Published in final edited form as:

Sci Stud Read. 2017 ; 21(1): 31–45. doi:10.1080/10888438.2016.1258702.

Individual Differences in Phonological Feedback Effects: Evidence for the Orthographic Recoding Hypothesis of Orthographic Learning

Dr Lindsay N. Harris and

Northern Illinois University, LEPP, DeKalb, IL 60115 United States

Dr Charles Perfetti

University of Pittsburgh, Psychology, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 United States

Abstract

Share (1995) has proposed *phonological recoding* (the translation of letters into sounds) as a self-teaching mechanism through which readers establish complete lexical representations. More recently, McKague et al. (2008) proposed a similar role for *orthographic recoding*, i.e., feedback from sounds to letters, in building and refining lexical representations. We reasoned that an interaction between feedback consistency measures and spelling ability in a spelling decision experiment would lend support to this hypothesis. In a linear mixed effects logistic regression of accuracy data this interaction was significant. Better spellers but not poorer spellers were immune to feedback effects in deciding if a word is spelled correctly, which is consistent with McKague et al.'s prediction that the impact of phonological feedback on word recognition will diminish when the orthographic representation for an item is fully specified. The study demonstrates the importance of considering individual differences when investigating the role of phonology in reading.

Keywords

orthographic learning; phonological feedback; individual differences; lexical representations

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Feedback from phonology to orthography has been proposed as a basis for building orthographic representations of less well-known words (McKague et al., 2008). In the present study, we test this notion of “orthographic recoding”. If accurate, the better spellers amongst skilled adult readers should be less sensitive to phonological feedback consistency than are poorer spellers when making decisions about spelling. We analyze the data collected in a spelling decision task to test the hypothesis that feedback from phonology to orthography is a tool for increasing the specificity of orthographic representations.

1.1 Phonological Influences on Orthographic Processes

Dual-route (e.g., Coltheart et al., 2001), connectionist (e.g., Seidenberg & McClelland, 1989), and dynamic (e.g., Van Orden & Goldinger, 1994) models of word reading all assume bidirectionality between phonological and orthographic information. The flow of information from orthography to phonology is empirically noncontroversial, but empirical support for feedback from phonology to orthography has been inconsistent. The most common method of investigating phonological feedback involves the manipulation of the *feedback consistency* of stimuli in a lexical decision or naming task. A word is considered feedback consistent if its rime body maps to only one spelling (e.g., the *elf* in *shelf* can be spelled only one way), and feedback inconsistent if its rime can be spelled more than one way in the language in question (e.g., the *eer* in *sneer* can also be spelled *ear*, *ier*, or *ere*; Stone, Vanhoy, & Van Orden, 1997). In the first study to demonstrate feedback consistency effects, Stone et al. (1997) found that responses to feedback inconsistent words in a lexical decision task were slower than responses to feedback consistent words, and accuracy to feedback consistent words was higher. To explain these findings, Stone et al. proposed that the alternative spellings activated by feedback-inconsistent rimes create conflict during decision making.

Since that original study, researchers have both successfully replicated (Ziegler, Montant, & Jacobs, 1997; Lacruz & Folk, 2004; Perry, 2003) and failed to replicate (Peereman, Content, & Bonin, 1998; Massaro & Jesse, 2005) the results of Stone et al. Two recent studies that controlled extensively for factors that might confound results came to opposite conclusions. Ziegler, Petrova, and Ferrand (2008) found no evidence of a feedback consistency effect in a lexical decision task, despite controlling for both onset and rime consistency, and were able to produce feedback consistency effects with a neural network model not sensitive to feedback consistency, suggesting that presumed feedback effects are in fact attributable to other factors. Yap and Balota (2009), conversely, showed significant effects of feedback consistency in hierarchical regression analyses of a large-scale database, after controlling for over a dozen other variables known to impact word-reading behavior. (Yap and Balota grant that it is possible that there are covariates they did not control for, but it is not clear what these might be; theirs is also the first study to examine feedback consistency effects in multi syllabic words.)

