Published in final edited form as:

J Child Psychol Psychiatry. 2018 January ; 59(1): 76–87. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12774.

Pre-reader to beginning reader: changes induced by reading acquisition in print and speech brain networks

Katarzyna Chyl¹, Bartosz Kossowski^{2,3}, Agnieszka Dobska¹, Magdalena Łuniewska^{1,4}, Anna Banaszkiewicz², Agata Milechowska¹, Stephen J. Frost⁵, W. Einar Mencl⁵, Marek Wypych², Artur Marchewka², Kenneth R. Pugh^{5,6,7}, and Katarzyna Jednoróg¹

¹Laboratory of Psychophysiology, Department of Neurophysiology, Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology, PAS, Poland ²Laboratory of Brain Imaging, Neurobiology Center, Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology, PAS, Poland ³Faculty of Electronics and Information Technology, Warsaw University of Technology, Poland ⁴Faculty of Psychology, University of Warsaw, Poland ⁵Haskins Laboratories, New Haven, Connecticut, USA ⁶Department of Diagnostic Radiology, Yale University School of Medicine, Connecticut, USA ⁷Department of Psychology, University of Connecticut, USA

Abstract

Background—Literacy acquisition is a demanding process that induces significant changes in the brain, especially in the spoken and written language networks. Nevertheless, large-scale paediatric fMRI studies are still limited.

Methods—We analysed fMRI data to show how individual differences in reading performance correlate with brain activation for speech and print in 111 children attending kindergarten or first grade and examined group differences between a matched sub-set of emergent readers and pre-readers.

Results—Across the entire cohort, individual differences analysis revealed that reading skill was positively correlated with the magnitude of activation difference between words and symbol strings in left superior temporal, inferior frontal and fusiform gyri. Group comparisons of the matched sub-set of pre- and emergent-readers showed higher activity for emergent-readers in left inferior frontal, precentral and postcentral gyri. Individual differences in activation for natural vs. vocoded speech were also positively correlated with reading skill, primarily in the left temporal cortex but, in contrast to studies on adult illiterates, group comparisons revealed higher activity in pre-readers compared to readers in the frontal lobes. Print-speech co-activation was observed only in readers and individual differences analyses revealed a positive correlation between convergence and reading skill in the left superior temporal sulcus.

Correspondence: Katarzyna Jednoróg, Laboratory of Psychophysiology, Department of Neurophysiology, Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Pasteur 3, 02-093 Warsaw, Poland; Phone: +48 22 5892 392; k.jednorog@nencki.gov.pl.

Supporting information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

The authors have declared that they have no competing or potential conflicts of interest.

Conclusions—These results emphasise that a child's brain undergoes several modifications to both visual and oral language systems in the process of learning to read. They also suggest that print-speech convergence is a hallmark of acquiring literacy.

Keywords

fMRI; literacy; pre-readers; reading acquisition; print-speech convergence

INTRODUCTION

Literacy acquisition is a demanding process that induces significant changes in brain structure and function (Dehaene, Cohen, Morais & Kolinsky, 2015). In adults with varied literacy skills, reading performance has been shown to modulate responses to written words in left hemisphere (LH) language areas, including the visual word form area (VWFA) in left ventral occipito-temporal (vOT) cortex, superior temporal sulcus (STS), temporal pole, premotor cortex, inferior frontal gyrus (IFG) and supplementary motor area (Dehaene et al., 2010). Literacy skill has also been shown to affect activation patterns for spoken language processing, with some language areas showing greater activation (left posterior STS, bilateral middle temporal gyri [MTG], anterior cingulate), and others showing less activation (bilateral posterior superior temporal gyri [STG]) for literate relative to illiterate participants (Dehaene et al., 2010; see also Castro-Caldas et al., 1998).

Although the fMRI literature on literacy acquisition in children is growing, it is still relatively small and most of the studies have been conducted in a single language – English. In a cross-sectional study with beginning to expert readers ranging from 6 to 22 years of age, Turkeltaub and colleagues (2003) report positive correlations between reading and brain activity to print in multiple LH areas, including left inferior and middle temporal areas, whereas activation of the right posterior cortical areas was negatively related to reading outcomes. A similar study by Shaywitz and colleagues (2002) also showed increased left posterior activity and a general reduction in right hemisphere (RH) involvement in typical readers; however, the posterior LH shift was not observed in the reading disabled cohort. Moreover, successful remediation of reading skill was associated both with increased left posterior and decreased RH involvement (Shaywitz et al., 2004; see also Simos et al., 2002; 2007 for similar intervention results with MEG). In another longitudinal study of children aged 7–12, Ben-Shachar and colleagues (2011) also observed age-related increases in the sensitivity to printed words in posterior left vOT cortex with the magnitude of change further correlated with word reading efficiency gains. In one of the few fMRI studies looking at literacy acquisition in a language other than English, Brem et al. (2010) showed that print sensitivity in the VWFA emerged after only four hours of grapheme-phoneme correspondence training in German-speaking, non-reading kindergarten children. Studies looking at children with risk for dyslexia have failed to observe this pattern of print sensitivity in the LH posterior regions. Six-year-old children with dyslexia risk exhibited lower activation for words in bilateral vOT regions and higher activation in insula, thalamus and several right temporal regions relative to children without the risk for dyslexia (Specht et al., 2009). In another study, kindergarten pupils with behavioural risk of dyslexia had reduced activation for letters compared to false fonts in bilateral tempo-parietal regions

(Yamada et al., 2011). In sum, these developmental studies suggest that successful literacy learning is associated with increased reading specialization in LH ventral cortex and generally less RH and frontal involvement with experience and skill (Pugh et al., 2013; Richlan et al., 2009).

Besides studying the relationship between literacy skills and activation patterns for print, we propose that in learning to read a critical measure should entail focus on changes in the neural correlates of speech and print-speech integration. The impact of literacy on speech processing has been documented in adult literates and illiterates, described above, as well as in a study of reading and pre-reading 6-year-old children showing that reading performance was positively correlated with spoken language processing in the left IFG, left posterior STS and left temporal pole (Monzalvo and Dehaene-Lambertz, 2013). Surprisingly, greater activation for pre-readers than readers was observed in left anterior insula and precentral gyrus in an additional group contrast.

