

# Robert Owen Centre for Educational Change

Active Literacy – A Focused Review of Literature Supporting North Lanarkshire Council’s Professional Learning Approach for Literacy

Deja Lusk, Kevin Lowden & Stuart Hall



University of Glasgow

Robert Owen Centre for Educational Change

# 1 INTRODUCTION

This focused literature review has been prepared by researchers at the Robert Owen Centre for Educational Change at the University of Glasgow in response to a request from North Lanarkshire Council Education Services for a focused review of the research literature regarding the underpinning concepts and theories of the Service's professional learning programme to enhance practitioners' teaching of literacy.

This review is a 'light touch' scoping of relevant recent literature (2010 to date). The focused review was tasked with updating the extensive literature review conducted by North Lanarkshire's Educational Psychologists in 2006 to inform the design of the Council's successful and widely adopted literacy pedagogical professional learning programme. The original review was extremely comprehensive and provided a robust foundation for the professional learning programme for primary school teachers that was piloted for four years. This was positively evaluated and highly rated by the Scottish Government in 2007. This review aimed to verify the Local Authority's ongoing pedagogical professional programme and confirm the conceptual foundations of the current approach or, identify new findings that have implications for its revision. Therefore, the main focus of the review was on any new published research that confirmed or challenged the current professional learning approach for literacy adopted by North Lanarkshire Council.

# 2 METHODS

The review was a focused study to ascertain whether new research has emerged since 2010 - the most recent date of references appearing in the original review. The original literature review, including details of its approach, search terms and the bibliographical sources accessed was not available at the time of writing. However, the research team has had access to the main references used by the original review. These helped to frame the new search terms and scope of the review.

## 2.1 KEY AREAS OF FOCUS

The senior leadership team at North Lanarkshire highlighted the following areas of the programme as key foci for the review:

Primary areas of focus -

- Phonics/ phonics debate
- Reading comprehension
- Dialogic reading
- Writing pedagogy

Additional areas of focus -

- Impact of Covid Pandemic on Acquisition of Early Literacy Skills
- Play Pedagogy
- Using ICT with Pupils with Persistent Literacy Difficulties (when to move to this)
- Curriculum Rationale: The Development of Literacy Skills (beyond the basics) through Relevant Contexts for Learning

## 2.2 SEARCH TERMS

The search terms were generated around the key foci for the review stated above and are shown below. These were reviewed and revised following the outcome of the initial search results.

Phonics; reading comprehension; dialogic reading; writing pedagogy; primary education.

## 2.3 BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DATABASES AND SOURCES

Academically recognised bibliographical educational research databases were accessed by the research team. These included:

- Australian Education Index;
- British Education Index;
- CUREE Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education;
- Educational Endowment Foundation (EEF);
- Education Information Resources;
- Education-line;
- ERIC;
- Google Scholar (with caution);
- Higher Education Academy website
- International Bibliography of the Social Sciences;
- International Education Academy website;
- JSTOR (Journal Storage);
- Scopus (inc. Web of Science).

Those sources that contained existing systematic reviews of recent peer-reviewed evidence and meta analyses were privileged. For example, the Educational Endowment Foundation sources were particularly helpful in that they synthesised key research findings on much of the search foci and also assessed impact and rigour of sources. Articles accessed, therefore were typically peer reviewed, scholarly articles, books and other relevant publications. Analysis of key themes regarding the reviews focus were considered against the broader design features of the North Lanarkshire Active Literacy Programme.

# 3 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## 3.1 KEY AREAS OF FOCUS

This section reports on the literature review's main areas of focus that reflect the core components of the Active Literacy Programme.

**Phonics** – particularly Systematic Synthetic Phonics (SSP).

Major evaluative research conducted as recently as 2021, confirms the EEF assessment of Systematic Synthetics Phonics approach as impactful for all learners as well as being cost-effective. The EEF evidence, based on 121 studies, states that there is some variation in impact between different phonological approaches, and overall synthetic phonics approaches have a greater impacts than analytic approaches (EEF 2023; Brady, 2020). A recent evaluation of a systematic synthetic-informed phonics intervention (Molotsky and Nakamura,

2022), found that the approach had a positive impact on learners' phonics outcomes, equivalent to one month's additional progress. However, one somewhat cautionary note comes from Joseph, et al (2023) who state that further large scale- randomised control trials are required to conclusively say whether systematic synthetic phonics instruction is more effective than other approaches to teaching reading. However, the weight of the EEF meta-analysis would indicate that there is confidence in their claims for SSP.