There are several issues in the phonological feedback consistency literature that may have prevented the field from reaching a clear consensus on the matter of feedback effects. First, all but one study (Perry, 2003) examined feedback effects at the level of the rime rather than at the individual phoneme. Categorically declaring a word “consistent” or “inconsistent” with regard to phonological feedback seems a rather blunt technique given that the individual phonemes in all words vary in their levels of feedback consistency. Vowels, in particular, can all be spelled more than one way in English (Kessler, Treiman, & Mullennix, 2008). Because research in our laboratory has utilized stimuli comprised of misspelled vowels in a spelling decision task, we have a felicitous opportunity to investigate the data from that experiment for evidence of feedback effects on behavior.

Additionally, the tasks used to investigate feedback effects have been exclusively lexical decision and naming. However, given that the cause of feedback effects is assumed to be

activation by phonology of alternative spellings, a spelling decision task is a more direct test of the existence of these effects, because participants are faced with one of the activated alternatives (assuming that the word's pronunciation is not affected by the misspelling). Researchers have also generally failed to control for individuals' differences in spelling ability in feedback consistency investigations, despite evidence that individual differences can significantly moderate cognitive processes in reading (Andrews, 2012). (An exception is Davies and Weekes [2005], who found feedback consistency effects in children with dyslexia, but not in control children.) Because we conducted assessments of individual differences in participants' spelling knowledge during the aforementioned experiment, these factors may be taken into account when examining the possibility of phonological influences on orthography.

1.2 Orthographic Recoding as a Mechanism for Orthographic Learning

McKague, Davis, Pratt, and Johnston (2008) have suggested that phonological feedback is useful *exclusively* during orthographic learning. Building on the self-teaching hypothesis (Share, 1995, 1999), which posits phonological recoding (the translation of letters into sounds) as a self-teaching mechanism through which readers establish complete lexical representations of words, McKague et al. proposed a similar role for what they termed *orthographic recoding*, i.e., feedback from sounds to letters, in building and refining lexical representations.

According to the lexical quality hypothesis (Perfetti & Hart, 2002; Perfetti, 2007), the quality of individual lexical representations can vary in their degree of completeness, or specificity. Partially specified representations can include free variables in the orthographic or phonological form where uncertainty exists; vowels are often the last element of a representation to become fully specified. McKague et al. reasoned that evidence that orthographic recoding at the level of the word leads to increased orthographic knowledge would support the lexical quality hypothesis and other item-based models of reading development (Share, 1995, 1999; Ehri, 1992, 2014). Moreover, they proposed that once an orthographic representation is fully specified phonological feedback has outlived its usefulness, and feedback consistency effects should not be observed for an item in an individual who has perfect orthographic knowledge of it. They tested this hypothesis in a training study that manipulated feedback consistency in pseudowords, and found moderate support for it.

Because we have spelling decision data that can be coded for feedback consistency, and individual differences data for the individuals who performed the tasks, we have the opportunity to offer complementary evidence in favor of the McKague et al. hypothesis, if it is correct. An interaction of feedback effects with spelling ability in our experiment would be consistent with the hypothesis. A brief description of the relevant methods and results from the experiment is provided below. For a discussion of the larger study and its findings, see Harris (2014).

2.0 METHODS

2.1 Participants

Participants were 145 Introduction to Psychology students at the University of Pittsburgh who received class credit for their participation. All spoke English at a native or near-native level.

2.2 Materials

Experimental stimuli were misspelled English words of between 5 and 9 letters in length, and were created by substituting one vowel in a word with another vowel (including *y*). Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT) workers verified that each experimental item was recognizable as a misspelling of the intended target word (e.g., that *conferm* was perceived as a misspelling of *confirm* and not *conform*). Each experimental session consisted of 40 experimental trials (misspellings) and 40 filler (correctly spelled) trials, for a total of 80 trials per participant.

The complete list of experimental stimuli used in the experiment is in Appendix A. Note that although each unseen target word was misspelled four different ways, with a quarter of participants encountering each misspelling, only trials for the two phoneme-preserving misspellings were included in the present analysis. This is because previous research has demonstrated that success at spelling judgments is significantly greater when a misspelling changes the pronunciation of the word (Harris, Perfetti, & Rickles, 2014). A spelling decision task using only phoneme-preserving misspellings will thus be likelier to reveal the quality of participants' orthographic representations, because a participant who does not have a fully specified representation for a given target will be persuaded by plausible misspellings (i.e., spellings that align with their phonological knowledge) whereas a participant whose representation is fully specified will not.