Our focus on convergence (spatial co-activation) of print and speech networks is further motivated by theory regarding the relationship between spoken and written language (Lieberman, 1992) and research indicating that individual differences in reading abilities, longitudinal outcomes in children, and print comprehension in adults closely depend upon the ability to re-organize speech sensitive networks in the LH to become responsive to print (Frost et al., 2009; Preston et al., 2016; Shankweiler et al., 2008). In 6–10 year old readers, reading readiness (as indexed by phonological awareness) was strongly correlated with the degree to which LH voxels relevant to spoken word processing were co-activated by print (Frost et al., 2009). Reinforcing the importance of print-speech integration for skilled reading, Preston and colleagues (2016) found that the extent to which 6–10 year old readers engage common voxels for print and speech in LH predicts performance on standardized reading tests two years later above and beyond total activation for either print or speech alone. Additionally, regions such as STS and STG have been found to preferentially respond to converging multisensory input (van Atteveldt et al., 2004) and show reduced activation in dyslexic compared to control children and adults (Blau et al., 2009, 2010).

Despite a growing body of evidence on how learning to read at different ages modifies brain systems for print, speech and their relation, we need more information at the earliest stages of literacy acquisition in other languages than English. Because, unlike other alphabetic orthographies, the English orthography has a very high degree of irregularity in spelling-sound mappings, previous research may have a limited relevance for a universal science of reading (Share, 2008). The current study addresses this gap directly testing Polish beginning readers from kindergarten and first grade. We selected children who could read at least one word and performed regression analysis to examine how reading performance correlates with the activation for print and speech as well as print-speech convergence in the first year of reading acquisition. Based on previous research in English, for better readers we expect to find higher activation for print in LH language areas including IFG, temporal and temporo-parietal areas. These regions should show print-speech convergence in more skilled readers. We hypothesize that the first stage of literacy acquisition affects also activation patterns for spoken language processing, but because we study implicit processing, higher activation in better readers is expected in the left temporal and IFG areas, but not in the vOT cortex

(Dehaene et al., 2011). To the extent that print and speech processing changes reflect less effort and attentional resources for better readers, we expect negative correlations with skill in anterior cingulate and anterior prefrontal cortex.

We also test if the onset of literacy induces a distinction in print and speech networks between beginning readers and pre-readers matched for age, sex and socioeconomic status (SES). For print, we expect to observe higher activation in beginning readers mainly in the LH temporal, tempo-parietal and frontal cortical areas, given findings from previous studies (with exception of Brem et al., 2010) suggesting that in the VWFA the specificity for print emerges relatively late in childhood. However, it is possible that it may develop earlier in a language such as Polish that has more transparent print-speech mappings than English. Differences between readers and pre-readers in speech processing has been less extensively studied and thus predictions are not as clear though Monzalvo and Dehaene-Lambertz (2013) study suggests decreased involvement of left precentral/insular cortex in readers compared to pre-readers.

METHODS

Participants

Data from 111 children ($M_{age}=6.90$, $SD=0.55$, $min=5.51$, $max=8.06$, 65 girls, 46 boys) out of 120 were included in the current analyses (for details see Supporting Information); data from nine subjects were excluded due to excessive motion in-scanner. Seventy-eight children were in first grade of elementary school and 33 attended kindergarten. All children met the following criteria: typical IQ, being born at term (>37 weeks) and right-handedness. None of the children had any history of neurological illness or brain damage and no symptoms of ADHD. The study was approved by the University of Warsaw Ethics Committee. All parents gave written informed consent to the study and children agreed orally.

Pre-reader/reader analysis subsample—Thirty-three children were not able to read a single word in 60 seconds. For categorical group comparisons, these pre-readers were matched pairwise for age, sex, IQ and SES with 33 readers. Subjects were matched to reduce total distance using the Hungarian optimization algorithm (Kuhn, 1955) to minimize the cost function: $d_{ij}=W_1 * (age_i - age_j)^2 + W_2 * (IQ_i - IQ_j)^2 + W_3 * (SES_i - SES_j)^2$ with weightings $W_1=2$; $W_2=W_3=1$. See Table 1 for sample and subsample demographics. Although the time of school/kindergarten year when children were tested did not differ between the groups, there was a significant difference in the formal reading instruction time: there were more first graders in the readers group.

Reading skill analysis subsample—The inclusion criterion for the regression analysis was a score of at least one word read aloud in a timed sight word reading task (Szczerbiński & Pelc-Pakała, 2013). Seventy-eight children fulfilled this criterion ($M_{age}=7.04$ years, $SD=0.53$, $min=5.94$, $max=8.06$): 66 first graders, 48 girls, 30 boys and 47 children with family history of dyslexia (FHD+). Reading performance ranged from one to 74 sight words read in 60 seconds ($M=22.65$, $SD=18.50$, $Mdn=16$).

Behavioural measures

Forty-seven days on average (min=4, max=144) before the neuroimaging session participants performed a sight word reading test, a subtest of the Decoding Test (Szczerski & Pelc-Pakała, 2013; see Supporting information for details), including also: letter knowledge, simple word and pseudo-word reading, elision and phoneme analysis. The delay between behavioral and fMRI testing did not differ between the groups and did not affect the pattern of fMRI results. Early print skills were assessed using an orthographic awareness test (Awramiuk & Krasowicz-Kupis, 2014). Rapid automatized naming (RAN) was tested with object and colour naming subtests (Fecenec et al., 2013). Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices (Polish adaptation: Szustrowa & Jaworowska, 2003) provided a measure of non-verbal IQ and the Picture Vocabulary Test: Comprehension indexed receptive vocabulary (Haman, Fronczyk & Łuniewska, 2012). The behavioural data were analysed in IBM SPSS Statistics v. 23.0.0.1.

fMRI Task and Procedure

Children received a short language localizer task in an event-related design with 4 stimulus conditions: 1) printed real words, 2) spoken real words, 3) printed symbol strings, and 4) spoken words vocoder processed to minimize phonetic content (for details see Supporting Information and Table S1). Conditions (3) and (4) can be considered as low-level non-linguistic *control* conditions that are matched in physical characteristics to the printed linguistic stimuli (length and visual complexity on screen) and to the spoken linguistic stimuli (dynamic frequency and amplitude content). However, linguistic content has been eliminated (orthographic and phonetic, respectively). This design evokes robust activation of the language network, and is sensitive to individual differences in reading skill in adults (Malins et al., 2016). Children were asked to pay attention to the stimuli - no explicit task was given to the participants. However, in such tasks reading occurs implicitly even without explicit instruction to read (Price, Wise & Frackowiak, 1996).

