



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

How do children read words? A focus on reading processes

van den Boer, M.

Publication date
2014

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van den Boer, M. (2014). *How do children read words? A focus on reading processes.*

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

I wish you to gasp not only at what you read but at the miracle of its being readable.

- Vladimir Nabokov -

Chapter 2

The specific relation of visual attention span with reading and spelling

Visual attention span, the number of orthographic units that can be processed at a glance, has been shown to predict reading performance in orthographically opaque languages (i.e., French and English), independent from phonological awareness. It was examined whether this relation is also found in Dutch, a more transparent orthography. Two unresolved issues are addressed. First, it was examined whether the contribution of visual attention span to reading was independent of rapid naming. Participants were 117 second graders, and 111 fifth graders. Visual attention span was a significant predictor of both beginning and advanced word reading fluency, after controlling for rapid naming. In a second study we examined the relation of visual attention span with spelling performance. Participants were 255 fourth graders. Visual attention span was a unique predictor of both orthographic knowledge and spelling performance. Based on the results we discuss a slightly different interpretation of visual attention span.

van den Boer, M., van Bergen, E., & de Jong, P. F. (in revision). The specific relation of visual attention span with reading and spelling. *Learning and Individual Differences*

INTRODUCTION

Reading requires mapping written word forms to spoken, phonological forms. Therefore, phonological skills have been put forward as the key factor determining reading performance (e.g., Ramus et al., 2003; Vellutino, Fletcher, Snowling, & Scanlon, 2004). Indeed, phonological awareness and rapid naming have been shown to predict reading performance in many languages, both concurrent and longitudinally, in typically developing children, as well as children with dyslexia (e.g., Cornwall, 1992; de Jong & van der Leij, 1999; Kirby, Parrila, & Pfeiffer, 2003; Landerl & Wimmer, 2008; Lervåg, Bråten, & Hulme, 2009; Moll, Fussenegger, Willburger, & Landerl, 2009; Torgesen, Wagner, Rashotte, Burgess, & Hecht, 1997; Vaessen & Blomert, 2010; Wolf & Bowers, 1999; Wolf et al., 2002; Ziegler et al., 2010).

However, there is by no means a perfect relation between phonological skills and reading. More recently, the role of visual rather than phonological processing in reading development has received more attention, stimulated by complaints of individuals with dyslexia that letters and words move around, blur and/or merge (e.g., Stein & Walsh, 1997; Vidyasagar & Pammer, 2010). Visual factors featured prominently in the first description of reading difficulties, as *word blindness*, or a defective visual memory for words (Morgan, 1896). A more recent multiple case study also indicated that two classes of impairments contribute to reading disabilities, that is phonological and visual impairments (White et al., 2006).

A prominent visual theory is the visual attention span hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, the visual attention span, that is the number of orthographic units (e.g., letters, clusters or syllables) that can be processed simultaneously at a glance, is a core skill determining reading performance, independent from phonological skills (e.g., Valdois et al., 2003; Valdois, Bosse, & Tainturier, 2004). Theoretically, the visual attention span hypothesis is grounded in the multiple-trace memory model (Ans, Carbonnel, & Valdois, 1998; Valdois et al., 2004). In this model of the reading process, two successive reading procedures are distinguished. In the global procedure words are processed as a whole. Only if a word is not identified through the global procedure, the analytic procedure is activated and the word is read through serial activation of smaller orthographic units, such as syllables, letter clusters or letters, for

which phonological outputs are successively generated and maintained in short-term memory. To enable processing through the global procedure, the visual attentional window, through which information from the orthographic input can be extracted, needs to extend over the entire letter string. If the visual attentional window does not cover the entire word, words cannot be processed in parallel, the analytic procedure is activated, and visual attention is focused successively on sublexical units. In other words, visual attention span, as a measure of the visual attentional window, plays a crucial role in parallel word processing.

Visual attention span has been shown to contribute to reading performance, independent from phonological skills in typically developing children (Bosse & Valdois, 2009; van den Boer, de Jong, & Haentjens-van Meeteren, 2013), and in children with dyslexia (Bosse, Tainturier, & Valdois, 2007). In first grade visual attention span correlated with reading rate, as well as accuracy, of both words and pseudowords (Bosse & Valdois, 2009). These relations decreased in Grades 3 and 5, with the exception of irregular word reading, for which visual attention span remained a stable predictor across grades. These findings suggest that visual attention span, fostering parallel word processing, is especially important in reading irregular or exception words, for which serial analytic processing could result in incorrect pronunciations. Similarly, visual attention span has been linked to the acquisition of orthographic knowledge. If the visual attention span covers the entire word, a whole word orthographic representation can be acquired, enabling word identification through the global procedure. Indeed, it has been shown that orthographic learning benefits from the availability of whole-word orthographic forms (Bosse, Chaves, Largy, & Valdois, 2013).

