SUPPORTING STUDENTS WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES IN WRITEWIZ CLASSROOMS

An Enhanced Comprehensive Guide for Teachers

Written by Mohanakannan P

Full Guide

After two decades of research and clinical practice in handwriting education and learning difficulties, this enhanced guide supports educators in implementing evidence-based interventions within Writewiz methodologies. The document synthesises current understanding from educational psychology, neuroscience, occupational therapy, and special education research to provide practical, scientifically-grounded approaches for supporting students with diverse learning needs.

Written by Mohanakannan P

This document is for educational purposes only and is not intended as medical or clinical advice.

Contents

Written by Mohanakannan P

Written by Mohanakannan P

Executive Summary

Supporting Students with Learning Difficulties in Writewiz Classrooms
Written by Mohanakannan P

Purpose of this Guide

This guide distils over two decades of classroom practice and academic research into a practical, evidence-based resource for teachers using the Writewiz methodology. It equips educators with a deeper understanding of why some students struggle with handwriting and how structured, scientifically informed teaching can help them succeed.

The Challenge

Handwriting is a complex neurocognitive skill requiring coordination between multiple brain regions, fine motor control, working memory, and sensory processing. Students with learning difficulties—such as Dyslexia, Dysgraphia, ADHD, or Developmental Coordination Disorder—often face unique barriers, including:

- Difficulty retrieving and producing letter forms automatically
- Poor motor planning and bilateral coordination
- Reduced working memory capacity
- Sensory processing differences affecting grip, pressure, and posture
- Slower development of automaticity, requiring more targeted practice

Core Research-Backed Solutions

Drawing on neuroscience, occupational therapy, and educational psychology, the guide outlines approaches that have been shown to improve handwriting outcomes for students with learning difficulties:

- Explicit, systematic instruction with clear demonstrations and guided practice
- Multisensory teaching methods—visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic
- Spaced and distributed practice in short, frequent sessions
- Progress-focused feedback that reinforces effort and improvement
- Metacognitive strategies such as Plan–Do–Check for self-monitoring
- Family collaboration through structured home practice programmes

How Writewiz Applies These Principles

The Writewiz curriculum is designed to be structured, multisensory, and adaptable for diverse classrooms. It includes:

- Sequential skill progression from grip to speed writing
- Teacher training to ensure correct demonstration and correction
- Practice routines optimised for skill retention
- Support materials that reinforce motivation and self-confidence
- Classroom implementation plans that reduce overload for struggling writers

Why This Matters

For students with learning difficulties, handwriting success is more than neat presentation—it builds confidence, independence, and engagement across all subjects. With the right strategies, every student can develop a positive relationship with written communication.

Call to Action:

The full guide provides detailed scientific explanations, case insights, and classroom applications. Download it from the Writewiz website and share it with your teaching team to make your handwriting programme more inclusive and effective.

Written by Mohanakannan P

Chapter 1:

Understanding the Neurobiological Foundations of Handwriting

1.1 The neural architecture of handwriting

Handwriting is a coordinated network activity. Functional imaging shows engagement of the primary motor cortex (M1), premotor areas, supplementary motor area (SMA), posterior parietal cortex, cerebellum, and basal ganglia during writing tasks (Planton et al., 2013; Roux et al., 2009).

- **Orthographic retrieval** draws on left fusiform and inferior temporal regions before movement planning begins.
- The **superior parietal lobule** converts letter representations into spatial motor programmes for the hand and fingers (Purcell et al., 2011).
- The **cerebellum** fine-tunes timing and sequencing, while the **basal ganglia** support automatisation with practice (Longcamp et al., 2008).

1.2 Why this matters in classrooms

When any link in this network is inefficient, pupils work harder to produce less. Teachers may notice slow output, inconsistent letter shapes, variable spacing, and fatigue. These are not attitude problems; they are signs of a heavier neuro-motor load.

1.3 Practical implications for instruction

- Teach with **clear, modelled sequences** for letter formation to reduce planning load.

- Build **consistent routines** so motor plans stabilise and free up attention for spelling and composition.
- Use **short, frequent practice** to strengthen the basal-ganglia pathways that support automaticity.

