Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Faculteit Psychologie en
Pedagogische Wetenschappen

Departement Psychologie



Doctoraatsprojecten

Visual and auditory temporal information processing in young children

Boets, Bart 25 oktober 2005

Promotor: Prof. Dr. P. Ghesquière

Proposal for doctoral thesis:
Visual and auditory temporal information processing in young children at family risk for dyslexia

Applicant:	Bart Boets
Promotor:	Prof. Dr. Pol Ghesquière (Centrum voor Orthopedagogiek)
Copromotor:	Prof. Dr. Jan Wouters (Lab. Exp ORL)
	Prof. Dr. Erik Vandenbussche† (Lab. Neuropsychology)

Summary

With this project we aim to investigate the influence of low-level auditory and visual sensory processing on the development of reading and spelling skills. According to the general magnocellular theory, deficient literacy development (dyslexia) might be the behavioural consequence of dysfunctional processing of transient and dynamic changing stimuli. In the auditory modality, a temporal processing deficit has been hypothesized to interfere with the accurate detection of the rapid acoustical changes in speech. Consequently, this subtle speech perception problem might cause a cascade of effects, starting with the disruption of normal development of the phonological system and resulting in problems learning to read and spell. Alternatively, extensive research also suggests the existence of an analogous visual temporal processing deficit in subjects with dyslexia, namely in the magnocellular system, affecting the development of orthographic skills and subsequent reading and spelling skills.

This general magnocellular theory, suggesting a cross-modal temporal information processing deficit in subjects with dyslexia, postulates that the sensory deficit might be causally related to the observed phonological, orthographic and literacy problems. However, this causal relation has never been evaluated empirically. In this study we want to address this issue.

In a longitudinal study we follow up 31 preschool children with a family history of dyslexia and 31 low risk control children. Participants are individually matched for gender, age, nonverbal IQ, school environment and parental educational level. Both at preschool and at first-grade age we collect multiple measures for auditory and visual processing, speech perception, phonological ability, orthography and reading and spelling skills. Auditory and visual processing is measured using psychophysical threshold tests embedded within a computer game. Auditory thresholds are estimated for (within and between channel) gap-in-noise detection, 2 Hz frequency modulation detection and tone-in-noise detection. Visual thresholds are estimated for the detection of motion coherence in random dot kinematograms. For speech perception we administer a speech-in-noise test and a categorical perception test. Phonological skills are measured by tasks assessing phonological awareness, rapid automatic naming and verbal short term memory. Orthography is measured by a letter knowledge task and a pseudohomophone task. Reading and spelling ability is assessed by multiple standardised and self-constructed tests.

Data will be analysed using Mixed Model Analysis comparing the genetically high risk versus low risk group. Furthermore, based on the first grade reading and spelling scores, children will be classified in a normal reading and a reading disabled (dyslexic) group and data will be retrospectively reanalysed comparing these both groups. Concurrent and predictive relations between variables will be explored calculating Spearman correlations and factor analyses. Finally, we aim to integrate all variables within a causal path model using confirmatory factor analysis.

Proposal for doctoral thesis:
Visual and auditory temporal information processing in young children at family risk for dyslexia

Applicant: Bart Boets
Promotor: Prof. Dr. Pol Ghesquière (Centrum voor Orthopedagogiek)
Copromotor: Prof. Dr. Jan Wouters (Lab. Exp ORL)
Prof. Dr. Erik Vandenbussche† (Lab. Neuropsychology)

Introduction

Developmental dyslexia is a specific learning disability that affects around 5 to 10 % of children and adults. It is characterised by severe reading and spelling difficulties that are persistent and resistant to usual teaching methods and remedial efforts. Historically there has been a longstanding discussion about the aetiology of these specific literacy problems. The origin has been sought in the visual, the auditory and the (psycho-) linguistic domain.

At present, the predominant etiological view postulates that dyslexia results from a phonological deficit. Research has provided ample evidence that in comparison with normal readers, dyslexics have specific difficulties processing the phonological structure of language and that training phonological skills improves reading performance of poor readers (for a review see Rack, 1994; Snowling, 2000).

Research in the underlying neurological dysfunction of dyslexia suggests that the phonological processing deficits as such may result from a more fundamental deficit in the basic perceptual mechanisms that are responsible for *temporal auditory information processing*. Dyslexics tend to have difficulties processing linguistic and non-linguistic stimuli that enter the nervous system in rapid succession (McAnally & Stein, 1996; Tallal, 1980; Tallal, Miller & Fitch, 1993; Rosen & Manganari, 2001; Van Ingelghem et al., 2001). Recent studies in this context focus more specifically on an impaired perception of dynamic aspects in the auditory signal itself, like amplitude and frequency modulations (Menell, McAnally & Stein, 1999; Talcott et al., 1999; Talcott et al., 2000; Talcott et al., 2002; Van Ingelghem et al., 2005; Witton et al., 1998). In these studies dyslexics show difficulties tracking rapid changes over time. This is necessary for the perception of speech, which is characterised by continuous variations in amplitude and frequency. It has been hypothesized that even subtle deficits in speech perception are likely to interfere with the development of fine-

grained phonological representations, which in turn impacts upon reading and spelling (for a review see McBride Chang, 1995).

Nevertheless, there is not yet convincing evidence of an impaired auditory temporal processing deficit in dyslexia since some studies could not demonstrate significant differences between dyslexic and non-dyslexic subjects (Hill et al., 1999; Mody et al., 1997). More general, there also exists a lot of controversy regarding the underlying causality in the auditory temporal deficit hypothesis (Rosen, 2003; Ramus, 2003; Ramus et al., 2003) and regarding the assumed relation between auditory and phonological processing (Marshall, Snowling & Bailey, 2001).

Apart from the studies on auditory temporal processing, extensive research over the last ten years has demonstrated a specific *visual* deficit in subjects with dyslexia. This does not concern an ophthalmic problem, but a measurable deficit in one of the subsystems of the human visual system, viz. the magnocellular system. The magnocellular (or transient) system responds to visual stimuli of low spatial and high temporal frequency and is predominantly a flicker and motion detecting system, transmitting information about stimulus change and general shape (Livingstone & Hubel, 1987; De Yoe & Van Essen, 1988). An intact magnocellular system and its appropriate interaction with the parvocellular (or sustained) system is supposed to play an important part in the reading process (Stein & Walsh, 1997; Lovegrove, 1994). Regarding the specific mechanism by which magnocellular processing may limit normal literacy development, there is still much speculation. Since this visual subsystem is mostly involved in encoding spatial information, it is probable that poor magnocellular functioning might result in uncertainty about letter position while reading and writing (Cornelissen et al., 1998). Furthermore, a magnocellular deficit has also been related to binocular instability and poor eye movement control, visual attention and visual search – all factors that might interfere with the development of orthographic skills and subsequent reading and spelling skills (Stein & Talcott, 1999; Stein, 2001; Talcott et al., 2000; Talcott & Witton, 2002).

Empirical evidence for a magnocellular visual deficit in dyslexia is mainly psychophysical (for reviews see Greatrex & Drasdo, 1995; Lovegrove, 1996). Apart from psychophysical studies, electro-physiological, histological and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies have demonstrated the magnocellular

deficit in subjects with dyslexia (e.g. Demb, Boyton, & Heeger, 1998; Eden et al., 1996; Livingstone et al., 1991). A few studies have failed to replicate these findings or have demonstrated the deficit only in particular subtypes of dyslexia (e.g. Borsting et al., 1996; Gross-Glenn et al., 1995). Although there is evidence for a consistent association between magnocellular deficit and dyslexia, the proper interpretation of this association remains a contentious issue. Some researchers (e.g. Skottun, 1997; 2000; Skottun & Parke, 1999) even challenge the hypothesis and data on which it is built. As is the case in the auditory line of research, it is obvious that additional research should be undertaken to clarify how the magnocellular deficit affects reading and spelling skills.

These two lines of research (the auditory and the visual approach) suggest there is a deficiency in the temporal information processing in dyslexics, respectively in the auditory and the visual system. As a result the hypothesis of a *general temporal processing deficit* or *"pan-modal deficit"* (Snowling, 2000, p. 174) is formulated (Eden, Stein, Wood & Wood, 1995; Farmer & Klein, 1995; Frith & Frith, 1996; Stein & Talcott, 1999; Stein & Walsh, 1997). In this hypothesis the reading and spelling problems of dyslexic people are attributed to a deficiency in the temporal processing capacity of both the auditory and visual system. In doing so, this research suggests an explicit *causal relation* between the auditory and visual temporal processing qualities on the one hand and the development of phonological, orthographic and subsequent reading and spelling skills on the other. An empirical evaluation of this causal hypothesis requires a longitudinal research design. Ideally, preschoolers should be assessed before receiving any formal instruction and should be followed up during the period of emergent literacy development. Such a design offers the opportunity to study the developmental pathway of the temporal processing skills and their interrelation and predictive value for speech perception, phonological and orthographic ability and developing literacy skills. Although similar predictive studies investigating the influence of phonological ability upon literacy development have been undertaken frequently (see e.g. the meta-analysis of Scarborough, 1998), longitudinal psychophysical studies exploring the influence of basic perceptual skills upon literacy development are very sparse and yield conflicting results (Heath & Hogben, 2004; Share, Jorm, Maclean & Matthews, 2002; Benasich & Tallal, 2002).

Research question

Notwithstanding the large number of studies demonstrating an auditory and visual temporal deficit in (adult and school-aged) dyslexics, the explicit causality of the general temporal processing deficit hypothesis has never been established directly by means of a longitudinal study. In this project we want to deal with this issue by studying a group of preschool children genetically at risk for dyslexia over a two-year time period from the beginning of the last year of kindergarten[1] up to the end of the first year of primary school. This option has been taken in function of an early detection and prediction of literacy problems and because it allows us to study dyslexia before any compensatory strategies might have been undertaken. In this way this project is a contribution to basic as well as to applied research.

The aim of the research project is (1) to develop differentiating psychophysical tests to screen auditory and visual temporal information processing deficits and speech perception problems in young children, (2) to construct a battery of phonological and orthographic tests applicable for kindergarten and first grade children, (3) to construct a battery of reading tests differentiating between reading accuracy versus reading speed and (4) to investigate the mutual relations between these abilities and the role they play in the development of reading and spelling and its problems.

Research design

Participants

Sixty-two five-year-old children attending the last year of kindergarten were included in the study (36 boys / 26 girls). Half of the participants were children of 'dyslexic families', the so-called high-risk group (HR); the other half were control children of 'normal reading families', the so-called low-risk group (LR). Since dyslexia tends to run strongly in families, preschoolers with dyslexic relatives are more likely than other children to develop reading problems. Gilger, Pennington, & DeFries (1991) estimate that roughly between 30 % and 50 % of such children will become reading disabled.

[1] In school system in Belgium-Flanders formal reading instruction starts in Grade 1 at six years. This means in kindergarten no reading instruction is offered.

All children were native Dutch speakers without any history of brain damage, long term hearing loss or visual problems. Additionally, at the moment of data collection they did not present any gross deficiencies in visual acuity (Landolt-C single optotypes Snellen acuity > 0.85) and/or hearing (audiometric pure-tone average < 25 dB HL). The HR children were selected on a basis of having at least one first-degree relative with a diagnosis of dyslexia. The LR children showed no history of speech or language problems and none of their family members suffered any learning or language problems. For every individual HR child we selected the best matching LR control child based on five criteria: (1) educational environment, i.e. same nursery school, (2) gender, (3) age, (4) nonverbal intelligence, and (5) parental educational level. Nonverbal intelligence was assessed by an adapted version of the Raven Coloured Progressive Matrices (RCPM) (Raven, Court, & Raven, 1984), a collective non-verbal intelligence test measuring spatial reasoning. Parental educational level was assessed using the ISCED-scale (International Standard Classification of Education by UNESCO, 1997), by converting classifications on the original seven-point scale to a three-point scale.

At the beginning of the study, the mean age for both the HR and LR group was 5 years and 4 months, not being statistically different ($p = .83$). The nonverbal IQ scores were slightly above population average (107 for HR group and 111 for LR group) and did not differ significantly ($p = 0.07$). Fisher's Exact Test also confirms that both groups did not differ in frequency distribution of the different educational categories ($p = .71$ for maternal and $p = .43$ for paternal educational level).

Further details about the participants and the selection procedure are described in Appendix 1 (Boets, Wouters, van Wieringen, & Ghesquière, in press).

Overview of the study

Table 1 offers an overview of the different measures administered in the longitudinal study. In order to study the developmental pathway (maturation) and the way different variables influence each other over time, all variables were assessed both in kindergarten and in first grade.

Table 1
Overview of the tests administered during the longitudinal study.

KINDERGARTEN

September '03
Non-verbal intelligence (Raven Coloured PM)

October – December '03
Auditory processing
- Gap-in-noise detection
- Frequency modulation detection
- Tone-in-noise detection

November – December '03
Phonological processing
- Phonological Awareness
  - First sound identity
  - End sound identity
  - Rhyme identity
  - Rhyme fluency
- Rapid Automatic Naming
  - Colour naming
  - Picture naming
- Verbal short-term memory
  - Digit span forward
  - Nonword repetition test

Letter knowledge
- Productive letter knowledge
- Receptive letter knowledge

May – June '04
Coherent motion detection
Speech perception
- Speech-in-noise perception
- Categorical perception (identification)
- Categorical perception (discrimination)

FIRST GRADE

January – March '05
Auditory processing
- Gap-in-noise detection
- Frequency modulation detection
- Tone-in-noise detection

March '05
Phonological processing
- Phonological Awareness
  - Rhyme
  - Alliteration
  - Phoneme deletion
  - Spoonerism
  - Auditory blending (synthesis)
  - Auditory analysis
- Rapid Automatic Naming
  - Colour naming
  - Picture naming
  - Letter naming
  - Digit naming
- Verbal short-term memory
  - Digit span forward
  - Nonword repetition test

Productive letter knowledge (speed/accuracy)
Speech rate
Vocabulary WISC-III
Block Design WISC-III
ADHD Questionnaire

April – June '05
Coherent motion detection
Speech perception
- Speech-in-noise perception
- Categorical perception (identification)
- Categorical perception (discrimination)

Between-channel gap detection

May '05
Reading
- One-minute real-word reading test
- Pseudoword reading test
- Real-word reading accuracy
- Real-word reading speed
- Pseudoword reading accuracy
- Pseudoword reading speed

Spelling
Pseudohomophone task

Apparatus

Temporal processing in the auditory and visual modality was assessed using psychophysical threshold tests. Based on a review of the research literature and in line with results collected at our research centre (see Van Ingelghem, et al., 2001; 2004; 2005) four auditory and one visual test have been selected. We will describe the psychophysical tests briefly; a detailed description of the stimuli and procedure can be found in Appendix 1 and 2.

Auditory tests

For auditory processing three psychophysical threshold tests were administered in kindergarten: one for *gap-detection in noise* (GAP), one for *2 Hz FM-detection* (FM) and one for *tone-in-noise detection* (TN). With the GAP-detection task we tested the hypothesis of a deficit in 'rapid and brief' temporal processing. With the FM-detection task we verified the hypothesis of a deficit in the processing of 'dynamic stimuli'. The TN-task was included as a non-temporal control task to verify the specificity of any observed temporal deficit, i.e. we wanted to examine whether a deficit might be the result of failing performance on auditory psychophysical tasks in general.

In first grade a fourth auditory test has been added: a *between-channel gap detection* task where the pre and post gap markers occupy different critical bands. The leading marker was a 1.0 oct-wide bandpassed noise centred at 1.0 kHz, the trailing marker was a 1.0 oct-wide bandpassed noise centred at 4.0 kHz. Since temporal processing in a between-channel gap detection task requires a relative timing operation between different stimulated channels (and as such different stimulated neural regions), it has been postulated that these stimuli must be processed centrally (Phillips, Taylor, Hall, Carr & Mossop, 1997). As such, this task might be a more appropriate measure to probe the perceptual mechanisms that might be involved in stop consonant discrimination.

For all auditory tests a similar psychophysical procedure was used. Thresholds were estimated using a three-interval forced-choice oddity paradigm. The subject's task was to identify the 'odd' stimulus, the one that sounded different from the other two. The length of the gap, the depth of modulation and the amplitude of the sinusoidal pulses were adjusted adaptively using a two-down, one-up rule, which targeted the threshold corresponding to 70.7 % correct responses (Levitt, 1971). In all

tests a threshold run was terminated after eight reversals. Thresholds for an individual run were calculated by the geometric mean of the values of the last four reversals. For each participant three reliable threshold estimates were determined for every experiment.

The forced-choice oddity paradigm was controlled by APEX, a software module developed for psycho-acoustical and psycho-electrical auditory testing (Laneau, Boets, Moonen, van Wieringen, & Wouters, 2005). In order to make the rather boring psychophysical tests more interesting and child friendly we integrated them in an interactive video game with intro and outro animation movies, aimed to transform the abstract meaningless acoustical signal into a concrete and well known 'daily life signal'. Furthermore, the use of a touch screen and an extensive reinforcing system contributed a lot to keep the child motivated and interested. More detailed information regarding the development of the child friendly auditory test platform can be found in Appendix 3 (Laneau, Boets, Moonen, van Wieringen, & Wouters, 2005).

For all auditory testing – also for the speech perception tests – the same calibrated equipment was used. Stimuli were saved as 16-bit wav-files on the hard disc of a Dell Latitude C800 and Toshiba Satellite 1400-103 portable computer. They were presented using an integrated audio PC-card and routed to an audiometer (Madsen OB622) in order to control the level of presentation. Stimuli were presented monaurally over calibrated TDH-39 headphones.

Visual magnocellular test

To assess visual magnocellular functioning, we administered a *coherent motion detection* task. On a computer screen children watched two rectangular patches, each containing 1103 randomly moving high luminance white dots on a black background. The target patch was segregated into three horizontal strips; in the middle strip a variable proportion of dots were moving coherently in horizontal direction, reversing direction every 330 msec – creating as such the impression of 'an emerging road in the snow'. Threshold was defined as the smallest proportion of coherently moving dots required for detection of the middle strip with reversing dot motion.

Coherent motion detection thresholds were estimated using a two-interval, two-alternative forced-choice procedure embedded within a computer game with animation movies. Similar to the auditory tests a two-down, one-up adaptive staircase paradigm was used, calculating threshold as the geometric mean of the values of the last four of eight reversals. Further information regarding the coherent motion detection task can be found in Appendix 2 (Boets, Wouters, van Wieringen, & Ghesquière, under revision).

Tests for speech perception

In order to assess the speech processing capacities of the subjects in our research group, we administered two specific speech perception tasks: one measuring speech-in-noise perception and one measuring categorical speech perception.

In the *speech-in-noise perception task* seven lists of ten high frequent monosyllables (taken from the Göttingerlist II, developed by Wouters, Damman & Bosman, 1994) were presented monaurally with an inter-stimulus interval of 7 seconds. Simultaneously a continuous stationary speech noise, with an identical spectrum as the average spectrum of every word list and with an equivalent RMS-level, was presented to the same ear, at a fixed level of 70 dB SPL. Words were presented at -1, -4 and –7 dB SPL signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). Before administration of the six test lists, one list was presented at an SNR of +4 dB as a practice list. The child's task was to repeat the words as accurately as possible, resulting in a percentage correct score for every test list.

