared educators. If educators are well prepared and trained, then they can easily provide accurate education to students and give them proper knowledge regarding reading instructions (DeLuca and Jill Willis). Secondly, a lot of states and countries are working on revising teacher preparation programs by including assessment and coursework grounded in the Science of Reading. For instance, Maryland has conducted a detailed review of literacy instructions for ensuring that all students around the globe, regardless of their background or home language they receive high-quality, research-based literacy education (DeLuca and Jill Willis). Furthermore, one congress based on the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) regularly reviews all reading coursework provided by more than 700 elementary teacher preparation programs to show proper alignment with evidence-based practices. All these

initiatives showed that the importance of giving teachers comprehensive knowledge and skills is necessary to implement effective literacy instruction (DeLuca and Jill Willis).

Table 2 Teacher Training and Assessment Policies

Country	Teacher Training Focus	Assessment Policies	Key Initiatives
USA	Science of Reading (phonics, phonemics)	State-mandated licensure exams (e.g., Praxis)	NCTQ reviews 700+ programs; states like Maryland revise curricula for equity.
UK	Synthetic phonics (mandated nationally)	Early Career Framework (ECF) assessments	Phonics Screening Check for Year 1 students.
Finland	Holistic literacy (balanced approaches)	Minimal standardized testing; mentor-guided eval.	Emphasis on teacher autonomy and master's-level training.
Australia	Structured literacy (gaining traction)	National Literacy and Numeracy Testing (NAPLAN)	Lobbying to align teacher prep with cognitive science (AERO, 2023).

It means that the evolution of literacy instruction shows an increasing recognition of the requirement for evidence-based, equitable, and inclusive practices. The required policy shifts in cities like New York and countries like Australia and the UK have demonstrated a commitment to improve literacy outcomes for all students around the globe (Al-Shidhani and Arora). Hence, by aligning various instructional approaches with the Science of Reading and resolving all diverse requirements of learners, educational systems can foster an environment in which every student has an equal opportunity to gain success (Bosnes and Ole Bosnes).

VI. CONCLUSION

Summing up all the discussion from above, it is concluded that the evolution of literacy instruction has been marked by the enduring debate between whole-language and phonics-based approaches, often referred to as the "Reading Wars". Although both methods have their evidence, the evidence consistently supports the efficiency of phonics instruction in enhancing foundational reading skills. However, all models have failed to prove universally effective across all contexts. The diversity of learners, educational settings, and cultural backgrounds necessitates a comprehensive approach to literacy instruction.

Based on this, a context-sensitive, linguistically informed, and equity-driven model of reading instruction is reliable to address the changed requirements of students. This model must integrate explicit phonics instructions with strategies that promote critical thinking, comprehension, and love for reading. It must be adaptable enough to accommodate various linguistic backgrounds, cultural contexts, and learning abilities so that all students have proper access to literacy education.

To achieve this, there is a need for continued research because it can easily refine our understanding of reading acquisition and develop highly instructional practices that are both inclusive and effective. Moreover, all teacher training programs must be aligned with the latest evidence from psycholinguistics and linguistics, equipping educators with the knowledge and skills for implementing research-based strategies. On the other hand, literacy policies must be informed properly by scientific evidence and tailored to meet the requirements of students and foster an environment in which all learners can thrive.

The global educational system can balance scientific evidence with local requirements through fostering collaboration among educators, researchers, and policymakers. Through following an evidence-based and flexible approach to literacy, educational systems can ensure that all students will get equal education regardless of their abilities and background, and have the opportunity to become proficient readers and lifelong learners.

REFERENCES

[1]. Al-Shidhani, Thuraya Ahmed, and Vinita Arora. "Understanding dyslexia in children through human development theories." Sultan Qaboos University Medical Journal 12, no. 3 (2012): 286. (2012).

[2]. Antvorskov, Khayreyah. "Neurodivergent Learner like Reading Disabilities and Dyslexia." (2023).

[3]. Arc.educationapps.vic.gov. Victoria's approach to teaching reading F-2, 2025. <https://arc.educationapps.vic.gov.au/learning/sites/literacy/2484/Victorias-approach-to-teaching-reading-F-2>.