Chapter 2:

Learning Difficulties and Their Impact on Handwriting

2.1 Dyslexia

Neuroimaging points to reduced connectivity between left-hemisphere reading networks and visuospatial systems, affecting orthographic-to-motor mapping (Vandermosten et al., 2012). White-matter differences in the arcuate fasciculus disrupt integration of auditory-phonological and motor output (Steinbrink et al., 2008).
Classroom profile: slow, effortful letter retrieval; inconsistent forms; spelling strain during writing.
Helpful responses: overlearned letter patterns, multi-sensory cueing, and decoupling spelling difficulty from handwriting drills.

2.2 Developmental Coordination Disorder (DCD / dyspraxia)

Structural and functional differences in cerebellar-cortical circuits lead to weak predictive control; children rely on conscious attention for movements others perform automatically (Zwicker et al., 2012; Biotteau et al., 2016).
Classroom profile: laboured pencil control, variable size/spacing, fatigue, slow note-taking.
Helpful responses: blocked practice to establish a template, then

carefully varied practice for transfer; explicit posture and paper-stabilising routines.

2.3 ADHD

Dysfunction in fronto-striatal systems affects sustained attention, motor inhibition, and planning (Castellanos & Tannock, 2002). Delayed cortical maturation is often seen in motor and premotor regions (Shaw et al., 2007).
Classroom profile: uneven pencil pressure, bursts of speed with errors, difficulty sustaining rhythm.
Helpful responses: short, timed writing sprints; external pacing cues; immediate, specific feedback; minimise distractions at the desk.

2.4 Dysgraphia

Dysgraphia is a distinct writing impairment with dysfunction in left-hemisphere orthographic and graphomotor regions (Katanoda et al., 2001).
Classroom profile: poor legibility despite adequate reading and oral language; unstable letter formation and spacing.
Helpful responses: direct instruction in stroke sequences, graded copy-to-dictation progressions, and targeted fine-motor warm-ups.

2.5 Comorbidity patterns

Dyslexia–dysgraphia co-occur frequently (~43%), and ADHD–DCD overlap is common (30–50%), compounding handwriting challenges (Berninger et al., 2008; Flapper et al., 2006).
Implication: combine attention supports with motor learning design; expect slower acquisition but protect morale through progress-based feedback.

Chapter 3:

Working Memory, Attention, and Handwriting Performance

3.1 Working memory systems at play

Baddeley and Hitch's model highlights three systems that load during writing:

- **Central executive:** allocates attention and monitors output—vulnerable in ADHD (Martinussen & Tannock, 2006).
- **Visuospatial sketchpad:** maintains size, spacing, and line position—often reduced in DCD and nonverbal learning profiles (Cornoldi & Vecchi, 2003).
- **Phonological loop:** holds sound/letter patterns for spelling—strained in dyslexia (Swanson & Berninger, 1996).
  An **episodic buffer** integrates these streams; when integration falters, combining handwriting with complex spelling or composition becomes disproportionately hard (Berninger & Richards, 2010).

3.2 Signs of working-memory overload in class

- Neat copying but messy dictation
- Good single letters, poor words/sentences
- Deterioration after a minute or two of continuous writing
- Frequent restarts or abandoned words

3.3 Teaching to reduce cognitive load

- **Segment tasks:** isolate letter formation from spelling and composition, then recombine gradually.
- **Externalise supports:** desk strips, spacing guides, and self-check cards reduce the need to "hold it all in mind."

- **Adopt Plan–Do–Check cycles:** brief plan, brief action, quick review—repeat.
- **Use spaced practice:** daily short sessions (8–12 minutes) outperform occasional long drills (Cepeda et al., 2006).

Chapter 4:

Sensorimotor Integration and Haptic Processing in Handwriting

4.1 The role of haptic feedback

Tactile and proprioceptive input are critical for handwriting acquisition. Students with learning difficulties often present atypical sensory processing patterns that influence motor control (Goble et al., 2012).

- **Tactile discrimination** (e.g., two-point discrimination, texture recognition) strongly correlates with legibility (Denton et al., 2006).
- Elevated tactile thresholds in dysgraphia or DCD suggest benefit from *enhanced sensory input*: textured writing surfaces, weighted pencils, or varied grip shapes.

