

# Orthographic learning during reading: the role of whole-word visual processing

Marie-line Bosse

Q1 Laboratoire de Psychologie et NeuroCognition, Université Pierre Mendès France,  
Grenoble, France

Nathalie Chaves and Pierre Largy

Laboratoire de Psychologie du Développement et Processus de Socialisation,  
Université Toulouse II le Mirail, Toulouse, France

Sylviane Valdois

Laboratoire de Psychologie et NeuroCognition, Université Pierre Mendès France,  
Grenoble, France

The self-teaching hypothesis suggests that knowledge about the orthographic structure of words is acquired incidentally during reading through phonological recoding. The current study assessed whether visual processing skills during reading further contribute to orthographic learning. French children were asked to read pseudowords. The whole pseudoword letter string was available at once for half of the targets while the pseudoword's sub-lexical units were discovered in turn for the other half. Then memorisation of the targets orthographic form was assessed. Although most pseudowords were accurately decoded, target orthographic forms were recognised more often when the pseudowords entire orthographic sequence was available at once during the learning phase. The whole-word presentation effect was significant and stable from third to fifth grades. This effect was affected neither by target reading accuracy nor by target reading speed during the learning phase. Results suggest that beyond recoding skills, the ability to process the entire orthographic letter string at once during reading contributes to efficient orthographic learning.

Learning to read and spell relies on the acquisition of at least two types of knowledge. First, the acquisition of decoding skills is required not only for processing newly encountered words in reading but also to generate phonologically plausible orthographic strings in spelling. However, the acquisition of word-specific orthographic knowledge is further required to read fluently and effortlessly (as skilled readers do) and to spell most words

1 correctly, at least in nontransparent languages as French or English. Although the acquisition  
2 of decoding skills has been extensively studied in the last decades, the acquisition of  
3 word-specific orthographic knowledge remains largely underspecified and is presently a  
4 central issue in literacy research (Castles & Nation, 2006, 2008).

5 The acquisition of specific orthographic knowledge is typically viewed as depending  
6 on the establishment of associations between written and spoken forms of words (Ehri,  
7 2005; Share, 1995; Stanovich, 1993). In practice, two situations favour this association:  
8 first, the direct-instruction situation (Share, 1995), when the child sees the written form  
9 and the teacher or another expert reader provides its corresponding spoken form; and sec-  
10 ond, the self-teaching situation, when the child is able to decode the written form and  
11 generate the corresponding spoken form. The direct-instruction situation typically occurs  
12 at the beginning of reading acquisition but as the child acquires decoding skills, it tends to  
13 disappear and is then replaced by the self-teaching situation. The self-teaching hypothesis  
14 (Jorm & Share, 1983; Share, 1995) assumes that self-teaching is the main way to acquire  
15 word-specific orthographic knowledge. According to this hypothesis, the ability to trans-  
16 late unfamiliar printed words into their spoken equivalents is the central means by which  
17 orthographic knowledge is acquired. By this account, phonological recoding (i.e., reading  
18 using knowledge on grapheme–phoneme relations) acts as a self-teaching device, enabling  
19 a child to independently develop the word-specific orthographic knowledge necessary for  
20 skilled reading. After a newly encountered word has been decoded successfully, a small  
21 number of successful encounters with the same word are sufficient to memorise its ortho-  
22 graphic form in long-term memory.

23 A growing body of empirical studies has investigated orthographic learning during self-  
24 teaching (Bowey & Muller, 2005; Cunningham, 2006; Cunningham, Perry, Stanovich &  
25 Share, 2002; Kyte & Johnson, 2006; Martin-Chang, Levy & O’Neil, 2007; Nation, Angell  
26 & Castles, 2007; Share, 1999, 2004). Most studies used variations of the self-teaching par-  
27 adigm initially developed by Share (1999) in which children are asked to read novel words  
28 embedded in short stories (e.g., Share, 1999, experiment 1) or in isolation (e.g., Share,  
29 1999, experiments 2 and 3). After a varying delay, the child’s word-specific orthographic  
30 knowledge is tested through recognition, spelling and/or reading tasks. All these studies  
31 provided evidence for the central aspects of the self-teaching hypothesis, in showing a  
32 relation between phonological recoding skills and orthographic learning. Moreover, ortho-  
33 graphic learning was found to be attenuated in conditions designed to minimise phonologi-  
34 cal recoding (Kyte & Johnson, 2006; Share, 1999), thus providing further support for the  
35 view that phonological recoding is critical to the acquisition of word-specific orthographic  
36 knowledge, as proposed by the self-teaching hypothesis.

37 However, there is evidence that phonological decoding cannot be the only factor re-  
38 lated to orthographic learning during self-teaching. Nation et al. (2007) showed that the  
39 relation between phonological decoding and orthographic learning did not hold at an  
40 item-by-item level of analysis. They indeed found that a good proportion of novel words,  
41 which were accurately recognised in the orthographic choice task, had not been read ac-  
42 curately during the learning phase, and vice versa that a good proportion of items were  
43 decoded correctly but not recognised, thus suggesting that there are factors involved in  
44 orthographic learning beyond the ability to phonologically decode novel words correctly  
45 (see however Share, 2008). Similarly, Share (2004) reported that Hebrew-learning first  
46 graders, despite adequate decoding skills, exhibited no evidence of orthographic learn-  
47 ing after several exposures to new words (see however Cunningham, 2006). Lastly, when  
48 investigating the relation between self-teaching and several abilities other than decoding

skills, some studies showed that prior orthographic knowledge (as measured using spelling choice tasks) significantly contributed to orthographic learning during self-teaching after controlling for decoding skills (Cunningham, 2006; Cunningham et al., 2002; Nation et al., 2007). Importantly, these results suggest that orthographic learning during self-teaching is not entirely parasitic on phonological processing abilities. However, they give few insights into what the other cognitive factors involved in orthographic learning could be. These findings are just evidence that, for the same level of decoding abilities, children who had been able to develop more specific orthographic knowledge during their literacy experience are also those who better memorise the orthographic forms of new words when reading in a self-teaching paradigm. Therefore, one remaining key issue is as follows: What cognitive factor(s), other than decoding skills, allow(s) some children to develop lexical orthographic knowledge better than others?