On each trial, four different stimuli from the same condition were presented in rapid succession in a "tetrad", designed to evoke strong activation with a relatively short imaging time. Each visual stimulus was presented for 250 ms, followed by a 200 ms blank screen, whereas each auditory stimulus was allowed 800 ms to play out. "Jittered" inter-trial intervals were employed with occasional "null" trials resulting in ITIs ranging from 4 to 13 seconds (6.25 seconds on average). The task was performed in two runs, each lasting 5:02. All conditions were presented in each run, with 48 trials per run presented pseudo-randomly, with no condition allowed to repeat more than 3 times in a row. This results in 24 total trials per condition, and 96 total stimuli per condition. Stimuli were presented using Presentation software (Neurobehavioral Systems). Before the scanning session children were familiarized with the task in a mock-scanner using different items.

fMRI Data Acquisition and Analyses

fMRI data was acquired on a 3T Siemens Trio scanner using a whole-brain echoplanar imaging sequence with 12-channel head coil (32 slices, slice-thickness 4 mm, TR=2000 ms, TE=30 ms, flip angle=80°, FOV=220 mm², matrix size=64×64, voxel size=3×3×4 mm). Anatomical data was acquired using a T1 weighted MP-RAGE sequence (176 slices, slice-

thickness=1 mm, TR=2530 ms, TE=3.32 ms, flip angle=7°, matrix size=256×256, voxel size=1×1×1 mm).

The pre-processing and analyses were performed using SPM8 (Wellcome Trust Center for Neuroimaging, London, UK). Images were realigned to the first functional volume. Then structural images from single subjects were co-registered to the mean functional image. Co-registered anatomical images were segmented using paediatric tissue probability maps (generated with Template-O-Matic toolbox). Next, DARTEL was used to create a group-specific template and flow fields based on segmented tissues (Ashburner, 2007). Functional images were normalized using compositions of flow fields and a group-specific template and smoothed with an 8 mm isotropic Gaussian kernel. The data was modelled for each fMRI run, using the canonical hemodynamic response function convolved with the experimental conditions and fixation periods. Besides adding movement regressors to the design matrix, ART toolbox was used to reject motion-affected volumes (for details see Supporting Information).

The general linear approach was used to analyse the data, contrasting experimental and rest trials in each subject. For each subject, contrasts were computed to examine word (print>rest and speech>rest) and word-specific effects for print and speech (print>symbol strings and speech>vocalized speech). For the results of brain activity to control conditions relative to rest, or reversed contrasts (i.e. symbol strings>print and vocalized speech>speech) see Supporting Information (Figures S1 and S2). At the second level, using one-sample t-tests we studied word and word-specific activation to print and speech in 3 groups: pre-readers, matched readers and total sample of readers. To uncover print-speech convergence regions we computed a null (AND) conjunction between word and word-specific activation to print and speech. For multiple regression analyses, the neural response for word-specific activation to print and speech was correlated with sight word reading skill, controlling for age as a variable of non-interest. Here again, a conjunction analysis for positive correlations was computed by the examining the intersection between the two contrasts. Using two-sample t-tests we compared word-specific brain activity to print and speech between pre-readers and matched readers. Results are reported at a significance level of $p < 0.005$ uncorrected, and an extent threshold of 50 voxels (Raschle et al., 2012), corresponding to the threshold of $p < 0.05$, corrected for multiple comparisons using a cluster size algorithm resulting from Monte Carlo simulations (3dClustSim, AFNI, <http://afni.nimh.nih.gov>). Significant clusters were labelled using Automated Anatomical Labeling (AAL) Atlas implemented in xjView toolbox (<http://www.alivelearn.net/xjview>).

RESULTS

Behavioural results: Pre-readers/readers analysis

Independent samples t-tests showed significant differences between matched readers and pre-readers in letter knowledge task, pseudo-word reading, phoneme analysis, phoneme elision, orthographic awareness, vocabulary size and rapid automatized naming. For means, standard deviations and t-statistics see Table 1.

Behavioural results: Beginning readers

Using Pearson correlations we found that sight word reading correlated with pseudo-word reading ($r=0.87$; $p<.001$) and several tests measuring reading-related skills, such as letter knowledge ($r=0.58$; $p<.001$), phoneme analysis ($r=0.42$; $p<.001$), elision ($r=0.72$; $p<.001$), orthographic awareness ($r=0.51$; $p<.001$) and verbal working memory ($r=0.31$; $p=.006$). Reading score did not correlate with vocabulary size or RAN. We observed a significant correlation with non-verbal IQ ($r=0.34$; $p=.002$). The reading score did not correlate with age and SES. The independent samples t-test revealed no differences in reading score between boys and girls or FHD+ and FHD- children.

fMRI Results: Pre-readers/readers analysis

Pre-readers versus matched readers—Figure 1 illustrates word (A: print>rest and speech>rest) and word-specific (B: print>symbol strings and speech>vocoded speech) activation for pre-readers and matched readers (see Table S2 and S3 for the location of cluster maxima). Regions in which printed words elicited significantly higher activity than symbol strings were exclusively found in the LH in both groups. Pre-readers activated two small clusters in the left caudate and lingual gyrus, whereas matched readers showed activation in the IFG, precentral and postcentral gyri. Neural response for speech>vocoded speech in pre-readers and matched readers was present mainly in bilateral superior, middle temporal and inferior frontal cortex.

While we observed a co-activation for print>rest and speech>rest in bilateral IFG, insula, and STG/MTG/STS (see Table S4 for coordinates and spatial extent) in readers, this co-activation was absent in pre-readers. Neither did we observe word-specific co-activation in any of the groups.

The results of two-sample t-test on word-specific activation for print and speech are presented in Figure 2 and Table 2. For print, pre-readers had higher activation in the left caudate than matched readers. The opposite contrast showed enhanced activation in the left IFG, precentral and postcentral gyri in matched readers. In the pre-reading children, speech induced larger activation in the bilateral precentral gyrus, left IFG and right Rolandic operculum. The reverse contrast (matched readers>pre-readers) yielded no significant activations.