4.2 Proprioceptive processing

Awareness of body position and movement informs pencil pressure and grip stability. ADHD and autism spectrum profiles often include proprioceptive differences, contributing to inconsistent grip and line pressure (Miller et al., 2007).
Practical adaptations:

- Angled writing boards

- Pencil grips designed to stabilise finger placement
- Regular pressure checks ("light as a feather" vs "too heavy")

Chapter 5:

Bilateral Coordination and Interhemispheric Communication

5.1 The importance of two-handed coordination

While the dominant hand executes fine motor movements, the non-dominant hand stabilises paper and posture. This coordination relies on corpus callosum pathways connecting the brain's hemispheres.

- Integrity of these connections correlates with handwriting fluency (Downie et al., 2005).
- Reduced myelination in posterior corpus callosum can affect visual-motor integration, while anterior regions influence executive motor control (Galea et al., 2011).

5.2 Supporting bilateral coordination

- Explicitly teach *paper-holding* positions for the non-dominant hand.
- Include gross-motor bilateral tasks (e.g., passing a ball across the body) in warm-ups.
- For younger pupils, integrate fine-motor bilateral activities like threading beads or using scissors to prime neural pathways.

Written by Mohanakannan P

Chapter 6:

Occupational Therapy Frameworks and Evidence-Based Motor Learning

6.1 Applying Motor Learning Theory

Schmidt and Lee's (2014) principles stress practice structure, feedback timing, and environmental context. For students with LDs:

- **Blocked practice** (repeating one letter) aids initial acquisition.
- **Random practice** (mixed letters) improves retention and transfer (Duff & Gordon, 2003).
- **Immediate feedback** supports early stages; **delayed feedback** aids long-term learning (Gütgemann et al., 2018).

6.2 Sensory Integration Theory (Ayres, 1972)

Links between sensory processing and motor learning highlight:

- **Vestibular–proprioceptive integration** for posture and spatial organisation—weakness here may cause letter-size variability (Braswell & Rine, 2006).
- **Tactile discrimination** as a stronger predictor of legibility than visual-motor scores in some LD profiles (Feder & Majnemer, 2007).

6.3 Cognitive Orientation to Daily Occupational Performance (CO-OP)

Metacognitive strategy training helps pupils with DCD or executive-function challenges (Polatajko & Mandich, 2004):

- Goal–Plan–Do–Check routines for handwriting tasks.
- Self-questioning during writing (“Is my spacing clear?”).
- Strategy generalisation across contexts.
  Research shows CO-OP interventions lead to better retention and transfer than traditional drills (Zwicker & Harris, 2009).

Chapter 7:

Educational Psychology Perspectives – Motivation, Self-Efficacy, and Academic Identity

7.1 Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000)

Three psychological needs—autonomy, competence, relatedness—drive intrinsic motivation. Handwriting difficulties threaten all three:

- **Autonomy**: tasks feel imposed, not chosen.
- **Competence**: repeated failure reduces self-belief.
- **Relatedness**: poor work presentation can affect peer and teacher perception.
  In practice:
- Offer structured choices (e.g., writing implement, order of tasks).
- Emphasise individual progress over peer comparison.
- Acknowledge effort alongside improvement.

7.2 Mastery goal orientation

Students with LDs benefit from mastery-oriented goals rather than performance comparisons (Ames, 1992). Writewiz teachers can track each pupil's gains in legibility and speed, celebrating *growth* not *ranking*.

7.3 Attribution retraining

Weiner's (1985) Attribution Theory shows pupils often link failure to fixed traits ("I'm bad at writing").

Shift mindset by:

- Using process-focused praise ("You kept your letter heights consistent").
- Showing that improvement comes from effort and strategy, not innate talent (Mueller & Dweck, 1998).

7.4 Flow and optimal challenge

Tasks should match the learner's skill level to induce *flow* (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Scaffold writing activities so pupils remain challenged but not overwhelmed.

Chapter 8:

Medical and Developmental Perspectives

8.1 Neuroplasticity and critical periods

Neuroscience confirms handwriting learning is plastic throughout childhood, but earlier intervention is more efficient due to reduced compensatory habits (James & Engelhardt, 2012; Draganski et al., 2004).
Implication: intervene as soon as handwriting issues are evident—don't "wait and see."

