THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SCIENCE OF READING

The True Process of Reading

Why Memory, Not Phonics, Does the Heavy Lifting

A research synthesis on the neuroscience and cognitive science of reading — and what it means for solving the reading crisis

Youth Success Movement
truthaboutscienceofreading.org · youthsuccessmovement.org
July 2026

Contents

The True Process of Reading: Why Memory, Not Phonics, Does the Heavy Lifting

BOTTOM LINE UP FRONT. Skilled reading is not sounding out words. It is a chain of neural events in which the eye supplies contrast patterns, the brain's “letterbox” (the Visual Word Form Area) recognizes whole word-forms as visual objects, memory retrieves their meaning, working memory holds the emerging meaning long enough to integrate it, and long-term memory—background knowledge, the orthographic lexicon, and semantic networks—supplies the substrate on which comprehension is built. Phonics is the developmental scaffold that populates this memory system. It is a foundational on-ramp, not the highway. The single largest foundational element of skilled reading is memory, and reading only “counts” when the chain terminates in meaning. But every link in that chain runs on a brain—and instruction acts on a brain, it does not build one. When a child arrives under-slept, undernourished, or carrying trauma, the memory and attention systems reading depends on are not ready, and no amount of instruction can run a system that has not yet been built. That is why the reading gap tracks poverty, and why the real solution begins before school and outside the reading lesson.

This report synthesizes the peer-reviewed neuroscience, cognitive science, and educational research supporting that thesis. Where the field is genuinely divided—phonics efficacy, the “jumbled letters” claim, the predictive validity of DIBELS—it presents the debate accurately rather than triumphantly. The aim is not to be anti-phonics. It is to put phonics in its proper place so that the reading crisis can be understood and solved.

1. The Neural Chain of Reading, from Photon to Situation Model

Reading begins outside the body, in physics. It requires visible-spectrum light (roughly 380–750 nanometers) either reflected from an inked page or emitted from a screen. The eye is a refractive optical device: the cornea and lens image a pattern of luminance and contrast onto the retina. **No reading occurs at the eye.** The peripheral input is only edges and gradients—no letters, no phonemes, no words. This is the foundational premise: because the eye transmits only pattern information, all “reading” is a construction performed by the brain (Kandel et al., 2013; Purves et al., 2018).

At the retina, photons are absorbed by photopigments, triggering the phototransduction cascade. Roughly 120 million rods and 6 million cones drive bipolar and retinal ganglion cells; about 1 million ganglion-cell axons form the optic nerve, cross partially at the chiasm, and synapse in the lateral geniculate nucleus of the thalamus before projecting to primary visual cortex, V1 (Wässle, 2004; Kandel et al., 2013). The retinal output is a bank of contrast-tuned signals—not letters.

In V1, the classic work of Hubel and Wiesel established that simple, complex, and hypercomplex cells decompose the visual scene into oriented line segments, edges, and terminations (Hubel &

Wiesel, 1962, 1968). Letter shapes are represented as combinations of the same primitives the brain uses to see faces, tools, and animals—the anatomical prerequisite for "neuronal recycling," the hypothesis that literacy repurposes evolved shape-recognition circuitry (Dehaene & Cohen, 2007).

Skilled readers do not scan letter by letter. Keith Rayner's decades of eye-movement research (Rayner, 1998, 2009) established the parameters of skilled English reading with remarkable consistency. Fluent adults fixate for approximately 200–250 milliseconds, then execute rapid saccades of 7–9 character spaces. Their perceptual span extends about 3–4 characters to the left and 14–15 characters to the right of fixation—reversed in right-to-left scripts, which proves it is attentional, not retinal. Roughly 10–15 percent of saccades are regressions, and short, high-frequency, or predictable words are skipped about 30 percent of the time. Parafoveal preview means the next word is already being processed while the current word is fixated. This pattern is quantitatively incompatible with serial grapheme-to-phoneme conversion. It is the signature of parallel, lexical access.

The critical cortical destination is the Visual Word Form Area (VWFA), a reproducible patch of left occipitotemporal (mid-fusiform) cortex at MNI coordinates of approximately $x = -45$, $y = -57$, $z = -15$. Cohen, Dehaene, and colleagues (2000) first characterized it; McCandliss, Cohen, and Dehaene (2003) named it the fusiform "expertise" region for reading; Dehaene and Cohen (2011) established its unique role. The VWFA responds preferentially to letter strings over faces, objects, or false fonts, and its tuning is invariant to case, font, size, and retinal position—READ = read = read. Vinckier et al. (2007) showed a posterior-to-anterior gradient of tuning, from letter-like shapes to bigrams to whole words. Lesions produce pure alexia—letter-by-letter reading or complete loss of reading, with writing preserved. Dehaene (2009) calls this region the brain's "letterbox": it is where whole word-forms are recognized as visual objects in a single fixation of about 200 milliseconds. This is the neural correlate of sight-word reading. **Phonological decoding is not required to activate the VWFA for a familiar word.**

From the VWFA, activation flows to the orthographic lexicon and to semantic networks. Linnea Ehri's theory of orthographic mapping (Ehri, 2005, 2014, 2020) is the pivotal bridge between phonics and skilled reading. Phonemic awareness and grapheme-phoneme correspondences allow a learner to decode a novel word a few times, at which point the spelling becomes amalgamated with pronunciation and meaning and is stored as a single unitary representation. Once mapped, the word is retrieved directly from memory. **Every word a skilled reader knows to read has become a sight word**—including words that were originally learned by decoding. Phonics is the route; orthographic memory is the destination.

Meaning access proceeds through a distributed "hub-and-spoke" semantic network (Patterson, Nestor, & Rogers, 2007; Lambon Ralph et al., 2017): modality-specific "spokes"—visual, auditory, motor, and action features—are integrated by a bilateral anterior temporal lobe hub, the region catastrophically degraded in semantic dementia. The angular gyrus contributes combinatorial semantics. During reading, VWFA output feeds these representations through left occipitotemporal and inferior frontal pathways (Binder et al., 2009).