Previous studies with dyslexic adults and children suggest that their phoneme boundaries are less distinct, resulting in a less consistent and categorical perception (e.g. Gerrits, 2003; Go dfrey et al., 1981; Koopmans-van Beinum, Schwippert & Kuijpers, 1998; Maassen et al., 2001; Serniclaes et al., 2001, Serniclaes et al., 2004; Werker & Tees, 1987). To investigate this hypothesis, a ten-point speech continuum ranging from /bAk/ to /dAk/ (i.e. the Dutch word for 'box / basket' and 'roof') was presented by means of an *identification and discrimination categorical perception task*. Stimuli were identical to the ones used by Koopmans-van Beinum, Schwippert and Kuijpers (1998), constructed by acoustical linear interpolation of the onset values of the second formant F_2 (ranging from 1100 to 1800 Hz in ten physically equal

steps). Stimuli were presented monaurally at a comfortable listening level of 70 dB SPL.

Stimulus presentation and response registration was controlled by E-prime, a software module for psychological experiments (Schneider, Eschman & Zuccolotto, 2002). In order to make the rather boring tests more child friendly we integrated them in a videogame with an introductory and concluding movie, animated buttons and attractive feedback. Prior to testing, the child was presented an introductory animation movie about a cat waking up in a basket (= /bAk/ in Dutch) and climbing on the roof (= /dAk/ in Dutch). After the cat disappearing out of view, the movie explained that the child can know where the cat actually is – in the /bAk/ or on the /dAk/ -by listening very carefully. For every child, a 2AFC forced-choice identification task was administered twice, followed by a same-different (AX) discrimination task.

Identification task. Subjects were sitting in front of a computer screen, depicting a picture of a basket and a roof, representing the possible response options (/bAk/ vs. /dAk/). The ten stimuli of the continuum were presented six times in a random order in three series, making it impossible for the same stimulus to be presented more than two consecutive times. The child was instructed to repeat the perceived word and point to the corresponding picture. Participants were given an unlimited time in which to respond. Prior to collecting identification data, we administered a pretest presenting each of the two endpoint stimuli five times. The whole experiment (pretest + 3 series) was administered twice, leading to 12 presentations of each stimulus of the continuum.

Discrimination task. In the discrimination task, a stimulus pair (with ISI = 400 ms) was presented to the child and he/she had to point to one of two pictures representing "the same" or "different". In order to obtain a bias-free measure of discriminability, the task contained physically different as well as identical pairs. Subjects were presented two series of 31 stimulus pairs. Each series consisted of one identical pair for each of the ten stimuli and three physically different pairs for each of the seven 3-step comparisons (1-4, 2-5, 3-6, 4-7, 5-8, 6-9, 7-10) (1x10 + 3x7 = 31 stimuli). The internal order of the different stimulus pairs was balanced over the two series. The task was preceded by 10 practice items, comprising pairs that were clearly different or identical.

Phonological tests

Phonological tests were selected to reflect the three traditional domains of phonological processing: *phonological awareness*, *verbal short-term memory* and *rapid automatic naming*. A detailed description of the phonological test battery and the *letter knowledge* task administered in kindergarten can be found in Appendix 1.

In first grade, two additional rapid automatic naming tasks were added to investigate naming speed for letters and digits. Moreover, the tasks tapping phonological awareness were replaced by age-appropriate tasks. In the rhyme and alliteration test, three one-syllable words were orally presented, and the child had to select the two words sharing respectively the same end rhyme or sharing the same first sound. The phoneme deletion test was an adaptation of the test described by de Jong and Wolters (2002) and consisted of two subtests, each comprising ten items. In the first subtest a digitally recorded nonword was auditory presented and the child was instructed to delete a particular phoneme to uncover the remaining real word. In the second subtest, the residual word part after deletion of the phoneme still remained a nonword. The spoonerism test consisted of three subtests, each comprising ten items. The first was a semi-spoonerism test where the child was instructed to replace the consonantal onset of a word with a given sound in order to uncover a new word. In the second and third subtest two one-syllable words were given and the child was instructed to interchange their consonantal onset in order to reveal two new words (e.g. 'saai - hok' becomes 'haai - sok'). In the second subtest words started with a single consonant, in the third subtest words started with a consonantal cluster. In the auditory blending test subjects had to listen to twenty digitally recorded words presented sound by sound (e.g. 'p-l-a-n-t') and had to tell what the original whole word was (Verhoeven, 1995; DMT- Leerlingvolgsysteem Cito). Reversely, in the auditory analysis test, subjects had to decompose twenty one-syllable words in their constituent sounds (Verhoeven, 1995; DMT- Leerlingvolgsysteem Cito).

The first grade letter knowledge task measured both accuracy and speed for naming the most common Dutch letters and letter combinations (constructed by combining Verhoeven, 1995 and Ghesquière & Ruijssenaars, 1994).

In the task measuring speech rate, children had to count as fast as possible from one to ten and they had to repeat as fast and accurately as possible a given word five times. The test consisted of one digit string and four word items differing in

length and articulatory difficulty. Every item was administered twice. Responses were digitally recorded and analysed using Cool Edit software.

Reading and spelling skills / orthographic ability

To assess reading skills, six reading tests were administered at the end of the first grade. Two of them are standardised and will be used in the diagnostic process to determine the reading retarded group [the One-Minute Real-Word Reading test (Brus, 1973) and the Pseudo-Word Reading Test (van den Bos, Spelberg, Scheepstra, de Vries, 1994)]. To discern between accuracy and speed of reading, we constructed four additional reading tests. The reading accuracy tests for words and nonwords were constructed according to the description provided by de Jong and Wolters (2002) and consisted both of 40 items gradually increasing in difficulty. For these tests there was no time limit. To assess reading speed we aimed to develop a test yielding almost 100 % reading accuracy. As such, test scores would only reflect the variation in reading speed and not in accuracy. In order to obtain a minimal error score, the word reading speed test consisted exclusively of high-frequent one-syllable words, known by 90 % or more of Belgian six-year-olds (Schaerlaekens, Kohnstamm & Lejaeghere, 1999). By decomposing and recombining these words, the items for the nonword reading speed test were constructed. Both speed tests consisted of 150 items, to be read within a two-minute time limit.

Spelling skills were assessed using a standardised spelling test [Spelling, Leerlingvolgsysteem CSBO (Dudal, 1997)]. To specifically measure the orthographic skills we constructed a word-pseudohomophone task integrated in a computer game. In this orthographic task 40 words (known by > 90 % of Belgian six-year-olds) were presented one by one on a computer screen together with a nonword with the same pronunciation (e.g. 'blauw' and 'blouw'). To avoid confusion about the intended word, simultaneously the word was auditory presented and used in an example sentence. The child's task was to point to the correctly spelled word. Upon correct responding a portion of a computer-generated picture popped up on the monitor. With every additional response a more completed representation of the picture was obtained. Throughout the task a complete picture was constructed, in jig-saw fashion, revealing a funny image.

Further tests

Intelligence. Children were matched based on their results on Raven Coloured Progressive Matrices, a nonverbal intelligence test measuring spatial reasoning. This test was administered at the beginning of the last year in kindergarten. In first grade two additional intelligence tests were administered, i.e. the subtest Block Design and the subtest Vocabulary from WISC-III (Wechsler, 2002).

ADHD rating scale. Given the higher incidence of attention-related deficits (ADHD/ADD) in the reading disabled population, it is plausible that attention could explain much of the shared variance between individual differences in reading and sensory thresholds (see e.g. Willcutt & Pennington, 2000; Breier, Fletcher, Foorman, Klaas & Gray, 2003). To explore the potential mediating role of ADHD symptoms we collected teacher reports using the ADHD rating scale (Scholte & van der Ploeg, 1998). This rating scale, based on the DSM-IV criteria of ADHD, consists of 18 items: 6 addressing inattentive behaviour, 6 addressing hyperactive behaviour and 6 addressing impulsive behaviour.

Data analysis

First, we will analyse all data comparing HR versus LR group at the level of the matched individuals. To do this, we use Mixed Model Analysis (MMA) with school as a random variable (1 to 31) and participant group (HR versus LR) as the fixed between-subject variable (Littell, Milliken, Stroup & Wolfinger, 1996). Age, nonverbal IQ and educational level of both mother and father will be added as fixed (co)variables. Additionally, for the psychophysical data we will also compute a series of Repeated Measures MMA with threshold run (1 to 3 or 1 to 4) as the within-subject variable. MMA was chosen not merely to allow a paired wise comparison, but also because of its robustness in analysing semi-normally distributed data (Verbeke & Lesaffre, 1997).

Second, based on the first grade reading and spelling scores, we will define a normal reading and a reading retarded group[2] and we will retrospectively reanalyse all data comparing these both groups.

[2] We acknowledge that we will not be able to 'diagnose' children as being dyslexic at the end of the first grade. In order to do so, a more extensive clinical examination should be done. For this reason, we will describe the deviant reading group as 'reading retarded' instead of 'dyslexic'. Noteworthy, it has been demonstrated that differences among children in their reading and spelling abilities (and disabilities) are quite stable over time. The majority of those identified as having reading difficulties in first grade continue to read poorly throughout their school years and beyond (McCardle, Scarborough & Catts, 2001).

Third, in order to explore relationships between variables, Spearman correlations will be calculated, both between variables administered in the same period (concurrent relations) as between variables administered in different periods (predictive or longitudinal relations). Moreover, to examine whether the phonological tests indeed reflect the hypothesised threefold structure, a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation will be carried out. Finally, in order to illuminate the complete developmental/causal pathway, we aim to integrate all data in one global analysis. This will probably be done, using Structural Equation Models and/or Path Analysis.

Results

The preschool data regarding auditory processing, phonological processing and visual coherent motion detection have already been analysed and described (see Appendix 1 and 2). The main results demonstrate that phonological awareness and letter knowledge turn out to be the best indicators to differentiate between preschool children with low versus high familial risk of developing dyslexia. In contrast, none of the auditory processing tasks, nor visual coherent motion detection is able to differentiate significantly between both groups. However, there is a significant relation between these sensory measures and developing literacy skills, even while taking into account the influence of differences in intelligence: sensitivity to coherent motion is uniquely related to orthographic skills, whereas sensitivity to auditory FM and tone-in-noise detection is specifically predictive for emerging phonological skills. In sum, these results suggest that basic visual and auditory sensitivity is likely to play an important role in the development of fine-grained orthographic and phonological representations necessary for successful reading.

References

Benasich, A. A., & Tallal, P. (2002). Infant discrimination of rapid auditory cues predicts later language impairment. Behavioural Brain Research, 136(1), 31-49.

Boets, B., Wouters, J., van Wieringen, A., & Ghesquiere, P. (in press). Auditory temporal information processing in preschool children at family risk for dyslexia: relations with phonological abilities and developing literacy skills. Brain and Language.

Boets, B., Wouters, J., van Wieringen, A., & Ghesquiere, P. (under revision). Coherent motion detection in preschoolers at family risk for dyslexia. Vision Research.

Borsting, E., Ridder, W. H., Dudeck, K., Kelley, C., Matsui, L., & Motoyapa, J. (1996). The presence of a magnocellular defect depends on the type of dyslexia. Vision Research, 36, 1047-1053.

Breier, J. I., Fletcher, J. M., Foorman, B. R., Klaas, P., & Gray, L. C. (2003). Auditory temporal processing in children with specific reading disability with and without attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 46, 31-42.

Brus, B. T., & Voeten, M. J. (1973). Eén-minuut-test vorm A en B. Verantwoording en handleiding. Nijmegen: Berkhout.

Cornelissen, P. L., Hansen, P. C., Gilchrist, I. , Cormack, F., Essex, J., & Frankish, C. (1998). Coherent motion detection and letter position encoding. Vision Research, 38, 2181-2191.

de Jong, P. F., & Wolters, G. (2002). Fonemisch bewustzijn, benoemsnelheid en leren lezen. Pedagogische Studieën, 79, 53-63.

De Yoe, E. A., & Van Essen, D. C. (1988). Concurrent processing streams in monkey visual cortex. Trends in Neuroscience, 11 , 219-226.

Demb, J., Boynton, G., & Heeger, G. (1998). Functional magnetic resonance imaging of early visual pathways in dyslexia. Journal of Neuroscience, 18, 6939-6951.

Dudal, P. (1997). Leerlingvolgsysteem VCLB (CSBO). Spelling: Toetsen 1-2-3. Basisboek en kopieerbundel. Leuven: Garant.

Eden, G., Van Meter, J., Rumsey, J., Maisog, J., Woods, R., & Zeffiro, T. (1996). Abnormal processing of visual motion in dyslexia revealed by functional brain imaging. Nature, 382, 66-69.

Eden, G. F., Stein, J. F., & Wood, F. B. (1995). Temporal and spatial processing in reading disabled and normal children. Cortex, 31, 451-468.

Farmer, M. E., & Klein, R. M. (1995). The evidence for a temporal processing deficit linked to dyslexia: A review. Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, 2(4), 460-493.

Frith, C., & Frith, U. (1996). A biological marker for dyslexia. Nature, 382, 19-20.

Gerrits, E. (2003). Speech perception of young children at risk for dyslexia and children with specific language impairment. Proceedings of the 15 th International Conference on Phonetic Sciences (pp. 2357-2360). Barcelona, Spain, 3 - 9 Augustus 2003.

Ghesquiere, P., & Ruijssenaars, A. J. J. M. (1994). Vlaamse normen voor studietoetsen technisch lezen lager onderwijs. Leuven: University Press.

Gilger, J. W., Pennington, B. F., & DeFries, J. C. (1991). Risk for reading disability as a function of parental history in three family studies. Reading and Writing, 3(3-4), 205-217.

Godfrey, J. J., Syrdal-Lasky, A. K., Millay, K. K., & Knox, C. M. (1981). Performance of dyslexic children on speech perception tests. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 32, 401-424.

Greatrex, J. C., & Drasdo, N. (1995). The magnocellular deficit hypothesis in dyslexia: a review of reported evidence. Ophtalmic and Physiological Optics, 15, 501-506.

Gross-Glenn, K., Skottun, B. C., Glenn, W., Kusch, A., Lingua, F., Dunbar, M., Jallad, B., Lubs, H., Levin, B., Rabin, M., Park, L. A., & Duara, R. (1995). Contrast sensitivity in dyslexia. Visual Neuroscience, 12, 153-163.

Heath, S. M., & Hogben, J. H. (2004). Cost-effective predicition of reading difficulties. Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 47, 751-765.

Hill, N. I, Bailey, P. J, Griffiths, Y. M, & Snowling, M. J. (1999). Frequency acuity and binaural masking release in dyslexic listeners. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 106(6), 53-58.

Koopmans-van Beinum, F., Schwippert, C. E., & Kuijpers, C. T. L. (1998). Speech perception in dyslexia: measurements from birth onwards. Proceedings of the 5 th International Conference on Spoken Language Processing, Sydney, Australia, November 30 - December 4, 1998 (Vol. 3, pp. 903-906).

Laneau, J., Boets, B., Moonen, M., van Wieringen, A., & Wouters, J. (2005). A flexible auditory research platform using acoustic or electric stimuli for adults and young children. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 142(1), 131-136.

Levitt, H. (1971). Transformed up-down methods in psychoacoustics. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 49, 467-477.

Littell, R. C., Milliken, G. A., Stroup, W. W., & Wolfinger, R. D. (1996). SAS system for mixed models. Cary, NC: Sas Institute INC.

Livingstone, M., & Hubel, D. (1987). Psychophysical evidence for separate channels for the perception of form, colour, movement and depth. Journal of Neuroscience , 7, 3416-3468.

Livingstone, M. S, Rosen, G. D, Drislane, F. W, & Galaburda, A. M. (1991). Physiological and anatomical evidence for a magnocellular defect in developmental dyslexia. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, 88(18), 7943-7.

Lovegrove, B. (1996). Dyslexia and a transient/magnocellular pathway deficit: The current situation and future directions. Australian Journal of Psychology, 48(3), 167-171.

Lovegrove, W. (1994). Visual deficits in dyslexia: evidence and implications. In A. Fawcett, & R. Nicolson (Eds), Dyslexia in children: multidisciplinary perspectives (pp. 113-135). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Maassen, B., Groenen, P., Crul, T., Assman-Hulsmans, C., & Gabrëls, F. (2001). Identification and discrimination of voicing and place-of-articulation in developmental dyslexia. Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics, 15(4), 319-339.

Marshall, C. M, Snowling, M. J, & Bailey, P. J. (2001). Rapid auditory processing and phonological ability in normal readers and readers with dyslexia. J-Speech-Lang-Hear-Res, 44(4), 925-40.

McAnally, K. I., & Stein, J. F. (1996). Auditory temporal coding in dyslexia. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences, 263, 961-965.

McBride Chang, C. (1996). Models of speech perception and phonological processing in reading. Child Development, 67(4), 1836-1856.

McCardle, P., Scarborough, H. S., & Catts, H. W. (2001). Predicting, explaining and preventing children's reading difficulties. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 16(4), 230-239.

Menell, P., McAnally, K. I, & Stein, J. F. (1999). Psychophysical sensitivity and physiological response to amplitude modulation in adult dyslexic listeners. Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 42(4), 797-803.

Mody, M., Studdert Kennedy, M., & Brady, S. (1997). Speech perception deficits in poor readers: auditory processing or phonological coding? Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 64(2), 199-231.

Phillips, D. P., Taylor, T. L., Hall, S. E., Carr, M. M., & Mossop, J. E. (1997). Detection of silent intervals between noises activating different perceptual channels: some properties of 'central'

auditory gap detection. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 101(6), 3694-3705.

Rack, J. P. (1994). Dyslexia: The phonological deficit hypothesis. In A. Fawcett, & R. Nicolson (Eds.), Dyslexia in children: multidisciplinary perspectives . London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Ramus, F. (2003). Developmental dyslexia: specific phonological deficit or general sensorimotor dysfunction? Current Opinions in Neurobiology, 13(2), 212-218.

Ramus, F., Rosen, S., Dakin, S. C., Day, B. L., Castellote, J. M., White, S., & Frith, U. (2003). Theories of developmental dyslexia: insights from a multiple case study of dyslexic adults. Brain, 126(4), 841-865.

Raven, J. C., Court, J. H., & Raven, J. (1984). Manual for Raven's Progressive Matrices and Vocabulary Scales. London: Lewis.

Rosen, S. (2003). Auditory processing in dyslexia and specific language impairment: is there a deficit? What is its nature? Does it explain anything? Journal of Phonetics, 31, 509-527.

Rosen, S., & Manganari, E. (2001). Is there a relationship between speech and nonspeech auditory processing in children with dyslexia? Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 44(4), 720-736.

Scarborough, H. S. (1998). Early identification of children at risk for reading disabilities: phonological awareness and some other promising predictors. In B.K. Shapiro, P.J. Accardo, & A.J. Capute (Eds), Specific reading disability: a view of the spectrum (pp. 75-119). Timonium, MD: York Press.

Schaerlaekens, A. M., Kohnstamm, D., & Lejaeghere, M. (1999). Streeflijst woordenschat voor zesjarigen (derde herziene druk). Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Schneider, W., Eschman, A., & Zuccolotto, A. (2002). E-Prime User's Guide. Pittsburgh: Psychology Software Tools Inc.

Scholte, E. M., & van der Ploeg, J. D. (1998). ADHD Vragenlijst (AVL). Handleiding. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Serniclaes, W., Sprenger-Charolles, L., Carré, R., & Démonet, J. F. (2001). Perceptual discrimination of speech sounds in dyslexics. Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 44, 384-399.