[4]. Bosnes, Ingunn and Eystein Stordal, Hans M. Nordahl, Tor Å. Myklebust and Ove Almkvist. Ole Bosnes. "Processing speed and working memory are predicted by components of successful ageing: a HUNT study." BMC Psychology 10, no. 1 (2022): 16. (2022).

[5]. Bowman-Perrott, Lisa, Lakshmi Mahadevan, Matthew Etchells, and Sharon deMarín. "Assessing the academic, social, and language production outcomes of English language learners engaged in peer tutoring: A systematic review." One 1:1 tutoring study showed ELLs increased five additional months of learning in a year by comparing with national averages that achieved partial results with native speakers (2016).

[6]. Bradbury, Alice. "The impact of the Phonics Screening Check on grouping by ability: A 'necessary evil'amid the policy storm." British Educational Research Journal 44, no. 4 (2018): 539-556. (2018).

[7]. Carol Moxam. "The link between language and spelling: What speech-language pathologists and teachers need to know." Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools 51, no. 4 (2020): 939-954. (2020).

[8]. Cave, Gilbert T. Why Johnny Can't Read. 2022. <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/literature-and-writing/why-johnny-cant-

read#:~:text=%22Why%20Johnny%20Can't%20Read ,literacy%20in%20diverse%20classroom%20settings. >.

[9]. Cothran, Martin. This is the History of Phonics. 2014. <https://www.memoriapress.com/articles/history-phonics/#:~:text=One%20of%20the%20largest%20research,Classical%20Teacher%20Summer%202014%20edition.>.

[10]. DeLuca, Christopher, and Bronwen Cowie, Christine Harrison, Andrew Coombs, Andrew Gibson, Suzanne Trask, Jill Willis. "Policies, programs, and practices: Exploring the complex dynamics of assessment education in teacher education across four countries." In Frontiers in Education, vol. 4, p. 132. Frontiers Media SA, 2019. (2019).

[11]. Ehri, Linnea C., Steven A. Stahl, Dale M. Willows, Simone R. Nunes. "Systematic phonics instruction helps students learn to read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's meta-analysis." Review of educational research 71, no. 3 (2001): 393-447. (2001).

[12]. Eng, Monica. Illinois gets re-hooked on phonics. 2023. <https://www.axios.com/local/chicago/2024/01/30/illinois-literacy-plan-reading-scores-low>.

[13]. Fabio Richlan. "Developmental dyslexia: dysfunction of a left hemisphere reading network." Frontiers in human neuroscience 6 (2012): 120. (2012).

[14]. Fathimath Shaheema. "Reading instruction: content knowledge, self-perceived teaching abilities and beliefs of teachers in key stage one of Maldivian schools." (2023).

[15]. Feizpour, Azadeh, and Farshad A. Mansouri. Helena C. Parkington. "Cognitive sex differences in effects of music in the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test." Psychology of Music 48, no. 2 (2020): 252-265. (2020).

[16]. Gamse, Beth C., Megan Horst, Beth Boulay, and Fatih Unlu. Robin Tepper Jacob. "Reading First Impact Study. Final Report. NCEE 2009-4038." National Centre for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (2008). (2008).

[17]. Gardner, Keith. "THE INITIAL TEACHING ALPHABET (i.t.a.) AND REMEDIAL READING PROGRAMME." The Slow Learning Child, 13(2), 67–71 (2006).

[18]. Gawne, Linda. "The politics and pedagogy of teaching literacy in the state of Victoria, Australia." Educational Research for Policy and Practice (2024): 1-16. (2024).

[19]. George, Sigy. Five Pillars of Reading. 2023. <https://informationmatters.org/2023/09/five-pillars-of-reading/>.

[20]. Giazitzidou, Sophia, Susana Padeliadu, Angeliki Mouzaki. "Pathways from morphological awareness to reading fluency: the mediating role of phonological awareness and vocabulary." Reading and Writing 37, no. 5 (2024): 1109-1131. (2024).