The work of Valdois and colleagues (Bosse et al., 2007; Bosse & Valdois, 2009; Valdois et al., 2003; Valdois et al., 2004) clearly shows that visual attention span is an important predictor of reading performance. However, this relation has only been established for children learning to read an opaque orthography (i.e., French and English). In the current study we examined whether a similar relation is found for children learning to read Dutch, a more transparent orthography, to establish whether visual attention span, similar to phonological awareness and rapid naming, can be considered a key predictor of reading performance across languages. In addition, we

address two unresolved issues concerning visual attention span that could further specify the nature of its relation with reading.

First, the contribution of visual attention span has been shown to be independent of phonological awareness (e.g., Bosse & Valdois, 2009), but rapid naming, another important predictor of reading performance, has not been controlled for. Rapid naming, especially of letters, requires similar processes as visual attention span, which is typically measured as the ability to report back briefly presented strings of five letters (e.g., R H S D M). Both tasks require participants to quickly identify and name letters. However, as argued by Bosse and Valdois (2009), there are also important differences between the tasks. For example, visual information is available only briefly in a visual attention span task, but remains available in rapid naming tasks. A study including both tasks is needed to determine whether it is the similarities or the differences between the tasks that characterize the relation of visual attention span with reading performance.

The second issue concerns the relation of visual attention span with spelling performance. To our knowledge this relation has not yet been studied. In fact, a relation would not be expected if visual attention span indeed reflects parallel visual processing of orthographic units within a fixation, since in a spelling task phonological rather than orthographic word forms are presented.

However, there are important similarities between reading and spelling as well. Similar to the representation of word reading processes in the multiple-trace memory model, it is assumed that spelling a word can be achieved in two ways (Ehri, 2000; Tainturier & Rapp, 2000). A stored orthographic representation can be retrieved from memory, or a word's spelling can be assembled through serial sublexical phoneme-grapheme conversion. Thus, reading and spelling both rely on orthographic knowledge at a lexical as well as sublexical level. Accordingly, if visual attention span is related to the acquisition of orthographic knowledge, a relation with spelling performance would be expected.

This relation, however, might be indirect, rather than direct. According to the self-teaching hypothesis (Share, 1995, 1999), orthographic representations are mainly acquired through phonological recoding of letter strings encountered during reading.

Every time a word is successfully decoded into its phonological code, a link can be established between the written and spoken word forms, and an orthographic representation can be built or strengthened. In line with this theory, the relation between visual attention span and spelling would be expected to be mediated by reading skills. Visual attention span could affect reading and thereby the acquisition of the orthographic knowledge, which in turn is called upon during spelling tasks.

We present two studies that address these issues. In the first study we focused on the contribution of visual attention span to reading performance of both beginning (Grade 2), and advanced (Grade 5) readers in a more transparent orthography. Importantly, we examined whether the relation was independent of rapid naming, in addition to phonological awareness. In a previous study (van den Boer et al., 2013) we have shown that visual attention span is related to naming speed of single words, independent from rapid naming, in Grade 2 beginning readers. In the current study we aimed to extend this finding, by including both beginning and advanced readers, and by looking at the effects on a standardized continuous measure of word reading.

In the second study we focus on spelling. Spelling performance relies on phoneme-grapheme connections, and accordingly, phonological awareness has been shown to be a strong predictor (Landerl & Wimmer, 2008; Moll et al., 2009; Nikolopoulos, Goulandris, Hulme, & Snowling, 2006; Verhagen, Aarnoutse, van Leeuwe, 2008; 2010). The relation of rapid naming with spelling performance is less clear. Some studies have shown a unique contribution to spelling (Savage, Pillay, & Melidona, 2008; Sunseth & Bowers, 2002; Verhagen et al., 2010), whereas others have indicated that rapid naming did not contribute to spelling performance over and above phonological awareness (Cornwall, 1992; Landerl & Wimmer, 2008). The relation of visual attention span with spelling performance has not yet been studied. A direct relation with spelling performance, independent of reading fluency and orthographic knowledge, would pose a challenge for the current interpretation of the nature of visual attention span and its relation to reading in terms of parallel mainly visual processing of orthographic units.

