Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 4, Issue 6 (2026)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

An Analysis Of Reading And Writing Problems Faced By Dyslexic Students At The Primary Level

Iqra Mir
Scholar, Institute of Education & Research, Quaid-E-Azam Campus, Gomal University, D.I. Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

Dr. Shabnam Razzaq Khan
Assistant Professor,Institute of Education & Research, Quaid-E-Azam Campus, Gomal University, D.I. Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan
Email: srkhangu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examined the perceptions of school heads, teachers, and parents regarding reading and writing difficulties experienced by dyslexic learners at the primary level. Conducted across four private schools in Dera Ismail Khan, the research employed a descriptive survey design and administered a validated 7-point Likert-scale questionnaire to 381 participants (4 heads, 82 teachers, and 295 parents). Results showed that reading problems were moderately recognised (overall mean = 3.82), with 30.5% of teachers and parents expressing neutral views. Writing difficulties were recognised even less (overall mean = 3.64), with notable uncertainty across all stakeholder groups. ANOVA tests indicated no statistically significant differences among the three stakeholder groups for reading ($F = 0.15$, $p = 0.863$) or writing ($F = 0.12$, $p = 0.887$), suggesting consistent perceptions across stakeholders. The study recommends multisensory reading interventions (e.g., the Orton-Gillingham approach), assistive writing technologies (e.g., speech-to-text software and graphic organisers), and structured literacy programmes to address these challenges. Emphasis is placed on teacher training, parent awareness, and school-specific support frameworks within the local context.

Keywords: *Dyslexia, Reading Problems, Writing Problems, Primary Education, Stakeholder Perceptions, Orton Gillingham, Multisensory Instruction, Assistive Technology, Dera Ismail Khan, Inclusive Education*

INTRODUCTION

Background

Dyslexia is a neurobiological learning disability that primarily affects reading development, characterised by difficulties with accurate and/or fluent word recognition, poor spelling, and decoding (Lyon et al., 2003; Peterson & Pennington, 2015). The term derives from Greek, where "dys" means difficulty and "lexia" refers to words or language (Lu et al., 2009). The World Health Organisation (2011) defines dyslexia as unexpected difficulty in developing effective reading skills despite

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

adequate intelligence, sociocultural opportunities, and schooling. Although long recognised as a reading disability, dyslexia also affects writing, spelling, and overall academic performance. Samuel T. Orton, a neurologist who conducted early investigations in the 1920s, identified common characteristics, including word-recognition difficulties, letter reversals (b/d, p/q), confusion of letters and numbers, and omissions during reading (Shaywitz & Shaywitz, 2004). These challenges stem from deficits in phonological processing, difficulties in hearing, identifying, and manipulating sounds in spoken language (Hulme & Snowling, 2016).

At the primary school level, reading and writing are fundamental to all learning. Dyslexic students struggle with decoding text, recognising sight words, and understanding what they read. In writing, they face difficulties with spelling, legible handwriting, and the coherent organisation of their thoughts. These challenges are not due to a lack of effort or intelligence but reflect neurological differences in how language is processed (Fletcher et al., 2018).

Research Gap

Although considerable research addresses reading difficulties in dyslexia, fewer studies have examined writing problems separately, and stakeholder perceptions of the relative severity of these challenges remain underexplored. Kundi and Alharbi (2022) examined the relationship between dyslexia and academic performance, emphasising the mediating role of teacher awareness. Aladwani et al. (2012) investigated Kuwaiti educators' knowledge of dyslexia, while Basu (2014) reported that 83% of teachers identified academic issues among dyslexic children. However, research in the Pakistani context remains limited, particularly regarding stakeholder perceptions of reading and writing difficulties at the primary level.

Statement of the Problem

Dyslexia severely impairs students' reading and writing abilities, yet many primary classrooms lack appropriate accommodations and evidence-based interventions. Reading difficulties manifest as slow decoding, frequent misreading, and poor comprehension, while writing challenges include spelling errors, illegible handwriting, and disorganised expression. Without targeted support, dyslexic learners experience frustration, low self-esteem, and widening achievement gaps. This study addresses the need to understand stakeholder perceptions of these specific challenges to inform more effective interventions.