It has already been suggested that differences in visual/orthographic processing might determine self-teaching as a secondary source of variance (Cunningham et al., 2002; Share, 1995, 1999). The literature on deaf people provides support for visual processing in promoting orthographic learning, showing that some deaf children do achieve correct levels of reading proficiency by relying on visual processing for orthographic learning, despite poor decoding skills (Beech & Harris, 1997; Paul, 2001). The effect of visual processing on orthographic acquisition has been straightforwardly addressed by Martens and de Jong (2006), using mixed-case words (e.g., WoRd). Case mixing has been shown to hamper word recognition, an effect attributed to the disruption of multi-letter visual units (Mayall, Humphreys & Olson, 1997). This disruption might induce serial letter-by-letter processing and be responsible for an increase in attentional demands (Mayall, Humphreys, Mechelli, Olson & Price, 2001). In Martens and de Jong's (2006) experiment, children repeatedly read pseudowords presented in either mixed case or lower case during the learning phase. One day after this training phase, lower case pseudowords were recognised faster after lower case training than after mixed-case training. Results thus suggest that disrupting visual multi-letter processing of words affects orthographic knowledge acquisition. As a whole, these findings suggest a role of visual processing in lexical orthographic learning. However, the precise nature of the visual/orthographic processing mechanism involved in orthographic learning remains unclear (see Castles & Nation, 2006 for a detailed discussion). Obviously, some form of visual-orthographic processing is involved in phonological recoding as well so that successful decoding reflects good visual-to-phonology mapping of the relevant orthographic units. Recent theoretical and empirical data however suggest that in addition to phonological recoding skills and grapheme visual processing, whole-word visual attentional processing might be a second key factor contributing to orthographic learning.

Whole-word visual attentional processing refers to the simultaneous processing of all the orthographic units of a word. This simultaneous processing relates to the visual attention span (Bosse, Tainturier & Valdois, 2007) and has to be distinguished from other visual spans such as the perceptual span defined by Rayner (e.g., Rayner, 1986; see Bosse & Valdois, 2009, for a discussion about differences between perceptual span and visual attention span). The visual attention span is itself based on the connectionist multitrace memory (hereafter MTM) model of polysyllabic word reading (Ans, Carbonnel & Valdois, 1998). An essential feature of the model is the inclusion of a visual attentional window through which orthographic information is extracted from the to-be-read letter string. The model further postulates the existence of two reading modes: global mode and analytic mode. In the global reading mode involved in familiar word processing, the visual attentional window extends over the whole sequence of the word to be read. Global processing typically

1 fails for unfamiliar words that are then processed analytically. In the analytic reading mode,  
2 the attentional window narrows down to focus attention on the first relevant unit of the  
3 orthographic string. Analytic processing then proceeds through a narrow visual attentional  
4 window that shifts from left to right, focusing attention on the different orthographic units  
5 of the input in turn. Type of processing thus relies on the size of the visual attentional win-  
6 dow that is typically larger for familiar word than for unfamiliar word processing. Although  
7 the model has not yet been adapted to simulate acquisition, it provides new insights on the  
8 way visual abilities might impact on reading and orthographic acquisition (Valdois, Bosse  
9 & Tainturier, 2004). In the network, a new word memory trace is created each time the  
10 entire orthographic input and the entire phonological output of the item are simultaneously  
11 available. This would happen in both the direct-instruction situation and the self-teaching  
12 situation. In situations of self-teaching, availability of the whole phonological form de-  
13 pends on the ability to decode the novel word by analytic processing. Availability of the  
14 entire orthographic input is conditioned by the visual attentional window's ability to extend  
15 over the whole-word letter string. A visual attentional window large enough to hold the en-  
16 tire word sequence is then required for the acquisition of word-specific orthographic infor-  
17 mation. Decoding skills, relying on small orthographic unit processing, might be efficient  
18 at a time when the visual attentional window is not mature enough to efficiently process  
19 the entire word orthographic sequence. In such a case, the entire orthographic input and the  
20 entire phonological output of the item would not be simultaneously available and then the  
21 word memory trace would not be created. Accordingly, although phonological recoding is  
22 critical for the acquisition of orthographic knowledge, the ability to spread visual attention  
23 over the whole-word letter string might predict word-specific orthographic learning beyond  
24 the contribution of phonological recoding skills.

25 Visual parallel processing abilities have been investigated in dyslexic children within  
26 the framework of the visual attention span disorder hypothesis (Bosse et al., 2007). Poor  
27 visual attention span abilities – thus poor multielement visual parallel processing (Lassus-  
28 Sangosse, N'Guyen-Morel & Valdois, 2008) – in dyslexic children were found to account  
29 for the children's poor reading outcome independently of their phonological skills. Bosse  
30 and Valdois (2009) further explored whether visual attention span abilities contributed to  
31 the development of reading skills in first, third and fifth graders. They showed not only  
32 that visual attention span ability increased with reading expertise but also that visual paral-  
33 lel processing ability more specifically related to performance in irregular word reading,  
34 which relies on lexical orthographic knowledge. Namely, the unique contribution of the  
35 visual attention span to reading remained large and stable over grades for irregular words  
36 but decreased sharply from the first grade to later grades for both regular words and pseu-  
37 dowords. This latter result suggests some specific influence of parallel visual processing on  
38 lexical orthographic knowledge acquisition. To sum up, both the MTM model and available  
39 empirical data suggest that lexical orthographic learning might rely not only on decoding  
40 skills but also on the child's ability to process the entire letter string of the word in paral-  
41 lel. However, the need to process the entire letter sequence of the word simultaneously for  
42 acquiring specific orthographic knowledge remains to be experimentally explored.

43 The main goal of the present study was to determine whether orthographic learning dur-  
44 ing self-teaching in part relied on simultaneous processing of the entire orthographic word  
45 sequence. To test this hypothesis, the experiment directly manipulated the amount of ortho-  
46 graphic information available during processing. As in the classical self-teaching para-  
47 digm, participants had to read novel words and were later evaluated on their orthographic  
48 knowledge of these words. We assessed the effect of simultaneous processing of the entire

orthographic word sequence by comparing orthographic learning of novel words under two conditions: In the whole-word condition, the entire letter string of the novel word was available during processing while in the partial word condition, only sub-lexical parts of the word letter-string were available at a time. We reasoned that if visual processing of the whole-word orthographic sequence is crucial for specific orthographic learning then, preventing simultaneous processing of the entire word string while preserving accurate phonological decoding would affect orthographic learning. This hypothesis was assessed across three different grades (third to fifth grades). Higher graders were expected to learn orthographic patterns more easily because of their longer learning experience. As visual attention span ability is known to increase with grade (Bosse & Valdois, 2009), we also expected a larger learning condition effect in older children.