Beginning readers—For full description of the larger reading sample, we also computed word and word-specific activation analyses with all 78 readers (see Figure 3 and Table S5 and S6). Word-specific activation for print was observed in the left IFG and precentral gyri, and also in left tempo-parietal and vOT cortex. Speech-specific activation was present mainly in bilateral superior, middle temporal and inferior frontal cortex. Print and speech co-activation was found in bilateral IFG/insula, left precentral gyrus, and the bilateral STG/MTG/STS. Word-specific co-activation of print and speech was restricted to two left IFG clusters, right insula and left STG/STS (see Table S4).

An additional analysis in which control conditions are contrasted with experimental conditions or rest can be found in the Supporting Information (Figure S1, pre-readers and matched readers; Figure S2, all readers).

fMRI Results: Reading skill analysis

Next, we correlated sight word reading skill with word-specific activation for print and speech (see Figure 4 and Table 3).

Better performance was related to enhanced activity for print in bilateral STG and MTG, calcarine and cuneus, left fusiform and inferior occipital gyri, left superior parietal lobule, left precentral gyrus, and bilateral IFG. Negative correlations were present in the bilateral medial part of superior frontal gyrus, anterior cingulate, left precuneus, insula and middle frontal gyrus. Reading efficiency was related to stronger word-specific activation for speech in bilateral STG and MTG. Negative correlations were observed only in the left inferior parietal lobule. An intersection of positive correlations (conjunction) for print and speech was found exclusively in the left MTG/STS ($x=-47$, $y=-45$, $z=0$; 580 voxels, see Figure 5).

Additional regression analyses of experimental conditions relative to rest are reported in Table S7.

DISCUSSION

Neural structures processing print

Pre-readers and matched readers, when implicitly processing printed words, engaged partially non-overlapping neuronal networks. In pre-readers, activation levels did not differentiate words from symbol strings: they showed activation only in the left caudate and lingual gyrus. In matched readers, words triggered implicit reading even though no linguistic decisions were required, as shown by the involvement of higher order language areas only for words (see Figure S1 for brain activity to control conditions and to reversed contrasts). According to our expectations, readers relative to pre-readers showed higher activation for print than for symbol strings in several LH frontal structures such as IFG, precentral and postcentral gyri. Greater engagement of these areas, specifically the IFG, has been associated with phonological recoding during reading (Pugh et al., 2010) and possibly related to top-down cognitive control relevant to reading (Pollack, Luk & Christodoulou, 2015). Left precentral and postcentral gyri are essential for convergence between the oral and written language networks and are typically activated when speech is produced, connecting visual words with articulatory representations (Monzalvo, Fluss, Billard, Dehaene & Dehaene-Lambertz, 2012; Price, 2010). This pattern of results would be supported by most theories of reading acquisition, where at the beginning greater reliance on segmentation and letter decoding rather than lexical processing is observed. According to the dorsal-ventral model (Pugh et al., 2001), left inferior occipital areas play an increasingly important role in the processing of print in beginners as they become more skilled (Blomert, 2011; Shaywitz et al., 2002; Turkeltaub et al., 2003).

No word-specific activation was observed in the VWFA in either group, as both words and symbol strings activated the left ventral occipito-temporal cortex (Price et al., 1996;

Turkeltaub et al., 2003) with even higher magnitude of response for symbol strings in the posterior medial part (see Figure S1; Brem et al., 2006, 2009; van der Mark et al., 2009). These results therefore do not support the hypothesis that the occipito-temporal print sensitivity is established in transparent languages during the earliest phase of reading acquisition in childhood (Brem et al., 2010), but rather agree with the notion that print-specific tuning emerges after children master basic reading abilities (Maurer et al., 2006). Reinforcing the idea that VWFA comes in at a somewhat later point in learning, for the whole sample of readers (including older, more skilled readers) word-specific activation in VWFA was observed (see Table S4). The local maximum of the VWFA activation ($x = -45$, $y = -48$, $z = -20$) was very close to the classical VWFA location ($x = -45$, $y = -57$, $z = -12$) with an Euclidean distance of 12 mm and with more anterior and lateral location than symbol specific activation. This pattern of results suggests that brain activity to words relative to symbol strings changes gradually as reading skill increases. Pre-readers show almost no difference in activity for print and symbol strings (in line with previous research Cantlon et al., 2011), poorer/younger readers show higher activity for symbol strings than print (see Figure S1), and finally better/older readers show word specific activation (print > symbols, Figure S2). So it seems that VWFA selectivity to words is highly dependent on reading experience and requires more than a brief exposure to print (in contrast to Brem et al., 2010).

In agreement with these observations, when the group of readers was considered as a whole (ranging from inexperienced to more experienced readers), the positive correlation between reading skill and the word-specific neural response to print was present in VWFA and a number of bilateral (inferior and middle temporal, IFG, calcarine, cuneus, inferior occipital gyri) areas. Activity of the VWFA is known to correlate with reading proficiency in both young and adult readers (Dehaene et al., 2015; Shaywitz et al., 2002). Here we show that even at the onset of reading acquisition (and in contrast to Turkeltaub et al., 2003), reading skill correlates with the magnitude of word-specific brain activation in the left vOT cortex, reinforcing the evidence that specialization for print in this region emerges with higher reading expertise. Although studies diverge on the concept of contribution of this area to non-reading tasks, they converge on an idea that it is generally involved in expert perception (Price and Devlin, 2003), including visual word processing (Langer et al., 2015). As predicted, literacy acquisition allows the left-hemispheric spoken language network to be activated by print because correlation was also observed in language processing LH areas including inferior frontal, temporal and temporo-parietal areas. These areas mature early in the acquisition of literacy (Turkeltaub et al., 2003) and display stronger activation during reading in control vs. dyslexic subjects (Shaywitz et al., 2002; Richlan, 2012) and are important for phonological processing, letter-sound integration and lexical-semantic processes (Cao et al., 2006; Van Atteveldt et al., 2004).