Serniclaes, W., Van Heghe, S., Mousty, P., Carré, R., & Sprenger-Charolles, L. (2004). Allophonic mode of speech perception in dyslexia. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 87, 336-361.

Share, D. L., Jorm, A. F., Maclean, R., & Matthews, R. (2002). Temporal processing and reading disability. Reading and Writing, 15(1-2), 151-178.

Skottun, B. C. (1997). Some remarks on the magnocellular deficit theory of dyslexia. Vision Research, 37, 965-966.

Skottun, B. C. (2000). The magnocellular deficit theory of dyslexia: the evidence from contrast sensitivity. Vision Research, 40, 111-127.

Skottun, B. C., & Parke, L. A. (1999). The possible relationship between visual deficits and dyslexia. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 32, 2-5.

Snowling, M. J. (2000). Dyslexia (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Stein, J. (2001). The magnocellular theory of developmental dyslexia. Dyslexia, 7, 12-36.

Stein, J., & Talcott, J. (1999). Impaired neuronal timing in developmental dyslexia. The magnocellular hypothesis. Dyslexia, 5, 59-77.

Stein, J., & Walsh, V. (1997). To see but not to read; the magnocellular theory of dyslexia. Trends in Neuroscience, 20(4), 147-152.

Talcott, J. B, Hansen, P. C, Assoku, E. L, & Stein, J. F. (2000). Visual motion sensitivity in dyslexia: evidence for temporal and energy integration deficits. Neuropsychologia, 38(7), 935-943.

Talcott, J. B, Witton, C., Hebb, G. S, Stoodley, C. J, Westwood, E. A, France, S. J, Hansen, P. C, & Stein, J. F. (2002). On the relationship between dynamic visual and auditory processing and literacy skills; results from a large primary-school study. Dyslexia, 8(4), 204-225.

Talcott, J. B, Witton, C., McClean, M., Hansen, P. C, Rees, A., Green, G., & Stein, J. F. (1999). Can sensitivity to auditory frequency modulation predict children's phonological and reading skills? Neuroreport, 10(10), 2045-2050.

Talcott, J. B, Witton, C., McLean, M. F, Hansen, P. C, Rees, A., Green, G. G, & Stein, J. F. (2000). Dynamic sensory sensitivity and children's word decoding skills. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, USA, 97(6), 2952-2957.

Talcott, J. B., & Witton, C. (2002). A sensory linguistic approach to the development of normal and impaired reading skills. In E. Witruk, A. Friederici, & T. Lachmann (Eds.), Neuropsychology and cognition series. Basic functions of language and language disorders. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Tallal, P. (1980). Auditory temporal perception, phonics, and reading disabilities in children. Brain and Language, 9(2), 182-198.

Tallal, P., Miller, S., & Fitch, R. H. (1993). Neurobiological basis of speech: a case for the preeminence of temporal processing. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 682, 27-47.

van den Bos, K. P., Spelberg, H. C. L., Scheepstra, A. J. M., & De Vries, J. R. (1994). De Klepel. Vorm A en B. Een test voor de leesvaardigheid van pseudowoorden. Verantwoording, handleiding, diagnostiek en behandeling. Nijmegen: Berkhout.

Van Ingelghem, M., Boets, B., van Wieringen, A., Ghesquiere, P., & Wouters, J. (2004). Auditory and visual temporal processing in dyslexic and normal reading children matched for sex, age and intellectual ability. Paper presented at 6th BDA International conference, 27-30 march 2004, University of Warwick, UK .

Van Ingelghem, M., Boets, B., van Wieringen, A., Onghena, P., Ghesquiere, P., & Wouters, J. (2005). An auditory temporal processing deficit in children with dyslexia? In P. Ghesquiere & A.J.J.M. Ruijssenaars (Eds), Learning disabilities: a challenge to teaching and instruction. Series: Studia Paedagogica 40. (pp. 47-63). Leuven: University Press.

Van Ingelghem, M., van Wieringen, A., Wouters, J., Vandenbussche, E., Onghena, P., & Ghesquiere, P. (2001). Psychophysical evidence for a general temporal processing deficit in children with dyslexia. Neuroreport, 12(16), 3603-3607.

Verbeke, G., & Lesaffre, E. (1997). The effect of misspecifying the random-effects distribution in linear mixed models for longitudinal data. Computational Statistics and Data Analysis, 23, 541-556.

Verhoeven, L. (1995). Drie-Minuten-Toets. Arnhem: Cito.

Wechsler, D. (1992). Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (3rd Edition NL). London: The Psychological Corporation.

Werker, J. F., & Tees, R. C. (1987). Speech perception in severely disabled and average reading children. Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology, 41, 48-61.

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

Witton, C., Talcott, J. B, Hansen, P. C, Richardson, A. J, Griffiths, T. D, Rees, A., Stein, J. F, & Green, G. G. (1998). Sensitivity to dynamic auditory and visual stimuli predicts nonword reading ability in both dyslexic and normal readers. Current Biology, 8(14), 791-797.

Wouters, J., Damman, W., & Bosman, A. J. (1994). Vlaamse opnamen van woordenlijsten voor spraakaudiometrie. CD NKO - K.U.Leuven/U.Z.Leuven.

Appendix 1:
Manuscript accepted for publication in Brain and Language.

Boets, B., Wouters, J., van Wieringen, A., & Ghesquière, P. (in press). Auditory temporal information processing in preschool children at family risk for dyslexia: relations with phonological abilities and developing literacy skills. Brain and Language.

Appendix 2:
Manuscript under revision for Vision Research.

Boets, B., Wouters, J., van Wieringen, A., & Ghesquière, P. (in press). Coherent motion detection in preschool children at family risk for dyslexia. Vision Research.

Appendix 3:
Extract from manuscript published in Journal of Neuroscience Methods.

Laneau, J., Boets, B., Moonen, M., van Wieringen, A., & Wouters, J. (2005). A flexible auditory research platform using acoustic or electric stimuli for adults and young children. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 142(1), 131-136.

ARTICLE IN PRESS

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SCIENCE DIRECT®

Brain and Language xxx (2005) xxx–xxx

Brain and Language

www.elsevier.com/locate/b&l

Auditory temporal information processing in preschool children at family risk for dyslexia: Relations with phonological abilities and developing literacy skills

Bart Boets [a,*], Jan Wouters [b], Astrid van Wieringen [b], Pol Ghesquière [a]

[a] *Centre for Disability, Special Needs Education and Child Care, University of Leuven, Belgium*
[b] *Laboratory for Experimental ORL, University of Leuven, Belgium*

Accepted 9 July 2005

Abstract

In this project, the hypothesis of an auditory temporal processing deficit in dyslexia was tested by examining auditory processing in relation to phonological skills in two contrasting groups of five-year-old preschool children, a familial high risk and a familial low risk group. Participants were individually matched for gender, age, non-verbal IQ, school environment, and parental educational level. Psychophysical thresholds were estimated for gap-detection, frequency modulation detection, and tone-in-noise detection using a three-interval forced-choice adaptive staircase paradigm embedded within a computer game. Phonological skills were measured by tasks assessing phonological awareness, rapid serial naming, and verbal short-term memory. Significant group differences were found for phonological awareness and letter knowledge. In contrast, none of the auditory tasks differentiated significantly between both groups. However, both frequency modulation and tone-in-noise detection were significantly related to phonological awareness. This relation with phonological skills was not present for gap-detection.
© 2005 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Auditory temporal processing; Reading development; Dyslexia; Prediction; Preschoolers; Phonological awareness; Verbal short-term memory; Rapid automatic naming

1. Introduction

Developmental dyslexia is characterised by serious reading and spelling difficulties that are persistent and resistant to the usual didactic measures and remedial efforts. At present it is well established that a major cause of these problems lies in the phonological domain (see Snowling, 2000 for a review). One hypothesis maintains that this phonological deficit results from a more fundamental deficit in the basic perceptual mechanisms that are responsible for auditory temporal information processing.

The auditory temporal hypothesis originated from studies on children with specific language impairments (SLI) and was later extended to dyslexia. The empirical evidence started with Tallal's repetition task (Tallal, 1980). In this temporal order judgement (TOJ) task, two complex tones with different fundamentals were presented in pairs at various inter-stimulus intervals (ISI) and the listener responded with two button presses to identify the order of the stimuli presented. Tallal found that children with dyslexia, in comparison to normal readers, were impaired in discriminating and sequencing pairs of short-lived stimuli with short ISI, and concluded that the dyslexic deficit was specific to processing stimuli that are brief and occur in rapid succession. Moreover, she found a high correlation between this basic perceptual processing of non-speech signals and phonological skills ($r = .81$). Following further evidence that dyslexic and SLI children had great difficulty discriminating

* Corresponding author. Fax: +32 0 16 32 59 33.
E-mail address: bart.boets@ped.kuleuven.be (B. Boets).

0093-934X/$ - see front matter © 2005 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.bandl.2005.07.026

syllables containing stop consonants (such as /ba/ and /da/), the claim of a temporal deficit was extended to apply to both non-linguistic and linguistic auditory stimuli (Tallal & Piercy, 1973; Tallal, Miller, & Fitch, 1993). Since discrimination of such syllables critically depends on accurate detection of the rapid frequency changes in the first milliseconds of voicing, inaccurate detection of these formant transitions would inevitably interfere with the identification of the phonological cues that are typical for spoken language. This hypothesis of a direct association between basic auditory processing and speech or language processing was strengthened by demonstrating that speech stimuli with lengthened transitions were much better discriminated (Tallal & Piercy, 1975). From this association sprang the claim that the temporal auditory problem *caused* the language problem, and subsequently the deficient phonological and reading development. During decades this supposed causal mechanism has been put forward as a plausible explanation of dyslexia.

Since the formulation of this theory there have been multiple studies exploring the auditory temporal abilities of individuals with dyslexia. While the bulk of studies has been done on adults, a minority of recent studies focused on school aged children and some very few on preschoolers. In line with the scope of our study, we will mainly restrict our report to psychophysical studies using specific non-speech stimuli to examine younger subjects.

Probably the most straightforward way to measure temporal processing is a gap-detection task; this task estimates the smallest detectable interruption in an auditory stimulus. Van Ingelghem and colleagues (van Ingelghem et al., 2001, 2005) found a significant gap-detection deficit in 11-year-old dyslexic children compared to normal reading children. Moreover, the results on the task were significantly related to both real word reading and non-word reading ($r = -.57$ and $r = -.60$, respectively). These results were replicated in a broader study in dyslexic and normal reading children matched for sex, age, and intellectual ability (Van Ingelghem, Boets, van Wieringen, Ghesquiere, & Wouters, 2004). The observed results are in line with McCroskey and Kidder (1980), but are not consistent with observations reported by McAnally and Stein (1996), Schulte Korne, Deimel, Bartling, and Remschmidt (1998), and Adlard and Hazan (1998). Hautus, Setchell, Waldie, and Kirk (2003) also observed higher gap-detection thresholds in dyslexic subjects, but these thresholds were only significantly higher for the young reading-impaired subjects (aged 6–9 years) and not for the older ones (aged 10 years up to adulthood). The authors interpreted these results as suggestive for a passing maturational lag in temporal acuity in children with dyslexia. In an interesting study of Fischer and Hartnegg (2004), investigating a large group of subjects covering an age-range of 7–22 years, a higher proportion of subjects with dyslexia were unable to perform a gap-detection task even at its easiest level. However, within the group of participants for whom a threshold value could be assigned, there was no significant difference between dyslexics and normal readers.

Studdert Kennedy and Mody (1995) challenged Tallal's auditory theory and argued that the observed phonological impairments in dyslexics are in origin speech-specific and cannot be attributed to a more general lower-level auditory deficit. Besides this fundamental criticism they also postulated that stimulus processing should only be regarded as temporal when the defining features of the stimuli are changing in time and not merely because of their rapid and brief presentation. This new temporal concept resulted in a new series of studies that investigated auditory temporal processing in dyslexia using "dynamic stimuli" (see Talcott et al., 2000). Most of these studies were carried out on adult samples and demonstrated a relative impairment in sensitivity to amplitude modulation (AM) (McAnally & Stein, 1997; Menell, McAnally, & Stein, 1999; Rocheron, Lorenzi, Fullgrabe, & Dumont, 2002) and frequency modulation (FM) (e.g., Stein & McAnally, 1995). In addition, Witton et al. (1998) found that sensitivity to 2 and 40 Hz FM, for both dyslexics and controls, significantly correlated with phonological decoding skills. This relationship between FM sensitivity and phonological ability has also been demonstrated by Talcott et al. (1999) in a random group of children. More recently, Van Ingelghem et al. (2005) demonstrated a significant difference in FM sensitivity in a group of 11-year-old dyslexic children compared to normal reading children. However, in a similar but broader well-controlled study with IQ-matched control subjects, this difference could not be replicated (Van Ingelghem et al., 2004).

These studies with 'dynamic' stimuli again point to an auditory temporal processing deficit as a possible cause of dyslexics' phonological problems. Accurate tracking of amplitude and frequency changes is exactly what is needed for the perception of speech, which is characterised by temporal and spectral variations. Since speech perception is the basis for developing phonological skills, it is likely that impairments in AM and FM detection affect phonological skill development via speech perception (McBride Chang, 1996).

With respect to preschool subjects, as far as we know, there have only been a few longitudinal studies applying psychophysical measures. Heath and Hogben (2004) and Share, Jorm, Maclean, and Matthews (2002) administered Tallal's repetition test to a large unselected group of kindergarten children and followed them up until, respectively, second and third grade. However, neither of both research groups was able to predict grade two or three literacy scores based on the auditory data collected in preschool. Conversely, Benasich and Tallal (2002) administered an operantly conditioned head-turn

version of the repetition test to infants 7.5 months of age born into families who were either positive or negative for family history of language impairment (SLI). Not only did these authors observe significantly poorer thresholds for children born into risk families, but they also demonstrated that rapid auditory processing thresholds at 7.5 months of age were the single best predictor of language development at two years of age and together with gender predicted up to 40% of variance in language outcome at three years of age. Unfortunately, information about literacy development and its relation with rapid processing thresholds is currently not yet available for these children. In contrast with the sparse psychophysical studies, there is a growing number of neurophysiologic studies focusing on the temporal characteristics of speech processing in very young subjects that already demonstrated promising results comparing genetically high risk versus low risk children (e.g., Jyväskylä Longitudinal Study of Dyslexia, see Lyytinen et al., 2001; Dutch Dyslexia Research Programme; Molfese, 2000).

Notwithstanding the large number of studies demonstrating an auditory deficit in dyslexics, the explicit causality of the auditory hypothesis has never been established directly by means of a longitudinal study. Here, we report data from a longitudinal study that explores (i) the development of basic auditory skills, speech perception, phonological abilities, and reading skills over a two-year time period from the beginning of the last year of kindergarten[1] up to the end of the first year of primary school; (ii) the mutual relations between these abilities and the way they influence each other over time. In this paper, we will discuss the first results about the relation between auditory temporal processing skills and phonological skills in two contrasting groups of preschool children, i.e., a genetically high risk and a genetically low risk group.

Auditory processing was assessed by means of three psychophysical threshold tests: one for gap-detection in noise (GAP), one for 2 Hz FM-detection (FM) and one for tone-in-noise detection (TN). With the GAP-detection task, we tested the hypothesis of a deficit in 'rapid and brief' temporal processing. With the FM-detection task, we verified the hypothesis of a deficit in the processing of 'dynamic stimuli.' The TN-task was included as a non-temporal control task to verify the specificity of any observed temporal deficit, i.e., we wanted to examine whether a deficit might be the result of failing performance on auditory psychophysical tasks in general. Phonological processing was assessed by administering a broad test battery comprising tasks for rapid serial naming, verbal short-term memory and phonological awareness. Developing literacy skills were measured using a letter knowledge task.

In this study, we aimed to answer the following questions. First, is it possible to obtain reliable results while administering such complex psychophysical tasks to very young subjects? Second, do genetically high risk children, in comparison to low risk children, perform significantly worse on phonological tasks? Third, do genetically high risk children, in comparison to low risk children, perform significantly worse on psychophysical tasks for auditory temporal processing? Fourth, are these auditory processing abilities related to phonological and developing literacy skills?

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

Sixty-two five-year-old children were included in the study. Half of the participants were children of 'dyslexic families,' the so-called high-risk group (HR); the other half were control children of 'normal reading families,' the so-called low-risk group (LR). Since dyslexia tends to run strongly in families, preschoolers with dyslexic relatives are more likely than other children to develop reading problems. Gilger, Pennington, and DeFries (1991) estimate that roughly between 30 and 50% of such children will become reading disabled.

The *HR children* were recruited by means of referrals and public announcements to encourage families with a child entering the last year of nursery school and having at least one member with a formal diagnosis of dyslexia to engage in the study. Following this recruitment, we received over 300 registrations. Based on a short semi-structured telephone interview we selected 162 potential candidate families who were sent three questionnaires. One questionnaire investigated in detail the reading and spelling (dis)abilities of all family members up to third degree and investigated the general development of the preschooler. The two other questionnaires were translations and adaptations of the Adult Reading History Questionnaire (Lefly & Pennington, 2000) and investigated the reading experiences and educational level of each parent. We assessed educational level using the ISCED-scale (International Standard Classification of Education by UNESCO, 1997), by converting classifications on the original seven-point scale to a three-point scale. Out of these 162 potential candidates, we selected 31 preschoolers based on the following criteria: having at least one first-degree relative being diagnosed as reading disabled by an authorized educational psychology service; being native Dutch speaker; born in 1998 and entering last year of nursery school at the beginning of the study; no history of brain damage, long-term hearing

[1] In Belgium school system formal instruction starts in Grade 1 at six years. This means in kindergarten no reading instruction is offered. This is in contrast to the kindergarten group studied by Share et al. (2002), who already received formal reading instruction.

Table 1
Characteristics of participants: descriptive statistics, paired t tests and Fisher's Exact Test

		HR ($n = 31$)			LR ($n = 31$)		p
Non-verbal IQ (mean/SD)[a]		107 (14)			111 (13)		.07
Age in months (mean/SD)		64 (3)			64 (3)		.83
Frequency distribution	Low (1)	Middle (2)	High (3)	Low (1)	Middle (2)	High (3)	
Maternal educational level	3	8	20	1	9	21	.71
Paternal educational level	6	14	11	2	16	13	.43

[a] Transformed RCPM scores with $M = 100$, $SD = 15$.

loss or visual problems. Of the 31 selected HR children, 3 reported with reading problems in only one (first-degree) relative, 5 reported with reading problems in two (first-degree) relatives, 12 with reading problems in three (first-degree or extended) relatives, and 11 with reading problems in four or more (first-degree or extended) relatives.

To further increase the number of future dyslexic children in our test population, we selected relatively more male than female preschoolers (ratio: 18M/13F). Finally, to exclude the "garden variety" poor readers whose literacy is poor due to a low IQ, we selected proportionally more children out of gifted and higher educated families (see Snowling, 2000).

Children of the LR group met the same selection criteria, with the restriction that they were not allowed to show any history of speech or language problems and that none of their family members might have suffered any learning or language deficiencies. For every individual HR child, we searched for the best matching LR control child based on five criteria: (1) educational environment, i.e., same nursery school, (2) gender, (3) age, (4) non-verbal intelligence, and (5) parental educational level. In effect, we selected the particular control child out of the group of same-sex classmates of the HR child. All these children—including the HR child—were administered an adapted version of the Raven Coloured Progressive Matrices (RCPM) (Raven, Court, & Raven, 1984), a collective non-verbal intelligence test measuring spatial reasoning. To assure the child's motivation and attention during testing, we integrated the test procedure within a game-like fairy tale.