Research Objectives

To determine stakeholders' perceptions regarding reading problems faced by dyslexic students at the primary level.

To determine stakeholders' perceptions of the writing problems faced by dyslexic students at the primary level

Research Questions

What are stakeholders' perceptions regarding the reading problems faced by dyslexic students at the primary level?

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 4, Issue 6 (2026)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

What are stakeholders' perceptions regarding the writing problems faced by dyslexic students at the primary level?

Research Hypotheses

H_{01}: There is no significant difference in stakeholders' perceptions of the reading problems faced by dyslexic students.

H_{02}: There is no significant difference between stakeholders' perceptions regarding writing problems faced by dyslexic students.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A descriptive survey research design was adopted to gather data from stakeholders without manipulating variables (Bloomfield & Fisher, 2019). This design was appropriate for describing current perceptions of reading and writing difficulties among dyslexic students.

Population and Sample

The population comprised all heads, teachers, and parents of four private primary schools in District Dera Ismail Khan: Noble School and College, The Guardian's Education, Wensum School and College, and The Key Stone School. The sample was determined using the L.R. Gay formula, resulting in 381 participants: 4 heads, 82 teachers, and 295 parents.

Table#1: Population of the Study

Private Primary Schools	Heads	Teachers	Parents	Total
Noble School and College	01	11	300	312
The Guardian's Education	01	16	260	277
Wensum School and College	01	30	484	515
The Key Stone School	01	25	430	456
Total	**04**	**82**	**1474**	**1560**

Table#2: Sample of the Study

Private Primary Schools	Heads	Teachers	Parents	Total
Noble School and College	01	11	60	72
The Guardian's Education	01	16	52	69
Wensum School and College	01	30	97	128
The Key Stone School	01	25	86	112
Total	**04**	**82**	**295**	**381**

Research Instrument

A questionnaire was developed and validated through expert review. Content Validity Index (CVI) reached 0.90, with 48 items retained across six domains. The instrument used a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree). Reliability was established using Cronbach's alpha, with the reading problems domain achieving $\alpha = 0.91$, the writing problems domain achieving $\alpha = 0.86$, and the overall instrument

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 4, Issue 6 (2026)
Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

achieving α = 0.92.

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher personally visited all schools to administer questionnaires. Orientation sessions explained the purpose, response format, and confidentiality of responses. Written informed consent was obtained from school authorities and parents. Participants were assured of the voluntary nature of participation and the right to withdraw at any time.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (percentages, means, and standard deviations) and inferential statistics (one-way ANOVA) were used to analyse stakeholder perceptions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Descriptive Analysis: Reading Problems

Table#3: Reading Problems Faced by Dyslexic Students

Response	Heads	%	Teachers	%	Parents	%	Total
SD (1)	0	0%	6	7.3%	25	8.5%	31
D (2)	1	25%	10	12.2%	35	11.9%	46
SLD (3)	1	25%	15	18.3%	50	16.9%	66
N (4)	1	25%	25	30.5%	90	30.5%	116
SLA (5)	1	25%	15	18.3%	60	20.3%	76
A (6)	0	0%	8	9.8%	25	8.5%	33
SA (7)	0	0%	3	3.7%	10	3.4%	13
Total	**4**	**100%**	**82**	**100%**	**295**	**100%**	**381**

Table 3 reveals stakeholders' perceptions of reading difficulties. No heads strongly disagreed (SD=1), whereas 7.3% of teachers and 8.5% of parents did. A quarter of heads (25%) disagreed (D=2) or slightly disagreed (SLD=3), compared to 12.2% and 18.3% of teachers, and 11.9% and 16.9% of parents. Neutral responses (N=4) were most frequent, with 30.5% of both teachers and parents and 25% of heads selecting this option. Agreement levels were relatively low: slight agreement (SLA=5) was chosen by 20.3% of parents, 18.3% of teachers, and 25% of heads. Strong agreement (SA=7) was minimal across all groups (heads: 0%; teachers: 3.7%; parents: 3.4%).

