

Research Highlights: Handwriting, Literacy, and the Limits of the Evidence

Research Overview: GHS Professional Learning Series | Highlights of Research Briefs 1 to 3

This document condenses the three GHS Research Briefs. Every claim keeps the hedges its source carries, because the limits of the evidence matter as much as its strengths. The full briefs, with their clinical commentary and Integrated Hourglass links, are free and open access at firstot.com.au/research.

1. Why Handwriting Matters for Literacy

- **Automaticity frees capacity.** When letter formation is automatic, cognitive resources shift from the mechanics of transcription to idea generation, planning, and sentence construction (Sweller, 1988; Sweller et al., 2019). In a randomised controlled trial, Year 1 students given supplemental handwriting and spelling instruction made significantly greater gains in fluency, legibility, and spelling than peers, and those gains transferred to sentence construction and word choice (Graham et al., 2018).
- **Fluency tracks writing quality.** Handwriting automaticity is associated with writing quality and, over the longer term, with reading (Malpique et al., 2020). The association with writing quality holds after accounting for attitude to writing, home language, and year level (Skar et al., 2022).
- **The hand supports the reading brain.** Physically forming a letter activates brain regions associated with reading, an effect not observed when letters are only viewed. There is moderate evidence that handwriting instruction improves spelling and word reading, with some evidence for phonological awareness (Ray et al., 2022).
- **Teaching writing improves reading.** A meta-analysis of 19 studies found writing instruction produced a small but statistically significant positive effect on reading, and transcription-focused instruction produced larger gains than instruction focused on other writing processes (Shanahan et al., 2024).
- **Early skills predict later literacy.** A systematic review of 17 studies involving 3,343 children found kindergarten handwriting skills predicted letter knowledge, word reading, and spelling, with phonemic awareness in a weaker evidence strand. The authors describe these conclusions as preliminary (Ray et al., 2022).
- **Strategy outperforms drill for students with difficulties.** Cognitive strategy training targeting planning, letter recall, and attentional regulation had the greatest effect on letter formation accuracy (Mathwin et al., 2023). Children with learning disabilities benefit most from interventions that combine handwriting, spelling, and self-management, though evidence is emerging (Bray et al., 2021).

2. What Effective Instruction Looks Like

- **Practice itself is the driver.** Regular practice matters more than the particular approach (Hoy et al., 2011). Review evidence points to at least twice-weekly sessions and at least 20 in total for reliable gains, though that threshold comes from studies of children already referred for difficulties, so treat it as a remediation guide, not a universal dose.
- **Isolated motor work does not transfer.** Fine-motor, sensorimotor, and visual-perceptual exercises, when used on their own, have not been shown to improve handwriting (Santangelo & Graham, 2016).
- **Multimodal and inside literacy.** Engage auditory, visual, tactile, and kinaesthetic pathways together, inside spelling, reading, and writing lessons. Practising formation from memory while saying the letter's sound supports handwriting and early reading (Howe et al., 2013; Ray et al., 2021; Wolf et al., 2017).
- **One style, held steady.** Maintain a single handwriting style for at least two years before introducing another, to support mastery and avoid competing motor programmes (Wolf et al., 2017).
- **Individualise, with a caveat.** Brief targeted assessment and customised practice improve legibility (Santangelo & Graham, 2016), though few underlying studies compared individualised with whole-class teaching, so the evidence does not establish that individualised instruction is superior.
- **The cognitive dimension matters.** In Year 2 students, cognitive approaches targeting explicit letter-formation planning showed large effect sizes against both multisensory approaches and no intervention (Zwicker & Hadwin, 2009). Treat this as preliminary: the sample was small and statistical significance was not reached.
- **Screen early, and screen the right things.** Around 20% of young students are at risk of handwriting difficulty (Fancher et al., 2018). Evaluation should cover speed and legibility; visual-motor integration measures have unverified screening value (Howe et al., 2013). The Letter Form Assessment v2 is a free, standardised option (Ray, 2023).

3. Where the Evidence Runs Out

The evidence is strong on two things: handwriting instruction supports literacy, and explicit, cognitively integrated approaches work best. It is silent on four design questions every teacher and therapist still has to answer, and no controlled trials were found for any of them. The GHS answers each through Cognitive Load Theory, motor-learning principles, and structured clinical reasoning, offered transparently as reasoning rather than as trial evidence.

Question 1 (Lined Paper): What size, and what configuration?

- Lined paper improves legibility compared with unlined paper, regardless of fine motor or visuomotor skill level. The same study found no effect on fluency, so the benefit is specific to legibility (Guilbert & Fernandez, 2025).
- A four-line grid may be better than a two-line system for letter sizing, with no differences in legibility, form, alignment, or spacing (Reidlinger et al., 2012). Beyond this, no evidence specifies optimal line sizes in millimetres, supports a graduated progression, or compares colour-coded with standard guiding lines.