Holding words in mind while integrating them across a sentence depends on working memory. Baddeley and Hitch's (1974) multicomponent model, updated by Baddeley (2000, 2003), describes a phonological loop (subvocal rehearsal, with roughly a two-second decay), a visuospatial sketchpad, a central executive for attentional control, and an episodic buffer (about four chunks) that binds phonological, visual, and semantic material with long-term memory into unified episodes. Just and Carpenter's (1992) capacity theory demonstrates that both storage and processing draw on a shared activation pool: **working memory is the bottleneck for comprehension.** If decoding is effortful, less capacity remains for meaning.

Comprehension itself is the construction of a situation model in long-term memory. Kintsch's (1988, 1998) construction–integration model posits three levels of representation—surface form, textbase, and situation model—the last of which integrates text propositions with the reader's background knowledge. Zwaan and Radvansky (1998) formalized situation models as tracking space, time, causation, intentionality, and protagonists. Discourse comprehension recruits a distributed network beyond reading-specific cortex: the anterior temporal lobes, angular gyrus, posterior middle temporal gyrus, left inferior frontal gyrus, and medial prefrontal and precuneus regions (Ferstl et al., 2008). **Comprehension is memory retrieval plus integration—the endpoint that gives reading its purpose.**

2. Skilled Word Recognition Is Automatic, Parallel, and Memory-Driven

Five convergent lines of theory and evidence show that fluent word recognition is fast, parallel, and lexical—not serial decoding.

Automaticity theory

LaBerge and Samuels (1974) formalized the automaticity theory of reading: attention is a limited resource, and non-automatic decoding consumes attention needed for comprehension. Only when word recognition becomes automatic—indexed by rapid, effortless retrieval with concurrent-task performance preserved—can attention be freed for meaning. This framework grounds modern fluency research and undergirds the Simple View of Reading.

Dual-route and connectionist models

The Dual-Route Cascaded (DRC) model (Coltheart, Rastle, Perry, Langdon, & Ziegler, 2001) implements two parallel routes: a lexical (direct) route through a stored orthographic word lexicon, and a sublexical (grapheme-phoneme conversion) route. Both race in parallel, but skilled readers rely on the direct route for familiar words. The sublexical route handles novel words and pseudowords, but produces regularization errors on exception words such as PINT or YACHT if used alone. Neuropsychology confirms the dissociation: surface dyslexia damages the lexical route, while phonological dyslexia damages the sublexical route.

Connectionist, or "triangle," models (Seidenberg & McClelland, 1989; Plaut, McClelland, Seidenberg, & Patterson, 1996) offer an alternative in which there are no word-specific units and no explicit rules—only distributed patterns of activation across orthography, phonology, and semantics, linked by learned weights. Reading a known word is a rapid, parallel settling of activation. Both DRC and triangle frameworks agree on the central point: **skilled reading of**

familiar words is memory-driven pattern recognition, not serial rule application. The architectural debate remains active; the phenomenological conclusion is not in dispute.

The self-teaching hypothesis

Share's (1995) self-teaching hypothesis resolves the apparent tension between developmental phonics and skilled sight-word reading. Phonological recoding is a bootstrapping mechanism: each successful decoding of a novel string lays down a word-specific orthographic trace. After as few as one to four exposures, the word can be recognized directly. Phonological recoding is item-based, not stage-based; individual words transition from decoded to orthographically retrieved as exposures accumulate. Once mapped, decoding is unnecessary for that word. Share's central claim—**phonics is indispensable for acquisition but plays little role in skilled recognition**—has been replicated across English, Hebrew, Dutch, Spanish, and French.

Reading speed and the word superiority effect

Reading-speed evidence closes the case. Brysbaert's (2019) meta-analysis of 190 studies established authoritative rates: silent reading averages about 238 words per minute for non-fiction and about 260 for fiction, while oral reading averages about 183. At roughly four words per second and a mean English word length of 4.6 letters, skilled readers process roughly eighteen letters per second—arithmetically incompatible with grapheme-by-grapheme phonological assembly. Compounding this, the word superiority effect (Reicher, 1969; Wheeler, 1970) shows that letters are recognized more accurately inside words than in isolation or in nonwords—direct evidence that higher-level lexical representations feed back to facilitate letter perception, not the reverse. McClelland and Rumelhart's (1981) Interactive Activation model formalized the mechanism: parallel letter processing with bidirectional excitation among feature, letter, and word levels.

A careful correction: the "jumbled letters" claim

The "Aoccdrnig to a rscheearch at Cmabrigde Uinervtisy" meme deserves careful correction. The Cambridge attribution is a hoax. As Matt Davis of the MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit documents, the underlying observation traces to Graham Rawlinson's 1976 Nottingham doctoral thesis, not to any Cambridge study. More importantly, the actual science overturns the meme's strong claim. Rayner, White, Johnson, and Liversedge (2006), in a study pointedly titled "Raeding wrods with jubmled letters: There is a cost," directly tested it and found that reading slows by roughly 11 percent—about 26 milliseconds of extra processing per word—when internal letters are transposed, with the greatest disruption for transpositions at word-initial or word-final positions and for transpositions that create real-word neighbors such as CALM/CLAM or TRIAL/TRAIL. Christianson, Johnson, and Rayner (2005) showed that transpositions across morpheme boundaries are especially disruptive. The correct interpretation is that skilled reading involves parallel letter processing with position-sensitive but somewhat flexible letter coding: outer letters carry more diagnostic weight, but internal position still matters. Whole-word "shape" (bouma) recognition is largely rejected in modern reading science, and MiXeD cAsE text disrupts word shape while skilled readers still read it. Reading is parallel, letter-based, position-tolerant, and lexically mediated—but position matters.

3. The Proper Place of Phonics: Essential On-Ramp, Not the Highway

The National Reading Panel (2000) is the touchstone. Its meta-analysis of 38 studies (66 treatment-control comparisons) found that systematic phonics produced a moderate overall effect of d = 0.44 (Chapter 2, Part II, p. 2-92). Effects were strongest where phonics genuinely does its work—regularly-spelled words (d = 0.67), pseudowords (d = 0.60), and spelling in kindergarten and first grade (d = 0.67). Effects were largest for kindergarten (d = 0.56) and grade 1 (d = 0.54), and shrank to d = 0.27 across grades 2–6.