[21]. Gov.uk. Phonics screening check: information for parents. 2025. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/phonics-screening-check-information-for-parents/phonics-screening-check-2024-information-for-parents-text-only-version#:~:text=The%20phonics%20screening%20ch

eck%20contains,you%20read%20with%20your%20child.>.

[22]. Graham, Steve, and Michael Hebert. "Writing to read: A meta-analysis of the impact of writing and writing instruction on reading." Harvard educational review 81, no. 4 (2011): 710-744. (2011).

[23]. Hansford, Nathaniel, and Kathryn Garforth, Jill D. Grande, Joshua King, and Sky McGlynn. Scott A. Dueker. "Reading recovery: a longitudinal meta-analysis." Discover Education 3, no. 1 (2024): 1-12. (2024).

[24]. Kostewicz, Douglas E. and Richard M. Kubina Jr. "The national reading panel guidepost: A review of reading outcome measures for students with emotional and behavioural disorders." Behavioural Disorders 33, no. 2 (2008): 62-74. (2008).

[25]. Kuhlmann, Emily Hope, and Amy Lynn Conrad. "Word reading in boys with isolated oral clefts: comparison to unaffected average and dyslexic readers using the dual-route model." The Cleft Palate Craniofacial Journal 57, no. 3 (2020): 310-320. (2020).

[26]. Lexialearning. The Science of Reading vs. Balanced Literacy: The History of the Reading Wars. 2022. <https://www.lexialearning.com/blog/the-science-of-reading-vs-balanced-literacy-the-history-of-the-reading-wars>.

[27]. Luscombe, Belinda. Inside the Massive Effort to Change the Way Kids Are Taught to Read. 2025. <https://time.com/6205084/phonics-science-of-reading-teachers>.

[28]. Mason, Lee, and Maria Otero. "Just how effective is direct instruction?" Perspectives on Behaviour Science 44, no. 2 (2021): 225-244 (2021).

[29]. Meaux, Ashley Bourque, Ginger Collins, Emily Diehm. "Morphological knowledge: Opportunities for collaboration through a multitiered system of supports." Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools 51, no. 3 (2020): 515-530. (2020).

[30]. Neurosciencenews. Distinctive Brain Pattern May Underlie Dyslexia. 2016. https://neurosciencenews.com/dyslexia-brain-pattern-5789/ nichd. Nih. National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read. 2025. <https://www.nichd.nih.gov/sites/default/files/publications/pubs/nrp/Documents/report.pdf>.

[31]. Okur, Mehmet and Veysel Aksoy. "The Effect of Verbal Working Memory Intervention on the Reading Performance of Students with Specific Learning Disabilities." Behavioural Sciences 15, no. 3 (2025): 356. (2025).

[32]. Pae, Hye K. "Toward a script relativity hypothesis: Focused research agenda for psycholinguistic experiments in the science of reading." Journal of Cultural Cognitive Science 6, no. 2 (2022): 97-117. (2020).

[33]. Pondiscio, Robert. Reading opens worlds — and NYC schools are finally getting it right. 2025. <https://nypost.com/2025/04/22/opinion/reading-opens-worlds-and-nyc-schools-are-getting-it-right/>.

[34]. Schwartz, Sarah. Lucy Calkins Says Balanced Literacy Needs 'Rebalancing'. 2020. <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/lucy-calkins-says-balanced-literacy-needs-rebalancing/2020/10>.

[35]. Winter, Jessica. The Rise and Fall of Vibes-Based Literacy. 2022. <https://www.newyorker.com/news/annals-of-education/the-rise-and-fall-of-vibes-based-literacy>.

[36]. Yin, Hue Chi, and Nor Aniza Ahmad. "PHONOLOGICAL LOOP AND VISUOSPATIAL SKETCHPAD OF WORKING MEMORY: COMPARISON BETWEEN WESTERN AND CHINESE MUSICAL INSTRUMENT BACKGROUND." ICERP 2017: 138. (2017).

[37]. Zou, Liye, and Myrto Mavilidi, Yanxia Chen, Fabian Herold, Kim Ouwehand, and Fred Paas. Zhihao Zhang. "The synergy of embodied cognition and cognitive load theory for optimised learning." Nature Human Behaviour (2025): 1-9. (2025).