Q3

### Experiment

#### Method


*Participants.* A total of 88 French children participated in the experiment. They were recruited from four schools in the Toulouse area (France). This sample consisted of 31 third graders (mean age = 8 years 8 months,  $SD = 4$  months), 28 fourth graders (mean age = 9 years 3 months,  $SD = 4$  months) and 29 fifth graders (mean age = 10 years 7 months,  $SD = 5$  months). They scored on the average on the Raven Standard Progressive Matrices (Raven, Court & Raven, 1998), which measure nonverbal reasoning ability (mean percentile = 62nd). Mean percentile was equivalent among grades: 61.1 ( $SD = 23.15$ ), 57.5 ( $SD = 24.3$ ) and 68.4 ( $SD = 22.5$ ), respectively, for Grades 3, 4 and 5 ( $F(2,85) = 1.6, ns$ ). Their mean reading age (Lefavrais, 1965) was 8 years 6 months ( $SD = 13$  months, range = 7;2–12;2) in third grade, 10 years 1 month ( $SD = 18$  months, range = 8;0–13;3) in fourth grade and 10 years 4 months ( $SD = 18$  months, range = 8;4–13;10) in fifth grade. Reading age significantly improved across grades ( $F(2,85) = 13.7, p < .0001$ ).

#### Experimental material

*Target pseudowords.* Twenty-eight (i.e., 14 pairs) bisyllabic pseudowords (see Appendix) ranging in length from five to nine letters ( $M = 7.1, SD = 0.9$ ) were designed. No pseudoword sounded like a real word or contained a syllable that constituted a real written word. All pseudowords contained two complex graphemes, one in each syllable. The complex graphemes were made of 2.2 letters ( $SD = 0.6$ , range 1–3) on average. Ten complex graphemes represented a vocalic phoneme, 14 a consonantal phoneme and 4 a combination of 2 phonemes (/Ri/ for *rhi* and *ry*, /on/ for *onn* and *aun*).

The 28 pseudowords were divided into two sets (see Appendix). Each set comprised the same 14 phonological target pseudowords, but with a different spelling (e.g., /pofu/ is *pauf-fou* in set A and *pôphou* in set B), so that each set contained 28 complex graphemes. Each set was further divided into two subsets so that the two complex graphemes coding for the same phoneme always appeared in different subsets (see Appendix).

*Pseudowords' presentation: window size manipulation.* In the learning phase, each child had to read aloud target pseudowords presented in isolation on the computer screen. Half of the targets were seen in large window (LW) condition and the other half in small window (SW) condition. Window size was counterbalanced across subsets. The 14 pseudowords



**Figure 1.** Conditions of pseudoword presentation: large window (a), small window (b).

of each set appeared four times each in a random order, in black (bold courier new font, size 24) at the centre of the white screen. A central fixation point was first displayed for one second. At the offset of the fixation point, the first syllable of the target was displayed (first screen of Figure 1) and the child had to read it silently, before pressing the space bar. Then, either the second syllable appeared with the first one (LW condition, second screen of Figure 1a), or the second syllable appeared while the first disappeared and was replaced by a mask (SW condition, second screen of Figure 1b). In both conditions, the child had to pronounce the whole pseudoword phonological sequence as soon as possible from the onset of the second syllable. The second screen disappeared when the child began to pronounce the pseudoword, and was replaced by a mask for 1,500 ms. Target presentation was computed with E-prime software (version 1.1; Schneider, Eschman & Zuccolotto, 2002) and a voice key was used to manage second screen disappearance.

*Orthographic learning assessment.* Following the training phase during which children read half of the 14 targets in LW condition and the other half in SW condition, two tasks were administered to assess orthographic learning: a spelling to dictation task and an orthographic choice task. These two tasks are typically used in the self-teaching paradigm, as two tests of word-specific orthographic knowledge. Although they differ in their degree of difficulty (e.g., Bosman & Van Orden, 1997) – since the spelling to dictation task is a reminder task while the orthographic choice task is an easier recognition task (see Rapp



& Lipka, 2011, for a recent discussion of the relationship between reading and spelling) – they both address the same cognitive skill. We thus used them as providing evidence for new (pseudo)words' orthographic learning.

*Spelling to dictation task.* Children were provided with the target pseudoword orally and asked to spell it as it was spelt in the reading task. Each target was repeated twice by the experimenter. We scored the number of correct spellings for the entire target pseudowords and for the complex graphemes of each syllable.

*Orthographic choice task.* Each child was given three homophonic alternative spellings for each target pseudoword: (1) the original target spelling previously seen (called hereafter, target pseudoword; e.g., *baitare* in set A), (2) a homophonic spelling in which the two target complex graphemes were replaced by two other complex graphemes that had been seen in two other pseudowords of the same set (hereafter, complex homophone; e.g., *beitart*) and corresponded to the other set target spelling and (3) another homophonic spelling in which the two complex graphemes were replaced by the most frequent graphemes for these target phonemes in French (hereafter, simple homophone; e.g., *bétar*). The 14 triplets for each target item were printed on a sheet of paper in 16-point Arial font with 1.5-line spacing. The triplets were randomly arranged across the page and the three homophones randomly ordered within each triplet. For each group of three homophones, the experimenter asked the child to circle the pseudoword that was spelt like in the reading task.

### *Procedure*

Children were tested individually in two separate sessions in a quiet room of the school. The two sessions of approximately 20 min were 7 days apart.

The 88 participants were randomly allocated to set A or set B. Forty-five children (14 in third grade, 16 in fourth grade and 15 in fifth grade) read the 14 pseudowords of set A, 43 children read the other set (17, 12 and 14, respectively). Seventeen third graders, 14 fourth graders and 13 fifth graders read subset 1 in LW condition and subset 2 in SW condition. For the other children (14, 14 and 16, respectively), the LW and SW conditions were reversed.