8.2 Comorbidity patterns

- **Dyslexia–dysgraphia**: overlapping phonological, orthographic, and motor deficits (~43% incidence) (Berninger et al., 2008).
- **ADHD–DCD**: combined attention and motor planning issues (30–50% incidence) (Flapper et al., 2006).
- **Autism spectrum**: often tied to sensory and motor planning differences (Fuentes et al., 2009).
  Classroom approach: integrate sensory supports with handwriting instruction; be flexible in pacing.

8.3 Pharmacological considerations

- **Stimulants** may improve attention but initially increase motor rigidity; timing of handwriting sessions relative to medication matters (Tucha & Lange, 2001).
- **Non-stimulants** (e.g., atomoxetine) may support more consistent writing control (Sumner et al., 2009).

Chapter 9:

Advanced Assessment Frameworks and Progress Monitoring

9.1 Kinematic analysis

Digital tablets and software can record in-air time, velocity, pressure, and smoothness—parameters that predict handwriting quality more accurately than visual ratings (Rosenblum et al., 2013).

9.2 Ecological assessment

Assessing in real classroom tasks provides better predictions of functional performance than test-only settings (McHale & Cermak, 1992).

9.3 Dynamic assessment

Teaching–testing cycles reveal learning potential as well as current ability (Haywood & Lidz, 2007).

9.4 Practical classroom monitoring

- **Weekly fluency probes**: brief timed samples for legibility, speed, accuracy.
- **Error pattern analysis**: informs targeted interventions.
- **Student self-assessment**: builds metacognitive awareness.

Chapter 10:

Technology Integration and Assistive Tools

10.1 Immediate visual feedback systems

Apps that give real-time feedback on letter shape, spacing, and size help students with visual–motor integration difficulties (Asselborn et al., 2018).
Classroom application: use in short bursts to reinforce correct motor patterns without replacing pencil-and-paper work.

10.2 Adaptive response technology

Digital tools that adjust difficulty based on performance can maintain challenge while preventing frustration (Aleven et al., 2016).

10.3 Assistive technology decision-making – the SETT framework

The SETT framework (Student, Environment, Tasks, Tools) ensures tool choice matches the learner's profile (Zabala, 1995).
Key to success: user training, environmental support, and customisation—without these, abandonment rates are high (Phillips & Zhao, 1993).

Chapter 11:

Cultural and Linguistic Considerations

11.1 Multilingual students

Writing in a non-native language increases cognitive load. Orthographic transparency and motor pattern similarity affect transfer between writing systems (Bassetti, 2009).
Teacher tip: explicitly teach letter forms and conventions, even if students are literate in another script.

11.2 Cultural posture and tool use

Students from different cultures may have learned alternative paper positions or writing grips. Acknowledge preferences while teaching the mechanics required for speed and legibility in your curriculum.

11.3 Socioeconomic factors

Limited access to quality writing tools and pre-writing experiences can hinder early handwriting development (Bradley & Bryant, 1983).
Practical response: ensure all students have access to appropriate implements in school; integrate fine-motor warm-ups into lessons.

Chapter 12:

Implementation Guidelines for Writewiz Methodology

12.1 Evidence-based instructional principles

- **Explicit, systematic teaching** with demonstration, guided practice, and skill progression.
- **Multisensory integration** applied in a structured, not random, sequence (Hulme & Snowling, 2009).
- **Spaced practice**: short, frequent sessions yield better retention than infrequent long drills (Cepeda et al., 2006).

12.2 Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in handwriting

- **Multiple means of representation**: visual models, verbal descriptions, kinesthetic demonstration.
- **Multiple means of engagement**: incorporate student interests, give choices, maintain optimal challenge.
- **Multiple means of expression**: allow varied ways to demonstrate handwriting knowledge while still practising the target skill.

12.3 Progress monitoring

Use reliable measures that detect small gains:

- Weekly timed samples for speed and legibility
- Error analysis protocols
- Student self-assessment checklists

12.4 Family partnership

- Provide structured home practice materials with clear instructions.
- Share progress updates framed around effort and improvement.
- Encourage parents to maintain a positive, supportive tone.