The GHS response. Line size reduces as automaticity develops, on the reasoning that larger lines lower spatial precision demands so attention can go to formation. The same four zones are used at every size, so the spatial language never changes, and progression is competency-based, since no research assigns a line size to a year level.

Question 2 (Dosage): How much practice, how often?

- A scoping review of 24 studies found a typical dose of about 13 weeks, a median of 20 minutes per session, and 3 sessions per week; the mean session length (34 minutes) is inflated by one weeklong intensive outlier (Gee et al., 2025). These describe how the studies were designed, not an optimal dose.
- Short daily sessions of roughly 50 to 100 minutes per week are recommended from Foundation to Year 3 (Graham, 2010). The consistent direction is that brief, frequent, spaced practice beats infrequent, longer sessions, but no trial has established a Tier 1 whole-class dose.

The GHS response. Tier 1 at 10 to 15 minutes daily; Tier 2 or 3 at 15 to 20 minutes across 3 to 5 sessions per week, minimum 15 to 20 sessions. Practice is embedded in phonics and literacy tasks wherever possible, so handwriting dosage runs concurrently with literacy instruction rather than competing with it.

Question 3 (Formation Scripts): Which verbal cues work best?

- Direct instruction pairing visual cues with verbal mediation, where the child talks through the formation sequence while writing, improves automatic handwriting and transfers to word reading (Berninger et al., 2006). Performance feedback on formation is among the most effective types of intervention (López-Escribano et al., 2022).
- No comparative research was found on cue types: metaphorical, character-based, landscape-based, or spatially explicit. Consistency of cue matters more than which cue is chosen (Wolf et al., 2017).

The GHS response. Spatially explicit, literal scripts using the same vocabulary as the four-zone page, so there is no metaphor to translate before the hand moves. The reasoning is cognitive load: a metaphorical cue adds a translation step competing for the working memory needed for motor planning. This is a reasoned position, not an evidence-based mandate.

Question 4 (Font Style): Print, pre-cursive, or cursive?

- No controlled evidence establishes that any font type produces superior outcomes. The strongest finding is consistency: maintaining the same format for at least two years produced better handwriting, spelling, and composing than switching. That study compared consistency with inconsistency, not print with cursive (Wolf et al., 2017).
- Cursive is not demonstrably faster. Among 715 French-speaking children, those taught cursive only wrote significantly more slowly by the end of Grade 2 (Morin et al., 2012). Nor is cursive a remedy for dyslexia: the reversal rationale rests on the premise that dyslexia is a visual processing difficulty, and the proportion of reversals is similar in children with and without dyslexia, the deficit being phonological rather than visual (Hebert et al., 2018).

The GHS response. ACT/NSW Print, because it matches the letterforms children meet in their reading materials, is mandated in ACT and NSW schools, and one font across every GHS resource removes a source of extraneous load. The line system, formation sequence, and scripts are font-agnostic and work with any state-appropriate font.

Positioning the GHS. Where the research is strong, the GHS follows it. Where it is thin, the GHS reasons from Cognitive Load Theory, motor-learning principles, and clinical reasoning, and says so. That absence of evidence is not a weakness; it is the gap the approach was built to fill.

References

Every source below was verified against the original article during preparation of the three Research Briefs.