Session 1 began with the Alouette reading test (Lefavrais, 1965) used to determine the participants' reading age. Then, the children were familiarised with the task and trained on 10 simple bisyllabic pseudowords, from which half was presented in the LW condition, the other half in the SW condition. Children were asked to read silently the first syllable, then to press the space bar to discover the second syllable and lastly articulate the entire pseudoword as soon as possible. Feedback was given during the training phase. During the experimental task, each child read 56 items, consisting of 14 pseudowords (seven in each of the LW and SW condition) that were presented four times each, in a random order. Reading errors were recorded by the experimenter. Two latencies were taken into account for each trial. First, the software registered latency between the first screen input and the space bar pressure. This latency corresponds to the first screen duration and was conditioned both by the first syllable silent reading speed and by motor time to press the space bar (hereafter first syllable processing speed). The second latency – measured between the second screen input and the beginning of articulation – corresponds to the second screen duration and was taken as a naming speed measure (hereafter naming speed). Seven days after session 1, the participants were presented with the spelling to dictation and orthographic choice tasks evaluating their orthographic learning of the 14 target pseudowords.

## Results

### *Preliminary analyses*

Preliminary analyses were carried out to assess whether pseudoword reading accuracy, first syllable processing speed and naming speed differed according to grade or window size condition (LW vs SW). Data from incorrectly read items were excluded from the speed analyses. For the naming speed analysis, trials with voice key errors were excluded (1.5% of the data). A lower cut-off was established at 150 ms, and faster responses were deemed to be errors. The application of this cut-off resulted in the exclusion of less than 1% of the data. Independently for each grade, trials with response times that were 2 *SDs* above mean response latency were excluded (3.9% of the data). Next, the speed measures were converted into items per second as recommended by Ratcliff (1993).

Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were carried out on each measure reported in Table 1. In each case, two analyses were conducted: one for participant data (F1), the other for item data (F2). Factors were Grade (3, 4 and 5) and Condition (LW vs SW).

The percentage of pseudowords correctly decoded during the learning phase was high (89% on average) and equivalent across conditions ( $F(1, 85) = 1.6$  and  $F(1, 27) = 1.7$ , both *ns*) and grades (both  $F(2, 85)$  and  $F(2, 54) < 1$ ), with no interaction effect ( $F(2, 85) = 1.3$  and  $F(2, 54) = 1.0$ , both *ns*). A qualitative analysis of error types showed that substitutions of one phoneme were the most frequent errors (70% in the LW condition, 61% in the SW condition). We also observed some one-phoneme addition errors (17% in the LW condition, 20% in the SW condition). Some more complex errors involving more than one phoneme were further found (13% in the LW condition, 19% in the SW condition). The distribution of error types slightly differed between the LW and SW conditions ( $\chi^2 = 8.2$ ,  $p < .05$ ). We also examined the distribution of errors between syllables. In the LW condition, 59% of reading errors were on first syllable, 37% on second syllable and 4% on both syllables. These percentages were, respectively, of 54%, 39% and 7% in the SW condition. Analysis showed that the distribution of errors between syllables was equivalent in the LW and SW conditions ( $\chi^2 = 5$ , *ns*).

The first syllable processing speed was similar across conditions (both  $F(1, 85)$  and  $F(1, 27) < 1$ ). However, first syllable processing speed increased with grades ( $F(2, 85) = 7.1$ ,  $p < .01$ ;  $F(2, 54) = 51.5$ ,  $p < .001$ ), suggesting that older children were faster to silently read and/or press the space bar. There was no interaction effect (both  $F(2, 85)$  and  $F(2, 54) < 1$ ). Naming speed differed across grades in the by-item analysis only ( $F(2, 85) < 1$ , *NS*;  $F(2, 54) = 3.4$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and was identical whatever the condition (both  $F(1, 85)$  and  $F(1, 27) < 1$ ). There was no interaction effect ( $F(2, 85) = 1.6$ , *ns*;  $F(2, 54) < 1$ ).

Taken together, these preliminary analyses show that pseudoword decoding was as efficient and fast in the SW condition as in the LW condition.

### *Spelling to dictation task*

The spelling to dictation task is a very difficult task in an opaque language such as French. Indeed, each complex phoneme could be spelled with several graphemes, frequently more than three (e.g., a final /r/ could be spelled r, re, rre, rt, rd, rs). As shown on Table 2, most children failed to spell entire pseudowords accurately in the spelling to dictation task (63% of the participants spelled none of the entire pseudoword correctly), so floor effects prevented the analyses on entire word spelling. However, correct spelling of complex graphemes, calculated separately for each syllable, varied from 10.6% to 26.1% (median value = 17.9;



**Table 1.** Pseudoword reading accuracy and reading speed (mean and *SD*) during the learning phase, as a function of grades (third, fourth and fifth grades) and window size (large window [LW] vs small window [SW] conditions).

	Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5	
	LW condition	SW condition	LW condition	SW condition	LW condition	SW condition
Percentage of reading accuracy	89 (12)	91 (8)	91 (11)	87 (12)	90 (11)	88 (13)
First syllable processing speed (syllable per second)	.79 (.26)	.79 (.27)	.92 (.22)	.91 (.21)	1.03 (.27)	1.04 (.28)
Reading speed (PW per second)	1.25 (.43)	1.23 (.43)	1.34 (.51)	1.30 (.52)	1.33 (.32)	1.37 (.39)

**Table 2.** Spelling to dictation task: mean percentage (and standard deviation) of accurately spelled target graphemes as a function of syllable position, grades and window size (large window [LW] vs small window [SW] conditions), and accurately spelled pseudowords.

	Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5	
	LW condition	SW condition	LW condition	SW condition	LW condition	SW condition
First syllable	14.7 (17.1)	10.6 (11.6)	16.3 (15.9)	11.7 (14)	15.3 (14.3)	17.7 (16.5)
Second syllable	19.4 (14.1)	19.4 (11.4)	23.5 (16.1)	18.9 (10.3)	25.1 (18.2)	26.1 (14.8)
Entire pseudoword	2.8 (6.8)	1.4 (5.7)	4.6 (7.8)	3.1 (6)	5.4 (11.7)	5.9 (9)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

only one participant was unable to spell any of the complex graphemes correctly). An ANOVA across participants was conducted on this measure to check whether each syllable had been as efficiently memorised during the learning phase. Grades, window size conditions and syllables position were the three variables entered in the analysis. As window condition was expected to influence entire word acquisition, no main effect of window condition was expected on single grapheme scores. However, as the first syllable was exposed for a longer duration in the LW condition, we controlled whether the complex grapheme of the first syllable was better memorised in the LW condition than in the SW condition.