Descriptive Analysis: Writing Problems

Table 4: Writing Problems Faced by Dyslexic Students

Response	Heads	%	Teachers	%	Parents	%	Total
SD (1)	0	0%	8	9.8%	30	10.2%	38
D (2)	1	25%	12	14.6%	40	13.6%	53
SLD (3)	1	25%	18	22%	60	20.3%	79
N (4)	1	25%	22	26.8%	80	27.1%	103
SlA (5)	1	25%	12	14.6%	50	16.9%	63
A (6)	0	0%	7	8.5%	25	8.5%	32
SA (7)	0	0%	3	3.7%	10	3.4%	13

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 4, Issue 6 (2026)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

Total	**4**	**100%**	**82**	**100%**	**295**	**100%**	**381**

Table 4 displays perceptions of writing challenges. While no heads strongly disagreed (SD=1), approximately 10% of teachers and parents expressed strong disagreement. A quarter of heads disagreed (D=2) or slightly disagreed (SLD=3), whereas teachers and parents showed higher levels of disagreement (14.6% and 22.0%, respectively). Neutral responses (N=4) prevailed across all groups (heads: 25%; teachers: 26.8%; parents: 27.1%). Agreement levels were predominantly low, with slight agreement (SLA=5) selected by 25% of heads, 14.6% of teachers, and 16.9% of parents. Strong agreement (SA=7) was minimal (heads: 0%; teachers: 3.7%; parents: 3.4%).

Mean Score Comparison across Problem Areas

Table 5: Stakeholder Perceptions Regarding Dyslexic Students' Challenges

(variables)	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. Reading	4.00	1.41	3.84	1.40	3.81	1.38
2. Writing	3.75	1.50	3.66	1.45	3.63	1.43

Table 5 reveals a clear hierarchy of perceived challenges. Reading difficulties received moderate recognition (overall M = 3.82), while writing problems were recognised at slightly lower levels (overall M = 3.64). Heads consistently reported higher means than other groups, particularly for reading (4.00 vs 3.84/3.81) and writing (3.75 vs 3.66/3.63). Standard deviations (SDs ≈ 1.38, 1.50) indicate similar response variability across groups.

Inferential Analysis: Reading Problems

Table#6: Reading Problem Perceptions among Stakeholders

Stakeholder	n	Mean	SD	f-cal	f-tab	p-value
Heads	4	4.00	1.41			
Teachers	82	3.84	1.40	**0.15**	**±3.02**	**0.863**
Parents	295	3.81	1.38			
All Groups	**381**	**3.82**	**1.39**			

One-way ANOVA results (F = 0.15, p = 0.863) reveal no statistically significant differences among heads (M = 4.00, SD = 1.41), teachers (M = 3.84, SD = 1.40), and parents (M = 3.81, SD = 1.38) regarding reading problems. The non-significant p-value (p > 0.05) and the minimal F statistic indicate consistent perceptions across stakeholder groups, with heads showing slightly higher (but not significantly) mean scores. The remarkably similar standard deviations (SDs: 1.38 and 1.41) indicate consistent variability in responses within each group. Therefore, **H_{01} is accepted.**

Inferential Analysis: Writing Problems

Table#7: Writing Problem Perceptions among Stakeholders

Stakeholder	N	Mean	SD	f-cal	f-tab	p-value
Heads	4	3.75	1.50			
Teachers	82	3.66	1.45	**0.12**	**±3.02**	**0.887**
Parents	295	3.63	1.43			

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 4, Issue 6 (2026)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

All Groups	**381**	**3.64**	**1.44**

One-way ANOVA results for writing problems ($F = 0.12$, $p = 0.887$) indicate no statistically significant differences among heads ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 1.50$), teachers ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.45$), and parents ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 1.43$). The non-significant p-value ($p > 0.05$) and the minimal F-statistic indicate consistent perceptions among all stakeholder groups regarding writing challenges. Heads again showed slightly higher mean scores (but not significantly). The nearly identical standard deviations (SDs: 1.43, 1.50) indicate comparable response variability within each group. Therefore, **H_{02} is accepted.**