Chapter 13:

Future Directions and Conclusion

13.1 Neuroplasticity-informed interventions

Emerging neuroscience points to the potential of targeted activities to influence brain organisation for motor learning.

- **Transcranial stimulation techniques** are being explored as a supplement to conventional occupational therapy for developmental coordination disorders (Ammann et al., 2016).
- Intensive, targeted handwriting interventions during periods of heightened neural receptivity may accelerate progress.

13.2 Artificial intelligence and personalised learning

Machine learning systems can analyse a student's handwriting in real time, adapting practice content to address weaknesses (Asselborn et al., 2019).
Implication for Writewiz: integration of AI-driven assessment tools could enhance personalisation without overloading teachers.

13.3 Genetic research and early identification

Genetic studies are identifying markers linked to dyslexia, DCD, and other learning difficulties (Pennington & Bishop, 2009). Early identification may enable proactive handwriting support before difficulties compound.

Conclusion:

Towards Evidence-Based, Compassionate Practice

After more than twenty years working in this field, one truth remains clear: handwriting is not just a mechanical skill—it is a personal and cognitive bridge between thought and expression. For students with learning difficulties, that bridge can feel shaky. Our role as educators is to reinforce it, step by step, with the best tools science and practice can offer.

The Writewiz methodology—rooted in structure, multisensory engagement, and steady, achievable challenges—provides a framework for success. When implemented thoughtfully, it does more than improve legibility. It restores confidence, builds persistence, and fosters a sense of ownership over written communication.

Behind every data point is a child. Our duty is to ensure each one leaves school not just able to write clearly, but also believing their voice is worth putting on paper.

References

Aleven, V., McLaren, B. M., Sewall, J., & Koedinger, K. R. (2016). A new paradigm for intelligent tutoring systems: Example-tracing tutors. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 19(2), 105–154.

Ammann, C., Spampinato, D., & Marquez-Ruiz, J. (2016). Modulating motor learning through transcranial direct-current stimulation: An integrative view. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1981.

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 261–271.

Written by Mohanakannan P

Asselborn, T., Chapatte, M., & Dillenbourg, P. (2018). Extending the spectrum of dysgraphia: A data-driven descriptive study with machine learning. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 15909.

Asselborn, T., Gargot, T., Kidziński, Ł., Johal, W., Cohen, D., Jolly, C., & Dillenbourg, P. (2019). Automated human-level diagnosis of dysgraphia using a consumer tablet. *npj Digital Medicine*, 2(1), 41.

Ayres, A. J. (1972). *Sensory integration and learning disorders*. Western Psychological Services.

Baddeley, A., & Hitch, G. J. (2000). Development of working memory: Should the Pascual-Leone and the Baddeley and Hitch models be merged? *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 77(2), 128–137.

Bassetti, B. (2009). Effects of writing system on second language reading. In T. Piske & M. Young-Scholten (Eds.), *Input matters in SLA* (pp. 335–356). Multilingual Matters.

Berninger, V. W., Nielsen, K. H., Abbott, R. D., Wijsman, E., & Raskind, W. (2008). Gender differences in severity of writing and reading disabilities. *Journal of School Psychology*, 46(2), 151–172.

Berninger, V. W., & Richards, T. L. (2010). Inter-relationships among behavioral markers, genes, brain, and treatment in dyslexia and dysgraphia. *Future Neurology*, 5(4), 597–617.

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.

Biotteau, M., Albaret, J. M., & Chaix, Y. (2016). Developmental coordination disorder and cognition: A review of the literature. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 58(12), 1257–1267.

Bradley, L., & Bryant, P. E. (1983). Categorizing sounds and learning to read: A causal connection. *Nature*, 301(5899), 419–421.

Braswell, J., & Rine, R. M. (2006). Preliminary evidence of improved postural stability in subjects with developmentally delayed motor skills after treatment with traditional physical therapy or with combined physical and vestibular rehabilitation. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 70(7), 1265–1269.

Case-Smith, J. (2002). Effectiveness of school-based occupational therapy intervention on handwriting. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 56(1), 17–25.