Teaching phonics is more effective on average than other approaches to early reading, such as whole language or alphabetic approaches. Evidence collated by EEF demonstrates that 'Phonics has a positive impact overall (+5 months) with extensive evidence and is an important component in the development of early reading skills, particularly for children from disadvantaged backgrounds.'<sup>1</sup>

Studies of phonics approaches have found they are effective in supporting younger learners (particularly 4-7 year olds) to master the basics of reading, with an average impact of an additional five months' progress over a year. Importantly, to be effective, phonics approaches should be embedded in a 'rich literacy environment' and seen as part of an overall literacy strategy. This reflects the way it is currently used in the NLC 's Active Literacy approach.

There is some evidence that socio-economically disadvantaged learners get a proportionally greater benefit from phonics approaches. The EEF, therefore, suggest targeted phonics interventions are likely to improve decoding skills more quickly for pupils who have experienced barriers to learning that arise from contexts where discussion and reading at home is limited.

The EEF evidence also provides advice on how phonics should be taught including, systematically supporting children to make connections between sound patterns heard and the way they are written and matched to children's level of phonic awareness and skills. This evidence notes that phonics 'improves the accuracy of the child's reading but not necessarily their comprehension'. Therefore, the EEF guidance states that 'it is important that children are successful in making progress in all aspects of reading including comprehension, the development of vocabulary and spelling, which should also be taught explicitly'. The research highlights that intensive phonics approaches that are led by teaching assistants have slightly lower overall impact (+4 months) compared to those involving teachers. The EEF, therefore, advises that teaching assistants should receive appropriate training and support in phonics for interventions before they take such a lead role.

Therefore, of the research that has been conducted to date included in this scoping of relevant literature, most support the use of phonics in schools for reading comprehension, dialogic reading and writing pedagogy (Bowers, 2020; Shanahan, 2020; Solity & Vousden, 2009; Wyse & Bradbury, 2022a; Molotsky, *et al* 2022). This includes studies of the effectiveness of SSP approaches in different contexts (particularly, Molotsky, *et al* 2022). One systematic literature review of effective reading interventions while finding that synthetic phonics has powerful effects on children's early word reading skills, states that the effects are 'far smaller at follow up. Overall, though, such recent research adds further weight to the EEF assessment of

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/phonics?utm\\_source=/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/phonics&utm\\_medium=search&utm\\_campaign=site\\_search&search\\_term=Phonics](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/phonics?utm_source=/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/phonics&utm_medium=search&utm_campaign=site_search&search_term=Phonics)

phonics, particularly SSP, as being an approach that is 'High impact for very low cost based on very extensive evidence'.<sup>2</sup>

### ***Phonics in the context of the Active Literacy programme***

It is important to note that North Lanarkshire Council's (NLC's) Active Literacy programme is a theory-informed approach to teaching reading which is supported by adaptable practices and comprehension strategies framed by Systematic Synthetic Phonics (SSP). However, it is also an integrated approach that incorporates Phonics, Spelling, Reading comprehension, Dialogic Reading, and writing with each element reinforcing the other. The SSP aspect is a synthesised approach which primarily supports reading through an adaptable phonics approach. The approach, when reaching higher stages of comprehension, incorporates a whole language approach using the phonics as a foundation and expanding on it to engage confident readers through more meaningful books. The SSP aspect of NLC's Active Learning programme, therefore, is a core element within a balanced and integrated instruction approach.

The phonics aspect of the programme also reflects the research literature on appropriate adaptation for learner needs. For example, each stage of phonics, while synthetic *and* analytical in nature, also uses activities and approaches which include the use of "high quality novels and non-fiction texts generally P4-P7 (not schemes)" (Cowan & Glover, n.d., p. 6). This is a means through which children and young people can engage in meaningful reading balancing the approach of phonics focus with engagement and enthusiasm of real-life reading skills.

Phonics has perhaps stimulated more debate in the field of literacy learning than any other aspect. (Wolfe, 2015; Wyse & Bradbury, 2022a, 2022b; Wyse & Goswami, 2008; Wyse & Styles, 2007). This debate has continued, despite clear evidence being available, and in recent years the debate has sparked renewed interest calling into question, once again, which pedagogical practices are most appropriate for teaching reading and writing in classrooms.