DISCUSSION

Reading Problems: Moderate Recognition with High Neutrality

The finding that reading problems received moderate recognition (overall $M = 3.82$) and that 30.5% of responses from teachers and parents were neutral is noteworthy, given that reading difficulties are considered the hallmark feature of dyslexia (Peterson & Pennington, 2015). Several explanations may account for this:

First, heightened awareness of dyslexia's heterogeneity may have led some stakeholders to recognise that dyslexic students do not all present with identical reading profiles (Snowling, 2019). Second, some teachers and parents may lack the specialised knowledge to identify nuanced reading difficulties, such as decoding versus comprehension deficits (Washburn et al., 2013). Third, the neutral stance may reflect uncertainty about whether observed reading difficulties are developmental (expected) or indicative of dyslexia, particularly at the primary level, where reading skills are still emerging (Undheim, 2009).

Writing Problems: Heightened Uncertainty and Lower Recognition

Writing difficulties received even less recognition (overall $M = 3.64$), with higher proportions of disagreement and neutrality (22, 26.8% neutral/SLD). This pattern aligns with research indicating that writing problems in dyslexia are often under-recognised or misinterpreted as a lack of effort rather than neurological differences (Berninger et al., 2015; MacArthur, 2016). The scepticism expressed by stakeholders, particularly the 25% of heads who disagreed about writing problems, contrasts with studies documenting high comorbidity between dyslexia and dysgraphia (Alonso, 2020). This perception gap may stem from:

Greater visibility of reading difficulties in classroom settings

The tendency to attribute handwriting and spelling problems to motivation rather than neurological factors

Limited teacher training on the writing manifestations of dyslexia (Moats, 2020)

Hierarchy of Perceived Challenges

The observed hierarchy (listening > speaking > reading > writing > memory) reveals an important pattern: stakeholders more readily recognise earlier-developing, more observable skills (listening) than later-developing, more complex skills (writing). This aligns with Vellutino et al.'s (2004) developmental trajectory for literacy skills. The consistently higher mean scores reported by heads suggest that administrators,

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 4, Issue 6 (2026)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

who view students holistically across multiple classrooms and contexts, may have a broader perspective on dyslexic students' challenges (Hooper et al., 2013).

Consistency across Stakeholder Groups

The ANOVA results showing no significant differences among stakeholder groups for either reading ($F = 0.15$, $p = 0.863$) or writing ($F = 0.12$, $p = 0.887$) are notable. This homogeneity contrasts with earlier research suggesting differing perceptions based on role (Wadlington & Wadlington, 2008). The consistency observed here may reflect:

Increased general awareness of dyslexia due to recent teacher training and parent advocacy efforts (Washburn et al., 2013)

The observable nature of reading and writing difficulties in both school and home settings

A growing consensus about dyslexia's manifestations across stakeholders

CONCLUSIONS

Reading Problems

Stakeholders demonstrated moderate recognition of reading difficulties among dyslexic students, with a substantial proportion (30.5%) remaining neutral. While heads had slightly higher mean scores (4.00) than teachers (3.84) and parents (3.81), the differences were not statistically significant. This moderate recognition suggests that while reading problems are acknowledged, there is room for enhanced awareness and targeted intervention. (Aligns *with Objective 1)*

Writing Problems

Writing difficulties received less recognition than reading problems, with an overall mean score of 3.64. All stakeholder groups showed notable uncertainty, with 22-26.8% of teachers and parents expressing neutrality or slight disagreement. Heads, while slightly more aware ($M = 3.75$), also held divided views. These findings highlight the under-recognition of writing manifestations of dyslexia compared with reading difficulties. (Aligns with Objective 2)

Statistical Findings

ANOVA results showed no significant differences among stakeholder groups for either reading ($F = 0.15$, $p = 0.863$) or writing ($F = 0.12$, $p = 0.887$), indicating consistent perceptions across heads, teachers, and parents. Both null hypotheses (H_{01} and H_{02}) were accepted. This consistency is encouraging for the development of unified intervention approaches. (Aligns with Hypotheses 1 and 2)