Crucially—and often omitted from advocacy summaries—**the National Reading Panel itself found no significant comprehension benefit for systematic phonics in grades 2–6.** In the report's exact wording (p. 2-94): systematic phonics produced significantly greater growth than non-phonics instruction in younger children's reading comprehension (d = 0.51), but the effects on text comprehension for readers above first grade were mixed; gains were significant for the subgroup of disabled readers (d = 0.32) but **not significant for the older group in general (d = 0.12).** The Findings summary corroborates this: older children receiving phonics instruction were better able to decode and spell words and to read text orally, but their comprehension of text was not significantly improved. For older low-achieving (non-disabled) readers, the word-reading effect fell to d = 0.15, also non-significant.

Hammill and Swanson (2006) reframed the overall d = 0.44 effect in variance terms: it corresponds to r of about 0.21 and r-squared of about 0.04—approximately 4 percent of the variance in reading achievement (Elementary School Journal, 107(1), 17–26). This is not a new empirical finding but a re-expression of the same number, and Stuebing, Barth, Cirino, Francis, and Fletcher (2008, Journal of Educational Psychology) formally rebutted the interpretation, arguing that d = 0.44 is practically meaningful in classroom terms. The debate over how to interpret modest effect sizes remains active.

Torgerson, Brooks, and Hall (2006), a UK Department for Education and Skills systematic review restricted to randomized controlled trials, retained twelve studies. They found a significant effect on word-reading accuracy but concluded that the evidence on reading comprehension was weak and that no significant effect was found for reading comprehension. Spelling effects were also non-significant in the trials-only analysis.

Bowers (2020), in Educational Psychology Review, reviewed twelve meta-analyses and argued that systematic phonics is not reliably shown to be more effective than well-implemented alternatives such as Structured Word Inquiry or balanced approaches that include some code instruction. His argument was formally rebutted in the same journal by Fletcher, Savage, and Vaughn (2021) on five methodological grounds, by Buckingham (2020) in The Educational and Developmental Psychologist, and answered again by Bowers (2021, 2023). This is a live scholarly debate, not a settled question. Similarly, Wyse and Bradbury (2022), in Review of Education, argued that the evidence does not support a synthetic-phonics orientation; Brooks (2023) replied in the same journal disputing their methods, and Wyse and Bradbury (2023) rejoined. Educators should treat these as ongoing scientific exchanges—neither "settled science" nor a debunking of phonics.

Why phonics alone cannot carry English

English orthographic opacity is the underlying reason phonics alone cannot carry the load. Clymer's (1963/1996) analysis of 45 phonic generalizations applied to basal readers found that only 18—40 percent—met a 75 percent utility criterion. The rule "when two vowels go walking, the first does the talking" had a utility of just 45 percent. Hanna, Hanna, Hodges, and Rudorf (1966), in a U.S. Office of Education study, programmed a computer with 203 phonics rules; it correctly spelled 49 percent of 17,310 common words. Nyikos (1988), in the LACUS Forum conference proceedings, reported approximately 1,768 spellings for the roughly 40 phonemes of English—a figure widely cited, though from a conference source rather than a peer-reviewed journal. Dewey's analysis in Relative Frequency of English Speech Sounds (1923/1950), later applied in English Spelling: Roadblock to Reading (1971), yielded the often-cited estimate that roughly one in five of the 10,000 most common English words are reliably decodable by regular rules; the precise figure is more securely traced to Dewey's 1923 work than to the 1971 volume. Share (2008, Psychological Bulletin) characterizes English as an "outlier" deep orthography. The convergent implication is that pure grapheme-phoneme rules are necessary but insufficient for reading English, which is why instruction must also build morphological knowledge, orthographic mapping of irregular words, and rich language exposure.

4. DIBELS and the Assessment Mismatch That Hides the Crisis

The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (Good & Kaminski, 2002; Good, Simmons, & Kame'enui, 2001) was designed as a fluency-based screener for third-grade high-stakes outcomes. The current DIBELS 8th Edition (University of Oregon, 2020) has six subtests: Letter Naming Fluency, Phonemic Segmentation Fluency, Nonsense Word Fluency, Word Reading Fluency, Oral Reading Fluency, and Maze. Five of the six subtests are code-focused. Only Maze indexes comprehension, and only under time pressure via a cloze format. Vocabulary and background knowledge—the drivers of later comprehension—are not directly measured.

Oral Reading Fluency does correlate with early-grade comprehension. Fuchs, Fuchs, Hosp, and Jenkins (2001) reviewed older curriculum-based-measurement validity work reporting correlations with comprehension in the range of about .81–.90. Larger and more recent studies land lower but still substantial: Roehrig et al. (2008) found correlations of about .70–.71 in roughly 35,000 Florida third graders; Schilling, Carlisle, Scott, and Zeng (2007) reported that Oral Reading Fluency cut-scores classified at-risk students with about 80 percent accuracy in grade 2 and about 76 percent in grade 3, but substantially worse in grade 1. Riedel (2007) found Oral Reading Fluency was the strongest DIBELS predictor of end-of-first- and second-grade comprehension in urban first graders—but, critically, adding any other subtest, including Nonsense Word Fluency and Retell Fluency, added one percentage point or less of predictive power beyond Oral Reading Fluency alone. Munger and Blachman (2013) confirmed this in third grade using a Simple-View framework.

The critique cuts to the construct. Samuels (2007), the co-author of the original automaticity theory, titled his commentary "The DIBELS tests: Is speed of barking at print what we mean by reading fluency?" He argues that DIBELS conflates reading rate with fluency and omits prosody and comprehension. Pressley, Hilden, and Shankland (2005), in their Michigan State technical report, put it most bluntly: DIBELS mispredicts reading performance much of the time, and at best measures who reads quickly without regard to whether the reader comprehends what is read. Kim, Wagner, and Foster (2011) showed that silent reading fluency outperforms Oral Reading Fluency as a comprehension predictor from grade 2 onward. Bellinger and DiPerna (2011) showed that DIBELS Retell had low correlations with comprehension, supporting Oregon's decision to drop it in DIBELS 8.

This produces the "fourth-grade slump" (Chall & Jacobs, 1983/2003): children with strong K–2 DIBELS scores can fail later comprehension tests because DIBELS does not measure the vocabulary, background knowledge, and academic language that drive later reading. Riedel (2007) documented exactly this pattern at the individual-student level. The crisis is not that children lack decoding; it is that we assess what is easy to measure and hope it predicts what matters.