Prominent in the field of literacy learning literature using phonics is the Department for Education's (DfE 2023) recommendations for teaching through a strictly synthetic phonics approach in England (Wolfe, 2015; Wyse & Bradbury, 2022a, 2022b; Wyse & Goswami, 2008; Wyse & Styles, 2007). The DfE is criticised for adopting a quite prescriptive approach and limiting teachers to rigid pedagogical practices. Research indicates that a more effective use of phonics education occurs when it uses a range of activities that assist children in making connections with broader works. Wolfe argues that in prescribed pedagogical practices "not only is choice reduced, one might also argue that insistence on the exclusive use of a single approach might result in 'deskilling' teachers professionally" (2015, p. 501).

While NLC's Active Literacy programme is considered an SSP, it does not strictly follow the DfE's prescriptive guidelines. For example, within the many robust resource packs provided for educators, there are no prescriptive methodologies which teachers must follow. Instead, teacher autonomy is encouraged while sticking to the foundations of the programme. That is, teachers are offered a range of options to frame their praxis and heavily encouraged not to 'cherry-pick' lessons. In this way, teachers are supported to autonomously use their professional judgement in alignment with Scottish Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) guidelines

---

<sup>2</sup> [Phonics | EEF \(educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk\)](https://www.educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk)

which contradicts the typical prescriptive pedagogy of the typical SSP prescribed by the DfE in England.

In 2022, Dominic Wyse and Alice Bradbury published a report examining these areas of practice. This report, funded through the Helen Hamlyn Trust, was based on research conducted by the Institute of Education, University College London (IOE UCL). It initiated interest on the effectiveness of current teaching approaches (Herald Scotland, 2022; National Literacy Trust, 2023; The Conversation, 2022; UCL Institute of Education, 2022). The resulting debate, called 'reading wars' (Wyse & Bradbury, 2022a), can easily be misconstrued as questioning the method of teaching reading and writing through phonics which has featured in most western educational systems since the late 1990's. However, this is not the case, as Wyse and Bradbury (2022) do not question the sound conceptual underpinnings for the use of phonics in literacy teaching, but rather how phonics is taught. The practice for teaching phonics are categorised into three primary areas (Wyse & Bradbury, 2022a). These three primary areas of practice are as follows:

*Phonics only approach* – This approach, consists of one or a combination of methods focusing on teaching children about phonemes and letters. The phonics only approach focuses primarily on identifying phonemes (sounds) and graphemes (letters). Within this approach are varying ways in which the phonemes and graphemes are used. The *Synthetic phonics* approach is where the phonemes and graphemes are pronounced in isolation before synthesising the sounds together. This approach separates sounds and letters forming each word. This is the primary approach supported by the English Government for more than a decade (Bowers, 2020, 2021; Department of Education, 2023). The *Analytical phonics* approach is more closely associated with Scotland according to the National Literacy Trust (2023). It supports a similar approach to phonemes and graphemes; however, they are not read in isolation before being synthesised. Instead, they are analysed as a whole in association with other words that are alike in nature.

The phonics only approach, whether synthetic or analytical, uses books which are specifically supported for identifying phonemes and graphemes and are often criticised for not encouraging enjoyment and thus engagement in reading (Wyse & Bradbury, 2022). In contrast, the whole language approach is praised for engaging young readers, encouraging enthusiasm for reading alongside phonetic understanding.

*Whole language approach* – Also called embedded phonics (National Literacy Trust, 2023), this approach is a form of reading in which whole texts are sourced for instruction, in lieu of reading materials specifically designed for phonetic acquisition and understanding. This approach is primarily focused on reading for meaning and understanding, often engaging readers through phonics via examples from books in a non-systematic way (Bowers, 2020; National Literacy Trust, 2023; Wyse & Bradbury, 2022a).

*Balanced instruction approach* – This approach is focused primarily on finding a balance between approaches while emphasising the meaning and understanding through whole books with systematic and targeted links to phonics (Bowers, 2020; National Literacy Trust, 2023; Wyse & Bradbury, 2022a).