The analysis revealed a significant main effect of syllable position ( $F(1,85) = 38.6, p < .001$ ), showing that the second syllable was systematically memorised more efficiently than the first syllable. No other variable or interaction was significant, suggesting that the first syllable was not processed differently in the LW and in the SW condition.

### *Orthographic choice task*

Three series of analyses were conducted to explore the orthographic choice task results. First, the effects of grade and window size were analysed using an ANOVA across participants (Table 3). Second, a mixed model analysis assessed whether the window size effect influenced orthographic learning beyond the contribution of reading skills. Finally, the relation between window size effect and correct decoding during the learning phase was explored in a by-item analysis (Table 4).

### *Grade and window size effects*

The pseudoword orthographic choice task required the child to recognise the orthographic form of the target pseudoword among three homophonic spellings: target, complex homophone (from the other set) and simple homophone. Results are presented in Table 3. Chi-square tests indicated that responses were not evenly distributed across the three alternatives in the different grade and window size conditions (respectively, for each column of Table 3:  $\chi^2(2) = 26, p < .001$ ;  $\chi^2(2) = 23.1, p < .001$ ;  $\chi^2(2) = 6.9, p < .05$ ;  $\chi^2(2) = 12.8, p < .01$ ;  $\chi^2(2) = 26.3, p < .001$  and  $\chi^2(2) = 12.1, p < .01$ ). As shown in Table 3, third graders chose the simple homophone more often than the other items and fifth graders chose the target more often. Globally, participants did not choose at random. The general tendency was to choose the simplest homophone when the target was not recognised.

A two-way ANOVA with repeated measures was performed on correct responses in the orthographic choice task. The independent variables were Grade (3, 4, 5) and Window Size (LW vs SW). Results showed a significant main effect of Grade ( $F(2,85) = 4.9, p < .01$ ) showing that the higher the grade, the better the targets were recognised. More importantly, the Window Size effect was significant ( $F(1,85) = 5.9, p < .05$ ), showing that target pseudowords were better recognised following the LW condition than the SW condition. The Window Size by Grade interaction was not significant ( $F(2,85) < 1$ ). Therefore, results provide no evidence that Grade modulates the effect of Window Size on target recognition.

### *Window size effect and reading skills*

We further controlled whether window size influenced orthographic learning beyond the influence of pseudoword decoding accuracy and reading speed as measured during the learning phase. A linear mixed model analysis was conducted to test the prediction that window size accounted for orthographic learning, after control of both pseudoword accuracy, first

**Table 3.** Orthographic choice task: mean percentage (and standard deviation) of orthographic choice on each pseudoword type, as a function of grades and window size (large window [LW] vs small window [SW] conditions).

	Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5	
	LW condition	SW condition	LW condition	SW condition	LW condition	SW condition
Orthographic choice						
(1) Target	35 (18.4)	28.6 (23.9)	40.8 (20.5)	35.7 (22.5)	50.2 (22.5)	41.4 (22)
(2) Complex homophone	18.4 (16.6)	23 (15.1)	25.5 (16.7)	21.9 (17.2)	23.6 (13.9)	22.2 (15.1)
(3) Simple homophone	46.5 (19.9)	48.4 (27.8)	33.7 (22.1)	42.3 (25)	26.1 (21.3)	36.5 (22.8)

**Table 4.** Total number of correctly and incorrectly recognised items in the orthographic choice task, as a function of window size (large window [LW] vs small window [SW] conditions) and decoding difficulty (correctly vs incorrectly decoded) during the reading phase.

	LW condition		SW condition	
	Correctly recognised	Incorrectly recognised	Correctly recognised	Incorrectly recognised
Correctly decoded	227	323	187	352
Incorrectly decoded	31	35	29	48

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

1 syllable processing speed, reading speed and total processing duration (i.e., time between  
2 the onset of the first screen and the offset of the second screen). In the mixed model,  
3 random factors, namely variability across participants and variability across items, were  
4 further controlled. Once random factors, pseudoword accuracy, speed measures and item  
5 duration were taken into account, window size remained as a significant predictor of per-  
6 formance in the orthographic choice task ( $\beta = .32, p < .05$ ), showing that the window size  
7 effect is effective beyond the contribution of reading skills, total duration of item or varia-  
8 tion between participants or between items. The three reading speed measures were also  
9 significantly included in the equation: first syllable processing speed ( $\beta = -.34, p < .05$ ),  
10 reading speed ( $\beta = -.41, p < .01$ ) and total processing duration ( $\beta = .49, p < .05$ ). Reading  
11 accuracy was not ( $\beta = -.06, ns$ ). This result replicates Nation et al.'s (2007) findings: the  
12 relation between decoding accuracy and orthographic learning does not hold at an item-  
13 by-item level when variability across participants is controlled.

#### 14 *Window size and decoding accuracy at the item level*

15 We conducted a by-item analysis to assess whether the association between window size  
16 condition and target orthographic learning was equivalent or not depending on successful  
17 or unsuccessful decoding of the target. We computed a within-item variable named Decod-  
18 ing Difficulty with two levels: correct decoding (i.e., when a target was decoded correctly  
19 by a child on each of the four exposures) and incorrect decoding (i.e., when a target was  
20 decoded incorrectly on at least one exposure). This variable was then entered into a  $2 \times 2$   
21 ANOVA along with Window Size (LW vs SW) as another within-item factor. Results were  
22 collapsed across grades since we previously found in the by-participants analyses that the  
23 impact of window size on target recognition was not influenced by grade. The dependent  
24 variable was the number of participants who accurately recognised target pseudowords in  
25 the orthographic choice task. Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 4 ('correct' columns).

26 The main effect of window size was marginally significant ( $F(1,27) = 4, p = .057$ ).  
27 Unsurprisingly, the main effect of decoding difficulty was significant ( $F(1,27) = 79,$   
28  $p < .001$ ), since 87% (414/474) of the recognised items had been correctly decoded during  
29 the learning phase. The Decoding Difficulty by Window Size interaction also was signifi-  
30 cant ( $F(1,27) = 4.6, p < .05$ ). Planned comparisons revealed that target pseudowords were  
31 better recognised following the LW condition than the SW condition but only when targets  
32 had been decoded accurately ( $F(1,27) = 4.9, p < .05$ ;  $F < 1$  for the incorrectly decoded tar-  
33 gets). Thus, visual processing of the whole letter string only affects orthographic learning  
34 when decoding has been successful.