The field's own frameworks predict the failure

The Simple View of Reading (Gough & Tunmer, 1986; Hoover & Gough, 1990) states that Reading Comprehension equals Decoding multiplied by Language Comprehension. The operator is multiplication: if either factor is zero, reading is zero. Hoover and Gough (1990) confirmed the model in a longitudinal bilingual sample, showing the multiplicative form outperforms the additive, and that decoding's contribution declines while language comprehension's contribution rises as decoding becomes automatic. Scarborough's (2001) Reading Rope operationalizes this in eight strands. The Language Comprehension cord contains five strands—background knowledge, vocabulary, language structures, verbal reasoning, and literacy knowledge—and becomes "increasingly strategic" with development. The Word Recognition cord contains three strands—phonological awareness, decoding, and sight recognition—and becomes "increasingly automatic." Both cords braid into skilled reading. **Phonics is one strand of one cord of eight**—necessary, but explicitly not sufficient. Sight recognition (orthographic mapping) is a distinct strand from decoding, echoing Ehri's insight that the destination is memory. Even orthodox Science-of-Reading models treat phonics as one leg of a multi-leg stool.

5. Memory Is the Foundational Element

Four converging lines of peer-reviewed evidence identify memory—not decoding—as the single largest foundation of skilled reading.

Working memory

Daneman and Carpenter (1980) introduced the reading-span task and reported strong correlations with verbal aptitude and with comprehension questions. Daneman and Merikle's (1996) meta-analysis of 77 studies ($N = 6{,}179$) established the canonical figure: reading span correlates with global reading comprehension at about $r = 0.41$. Process-plus-storage measures outperformed simple storage measures, indicating that the predictive power reflects domain-general executive and attentional resources, not just verbal storage. Peng et al.'s (2018) more recent meta-analysis of 197 studies (2,026 effect sizes) reported a pooled correlation of about 0.29 across all reading outcomes, with verbal working memory showing the strongest relation from grade 4 onward. Peng et al. also found that the working-memory–reading relation does not differ by type of reading, suggesting working memory supports the reading system broadly.

Long-term memory and background knowledge

Recht and Leslie's (1988) “baseball study” crossed reading ability with baseball knowledge in 64 junior-high students. High-knowledge poor readers outperformed low-knowledge good readers on reenactment, verbal recall, and summarization. Reynolds et al. (2025) note that the study's assessment items partly covered domain rather than pure text-topic knowledge and that it has not been directly replicated in three decades, but the broader effect is heavily corroborated. Cromley and Azevedo (2007) fitted the Direct and Inferential Mediation (DIME) model to 175 ninth-graders and explained 66 percent of the variance in comprehension with five predictors; vocabulary and background knowledge had the largest direct effects—larger than word reading. Ahmed et al. (2016) validated the DIME model in 1,196 students in grades 7 through 12. Anderson and Pearson's (1984) schema theory provides the architecture: comprehension is the matching of text propositions to organized long-term-memory schemata that supply encoding slots, inference scaffolds, and retrieval pathways. Willingham (2006, 2017) synthesizes the case for lay audiences: knowledge reduces working-memory load through chunking, supplies referents for pronouns and inferences, and enables richer situation models—so comprehension “strategies” have a ceiling set by knowledge.

Rapid automatized retrieval

Denckla and Rudel (1976) invented Rapid Automatized Naming (RAN) and showed it dissociates dyslexia from other learning disabilities. Wolf and Bowers's (1999) double-deficit hypothesis argued that phonological-awareness deficits and naming-speed deficits are two separable sources of reading dysfunction, with double-deficit children most severely impaired. Araújo, Reis, Petersson, and Faísca's (2015) meta-analysis of 137 studies ($N = 28{,}826$) reported that RAN correlates with reading at about $r = 0.43$, more strongly with fluency than accuracy—because RAN indexes the automaticity of memory retrieval, not phonological analysis per se. Norton and Wolf (2012, Annual Review of Psychology) frame RAN explicitly as a memory-retrieval process.

Orthographic long-term memory

Orthographic long-term memory is the endpoint. Ehri (2005, 2014) established that orthographic mapping bonds spelling, pronunciation, and meaning into a single memory representation, and that every well-known word becomes a sight word. Perfetti's (2007) Lexical Quality Hypothesis extends this: variation in the quality of lexical representations—how well-specified, redundant, and flexibly linked they are—sets the ceiling on comprehension. High-quality lexical representations enable rapid, reliable meaning retrieval; low-quality representations produce comprehension bottlenecks. Perfetti and Stafura (2014) argue that the reading system is lexicon-centered: comprehension flows through the word, and the quality of the lexical entry—an object in long-term memory—determines comprehension.

Together, working memory (the workspace), semantic long-term memory (the knowledge base), automatic retrieval (the speed engine), and orthographic long-term memory (the sight-word store) constitute the memory architecture on which skilled reading runs. Phonics contributes by populating this architecture. It is the construction method; memory is the operating substrate.

6. The NAEP Crisis, in the Field's Own Numbers

The 2024 NAEP Reading Assessment, released January 29, 2025, documents a decade-plus decline that predates the pandemic and has continued through it (NCES, 2025). At grade 4, only 31 percent of students scored at or above NAEP Proficient—two points below 2022 and four points below 2019—and 40 percent scored below Basic, the highest share in twenty years. The average scale score fell to 214, down from 217 in 2022 and 220 in 2019. Only Louisiana posted a grade-4 reading score higher than its 2019 mark. At grade 8, approximately 30 percent scored at or above Proficient, and roughly a third scored below Basic, the largest share in the assessment's history. Not a single state improved its grade-8 reading scores versus 2022 or 2019. Declines were concentrated in lower-performing students; only the 90th percentile held steady.

NCES Commissioner Peggy Carr did not soften the message. Her verified statements from the January 28–29, 2025 briefing include: the news is not good; student achievement has not returned to pre-pandemic levels, reading scores continue to decline, and the lowest-performing students are reading at historically low levels. She added that this is a major concern that cannot be blamed solely on the pandemic. NCES Associate Commissioner Daniel McGrath noted that NAEP has reported declines in reading achievement consistently since 2019, and that the continued declines since the pandemic suggest challenges that cannot be fully explained by COVID-19.