## ***Reading comprehension strategies***

These strategies use a range of approaches, including collaborative learning, to facilitate learner's understanding of text, including meaning associated with context. Meta analyses and other reviews of peer reviewed evidence have found that reading comprehension strategies have a high impact, particularly 10 week interventions. There is consensus in peer-reviewed evidence over the past decade that Reading Comprehension Strategies have a significant impact on average (+6 months over a year) and alongside phonics, it is a crucial component of early reading teaching.<sup>3</sup> The approach can also particularly benefit lower attaining learners. An EEF summary of key research literature reveals that successful reading comprehension approaches enable activities to be tailored to pupils' reading capabilities, and involve activities and texts that provide an appropriate level of challenge. Reading comprehension strategies can be effectively combined with collaborative learning approaches, phonics and use of digital media to enhance reading skills. This aligns well with North Lanarkshire Council's Active Literacy Programme. The research highlights the importance of effective diagnosis of learners' reading abilities and issues to inform the use of reading comprehension strategies which need to be taught explicitly and consistently with support for learners to 'apply the comprehension strategies independently to other reading tasks, contexts and subjects'.

## ***Dialogic reading***

Dialogic reading (DR) is an approach to reading aloud in which the reader encourages children to actively engage with the story through an intentional scaffolding instructional sequence (Pillinger & Vardy, 2022; Towson, Fettig, Fleury, & Abarca, 2017). This is accomplished through a shared book reading experience in which the reader engages the children by posing questions of them over multiple readings and conversations where the children are encouraged to take on the role of storytellers (Doyle & Bramwell, 2006; O'Sullivan, 2021; Pillinger & Vardy, 2022; Pillinger & Wood, 2014; Wall, Foltz, Kupfer, & Glenberg, 2022).

There is strong evidence to support the use of Dialogic Reading which has been shown to significantly increase expressive language vocabulary and category naming skills, which are among the early literacy skills. There is evidence that the experience of dialogic reading correlates with future literacy skills (Watkins, 2018); such as "emergent writing, knowledge of graphemes, grapheme-phoneme correspondence, and phonological awareness (all skills important for later reading)" (Doyle & Bramwell, 2006, p. 555). Further, there is evidence which supports the use of Diagnostic Reading in promoting not only emergent literacy but also social-emotional learning (Doyle & Bramwell, 2006).

Skill acquisition is supported by the oral language development used in small groups through listening as well as actively engaging in conversation about the books being read (Doyle & Bramwell, 2006; Pillinger & Vardy, 2022). This is further supported by the strong evidence that Diagnostic Reading significantly increases expressive language vocabulary and category naming skills, which are among the early literacy skills (Flynn, 2011).

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/reading-comprehension-strategies>

There is limited research indicating the effectiveness of dialogic reading on children with moderate to severely delayed language skills, but one small-scale study has shown that a significant increase in expressive vocabulary of children with these needs (Ramsey 2021).

Brannon and Dauksas (2014) found that the children of those parents who were provided with dialogic reading training, acquired significantly more words from pre-test to post-test and enhanced expressive language skills.

The findings from a recent PhD research study (Gordon, 2018) found that while a dialogic approach supported critical literacy, certain aspects of critical literacy were difficult to enact. However this study indicated the potential of 'dialogic teaching in valuing culturally-and-linguistically diverse students' contribution during the meaning-making process', as well as the importance of understanding the teacher's role in shaping the direction of critical dialogue.

In 2022, Pillinger and Vardy (2022) conducted a systematic literature review of the impact of Diagnostic Reading on the literacy and non-literacy skills of children and found evidence to support the use of Diagnostic Reading to promote the engagement of children a positive impact on children's enjoyment and motivation for reading. However, while Pillinger and Vardy's review (2022) does not contradict prior evidence supporting the use of Diagnostic Reading in educational and home settings in supporting language acquisition skills, they suggest that there are limitations on the extant research and call for further research to be conducted.

The recent evidence, therefore, suggests that Diagnostic Reading is a positive and effective means to engage children while promoting literacy and language acquisition skills. However, like much of the research in this area, a call for more research in understanding effective and sustainable pedagogy in this area would aid in fully assessing its impact.

### ***Writing pedagogy***

There appears to be limited recent relevant research evidence on this field, particularly evaluative research. The most recent literature in this key focus area highlights teacher education in the discourses of teaching writing (Bomer, Land, Rubin, & Van Dike, 2019). This research recaps six discourses relating to writing pedagogy from a leading expert in the field, namely Skills, Creativity, Process, Genre and Social practices (Bomer et al., 2019; Ivanič, 2004). While all of these discourses are important pedagogical practices for the development of writing skills, the most relevant to this literature review is that of skills discourse. Skills discourse is an emphasis on learning and linguistic patterns such as phonics and word formation which eventually leads to the formation of sentences, paragraphs and whole texts. This discourse relies on grammatical instruction. Additionally, this discourse is often the 'go to' for many educators to help identify gaps in language acquisition.