2.2.1 Offline Assessment—Each experimental session included an offline spelling assessment (Perfetti & Hart, 2002) for use as a measure of spelling ability in individual differences analyses. The assessment is adapted from Olson, Wise, Conners, Rack, & Fulker (1989), and requires participants to select only the correctly spelled words from a list of 140 items. Skill at the task is indexed by d' , an index of target sensitivity.

2.3 Procedure

Experimental and filler stimuli were presented at the center of a computer screen in random order, using E-Prime presentation software (Schneider, Eschman, & Zuccolotto, 2002). Subjects were encouraged to respond as accurately and as quickly as possible, and were informed that half the words they would see would be misspelled. They then completed a 10-trial practice block to become familiarized with the procedure. Each trial began with a white fixation cross appearing in the center of a black screen, which was replaced after 500ms by the stimulus, also in white. Subjects were instructed to hit the *Yes* key on a serial response box if the stimulus was spelled correctly and the *No* key if it was spelled incorrectly. The stimulus remained onscreen until a response was selected, for up to 2000ms. The next trial, beginning with a fixation cross, began 750 ms after a response was selected.

After the practice round, participants were given the opportunity to ask the experimenter any questions they might have about the procedure. The experimental session then proceeded in 4 blocks of 20 trials each, with participants given a chance to rest between blocks. The offline spelling assessment was administered following the experimental session.

3.0 RESULTS

Online and offline task performance measures are given in Table 1. Two subjects with experimental d' under 1.00 (indicating very poor target sensitivity) were removed from analyses, resulting in an n of 143. Responses with latencies < 250 ms (1.35% of trials) were removed from analyses. Incorrect trials (7.78% of trials) were removed from latency analyses. Finally, one of the 160 items was removed from analyses due to accuracy rates below chance.

3.1 Examination of Phonological Consistency

All misspelled stimuli were assessed for feed forward and feedback consistency. Consistency information was drawn from the report *Phoneme-Grapheme Correspondences as Cues to Spelling Improvement* (Hanna, Hanna, Hodges, & Rudorf, 1966). Grapheme-phoneme contingency was used as an index of feed forward (FF) consistency, i.e., the percentage of instances in which the misspelled grapheme is pronounced the way it is pronounced in the stimulus (e.g., in 72.24% of occurrences of the letter *i* it is pronounced /ɪ/, so *business* was assigned a FF consistency index of .7224). Phoneme-grapheme contingency was used as an index of feedback (FB) consistency, i.e., the percentage of instances in which the misspelled phoneme is spelled the way it is spelled in the stimulus (e.g., /ɪ/ is spelled with an *i* 68.4% of the time, so *business* was assigned a FB consistency index of .6840). Consistency indices for each of the experimental stimuli are provided in Appendix B.

3.2 Response Times

Response times (RTs) of correct responses to misspelled words were analyzed using linear mixed-effects (LME) regression (Baayen, Davidson, & Bates, 2008) with Stata statistical software. Offline spelling d' , FF consistency, and FB consistency were entered as fixed effects, as well as the interactions of spelling d' with FF and FB consistency. RTs and FF and FB consistency were log transformed to normalize their distributions. Participants and items were entered as random effects. In Table 2 we report regression coefficients (B) for the fixed effects variables, which estimate the effect size (in milliseconds) of the variable, and the z -value of the effect coefficient. As Table 2 indicates, two variables predicted RTs with marginal reliability: FF consistency ($p = .06$) and FF consistency $\times$ spelling d' ($p = .06$). No other variable significantly predicted RTs.

3.3 Accuracy

Accuracy data to misspelled words were analyzed using logistic mixed-effects regression with Stata statistical software. Offline spelling d' , FF consistency, and FB consistency were entered as fixed effects, as well as the interactions of spelling d' with FF and FB consistency. FF and FB consistency were log transformed to normalize their distributions. Participants and items were entered as random effects. In Table 3 we report odds ratios for the fixed

effects variables, which estimate the estimate the effect size (in ratio of the probability of answering correctly and the probability of answering incorrectly) of the variable, and the z-value of the odds ratio. As Table 3 indicates, the odds ratios of all of the fixed effects variables were significant. That the odds ratios are greater than one for spelling d' , log FB consistency, and spelling $d' \times \log$ FF consistency indicates that the likelihood of an accurate response in the presence of an increase in these variables was *greater* than the likelihood of an accurate response if their values remained the same. That the odds ratios are less than one for log FF consistency and spelling $d' \times \log$ FB consistency indicates that the likelihood of an accurate response in the presence of an increase in these variables was *less* than the likelihood of an accurate response if their values remained the same. That is, greater spelling ability and greater FB consistency positively impact spelling decision performance, whereas greater FF consistency negatively impacts spelling decisions.