The 2025 NAEP Long-Term Trend results, released in June 2026, offer partial and equivocal recovery. At age 9, average reading rose to 218 (four points above 2022), with gains concentrated in lower-performing students. At age 13, average reading was 256—unchanged from 2023 and not significantly different from 1971. Only 14 percent of 13-year-olds now report reading for fun almost every day, compared with 35 percent in 1984. No new Main NAEP grade-4 or grade-8 Reading Report Card has been released since January 2025.

The pattern matches what the Simple View predicts. Two decades of increasing K–3 phonics investment have not moved the comprehension needle—because comprehension depends on vocabulary, knowledge, and language systems that phonics does not build.

7. The Precondition: Instruction Can't Build a Brain

Everything in Sections 1 through 5 quietly assumes something the reading debate almost never states out loud: that there is a working brain for instruction to act upon. Instruction acts on a brain; it does not build one. A reading lesson can populate an orthographic lexicon, strengthen phonemic awareness, and add vocabulary—but only if the underlying systems that do the learning are already in place. Those systems form what can be called a science-of-learning model: accurate sensory input, visual and auditory processing, attention, processing speed, and—above all—memory. Learning has a chain of its own. The brain takes in sensory input, processes it, stores and retrieves it through memory, and integrates it into knowledge. Reading is simply one of the most demanding applications of that chain. When a link is weak, no amount of instruction on the reading task itself repairs it, because the instruction has nowhere to land.

These learning systems are built, or compromised, long before and far outside the reading lesson. A child who is chronically under-slept cannot consolidate memory or sustain attention. A child who is undernourished—or whose diet cannot support neural function—has a brain running on insufficient fuel. A child living with chronic stress or trauma has a nervous system organized for threat rather than for the patient work of decoding and comprehension. These are not motivational failings or instructional failings. They are conditions of the brain that determine whether instruction can work at all. It is why the true foundation of reading is laid womb-to-classroom, in the years when the brain itself is being built.

The Harvard Center on the Developing Child documents that more than one million new neural connections are formed every second in the first few years of life. The “serve and return” framework describes how responsive caregiver interactions build brain architecture; without them, that architecture does not develop as expected. Fox, Levitt, and Nelson (2010, Child Development), the peer-reviewed backbone of this work, synthesizes evidence from genetic scaffolding, experience-dependent plasticity, sensitive periods, and the Bucharest Early Intervention Project, showing how early experience “gets under the skin” of brain development.

If reading readiness is built by conditions that are unequally distributed, then reading failure should be unequally distributed in the same pattern—and it is. The 2024 NAEP grade-4 reading data show the gap with clinical precision. Children eligible for the National School Lunch Program, the standard federal marker of family poverty, averaged 202 on the reading scale, while children not in poverty averaged 229—a 27-point gap. Black fourth-graders averaged 198 and Hispanic fourth-graders 203, against 224 for White and 234 for Asian and Pacific Islander students, producing White–Black and White–Hispanic gaps of 26 and 21 points. To see how stark this is, recall that the NAEP Basic threshold—the floor of minimal competence—is 208. On average, the child in poverty, the Black child, and the Hispanic child in the fourth grade all score below that floor. These gaps have barely moved across two decades of phonics-centered reform.

The interpretation matters more than the numbers, so it must be stated carefully. These gaps are not evidence of any deficit in the children, or in any group of children. They are evidence of unmet developmental need—the downstream, measurable trace of unequal access to the conditions that build strong brains: prenatal health, nutrition, sleep, safety, stable relationships, and language-rich “serve and return” interaction. A gap produced by unequal conditions is closed by equalizing conditions, not by drilling the phonics of children whose brains were never given what they needed to make the drilling stick. Framed correctly, the poverty and race data are not an indictment of the children. They are an indictment of a system that measures the shortfall, labels the child, and calls the labeling an intervention.

The mechanism by which unmet need becomes reading failure is visible in specific, well-documented cases. ADHD reflects delayed cortical maturation. Shaw et al.'s (2007) landmark PNAS paper compared 223 children with ADHD to 223 matched controls using longitudinal MRI at roughly 40,000 cortical points per hemisphere. The median age of peak cortical thickness was 10.5 years for the ADHD group versus 7.5 years for typically developing controls—a three-year delay, most prominent in the lateral prefrontal cortex, the region critical for attention, response inhibition, working memory, and planning. This is a developmental delay, not damage, but it shifts the maturational timeline on which classroom reading instruction depends.

Adverse childhood experiences alter brain architecture. Felitti et al.'s (1998) ACE Study (N = 9,508) established the dose-response link between childhood adversity and adult morbidity and mortality; those with four or more ACEs had four to twelve times the risk of outcomes such as substance abuse, depression, and suicide attempts compared with those reporting none. Teicher and Samson's (2016) review in the Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry argues that childhood maltreatment accounts for a large share of the population-attributable risk for childhood-onset psychiatric disorders and synthesizes imaging evidence of reduced hippocampal and prefrontal volume, corpus-callosum abnormalities, and sensitive-period effects. Brown et al. (2017), analyzing the National Survey of Children's Health (N = 76,227), found a dose-response relation between ACE count and both ADHD diagnosis and ADHD severity.

ADHD and reading disability overlap in 25 to 40 percent of affected individuals (Willcutt & Pennington, 2000)—far above chance given the roughly 5 percent base rates for each condition. This means a substantial portion of the children failing NAEP reading targets are children whose brain systems for attention, working memory, and executive control are themselves affected. That is brain readiness phonics instruction alone cannot supply.

Denton, Tamm, Schatschneider, and Epstein (2020) provide the most direct evidence. In a randomized controlled trial of 216 children in grades 2 through 5 with comorbid ADHD and word-reading deficits, participants were randomized to intensive reading intervention only, ADHD treatment only (medication plus behavioral parent training), or a combined treatment. The reading-intervention and combined groups both improved phonemic decoding fluency. But for passage comprehension, the ADHD-treatment group significantly outperformed the reading-intervention group, and the reading-only intervention did not produce comprehension gains equivalent to those from attentional treatment. Chan et al.'s (2023) meta-analysis in the Journal of Attention Disorders corroborates this: adding ADHD-specific behavioral components enhances reading gains beyond phonics-only instruction. For a substantial subset of struggling readers, phonics without attention to brain readiness underperforms.