STUDY 1 - METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

One hundred and seventeen second-grade (52 boys, 65 girls), and 111 fifth-grade (51 boys, 60 girls) children from six schools in the Netherlands participated in the study. The mean ages of the children were 8 years ($SD = 5.70$ months) in Grade 2, and 11 years ($SD = 5.86$ months) in Grade 5. All children attended mainstream primary education. At the time of testing, second and fifth graders had received approximately one year five months and four years five months of instruction, respectively.

MATERIALS

Word reading fluency. Word reading fluency was assessed with the One Minute Test (*Eén Minuut Test*; Brus & Voeten, 1995). This standardized reading test is regularly used as a measure of reading achievement in Dutch schools. The test consists of 116 words of increasing length and difficulty. Children were asked to read the words aloud as quickly and accurately as possible for 1 minute. The score consisted of the number of items read correctly. Raw scores were also converted to norm scores, with an average of ten and a standard deviation of 3.

Nonverbal intelligence. Nonverbal intelligence was assessed with Raven's Standard Progressive Matrices test (Raven, 1960). Children were presented with 60 patterns from which a small part was omitted. They were instructed to identify out of six to eight alternatives the element that completed the pattern. They worked individually for 45 minutes to complete as many items as possible. The score consisted of the number of items correct.

Vocabulary. Vocabulary was assessed with the Vocabulary subtest from the RAKIT battery of intelligence tests (Bleichrodt, Drenth, Zaal, & Resing, 1984). Children were instructed to choose from among four alternatives the picture that best matched the word read aloud by the experimenter. The test included 45 items. The score consisted of the number of items correct.

Verbal short-term memory. Verbal short-term memory was assessed with a letter span task (e.g., Johnston, Rugg, & Scott, 1987). Children were presented with letter

sequences (e.g., F L B S) increasing in length from two to seven letters, three sequences of each length. They were asked to repeat the letters in the correct order. After two consecutive errors within the same sequence length, the task was discontinued. The score consisted of the number of sequences repeated correctly.

Phonological awareness. Phonological awareness was assessed with an elision and spoonerism task (de Jong & van der Leij, 2003). The experimenter read aloud a nonword. Children were first asked to repeat the nonword. Next, the experimenter repeated the nonword and named a phoneme to be deleted. Children were then asked to repeat the nonword without this phoneme. A total of 27 items were administered. For the first 18 items children were asked to delete a single phoneme (e.g., ‘tral’ without ‘r’), whereas in the next nine items the phoneme to be deleted was included twice (e.g., ‘gepgral’ without ‘g’). Fifth graders who gave more than three correct responses to these last nine items, were presented with an additional six items. For these items, children were asked to switch the position of two phonemes and report the resulting nonword (e.g., ‘larspos’ switch ‘l’ and ‘p’). The score consisted of the total number of correct responses.

Rapid naming. Rapid naming of digits (1, 3, 5, 6, and 8) was assessed. Children were presented with a sheet including five lines of ten digits each. They were asked to name aloud all digits as quickly as possible. The score consisted of the time needed to name all digits, converted to the number of digits named per second.

Visual attention span. The whole report visual attention span task was administered (see Valdois et al., 2003). Children were presented with 20 five-letter strings (e.g., R H S D M). They were asked to repeat as many letters as possible, in the correct order. The strings were created from ten consonants (B, D, F, H, L, M, P, R, S, and T), all presented twice in each letter position. The task was programmed in E-prime version 1.0 (Schneider, Eschman, & Zuccolotto, 2002). To focus attention, a plus sign was presented for 1000 ms. Letter strings were then presented for 200 ms in bold 24-point Arial font. The score consisted of the number of letters repeated correctly (from a total of 100).

PROCEDURE

All children were tested in January/February. The vocabulary and nonverbal intelligence tasks were administered during a classroom session of about 45 minutes each. The other tasks were administered in a fixed order to each child individually.

STUDY 1 - RESULTS

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. Thirteen children (eight in Grade 2, and five in Grade 5) were absent during classroom administrations of the vocabulary and nonverbal intelligence tasks. In addition, five scores (three in Grade 2, and two in Grade 5) were more than three standard deviations above or below the group mean. These outliers were coded as missing.

As could be expected, children in Grade 5 obtained higher scores than children in Grade 2 on all tasks (p 's < .001). In both grades, children showed average reading performance with a representative spread in reading abilities. However, children in Grade 2 obtained higher norm scores than children in Grade 5, indicating that they were relatively better readers.

Correlations between the variables for both grades are shown in Table 2. Nonverbal intelligence and vocabulary did not correlate significantly with word reading in Grade 2 nor Grade 5. Verbal short-term memory, phonological awareness, rapid naming, and visual attention span correlated significantly with word reading fluency in both grades.