In contrast to Turkeltaub et al. (2003), which included older readers, we did not observe disengagement of the RH inferotemporal cortical areas in better readers, which has been taken to indicate decreasing reliance on non-lexical form recognition for word identification. Instead, less proficient readers in response to print employed bilateral anterior cingulate and anterior prefrontal regions, supporting our hypothesis of increased attentional resources and

higher effort to perform the task (Shaywitz et al., 1998) and in line with studies on late literates (Dehaene et al., 2010).

Neural structures processing speech

Specialization of the LH structures (including STG, temporal pole and planum temporale) in speech processing was reported already in 3 month-old infants (Dehaene-Lambertz, Dehaene, & Hertz-Pannier, 2002) and can be also observed in both pre-readers and beginning readers in the current study. When pre-readers and matched readers were directly compared, in contrast to previous studies on adults (Dehaene et al., 2010) we did not find heightened word-specific activation to speech in readers compared to pre-readers. Only a reversed contrast showed increased activation of the right precentral gyrus and rolandic operculum as well as left IFG and postcentral gyrus in the pre-reading group compared to matched readers. These results are in line with Monzalvo and Dehaene-Lambertz (2013), where only left precentral/insular cortex distinguished pre-reading from reading children, and suggest greater involvement of articulatory processes (covert repetition) in pre-readers (Price, 2010), possibly to compensate for their comprehension difficulties.

At the same time, as expected, in the whole sample of beginning readers, literacy refined spoken language processing by enhancing activation in the temporal cortex to speech consistently with adult (Dehaene et al., 2010) and child (Monzalvo & Dehaene-Lambertz, 2013) studies. This pattern of results therefore supports a continuous effect of reading practice on the oral network instead of a sudden change after the onset of literacy acquisition and might reflect increased phonemic processing that accompanies reading acquisition. Additionally, activation of the left inferior parietal lobule was negatively correlated with reading skill. This structure plays a role in sub-lexical speech perception tasks (i.e. attention to phonemic segments) and its activation has been attributed to the phonological working memory system that uses articulatory mechanisms to keep phonemic representations active (Hickok & Poeppel, 2000). This result would therefore agree with our prediction of less effortful speech comprehension in better readers.

Print and speech co-activation

Co-activation for print and speech was observed in readers only, in bilateral MTG/STG/STS and IFG. In the total sample of readers additionally a word-specific co-activation was present only in left MTG/STG/STS and IFG. Moreover, in the left STS we found an overlapping positive correlation between reading skill and neural activity to spoken and written words. These results are in line with previous studies in English with somewhat older children (Frost et al., 2009) and adults, showing a relation between reading or phonological awareness skills and convergent activation for print and speech in LH language areas. They are also coherent with additional findings that this integration in left perisylvian regions is associated with higher skills concurrently and better reading outcomes 2 years later (Preston et al., 2016). Here, we show that in even in emerging 6–8-year-old readers (with maximally one year of reading instruction), the acquisition of reading enables access from vision to language processing system and at the same time enhances its responses to speech, perhaps due to increased phonemic awareness. Therefore the print-speech convergence in the

language cortex emerges already at the early steps of acquiring literacy, possibly being a pre-requisite for the later-developing word-specific tuning in more experienced readers.

Limitations

More than half of examined children had familial risk of dyslexia since they were recruited for the study on the early predictors the disorder (Džbaska et al., 2016). Around 30% of them will become dyslexic (Snowling & Melby-Lervag, 2016), resulting in an 18% prevalence of dyslexia in the current sample, which is somewhat higher than in general population (5–17%). Another concern is the educational stage which differed between pre-readers and matched readers and might have affected their exposure to print, even though the groups were matched for age. Finally, because a number of children were still pre-readers, we employed a passive task to study implicit processing related to print and speech. Thus we cannot exclude that in such task the observed findings are a mixture of specific effects related to reading processes and non-specific effects related to attention or engagement with the task. Indeed, we found increased activity in prefrontal and parietal areas belonging to the default mode network (DMN) in poor readers for speech relative to rest (see Table S7), which suggests a specific failure to disengage the DMN during task, already described in dyslexic children (Boros et al., 2016).

Conclusions

In summary, we have shown how literacy acquisition in a transparent orthography affects patterns of activation for print, speech, and their overlap. In emerging readers reading skill was positively correlated both with word-specific activation to print and speech in language-related areas, and with print-specific activation of the VWFA. Literacy was associated with activation of the left-hemispheric spoken language network by print and at the same time enhanced activation in the temporal cortex to speech. Young readers compared to pre-readers of Polish showed word-specific activation to print only in the left anterior dorsal regions including IFG, which argues against the idea of the rapid specialization in the ventral occipital cortex in transparent orthographies. When listening to speech pre-readers showed increased activation compared to readers in speech production cortical areas, suggestive of greater involvement of covert articulation. Finally, print and speech convergent activation was observed only in readers, with greater convergence correlated with increased reading skill. We suggest that print-speech convergence is a hallmark of acquiring literacy and should be further tested as a possible early marker of reading acquisition failure.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was funded by grants from the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education (IP2011 020271), National Science Center (2014/N/HS6/03515, 2011/03/D/HS6/05584 and 2014/14/A/HS6/00294), grants from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development P01 HD 001994 to Haskins Laboratories and P01 HD070837 to Georgia State University. The project was realised with the aid of CePT research infrastructure purchased with funds from the European Regional Development Fund as part of the

Innovative Economy Operational Programme, 2007 – 2013. The authors would like to thank all the families which participated in the current study.