### 35 **General Discussion**

36 This paper explored the role of whole-word visual processing on lexical orthographic  
37 learning via self-teaching in French children. As the self-teaching hypothesis is founded  
38 on the idea that phonological decoding skills are the sine qua non to acquire lexical ortho-  
39 graphic knowledge in long-term memory, we systematically controlled target's decoding  
40 accuracy and pseudoword decoding speed during the exposure phase. The self-teaching  
41 hypothesis also predicts that beyond decoding skills, other cognitive processes could be  
42 important for acquiring item-specific orthographic information. These other cognitive  
43 processes are frequently referred to as visual-orthographic processing, but they remain  
44 largely underspecified. The present study explored the issue of a complementary role of  
45  
46  
47  
48

whole-word visual processing in the self-teaching process. Our main hypothesis was that self-teaching depends not only on phonological recoding skills but also on the ability to process the entire word orthographic string at once during reading. Results are consistent with this hypothesis. In an orthographic choice task, item-specific orthographic recognition was found to decrease when the targets had been processed in the SW condition, a condition that preserves phonological decoding but prevents whole-word visual processing. In contrast, specific orthographic recognition is favoured in the LW condition, suggesting that whole-word processing contributes to enhance orthography learning.

#### *Self-teaching and decoding skills*

The current findings provide additional support for the self-teaching role of decoding skills. Indeed, both lexical orthographic recognition and first syllable decoding speed were found to increase with grade. In accordance with other self-teaching studies that have shown that orthographic learning depends on decoding accuracy (Bowey & Muller, 2005; Cunningham, 2006; Cunningham et al., 2002; de Jong & Share, 2007; Kyte & Johnson, 2006; Share, 1999), our findings confirm the general assumption that orthographic learning is achieved by way of print-to-sound translation. Not only decoding accuracy but also decoding speed seems crucial for lexical orthographic acquisition. Furthermore, our findings extend previous results in showing that the self-teaching paradigm applies to complex bisyllabic items as well.

In line with Nation et al.'s (2007) findings, the present results did not reveal an item-by-item relation compatible with a strong version of the self-teaching hypothesis. Although orthographic learning was greater for correctly decoded items than for incorrectly decoded items, the relation between reading accuracy and orthographic learning did not hold after control for variability between participants and between items (mixed model analysis). There were many cases of correctly decoded but not recognised items, and of recognised but not correctly decoded items (Table 4). This result confirms that there are factors involved in orthographic learning beyond decoding ability (Cunningham, 2006; Cunningham et al., 2002; Nation et al., 2007; Shahar-Yames & Share, 2008). This issue will be re-examined regarding our main results on whole-word visual processing.

Q6

#### *Self-teaching and whole-word visual processing*

Our most innovative finding is that whole-word visual processing favours long-term lexical orthographic acquisition. As the self-teaching hypothesis predicts that decoding accuracy is the primary factor affecting orthographic acquisition, items' decoding accuracy was systematically compared across window size conditions. Targets decoding was as successful in the SW condition as in the LW condition. However, participants better recognised targets when decoded in the LW condition, that is when all the target pseudoword letters were simultaneously available for processing. Moreover, both the mixed model analysis and the by-item regression analyses showed that window size affects orthographic learning beyond the influence of decoding. Results provide evidence that beyond decoding accuracy, whole-word visual processing affects lexical orthographic acquisition. Furthermore, the LW advantage was observed after a 7-day delay, suggesting that whole-word visual processing is involved in long-term orthographic acquisition.

Even if lexical orthographic learning was found to increase with grade, the LW condition advantage was not modulated by grade. Our prediction was that the learning condition effect would be larger in older children, because of their larger visual attention span



1 (Bosse & Valdois, 2009). The lack of significant interaction between grade and learning  
2 condition may suggest that visual attention span abilities allow processing entire dissyl-  
3 labic words simultaneously from the third grade.

4 Provided that decoding accuracy may present ceiling effects for advanced readers, read-  
5 ing speed can be viewed as a more discriminative measure of reading efficacy, more likely  
6 to affect performance in orthographic learning. In the experiment, targets processing speed  
7 was carefully measured. Analyses demonstrated that target processing speed (both first  
8 syllable processing and naming speed) was similar whatever the window size condition.  
9 The mixed model analysis confirmed that window size accounted for orthographic learning  
10 even after control of target reading speed. Thus, neither target decoding accuracy nor target  
11 decoding speed can explain the LW size advantage we found on target recognition.

12 Even if the first screen and second screen duration was identical in the large and SW  
13 conditions, it is noteworthy that the first syllable was exposed for a longer duration in the  
14 LW condition than in the SW condition. Indeed, the first syllable was present on both first  
15 and second screens in the LW condition but only on the first screen in the SW condition.  
16 Then, one could argue that actually the window size effect we have highlighted just reflects  
17 a first syllable duration effect. However if syllable duration was the relevant factor, then we  
18 would expect first syllable processing to be favoured in the LW condition as compared to  
19 the SW condition. This duration effect would affect both reading and orthographic learn-  
20 ing. As first evidence against this interpretation, we found that in the learning phase, the  
21 distribution of reading error types between syllables was equivalent whatever the condition  
22 (SW or LW). As second evidence against the duration effect hypothesis, most reading errors  
23 were found to occur on the first syllable (not the second) in the LW condition. Furthermore,  
24 the mixed model analysis showed that window size remained as a significant predictor  
25 of orthographic learning, even after control of total item duration (corresponding to first  
26 syllable duration in the LW condition) and first syllable processing speed (corresponding to  
27 first syllable duration in the SW condition). Lastly, results suggest that complex graphemes  
28 were better recalled when belonging to the second syllable, regardless of window size. This  
29 was true for the LW condition as well, suggesting that the first syllable was not processed  
30 longer when remaining available all along processing. In fact, the difference between first  
31 and second syllable memorisation was similar in the large and SW conditions. Thus, the  
32 overall results suggest that neither syllable duration nor item duration can account for the  
33 effect of window size on orthographic learning. Window size thus remains as a relevant  
34 factor affecting orthographic acquisition beyond the role of decoding skills.