One other theme in this research field reveals an emphasis on promoting writing pedagogy aimed at educational policy makers involved in developing standards and accountability measures (Bomer et al., 2019; Eutsler, Mitchell, Stamm, & Kogut, 2020; Ivanič, 2004).



## 3.2 ADDITIONAL AREAS OF FOCUS

This review was also tasked with a secondary focus on several additional areas of interest that impinge on the teaching of literacy and the use of the Active Literacy programme. These expansive and additional areas of interest for the review were.: Impact of Covid Pandemic on Acquisition of Early Literacy Skills; Play Pedagogy; Using ICT with Pupils with Persistent Literacy Difficulties; Curriculum Rationale: The Development of Literacy Skills through Relevant Contexts for Learning. Given the brief timescale of this review and a main focus on the key topics in Section 3.1, the review for the additional areas of focus was far more limited. Moreover, the scale and scope of the literature on these additional areas was considerable and each could justify a separate review. However, within these limitations, a number of insights emerge:

### ***The impact of COVID-19 on literacy learning***

Research conducted by the Department for Education (DfE) in autumn 2020, using STAR assessments for over 400,000 learners found a learning loss of up to 2 months in reading in both primary and secondary pupils (DfE, 2022), but younger primary learners experienced the greatest learning loss (Twist et al 2022), particularly regarding reading (Rose *et al* 2021). This loss was exacerbated for learners from disadvantaged backgrounds, with those in secondary education showing 50% greater learning loss (e.g. EEF, 2020). In the primary sector, learners experienced up to 2 months learning loss and there were regional variations that were more severe (DfE, 2021). Other research found that the poverty-related attainment gap, across all subjects, was exacerbated by COVID-19 (Blainey *et al.*, 2021; Blainey *et al.*, 2020).

It is arguable that, compared to England and Wales, the Scottish Government has been reticent about providing specific estimates of the scale of learning loss due to COVID-19. However, the Scottish Government has stated that educational outcomes are likely to have been negatively impacted, but stresses that the evidence on the scale of the impact so far is limited given and will take time to accurately assess and understand (Scottish Government, 2021).

There were no sources identified that specifically addressed what types of pedagogical strategies were effective in addressing literacy recovery associated with the detrimental Covid-related learning loss. However, given the insights gleaned from the literature on phonics and diagnostic reading regarding their appropriateness for literacy recovery, we can speculate that these approaches would have potential here.

Numerous studies report that parental/carer participation and engagement in reading with children during the COVID pandemic has a related impact on literacy skills (e.g.: Nevo, 2023; Wheeler & Hill, 2021), however much of this research also indicates that more studies are needed to understand this process. Research cautions that, due to the complexity of learning experiences and learning loss during the pandemic, a single approach to learning recovery is unlikely (Twist *et al* 2022). This has important implications for learning recovery approaches within schools and educational policy.

### ***Play pedagogy***

The literature indicates that play pedagogy can be an effective approach for literacy skill acquisition (Jones & Christensen, 2022), however, it is noteworthy that practitioners should

use different types of pedagogical approaches to ensure that all learning needs are met. It is also important to note that any pedagogical approach in a classroom setting should afford opportunities for the learner to deepen understanding of taught concepts/ allow for application of skills; it should not be in place of intended learning within a literacy curriculum. Furthermore, the evidence base for play-based learning is not strong or consistent (EEF, 2023), therefore further research is required in this area.

### ***ICT and literacy learning***

The literature on this topic often focuses on teacher's ICT awareness and skills, but does encourage the use of ICT for language acquisition and emphasises its use to enhance other appropriate pedagogical practices and resources. Evidence collated by EEF indicates that approaches using digital technology alone tend to be less successful than those led by a teacher or teaching assistant, particularly when using phonics. Further, research regarding the use of ICT with pupils primarily focuses on teacher awareness and encourages the use of it for language acquisition, but little is reported on when to move to this as an intervention. While outwith time frame for this review (10 year period), there is an EPPI analysis of systematic reviews. It reports that a meta-analysis of 12 randomised controlled trials (mostly US) found little evidence to support the widespread use of ICT in literacy learning in English and only weak evidence of a positive effect on writing (Torgesson et al.2003). However since the pandemic, digital and ICT approaches in teaching the curriculum have proliferated and newer approaches might offer more promise regarding the teaching of literacy.