PREDICTORS OF WORD READING

Hierarchical regression analyses were used to determine whether the predictor variables uniquely contributed to word reading fluency in Grades 2 and 5. For 15 children in Grade 2 and nine children in Grade 5 one or two scores on the predictor variables (mainly nonverbal intelligence and/or vocabulary) were missing, due to outlier scores or absence during task administration. These scores were imputed to

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Grade 2 and Grade 5

	Grade 2			Grade 5			<i>t</i> test
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Range	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Range	
Word reading (raw)	117	39.59 (14.45)	12 – 81	111	68.34 (11.40)	41 – 99	16.723*
Word reading (norm)	117	10.66 (2.93)	4 – 18	111	9.25 (2.58)	2 – 17	3.851*
Nonverbal IQ	108	29.85 (8.24)	9 – 45	105	41.72 (7.25)	21 – 57	11.152*
Vocabulary	109	41.80 (3.94)	33 – 51	106	50.69 (3.41)	40 – 57	17.668*
Verbal short-term memory	116	6.87 (1.70)	3 – 11	111	9.30 (2.23)	5 – 15	9.186*
Phonological awareness	117	15.48 (6.00)	1 – 27	111	23.66 (4.47)	15 – 32	11.715*
Rapid naming	117	1.75 (.39)	.96 – 2.63	110	2.27 (.45)	1.06 – 3.33	9.331*
Visual attention span	116	55.19 (11.73)	31 – 92	111	76.24 (11.94)	42 – 100	13.401*

Note. * $p < .001$

Table 2
Correlations Among All Variables for Grade 2 and Grade 5

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Word reading	-	.14	.00	.22*	.44**	.52**	.40**
2. Nonverbal IQ	.05	-	.21*	.21*	.26**	-.11	.25*
3. Vocabulary	-.07	.21*	-	.01	-.04	-.19*	.11
4. Verbal short-term memory	.38**	.26**	.17	-	.37**	.13	.30**
5. Phonological awareness	.35**	.30**	.06	.43**	-	.32**	.33**
6. Rapid naming	.51**	-.21*	-.24*	.16	.09	-	.28**
7. Visual attention span	.42**	-.01	.05	.35**	.20*	.16	-

Note. Grade 2 above diagonal, Grade 5 below diagonal.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

avoid losing these participants for the regression analyses. Missing scores were imputed based on the relations among the predictor variables, using the EM algorithm (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012). Little's MCAR test indicated that the data were missing completely at random, $\chi^2(24) = 18.583$, $p = .774$ in Grade 2, and $\chi^2(19) = 16.273$, $p = .639$ in Grade 5. The children with missing scores did not differ significantly from the children without missing scores on reading fluency and predictor variables before and after imputation. Results were very similar when listwise deletion was used to handle missing data.

In the first step the three control variables nonverbal intelligence, vocabulary, and verbal short-term memory were entered in the models. In the second step phonological awareness and rapid naming were added to the model. Visual attention span was entered in the third and final step, to examine its contribution to reading fluency, after controlling for both phonological awareness and rapid naming. The results are presented in Table 3. In Grade 2 the control variables did not account for any variance in word reading fluency. In Grade 5, however, the control variables accounted for 17% of the variance, mainly due to the effect of verbal short-term memory. Phonological awareness and rapid naming accounted for additional explained variance in both grades (32% in Grade 2 and 23% in Grade 5). Visual attention span, entered in the third step, also explained additional variance (2% in Grade 2 and 6% in Grade 5). Together the variables explained a substantial amount of variance in word reading fluency (40% in Grade 2 and 46% in Grade 5).

Standardized beta coefficients of the final model (see Table 3) indicated that in both grades rapid naming appeared to be the strongest predictor of word reading fluency. In Grade 2, the coefficient of phonological awareness was slightly higher than that of visual attention span. In Grade 5, however, the opposite was found; visual attention span appeared a slightly stronger predictor than phonological awareness.

Table 3

Hierarchical Regression Results of Phonological Awareness, Rapid Naming, and Visual Attention Span as Predictors of Word Reading Fluency in Grade 2 and Grade 5

	Grade 2		Grade 5	
	ΔR^2	β^1	ΔR^2	β^1
1. Nonverbal IQ	.06	.08	.17**	.07
Vocabulary		.05		-.02
Verbal short-term memory		.01		.12
2. Phonological awareness	.32**	.23**	.23**	.19*
Rapid naming		.41**		.45**
3. Visual attention span	.02*	.17*	.06**	.27**
<i>Total R²</i>	.40		.46	

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$.