35 We further showed that whole-word visual processing affects orthographic learning  
36 only when decoding has been successful. Such a finding suggests that whole-word visual  
37 processing affects orthographic learning at a processing step subsequent to phonological  
38 decoding. Thus, whole-word visual processing might correspond to the visual-orthographic  
39 factor frequently evoked in the literature as a secondary source of variance in lexical ortho-  
40 graphic acquisition (e.g., Share, 1995).

41 The finding that whole-word visual processing favours long-term lexical orthographic  
42 acquisition fits well with the learning process of the theoretical model of polysyllabic word  
43 reading of Ans et al. (1998; see Valdois et al., 2004). In this model, whole-word ortho-  
44 graphic learning corresponds to the creation of a word trace in episodic memory. This cre-  
45 ation occurs every time the whole input word phonological and orthographic information  
46 is simultaneously available for processing. In a self-teaching situation, sub-lexical units are  
47 sequentially decoded for the entire phonological form of the input word to be generated as  
48 output at the end of analytic processing. In the theoretical model, analytic processing relies

on a narrow visual attentional window that focuses on each of the relevant sub-lexical units of the input in turn. At the end of analytic processing, the entire phonological form of the input item is made available in phonological short-term memory but the corresponding unit has to be reactivated at the input orthographic level. This requires the visual attentional window to extend over the entire orthographic sequence of the input word, so leading to strengthen the links between the whole orthographic and phonological units for the creation of a new word-trace in long-term memory. In our experiments, a reallocation of visual attention on the entire input sequence was prevented in the SW condition, thus predicting poorer orthographic learning.

The VA span was introduced as the psychological counterpart of the theoretically defined visual attentional window (Bosse et al., 2007). A reduced VA span was found to characterize some dyslexic children who otherwise demonstrated very poor orthographic knowledge (Dubois, Lafaye de Micheaux, Noël & Valdois, 2007; Valdois et al., 2003, 2011). We further showed that a substantial number of dyslexic children exhibited impaired VA span capacities, which accounted for a significant amount of variance in reading when partialing out their phonological abilities (Bosse et al., 2007). Actually, variability of VA span exists among typically developing children and explains a significant part of irregular word reading (Bosse & Valdois, 2009) and spelling (Bosse & Valdois, 2008) variability. Both theoretical data and empirical findings thus suggest that the VA span might play a key role in word-specific orthographic acquisition and self-teaching. However, we acknowledge that the current findings are not direct evidence that the benefit provided by whole-word processing relies on VA span skills. Further studies are needed to confirm that VA span relates to whole-word orthographic learning by self-teaching.

To summarise, the present study explored whether differences in visual processing modulated orthographic learning by self-teaching in French third- to fifth-grade children. The essential and novel contribution of the current study is to provide evidence that whole-word visual processing improves orthographic learning. Indeed, orthographic learning is enhanced when all the letters of correctly decoded targets are simultaneously available for processing, in comparison with learning situations in which they are only discovered in turn. The whole-word visual processing advantage pointed out in the current study strongly suggests that beyond decoding ability, orthographic learning could further depend on child's visual attention span abilities.

## References

- Ans, B., Carbonnel, S. & Valdois, S. (1998). A connectionist multi-trace memory model of polysyllabic word reading. *Psychological Review*, 105, 678–723.
- Beech, J. R. & Harris, M. (1997). The prelingually deaf reader: A case of reliance on direct lexical access? *Journal of Research in Reading*, 29, 105–121.
- Bosman, A. M. T. & Van Orden, G. C. (1997). Why spelling is more difficult than reading. In C. A. Perfetti, L. Rieben & M. Fayol (Eds.), *Learning to spell*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bosse, M.-L., Tainturier, M.-J. & Valdois, S. (2007). Developmental dyslexia: The visual attention span hypothesis. *Cognition*, 104, 198–230.
- Bosse, M.-L. & Valdois, S. (2008). *Orthographic acquisition depends on early visual attention span: A longitudinal study*. Paper presented at the 7th British Dyslexia Association International Conference, Harrogate, UK, March.
- Bosse M.-L. & Valdois, S. (2009). Influence of the visual attention span on child reading performance: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 32, 230–253.
- Bowey, J. A. & Muller, D. (2005). Phonological recoding and rapid orthographic learning in third-graders' silent reading: A critical test of the self-teaching hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 92, 203–219.