To better understand how FB consistency interacted with spelling ability to predict accuracy, we graphed the predicted probability of a correct response for encounters with misspellings of a given FB consistency for participants with higher and lower spelling ability, according to the offline spelling d' measure (Figure 1). Although this graph represents predicted values and not actual data, the linear fits of the predicted probabilities are useful for visualizing the relationship between spelling ability and sensitivity to phonological feedback. As the fitted values demonstrate, participants with spelling d' greater than two are predicted to make, on average, spelling judgments with above 90% accuracy, regardless of the FB consistency of the misspelled phoneme. Participants with spelling d' less than two are predicted to steadily increase in accuracy, from around 85% to around 90%, as FB consistency increases.

4.0 DISCUSSION

Our aim in the present study was to investigate data collected in a spelling decision task for evidence of orthographic recoding as a mechanism of orthographic learning. All significant results appeared in our analyses of accuracy data. We found that offline spelling ability, feed forward phonological consistency, and feedback phonological consistency, as well as interactions of feed forward and feedback phonological consistency with offline spelling ability, each independently affected the odds of spelling decision accuracy when included in a model with the other variables. Feedback consistency has been an inconsistent predictor of word reading behavior in past research; we assume that phonological feedback was significant in our model because key characteristics of our task and stimuli were optimal for detecting its effect.

That increased FF consistency decreased the odds of a correct spelling decision in our task is not surprising. Recall that our index of FF consistency invokes the percentage of instances in which the misspelled grapheme is pronounced the way it is pronounced in the experimental stimulus. Our findings indicate that if the misspelling encountered by a participant tends to suggest the correct pronunciation of the misspelled word, he or she was likelier to make a wrong decision in our task than if the misspelling tends to suggest other pronunciations. This result is consistent with Harris, Perfetti, and Rickles's (2014) finding that misspellings that suggest the correct pronunciation of a word are less likely to be detected.

Similarly, we were not surprised that increased FB consistency increased the odds of a correct spelling decision. FB effects have been hypothesized to occur when the phoneme(s) activated by a letter(s) can be spelled multiple ways, and those alternate spellings interfere with word recognition. Because a higher FB consistency measure in our study indicates there are fewer ways for the phoneme to be spelled, it stands to reason that spelling decisions were facilitated by the relative absence of interfering spellings.

The inverse relationship of the FF and FB consistency variables to one another explains the opposite impacts of their interactions with spelling ability in our task. The significant interaction of spelling ability with FB consistency is consistent with the hypothesis that feedback from phonology to orthography is instrumental in learning orthographic forms and ceases to influence reading behavior once a lexical representation becomes fully specified (McKague et al., 2008). Research in children (Davies & Weekes, 2005; Bolger, Minas, Burman, & Booth, 2008) has previously shown greater effects of FB consistency in children with reading disability relative to normally reading children, but ours is the first study using real words and their misspellings to show such an association in adults. This association in mature readers supports item-based accounts of reading development, including the lexical quality hypothesis, that hold that lexical knowledge of individual items can vary in quality apart from one's general reading level, and orthographic learning continues on a word-by-word basis even for readers of considerable overall skill.

The interaction of spelling skill with feedback effects may explain why feedback effects in past studies that did not control for individual differences have tended to be small and unreliable. The lexical quality hypothesis assumes also that orthographic knowledge varies across words as well as individuals. Accordingly feedback effects vary for an individual across words with the relative quality of the orthographic and semantic representations. In a word for which an individual has high orthographic specificity, feedback effects will be small (or, according to the orthographic recoding hypothesis of McKague et al. [2008], absent), but in a word for which an individual has high semantic specificity, feedback effects will be larger. When data are averaged across all the participants in an experiment, feedback effects may be vanishingly small.