From this group, we selected the best overall matching LR control child. For the first two criteria (educational environment and gender) matching was perfect; for the remaining three criteria matching was as good as possible within the restrictions of having to choose within a concrete class group. For the age criterion, we were able to select all control children within an age-difference range of maximal five months. For the IQ criterion only four children differed more than one standard deviation with their matched counterpart. Since the RCPM is very age-sensitive in young children, we used age corrected norms to calculate this non-verbal IQ score. Concerning parental educational level we gave relatively more importance on getting a good fit for maternal than for paternal educational level. In this way, we were able to match 21 children in a perfect way for maternal educational level and 15 for paternal educational level.

Table 1 gives descriptive characteristics of both groups and test statistics. The mean age for both the HR and LR group was 5 years and 4 months, not being statistically different ($p = .83$). The non-verbal IQ scores were slightly above population average (107 for HR group and 111 for LR group) and neither differed significantly ($p = .07$). Fisher's Exact Test also confirms that both groups did not differ in frequency distribution of the different educational categories ($p = .71$ for maternal and $p = .43$ for paternal educational level).

2.2. Apparatus

2.2.1. Phonological tests

Tests were selected to reflect the three traditional domains of phonological skills (Wagner & Torgesen, 1987). Phonological awareness was measured by three sound identity tasks and a rhyme fluency task. Verbal short-term memory was measured by a digit span test and a non-word repetition test. Rapid automatic naming was assessed by administering a colour and an object rapid naming task.

2.2.1.1. Sound identity tasks. The child was required to choose from four alternatives the word that had the same (a) first sound, (b) end sound or (c) end rhyme as a given word (de Jong, Seveke, & van Veen, 2000, adapted by van Otterloo & Regtvoort). The distracter alternatives were systematically constructed to prevent guessing. All words were high frequent one-syllabic Dutch words. Each item consisted of a row of five pictures. The first picture represented the given word and was separated from the other pictures by a vertical line. All items were named for the child. The first-sound and end-sound identity tasks both consisted of 10 items, preceded by two practice items, and had a maximum score of 10. The rhyme identity task consisted of 12 items, preceded by two practice items, and had a maximum score of 12.

2.2.1.2. Rhyme fluency test. Participants were presented a one-syllable word and were required to produce as many

as possible rhyming (non-)words within a 20 s time period. To familiarize them with the task, the experimenter already offered an example rhyme word for every target item. Since we were interested in measuring rhyming abilities irrespective of vocabulary knowledge, the test score was the total number of phonologically correct responses, regardless of whether it was a real Dutch word or not. The test consisted of eight items, gradually getting more difficult, and was preceded by two practice items.

Based on the factor analysis of the phonological data (see Section 3), we recalculated the results of the rhyme fluency test to create a purer measure of rhyming ability, uncontaminated by fluency. For this *Simple rhyme test* each item was scored in binary fashion, and treated as correct if at least one rhyming response (word or non-word) was produced. The maximum score on the test was eight.

2.2.1.3. Non-word repetition test. A non-word repetition test (NRT) is frequently used as a pure measure of verbal short-term memory. Since neither the non-words nor the constituent syllables of the non-words used in the NRT correspond to existing words, the use of long-term memory representations to support recall of the non-words is prevented. The test was developed after a Dutch adaptation (Scheltinga, 2003) of the non-word repetition test reported by Gathercole, Willis, Baddeley, and Emslie (1994). This Dutch version of the NRT was again adapted for the use with Flemish children. The Flemish NRT consisted of four categories of non-words, varying in word length from two to five syllables. Each category contained 12 non-words. All 48 non-words and two test items were recorded on a CD and were presented once. In contrast to Gathercole et al. (1994), the presentation order of the words was determined by word length; starting with all the two-syllabic words and climbing gradually up to the five-syllabic words. The test consisted of 48 non-words, preceded by two practice items, and had a maximum score of 48.

2.2.1.4. Digit span forward. The test assessed the immediate serial recall of spoken lists of digits between 1 and 9. Prior to testing, children were asked to count from 1 to 10 to familiarize them with the counting string and to reduce the influence of possible differences in digit knowledge. After a practice session, three trials of each list length were presented, starting at a sequence of two digits. Testing continued with increasing list length until the child failed on two of three trials of the same list length. The test score was the total number of correctly recalled lists. To standardize assessment, all lists were recorded and presented on CD at a rate of one digit per second. For each list length, the stimuli of the first two trials were taken from the WISC-III (Wechsler, 1992). The third trial was selected from the Working Memory Battery for Children (see Gathercole & Pickering, 2000).

2.2.1.5. Rapid automatic naming. The test assessed the rapid serial naming for two types of familiar symbols: colours and objects (van den Bos, Zijlstra, & Spelberg, 2002). The objects represented five high-frequent, one-syllabic words: boom ('*tree*'), eend ('*duck*'), stoel ('*chair*'), schaar ('*scissors*'), and fiets ('*bicycle*'). The colours were represented by small rectangles in black, blue, red, yellow, and green. For each type of symbol one test card was given, consisting of 50 symbols in a random order (5 columns of 10 symbols). The child was instructed to name the symbols on a card as fast and accurately as possible. Prior to testing, the child was required to name the symbols in the last column of a card to determine whether he/she was familiar with all the presented symbols. For each card, the number of errors and the time to completion were recorded. Subsequently, the time to completion was transformed to the number of symbols named per second. As such, a higher speed score on the test corresponded to a higher naming speed.

2.2.2. Letter knowledge

To get a preliminary idea about the stage of reading development, we administered a letter knowledge task, since many studies have consistently proven this task to be the best predictor of the later development of literacy skills (see, e.g., Elbro & Scarborough, 2003, for a recent overview). To test for the receptive and productive letter knowledge, the 16 most frequently used letters in Dutch books for children were selected (Rolf & Van Rijnsoever, 1984).

2.2.2.1. Productive letter knowledge. Sixteen printed letters were presented on a card. The child had to name each of these letters. Both the sound and the name of a letter were considered correct. The maximum score was 16.

2.2.2.2. Receptive letter knowledge. Sixteen printed letters were presented on a card. The experimenter named all letter sounds in random order. After each sound, the child had to indicate the printed letter that matched the sound. The maximum score was 16.

2.2.3. Auditory tests

2.2.3.1. Audiometric pure-tone detection. Prior to administering any auditory psychophysical test we assessed all children on an audiometric pulsed pure-tone detection task to check for any hearing loss. All but one child obtained a PTA-score below the 25 dB HL criterion. For this child showing mild hearing loss, all further auditory testing was administered with increased stimulus amplitude proportionally to the hearing loss. Since detailed inspection of all her test results did not show any anomalies, her data were not excluded from further analyses.

2.2.3.2. GAP-detection test. In the GAP-detection test, white noise stimuli were used. The target stimulus was a

white noise stimulus containing a silent gap. The reference stimulus was an uninterrupted white noise. Stimuli were cosine gated on and off with 50 ms rise and fall times. Gap rise and fall times were 0.5 ms. Sixty-four target stimuli were constructed, comprising 32 gap sizes, varying between 100 and 0.1 ms. Gap length decreased with a factor 1.2 from 100 ms towards 6.5 ms. From here on gap length decreased with a fixed step size of 0.4 ms. To prevent participants from using overall duration as a cue for detection, the length of both the target and the reference stimulus was varied randomly from presentation to presentation (van Wieringen & Wouters, 1999). In the target stimulus, the length of the markers (i.e., noise components surrounding the gap) varied between 250 and 650 ms including on and off set (i.e., 250, 400, 500, and 650 ms). The length of the reference stimulus was 750, 900 or 1050 ms including on and off set. Stimuli were presented monaurally at 70 dB SPL with an inter stimulus interval (ISI) of 400 ms.

2.2.3.3. FM-detection test. In the FM-detection test, stimuli can be defined as $x(t) = A\sin[2\pi f_c t + \beta \sin(2\pi f_m t)]$ in which β is the modulation index ($\beta = \Delta f / f_m$), f_c the carrier frequency, f_m the modulation frequency and Δf the frequency deviation. The target stimulus was a 2 Hz frequency modulation (f_m) of a 1 kHz carrier tone (f_c) with varying modulation depth Δf. Modulation depth decreased with a factor 1.2 from 100 Hz towards 11 Hz. From a Δf of 11 Hz, a step size of 1 Hz was used. Frequency modulation in the target stimulus was sinusoidal and the modulation envelope was always in sine phase. The reference stimulus was a pure tone of 1 kHz ($\beta = 0$). The length of both the reference and the target stimulus was 1000 ms including 50 ms cosine-gated onset and offset. Stimuli were presented monaurally at 70 dB SPL with an ISI of 350 ms.

2.2.3.4. Tone-in-noise detection task. In the tone-in-noise (TN) detection task participants had to detect pure tone pulses within a one-octave noise signal, centered around 1 kHz (from 707 to 1414 Hz). Noise was presented monaurally at 55 dB SPL with an ISI of 300 ms. The length of both the target and the reference stimulus was 1620 ms, including 20 ms linearly gated rise and fall times. For the target stimulus noise contained two pure 1 kHz pulses of 440 ms, including 20 ms linearly gated on and offset. The first pulse started 320 ms after stimulus onset, the second one 960 ms after stimulus onset. The amplitude of the pulses varied with a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) between +25 and −20 dB. From +25 to −3 dB SNR amplitude decreased with a 4 dB step size. From here on amplitude decreased with a 1 dB step size.

All stimuli for GAP, FM, and TN were generated in MATLAB 5.1 and saved as 16-bit wav-files (sample frequency 44,100 Hz) on the hard disc of a Dell Latitude C800 and Toshiba Satellite 1400-103 portable computer. They were presented using an integrated audio PC-card and routed to an audiometer (Madsen OB622) in order to control the level of presentation. The stimuli were presented monaurally over calibrated TDH-39 headphones.

2.2.4. Psychophysical procedure

For all GAP, FM, and TN tests a similar psychophysical procedure was used. Thresholds were estimated using a three-interval forced-choice oddity paradigm. The subject's task was to identify the 'odd' stimulus, the one that sounded different from the other two. The length of the gap, the depth of modulation and the amplitude of the sinusoidal pulses were adjusted adaptively using a two-down, one-up rule, which targeted the threshold corresponding to 70.7% correct responses (Levitt, 1971). In all tests, a threshold run was terminated after eight reversals. Thresholds for an individual run were calculated by the geometric mean of the values of the last four reversals. For each participant three reliable threshold estimates were determined for every experiment. Prior to auditory data collection, participants were given a short period of practice, comprising supra-threshold trials, to familiarise them with the stimuli and the task.

The forced-choice oddity paradigm was controlled by APEX, a software module developed for psycho-acoustical and psycho-electrical auditory testing (Laneau, Boets, Moonen, van Wieringen, & Wouters, 2005). To make the rather boring psychophysical tests more interesting and child friendly we integrated them in an interactive video game with intro and outro animation movies, aimed to transform the abstract meaningless acoustical signal into a concrete and well known 'daily life signal.' This concept of testing was based upon earlier work of Soderquist and Shilling (1992) and Wightman and co-workers (Allen, Wightman, Kistler, & Dolan, 1989; Wightman, Allen, Dolan, Kistler, & Jamieson, 1989). During testing, the three intervals of every trial were visually represented on the screen by an identical character. The characters were animated synchronously with the presentation of the corresponding sound interval in order to create a psychological link between the moving object on the screen and the presented sound signal. The child's task was to choose, by pointing to the touch screen, which of the three characters corresponded to the target sound (i.e., sounded different from the other two). Immediately after the child touching the screen, visual feedback was given in the form of a moving cartoon. After correct selection, feedback was much more spectacular—and as such much more reinforcing—than after incorrect selection. During the sequence of trials constituting a single run, APEX also provided a more global reinforcement by adding little smiley faces to a rising ladder structure for every correct response and removing them again after every incorrect response. At the end of the run the number of smiley faces was evaluated and the child was rewarded proportionally.

For the GAP-detection experiment the video game displayed a teasing mouse who is trying to wake up three sleeping snakes because she wants to play with them. The child had to predict which one is going to wake up by listening to the specific interrupted noise sound 'sssssssss.' For the FM-detection experiment the introductory movie showed a mother dragon sitting in front of three eggs. The child's task was to predict which egg is ready to hatch, by listening to the baby dragon crying inside ('wouwouwouw'). For the TN-detection task we presented an introductory animation movie about a little monkey waiting desperately at the school gate for his father to pick him up by car. Three cars arrive at the school (making noise sound) and the child had to identify the father's car by listening to him honking his horn (= the pure tone pulses).

2.3. Data collection

All auditory and phonological data were collected within a 70-day period between the second and the fourth month of the last year in kindergarten. Intelligence testing (RCPM) took place one month earlier. Data collection was carried out by qualified psychologists and audiologists. Testing took place in a quiet room at the children's school. Since the LR child was selected out of the HR child's classmates, we could always test both children in exactly the same circumstances.

All phonological tests and the letter knowledge task were administered individually in one day during three sessions. After every subtest children were rewarded by receiving little stickers or stamps.

Auditory data were collected during two consecutive days. Testing always started with the pure-tone audiogram. Then we administered one run of the TN test since this is conceptually the easiest psychophysical task. Consequently, we administered one run of the GAP and FM test in a contra balanced way. This sequence was continued until we had three threshold estimates for every experiment.

2.4. Statistical analysis

Prior to analysis all data were individually checked for unexpected outliers. This resulted in the removal of only two unreliable phonological test scores for one subject of the dyslexic group.

All results were analysed in a paired wise manner, comparing HR versus LR group at the level of the matched individuals. Although both groups did not show a significant difference on any of the matching criteria, we decided to rule out any possible influence of age, non-verbal intelligence or parental educational level by controlling for these variables in our analyses. As such, we analysed the data using Mixed Model Analysis (MMA) with school as a random variable (1–31) and participant group (HR versus LR) as the fixed between-subject variable (Littell, Milliken, Stroup, & Wolfinger, 1996). Age, non-verbal IQ and educational level of both mother and father were added as fixed (co)variables. Additionally, for the auditory data, we also computed a series of Repeated Measures MMA with threshold run (1–3) as the within-subject variable, participant group as the between-subject variable and with the same covariates as mentioned above. MMA was chosen not merely to allow a paired wise comparison, but also because of its robustness in analysing semi-normally distributed data (Verbeke & Lesaffre, 1997). To approach a normal distribution for more variables, the GAP and FM thresholds and the results on the letter knowledge task were log-transformed prior to MMA. To explore the internal consistency of the different phonological tasks, Cronbach's α-coefficients were calculated. To explore the structure and the mutual relationships of the phonological tests a principal component factor analysis was done with varimax rotation. Relationships between variables were analysed using Spearman correlation coefficients.

3. Results

3.1. Phonological skills and letter knowledge

Descriptive statistics, MMA results and reliabilities (Cronbach's α) for all measures are displayed in Table 2. The internal consistency of the simple rhyme task, the non-word repetition test and the letter knowledge task was good. The reliability of the rhyme, first phoneme and end phoneme identity tasks was somewhat lower, probably because these tasks appeared to be rather difficult.[2]

For the colour and picture rapid naming tasks, we examined whether there might have been a speed-accuracy trade-off. Since there was no significant correlation between naming speed and error number and since the quantity of errors did not differ between both groups, we did not correct the speed scores for error rate.

Although the results on almost any phonological task were in the expected direction with the HR-group scoring less well than the LR-group, not all these group differences turned out to be statistically significant. Considering the tasks meant to measure phonological awareness, the scores of the HR-group were significantly lower for the rhyme fluency test and for the end phoneme identity test, with the results on the simple rhyme task being

[2] It is worth mentioning that for both HR and LR-group, the mean scores on the sound identity tasks are well above chance level. This is in contrast to a Dutch study where an odd-one-out categorization version of these tests was administered and where children of the same age were not able to exceed chance level on the last-sound and first-sound categorization test (de Jong & van der Leij, 1999).

Table 2
Phonological abilities and letter knowledge: descriptive statistics and p values for paired wise MMA, controlling for non-verbal IQ, age, and parental educational level

Measures	Cronbach's α	Maximum	HR		LR		p
			M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
Phonological awareness							
Rhyme fluency	—	—	14.3	9.6	18.9	8.2	.02
Simple rhyme	.88	8	6.2	2.4	7.3	1.8	.05
Rhyme identity	.69	12	8.7	2.7	9.8	1.9	.23
First-sound identity	.59	10	4.6	2.1	5.6	2.4	.20
End-sound identity	.63	10	4.5	2.2	5.9	2.4	.02
Rapid serial naming							
Colour naming	—	—	0.6	0.1	0.7	0.2	.12
Picture naming	—	—	0.6	0.1	0.7	0.2	.11
Verbal short-term memory							
Digit span	—	21	7.0	1.6	6.9	1.5	.66
Non-word repetition test	.84	48	16.8	5.3	20.3	7.1	.08
Letter knowledge	.90	32	5.6	6.6	8.2	6.9	.03
Factor phonological awareness	—	—	−0.73	1.2	0.00	1.0	.04
Factor rapid naming	—	—	−0.19	0.9	0.00	1.0	.30
Factor verbal STM	—	—	−0.14	0.9	0.00	1.0	.72

marginally significantly lower. For the rapid serial naming tests neither the picture naming nor the colour naming task differed significantly between both groups. On the tests of verbal short-term memory only the non-word repetition test showed a slight tendency towards differing between both groups.

It is noteworthy that some of the group differences have been tempered by applying the strict controlling MMA design. For example, by comparing both groups without controlling for non-verbal IQ, age, and parental educational level, we also found significant group differences for the non-word repetition test and simple rhyme test, and marginally significant differences on the first phoneme identity task.[3]

With respect to developing literacy skills, we found a significant group difference on the log-transformed letter knowledge scores.

Because the number of participants was not big enough to perform a reliable confirmatory factor analysis, an exploratory principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was carried out to examine the data structure. Since we wanted to explore the *unique* relation between the individual phonological sub skills and the auditory processing skills, unrelated (i.e. orthogonal) phonological factors were calculated. This analysis revealed that the rhyme fluency task disturbed the assumed threefold phonological structure. A post hoc explanation for this phenomenon might be that this fluency task depended only marginally on rhyming skills, while depending mostly on skills as flexible and creative thinking. Replacement of this test by the described simple rhyme test, which was a pure rhyme measure, resulted in an excellent three-factor structure (based on the eigenvalue criterion). The first factor had heavy loadings of the three sound identity tasks and the simple rhyme task, and a more modest loading of the non-word repetition test (see Table 3). As a consequence, this factor could be reliably labelled as the Phonological Awareness Factor (PhAw). The second factor was completely determined by heavy loadings of both the colour and the picture naming task, and as such could be regarded as the Rapid Automatic Naming Factor (RAN). Finally, the non-word repetition test and the digit span loaded heavily on the last factor, namely the Verbal Short-Term Memory Factor (VSTM).

Table 2 displays descriptive statistics and MMA results for these three latent phonological factors. To assist in the interpretation of these results, factor values were transformed to effect sizes relatively to the mean and standard deviation of the LR-group. As can be seen, both groups did not differ on Verbal Short-Term Memory and Rapid Automatic Naming, but they differed significantly on Phonological Awareness ($p = .04$).