- Barnett, A. L., Connelly, V., & Miller, B. (2020). The interaction of reading, spelling, and handwriting difficulties with writing development. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 53(2), 92–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219419894565>
- Berninger, V. W., Rutberg, J. E., Abbott, R. D., Garcia, N., Anderson-Youngstrom, M., Brooks, A., & Fulton, C. (2006). Tier 1 and Tier 2 early intervention for handwriting and composing. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(1), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.12.003>
- Bray, L., Skubik-Peplaski, C., & Ackerman, K. B. (2021). A systematic review of the effectiveness of interventions to improve handwriting and spelling in children with specific learning disabilities. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*, 14(4), 437–465. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19411243.2021.1934227>
- Fancher, L. A., Priestley-Hopkins, D. A., & Jeffries, L. M. (2018). Handwriting acquisition and intervention: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*, 11(4), 454–473. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19411243.2018.1534634>
- Gee, B., Lloyd, K., & Ewoniuk, J. (2025). Exploring the dosage of handwriting curricula among school-aged children. *Academic Journal of Health Sciences & Research*, 1(3).
- Graham, S. (2010). Want to improve children's writing? Don't neglect their handwriting. *American Educator*, 33(4), 20–27.
- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Adkins, M. (2018). The impact of supplemental handwriting and spelling instruction with first grade students who do not acquire transcription skills as rapidly as peers: A randomized control trial. *Reading and Writing*, 31, 1273–1294. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9822-0>
- Guilbert, J., & Fernandez, J. (2025). The use of lined paper in child education: Impact of line presence on handwriting quality. *Reading and Writing*, 38(9), 2543–2561. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-024-10612-w>
- Hebert, M., Kearns, D. M., Hayes, J. B., Bazis, P., & Cooper, S. (2018). Why children with dyslexia struggle with writing and how to help them. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 49(4), 843–863. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_LSHSS-DYSLC-18-0024
- Howe, T.-H., Roston, K. L., Sheu, C.-F., & Hinojosa, J. (2013). Assessing handwriting intervention effectiveness in elementary school students: A two-group controlled study. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 67, 19–27. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2013.005470>
- Hoy, M. M. P., Egan, M. Y., & Feder, K. P. (2011). A systematic review of interventions to improve handwriting. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 78(1), 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.2182/cjot.2011.78.1.3>
- Kadar, M., Wan Yunus, F., Tan, E., Chai, S. C., Razaob@Razab, N. A., & Kasim, D. H. M. (2020). A systematic review of occupational therapy intervention for handwriting skills in 4–6 year old children. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 67, 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1630.12626>
- López-Escribano, C., Martín-Babarro, J., & Pérez-López, R. (2022). Promoting handwriting fluency for preschool and elementary-age students: Meta-analysis and meta-synthesis of research from 2000 to 2020. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 841573. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.841573>
- Malpique, A. A., Pino-Pasternak, D., & Roberto, M. S. (2020). Writing and reading performance in Year 1 Australian classrooms: Associations with handwriting automaticity and writing instruction. *Reading and Writing*, 33, 783–805. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-019-09994-z>
- Mathwin, K., Chapparo, C., & Hinit, J. (2023). Children with handwriting difficulties: Impact of cognitive strategy training for acquisition of accurate alphabet-letter-writing. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 86(6), 451–461. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03080226221148413>
- Morin, M.-F., Lavoie, N., & Montésinos-Gelet, I. (2012). The effects of manuscript, cursive or manuscript/cursive styles on writing development in Grade 2. *Language and Literacy*, 14(1), 110–124. <https://doi.org/10.20360/G21S3V>
- Ray, K. (2023). Letter Form Assessment Version 2 (LFA). Open Research Newcastle. <https://hdl.handle.net/1959.13/1468664>
- Ray, K., Dally, K., Colyvas, K., & Lane, A. E. (2021). The effects of a whole-class kindergarten handwriting intervention on early reading skills. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(4), 543–558. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.395>
- Ray, K., Dally, K., Rowlandson, L., Tam, K. I., & Lane, A. E. (2022). The relationship of handwriting ability and literacy in kindergarten: A systematic review. *Reading and Writing*, 35, 1119–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-021-10224-8>
- Reidlinger, W., Candler, C., & Neville, M. (2012). Comparison of differently lined paper on letter production quality in first graders. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*, 5(2), 155–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19411243.2012.701544>
- Santangelo, T., & Graham, S. (2016). A comprehensive meta-analysis of handwriting instruction. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28, 225–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9335-1>
- Shanahan, E., Reno, E., Chandler, B. W., Novelli, C., An, J., Choi, S., & McMaster, K. L. (2024). Effects of writing instruction on the reading outcomes of students with literacy difficulties in pre-kindergarten to fifth grade: A meta-analysis. *Reading and Writing*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-024-10527-6>
- Skar, G. B., Lei, P.-W., Graham, S., Aasen, A. J., Johansen, M. B., & Kvistad, A. H. (2022). Handwriting fluency and the quality of primary grade students' writing. *Reading and Writing*, 35, 509–538. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-021-10185-y>
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
- Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Paas, F. (2019). Cognitive architecture and instructional design: 20 years later. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31(2), 261–292. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09465-5>
- Wolf, B., Abbott, R. D., & Berninger, V. W. (2017). Effective beginning handwriting instruction: Multimodal, consistent format for 2 years, and linked to spelling and composing. *Reading and Writing*, 30, 299–317. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-016-9674-4>
- Zwicker, J. G., & Hadwin, A. F. (2009). Cognitive versus multisensory approaches to handwriting intervention: A randomized controlled trial. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health*, 29(1), 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.3928/15394492-20090101-06>

Read the full briefs. All three GHS Research Briefs are free and open access, with no sign-up, at firstot.com.au/research. The Groundwork Handwriting System professional learning covers the tools these briefs point to: the four-zone paper series, the 52-letter formation animation, and customisable phonics-integrated templates. James Lyra (OT), FIRST Occupational Therapy, james@firstot.com.au