¹ Standardized beta coefficients from the final model, including all predictors

STUDY 2 - METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

Two hundred and fifty-five fourth-grade children (133 boys, 122 girls) participated in this study, with a mean age of 9 years 11 months ($SD = 5.41$ months). All children attended mainstream primary education at one of 11 participating schools in the Netherlands, and had received approximately three years five months of instruction at the time of testing.

MATERIALS

Word reading fluency. Word reading fluency was assessed with the One Minute Test as described for Study 1.

Nonword reading fluency. Nonword reading fluency was assessed with the Klepel (van den Bos, Iutje Spelberg, Scheepstra, & de Vries, 1994). This standardized reading test is regularly used as a measure of reading achievement in Dutch schools. The test consists of 116 nonwords of increasing length and difficulty. Children were asked to

read the nonwords aloud as quickly and accurately as possible for 2 minutes. The score consisted of the number of items read correctly.

Orthographic knowledge. Orthographic knowledge was assessed with an orthographic choice task. Children were presented with four alternative spellings of words. They were instructed to choose the correct spelling (e.g., haut hout houd haud; for the word 'hout', meaning *wood*). The task consisted of 70 items. The score consisted of the number of items correct.

Spelling. Spelling was assessed with a spelling to dictation task (*PI-dictee*; Geelhoed & Reitsma, 1999). This standardized spelling test is regularly used in Dutch schools to evaluate spelling achievement. We administered three blocks of 15 words each, that increased in difficulty. The experimenter dictated the 45 words. Each word was read aloud, as well as a sentence including the word. Then, children were instructed to write down the target word. The score consisted of the number of items spelled correctly.

Nonverbal intelligence. Nonverbal intelligence was assessed with a subtest from the *Groninger School Onderzoek* (Kema & Kema-van Leggelo, 1987). Children were presented with four pictures. Three pictures shared one or more characteristic(s), but the fourth picture did not. They were instructed to identify the odd one out. Children had 10 minutes to complete the task, which consisted of a total of 27 items. The score consisted of the number of items correct.

Verbal short-term memory. Verbal short-term memory was assessed with the letter span task as described for Study 1.

Phonological awareness. Phonological awareness was assessed with the elision and spoonerism task as described for Study 1.

Rapid naming. Rapid naming of digits was assessed as described for Study 1. In addition, rapid naming of letters (A, D, O, P, S) was assessed in the same way.

Visual attention span. A whole report visual attention span task was administered as described for Study 1.

PROCEDURE

All children were tested in January/February. The nonverbal intelligence, orthographic choice and spelling tasks were administered during a classroom session of about 1 hour. The other tasks were administered in a fixed order to each child individually. The data was part of a larger dataset, also including assessment of oral or silent reading skills which are reported elsewhere (see van den Boer, van Bergen, & de Jong, in revision).

STUDY 2 - RESULTS

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 4 and correlations between the variables are shown in Table 5. A strong correlation was found between word and nonword reading ($r = .86$). Orthographic choice and spelling correlated moderately ($r = .68$). Moderate correlations were also found between the reading and spelling tasks (r 's between .46 and .65). Verbal short-term memory, phonological awareness, rapid naming and visual attention span correlated significantly with the reading and spelling tasks, and with each other. Nonverbal intelligence correlated significantly with orthographic knowledge and phonological awareness.

PREDICTORS OF READING AND SPELLING

As in Study 1, hierarchical regression analysis was used to determine whether nonverbal intelligence, verbal short-term memory, phonological awareness, rapid naming, and visual attention span uniquely contributed to word reading fluency, nonword reading fluency, orthographic knowledge and spelling performance. We assessed rapid naming of letters and digits, but these measures were found to be very similar, both in average naming speed, and in the correlations with the other variables. Rapid naming of letters was included in the regression analyses, mainly because of its similarity to the other predictors (i.e., all tasks included letters as stimuli). However, the results were the same when rapid naming of digits rather than letters was used, unless otherwise specified.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for Grade 4

	Grade 4		
	<i>N</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	Range
Word reading	254	64.81 (13.57)	27 – 102
Nonword reading	255	56.89 (18.74)	18 – 101
Orthographic knowledge	234	57.96 (6.42)	39 – 70
Spelling	249	31.63 (7.32)	10 – 44
Nonverbal intelligence	253	20.50 (2.88)	12 – 27
Verbal short-term memory	253	10.44 (2.25)	6 – 17
Phonological awareness	228	20.86 (6.43)	5 – 33
Rapid naming digits	255	2.18 (.41)	1.25 – 3.36
Rapid naming letters	254	2.10 (.38)	1.07 – 3.17
Visual attention span	233	73.45 (12.83)	36 – 98