3.2. Auditory measures

For every auditory experiment, a paired wise Repeated Measures MMA was computed with group as between-subject variable (HR versus LR) and threshold run as within-subject variable (run 1–3). Results can be summarised as follows: (a) neither for GAP, nor for FM, nor for TN-detection there was a significant group effect ($p = .08$, $p = .33$, and $p = .66$, respectively); (b) the three

[3] Interestingly, this change in significance was caused almost completely by the influence of maternal educational level.

Table 3
Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation: factor loadings of the phonological measures

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
	Phonological awareness	Rapid automatized naming	Verbal short-term memory
Simple rhyme	.68		
Rhyme identity	.83		
First-sound identity	.82		
End-sound identity	.80		
Colour naming		.91	
Picture naming		.92	
Digit span			.83
Non-word repetition test	.36		.74

Note. Only factor loadings above .35 have been depicted.

auditory tests showed a significant effect of threshold run ($p < .001$, $p = .01$, and $p < .001$, respectively); and (c) for none of the tests the group by run interaction was significant ($p = .67$, $p = .21$, and $p = .47$, respectively). For every auditory experiment, post hoc analysis revealed that none of the three threshold measures differentiated significantly between HR and LR group. Furthermore, for every experiment there was only a significant learning effect from the first to the second run; the second and third run did not differ significantly from each other.

Importantly, in contrast to the phonological data, the results were not influenced by applying the conservative MMA design. Even while analysing the auditory data without any covariates added, the null-results were virtually identical.

Although the Repeated Measures MMA revealed a general learning effect from the first to the second threshold run, this tendency did certainly not apply to all subjects. For many of them, the first threshold was better than the second or third, or the second threshold was better than the third. Moreover, since we are interested in threshold estimations as an indicator of a subject's sensory capability, average threshold (or the average of the last two threshold runs) might not be the most appropriate measure; especially not in this age group that traditionally shows a high intrasubject variability (Wightman & Allen, 1992). Because our interest is in the best level of performance a subject is able to reach, a more reasonable estimator of threshold is each subject's "best" performance, or the lowest threshold of the three estimates for every experiment (see Wightman et al., 1989). While using a three-interval oddity paradigm, the probability of progressing to the next more difficult level just by chance is only 11.1% (1–9). This means that the probability of progressing two consecutive levels by guessing is very small (only 1.23%). Hence, on an average of 35 trials for every run and every experiment, it turns out to be very implausible that this "best threshold" would just be the result of lucky guessing instead of reflecting the real sensory capability limit. Threshold estimates and test statistics for the best and second best threshold and for the mean of the two best thresholds are given in Table 4. For every auditory experiment, Mixed Model Analysis showed there was no significant group effect.

Table 4
Auditory measures: descriptive statistics and p values for paired wise MMA, controlling for non-verbal IQ, age, and parental educational level

Measures	HR		LR		p
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
PTA (dB HL)	13.3	5.1	13.4	6.0	.94
Best GAP1 (ms)	4.2	2.4	4.2	3.1	.88
Best GAP2 (ms)	7.4	6.7	5.8	4.3	.30
AV GAP1/2 (ms)	5.8	4.3	5.0	3.6	.40
Best FM1 (Hz)	6.0	3.8	5.4	2.2	.91
Best FM2 (Hz)	10.4	6.2	9.0	6.3	.28
AV FM 1/2 (Hz)	8.2	4.6	7.2	4.0	.41
Best TN1 (dB SNR)	−8.0	2.3	−9.0	1.8	.71
Best TN2 (dB SNR)	−6.9	2.4	−7.5	1.4	.94
AV TN1/2 (dB SNR)	−7.5	2.3	−8.2	1.5	.81

Note. PTA, Pure Tone Average; BestGAP1-2, best and second best GAP threshold; AVGAP1/2, average of the two best GAP thresholds; BestFM1-2, best and second best FM threshold; AVFM1/2, average of the two best FM thresholds; BestTN1-2, best and second best TN threshold; and AVTN1/2, average of the two best TN thresholds.

Spearman rank correlations between the best and the second best threshold estimate for every experiment appeared to be satisfactory and were $r_s = .79$ for GAP, $r_s = .75$ for FM, and $r_s = .83$ for TN, all being significant at the $p < .0001$ level.

Table 5 shows the Spearman rank interrelations between the different auditory psychophysical measures, and their relation to age and non-verbal IQ. None of the auditory tasks seemed to be related to age, and only GAP-detection showed a significant relation to non-verbal intelligence. All auditory tasks appeared to be significantly correlated with each other, with the relation between FM and TN being the most substantial one.

3.3. Relations between phonological and auditory skills

To analyse the relationship between participants' auditory processing skills and their phonological abilities and developing literacy skills, Spearman correlation coefficients were calculated between the participants' GAP, FM, and TN thresholds on the one hand, and the raw and combined phonological and letter knowledge scores on the other hand. Table 6 offers an overview of these correlations for total group (TG), HR-group and LR-group. Correlations have been partialed out for the possible influence of age and non-verbal IQ.

For the total group both FM- and TN-detection were significantly related to all variables measuring phonological awareness skills, and consequently they were also significantly related to the composite Phonological Awareness factor ($r_s = -.48$ and $-.35$, respectively). In

Table 5
Spearman correlation coefficients: age, non-verbal intelligence, and auditory measures

	AVGAP1/2	AVFM1/2	AVTN1/2
Age	0.1	0.15	−0.13
Non-verbal IQ	−0.32*	−0.16	−0.18
AVGAP1/2		0.27*	0.36**
AVFM1/2			0.43***

Note. AVGAP1/2, average of the two best GAP thresholds in ms; AVFM1/2, average of the two best FM thresholds in Hz; AVTN1/2, average of the two best TN thresholds in SNR.
* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.
*** $p < .001$.

contrast, GAP-detection was not related to any of the phonological variables. FM-detection was the only auditory variable being significantly related to letter knowledge.

For both groups separately, slightly different relationships could be observed. In the HR-group only TN-detection was significantly related to Phonological Awareness and its constituent subtasks, whereas in the LR-group FM-detection was exclusively related to this Phonological Awareness factor. Remarkably, in the HR-group both FM and TN-detection appeared to be significantly related to Picture Naming ($r_s = -.41$). The GAP-detection task again appeared to be unrelated to any of the phonological variables. In the subgroups, the power of the Spearman test was too weak to reveal a relation between letter knowledge and any of the auditory variables.

3.4. Individual deviance analysis

Since one of the goals of this study was to explore early indicators of dyslexia and in view of the fact that group comparisons might mask significant individual differences, we also carried out analyses on the subject level. To decide which individual did and did not show abnormal performance, we adopted the two-step criterion as suggested by Ramus et al. (2003). Applying this procedure, the criterion for deviance has been placed on 1.65 standard deviations of the mean of the LR-group. In a normal distribution, this corresponds to the fifth percentile and as such it is a fairly strict criterion. However, if a LR subject may occasionally show abnormal performance, this would make the criterion much more stringent by excessively influencing the LR mean and standard deviations. Moreover, the occurrence of these low scoring LR subjects might be especially probable in this preschool population since there is still a chance that even children of the LR group would become dyslexic. For this reason, the criterion has been applied in two steps: (1) compute the control mean and standard deviation and identify LR subjects who qualify for abnormal performance according to the 1.65 *SD* criterion (typically, this applied to 1 or 2 LR subjects for each measure); (2) recompute the LR mean and standard deviation excluding these deviant LR subjects, and identify HR subjects who are outside ±1.65 *SD*.

Individual scores for the psychophysical measures (average of best and second best threshold) and for the phonological factors are plotted in Fig. 1. A distribution analysis on the data of the 'restricted' LR-group confirmed the normality of these variables. As such, the 1.65 *SD* deviance criterion corresponded indeed to the postulated fifth percentile. A deviance analysis on Phonological Awareness revealed that 12 HR subjects out of 30 showed abnormal performance, this corresponds to 40% of the HR group. In the LR group 5 subjects out of 31

Table 6
Spearman partial correlation coefficients, partialed out for age and non-verbal IQ

	Simple rhyme	Rhyme identity	First-sound identity	End-sound identity	Colour naming	Picture naming	Digit span	Non-word repetition test	Factor PhAW	Factor RAN	Factor VSTM	Letter knowledge
Total group (N = 61)												
AV GAP1/2												
AV FM 1/2	−0.33*	−0.34**	−0.43***	−0.45***		−0.24			−0.48****			−0.29*
AV TN1/2		−0.29*	−0.36**	−0.28*		−0.24			−0.35**			
HR (N = 30)												
AV GAP1/2	−0.36											
AV FM 1/2	−0.43*		−0.34	−0.33	−0.32	−0.41*			−0.34	−0.31		
AV TN1/2		−0.39*	−0.55**	−0.50**		−0.41*			−0.52**		0.36	
LR (N = 31)												
AV GAP1/2												
AV FM 1/2		−0.42*	−0.50**	−0.59***					−0.60***			
AV TN1/2												

Note. AVGAP1/2, average of the two best GAP thresholds in ms; AVFM1/2, average of the two best FM thresholds in Hz; AVTN1/2, average of the two best TN thresholds in SNR. Only correlations with a p value above .10 have been depicted.
* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.
*** $p < .001$.
**** $p < .0001$.



Fig. 1. Individual Z scores on phonological and auditory measures. The solid line indicates the mean for all LR subjects above Pc 5; the dashed line indicates the chosen deviance criterion (1.65 *SD* deviating of the LR mean after excluding deviant LR subjects). Deviant individuals are identified by their pair number.

(=16%) had abnormal performance. For Rapid Automatic Naming 3 subjects out of each group had abnormal performance (corresponding to 10%) and for Verbal STM 3 HR versus 2 LR subjects showed deviant scores (10% versus 6%). Considering the auditory measures, for both FM and GAP detection there were 8 HR subjects versus 4 LR subjects who showed abnormal performance (26% versus 13%). For TN there were 3 HR subjects (10%) versus 1 LR subject (3%) having deviant results.

To summarize, again Phonological Awareness turned out to discriminate best between both groups by having a significant higher proportion of deviant subjects in the HR group (Fisher Exact Test, $p=.04$). For both GAP detection and FM detection the proportion of subjects showing abnormal performance was twice as high in the HR group compared to the LR group. However, this tendency was not significant (Fisher Exact Test, $p=.17$ for both tests).

By looking at the individual scores for all subjects showing abnormal performance in at least one measure, it becomes clear that there is no straightforward regularity or tendency between these measures. Auditory deficits appeared to be largely mutually unrelated with some subjects differing only on one task, others on two or three tasks, but without any consistency. The same applied for deficits on the phonological factors. Moreover, the relation between auditory deficiencies on the one hand and phonological deficiencies (more specifically in phonological awareness) on the other hand was even more ambiguous. Some subjects suffered really serious deficits in auditory processing without showing any phonological problems. Conversely, other subjects obtained deviant phonological results while demonstrating perfectly intact auditory processing. Finally, in some subjects phonological and auditory processing deficits appeared to be partially related.

4. Discussion

4.1. Feasibility of psychophysical testing in preschoolers

One of the main objectives of this study was to explore the feasibility of administering complex psychophysical tests to very young subjects. Based on our results, this research question can be answered entirely confirmative. Not only did the children perform surprisingly accurately, but they also really enjoyed the auditory tasks.

While comparing the auditory thresholds of our LR-subjects with results on identical tasks administered to 11-year-old normal reading children (Van Ingelghem et al., 2004), the preschoolers showed an overall weaker

discrimination capacity (GAP: 4.2 versus 2.1 ms, FM: 5.4 versus 3.3 Hz, and TN: −9.0 versus −12.7 dB SNR). The higher thresholds of preschoolers compared to older children and adults is a general observation that has been demonstrated in numerous auditory studies across all kind of discrimination tasks (e.g., Allen et al., 1989; Irwin, Ball, Kay, Stillman, & Rosser, 1985; Jensen & Neff, 1993; Morrongiello, Kulig, & Clifton, 1984; Trehub, Schneider, & Henderson, 1995; Schneider & Trehub, 1992). However, it remains unclear whether this weaker discrimination reflects an underlying sensory immaturity or has a cognitive origin (e.g., non-optimal listening strategies, fluctuations in attention, etc.). Another general observation in psychophysical testing with preschoolers concerns the higher inter- and intrasubject variability. As Wightman and colleagues demonstrated, the intrasubject variability might mainly result from central non-auditory attentional factors (e.g., Oh, Wightman, & Lutfi, 2001; Wightman et al., 1989; Wightman, Callahan, Lutfi, Kistler, & Oh, 2003). For this reason, the way we reduced this excessive variability by opting for a 'best threshold analysis,' can be justified. In contrast, the intersubject variability is not a result of error variance, but reflects reliable differences in the speed of neural development (e.g., Allen & Wightman, 1994). Because of this substantial intersubject variability caution is required while interpreting averages and group performances (Wightman & Allen, 1992).

4.2. Phonological abilities and letter knowledge

With respect to the phonological data, the exploratory factor analysis convincingly revealed the three-dimensional phonological structure as postulated by Wagner and Torgesen (1987). Moreover, both the group analysis and the individual deviance analysis clearly demonstrated the robustness of the phonological deficit hypothesis in dyslexia-prone children. Even at a preschool age, the HR-children already showed a significant deficit in phonological awareness, not only at the rhyme-level but also at the level of the phonemes. These results are consistent with other longitudinal prospective studies that revealed similar deficits in genetically at risk children (e.g., Elbro, Borstrom, & Petersen, 1998; Gallagher, Frith, & Snowling, 2000; Pennington & Lefly, 2001; Scarborough, 1989, 1990, 1998). The group differences on the factors rapid automatic naming and verbal short-term memory were insignificant but in the expected direction with the HR-group scoring less well than the LR-group. These results are in line with findings by Elbro et al. (1998). However, some researchers did find significant differences on verbal short-term memory (Pennington & Lefly, 2001—significant group difference in first grade, but not in kindergarten) and rapid automatic naming (de Jong & van der Leij, 2003; Pennington & Lefly, 2001), but only while comparing HR *dyslexic* subjects versus LR *normal* readers. This means they retrospectively reanalysed the kindergarten data after having diagnosed their subjects in second or third grade. Since currently the children in our study are still attending kindergarten, we do not yet know who will finally become dyslexic, and consequently we obviously cannot carry out this analysis yet.

Although most children hardly knew any letters at the beginning of the last year in kindergarten (on average about three or four letters), the group difference was already significant. Again this result is in line with any of the previously mentioned longitudinal studies. Since both letter knowledge and phonological awareness have consistently been proven to be among the best single preschool predictors of literacy development (see, e.g., the impressive meta-analysis of Scarborough, 1998; based on 61 studies), and since the HR versus LR group differed especially on these measures, it is likely that the familial high risk group will contain a disproportionally high number of future cases of dyslexia.

4.3. Auditory processing skills

We studied GAP- and FM-detection in order to investigate auditory temporal ('rapid and brief' versus 'dynamic') processing. In line with the temporal hypothesis we expected these tasks to differentiate between both risk groups and to be related to specific pre-reading skills like phonological processing and letter knowledge. However, we did not find any significant differences in auditory processing between the HR and the LR group, neither at a group level nor in individual deviance analyses. Although there were twice as many subjects showing abnormal performance for GAP- and FM-detection in the HR-group, this tendency did not reach significance. Assuming the correctness of the causal auditory hypothesis, this lack of significance might be attributed either to the typically greater interindividual variability in children (cfr. supra) or to the fact that we did not study a well-defined clinical group but only a risk group that still might show substantial overlap with the non-affected control group. Moreover, Bishop et al. (1999) demonstrated in a twin study on SLI children that in contrast to the highly heritable phonological skills, auditory skills depend less on genetic and more on environmental influences. As such, our finding of a phonological deficit in combination with relatively intact auditory skills in this genetic high risk group corresponds well with the results of Bishop and colleagues.

Recently, an alternative explanation has been put forward to explain the variably observed auditory deficits in subjects with specific language impairment and dyslexia. Bishop and colleagues (Bishop & McArthur, 2004, 2005; McArthur & Bishop, 2004) and Wright and Zecker (2004) suggested that these subjects might not suffer from a specific chronic auditory deficit, but rather from

a more general and passing auditory maturational delay (estimated to encompass about three or four years). In that perspective the differential sensitivity of a task will be at best when administered in the age period that the measured skill is sharply improving in typically developing subjects. However, in spite of having administered our auditory tasks during a sensitive developmental period—it has been demonstrated that normally developing five-year-old subjects undergo a rapid maturation of both spectral and temporal auditory abilities[4] (see, e.g., Irwin et al., 1985; Jensen & Neff, 1993; Thompson et al., 1999; Wightman et al., 1989)—we did not observe the hypothesized developmental delay in the HR group. This is markedly in contrast with results obtained by Hautus et al. (2003), who demonstrated that younger reading-impaired children (aged 6–9 years) had significantly higher gap-detection thresholds than age-matched controls while older dyslexic subjects (aged 10–13 and adults) did no longer differ from controls.

4.4. Relations between auditory and phonological abilities

With regard to relations between auditory processing and phonological processing, both FM- and TN-detection thresholds were significantly related to phonological awareness and—to some extent—to rapid automatic naming and letter knowledge. In contrast, the GAP-detection task was completely unrelated to any phonological measure. These results suggest that it is not the specific temporal aspect of auditory processing that is related to developing phonological abilities, since the temporal GAP-detection task was not related whereas the non-temporal TN-detection task turned out to be significantly related to phonological processing. Instead it appears as if the common spectral or frequency sensitive characteristic of TN- and FM-detection causes the relation with phonological ability. At a neurophysiologic level this might imply that a more accurate phase-locking system or smaller and more sharply tuned auditory filters are somehow related to better phonological processing (see, e.g., Carney, Heinz, Evilsizer, Gilkey, & Colburn, 2002; Moore, 1997). This is in line with many studies demonstrating an impairment in frequency discrimination in dyslexic subjects (e.g., Ahissar, Protopapas, Reid, & Merzenich, 2000; Amitay, Ben-Yehudah, Banai, & Ahissar, 2002; Fischer & Hartnegg, 2004; Cacace, McFarland, Ouimet, Schrieber, & Marro, 2000). Talcott et al. (2002) reported similar observations from a large-scale primary school study in which auditory frequency resolution differed between groups of children with different literacy skills. In the same way, Hulslander et al. (2004) observed a significant correlation between FM-thresholds and scores on a phoneme awareness composite, even while controlling for individual differences for full-scale IQ. Evidence supporting the neurophysiologic explanation for a deficit in frequency sensitivity has been put forward by McAnally and Stein (1996) who demonstrated that dyslexics were less able to generate neural discharges phase-locked to the temporal fine structure of the acoustic stimuli. Data consistent with these findings were also reported by Baldeweg, Richardson, Watkins, Foale, and Gurzelier (1999); Dougherty, Cynader, Bjornson, Edgell, and Giaschi (1998) and Schulte Korne et al. (1998). Recently, Amitay, Ahissar, and Nelken (2002) also found evidence for a deficit in tone-in-noise detection in adult dyslexic subjects. However, their results were conflicting with McAnally's findings of a phase-locking deficit in dyslexics (for a similar conclusion see also Hill, Bailey, Griffiths, & Snowling, 1999).