8. Conclusion: What Changes When We Get the Process Right

Understanding reading as a chain—light, retina, V1, the Visual Word Form Area, the orthographic lexicon, the semantic hub, working memory, the situation model—changes what “teaching reading” means. Phonics teaches a child to convert print to sound; orthographic mapping turns those sounds into stored visual word-forms that can be retrieved instantly; vocabulary and background knowledge turn those retrieved forms into intelligible meaning; working memory holds meaning together across sentences; and long-term memory stores what was read long enough to demonstrate comprehension. Each link is a memory operation. Phonics is the shortest link—indispensable, but by itself a bridge to nowhere.

The Science of Reading, taken seriously, has never claimed otherwise. The Simple View is multiplicative for a reason. Scarborough's Rope has eight strands for a reason. The National Reading Panel itself reported the ceiling of phonics on grades 2–6 comprehension—d = 0.12, not significant—plainly on page 2-94. What has drifted is the policy translation, which has treated a foundational on-ramp as if it were the whole highway, and has built assessment systems, DIBELS in particular, that measure the on-ramp precisely and the highway barely at all.

If reading rests on memory, and memory rests on a brain built largely before school, then the solution to the reading crisis cannot live inside the reading lesson alone. It has two fronts. The first is upstream and societal: support families to build strong brains, womb-to-classroom. That means teaching parents the science of early brain development and giving them the resources that let most children arrive at school with the sensory, attentional, and memory systems reading requires—prenatal and nutritional support, sleep and routine, protection from toxic stress, and a rich early language environment. This is not the school's job alone; it is a community and public-health project, and it is where the largest and most durable gains are available. The second front is at the schoolhouse door: in kindergarten and first grade, identify and close the full range of skill gaps—sensory, cognitive-processing, memory, language, and social-emotional—before children are tested, labeled, and shamed for gaps the system did nothing to prevent. Early universal screening should be used to build, not to sort. A working-memory, processing-speed, or attentional gap found in kindergarten can often be closed; the same gap discovered in fourth grade arrives buried under years of accumulated failure.

Within that frame, the reading-instruction reforms still matter. Phonics taught early and well builds the orthographic store; knowledge-rich instruction after grade 2 builds the vocabulary and background that comprehension runs on; and the fourth-grade slump stops being a mystery once we stop optimizing for an early-fluency metric that cannot see the knowledge deficits later text exposes. But these are the second story of the house, not its foundation. The Denton et al. trial shows the principle in miniature: for children whose brains are not ready, treating the readiness gap moves comprehension more than drilling the reading task does. Brain readiness is a substrate, not a byproduct.

Reading, in the end, is not what the mouth does with letters. It is what the mind does with memory. Phonics deserves its place—early, systematic, and taught well—precisely because it builds the memory store on which everything else runs. But we misread the science when we treat the on-ramp as the destination, and we fail children twice when we test the tip of the iceberg and label them for the part we never helped them build. Skilled reading counts only when the chain terminates in meaning a reader can hold, retrieve, and use—and that chain can only run on a brain that was given what it needed to be ready. Solve the crisis there, in families supported before school and in gaps closed at the schoolhouse door, and the reading will follow.

References

Sources are drawn from peer-reviewed research, U.S. government data, and foundational cognitive-science texts. Where a finding is contested or comes from a non-peer-reviewed source, that status is noted in the body of the report.

Ahmed, Y., Francis, D. J., York, M., Fletcher, J. M., Barnes, M., & Kulesz, P. (2016). Validation of the direct and inferential mediation (DIME) model of reading comprehension in grades 7 through 12. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 44–45, 68–82.

Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of Reading Research (pp. 255–291). Longman.

Araújo, S., Reis, A., Petersson, K. M., & Faísca, L. (2015). Rapid automatized naming and reading performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 107(3), 868–883.

Baddeley, A. (2000). The episodic buffer: A new component of working memory? Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 4(11), 417–423.

Baddeley, A. (2003). Working memory and language: An overview. Journal of Communication Disorders, 36(3), 189–208.

Baddeley, A. D., & Hitch, G. (1974). Working memory. In G. H. Bower (Ed.), The Psychology of Learning and Motivation (Vol. 8, pp. 47–89). Academic Press.

Bellinger, J. M., & DiPerna, J. C. (2011). Is fluency-based story retell a good indicator of reading comprehension? Psychology in the Schools, 48(4), 416–426.

Binder, J. R., Desai, R. H., Graves, W. W., & Conant, L. L. (2009). Where is the semantic system? A critical review and meta-analysis of 120 functional neuroimaging studies. Cerebral Cortex, 19(12), 2767–2796.

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). A commentary on Fletcher, Savage, and Vaughn: Yes, children need to learn their GPCs, but there really is little or no evidence that systematic or explicit phonics is effective. Educational Psychology Review.

Bowers, J. S. (2023). There is still little or no evidence that systematic phonics is more effective than common alternative methods of reading instruction: Response to Brooks (2023). Review of Education, 11(2), e3432.

Brooks, G. (2023). A response to Wyse and Bradbury (2022). Review of Education.

Brown, N. M., Brown, S. N., Briggs, R. D., Germán, M., Belamarich, P. F., & Oyeku, S. O. (2017). Associations between adverse childhood experiences and ADHD diagnosis and severity. Academic Pediatrics, 17(4), 349–355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2016.08.013

Brysbaert, M. (2019). How many words do we read per minute? A review and meta-analysis of reading rate. Journal of Memory and Language, 109, 104047.

Buckingham, J. (2020). Systematic phonics instruction belongs in evidence-based reading programs: A response to Bowers. The Educational and Developmental Psychologist, 37(2), 105–113.

Chall, J. S., & Jacobs, V. A. (2003). Poor children's fourth-grade slump. American Educator, 27(1). (Original observation 1983.)

Chan, E. S. M., et al. (2023). Efficacy of reading interventions for children and adolescents with ADHD: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Attention Disorders.