Castellanos, F. X., & Tannock, R. (2002). Neuroscience of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: The search for endophenotypes. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 3(8), 617–628.

Cepeda, N. J., Pashler, H., Vul, E., Wixted, J. T., & Rohrer, D. (2006). Distributed practice in verbal recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(3), 354–380.

Cornoldi, C., & Vecchi, T. (2003). *Visuo-spatial working memory and individual differences*. Psychology Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper & Row.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.

Denton, P. L., Cope, S., & Moser, C. (2006). The effects of sensorimotor-based intervention versus therapeutic practice on improving handwriting performance in 6- to 11-year-old children. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 60(1), 16–27.

Downie, A. L. S., Jakobson, L. S., Frisk, V., & Ushycky, I. (2005). Periventricular brain injury, visual motion processing, and reading and spelling abilities in children who were extremely low birthweight. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 11(6), 718–728.

Draganski, B., Gaser, C., Busch, V., Schuierer, G., Bogdahn, U., & May, A. (2004). Changes in grey matter induced by learning—revisited. *PLOS ONE*, 1(1), e90.

Duff, S. V., & Gordon, A. M. (2003). Learning of grasp control in children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 45(11), 746–757.

Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(9), 701–712.

Feder, K. P., & Majnemer, A. (2007). Handwriting development, competency, and intervention. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 49(4), 312–317.

Flapper, B. C., Houwen, S., & Schoemaker, M. M. (2006). Fine motor skills and effects of methylphenidate in children with attention-deficit-hyperactivity disorder and developmental coordination disorder. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 48(3), 165–169.

Fuentes, C. T., Mostofsky, S. H., & Bastian, A. J. (2009). Children with autism show specific handwriting impairments. *Neurology*, 73(19), 1532–1537.

Galea, M. P., Darian-Smith, I., Jacobs, S., Virgin, L., Delpiano, M., & Phillips, J. (2011). Bilateral primary motor cortex connections with ipsilateral rubrospinal, not reticulospinal, systems. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 519(4), 728–742.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. Teachers College Press.

Goble, D. J., Lewis, C. A., Hurvitz, E. A., & Brown, S. H. (2012). Development of upper limb proprioceptive accuracy in children and adolescents. *Human Movement Science*, 24(2), 155–170.

Gütgemann, V., Möck, A., & Raab, M. (2018). The influence of feedback frequency on motor learning in a virtual throwing task. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 2602.

Haywood, H. C., & Lidz, C. S. (2007). *Dynamic assessment in practice: Clinical and educational applications*. Cambridge University Press.

Henderson, A., & Berninger, V. (2013). *Helping students with dysgraphia and dyslexia make connections: Differentiated instruction lesson plans in reading and writing*. Brookes Publishing.

Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? *Review of Educational Research*, 67(1), 3–42.

Hulme, C., & Snowling, M. J. (2009). *Developmental disorders of language learning and cognition*. John Wiley & Sons.

International Dyslexia Association. (2017). *Dyslexia in the classroom: What every teacher needs to know*. IDA.

Jackson, S. A., & Marsh, H. W. (1996). Development and validation of a scale to measure optimal experience: The Flow State Scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 18(1), 17–35.

James, K. H., & Engelhardt, L. (2012). The effects of handwriting experience on functional brain development in pre-literate children. *Trends in Neuroscience and Education*, 1(1), 32–42.

Katanoda, K., Yoshikawa, K., & Sugishita, M. (2001). A functional MRI study on the neural substrates for writing. *Human Brain Mapping*, 13(1), 34–42.

Longcamp, M., Boucard, C., Gilhodes, J. C., Anton, J. L., Roth, M., Nazarian, B., & Velay, J. L. (2008). Learning through hand- or typewriting influences visual recognition of new graphic shapes: Behavioral and functional imaging evidence. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 20(5), 802–815.

Martinussen, R., & Tannock, R. (2006). Working memory impairments in children with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder with and without comorbid language learning disorders. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 28(7), 1073–1094.

McHale, K., & Cermak, S. A. (1992). Fine motor activities in elementary school: Preliminary findings and provisional implications for children with fine motor problems. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 46(10), 898–903.