The significant relation we observed between the auditory measures and phonological awareness is in line with the results of Share et al. (2002) who also found a reliable *concurrent* correlation between a non-linguistic TOJ task and phoneme segmentation at school entry. Unfortunately, this relation could not be interpreted in a causal way since the auditory measures were not able to *predict* any later phonological or reading skills. Instead, Share and colleagues speculated that the association between early temporal processing and phonological awareness might be the result of a higher-order common cause of an unspecified metalinguistic nature. Similarly, the substantial concurrent correlation we found between phonological and spectral auditory measures should not be interpreted in a directional or causal way. After all, while inspecting individual data in the deviance analysis, it is clear that there is no obvious straightforward relation between deficits in auditory measures and deficits in phonological skills. Although deviant auditory processing tends to be a risk indicator for a deficit in phonological development, intact auditory processing is certainly not a sufficient prerequisite for developing normal phonological skills. More generally, we have to conclude that we are not able to demonstrate a consistent and convincing pattern in individual deficiencies, neither within the auditory skills, nor within the phonological sub-skills, nor within the relation between auditory and phonological skills.

5. Conclusion

To conclude, phonological awareness and letter knowledge turn out to be the best indicators to differen-

[4] For instance, regarding frequency discrimination, an almost linear improvement has been observed from 4 to 9 years, after which adult levels of performance are obtained (Jensen & Neff, 1993; Thompson, Cranford, & Hoyer, 1999). Similarly, with respect to GAP-detection thresholds, Wightman et al. (1989) and Irwin et al. (1985) observed a sharp maturational improvement from 3 years on up to 7 years and extending slightly up to 11 years before reaching adult levels.

tiate between preschool children with low versus high familial risk of developing dyslexia. In contrast, none of the auditory processing tasks is able to differentiate significantly between both groups. However, auditory spectral tasks (FM and TN-detection thresholds) are highly significantly related to phonological awareness. This relation is not present for a specific temporal GAP-detection task. Nevertheless, identifying deviant subjects in auditory spectral processing in order to predict deficiencies in phonological skills and subsequent reading development does not yet seem to be a viable option, since at the level of individual subjects the relation between auditory and phonological skills seems to be much less straightforward.

Acknowledgments

This research was financed by the Queen Fabiola Fund and the Fund for Scientific Research—Flanders (Belgium), Grant G.0216.02. We thank the children and school staff who were involved in this study, Caroline Van Eccelpoel, Sandra Schoonbrood, and Leen Vanrie for assistance with testing, and we especially show gratitude to Erik Vandenbussche who was one of the inspirators of this project but unfortunately deceased in December 2002. Furthermore, we thank Mieke Van Ingelghem for stimulating discussion, Geert Verbeke for advice about statistical modeling, Willy Leung for creating the animation movies, Johan Laneau for setting up the software for the test platform, and Frederic Wightman and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on previous drafts of this paper.

References

Adlard, A., & Hazan, V. (1998). Speech perception in children with specific reading difficulties (dyslexia). *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 51*(1), 153–177.

Ahissar, M., Protopapas, A., Reid, M., & Merzenich, M. (2000). Auditory processing parallels reading abilities in adults. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science of the United States of America, 97*(12), 6832–6837.

Allen, P., Wightman, F., Kistler, D., & Dolan, T. (1989). Frequency resolution in children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 32*(2), 317–322.

Allen, P., & Wightman, F. (1994). Psychometric functions for children's detection of tones in noise. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 37*(1), 205–215.

Amitay, S., Ahissar, M., & Nelken, I. (2002). Auditory processing deficits in reading disabled adults. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology, 3*, 302–320.

Amitay, S., Ben-Yehudah, G., Banai, K., & Ahissar, M. (2002). Disabled readers suffer from visual and auditory impairments but not from a specific magnocellular deficit. *Brain, 125*(10), 2272–2285.

Baldeweg, T., Richardson, A., Watkins, S., Foale, C., & Gurzelier, J. (1999). Impaired auditory frequency discrimination in dyslexia detected with mismatch evoked potentials. *Annals of Neurology, 45*(4), 495–503.

Benasich, A. A., & Tallal, P. (2002). Infant discrimination of rapid auditory cues predicts later language impairment. *Behavioural Brain Research, 136*, 31–49.

Bishop, D. V., Bishop, S. J., Bright, P., James, C., Delaney, T., & Tallal, P. (1999). Different origin of auditory and phonological processing problems in children with language impairment: Evidence from a twin study. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 42*(1), 155–168.

Bishop, D. V. M., & McArthur, G. M. (2004). Immature cortical responses to auditory stimuli in specific language impairment: Evidence from ERPs to rapid tone sequences. *Developmental Science, 7*(4), F11–F18.

Bishop, D. V. M., & McArthur, G. M. (2005). Individual differences in auditory processing in specific language impairment: A follow-up study using event-related potentials and behavioural thresholds. *Cortex, 41*(3), 327–341.

Cacace, A. T., McFarland, D. J., Ouimet, J. R., Schrieber, E. J., & Marro, P. (2000). Temporal processing deficits in remediation-resistant reading-impaired children. *Audiology and Neurootology, 5*(2), 83–97.

Carney, L. H., Heinz, M. G., Evilsizer, M. E., Gilkey, R. H., & Colburn, H. S. (2002). Auditory phase opponency: A temporal model for masked detection at low frequencies. *Acta Acustica, 88*, 334–347.

de Jong, P. F., & van der Leij, A. (1999). Specific contributions of phonological abilities to early reading acquisition: Results from a Dutch latent variable longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(3), 450–476.

de Jong, P. F., Seveke, M. J., & van Veen, M. (2000). Phonological sensitivity and the acquisition of new words in children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 76*(4), 275–301.

de Jong, P. F., & van der Leij, A. (2003). Developmental changes in the manifestation of a phonological deficit in dyslexic children learning to read a regular orthography. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(1), 22–40.

Dougherty, R. F., Cynader, M. S., Bjornson, B. H., Edgell, D., & Giaschi, D. E. (1998). Dichotic pitch: A new stimulus distinguishes normal and dyslexic auditory function. *Neuroreport, 9*(13), 3001–3005.

Elbro, C., Borstrom, I., & Petersen, D. (1998). Predicting dyslexia from kindergarten: The importance of distinctness of phonological representations of lexical items. *Reading Research Quarterly, 33*(1), 36–60.

Elbro, C., & Scarborough, H. S. (2003). Early identification. In P. Bryant & T. Nunes (Eds.), *Handbook of children's reading* (pp. 339–359). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Fischer, B., & Hartnegg, K. (2004). On the development of low-level auditory discrimination and deficits in dyslexia. *Dyslexia, 10*(2), 105–118.

Gallagher, A., Frith, U., & Snowling, M. J. (2000). Precursors of literacy delay among children at genetic risk of dyslexia. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 41*(2), 203–213.

Gathercole, S., & Pickering, S. (2000). Assessment of working memory in six- and seven-year-old children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*, 377–390.

Gathercole, S. E., Willis, C. S., Baddeley, A. D., & Emslie, H. (1994). The Children's Test of Nonword Repetition: A test of phonological working memory. *Memory, 2*(2), 103–127.

Gilger, J. W., Pennington, B. F., & DeFries, J. C. (1991). Risk for reading disability as a function of parental history in three family studies. *Reading and Writing, 3*(3-4), 205–217.

Hautus, M. J., Setchell, G. J., Waldie, K. E., & Kirk, I. J. (2003). Age-related improvements in auditory temporal resolution in reading-impaired children. *Dyslexia, 9*, 37–45.

Heath, S. M., & Hogben, J. H. (2004). Cost-effective prediction of reading difficulties. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 47*, 751–765.

Hill, N. I., Bailey, P. J., Griffiths, Y. M., & Snowling, M. J. (1999). Frequency acuity and binaural masking release in dyslexic listeners. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 106*(6), 53–58.

Hulslander, J., Talcott, J., Witton, C., DeFries, J., Pennington, B., Wadsworth, S., et al. (2004). Sensory processing, reading, IQ and attention. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 88*, 274–295.

Irwin, R. J., Ball, A. K., Kay, N., Stillman, J. A., & Rosser, J. (1985). The development of auditory temporal acuity in children. *Child Development, 56*(3), 614–620.

Jensen, J. K., & Neff, D. L. (1993). Development of basic auditory discrimination in preschool children. *Psychological Science, 4*(2), 104–107.

Laneau, J., Boets, B., Moonen, M., van Wieringen, A., & Wouters, J. (2005). A flexible auditory research platform using acoustic or electric stimuli for adults and young children. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 142*(1), 131–136.

Lefly, D. L., & Pennington, B. F. (2000). Reliability and validity of the adult reading history questionnaire. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 33*(3), 286–296.

Levitt, H. (1971). Transformed up-down methods in psychoacoustics. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 49*, 467–477.

Littell, R. C., Milliken, G. A., Stroup, W. W., & Wolfinger, R. D. (1996). *SAS system for mixed models*. Cary, NC: Sas Institute Inc.

Lyytinen, H., Ahonen, T., Eklund, K., Guttorm, T. K., Laakso, M. L., Leinonen, S., et al. (2001). Developmental pathways of children with and without familial risk for dyslexia during the first years of life. *Developmental Neuropsychology, 20*(2), 535–554.

McAnally, K. I., & Stein, J. F. (1996). Auditory temporal coding in dyslexia. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences, 263*, 961–965.

McAnally, K. I., & Stein, J. F. (1997). Scalp potentials evoked by amplitude-modulated tones in dyslexia. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research, 40*(4), 939–945.

McArthur, G. M., & Bishop, D. V. M. (2004). Which people with specific language impairment have auditory deficits. *Cognitive Neuropsychology, 21*(1), 79–94.

McBride Chang, C. (1996). Models of speech perception and phonological processing in reading. *Child Development, 67*(4), 1836–1856.

McCroskey, R. L., & Kidder, H. C. (1980). Auditory fusion among learning disabled, reading disabled, and normal children. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 13*(2), 69–76.

Menell, P., McAnally, K. I., & Stein, J. F. (1999). Psychophysical sensitivity and physiological response to amplitude modulation in adult dyslexic listeners. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 42*(4), 797–803.

Molfese, D. L. (2000). Predicting dyslexia at 8 years of age using neonatal brain responses. *Brain and Language, 72*(3), 238–245.

Moore, B. C. J. (1997). *An introduction to the psychology of hearing*. London: Academic Press.

Morrongiello, B. A., Kulig, J. W., & Clifton, R. K. (1984). Developmental changes in auditory temporal perception. *Child Development, 55*(2), 461–471.

Oh, E. L., Wightman, F. L., & Lutfi, R. A. (2001). Children's detection of pure-tone signals with random multitone maskers. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 109*, 2888–2895.

Pennington, B. F., & Lefly, D. L. (2001). Early reading development in children at family risk for dyslexia. *Child Development, 72*(3), 816–833.

Ramus, F., Rosen, S., Dakin, S. C., Day, B. L., Castellote, J. M., White, S., et al. (2003). Theories of developmental dyslexia: Insights from a multiple case study of dyslexic adults. *Brain, 126*(4), 841–865.

Raven, J. C., Court, J. H., & Raven, J. (1984). *Manual for Raven's progressive matrices and vocabulary scales*. London: Lewis.

Rocheron, I., Lorenzi, C., Fullgrabe, C., & Dumont, A. (2002). Temporal envelope perception in dyslexic children. *Neuroreport, 13*(13), 1683–1687.

Rolf, P. C., & Van Rijnsoever, R. J. (1984). *Positionele letterfrekwenties van het Nederlands*. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Scarborough, H. S. (1989). Prediction of reading disability from familial and individual differences. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*(1), 101–108.

Scarborough, H. S. (1990). Very early language deficits in dyslexic children. *Child Development, 61*(6), 1728–1743.

Scarborough, H. S. (1998). Early identification of children at risk for reading disabilities: Phonological awareness and some other promising predictors. In P. J. Accardo, A. J. Capute, & B. K. Shapiro (Eds.), *Specific reading disability: A view of the spectrum* (pp. 75–119). Timonium, MD: York Press.

Scheltinga, F. (2003). *The Dutch Nonword Repetition Test*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Amsterdam.

Schneider, B. A., & Trehub, S. E. (1992). Sources of developmental change in auditory sensitivity. In L. A. Werner & E. W. Rubel (Eds.), *Developmental psychoacoustics* (pp. 3–46). Washington: American Psychological Association.

Schulte Korne, G., Deimel, W., Bartling, J., & Remschmidt, H. (1998). Role of auditory temporal processing for reading and spelling disability. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 86*(3), 1043–1047.

Share, D. L., Jorm, A. F., Maclean, R., & Matthews, R. (2002). Temporal processing and reading disability. *Reading and Writing, 15*(1–2), 151–178.

Snowling, M. J. (2000). *Dyslexia* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Soderquist, D. R., & Shilling, R. D. (1992). Forward masking in young children—Rocket ship psychophysics. *Current Psychology: Research and Reviews, 11*(2), 145–156.

Stein, J. F., & McAnally, K. (1995). Auditory temporal processing in developmental dyslexics. *Irish Journal of Psychology, 16*(3), 220–228.

Studdert Kennedy, M., & Mody, M. (1995). Auditory temporal perception deficits in the reading-impaired: A critical review of the evidence. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 2*(4), 508–514.

Talcott, J. B., Witton, C., McClean, M., Hansen, P. C., Rees, A., Green, G., et al. (1999). Can sensitivity to auditory frequency modulation predict children's phonological and reading skills?. *Neuroreport, 10*(10), 2045–2050.

Talcott, J. B., Witton, C., McLean, M. F., Hansen, P. C., Rees, A., Green, G. G., et al. (2000). Dynamic sensory sensitivity and children's word decoding skills. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science of the United States of America, 97*(6), 2952–2957.

Talcott, J. B., Witton, C., Hebb, G. S., Stoodley, C. J., Westwood, E. A., France, S. J., et al. (2002). On the relationship between dynamic visual and auditory processing and literacy skills; results from a large primary-school study. *Dyslexia, 8*(4), 204–225.

Tallal, P., & Piercy, M. (1973). Defects of nonverbal auditory perception in children with developmental aphasia. *Nature, 241*, 468–469.

Tallal, P., & Piercy, M. (1975). Developmental aphasia: Rate of auditory processing and selective impairment of consonant perception. *Neuropsychologia, 13*, 69–74.

Tallal, P. (1980). Auditory temporal perception, phonics, and reading disabilities in children. *Brain and Language, 9*(2), 182–198.

Tallal, P., Miller, S., & Fitch, R. H. (1993). Neurobiological basis of speech: A case for the preeminence of temporal processing. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 682*, 27–47.

Thompson, N. C., Cranford, J. L., & Hoyer, E. (1999). Brief-tone frequency discrimination by children. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 42*, 1061–1068.

Trehub, S. E., Schneider, B. A., & Henderson, J. L. (1995). Gap detection in infants, children, and adults. *Journal of the Acoustic Society of America, 98*(5 Pt. 1), 2532–2541.

van den Bos, K. P., Zijlstra, B. J. H., & Spelberg, H. C. (2002). Life-span data on continuous-naming speeds of numbers, letters, colors, and pictured objects, and word-reading speed. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 6*(1), 25–49.

Van Ingelghem, M., van Wieringen, A., Wouters, J., Vandenbussche, E., Onghena, P., & Ghesquiere, P. (2001). Psychophysical evidence for a general temporal processing deficit in children with dyslexia. *Neuroreport, 12*(16), 3603–3607.

Van Ingelghem, M., Boets, B., van Wieringen, A., Ghesquiere, P., & Wouters, J. (2004). Auditory and visual temporal processing in dyslexic and normal reading children matched for sex, age and intellectual ability. In Paper presented at the 6th BDA International conference, 27–30 March 2004, University of Warwick, UK.

Van Ingelghem, M., Boets, B., van Wieringen, A., Onghena, P., Ghesquiere, P., & Wouters, J. (2005). An auditory temporal processing deficit in children with dyslexia. In P. Ghesquiere & A. J. J. M. Ruijssenaars (Eds.), *Children with learning disabilities: A challenge to teaching and instruction Series: Studia Paedagogica* (pp. 47–63). Leuven: University Press.

van Wieringen, A., & Wouters, J. (1999). Gap detection in single- and multiple- channel stimuli by LAURA cochlear implantees. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 106*, 1925–1939.

Verbeke, G., & Lesaffre, E. (1997). The effect of misspecifying the random-effects distribution in linear mixed models for longitudinal data. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis, 23*, 541–556.

Wagner, R. K., & Torgesen, J. K. (1987). The nature of phonological processing and its causal role in the acquisition of reading skills. *Psychological Bulletin, 101*(2), 192–212.

Wechsler, D. (1992). *Wechsler intelligence scale for children* (3rd ed.). London: The Psychological Corporation.

Wightman, F., Allen, P., Dolan, T., Kistler, D., & Jamieson, D. (1989). Temporal resolution in children. *Child Development, 60*(3), 611–624.

Wightman, F., & Allen, P. (1992). Individual differences in auditory capability among preschool children. In L. A. Werner & E. W. Rubel (Eds.), *Developmental Psychoacoustics* (pp. 113–134). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Wightman, F. L., Callahan, M. R., Lutfi, R. A., Kistler, D. J., & Oh, E. (2003). Children's detection of pure-tone signals: Informational masking with contralateral maskers. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 113*(6), 3297–3305.

Witton, C., Talcott, J. B., Hansen, P. C., Richardson, A. J., Griffiths, T. D., Rees, A., et al. (1998). Sensitivity to dynamic auditory and visual stimuli predicts nonword reading ability in both dyslexic and normal readers. *Current Biology, 8*(14), 791–797.

Wright, B. A., & Zecker, S. G. (2004). Learning problems, delayed development and puberty. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science of the United States of America, 101*(26), 9942–9946.

Coherent motion detection in preschool children at family risk for dyslexia

Bart Boets[1], Jan Wouters[2],

Astrid van Wieringen[2] & Pol Ghesquière[1]

[1]Centre for Disability, Special Needs Education and Child Care,

University of Leuven, Belgium

&

[2]Laboratory for Experimental ORL,

University of Leuven, Belgium

Corresponding author:

Bart Boets

Centre for Disability, Special Needs Education and Child Care

Faculty of Psychology and Educational Science

University of Leuven

Vesaliusstraat 2, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

Tel. +32 (0)16/ 32.61.82

Fax. +32 (0)16/ 32.59.33

Email: bart.boets@ped.kuleuven.ac.be

ABSTRACT

We tested sensitivity to coherent motion (CM) in random dot kinematograms in a group of five-year-old preschool children genetically at risk for dyslexia, compared to a group of well-matched control children. No significant differences were observed, either in a group analysis or in an individual deviance analysis. Nonetheless, CM-thresholds were significantly related to emerging orthographic skills. In a previous study on the same subjects (Boets, van Wieringen, Wouters, Ghesquière, submitted), we demonstrated that both risk groups already differed on measures of phonological awareness and letter knowledge. Moreover, auditory spectral processing (especially 2 Hz FM detection) was significantly related to phonological ability. In sum, the actual visual and previous auditory data combined, seem to suggest an exclusive relation between CM sensitivity and orthographic skills on the one hand, and FM sensitivity and phonological skills on the other.