### ***The development of literacy skills through relevant contexts for learning as part of curriculum rationale***

Within the timescale for the drafting of this report, no relevant peer reviewed sources on this topic were identified. However, educational advice, particularly from Educational Scotland is available and features good practice for the teaching of literacy and its assessment across the curriculum to reflect learner's needs.<sup>4</sup> While not peer-reviewed, this material is based on evidence of effective practice and is research informed. The overall content and advice contained in this type of material aligns very well with the design features of the NLC Active literacy approach.

## **4 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION**

The original literature review conducted by NLC Educational Psychologists, provided a strong conceptual framework and sound evidence-informed basis for the design of the NLC Active Literacy approach. There appears to be no research in the past 10 years that seriously contradicts the NLC approach's underpinning theory and methods. Therefore, we suggest that guidance on the implementation of the NLC's literacy approach continues unchanged and is followed to promote reliability of translation into practice.

Reflecting on available evidence, NLC's Active Literacy approach programme is relevant in its use of supporting language development through supported activities, balanced praxis and pedagogical resources. The research suggests that practitioners are provided with robust

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://education.gov.scot/media/qteey2ju/literacy-across-learning-pp.pdf>

training and follow-up support when necessary to effectively teach the combination of approaches that make up the Council's approach to teaching literacy .

The EEF evidence, in particular, also strongly suggests that the components of the North Lanarkshire approach are pertinent for recovery following the Pandemic and for supporting pupils with persistent literacy difficulties associated with ASN.

Given the relatively limited range of recent literature, the team did explore a limited amount of 'grey literature' since 2010. This largely consisted of blogs and non-peer-reviewed sources that debate the efficacy of phonics approaches. However, as commentators highlight (e.g.: Buckingham et al 2019), this debate largely reflects the many vested interests and ideological stances of the various contributors and is of limited use for designing interventions.

The Active Literacy programme, as supported by school level evidence, continues to remain an effective theory-informed approach. The underpinning SSP conceptual framework is still validated by very robust research evidence. This evidence continues to support the use of NLC's Active Literacy programme and endorses its use for promoting the learning of all children and young people, including those from disadvantaged backgrounds and SEN.

There is a major strand of literature that focuses on evidencing the impact of phonics in the teaching of literacy. We know that while this is a key part of the North Lanarkshire Active Literacy approach, it is also a unique combination of other components. It is, therefore, difficult to find definitive evidence to compare with the combination of design features of the North Lanarkshire Active Literacy Programme. However, the literature, including systematic reviews, and particularly the Education Endowment Foundation's assessment of impactful literacy approaches, indicates that the main components of the North Lanarkshire approach have been demonstrated to be effective separately (i.e. Phonics, Reading comprehension Strategies and Dialogic reading). It is logical, therefore, to assume that these components can reinforce one another to provide a comprehensive and holistic approach to literacy learning for all children in primary education. A final caveat, however, is the importance of the quality of the professional learning that builds capacity of practitioners and the extent to which practitioners and school leaders apply this professional learning and adhere to the Active Literacy model.

## 5 REFERENCES

Blainey, K. and Hannay, T. (2021). The Impact of School Closures on Autumn 2020 School Attainment. [online]. Available: [https://www.risingstars-uk.com/media/Rising-Stars/Assessment/RS\\_Assessment\\_white\\_paper\\_2021\\_impact\\_of\\_school\\_closures\\_on\\_autumn\\_2020\\_attainment.pdf](https://www.risingstars-uk.com/media/Rising-Stars/Assessment/RS_Assessment_white_paper_2021_impact_of_school_closures_on_autumn_2020_attainment.pdf) [9 March, 2022]

Bomer, R., Land, C. L., Rubin, J. C., & Van Dike, L. M. (2019). Constructs of Teaching Writing in Research About Literacy Teacher Education. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X19833783>, 51(2), 196–213.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X19833783>

Bowers, J. S. (2020). Reconsidering the Evidence That Systematic Phonics Is More Effective Than Alternative Methods of Reading Instruction. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32(3), 681–705. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10648-019-09515-Y>