Our finding of an association of feedback consistency effects with spelling skill is also consistent with the hypothesis that phonological feedback is used in orthographic learning, and will be reduced when the orthographic representation for an item is fully specified. For a word that is well-specified orthographically, phonological activation continues to occur as part of the word identification process; however, this activation is dominated by word-specific phonology, so that consistency with other words is less relevant. Thus, a word such as *have* with phonology that is inconsistent with other words (e.g., *save*, *wave*, *behave*) has gained a word-specific phonology that is rapidly activated and is relatively protected from interference from words with different pronunciations. Word-specific knowledge, with both orthographic and phonological information represented precisely for a given word, defines lexical quality. The correlations with spelling skill that we observed reflect the fact that on average, a skilled speller will have more high-quality representations among the words sampled in the experiment than will a less skilled speller.

The orthographic learning mechanism that brings about these more precise representations is phonological feedback during reading. Thus, all words, regardless of the consistency of their spelling patterns, activate their word-specific phonology and this binds to the orthographic representation of the word. The self-teaching mechanism proposed by Share (1995) is a basis for initiating an orthographic representation. Added to that initial learning process is, with experience the repeated retrieval of word-specific phonology on the basis of a word-specific spelling—a practice effect that robustly binds orthography with phonology. Research beyond the kind of correlational study we have reported here is needed to establish this hypothesis. However, evidence supports the initial stages of orthographic learning hypothesized by the self teaching hypothesis (Share, 1999; Bowey & Muller, 2005; Cunningham, 2006; Ricketts, Bishop, Pimperton, & Nation, 2011). And the hypothesis that repeated phonological retrieval from written words occurs and strengthens the orthographic-phonological binding is consistent with the effects of word frequency on word processing, including the reduced effect of consistency and regularity with more frequently encountered words (Seidenberg, Waters, Barnes, & Tanenhaus, 1984; Andrews, 1982; Frost, Katz, & Bentin, 1987; Jared et al., 1990; Paap & Noel, 1991). In this broader context, the contribution of the present study is the demonstration that individual differences in reading-related skills can modulate the influence that segmental phonology has on orthographic processes.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Juan Zhang for help with stimulus creation, to Kimberly Muth for assistance with data collection, and to Matt Hamilton for unflagging guidance on statistical analyses. The suggestions of two anonymous reviewers also greatly improved the manuscript.

Funding

This research was supported by NICHD grant R01HD058566-02.

References

- Andrews S. Phonological recoding: Is the regularity effect consistent? *Memory & Cognition*. 1982; 10:565–575.
- Andrews, S. Individual differences in skilled visual word recognition and reading. In: Adelman, JS., editor. *Visual Word Recognition Vol. 2: Meaning and Context, Individuals and Development*. 2012. p. 151-172.
- Bolger DJ, Minas J, Burman DD, Booth JR. Differential effects of orthographic and phonological consistency in cortex for children with and without reading impairment. *Neuropsychologia*. 2008; 46(14):3210–3224. [PubMed: 18725239]
- Bowey JA, Muller D. Phonological recoding and rapid orthographic learning in third-graders' silent reading: A critical test of the self-teaching hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*. 2005; 92(3):203–219. [PubMed: 16095604]
- Brown, JI., Bennett, FM., Hanna, G. *The Nelson Denny reading test (form E)*. Chicago: Riverside Publishing; 1981.
- Coltheart M, Rastle K, Perry C, Langdon R, Ziegler J. DRC: a dual route cascaded model of visual word recognition and reading aloud. *Psychological Review*. 2001; 108(1):204. [PubMed: 11212628]
- Cunningham AE. Accounting for children's orthographic learning while reading text: Do children self-teach? *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*. 2006; 95(1):56–77. [PubMed: 16714031]
- Davies RA, Weekes BS. Effects of feed forward and feedback consistency on reading and spelling in dyslexia. *Dyslexia: The Journal of the British Dyslexia Association*. 2005; 11(4):233–252.