KEYWORDS: Dyslexia; Preschool children; Motion Coherence; Auditory frequency modulation; Magnocellular

INTRODUCTION

Developmental dyslexia is a specific failure to acquire reading and spelling skills despite adequate intelligence and education, affecting around 5-10 % of children and adults. The predominant etiological view postulates that dyslexia results from a phonological deficit (Snowling, 2000). However, extensive research during the last decade also demonstrated a specific sensory processing deficit in individuals with dyslexia and it has been suggested that this deficit might be causal to both the observed phonological and literacy problems (Farmer & Klein, 1995; Stein, 2001). To investigate the assumed causality of this sensorial deficit hypothesis we assessed auditory and visual processing in two contrasting groups of five-year-old preschool children, a genetically high risk and a genetically low risk group. In a previous paper (Boets et al., submitted) we reported the absence of a significant group difference for any of three administered auditory measures, in the presence of a significant difference for phonological awareness and letter knowledge. However, spectral auditory tasks (particularly 2 Hz frequency modulation detection) turned out to be highly significantly related to phonological awareness. In this paper, we will focus upon sensory processing in the visual modality, assessed in the same group of preschool children. In particular, we consider the question whether a deficit in coherent motion processing may already be observable in preschool children at risk of dyslexia and we investigate the relationship between motion processing and developing literacy skills.

Within the visual modality, dyslexia research has mainly focused upon sensory processing in the magnocellular visual pathway. Early studies using stimuli that assess the peripheral visual system (e.g., contrast sensitivity and flicker sensitivity paradigms) demonstrated that dyslexics tend to show a deficit in processing stimuli with low spatial and high temporal resolution (for a review, see Lovegrove, 1996, but see Skottun, 2000 for a critical revision). More recently, interesting results have also been obtained with

stimuli that imply higher level magnocellular functioning such as coherent motion detection tasks (CM). These tasks, relying predominantly upon processing in area V5/MT of the cortex, have proven to differentiate relatively reliable between groups of dyslexic and normal reading subjects (Witton et al., 1998; Raymond & Sorensen, 1998; Talcott, Hansen, Assoku, & Stein, 2000; Hansen, Stein, Orde, Winter, & Talcott, 2001; Ridder, Borsting, & Banton, 2001; Talcott et al., 2003; Cornelissen, Richardson, Mason, Fowler, & Stein, 1995; Everatt, Bradshaw, & Hibbard, 1999; Van Ingelghem, Boets, van Wieringen, Ghesquière, & Wouters, 2004; Wilmer, Richardson, Chen, & Stein, 2004). Moreover, functional imaging studies have confirmed that activation of area V5/MT in response to coherent motion stimuli was not as robust in dyslexics compared to controls (Eden et al., 1996). Demb, Boyner and Heeger (1997) have even demonstrated a reliable relation between the magnitude of the hemodynamic BOLD-response in extrastriate area MT and overall reading skills in dyslexic subjects. In psychophysical studies too, sensitivity to motion stimuli has been related to (nonword) reading ability (Van Ingelghem et al., 2004; Witton et al., 1998, Talcott et al., 1998), orthographic ability (Talcott et al., 2000; Talcott et al., 2002; Van Ingelghem et al., 2004) and letter position encoding (Cornelissen et al., 1998). However, evidence of a motion coherence deficit in dyslexia is not yet unequivocal since some studies failed to find differentiating thresholds (Kronbichler, Hutzler, & Wimmer, 2002; Ramus et al., 2003; Amitay, Ben-Yehudah, Banai, & Ahissar, 2002; Hulslander et al., 2004). Moreover, a deficit in motion processing might not be an exclusive characteristic of dyslexia, since it has also been demonstrated in other developmental disorders like for example autism (Milne et al., 2002) and Williams-syndrome (see e.g., Atkinson et al., 1997).

Regarding the specific mechanism by which coherent motion sensitivity may limit normal literacy development, there is still much speculation. Since CM-thresholds

are a robust measure of magnocellular processing and since this visual subsystem is mostly involved in encoding spatial information, it is probable that poor magnocellular functioning might result in uncertainty about letter position while reading and writing (Cornelissen et al., 1998). Furthermore, a magnocellular deficit has also been related to binocular instability and poor eye movement control, visual attention and visual search – all factors that might interfere with the development of orthographic skills and subsequent reading and spelling skills (Stein & Talcott, 1999; Stein, 2001; Talcott et al., 2000).

Notwithstanding the considerable empirical evidence that CM-thresholds are able to differentiate reliably between adult and school-aged dyslexic and normal reading subjects, the differentiating and predictive power of this task has never been investigated in preschool children. In this study we want to address this issue. Furthermore, to investigate the specific relation between sensory processing and different aspects of literacy development, we will also integrate the previously administered phonological measures and the 2 Hz FM detection thresholds in our correlation analyses. This has been done since in a series of former studies CM detection has gradually been linked to FM detection (see e.g. Witton et al., 1998; Talcott et al., 2000; Talcott et al., 2002; Talcott et al., 2003). According to Talcott, Witton and colleagues both psychophysical tasks could be regarded as 'dynamic' stimuli tasks by relying upon long-duration stimuli that require the perception of a dimension changing in time ('perception of rate'). While CM detection depends on the successful detection and integration of local motion signals over both time and space, FM detection depends on tracking the dynamic changes in the frequency of a tone over time. Interestingly, in some recent studies where FM and CM-detection tasks have been administered to the same subjects (school-aged children), it has been demonstrated that orthographic skills co-vary most strongly with CM sensitivity, whereas phonological

skills co-vary most strongly with FM sensitivity (Talcott et al., 2000; Talcott & Witton, 2002). In this study we will explore whether these specific relations might already be present in preschool subjects.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

Sixty-two five-year-old children attending the last year of kindergarten[1] were included in the study (36 boys / 26 girls). Half of the participants were children of 'dyslexic families', the so-called high-risk group (HR); the other half were control children of 'normal reading families', the so-called low-risk group (LR). All children were native Dutch speakers without any history of brain damage, long term hearing loss or visual problems. Additionally, at the moment of data collection they did not present any gross deficiencies in visual acuity (Landolt-C single optotypes Snellen acuity > 0.85) and/or audiology (audiometric pure-tone average < 25 dB HL). The HR children were selected on a basis of having at least one first-degree relative with a diagnosis of dyslexia. The LR children showed no history of speech or language problems and none of their family members suffered any learning or language problems. For every individual HR child we selected the best matching LR control child based on five criteria: (1) educational environment, i.e. same nursery school, (2) gender, (3) age, (4) nonverbal intelligence, and (5) parental educational level. Nonverbal intelligence was assessed by an adapted version of the Raven Coloured Progressive Matrices (RCPM) (Raven, Court, & Raven, 1984), a collective non-verbal intelligence test measuring spatial reasoning. Parental educational level was assessed using the ISCED-scale (International Standard Classification of Education by UNESCO, 1997),

[1] In the Belgian school system formal instruction starts in Grade 1 at six years. This means in kindergarten no reading instruction is offered.

by converting classifications on the original seven-point scale to a three-point scale. Further details about the participants and the selection procedure are described in Boets et al., (submitted).

Table 1 gives descriptive characteristics of both groups. At the time of collecting the visual data the mean age for both the HR and LR group was 5 years and 8 months, not being statistically different ($p = .83$). The nonverbal IQ scores were slightly above population average (107 for HR group and 111 for LR group) and did not differ significantly ($p = 0.07$). Fisher's Exact Test also confirms that both groups did not differ in frequency distribution of the different educational categories ($p = .71$ for maternal and $p = .43$ for paternal educational level).

<INSERT TABLE 1>

Apparatus

Phonological skills were assessed by a broad test battery comprising eight tests. A principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation confirmed that the battery reflected the three traditional phonological domains: (a) *phonological awareness* (Phon Awareness): high loadings from first-sound and end-sound identity task, rhyme identity task and simple rhyme task, (b) *rapid automatic naming* (RAN): high loadings from both the colours and objects rapid automatic naming tasks and (c) *verbal short-term memory* (Verbal STM): high loadings from the nonword repetition task and the digit span forward task. Details about the composition of the battery can be found in Boets et al., (submitted); in this paper we will only refer to the factor scores.

Productive letter knowledge. This task was intended as a preliminary measure of literacy development. The sixteen most frequently used letters in Dutch books were

presented on a card and the child had to name each of these letters. Both the sound and the name of a letter were considered correct.

CM-detection test. For the CM-detection test, children were sitting in a low-luminance (mesopic) environment at 40 cm distance from an Elo Intuitive 1725L 17'' touch screen (75 Hz refresh rate) on which the random dot kinematograms (RDK) were displayed. The display resolution was set to 640 x 480 pixels. The stimuli were generated online by a portable computer (Dell Latitude C800 and Toshiba Satellite 1400-103) and comprised of two rectangular patches, each containing 1103 randomly moving high luminance white dots on a black background (dot size = 1 pixel or 0.07° diameter, dot density = 2.5 dots/deg^2, velocity = 7.3 deg/sec, life time = 5 video frames or 200 msec, maximal duration of stimulus presentation = 6 sec, luminance of dots = 125 cd/m^2, luminance of background = 0.39 cd/m^2, Michelson contrast = 99.4 %). At a viewing distance of 40 cm each patch of dots subtended 16 x 27.2° visual angle, separated horizontally by 3.8°. The target patch was segregated into three horizontal strips (see Gunn et al., 2002); in the middle strip a variable proportion of dots were moving coherently in horizontal direction, reversing direction every 330 msec – creating as such the impression of 'an emerging road in the snow'. All other dots were moving randomly in a Brownian manner. The two patches were presented simultaneously and the subject had to identify the patch containing the strip with coherently moving dots. Threshold was defined as the smallest proportion of coherently moving dots required for detection of the middle strip with reversing dot motion. Thresholds were estimated using a two-down, one-up adaptive staircase paradigm, which targeted the threshold corresponding to 70.7 % correct responses (Levitt, 1971). Percentage coherence in the middle strip of the target patch started at 100 % and decreased with a factor of 1.16. After four reversals factor 1.14 was used. A threshold run was terminated after eight reversals and thresholds for an individual run were calculated by the geometric mean of

the values of the last four reversals. For every subject four thresholds were determined. Prior to data collection, participants were given a short period of practice, comprising supra-threshold trials, to familiarise them with the stimuli and the task.

To ensure the child's attention and motivation we integrated the psychophysical test in a computer game with animation movies, aimed to transform the abstract meaningless stimuli into a concrete and well-known 'daily life signal'. Before administering the CM-detection experiment children watched an introductory animation movie about a little dog and a little bear getting lost in the snow. The children were asked to help them find their way home again by visually inspecting each stimulus patch and reporting which patch contains the road to get home (inspired by work of Atkinson et al., 2003). Immediately after the child's response, corresponding auditory feedback was presented.

FM-detection test. In this test participants had to detect a 2 Hz sinusoidal frequency modulation of a 1 kHz carrier tone with varying modulation depth. Threshold was defined as the minimum depth of frequency deviation required to detect the modulation. Modulation depth decreased with a factor 1.2 from 100 Hz towards 11 Hz, from where a fixed step size of 1 Hz was used. The length of both the reference and the target stimulus was 1000 ms including 50 ms cosine-gated onset and offset. Stimuli were generated in MATLAB 5.1 and saved as 16-bit wav-files (sample frequency 44100 Hz) on the hard disc of the same portable computers as used for the CM-experiment. They were presented using an integrated audio PC-card and routed to an audiometer (Madsen OB622) in order to control the level of presentation. The stimuli were presented monaurally over a calibrated TDH-39 headphone at 70 dB SPL with an ISI of 350 ms. FM-thresholds were estimated using a three-interval forced-choice oddity paradigm embedded within an interactive computer game with animation movies (Laneau, Boets, Moonen, van Wieringen & Wouters, 2005). Similarly to the CM-

experiment a two-down, one-up adaptive staircase procedure was used and threshold was calculated as the geometric mean of the values of the last four of eight reversals. After a short period of practice, three thresholds were determined for every subject. For the correlation data we present here, the average of the best and second best threshold was used as an indicator of FM sensitivity. A more detailed description of the stimuli, procedure and results can be found in Boets et al., (submitted).

Data collection was carried out by qualified psychologists and audiologists. Testing took place in a quiet room at the children's school. Since the LR child was selected from the HR child's classmates, both children could always be tested in exactly the same circumstances.

Statistical Analysis

Prior to analysis, psychophysical thresholds were $\log_{10}$-transformed in order to obtain normally distributed data. All results were analysed in a paired wise manner, comparing HR versus LR group at the level of the matched individuals. Although the groups did not show a significant difference on any of the matching criteria, we decided to rule out any possible influence of age, nonverbal intelligence or parental educational level by controlling for these variables in our analysis. As such, we analysed the data using Mixed Model Analysis (MMA) with school as a random variable (1 to 31) and participant group (HR versus LR) as the fixed between-subject variable (Littell, Milliken, Stroup, & Wolfinger, 1996). Age, nonverbal IQ and educational level of both mother and father were added as fixed (co)variables. Relationships between variables were analysed using Spearman correlation coefficients, partialed out for the influence of nonverbal intelligence.

RESULTS

A paired wise Repeated Measures MMA with group as between-subject variable (HR versus LR), threshold run as within-subject variable (run 1 to 4) and with the same covariates as mentioned above, revealed no significant effect for group ($p = .20$), a significant effect for threshold run ($p < .0001$) and no significant group x run interaction effect ($p = .25$). Post-hoc analysis revealed that none of the four CM threshold measures differentiated significantly between HR and LR group. Furthermore, there was only a significant learning effect from the first to the second run; the second, third and fourth run did not differ significantly from each other.

Although the Repeated Measures MMA revealed a general learning effect from the first to the second run, this tendency did not apply to all subjects. For many of them, the first threshold was better than the second, third or fourth. Moreover, since we are interested in threshold estimation as an indicator of a subject's true sensory capability – i.e. the best level of performance a subject is able to reach, regardless of interfering factors like for example fluctuations in concentration and motivation – average threshold (or the average of the last two or three threshold runs) might not be the most appropriate measure. To cope with the high intrasubject variability which is typical for younger children (see e.g. Wightman & Allen, 1992), a more reasonable estimator is each subject's 'best' performance, or the lowest threshold of the different runs. For this reason we used the average of the best and second best threshold as a true indicator of a child's CM sensitivity. The Spearman rank correlation between this best and second best threshold estimate appeared to be very satisfactory ($\underline{r}_s = .91$, $p < .0001$), indicating a reliable threshold estimation.

Threshold estimates and test statistics for the best and second best threshold and for the average of the two best thresholds are given in Table 1. Although the observed difference was in the expected direction with the HR-group scoring less well than the

LR-group, the coherent motion detection task did not differentiate significantly between the groups. It is worth mentioning that these null-results were not merely the consequence of applying such a strict controlling MMA design, as the results were virtually identical when the analysis was repeated without any covariates added.

Since group comparisons might mask major individual differences, we also carried out an analysis at the subject level. To decide which individual did and did not show abnormal performance, we adopted the two-step criterion as suggested by Ramus et al., (2003). Applying this procedure, the criterion for deviance was placed at 1.65 standard deviations of the 'purified' mean of the LR-group, after first having excluded all deviant LR-subjects (by applying a similar 1.65 SD criterion, resulting in the removal of two deviant LR subjects). A distribution analysis on the coherent motion thresholds of the 'restricted' LR-group confirmed the normality of the data. Hence, the 1.65 SD deviance criterion corresponds to the fifth percentile and is thus a fairly strict criterion. The individual deviance analysis for the averaged best and second best coherent motion threshold revealed that the proportion of subjects showing abnormal performance was equal in both groups: four subjects in the HR group and four subjects in the LR group scored below the fifth percentile. This corresponded to 13 % of each group.

<INSERT TABLE 2 AND 3 ABOUT HERE>

Table 2 shows Spearman rank interrelations between psychophysical thresholds, phonological ability and letter knowledge, and their relation to age and nonverbal IQ. Neither CM, nor FM were related to age, and only CM-detection showed a significant relation to nonverbal intelligence. To exclude the variance attributable to individual differences in intelligence, all further correlations have been partialed out for the

influence of nonverbal IQ. Table 3 offers similar Spearman rank correlations for both risk groups separately.

FM-detection was highly significantly related to Phonological Awareness and – to a lesser extent - to Productive Letter Knowledge. There was no correlation with Verbal STM and only in the HR group the correlation with Rapid Automatic Naming was significant. The relation with Phonological Awareness seemed to be the most robust in the LR-group where 37 % of the variance in phonological awareness could be predicted from sensitivity to FM. CM-detection on the other hand, turned out to be completely unrelated to any phonological measure, but was significantly related to Letter Knowledge. However, this relation only seemed to hold for the LR-group.

In previous research CM-detection has been found to be specifically related to orthographic skills. Since it is impossible to administer a pure orthographic test at this preschool age, we considered Letter Knowledge as the best approximate measure to obtain an indication about orthographic ability. After all, resolving a letter knowledge task relies on recognizing the visual features of the written symbol on the one hand, and retrieving the corresponding linguistic information on the other. As such, Letter Knowledge might be regarded as a measure that reflects both orthographic and phonological skills. To create a more 'pure' orthographic measure we extracted all the phonological aspects out of the letter knowledge task by statistically removing all the variance due to differences in Phonological Awareness, Rapid Automatic Naming and Verbal STM. Concretely, we calculated the Spearman correlation between CM and Letter Knowledge and added nonverbal IQ, Phonological Awareness, Rapid Automatic Naming and Verbal STM as partial variables. In doing so, we still observed a significant relation between CM and the orthographic aspects of Letter Knowledge, both in the total group (r_s = -.27, p = .04) and in the LR-group (r_s = -.41, p = .03). For the HR-group this relation was considerable but not significant (r_s = -.31, p = .11). This means, that

again the relation turned out to be the most substantial in the LR-group where 17 % of the variance in orthographic skills could be predicted from sensitivity to CM-detection. Interestingly, in contrast, the correlation between FM and the orthographic aspect of Letter Knowledge was not significant (in neither of the two groups). Considering the whole of these observations, this seems to imply an exclusive relation between FM and phonological awareness on the one hand, and CM and orthographic skills on the other (see Figure 1A and 1B).

<INSERT FIGURE 1>

Although FM and CM appeared to be related to different and dissociated aspects of literacy development, they also shared some common variance. Indeed, both in the total group and in the LR-group FM and CM were significantly related to each other. Again, this relation was not present in the HR-group. This might imply that both psychophysical tasks (at least in the LR-group) rely upon some common neurological mechanism involved in 'dynamic processing'. Importantly, this hypothesised common mechanism is not involved in psychophysical processing in general, since CM proved to be completely unrelated to two other auditory measures that were also administered to the same subjects (i.e. gap detection in broadband noise and tone-in-noise detection; for details see Boets, et al., submitted).

DISCUSSION

In this study we tested sensory processing and phonological and orthographic abilities in five-year-old preschool subjects who never received any formal reading instruction. As reported previously, a significant deficit in phonological awareness and letter knowledge could be demonstrated in the dyslexia-prone HR group. Consequently, since both letter knowledge and phonological awareness have consistently been proven

to be the best preschool predictors of literacy development (see e.g. Scarborough, 1998), it is likely that the genetically high risk group will contain a disproportionally high number of future cases of dyslexia.

For CM detection we did not observe any significant differences between the high and low risk groups, either at a group level, or in the individual deviance analysis. Although these results are consistent with a minority of studies that also failed to find any group differences (Kronbichler et al., 2002; Amitay et al., 2002; Ramus et al., 2003; Hulslander et al., 2004), they clearly conflict with the mass of evidence provided by most other studies. The same applied to the FM detection data that did not reveal a group difference either. A straightforward explanation for this lack of a group difference might be the fact that we did not study a well-defined clinical group but only an at risk group that still might show substantial overlap with the control group. Moreover, Bishop et al., (1999) demonstrated in a twin study on SLI children that in contrast to the highly heritable phonological skills, auditory skills depend less on genetic and more on environmental influences. As such, our finding of a phonological deficit in combination with relatively intact sensorial skills in this genetic high risk group corresponds well with the results of Bishop and colleagues.