Again, missing values were imputed to avoid losing participants for the analyses. Three children were excluded from further analyses because scores were missing on three or more tasks. For 40 children one or two scores were missing on the predictor variables, because children were unable or unwilling to complete a task, or due to errors in task administration by the test assistants. These scores were imputed based on the relations among the predictor variables, using the EM algorithm. Little's MCAR test indicated that the scores were missing completely at random, $\chi^2(29) = 37.293$, $p = .139$. The children with missing scores on the predictors did not differ from the children without missing scores on the predictors and the dependent variables before and after imputation. For 23 children one or two scores were missing on the dependent variables, because children were absent during classroom administration of the spelling tests, or obtained a score that was more than three standard deviations above or below the group mean. Little's MCAR test indicated that these scores were not missing completely at random, $\chi^2(11) = 46.460$, $p < .001$. Consequently, these scores were not imputed. Therefore, the sample size fluctuates across analyses (see Table 6). Results were very similar when listwise deletion was used to handle missing data.

In the first step we entered nonverbal intelligence and verbal short-term memory. Phonological awareness and rapid naming were added in the second step. Visual attention span was again entered in the third and final step. The results are presented in Table 6. Nonverbal intelligence and verbal short-term memory accounted for variance in word and nonword reading (16% and 10% respectively). Phonological awareness and rapid naming accounted for additional explained variance in both word and nonword reading fluency (28% and 44% respectively). Visual attention span, entered in the third step, also explained additional variance (3% for both word and nonword reading). Together the variables explained a substantial amount of variance in word and nonword reading fluency (47% and 57% respectively). Standardized beta coefficients indicated that rapid naming appears to be the strongest predictor of reading fluency, as in Study 1. Phonological awareness related more strongly to nonword than to word reading fluency, but was a significant predictor of both. Visual attention span was a significant and equally strong predictor of word and nonword reading fluency.

Nonverbal intelligence and verbal short-term memory also accounted for variance in orthographic knowledge and spelling (10% and 17% respectively). Phonological awareness and rapid naming accounted for additional explained variance in both orthographic knowledge and spelling (10% and 19% respectively), although this effect was mainly due to the effect of phonological awareness. Standardized beta coefficients indicated that rapid naming did not contribute significantly to orthographic knowledge. The contribution of rapid naming to spelling was small, but significant. However, when rapid naming of digits, rather than letters, was included in the model, rapid naming did not contribute significantly to either orthographic knowledge, or spelling. Visual attention span, entered in the third step, explained additional variance in both orthographic knowledge and spelling (3% and 6% respectively). All predictors had stronger effects on spelling performance than on orthographic knowledge. Together the variables explained a substantial amount of variance in orthographic knowledge and spelling (23% and 41% respectively).

In addition, we examined whether the relation between visual attention span and spelling performance was mediated by reading performance and/or orthographic knowledge. Word reading fluency and/or orthographic knowledge were added to the

Table 5
Correlations Among All Variables for Grade 4

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Word reading	-									
2. Nonword reading	.86**	-								
3. Orthographic knowledge	.54**	.46**	-							
4. Spelling	.65**	.59**	.68**	-						
5. Nonverbal intelligence	.00	-.01	.16*	.11	-					
6. Verbal short-term memory	.38**	.31**	.27**	.40**	.04	-				
7. Phonological awareness	.44**	.55**	.39**	.53**	.18**	.35**	-			
8. Rapid naming digits	.58**	.64**	.18**	.31**	-.10	.22**	.28**	-		
9. Rapid naming letters	.56**	.63**	.24**	.34**	-.06	.17**	.29**	.74**	-	
10. Visual attention span	.48**	.52**	.36**	.50**	.07	.32**	.42**	.38**	.37**	-

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 6
Hierarchical Regression Results of Phonological Awareness, Rapid Naming, and Visual Attention Span as Predictors of Word and Pseudoword Reading Fluency, Orthographic Knowledge and Spelling in Grade 4

	Word reading (<i>N</i> = 251)		Nonword reading (<i>N</i> = 252)		Orthographic knowledge (<i>N</i> = 234)		Spelling (<i>N</i> = 246)	
	ΔR^2	β^1	ΔR^2	β^1	ΔR^2	β^1	ΔR^2	β^1
1. Nonverbal IQ Short-term memory	.16**	-.04 .19**	.10**	-.06 .06	.10**	.11 .10	.17**	.02 .17**
2. Phonological awareness Rapid naming	.28**	.18** .38**	.44**	.31** .44**	.10**	.22** .10	.19**	.30** .11*
3. Visual attention span	.03**	.21**	.03**	.21**	.03**	.20**	.06**	.28**
<i>Total R</i> ²	.47		.57		.23		.41	

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$.