- Ehri, LC. Reconceptualising sight word reading. In: Gough, PB, Ehri, LC., Treiman, R., editors. *Reading acquisition*. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; 1992. p. 107-143.
- Ehri LC. Orthographic mapping in the acquisition of sight word reading, spelling memory, and vocabulary learning. *Scientific Studies of Reading*. 2014; 18(1):5–21.
- Frost R, Katz L, Bentin S. Strategies for visual word recognition and orthographic depth: A multilingual comparison. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*. 1987; 13:104–115. [PubMed: 2951484]
- Hanna, PR., Hanna, JS., Hodges, RE., Rudorf, EH. Phoneme-grapheme correspondences as cues to spelling improvement. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, & Welfare; 1966.
- Harris, LN. Doctoral dissertation. 2014. Why detecting a misspelling in language is easier than in language: Segmental and suprasegmental influences on orthographic processing. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Accession Order No. AAT 3648020)
- Harris LN, Perfetti CA, Rickles B. Error-related negativities during spelling judgments expose orthographic knowledge. *Neuropsychologia*. 2014; 54:112–128. [PubMed: 24389506]
- Jared D, McRae K, Seidenberg MS. The basis of consistency effects in word naming. *Journal of Memory and Language*. 1990; 29:687–715.
- Kessler, B., Treiman, R., Mullennix, J. Feedback consistency effects in single-word reading. In: Grigorenko, EJ., Naples, A., editors. *Single-word reading: Biological and behavioral perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum; 2008. p. 159-174.
- Lacruz I, Folk JR. Feed forward and feedback consistency effects for high- and low-frequency words in lexical decision and naming. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*. 2004; 57A: 1261–1284.
- Massaro, DW., Jesse, A. The magic of reading: Too many influences for quick and easy explanations. In: Trabasso, T., Sabatini, J., Massaro, DW., Calfee, RC., editors. *From orthography to pedagogy: Essays in honor of Richard L. Venezky*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum; 2005. p. 37-61.
- McKague M, Davis C, Pratt C, Johnston MB. The role of feedback from phonology to orthography in orthographic learning: an extension of item-based accounts. *Journal of Research in Reading*. 2008; 31(1):55–76.
- Nelson, J. Doctoral dissertation. 2010. Reading skill and components of word knowledge affect eye movements during reading processing. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Accession Order No. AAT 3435507)
- Olson R, Wise B, Conners F, Rack J, Fulker D. Specific deficits in component reading and language skills: Genetic and environmental influences. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 1989; 22(6):339–348. [PubMed: 2738467]
- Paap KR, Noel RW. Dual-route models of print to sound: Still a good horse race. *Psychological Research*. 1991; 53:13–24.
- Peereman R, Content A, Bonin P. Is perception a two-way street? The case of feedback consistency in visual word recognition. *Journal of Memory & Language*. 1998; 39:151–174.
- Perfetti CA. Reading ability: Lexical quality to comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*. 2007; 11(4):357–383.
- Perfetti, CA., Hart, L. The lexical quality hypothesis. In: Verhoeven, L., Elbro, C., Reitsma, P., editors. *Precursors of Functional Literacy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 2002. p. 67-86.
- Perry C. A phoneme-grapheme feedback consistency effect. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*. 2003; 10:392–397. [PubMed: 12921415]
- Ricketts J, Bishop DV, Pimperton H, Nation K. The role of self-teaching in learning orthographic and semantic aspects of new words. *Scientific Studies of Reading*. 2011; 15(1):47–70.
- Schneider, W., Eschman, A., Zuccolotto, A. E-Prime 1.0. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Software Tools; 2002.
- Seidenberg MS, McClelland JL. A distributed, developmental model of word recognition and naming. *Psychological Review*. 1989; 96(4):523. [PubMed: 2798649]
- Seidenberg MS, Waters GS, Barnes MA, Tanenhaus MK. When does irregular spelling or pronunciation influence word recognition. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*. 1984; 23:383–404.