References

- Ashburner J. A fast diffeomorphic image registration algorithm. *NeuroImage*. 2007; 38:95–113. [PubMed: 17761438]
- Awramiuk E, Krasowicz-Kupis G. Reading and spelling acquisition in Polish. Educational and linguistic determinants. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*. 2014; 14:1–24.
- Ben-Shachar M, Dougherty RF, Deutsch GK, Wandell BA. The Development of Cortical Sensitivity to Visual Word Forms. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*. 2011; 23(9):2387–2399. [PubMed: 21261451]
- Blau V, van Atteveldt N, Ekkebus M, Goebel R, Blomert L. Reduced Neural Integration of Letters and Speech Sounds Links Phonological and Reading Deficits in Adult Dyslexia. *Current Biology*. 2009; 19(6):503–508. [PubMed: 19285401]
- Blau V, Reithler J, van Atteveldt N, Seitz J, Gerretsen P, Goebel R, Blomert L. Deviant processing of letters and speech sounds as proximate cause of reading failure: a functional magnetic resonance imaging study of dyslexic children. *Brain*. 2010; 133(3):868–879. [PubMed: 20061325]
- Blomert L. The neural signature of orthographic–phonological binding in successful and failing reading development. *NeuroImage*. 2011; 57(3):695–703. [PubMed: 21056673]
- Boersma P, Weenink D. Praat, a system for doing phonetics by computer. *Glott International*. 2001; 5(9/10):341–345.
- Brem S, Bucher K, Halder P, Summers P, Dietrich T, Martin E, Brandeis D. Evidence for developmental changes in the visual word processing network beyond adolescence. *NeuroImage*. 2006; 29(3):822–837. [PubMed: 16257546]
- Brem S, Halder P, Bucher K, Summers P, Martin E, Brandeis D. Tuning of the visual word processing system: Distinct developmental ERP and fMRI effects. *Human Brain Mapping*. 2009; 30(6):1833–1844. [PubMed: 19288464]
- Brem S, Bach S, Kucian K, Kujala JV, Guttorm TK, Martin E, Lyytinen H. Brain sensitivity to print emerges when children learn letter–speech sound correspondences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2010; 107(17):7939–7944.
- Cao F, Bitan T, Chou TL, Burman DD, Booth JR. Deficient orthographic and phonological representations in children with dyslexia revealed by brain activation patterns. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 2006; 47(10):1041–1050. [PubMed: 17073983]
- Castro-Caldas A, Petersson KM, Reis A, Stone-Elander S, Ingvar M. The illiterate brain. Learning to read and write during childhood influences the functional organization of the adult brain. *Brain*. 1998; 121(6):1053–1063. [PubMed: 9648541]
- Cone NE, Burman DD, Bitan T, Bolger DJ, Booth JR. Developmental changes in brain regions involved in phonological and orthographic processing during spoken language processing. *NeuroImage*. 2008; 41(2):623–635. [PubMed: 18413290]
- Dehaene-Lambertz G, Dehaene S, Hertz-Pannier L. Functional neuroimaging of speech perception in infants. *Science*. 2002; 298(5600):2013–2015. [PubMed: 12471265]
- D baska A, Łuniewska M, Chyl K, Banaszkiewicz A, elechowska A, Wypych M, Marchewka A, Pugh K, Jednoróg K. Neural basis of phonological awareness in beginning readers with familial risk of dyslexia - Results from shallow orthography. *NeuroImage*. 2016; 132:406–416. [PubMed: 26931814]
- Dehaene S, Cohen L, Morais J, Kolinsky R. Illiterate to literate: behavioural and cerebral changes induced by reading acquisition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*. 2015; 16(4):234–244. [PubMed: 25783611]
- Dehaene S, Pegado F, Braga LW, Ventura P, Nunes Filho G, Jobert A, Dehaene-Lambertz G. How learning to read changes the cortical networks for vision and language. *Science*. 2010; 330(6009):1359–1364. [PubMed: 21071632]

- Eberhard-Moscicka AK, Jost LB, Raith M, Maurer U. Neurocognitive mechanisms of learning to read: print tuning in beginning readers related to word-reading fluency and semantics but not phonology. *Developmental Science*. 2015; 18(1):106–118. [PubMed: 24863157]
- Fecenec, D., Jaworowska, A., Matczak, A., Stańczak, J., Zalewska, E. Test szybkiego nazywania (TSN). Podręcznik. Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego; Warszawa (Poland); 2013.
- Frost SJ, Landi N, Mencl WE, Sandak R, Fulbright RK, Tejada ET, Jacobsen L. Phonological awareness predicts activation patterns for print and speech. *Annals of Dyslexia*. 2009; 59(1):78–97. [PubMed: 19306061]
- Haman, E., Fronczyk, K., Łuniewska, M. Podręcznik. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych; 2012. Obrazkowy Test Słownikowy - Rozumienie (OTSR).
- Haman, E., Etenkowski, B., Łuniewska, M., Szwabe, J., Dobrowska, E., Szreder, M., Łaziński, M. Polish CDS Corpus. Talkbank; 2011.
- Hickok G, Poeppel D. Towards a functional neuroanatomy of speech perception. *Trends in cognitive sciences*. 2000; 4(4):131–138. [PubMed: 10740277]
- Langer N, Peysakhovich B, Zuk J, Drottat M, Silva DD, Smith S, Becker BLC, Grant PE, Gaab N. White Matter Alterations in Infants at Risk for Developmental Dyslexia. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2015:bhv281.
- Lieberman AM. The relation of speech to reading and writing. *Advances in psychology*. 1992; 94:167–178.
- Malins JG, Gumkowski N, Buis B, Molfese P, Rueckl JG, Frost SJ, Pugh KR, Morris R, Mencl WE. Dough, tough, cough, rough: A “fast” fMRI localizer of component processes in reading. *Neuropsychologia*. 2016; 91:394–406. [PubMed: 27592331]
- Maurer U, Brem S, Kranz F, Bucher K, Benz R, Halder P, Steinhausen H, Brandeis D. Coarse neural tuning for print peaks when children learn to read. *NeuroImage*. 2006; 33(2):749–758. [PubMed: 16920367]
- Monzalvo K, Dehaene-Lambertz G. How reading acquisition changes children’s spoken language network. *Brain and Language*. 2013; 127(3):356–365. [PubMed: 24216407]
- Monzalvo K, Fluss J, Billard C, Dehaene S, Dehaene-Lambertz G. Cortical networks for vision and language in dyslexic and normal children of variable socio-economic status. *NeuroImage*. 2012; 61(1):258–274. [PubMed: 22387166]
- Parvainen T, Helenius P, Poskiparta R, Niemi P, Salmelin R. Cortical sequence of word perception in beginning readers. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2006; 26(22):6052–6061. [PubMed: 16738248]
- Pollack C, Luk G, Christodoulou JA. A meta-analysis of functional reading systems in typically developing and struggling readers across different alphabetic languages. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2015; 6
- Preston JL, Molfese PJ, Frost SJ, Mencl WE, Fulbright RK, Hoeft F, Landi N. Print-Speech Convergence Predicts Future Reading Outcomes in Early Readers. *Psychological Science*. 2016; 27(1):75–84. [PubMed: 26589242]
- Price CJ. The anatomy of language: a review of 100 fMRI studies published in 2009. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 2010; 1191(1):62–88. [PubMed: 20392276]
- Price CJ, Devlin JT. The myth of the visual word form area. *NeuroImage*. 2003; 19:473–481. [PubMed: 12880781]
- Price CJ, Wise RJ, Frackowiak RS. Demonstrating the implicit processing of visually presented words and pseudowords. *Cerebral cortex*. 1996; 6(1):62–70. [PubMed: 8670639]
- Pugh, KR., Frost, SJ., Sandak, R., Landi, N., Moore, D., Porta, GD., Rueckl, JG. The Neural Basis of Reading. Oxford; 2010. Mapping the Word Reading Circuitry in Skilled and Disabled Readers. Scholarship
- Pugh KR, Mencl WE, Jenner A, Katz I, Frost SJ, Lee J-R, Shaywitz SE, et al. Neurobiological studies of reading and reading disability. *Journal of Communication Disorders*. 2001; 34(6)
- Pugh KR, Landi N, Preston JL, Mencl EW, Austin AC, Sibley D, Fulbright RK, Seidenberg MS, Grigorenko EL, Constable RT, Molfese P, Frost SJ. The relationship between phonological and auditory processing and brain organization in beginning readers. *Brain and Language*. 2013; 125(2):173–183. [PubMed: 22572517]