Considering the relations between sensory processing and the orthographic and phonological sub skills of literacy development, our preschool data convincingly confirm previous results from adults and school-aged children (Talcott et al., 2000; Talcott & Witton, 2002). Even while taking into account the influence of general cognitive ability, sensitivity to CM seems to be uniquely related to orthographic skills, whereas sensitivity to FM seems to be specifically related to phonological skills. This relation appears to be the most robust in the LR group where 17% of the variance in orthographic skills could be predicted from differences in sensitivity to CM and 37% of the variance in phonological awareness could be predicted from sensitivity to FM.

The finding of these more substantial correlations in the LR/control group compared to the HR/dyslexic group is in line with most other studies (Rosen, 2003). Ahissar, Protopapas, Reid, and Merzenich (2000) have hypothesized that the suppression of these correlations in adult dyslexics might be due to variably compensated literacy skills, in contrast to the lagging sensory skills. However, our data do not provide much support for this interpretation, since we observed a similar pattern in preschool children who have not even been diagnosed or detected as being dyslexic. Actually, the children studied had not yet received any formal reading instruction; indeed, they have had no opportunity to compensate or be treated for their undetected impairments.

With respect to the causality of the observed relations between literacy skills and basic sensory measures, it has been suggested that better sensorial sensitivity might be a consequence and not a cause of better literacy skills (Talcott & Witton, 2002). Indeed, based on adult and school-aged data, the possibility cannot be ruled out that reading experience (or print exposure) improves CM and FM detection performance rather than vice versa. In fact, it would not be too far-fetched to expect visual and auditory skills of good readers to be more finely tuned than those of dyslexics by virtue of their more highly trained orthographic and phonological systems. However, this study on preschool subjects demonstrated that there already exists a reliable preceding relation between sensory and preliminary literacy skills, even before having received any instruction or before having been exposed extensively to a lot of print. Therefore, it seems unlikely to consider the sensorial deficits in dyslexics as a consequence of lack of reading experience. Instead, the results of our study seem to be consistent with the general hypothesis that basic sensory processing skills do influence (albeit in a facilitating or in an inhibiting way) the development of phonological, orthographic and reading abilities.

To conclude, phonological awareness and letter knowledge turn out to be the best indicators to differentiate between preschool children with low versus high genetic risk of developing dyslexia. In contrast, neither visual coherent motion detection nor auditory 2 Hz frequency modulation detection is able to differentiate significantly between both groups. Nevertheless, there is a significant relation between these dynamic sensory measures and developing literacy skills, even while taking into account the influence of differences in intelligence: sensitivity to CM is uniquely related to orthographic skills and not to phonological ability, whereas sensitivity to FM is specifically predictive for emerging phonological skills and not for orthographic skills. In sum, these results suggest that basic visual and auditory sensitivity is likely to play an important role in the development of fine-grained orthographic and phonological representations necessary for successful reading.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was financed by the Fund for Scientific Research – Flanders (Belgium), Grant G.0216.02. We thank the children and school staff who were involved in this study and we especially show gratitude to Erik Vandenbussche who was one of the inspirators of this project but unfortunately deceased in December 2002. Furthermore, we thank Peter Stiers for stimulating discussion, Kathelijne Jordens for assistance with data collection, Willy Leung for creating the animation movies, Johan Laneau and Aleksander Nowinski for setting up the software for the auditory and the visual test platform, and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on previous drafts of this paper.

References

Ahissar, M., Protopapas, A., Reid, M., & Merzenich, M. (2000). Auditory processing parallels reading abilities in adults. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, 97 (12), 6832-6837.

Amitay, S., Ben-Yehudah, G., Banai, K., & Ahissar, M. (2002). Disabled readers suffer from visual and auditory impairments but not from a specific magnocellular deficit. Brain, 125(10), 2272-2284.

Atkinson, J., King, J., Braddick, O., Nokes, L., Anker, S., & Braddick, F. (1997). A specific deficit of dorsal stream function in Williams' syndrome. Neuroreport, 8(8), 1919-1922.

Atkinson, J., Braddick, O., Anker, S., Curran, W., Andrew, R., Wattam-Bell, J., & Braddick, F. (2003). Neurobiological models of visuospatial cognition in children with Williams syndrome: measures of dorsal-stream and frontal function. Developmental Neuropsychology, 23, 139-172.

Bishop, D. V., Bishop, S. J., Bright, P., James, C., Delaney, T., & Tallal, P. (1999). Different origin of auditory and phonological processing problems in children with language impairment: evidence from a twin study. Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 42(1), 155-168.

Boets, B., Wouters, J., van Wieringen, A., & Ghesquière, P. (submitted). Auditory temporal information processing in preschool children at family risk for dyslexia: relations with phonological abilities and developing literacy skills. Brain and Language.

Cornelissen, P., Richardson, A., Mason, A., Fowler, S., & Stein, J. (1995). Contrast sensitivity and coherent motion detection measures at photopic luminance levels in dyslexics and controls. Vision Research, 35, 1483-1494.

Cornelissen, P. L., Hansen, P. C., Gilchrist, I. , Cormack, F., Essex, J., & Frankish, C. (1998). Coherent motion detection and letter position encoding. Vision Research, 38, 2181-2191.

Demb, J., Boynton, G., & Heeger, G. (1997). Brain activity in visual cortex predicts individual differences in reading performance. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA, 94, 13363-13366.

Eden, G., Van Meter, J., Rumsey, J., Maisog, J., Woods, R., & Zeffiro, T. (1996). Abnormal processing of visual motion in dyslexia revealed by functional brain imaging. Nature, 382, 66-69.

Everatt, J., Bradshaw, M., & Hibbard, P. (1999). Visual processing and dyslexia. Perception, 28, 243-254.

Farmer, M. E., & Klein, R. M. (1995). The evidence for a temporal processing deficit linked to dyslexia: A review. Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, 2(4), 460-493.

Gunn, A., Cory, E., Atkinson, J., Braddick, O., Wattam-Bel, J., Guzzetta, A., & Cioni, G. (2002). Dorsal and ventral stream sensitivity in normal development and hemiplegia. Neuroreport, 13(6), 843-847.

Hansen, P. C, Stein, J. F, Orde, S. R, Winter, J. L, & Talcott, J. B. (2001). Are dyslexics' visual deficits limited to measures of dorsal stream function? Neuroreport, 12(7), 1527-1530.

Hulslander, J., Talcott, J., Witton, C., DeFries, J., Pennington, B., Wadsworth, S., Willcutt, E., & Olson, R. (2004). Sensory processing, reading, IQ and attention. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 88, 274-295.

Kronbichler, M., Hutzler, F., & Wimmer, H. (2002). Dyslexia: verbal impairments in the absence of magnocellular impairments. Neuroreport, 13(5), 617-620.

Laneau, J., Boets, B., Moonen, M., van Wieringen, A., & Wouters, J. (2005). A flexible auditory research platform using acoustic or electric stimuli for adults and young children. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 142(1), 131-136.

Levitt, H. (1971). Transformed up-down methods in psychoacoustics. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 49, 467-477.

Littell, R. C., Milliken, G. A., Stroup, W. W., & Wolfinger, R. D. (1996). SAS system for mixed models. Cary, NC: Sas Institute INC.

Lovegrove, B. (1996). Dyslexia and a transient/magnocellular pathway deficit: The current situation and future directions. Australian Journal of Psychology, 48(3), 167-171.

Milne, E., Swettenham, J., Hansen, P., Campbell, R., Jeffries, H., & Plaisted, K. (2002). High motion coherence thresholds in children with autism. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 43(2), 255-263.

Ramus, F., Rosen, S., Dakin, S. C., Day, B. L., Castellote, J. M., White, S., & Frith, U. (2003). Theories of developmental dyslexia: insights from a multiple case study of dyslexic adults. Brain, 126(4), 841-865.

Raven, J. C., Court, J. H., & Raven, J. (1984). Manual for Raven's Progressive Matrices and Vocabulary Scales. London: Lewis.

Raymond, J., & Sorensen, R. (1998). Visual motion perception in children with dyslexia: normal detection but abnormal integration. Visual Cognition, 5(3), 389-404.

Ridder, W. H., Borsting, E., & Banton, T. (2001). All developmental dyslexic subtypes display an elevated motion coherence threshold. Optometry and Vision Science, 78, 510-517.

Rosen, S. (2003). Auditory processing in dyslexia and specific language impairment: is there a deficit? What is its nature? Does it explain anything? Journal of Phonetics, 31, 509-527.

Scarborough, H.S. (1998). Early identification of children at risk for reading disabilities: phonological awareness and some other promising predictors. In P.J. Accardo, A.J. Capute & B.K. Shapiro (Eds.), Specific reading disability: a view of the spectrum (pp 75-119). Timonium, MD: York Press.

Skottun, B. C. (2000). The magnocellular deficit theory of dyslexia: the evidence from contrast sensitivity. Vision Research, 40, 111-127.

Snowling, M. J. (2000). Dyslexia (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Stein, J., & Talcott, J. (1999). Impaired neuronal timing in developmental dyslexia. The magnocellular hypothesis. Dyslexia, 5, 59-77.

Stein, J. (2001). The magnocellular theory of developmental dyslexia. Dyslexia, 7, 12-36.

Talcott, J., Hansen, P., Willis-Owen, C., McKinnell, I., Richardson, A., & Stein, J. (1998). Visual magnocellular impairment in adut developmental dyslexics. Neuro-Ophtalmology, 20, 187-201.

Talcott, J. B, Hansen, P. C, Assoku, E. L, & Stein, J. F. (2000). Visual motion sensitivity in dyslexia: evidence for temporal and energy integration deficits. Neuropsychologia, 38(7), 935-943.

Talcott, J. B, Witton, C., McLean, M. F, Hansen, P. C, Rees, A., Green, G. G, & Stein, J. F. (2000). Dynamic sensory sensitivity and children's word decoding skills. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, USA, 97(6), 2952-2957.

Talcott, J. B, Witton, C., Hebb, G. S, Stoodley, C. J, Westwood, E. A, France, S. J, Hansen, P. C, & Stein, J. F. (2002). On the relationship between dynamic visual and auditory processing and literacy skills; results from a large primary-school study. Dyslexia, 8(4), 204-225.

Talcott, J. B., Gram, A., Van Ingelghem, M., Witton, C., Stein, J. F., & Toennessen, F. E. (2003). Impaired sensitivity to dynamic stimuli in poor readers of a regular orthography. Brain and Language, 87, 259-266.

Talcott, J. B., & Witton, C. (2002). A sensory linguistic approach to the development of normal and impaired reading skills. In E. Witruk, A. Friederici, & T. Lachmann (Eds.), Neuropsychology and cognition series. Basic functions of language and language disorders. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Van Ingelghem, M., Boets, B., van Wieringen, A., Ghesquière, P., & Wouters, J. (2004). Auditory and visual temporal processing in dyslexic and normal reading children matched for sex, age and intellectual ability. Paper presented at 6th BDA International Conference, 27-30 March 2004, University of Warwick, UK .

Wightman, F., & Allen, P. (1992). Individual differences in auditory capability among preschool children. In L.A. Werner , & E.W. Rubel (Eds.), Developmental Psychoacoustics (pp. 113-134). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Wilmer, J. B., Richardson, A. J., Chen, Y., & Stein, J. F. (2004). Two visual motion processing deficits in developmental dyslexia associated with different reading skills deficits. Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 16(4), 528-540.

Witton, C., Talcott, J. B, Hansen, P. C, Richardson, A. J, Griffiths, T. D, Rees, A., Stein, J. F, & Green, G. G. (1998). Sensitivity to dynamic auditory and visual stimuli predicts nonword reading ability in both dyslexic and normal readers. Current Biology, 8(14), 791-797.

Legend to figure 1:

(A) Thresholds for detecting coherent motion plotted against a Productive Letter Knowledge measure for 31 HR and 31 LR subjects. (B) Thresholds for detecting 2 Hz FM of a 1000 Hz tone plotted against a combined measure of Phonological Awareness for 30 HR and 31 LR subjects. HR subjects: filled diamonds; LR subjects: empty squares.

Table 1

Characteristics of participants and coherent motion detection thresholds.

	HR		LR		
Measures	M	SD	M	SD	*p*
Nonverbal IQ	107	14	111	13	.07 [a]
Age in months	68	3	68	3	.83 [a]
Best CM1 (% coherence)	0.19	0.11	0.17	0.08	.28 [b]
Best CM2 (% coherence)	0.22	0.13	0.19	0.09	.14 [b]
AV CM1/2 (% coherence)	0.20	0.12	0.18	0.09	.19 [b]

Note: BestCM1-2: best and second best CM threshold, AVCM1/2: average of the two best CM thresholds;

[a]paired t-test; [b]paired wise MMA controlled for nonverbal IQ, age and parental educational level

Table 2

Spearman (partial) correlations for total group of subjects (n = 61/62)

			Letter	Phon		Verbal		
	Age	RCPM	Knowledge	Awareness	RAN	STM	AV FM 1/2	AV CM 1/2
Letter Knowledge	-0.08	0.26*	-	0.42***	0.09	-0.07	-0.36**	-0.29*
Phonological Awareness	-0.08	0.26*	0.46***	-	-0.02	-0.10	-0.48****	-0.11
RAN	0.25*	-0.21	0.03	-0.08	-	0.02	-0.12	-0.06
Verbal STM	0.07	0.19	-0.02	-0.04	-0.02	-	-0.05	-0.04
AV FM 1/2	0.15	-0.16	-0.40**	-0.49****	-0.08	-0.08	-	0.26*
AV CM 1/2	0.18	-0.30*	-0.33**	-0.18	0.01	-0.10	0.29*	-

Note: Coefficients above the diagonal are partial correlations after removing variance attributable to individual differences in nonverbal intelligence (RCPM)

* p< .05, ** p < .01, *** p< .001, **** p <.0001

Table 3

Spearman partial correlations for LR and HR group separately (after removing variance attributable to individual differences in nonverbal intelligence)

	Letter Knowledge	Phonological Awareness	RAN	Verbal STM	AV FM 1/2	AV CM 1/2
Letter Knowledge	-	0.17	0.17	0.01	-0.31*	-0.41**
Phonological Awareness	0.46**	-	-0.11	-0.08	-0.61****	-0.29
RAN	-0.14	-0.04	-	-0.29	0.13	0.11
Verbal STM	-0.18	-0.14	0.30	-	-0.16	0.06
AV FM 1/2	-0.38**	-0.35*	-0.33*	0.07	-	0.44**
AV CM 1/2	-0.19	0.09	-0.25	-0.16	0.08	-

Note: Coefficients above the diagonal concern the LR group (n = 31), coefficients under the diagonal concern the HR group (n=30).

* p <.10, ** p< .05, *** p < .01, **** p< .001

Figure 1:



Extract from manuscript published in Journal of Neuroscience Methods.

Laneau, J., Boets, B., Moonen, M., van Wieringen, A., & Wouters, J. (2005). A flexible auditory research platform using acoustic or electric stimuli for adults and young children. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 142(1), 131-136.

...

4. Animated mode

The graphical user interface has been extended to allow testing of very young children. Currently, this animated mode is applicable for constant stimuli experiments, adaptive experiments and closed set identification experiments. In general, children - and especially preschoolers - are much harder to test because of the cognitive demands and the dull repetitive structure of psychophysical tasks. In order to make the relatively tedious psychophysical tests more interesting and child-friendly we integrated them in an interactive video game. This concept of testing was based upon earlier work of Soderquist and Shilling (1992) and Allen and colleagues (Allen et al., 1989; Wightman et al., 1989).

Because the most important condition for successful psychophysical testing of young children is the transformation of the abstract meaningless acoustical signal into a concrete and well known 'daily life signal', we have invented three short stories. These stories were intended to give a psychological and naturally fitting meaning to a broad set of possible stimuli. Every story was worked out through a collection of animated cartoons. An introductory movie tells a story and introduces the specific target sound in a game-like manner. During tests with multiple-sound-interval trials, every interval is visually represented on the screen by a funny character (of for instance an animal, or a car). The characters are animated synchronously with the presentation of the corresponding sound interval. The experimenter can have manual control over the initiation of consecutive trials and as such is able to initiate a trial only when

the child is attentive and looking at the monitor. The child's task is to choose, by pointing to the (touch) screen, which of the characters corresponds to the target sound. The child can be given an unlimited time in which to respond. Immediately after the child's response, visual feedback is given in the form of an animated cartoon. A correct response is reinforced with a spectacular movement of the selected character. In case of an incorrect response, feedback (presented through animation of the misidentified character) is much more modest. During the sequence of trials constituting of a single run, APEX also provides a more global reinforcement by adding smiley faces to a rising ladder structure for every correct response. Every incorrect response is optionally punished by removing a smiley from the ladder structure. At the end of the run the number of smiley faces may be evaluated and the child could be rewarded proportionally. The ladder structure with the smileys is continuously presented to the subject at the right of the computer screen. To round off the experiment and as a final reward for the child's achievement, an animated closing movie can be shown.

The intro and closing movies are optional and can be skipped for children that require less conditioning. Also the reinforcement can be adjusted by leaving out feedback or omitting the ladder structure with the smileys.

At present, APEX contains three sets of animated cartoons, that have been used for gap-in-noise detection, frequency modulation detection and tone-in-noise detection experiments with normal hearing children (Boets et al., 2004) and for speech tests (word recognition and phoneme discrimination). Of course, these scenarios are applicable to any kind of experiments like frequency and intensity discrimination, amplitude modulation detection, etc ….. If deemed necessary for appropriate conditioning of the child, it is possible to invent a new introductory story (for the optional intro and closing movies) or adjust the existing ones to the particular task at hand.

For instance, one scenario (see Fig. 3 and Movie 1) starts with an introductory movie about a mother dragon sitting in front of three eggs, explaining that it is possible to know which egg is ready to hatch, as you can hear the baby dragon crying inside. During stimulus presentation each egg shakes synchronously with the corresponding sound signal. After a correct response of the child a cute fire spewing baby dragon jumps out of the selected egg. After an incorrect response of the child the selected egg only shows a small crack on its shell. The concluding closing movie shows three little baby dragons breaking out of their eggs and spewing fire.

All animations used in APEX (intro and outro movies, the animated buttons, the feedback and reinforcement) are created using vector-based animations using Macromedia Flash software. This allows the program to easily resize the animations without loss of quality for different screen resolutions or for different screen layouts of the various experimental procedures. Moreover, new animations can easily be created by the researcher and incorporated into APEX.

Figure 3:



Screenshots of the graphical user interface for testing young children. The present screenshots show the scenario using the dragon eggs procedure with three intervals. Panel A depicts a frame of the introductory movie showing the mother dragon trying to figure out which egg is ready to hatch. Panel B depicts the graphical user interface at the start of the test. Each stimulus interval is represented by a dragon egg. At the right hand side of the user interface the ladder structure for reinforcement is shown. Panel C depicts the positive feedback after a correct answer at the seventh trial (indicated in the progress bar at the bottom of the user interface). Note the increase in number of smileys in the ladder structure to reinforce the children. Panel D depicts the negative feedback after an incorrect answer.