¹ Standardized beta coefficients from the final model, including all predictors

regression analysis in the first step, followed by nonverbal intelligence and verbal short-term memory, phonological awareness and rapid naming, and in the fourth and final step visual attention span. Results indicated that visual attention span remained a significant unique predictor of spelling performance.

DISCUSSION

In the current study we examined the relation of visual attention span with literacy skills in a more transparent orthography. In the first study we examined whether visual attention span contributed to both beginning and advanced reading, and whether this relation was independent of rapid naming. In the second study we examined the relation of visual attention span with orthographic knowledge and spelling performance.

Visual attention span was a significant predictor of word reading fluency for both beginning (Grade 2) and more advanced (Grades 4 and 5) readers. Previous studies have already shown that the contribution of visual attention span to reading performance is independent of phonological awareness (Bosse et al., 2007; Bosse & Valdois, 2009; Valdois et al., 2003; Valdois et al., 2004). The results of the current study indicate that the relation is also independent of rapid naming. Verbal short-term memory of letter strings was also controlled for. Our results therefore support the claim of Valdois and colleagues (Bosse & Valdois, 2009; Valdois et al., 2004), that although the visual attention span task involves reporting verbal material, it should not be considered a rapid naming task, nor a verbal short-term memory task.

We also examined the relation of visual attention span with nonword reading. In line with previous studies (Bosse & Valdois, 2009; van den Boer et al., 2013) visual attention span related equally strongly to word and nonword reading. The positive relation between visual attention span and reading fluency can be interpreted within the framework of the multiple-trace memory model (Ans et al., 1998; Valdois et al., 2004). Within the multiple-trace memory model, visual attention span as a measure of the visual attentional window is essential in determining the efficiency of letter string processing. If the orthographic representation of a word has been stored in memory, the size of the visual attentional window determines whether the word can be

processed through the global route. The relation with nonword reading indicates that it also determines the size of the orthographic units that can be processed through the analytic procedure if an orthographic representation of the letter string is not available. In other words, visual attention span seems to affect processing speed of all letter strings at all stages of reading development.

However, Bosse and Valdois (2009) showed that the contribution of visual attention span to word reading decreased for regular words, and remained stable across grades only for irregular words. They ascribed this result to the effect of visual attention span on the long-term acquisition and establishment of orthographic knowledge, which is of specific importance in reading irregular words, more than regular words or nonwords. Our results in Dutch, a relatively transparent language, in contrast, did not show a decrease in the contribution of visual attention span to word reading fluency. If anything, we found an increase in the relation. Therefore, our results might indicate that, perhaps especially in languages with relatively few exception words, the crucial aspect in the relation of visual attention span with reading fluency might not be the acquisition of orthographic knowledge. Rather, it could be the amount of orthographic information that can be processed within one glance, irrespective of whether this information is mapped onto whole-word phonology through the global route or to sublexical units in the analytic procedure.

To our knowledge, this is the first study that also examined the relation of visual attention span with spelling abilities. Visual attention span was a unique predictor of both orthographic knowledge and spelling performance. The contribution of visual attention span to spelling skills appeared to be as strong as to reading fluency, if not stronger. Similar to the effect of visual attention span on reading exception words, the effect on spelling could be explained through the acquisition of orthographic knowledge (Bosse & Valdois, 2009). Such an interpretation, however, would mean that the relation of visual attention span with spelling abilities is indirect, rather than direct. Visual attention span could determine the extraction and storage of orthographic information during reading, which in turn determines the quality of the orthographic representations that can be called upon in spelling tasks. However, the effect of visual attention span on spelling performance remained significant after

controlling for reading fluency and orthographic knowledge. Thus, there seems to be a specific relation between visual attention span and spelling.