- Raschle NM, Zuk J, Gaab N. Functional characteristics of developmental dyslexia in left-hemispheric posterior brain regions predate reading onset. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2012; 109(6):2156–2161.
- Richlan F, Kronbichler M, Wimmer H. Functional abnormalities in the dyslexic brain: a quantitative meta-analysis of the neuroimaging studies. *Human Brain Mapping*. 2009; 30(10):3299–308. [PubMed: 19288465]
- Richlan F, Kronbichler M, Wimmer H. Meta-analyzing brain dysfunctions in dyslexic children and adults. *NeuroImage*. 2011; 56(3):1735–1742. [PubMed: 21338695]
- Richlan F. Developmental dyslexia: dysfunction of a left hemisphere reading network. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*. 2012; 6
- Shankweiler DP, Mencl WE, Braze D, Tabor W, Pugh KR, Fulbright RK. Reading Differences and Brain: Cortical Integration of Speech and Print in Sentence Processing Varies With Reader Skill. *Developmental Neuropsychology*. 2008; 33(6):745–775. [PubMed: 19005913]
- Simos PG, Fletcher JM, Bergamn MD, Breier JI, Foorman BR, Castillo EM. Dyslexia-specific brain activation profile becomes normal following successful remedial training. *Neurology*. 2002; 58(8):1203–1213. [PubMed: 11971088]
- Simos PG, Fletcher JM, Sarkari S, Billingsley RL, Denton C, Papanicolaou AC, Panagiotis G. Altering the brain circuits for reading through intervention: A magnetic source imaging study. *Neuropsychology*. 2007; 21(4):485–496. [PubMed: 17605581]
- Share DL. On the anglocentricities of current reading research and practice: The perils of overreliance on an “outlier” orthography. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2008; 134(4):584–615. [PubMed: 18605821]
- Shaywitz SE, Shaywitz BA, Pugh KR, Fulbright RK, Constable RT, Mencl WE. Functional disruption in the organization of the brain for reading in dyslexia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 1998; 95:2636–2641.
- Shaywitz BA, Shaywitz SE, Pugh KR, Mencl WE, Fulbright RK, Skudlarski P, Constable RT. Disruption of posterior brain systems for reading in children with developmental dyslexia. *Biological psychiatry*. 2002; 52(2):101–110. [PubMed: 12114001]
- Shaywitz BA, Shaywitz SE, Pugh KR, Fulbright RK, Skudlarski P, Mencl WE, Constable RT, Holahan JM, Marchione KE, Fletcher JM, Lyon GR, Gore JC. Development of left occipitotemporal systems for skilled reading in children after a phonologically- based intervention. *Biological psychiatry*. 2004; 55(9):926–933. [PubMed: 15110736]
- Snowling MJ, Melby-Lervag M. Oral language deficits in familial dyslexia: A meta-analysis and review. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2016; 142(5):498–545. [PubMed: 26727308]
- Specht K, Hugdahl K, Ofte S, Nygard M, Bjomerud A, Plante E, Elland T. Brain activation on pre-reading tasks reveals at-risk status for dyslexia in 6-year-old children. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*. 2009; 50(1):79–91. [PubMed: 18826418]
- Szczerbiński M, Pelc-Pakała O. Zestaw metod do diagnozy trudno ci w czytaniu – Test Dekodowania [The Decoding Test – a set of tools for diagnosing reading difficulties]. (PTPiP). Gdańsk. 2013
- Szustrowa, T., Jaworowska, A. TMK – Test Matrycy Ravena w wersji kolorowej [RCM - Raven Colored Matrices]. Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych; Warszawa, Poland: 2003.
- Turkeltaub P, Gareau L, Flowers D, Zeffiro T, Eden GF. Development of neural mechanisms for reading. *Nature Neuroscience*. 2003; 6(7):767–773. [PubMed: 12754516]
- Van Atteveldt N, Formisano E, Goebel R, Blomert L. Integration of letters and speech sounds in the human brain. *Neuron*. 2004; 43(2):271–282. [PubMed: 15260962]
- van der Mark S, Bucher K, Maurer U, Schulz E, Brem S, Buckelmüller J, Kronbichler M, Loenneker T, Klaver P, Martin E, Brandeis D. Children with dyslexia lack multiple specializations along the visual word-form (VWF) system. *NeuroImage*. 2009; 47(4):1940–1949. [PubMed: 19446640]
- Yamada Y, Stevens C, Dow M, Harn B, Chard DJ, Neville HJ. Emergence of the neural network for reading in five-year-old beginning readers of different levels of pre-literacy abilities: An fMRI study. *NeuroImage*. 2011; 57(3):704–713. [PubMed: 20977940]

Key points

- Literacy acquisition induces significant brain reorganization of the language network.
- In emerging readers reading skill correlates with the word-specific activation to print and speech in a number of brain areas
- Nonetheless, only in the left IFG, precentral and postcentral gyri did readers show higher activity to print than pre-readers, suggesting that specialization for print over other visual symbols begins in the dorsal network.
- Print and speech converging activation can be only found in readers in left hemispheric language areas, while reading skill enhances such convergence in the left STS.