- Bowers, J. S. (2021). Yes Children Need to Learn Their GPCs but There Really Is Little or No Evidence that Systematic or Explicit Phonics Is Effective: a response to Fletcher, Savage, and Sharon (2020). *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(4), 1965–1979. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10648-021-09602-Z>
- Brady, S., (2020) A 2020 Perspective on Research Findings on Alphabetics (PA & Phonics): Implications for Instruction. *The Reading League Journal*. pp20-28. <https://www.thereadingleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Brady-Expanded-Version-of-Alphabetics-TRLJ.pdf> (accessed 28/08/2023)
- Brannon, D., and Dauksas, L. (2014) The Effectiveness of Dialogic Reading in Increasing English Language Learning Preschool Children’s Expressive Language. *International Research in Early Childhood Education*. Vol. 5, No. 1, 2014, pp 1-10
- Buckingham, J., Wheldall, K., and Beaman-Wheldall, R. (2019) Why Jaydon can’t read: The triumph of ideology over evidence in teaching reading. *Policy: A journal of public policy and ideas*. Volume 29. Issue 3. pp 21-32
- Cowan, T., & Glover, A. (n.d.). *An Overview of Active Literacy*. North Lanarkshire. Department of Education. (2023). *The reading framework*. London.
- Doyle, B. G., & Bramwell, W. (2006). Promoting Emergent Literacy and Social–Emotional Learning Through Dialogic Reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(6), 554–564. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.59.6.5>
- Educational Endowment Foundation (2020) Rapid evidence assessment Impact of school closures on the attainment gap. [https://d2tic4wvo1iusb.cloudfront.net/production/documents/guidance/REA\\_-\\_Impact\\_of\\_school\\_closures\\_on\\_the\\_attainment\\_gap\\_summary.pdf?v=1694100771](https://d2tic4wvo1iusb.cloudfront.net/production/documents/guidance/REA_-_Impact_of_school_closures_on_the_attainment_gap_summary.pdf?v=1694100771)
- Eutsler, L., Mitchell, C., Stamm, B., & Kogut, A. (2020). The influence of mobile technologies on preschool and elementary children’s literacy achievement: a systematic review spanning 2007–2019. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68(4), 1739–1768. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11423-020-09786-1/FIGURES/3>
- Flynn, K. S. (2011). Developing Children’s Oral Language Skills through Dialogic Reading. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 44(2), 8–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004005991104400201>
- Gordon, C. (2018) *The Role of Dialogic Teaching in Fostering Critical Literacy in an Urban High School English Classroom*. Dissertation, Georgia State University, 2018. [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse\\_diss/58](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse_diss/58)
- Herald Scotland. (2022, May 30). Education in Scotland: Phonics failures “mean whole classes reach secondary without reading skills” | HeraldScotland. Retrieved August 24, 2023, from <https://www.heraldsotland.com/politics/20174305.education-scotland-phonics-failures-mean-whole-classes-reach-secondary-without-reading-skills/>
- Ivanič, R. (2004). Discourses of writing and learning to write. *Language and Education*, 18(3), 220–245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780408666877>

Jones, M. E., & Christensen, A. E. (2022). Play, Cognition, and Early Literacy. In *Constructing Strong Foundations of Early Literacy* (pp. 119–142). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429284021-9/PLAY-COGNITION-EARLY-LITERACY-MALINDA-JONES-ANN-CHRISTENSEN>

Joseph, A., Siddeeqa, A., and Crenna-Jennings, W. (2023) *Essex Year of Reading 2022-23: Reading skills, outcomes and interventions – A review of the evidence*. Essex Education Task Force. Education Policy Institute.

Lucas, M., Nelson, J. and Sims, D. (2020). *Schools' responses to Covid-19: Pupil engagement in remote learning*. Slough: NFER. Available: [https://www.nfer.ac.uk/media/4073/schools\\_responses\\_to\\_covid\\_19\\_pupil\\_engagement\\_in\\_remote\\_learning.pdf](https://www.nfer.ac.uk/media/4073/schools_responses_to_covid_19_pupil_engagement_in_remote_learning.pdf)

Molotsky, A., Dias, P., and Nakamura, P. (2022) *Read Write Inc. Phonics and Fresh Start: Evaluation Report*. Education Endowment Foundation.