- 1 Q9 Castles, A. & Nation, K. (2006). How does orthographic learning happen? In S. Andrews (Ed.), *From inkmarks to*  
 2 *ideas: Challenges and controversies about word recognition and reading*. London: Psychology Press.
- 3 Castles, A. & Nation, K. (2008). Learning to be a good orthographic reader. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 31,  
 4 1–7.
- 5 Cunningham, A. E. (2006). Accounting for children's orthographic learning while reading text: Do children self-  
 6 teach? *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 95, 56–77.
- 7 Cunningham, A. E., Perry, K. E., Stanovich, K. E. & Share, D. L. (2002). Orthographic learning during reading:  
 8 Examining the role of the self-teaching. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 82, 185–199.
- 9 de Jong, P. F. & Share, D. L. (2007). Orthographic learning during oral and silent reading. *Scientific Studies of*  
 10 *Reading*, 11, 55–71.
- 11 Dubois, M., Lafaye de Micheaux, P., Noël, M. P. & Valdois, S. (2007). Pre-orthographical constraints on visual  
 12 word recognition: Evidence from a case study of developmental surface dyslexia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*,  
 13 24(6), 623–660.
- 14 Ehri, L. C. (2005). Learning to read words: Theory, findings, and issues. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 9, 167–188.
- 15 Jorm, A. F. & Share, D. L. (1983). Phonological recoding and reading acquisition. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 4,  
 16 103–147.
- 17 Kyte, C. S. & Johnson, C. J. (2006). The role of phonological recoding in orthographic learning. *Journal of Ex-*  
 18 *perimental Child Psychology*, 93, 166–185.
- 19 Q10 Lassus-Sangosse, D., N'Guyen-Morel, M. A. & Valdois, S. (2008). Sequential or simultaneous visual processing  
 20 deficit in developmental dyslexia. *Vision Research*, 979–988.
- 21 Lefavrais, P. (1965). *Test de l'Alouette*. Paris: Editions du centre de psychologie appliquée.
- 22 Martens, V. E. G. & de Jong, P. F. (2006). The effect of visual word features on the acquisition of orthographic  
 23 knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 93, 337–356.
- 24 Martin-Chang, S. L., Levy, B. A. & O'Neil, S. (2007). Word acquisition, retention, and transfer: Findings from  
 25 contextual and isolated word training. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 96(1), 37–56.
- 26 Mayall, K., Humphreys, G. W., Mechelli, A., Olson, A. & Price, C. J. (2001). The effects of case mixing on word  
 27 recognition: Evidence from a PET study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 13, 1275–1286.
- 28 Mayall, K., Humphreys, G. W. & Olson, A. (1997). Disruption to word or letter processing? The origins of case-  
 29 mixing effects. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 23(5), 1275–1286.
- 30 Nation, K., Angell, P. & Castles, A. (2007). Orthographic learning via self-teaching in children learning to read  
 31 English: Effects of exposure, durability, and context. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 96, 71–84.
- 32 Paul, P. (2001). *Language and deafness* (3rd ed.). San Diego, CA: Singular Publishing Group.
- 33 Ratcliff, R. (1993). Methods for dealing with reaction time outliers. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 510–532.
- 34 Raven, J. C., Court, J. H. & Raven, J. (1998). *Progressive matrices standard (PM38)*. Paris: EAP.
- 35 Rayner, K. (1986). Eye movements and the perceptual span in beginning and skilled readers. *Journal of Experi-*  
 36 *mental Child Psychology*, 41, 211–236.
- 37 Q11 Schneider, W., Eschman, A. & Zuccolotto, A. (2002). *E-Prime reference guide*. Psychology Software Tools, Inc.
- 38 Share, D. L. (1995). Phonological recoding and self-teaching: Sine qua non of reading acquisition. *Cognition*,  
 39 55, 151–218.
- 40 Share, D. L. (1999). Phonological recoding and orthographic learning: A direct test of the self-teaching hypoth-  
 41 esis. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 72, 95–129.
- 42 Share, D. L. (2004). Orthographic learning at a glance: On the time course and developmental onset of self-  
 43 teaching. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 87(4), 267–298.
- 44 Share, D. L. (2008). Orthographic learning, phonological recoding, and self-teaching. *Advances in Child Devel-*  
 45 *opment and Behavior*, 36, 31–82.
- 46 Stanovich, K. E. (1993). The language code: Issues in word recognition. In S. R. Yussen & M. C. Smith (Eds.),  
 47 *Reading across the life span* (pp. 111–135). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- 48 Valdois, S., Bidet-Ildes, C., Prado, C., Lassus-Sangosse, D., Guinet E. & Orliaguet, J. P. (2011). A visual process-  
 ing but no phonological disorder in a child with mixed dyslexia. *Cortex*, 47, 1197–1218.
- Valdois, S., Bosse, M.-L., Ans, B., Carbonnel, S., Zorman, M., David, D. & Pellat, J. (2003). Phonological and  
 visual processing deficits can dissociate in developmental dyslexia: Evidence from two case studies. *Reading*  
*and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 16, 541–572.
- Valdois, S., Bosse, M.-L. & Tainturier, M.-J. (2004). The cognitive deficits responsible for developmental dys-  
 lexia: Review of evidence for a selective visual attention disorder. *Dyslexia*, 10, 1–25.

## Appendix

Q12 Table A1. Experimental pseudowords; complex graphemes are in bold

		Experiment 2	
		Set A	Set B
Subset 1	Homophone		Homophone
	pauffou		pôphou
	baitare		beitart
	quavonne		kavaune
	cipulle		scipule
	daintho		deintto
	ryteau		rhitau
	hanlouque		henlouk
Subset 2	deiphon		daiffon
	kaltart		qaltare
	sciraune		cironne
	teingule		taingulle
	bôtti		bauthi
	rhinak		rynaque
	henchau		hancheau

Q13 **Marie-line Bosse** is lecturer at the Joseph Fourier University and researcher in the Laboratory of Psychology and Neuro-Cognition (LPNC, UMR5105 CNRS) at Pierre Mendès France University (Grenoble, France) since 2008. Her research focus on reading and spelling acquisition mechanisms. She is particularly interested in the memorisation of whole-word forms, a fundamental step to acquire fluent reading and good orthographic skills. Between 2006 and 2006, she was lecturer and researcher at le Mirail University (Toulouse, France). Before that and during 15 years, she was a teacher of 3- to 11-year-old children.

*Received 1 August 2012; revised version received 20 November 2012.*

Q14 **Address for correspondence:** Marie-Line Bosse, Laboratoire de Psychologie et Neurocognition, CNRS UMR 5105, Université Pierre Mendès France, B.P. 47 – BSHM – 38040 Grenoble Cedex 09, France. E-mail: *Marie-line.Bosse@ujf-grenoble.fr*

## Author Queries

- Q1 Author: Please check affiliations for all the authors as typeset for correctness.
- Q2 Author: A running head short title was not supplied; please check if this one is suitable and, if not, please supply a short title that can be used instead.
- Q3 Please check levels of all the section headings as typeset for correctness.
- Q4 The term “N.S.” has been changed to “*ns*” as per journal style. Please check for correctness.
- Q5 Please provide an expanded form of ‘PW’.
- Q6 Shahar-Yames and Share (2008) has not been included in the Reference List, please supply full publication details.
- Q7 Please provide an expanded form of ‘VA’.
- Q8 Author: Please provide page range in Bosman and Van Orden (1997).
- Q9 Author: Please provide page range in Castles and Nation (2006).
- Q10 Author: Please provide volume number in Lassus-Sangosse et al. (2008).
- Q11 Author: Please provide publisher’s location in Schneider et al. (2002).
- Q12 Author: The tabular presentation appearing in the Appendix has been set as Table A1. Please check for correctness.
- Q13 Author: Please check the biography for the author ‘Marie-line Bosse’ as typeset for correctness. Also check that biographies for the authors 'Nathalie Chaves, Pierre Largy and Sylviane Valdois' have not been provided in this article.
- Q14 Please check the correspondence address as typeset for correctness.