Groundwork
HANDWRITING SYSTEM

Handwriting Research Summary: Evidence-Based Practices for Teachers and Occupational Therapists

*Research Overview: GHS Professional Learning Series | Research Brief **2 of 3***

Effective Instruction and Intervention

- Prioritise regular handwriting practice itself, regardless of the specific approach, as the main driver of improvement (Hoy, Egan, & Feder, 2011). Systematic review evidence suggests that at least twice-weekly sessions and at least 20 sessions in total are required for reliable gains. Since this threshold is based on studies with children already referred for handwriting difficulties, use it as a guide for remediation rather than a universal dose.
- Avoid focusing exclusively on isolated motor activities (e.g., fine-motor, sensorimotor, or visual-perceptual exercises) as a handwriting intervention, since these have not been shown to improve handwriting (Santangelo & Graham, 2016). Note: This finding comes from a comprehensive meta-analysis, which provides stronger evidence than single studies.
- Use multimodal instruction that engages auditory, visual, tactile, and kinaesthetic (movement) pathways simultaneously, integrating these into spelling, reading, and writing lessons. For example, have students say, trace, and write letters during phonics lessons (Wolf, Abbott, & Berninger, 2017).
- Integrate motor skill development with letter-formation practice and functional writing tasks. Practising letter formation from memory while saying the letter's sound, using a recall-retrieve-reproduce-repeat approach, supports early handwriting and reading development (Howe, Roston, Sheu, & Hinojosa, 2013; Ray, Dally, Colyvas, & Lane, 2021; Santangelo & Graham, 2016).
- Combine low-level practice (copying letters) with high-level tasks (writing sentences in context) across multiple contexts (Howe et al., 2013).
- Maintain a single handwriting style (e.g., print) for at least two years before introducing another (e.g., cursive) to support mastery and avoid competing motor programmes (Wolf et al., 2017).
- Tailor instruction to each student to improve legibility, using brief, targeted assessments to identify specific formation difficulties and customise practice (Santangelo & Graham, 2016). Note: Since only some underlying studies compared individualised teaching with whole-class instruction, the evidence does not indicate that individualised teaching is superior. This comparison evidence is limited and should be interpreted cautiously.

- For second-grade students, use cognitive approaches that target thinking strategies such as explicit letter-formation planning. These approaches showed large effect sizes compared to both multisensory approaches and no intervention, highlighting the importance of the cognitive dimension alongside multisensory practice (Zwicker & Hadwin, 2009). Note: Treat these findings as preliminary, as the sample was small and statistical significance was not reached.

> **Integrated Hourglass link:**
> *The instruction and intervention evidence maps directly onto the Integrated Hourglass's dual-stream approach. Working on the bottom-up Perceptual-Motor layer alone is not enough; effective practice engages it alongside the top-down Cognitive Integration and Language & Literacy layers through phonics and composition tasks. This is why the GHS deliberately combines cognitive strategies (explicit verbal formation prompts, consistent starting points, structured stroke sequences) with multisensory delivery (visual model, auditory cue, kinaesthetic execution). Both add value, and operating across both streams simultaneously is the defining clinical rationale of the GHS.*

Assessment and Evaluation

- Handwriting tasks comprise an estimated 42% of a primary school student's day, making handwriting proficiency a crucial factor in academic engagement and success (Fancher, Priestley-Hopkins, & Jeffries, 2018).
- Around 20% of young students are at risk for handwriting difficulties. Early identification, particularly via kindergarten screening for letter formation and writing speed, is therefore essential (Fancher et al., 2018).
- A comprehensive handwriting evaluation should include both speed and legibility measures. Timed writing tasks in the classroom offer a practical first step for identifying students at risk. Visual-motor integration assessments can also be included, but their limitations must be acknowledged (Howe et al., 2013).
- Visual-motor integration, the coordination of visual information with hand movement, has been described as a possible predictor of handwriting success. Notably, students with poor handwriting often perform poorly on visual-motor integration assessments, such as the Beery-Buktenica Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration. However, its screening value remains unverified, so these measures should be interpreted cautiously and not considered strong standalone predictors (Howe et al., 2013).
- The **Letter Form Assessment Version 2 (LFA)** by Ray (2023) is a valuable open-source, standardised, and performance-based tool for individual assessment (see References for the link).

Integrated Hourglass link:

Visual-motor integration is in the Perceptual-Motor layer of the bottom-up stream. It also sits at the interface between the bottom-up stream and the performance area in Education & Schooling, where handwriting difficulties are most evident. Assessment that targets visual-motor integration is therefore both bottom-up in its clinical focus and participation-oriented in its purpose.

Age-Appropriate Considerations

- Early skill development in preschool and the early primary years creates the foundation for complex written communication in later schooling (Kadar et al., 2020).
- Use intervention in the 4–6-year age range to improve handwriting skills in children with and without identified disabilities, supporting universal Tier 1 handwriting instruction from the Foundation year (Kadar, Wan Yunus, Tan, Chai, Razaob@Razab, & Kasim, 2020). Note that the evidence base remains limited, so treat these conclusions as preliminary.
- In late preschool, prioritise letter-forming experiences, then shift to explicit, structured instruction in the primary grades (Fancher et al., 2018).

Collaboration and Implementation

- Enable teachers to identify handwriting difficulties early by observing irregular letter formation, poor spacing, or slow output. Combine teacher identification processes with OT assessment to optimise early support (Fancher et al., 2018).
- Integrate OT intervention into the classroom curriculum rather than relying solely on withdrawal settings to achieve greater time and cost efficiency (Kadar et al., 2020). Co-planning between teachers and OTs to design in-class handwriting activities strengthens the link between intervention and classroom learning.
- Implement small-group handwriting sessions, such as the “Handwriting Club” model (Howe et al., 2013), to fit school timetables and deliver short-term Tier 2 support within a response-to-intervention framework.
- Increase opportunities for writing practice to support improved writing and reading outcomes (Malpique, Pino-Pasternak, & Roberto, 2020). Notably, the amount of handwriting instruction was not significantly related to writing performance, suggesting that practice opportunities, rather than instructional time alone, are most beneficial. Treat this as an association, not evidence of causation.

References

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

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

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

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

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

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