National Literacy Trust. (2023). *What is phonics? | National Literacy Trust*. Retrieved August 22, 2023, from <https://literacytrust.org.uk/information/what-is-literacy/what-phonics/>

Nevo, E. (2023). The Effect of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Low SES Kindergarteners' Language Abilities. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10643-023-01444-4/FIGURES/1>

O'Sullivan, J. (2021). Replacing a reading scheme with dialogic reading: an action research case study in 15 London nurseries. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 29(1), 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2020.1754172>

Pillinger, C., & Vardy, E. J. (2022). The story so far: A systematic review of the dialogic reading literature. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 45(4), 533–548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12407>

Pillinger, C., & Wood, C. (2014). Pilot study evaluating the impact of dialogic reading and shared reading at transition to primary school: Early literacy skills and parental attitudes. *Literacy*, 48(3), 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/LIT.12018>

Ramsey, W. R., Bellom-Rohrbacher, K., & Saenz, T. (2021). The effects of dialogic reading on the expressive vocabulary of pre-school aged children with moderate to severely impaired expressive language skills. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 37(3), 279–299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02656590211019449>

Rose, S., Badr, K., Fletcher, L., Paxman, T., Lord, P., Rutt, S., Styles, B. and Twist, L. (2021). *Impact of School Closures and Subsequent Support Strategies on Attainment and Socio-Emotional Wellbeing in Key Stage 1: Research Report* [online]. Available:

<https://d2tic4wvo1iusb.cloudfront.net/documents/pages/projects/Impact-on-KS1-Closures-Report.pdf?v=1638448453>

Scottish Government (2021) *Scotland's Wellbeing: The Impact of COVID-19 – Summary*. Edinburgh.

<https://nationalperformance.gov.scot/scotlands-wellbeing-impact-covid-19-summary>

- Shanahan, T. (2020). What Constitutes a Science of Reading Instruction? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S1), S235–S247. <https://doi.org/10.1002/RRQ.349>
- Solity, J., & Vousden, J. (2009). Real books vs reading schemes: a new perspective from instructional psychology. *Educational Psychology*, 29(4), 469–511. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410903103657>
- The Conversation. (2022, January 19). Phonics teaching in England needs to change – our new research points to a better approach. Retrieved August 24, 2023, from <https://theconversation.com/phonics-teaching-in-england-needs-to-change-our-new-research-points-to-a-better-approach-172655#>
- Torgerson C, Zhu D (2003) A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of ICT on literacy learning in English, 5-16. In: *Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Towson, J. A., Fetting, A., Fleury, V. P., & Abarca, D. L. (2017). Dialogic Reading in Early Childhood Settings: A Summary of the Evidence Base. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121417724875>, 37(3), 132–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121417724875>
- Twist, L., Jones, J., and Treleaven, O. (2022) The Impact of Covid-19 on pupil attainment. A summary of research evidence. National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER). Slough.
- UCL Institute of Education. (2022, January 19). Government’s approach to teaching reading is uninformed and failing children | UCL News - UCL – University College London. Retrieved August 24, 2023, from <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2022/jan/governments-approach-teaching-reading-uninformed-and-failing-children>
- Wall, D., Foltz, S., Kupfer, A., & Glenberg, A. M. (2022). Embodied Action Scaffolds Dialogic Reading. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(1), 401–419. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10648-021-09617-6/TABLES/5>
- Watkins, P. (2018). *Teaching and Developing Reading Skills*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wheeler, D. L., & Hill, J. C. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 on early childhood reading practices. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687984211044187>
- Whitehurst, G. J., Falco, F. L., Lonigan, C. J., Fischel, J. E., DeBaryshe, B. D., Valdez-Menchaca, M. C., & Caulfield, M. (1988). Accelerating Language Development Through Picture Book Reading. *Developmental Psychology*, 24(4), 552–559. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.24.4.552>
- Wolfe, S. C. (2015). Talking policy into practice: probing the debates around the effective teaching of early reading. 43(5), 498–513. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2013.828765>
- Wyse, D., & Bradbury, A. (2022a). Reading wars or reading reconciliation? A critical examination of robust research evidence, curriculum policy and teachers’ practices for

teaching phonics and reading. *Review of Education*, 10(1).  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/REV3.3314>

Wyse, D., & Bradbury, A. (2022b). The passion, pedagogy and politics of reading. *English in Education*, 56(3), 247–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04250494.2022.2091987>

Wyse, D., & Goswami, U. (2008). Synthetic phonics and the teaching of reading. *British Educational Research Journal*, 34(6), 691–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920802268912>

Wyse, D., & Styles, M. (2007). Synthetic phonics and the teaching of reading: The debate surrounding England's "Rose Report." *Literacy*, 41(1), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-9345.2007.00455.X>

Yasemin., Y and Cemal, A. (2022), The Effect of a Dialogic Reading Program on the Early Literacy Skills of Children in Preschool Period (December 13, 2022). *Education Quarterly Reviews*, Vol.5 Special Issue 2 Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4301081>