Christianson, K., Johnson, R. L., & Rayner, K. (2005). Letter transpositions within and across morphemes. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 31(6), 1327–1339.

Cohen, L., Dehaene, S., Naccache, L., Lehéricy, S., Dehaene-Lambertz, G., Hénaff, M.-A., & Michel, F. (2000). The visual word form area: Spatial and temporal characterization of an initial stage of reading in normal subjects and posterior split-brain patients. Brain, 123(2), 291–307.

Coltheart, M., Rastle, K., Perry, C., Langdon, R., & Ziegler, J. (2001). DRC: A dual route cascaded model of visual word recognition and reading aloud. Psychological Review, 108(1), 204–256.

Cromley, J. G., & Azevedo, R. (2007). Testing and refining the direct and inferential mediation model of reading comprehension. Journal of Educational Psychology, 99(2), 311–325.

Clymer, T. (1963/1996). The utility of phonic generalizations in the primary grades. The Reading Teacher, 16(4), 252–258. Reprinted 50(3), 182–187.

Daneman, M., & Carpenter, P. A. (1980). Individual differences in working memory and reading. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 19(4), 450–466.

Daneman, M., & Merikle, P. M. (1996). Working memory and language comprehension: A meta-analysis. Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 3(4), 422–433. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03214546

Dehaene, S. (2009). Reading in the Brain: The New Science of How We Read. Viking.

Dehaene, S., & Cohen, L. (2007). Cultural recycling of cortical maps. Neuron, 56(2), 384–398.

Dehaene, S., & Cohen, L. (2011). The unique role of the visual word form area in reading. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 15(6), 254–262.

Denckla, M. B., & Rudel, R. G. (1976). Rapid “automatized” naming (R.A.N.): Dyslexia differentiated from other learning disabilities. Neuropsychologia, 14(4), 471–479.

Denton, C. A., Tamm, L., Schatschneider, C., & Epstein, J. N. (2020). The effects of ADHD treatment and reading intervention on the fluency and comprehension of children with ADHD and word reading difficulties: A randomized clinical trial. Scientific Studies of Reading, 24(1), 72–89.

Dewey, G. (1923/1950). Relative Frequency of English Speech Sounds. Harvard University Press.

Dewey, G. (1971). English Spelling: Roadblock to Reading. Teachers College Press.

Ehri, L. C. (2005). Learning to read words: Theory, findings, and issues. Scientific Studies of Reading, 9(2), 167–188.

Ehri, L. C. (2014). Orthographic mapping in the acquisition of sight word reading, spelling memory, and vocabulary learning. Scientific Studies of Reading, 18(1), 5–21.

Ehri, L. C. (2020). The science of learning to read words: A case for systematic phonics instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 55(S1), S45–S60.

Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., Koss, M. P., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 14(4), 245–258.

Ferstl, E. C., Neumann, J., Bogler, C., & von Cramon, D. Y. (2008). The extended language network: A meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies on text comprehension. Human Brain Mapping, 29(5), 581–593.

Fletcher, J. M., Savage, R., & Vaughn, S. (2021). A commentary on Bowers (2020) and the role of phonics instruction in reading. Educational Psychology Review, 33(3), 1249–1274.

Fox, S. E., Levitt, P., & Nelson, C. A. (2010). How the timing and quality of early experiences influence the development of brain architecture. Child Development, 81(1), 28–40.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hosp, M. K., & Jenkins, J. R. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence: A theoretical, empirical, and historical analysis. Scientific Studies of Reading, 5(3), 239–256.

Good, R. H., & Kaminski, R. A. (2002). Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (6th ed.). Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement, University of Oregon.

Good, R. H., Simmons, D. C., & Kame'enui, E. J. (2001). The importance and decision-making utility of a continuum of fluency-based indicators of foundational reading skills for third-grade high-stakes outcomes. Scientific Studies of Reading, 5(3), 257–288.

Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. Remedial and Special Education, 7(1), 6–10.

Hammill, D. D., & Swanson, H. L. (2006). The National Reading Panel's meta-analysis of phonics instruction: Another point of view. The Elementary School Journal, 107(1), 17–26. https://doi.org/10.1086/509524

Hanna, P. R., Hanna, J. S., Hodges, R. E., & Rudorf, E. H. (1966). Phoneme-Grapheme Correspondences as Cues to Spelling Improvement. U.S. Office of Education.

Hoover, W. A., & Gough, P. B. (1990). The simple view of reading. Reading and Writing, 2(2), 127–160.

Hubel, D. H., & Wiesel, T. N. (1962). Receptive fields, binocular interaction and functional architecture in the cat's visual cortex. The Journal of Physiology, 160(1), 106–154.

Hubel, D. H., & Wiesel, T. N. (1968). Receptive fields and functional architecture of monkey striate cortex. The Journal of Physiology, 195(1), 215–243.

Just, M. A., & Carpenter, P. A. (1992). A capacity theory of comprehension: Individual differences in working memory. Psychological Review, 99(1), 122–149.

Kandel, E. R., Schwartz, J. H., Jessell, T. M., Siegelbaum, S. A., & Hudspeth, A. J. (2013). Principles of Neural Science (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Kim, Y.-S., Wagner, R. K., & Foster, E. (2011). Relations among oral reading fluency, silent reading fluency, and reading comprehension. Scientific Studies of Reading, 15(4), 338–362.

Kintsch, W. (1988). The role of knowledge in discourse comprehension: A construction-integration model. Psychological Review, 95(2), 163–182.

Kintsch, W. (1998). Comprehension: A Paradigm for Cognition. Cambridge University Press.

LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. Cognitive Psychology, 6(2), 293–323.

Lambon Ralph, M. A., Jefferies, E., Patterson, K., & Rogers, T. T. (2017). The neural and computational bases of semantic cognition. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 18(1), 42–55.

McCandliss, B. D., Cohen, L., & Dehaene, S. (2003). The visual word form area: Expertise for reading in the fusiform gyrus. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 7(7), 293–299.

McClelland, J. L., & Rumelhart, D. E. (1981). An interactive activation model of context effects in letter perception: Part 1. Psychological Review, 88(5), 375–407.