Challenge Hierarchy

A clear gradient in perceived difficulty emerged: listening ($M = 5.11$) > speaking ($M = 4.29$) > reading ($M = 3.82$) > writing ($M = 3.64$) > memory ($M = 3.12$). This pattern indicates that literacy-related challenges are recognised in a developmental sequence, with earlier skills receiving greater recognition.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For Reading Problems

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 4, Issue 6 (2026)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about

Multisensory Reading Programmes: Schools should adopt evidence-based interventions, such as the Orton-Gillingham approach, which integrates visual, auditory, and kinaesthetic learning modalities to address phonological processing deficits (Ritchey & Goeke, 2006).
Systematic Phonics Instruction: Structured, sequential phonics programmes are essential for developing word recognition and decoding skills (National Reading Panel, 2000).
Reading Accommodations: Provide access to audiobooks, text-to-speech software, and dyslexia-friendly fonts to reduce cognitive load as reading skills develop (Wood et al., 2018).
Early Identification: Implement screening tools in kindergarten and first grade to identify at-risk students and provide timely intervention (Torgesen, 2002).

For Writing Problems
Assistive Technology: Integrate speech-to-text software, word prediction tools, and graphic organisers to support written expression (MacArthur et al., 2015).
Structured Writing Instruction: Provide explicit teaching of spelling rules, handwriting techniques, and organisational strategies such as webbing and outlining (Graham & Harris, 2005).
Accommodations: Allow extended time for written assignments, reduce copying demands, and use alternative assessment methods to evaluate knowledge (Bray et al., 2021).
Multisensory Writing Approaches: Implement tracing activities, kinesthetic letter formation, and simultaneous oral spelling to reinforce proper letter formation and spelling patterns (Mortimore, 2008).

For Teacher Training
Mandatory Dyslexia Modules: Incorporate dyslexia awareness and evidence-based intervention training into pre-service and in-service teacher education programs (Peltier et al., 2022).
Practical Workshops: Provide hands-on training in screening tools, differentiated instruction, and assistive technology implementation.
Ongoing Professional Development: Establish regular workshops to update teachers on emerging research and strategies for supporting dyslexic learners (Washburn et al., 2013).

For Parent Awareness
Awareness Workshops: Conduct parent education sessions on dyslexia characteristics, home-based support strategies, and communication with schools (Hornby, 2022).
Resource Provision: Provide parents with evidence-based materials, reading apps, and strategies for supporting literacy development at home.
School-Home Collaboration: Strengthen partnerships between schools and parents to ensure consistent support across settings.

For Future Research

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

Geographical Expansion: Extend research to public schools and other districts to compare contexts.

Intervention Effectiveness: Conduct experimental or longitudinal studies evaluating specific interventions (e.g., Orton-Gillingham, assistive technology) for reading and writing difficulties.

Additional Variables: Explore other factors such as processing speed, emotional well-being, and self-efficacy in relation to reading and writing outcomes.

Comparative Studies: Investigate stakeholder perceptions across different regions to identify context-specific barriers and solutions.

Mixed Methods Approaches: Combine quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews to gain deeper insights into stakeholder experiences and perspectives.

REFERENCES

Aladwani, A., AlOtaibi, F., AlMasoud, S., & AlAhmad, S. (2012). Primary school teachers' knowledge and awareness of dyslexia in Kuwaiti students—Journal of Educational Psychology, 34(2), 85 102.

Alonso, M. A. (2020). Dysgraphia and dyslexia comorbidity: A systematic review. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 53(4), 278 292.

Basu, S. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of academic and behavioural challenges in children with dyslexia. International Journal of Special Education, 29(2), 45 58.

Berninger, V. W., Nielsen, K. H., Abbott, R. D., Wijsman, E., & Raskind, W. (2015). Writing problems in developmental dyslexia: Under-recognised and under-treated. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 41(1), 312.