Figure 1.

A: Word (print>rest and speech>rest) and B: word-specific (print>symbol strings and speech>vocoded speech) activation in matched readers and pre-readers ($p < 0.05$ cluster-corrected; $p < 0.005$ height threshold).

Figure 2.

Differences between pre-readers and matched readers in word-specific brain response to print (words>>false font) and speech (speech>vocoded speech) ($p < 0.05$ cluster-corrected; $p < 0.005$ height threshold).

Figure 3.

A: Word (print>rest and speech>rest) and B: word-specific (print>symbol strings and speech>vocoded speech) activation in 78 readers ($p < 0.05$ cluster-corrected; $p < 0.005$ height threshold).

Figure 4. Correlations between sight word reading and word-specific brain response to print (words > false font) and speech (speech > vocoded speech) ($p < 0.05$ cluster-corrected; $p < 0.005$ height threshold).

Figure 5.

Overlap between positive correlations of reading skill and word-specific activation to print and speech. Scatterplots present contrast estimates from left MTG/STS and standardized sight word reading score controlled for age.

Table 1

Demographics and test performance in pre-readers and matched readers.

Characteristic	Matched readers	Pre-readers	test	p-value
N	33	33		
Age (months)	80.68 ± 4.72	79.01 ± 5.73	t=1.29	ns
Sex	14 M, 19 F	16 M, 17 F	$\chi^2=0.24$	ns
Grade	7 K, 26 E	21 K, 12 E	$\chi^2=12.16$	<.001
FHD status	13 FHD–, 20 FHD+	12 FHD–, 21 FHD+	$\chi^2=0.06$	ns
SES	48.40 ± 10.37	43.43 ± 12.01	t=1.75	ns
Raven IQ [^]	7.33 ± 1.30	7.03 ± 1.40	t=0.91	ns
Articulation [*] (% of correctly pronounced words)	89.7 ± 18.03	77.57 ± 32.78	t=1.87	.067
Sight word reading [*] (words per minute)	21.03 ± 17.77	0	t=6.80	<.001
Letter knowledge [*] (identification of 64 lower & upper case letters)	57.7 ± 10.69	25.27 ± 14.61	t=9.34	<.001
Pseudo-word reading [*] (pseudo-words per minute)	16.72 ± 11.99	0	t=8.01	<.001
Phoneme analysis [*] (N of correctly analysed words)	8.84 ± 2.57	2.12 ± 2.84	t=10.06	<.001
Phoneme elision [*] (N of correctly deleted phonemes)	5.39 ± 3.9	0.79 ± 1.65	t=6.25	<.001
Rapid automatized naming [^] (average time in object and colour subtests)	6.98 ± 2.04	5.78 ± 1.93	t=2.44	.017
Picture vocabulary task [*] (N of correctly recognized pictures)	79.72 ± 5.61	73.3 ± 6.60	t=4.26	<.001
Orthographic awareness [*] (% of correctly identified trigrams)	66.56 ± 15.11	52.71 ± 13.05	t=3.92	<.001

M: male; F: female; K: kindergarten; E: elementary school; FHD: Familial History of Dyslexia; SES: Socioeconomic status;

^{*} raw values;[^] standard values.

Table 2

Comparison of word-specific brain activity to print (print>symbol strings) and speech (speech>vocoded speech) in readers and pre-readers.

Brain region	Hemisphere	x	y	z	t	Voxels
Print: pre-readers>matched readers						
Caudate	L	-4	20	0	3.52	71
Print: matched readers>pre-readers						
Precentral	L	-52	-3	42	3.90	257
Precentral, Inferior frontal (oper)	L	-48	9	30	3.52	105
Postcentral	L	-48	-32	57	3.10	64
Speech: pre-readers> matched readers						
Precentral	R	32	-24	58	3.43	174
Postcentral	L	-56	-12	46	3.38	211
Inferior frontal (tri)	L	-51	34	16	3.14	92
Rolandic operculum	R	58	3	3	2.99	80

Table 3

Correlations between sight word reading and brain response to print (print>symbol strings) and speech (speech>vocoded speech).

Brain region	Hemisphere	x	y	z	t	Voxels
Print – positive correlations						
Middle & Superior temporal	L	-58	-36	4	6.34	2383
Middle & Superior temporal	R	54	-32	6	4.99	2173
Calcarine (L&R), Cuneus (L&R)	L&R	10	-102	12	4.98	2640
Precentral, Inferior frontal (tri, oper)	L	-42	-3	40	4.86	2750
Inferior occipital	R	28	-93	-4	4.63	666
Inferior frontal (orb, tri)	L	-44	30	-4	4.37	554
Fusiform, Inferior occipital	L	-39	-63	-15	4.31	1439
Lingual	L	-22	-98	-16	4.26	170
Vermis (VI), cerebellum (VI)	R	2	-72	-18	3.76	281
Inferior frontal (tri, oper)	R	42	30	20	3.56	946
Inferior & Superior parietal	L	-28	-57	46	3.33	307
Print – negative correlations						
Superior medial frontal (L&R), Anterior cingulum (L&R), Medial orbital frontal (L)	L&R	6	46	0	4.87	2803
Insula	L	-40	-3	-4	3.69	193
Middle orbital frontal	L	-33	56	-9	3.22	221
Precuneus (L)	L	-9	-62	62	3.22	123
Speech – positive correlations						
Middle temporal	L	-44	-45	3	3.76	741
Superior temporal	L	-63	-10	2	3.18	67
Medial orbital frontal	L	-6	50	-14	3.16	76
Middle temporal	L	-54	-8	-18	3.10	209
Superior temporal pole	R	26	6	-22	3.08	52
Superior temporal pole	L	-36	18	-24	3.06	64
Middle temporal	R	46	-51	12	3.02	75
Speech – negative correlations						
Inferior parietal	L	-56	-57	42	3.10	75