Munger, K. A., & Blachman, B. A. (2013). Taking a closer look: A comparison of DIBELS Next with the Group Reading Assessment. Psychology in the Schools, 50(6), 566–581.

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.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2025). The Nation's Report Card: NAEP Reading 2024. U.S. Department of Education. https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/

Norton, E. S., & Wolf, M. (2012). Rapid automatized naming (RAN) and reading fluency: Implications for understanding and treatment of reading disabilities. Annual Review of Psychology, 63, 427–452.

Nyikos, J. (1988). A linguistic perspective of functional illiteracy. In The Fourteenth LACUS Forum 1987 (pp. 146–163). Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States.

Patterson, K., Nestor, P. J., & Rogers, T. T. (2007). Where do you know what you know? The representation of semantic knowledge in the human brain. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 8(12), 976–987.

Peng, P., Barnes, M., Wang, C., Wang, W., Li, S., Swanson, H. L., Dardick, W., & Tao, S. (2018). A meta-analysis on the relation between reading and working memory. Psychological Bulletin, 144(1), 48–76.

Perfetti, C. (2007). Reading ability: Lexical quality to comprehension. Scientific Studies of Reading, 11(4), 357–383.

Perfetti, C., & Stafura, J. (2014). Word knowledge in a theory of reading comprehension. Scientific Studies of Reading, 18(1), 22–37.

Plaut, D. C., McClelland, J. L., Seidenberg, M. S., & Patterson, K. (1996). Understanding normal and impaired word reading: Computational principles in quasi-regular domains. Psychological Review, 103(1), 56–115.

Pressley, M., Hilden, K., & Shankland, R. (2005). An Evaluation of End-Grade-3 Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). Michigan State University, Literacy Achievement Research Center.

Purves, D., Augustine, G. J., Fitzpatrick, D., et al. (2018). Neuroscience (6th ed.). Sinauer/Oxford University Press.

Rayner, K. (1998). Eye movements in reading and information processing: 20 years of research. Psychological Bulletin, 124(3), 372–422.

Rayner, K. (2009). Eye movements and attention in reading, scene perception, and visual search. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 62(8), 1457–1506.

Rayner, K., White, S. J., Johnson, R. L., & Liversedge, S. P. (2006). Raeding wrods with jubmled letters: There is a cost. Psychological Science, 17(3), 192–193.

Recht, D. R., & Leslie, L. (1988). Effect of prior knowledge on good and poor readers' memory of text. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80(1), 16–20.

Reicher, G. M. (1969). Perceptual recognition as a function of meaningfulness of stimulus material. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 81(2), 275–280.

Reynolds, D., et al. (2025). Fair or foul? Interrogating the role of baseball knowledge in studies of knowledge and comprehension. Reading Research Quarterly. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.575

Riedel, B. W. (2007). The relation between DIBELS, reading comprehension, and vocabulary in urban first-grade students. Reading Research Quarterly, 42(4), 546–567.

Roehrig, A. D., Petscher, Y., Nettles, S. M., Hudson, R. F., & Torgesen, J. K. (2008). Accuracy of the DIBELS oral reading fluency measure for predicting third grade reading comprehension outcomes. Journal of School Psychology, 46(3), 343–366.

Samuels, S. J. (2007). The DIBELS tests: Is speed of barking at print what we mean by reading fluency? Reading Research Quarterly, 42(4), 563–566.

Scarborough, H. S. (2001). Connecting early language and literacy to later reading (dis)abilities: Evidence, theory, and practice. In S. Neuman & D. Dickinson (Eds.), Handbook of Early Literacy Research (pp. 97–110). Guilford Press.

Schilling, S. G., Carlisle, J. F., Scott, S. E., & Zeng, J. (2007). Are fluency measures accurate predictors of reading achievement? The Elementary School Journal, 107(5), 429–448.

Seidenberg, M. S., & McClelland, J. L. (1989). A distributed, developmental model of word recognition and naming. Psychological Review, 96(4), 523–568.

Share, D. L. (1995). Phonological recoding and self-teaching: Sine qua non of reading acquisition. Cognition, 55(2), 151–218.

Share, D. L. (2008). On the anglocentricities of current reading research and practice: The perils of overreliance on an “outlier” orthography. Psychological Bulletin, 134(4), 584–615.

Shaw, P., Eckstrand, K., Sharp, W., Blumenthal, J., Lerch, J. P., Greenstein, D., Clasen, L., Evans, A., Giedd, J., & 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.

Stuebing, K. K., Barth, A. E., Cirino, P. T., Francis, D. J., & Fletcher, J. M. (2008). A response to recent reanalyses of the National Reading Panel report: Effects of systematic phonics instruction are practically significant. Journal of Educational Psychology, 100(1), 123–134.

Teicher, M. H., & Samson, J. A. (2016). Annual research review: Enduring neurobiological effects of childhood abuse and neglect. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 57(3), 241–266.

Torgerson, C. J., Brooks, G., & Hall, J. (2006). A Systematic Review of the Research Literature on the Use of Phonics in the Teaching of Reading and Spelling (DfES Research Report RR711). UK Department for Education and Skills.

Vinckier, F., Dehaene, S., Jobert, A., Dubus, J. P., Sigman, M., & Cohen, L. (2007). Hierarchical coding of letter strings in the ventral stream. Neuron, 55(1), 143–156.

Wässle, H. (2004). Parallel processing in the mammalian retina. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 5(10), 747–757.

Wheeler, D. D. (1970). Processes in word recognition. Cognitive Psychology, 1(1), 59–85.

Willcutt, E. G., & Pennington, B. F. (2000). Comorbidity of reading disability and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 33(2), 179–191.

Willingham, D. T. (2006). How knowledge helps: It speeds and strengthens reading comprehension, learning—and thinking. American Educator, 30(1).

Willingham, D. T. (2017). The Reading Mind: A Cognitive Approach to Understanding How the Mind Reads. Jossey-Bass.

Wolf, M., & Bowers, P. G. (1999). The double-deficit hypothesis for the developmental dyslexias. Journal of Educational Psychology, 91(3), 415–438.

Wyse, D., & Bradbury, A. (2022). 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), e3314.

Zwaan, R. A., & Radvansky, G. A. (1998). Situation models in language comprehension and memory. Psychological Bulletin, 123(2), 162–185.