Alternatively, it has been suggested that visual attention span taps grapheme-phoneme connections, or verbal coding abilities, rather than visual processing (Hawelka & Wimmer, 2008; Ziegler, Pech-Georgel, Dufau, & Grainger, 2010). Since reading and spelling rely heavily on grapheme-phoneme connections, such an interpretation of visual attention span could also explain the relations with both types of literacy skills. The contributions of visual attention span to reading and spelling performance were independent of verbal short-term memory, phonological awareness, and rapid naming. These tasks were quite similar to the visual attention span task, since all tasks included letters (or words) as stimuli, and all tasks required verbal output. Moreover, rapid naming also involves verbal coding as the names of the symbols (i.e., letters or digits) have to be provided. However, an important difference between visual attention span and the phonological tasks included in the study is the focus on fast parallel multi-element processing. Thus, verbal coding could be involved in visual attention span, but performance on the task probably does not reflect the ability to generate verbal codes per se, but rather the ability to generate verbal codes in parallel.

An interpretation of visual attention span in terms of parallel processing of orthographic units, and simultaneously, parallel activation of the corresponding phonological codes, incorporates both the multi-element, and the verbal coding interpretations of the task. Parallel activation of phonology from print obviously fosters reading speed. However, parallel multi-element processing does not seem to be all that essential to spelling performance, where orthographic word forms need to be activated accurately more than quickly. Nevertheless, the specific relation between visual attention span and spelling could indicate that also in spelling tasks parallel activation of word forms boosts performance.

The specific relation of visual attention span with spelling seems easier to understand, however, if we interpret visual attention span in terms of the quality of orthography-phonology connections. This is a slightly different, though related interpretation, since only strong connections would enable processing multiple elements within one glance. The connection between written and spoken word forms is important for both reading and spelling performance (Perfetti & Hart, 2002). Different from the rapid

naming task, where orthographic information remains available, and from the phonological awareness tasks, where there is no constraint on processing time, the visual attention span task demands strong orthography-phonology connections, because letters are presented only briefly, and need to be reported verbally. Only if the letters automatically activate the associated phonological codes within one glance, can the letters be reported correctly.

In addition to visual attention span we included phonological awareness and rapid naming as predictors of reading and spelling. Phonological awareness was related to word reading across grades, and was an even stronger predictor of nonword reading. The relation between phonological awareness and reading is generally found to be stronger in less transparent orthographies (e.g., Ziegler et al., 2010). However, the current results are in line with a number of studies indicating that strong relations are also found in transparent languages, when sufficiently difficult measures are used to assess phonological awareness skills (Caravolas, Volín, & Hulme, 2005; de Jong & van der Leij, 2003; Patel, Snowling, & de Jong, 2004; Vaessen & Blomert, 2010). In line with previous studies, phonological awareness was also a strong predictor of spelling performance (Landerl & Wimmer, 2008; Moll et al., 2009; Nikolopoulos et al., 2006; Verhagen et al., 2008; 2010).

As is often found in transparent orthographies, rapid naming appeared to be the strongest predictor of reading fluency (de Jong & van der Leij, 2002; Landerl & Wimmer, 2008; Moll et al., 2009; Vaessen & Blomert, 2010), with equal relations with both word and nonword reading (Georgiou, Papadopoulos, Fella, & Parilla, 2012; Moll et al., 2009; van den Boer et al., 2013). In contrast, rapid naming was the least important predictor of spelling. Rapid naming of digits did not contribute significantly to spelling performance, and rapid naming of letters had a very small independent effect. It has been shown before that rapid naming does not contribute (much) to spelling performance over and above phonological awareness (Cornwall, 1992; Landerl & Wimmer, 2008). The results are also in line with findings of Wimmer and Mayringer (2002). In children who spoke German, a transparent orthography similar to Dutch, they found that a rapid naming deficit was associated with a specific problem with fluent reading. Spelling difficulties, in contrast, were associated with deficits in phonological awareness. The dissociation led the authors to

propose the phonological speed dyslexia account, which states that some children do build orthographic representations, but lack efficiency accessing and using these representations to foster fluent reading. They do, however, succeed in spelling tasks, since orthographic representations are intact and can be accessed when performance is less time constrained. There is still quite some debate about the exact nature of the relation between rapid naming and reading (see Kirby, Georgiou, Martinussen, & Parilla, 2010, for a review). If rapid naming indeed contributes to reading, but not to spelling performance, likely explanations would include the ability to access and retrieve phonological representations (e.g., Wagner & Torgesen, 1987), rather than the learning of orthographic codes (e.g., Bowers, 1995).

In sum, the current study showed that visual attention span is a predictor of both beginning and advanced reading skills, and of spelling performance in an orthographically transparent language. Importantly, visual attention span contributed to literacy skills independent of established phonological predictors, that is phonological awareness and rapid naming. Based on the relation of visual attention span with fluent reading and most importantly spelling, we suggest that visual attention span performance might reflect the quality of the connections between orthographic and phonological units, and thereby parallel activation of phonology upon encountering orthography and vice versa.