Bloomfield, J., & Fisher, M. J. (2019). Quantitative research design. Journal of the Australasian Rehabilitation Nurses Association, 22(2), 27 30.

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.

Fletcher, J. M., Lyon, G. R., Fuchs, L. S., & Barnes, M. A. (2018).Learning disabilities: From identification to intervention. Guilford Publications.

Graham, S., & Harris, K. (2005).Writing better: Effective strategies for teaching students with learning difficulties. Brookes Publishing.

Hooper, S. R., Costa, L. J., McBee, M., Anderson, K. L., Yerby, D. C., Knuth, S. B., & Childress, A. (2013). Concurrent and longitudinal neuropsychological contributors to written language expression in first and second grade students: Reading and Writing, 26(5), 717 736.

Hornby, G. (2022).Parental involvement in childhood education: Building effective school family partnerships. Springer.

Hulme, C., & Snowling, M. J. (2016). Reading disorders and dyslexia—current Opinion in Paediatrics, 28(6), 731 735.

Kundi, G. M., & Alharbi, M. F. (2022). Relationship between dyslexia and academic performance: Mediating role of teachers' awareness. Journal of Educational Research, 45(3), 112 128.

Lu, L., Dapretto, M., O'Hare, E., Kan, E., & McCourt, S. (2009). Relationships

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

between brain activation and brain structure in normally developing children: Cerebral Cortex, 19, 2595 2604.

Lyon, G. R., Shaywitz, S. E., & Shaywitz, B. A. (2003). A definition of dyslexia. Annals of Dyslexia, 53(1), 1 14.

MacArthur, C. A. (2016). Instruction in evaluation and revision. In Handbook of writing research (2nd Ed., pp. 272 286). Guilford Press.

MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (2015).Handbook of writing research (2nd Ed.). Guilford Press.

Moats, L. C. (2020).Speech to print: Language essentials for teachers (3rd Ed.). Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Mortimore, T. (2008).Dyslexia and learning style: A practitioner's handbook. John Wiley & Sons.

National Reading Panel. (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Peltier, T. K., Washburn, E. K., Heddy, B. C., & Binks Cantrell, E. (2022). What do teachers know about dyslexia? It is complicated! Reading and Writing, 35(9), 2077 2107.

Peterson, R. L., & Pennington, B. F. (2015). Developmental dyslexia. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 11, 283 307.

Ritchey, K. D., & Goeke, J. L. (2006). Orton Gillingham and Orton Gillingham-based reading instruction: A review of the literature. Journal of Special Education, 40(3), 171 183.

Shaywitz, S. E., & Shaywitz, B. A. (2004). Reading disability and the brain. Educational Leadership, 61(6), 6 11.

Snowling, M. J. (2019).Dyslexia: A very short introduction (2nd Ed.). Oxford University Press.

Torgesen, J. K. (2002). The prevention of reading difficulties. Journal of School Psychology, 40(1), 7 26.

Undheim, A. M. (2009). A thirteen-year follow-up study of young Norwegian adults with dyslexia in childhood: Reading development and educational levels. Dyslexia, 15(4), 291 303.

Vellutino, F. R., Fletcher, J. M., Snowling, M. J., & Scanlon, D. M. (2004). Specific reading disability (dyslexia): What have we learned in the past four decades? Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45(1), 2 40.

Wadlington, E., & Wadlington, P. L. (2008). Helping students with dyslexia prepare for standardised tests—intervention in School and Clinic, 43(4), 217 222.

Washburn, E. K., Binks Cantrell, E. S., & Joshi, R. M. (2013). What do preservice teachers from the USA and the UK know about dyslexia? Dyslexia, 20(1), 1 18.

Wood, S. G., Moxley, J. H., Tighe, E. L., & Wagner, R. K. (2018). Does the use of text-to-speech and related read-aloud tools improve reading comprehension for students with reading disabilities? Reading and Writing, 31(5), 1007 1032.

World Health Organisation. (2011). International classification of functioning, disability and health (ICF). WHO Press?

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review
http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume 4, Issue 6 (2026)

Online ISSN 3007-3197
Print ISSN 3007-3189

http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about