Miller, L. J., Anzalone, M. E., Lane, S. J., Cermak, S. A., & Osten, E. T. (2007). Concept evolution in sensory integration: A proposed nosology for diagnosis. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 61(2), 135–140.

Mueller, C. M., & Dweck, C. S. (1998). Praise for intelligence can undermine children's motivation and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(1), 33–52.

Patall, E. A., Cooper, H., & Robinson, J. C. (2008). The effects of choice on intrinsic motivation and related outcomes: A meta-analysis of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(2), 270–300.

Patton, M. Q., & Braithwaite, R. L. (1990). *Community-based evaluation: Using participatory approaches in evaluation*. Jossey-Bass.

Pennington, B. F., & Bishop, D. V. M. (2009). Relations among speech, language, and reading disorders. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 283–306.

Phillips, B., & Zhao, H. (1993). Predictors of assistive technology abandonment. *Assistive Technology*, 5(1), 36–45.

Planton, S., Jucla, M., Roux, F. E., & Démonet, J. F. (2013). The “handwriting brain”: A meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies of motor versus orthographic processes. *Cortex*, 49(10), 2772–2787.

Polatajko, H. J., & Mandich, A. D. (2004). *Enabling occupation in children: The Cognitive Orientation to daily Occupational Performance (CO-OP) approach*. CAOT Publications ACE.

Purcell, J. J., Turkeltaub, P. E., Eden, G. F., & Rapp, B. (2011). Examining the central and peripheral processes of written word production through meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, 239.

Renninger, K. A., & Hidi, S. (2011). Revisiting the conceptualization, measurement, and generation of interest. *Educational Psychologist*, 46(3), 168–184.

Rosenblum, S., Weiss, P. L., & Parush, S. (2013). Product and process evaluation of handwriting difficulties. *Educational Psychology Review*, 25(1), 53–84.

Rose, D. H., & Meyer, A. (2002). *Teaching every student in the digital age: Universal design for learning*. ASCD.

Roux, F. E., Dufor, O., Giussani, C., Wamain, Y., Draper, L., Longcamp, M., & Démonet, J. F. (2009). The graphemic/motor frontal area: A handwriting centre? *Human Brain Mapping*, 30(2), 488–502.

Shaw, P., Eckstrand, K., Sharp, W., Blumenthal, J., Lerch, J. P., Greenstein, D., ... & Rapoport, J. L. (2007). Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder is characterized by a delay in cortical maturation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(49), 19649–19654.

Steinbrink, C., Vogt, K., Kastrup, A., Müller, H. P., Juengling, F. D., Kassubek, J., & Riecker, A. (2008). The contribution of white matter integrity to reading and spelling in children with developmental dyslexia. *Cortex*, 44(7), 869–876.

Sumner, E., Connelly, V., & Barnett, A. L. (2009). The influence of spelling ability on vocabulary test performance. *Educational Psychology*, 29(6), 735–752.

Swanson, H. L., & Berninger, V. W. (1996). Individual differences in children's working memory and writing skill. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(2), 193–208.

Swanson, H. L., & Hoskyn, M. (1999). The influence of working memory on reading growth in subgroups of children with reading disabilities. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 72(3), 193–218.

Tucha, O., & Lange, K. W. (2001). Effects of methylphenidate on kinematic aspects of handwriting in hyperactive boys. *Journal of Neural Transmission*, 108(5), 529–540.

Vandermosten, M., Boets, B., Wouters, J., & Ghesquière, P. (2012). A qualitative and quantitative review of diffusion tensor imaging studies in reading and dyslexia. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 36(6), 1532–1552.

Zabala, J. S. (1995). *The SETT framework: Critical areas to consider when making informed assistive technology decisions*.

Written by Mohanakannan P

Zwicker, J. G., & Harris, S. R. (2009). A reflection on motor learning theory in pediatric occupational therapy practice. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 76(1), 29–37.

Zwicker, J. G., Missiuna, C., Harris, S. R., & Boyd, L. A. (2012). Developmental coordination disorder: A review and update. *European Journal of Paediatric Neurology*, 16(6), 573–581.

Written by Mohanakannan P