- Share DL. Phonological recoding and self-teaching: Sine qua non of reading acquisition. *Cognition*. 1995; 55:151–218. [PubMed: 7789090]
- Share DL. Phonological recoding and orthographic learning: A direct test of the self-teaching hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*. 1999; 72:95–129. [PubMed: 9927525]
- Stone GO, Vanhoy M, Van Orden GC. Perception is a two-way street: Feed forward and feedback phonology in visual word recognition. *Journal of Memory and Language*. 1997; 36:337–359.
- Van Orden GC, Goldinger SD. Interdependence of form and function in cognitive systems explains perception of printed words. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*. 1994; 20(6):1269–1291. [PubMed: 7844512]
- Yap MJ, Balota DA. Visual word recognition of multisyllabic words. *Journal of Memory and Language*. 2009; 60(4):502–529.
- Ziegler JC, Montant M, Jacobs AM. The feedback consistency effect in lexical decision and naming. *Journal of Memory and Language*. 1997; 37:533–554.
- Ziegler JC, Petrova A, Ferrand L. Feedback consistency effects in visual and auditory word recognition: Where do we stand after more than a decade? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*. 2008; 34:643–661.

Appendix A

Unseen targets and experimental stimuli used in the spelling decision task.

Unseen Target	Experimental Stimuli
announcer	annauncer
	anneuncer
	announcir
	announcar
Another	anuther
	anather
	another
	another
Betray	betrey
	betroy
	butray
	botray
bleachers	bleechers
	bleochers
	bleachurs
	bleachars
business	bisiness
	basiness
	businiss
	businass
certainly	cyrtainly
	certainly

Unseen Target	Experimental Stimuli
	certainly certaonly
colored	culored celored colured colired
colorful	culorful cilorful colorfol colorfil
comfort	cumfort camfort comfert comfart
consensus	consynsus consonsus cunsensus cansensus
container	contayner contaoner cuntainer centainer
determine	deturmine detormine ditermine determine
dirtier	dertier dartier dirtiy dirtiar
discover	discover discever dyscover doscover
divergent	divirgent divargent dyvergent

Unseen Target	Experimental Stimuli
	duvergent
diversion	divirsion divarsion dyversion doverision
divulge	divolge divylge devulge dovulge
dynamite	dinamite dunamite dynamyte dynamate
easily	eesily eosily easely easoly
governor	guvernor givernor govurner govirnor
interpret	intirpret intorpret interprryt interprat
language	lenguage longuage languge languoge
machine	machene machone mechine mychine
motherly	mutherly metherly mothurly motharly

Unseen Target	Experimental Stimuli
movement	muvement
	mevement
	movemint
	movemont
movers	muvers
	mevers
	movirs
	movars
moving	muving
	meving
	movyng
	movung
mystical	mistical
	mostical
	mysticul
	mysticil
percolate	pircolate
	porcolate
	perculate
	percilate
physical	phisical
	phosical
	physycal
	physocal
prettiest	prittiest
	prottiest
	prettyest
	prettuest
prevail	preveil
	prevoil
	privail
	pruvail
purpose	perpose
	parpose
	purpuse
	purpase

Unseen Target	Experimental Stimuli
refurbish	referbish
	reforbish
	rifurbish
	rofurbish
service	sirvice
	sorvice
	servyce
	servace
surgery	sergery
	sorgery
	surgury
	surgory
various	verious
	vorious
	varyous
	varuous
weirdest	wyirdest
	woirdest
	weirdyst
	weirdast
wonderful	wunderful
	wenderful
	wonderfol
	wonderfyl
worthless	werthless
	warthless
	worthliss
	worthloss

Appendix B

Feed forward and feedback measures of phonological consistency for the four misspellings of each of the 40 experimental items in the spelling decision task.

Unseen Target	Misspelled Phoneme (IPA/Hanna)	Correctly Spelled as	Misspelled as	FB Consistency Index	FF Consistency Index
announcer	au / OU	ou	Au	5	4
			Eu	5	5

Unseen Target	Misspelled Phoneme (IPA/Hanna)	Correctly Spelled as	Misspelled as	FB Consistency Index	FF Consistency Index
another	əɪ / U2 + E5	er	ir	15	2
			ar	15	2
	ʌ / U3	o	u	6	9
			a	6	10
betray	/ U2 + E5	er	ur	15	1
			yr	15	1
	eɪ / A	ay	ey	16	5
			oy	16	2
bleachers	ə / ə	e	u	22	9
			o	22	11
	iɪ / E	ea	ee	16	3
			eo	16	2
business	əɪ / U2 + E5	er	ur	15	1
			ar	15	2
	ɪ / I3	u	i	22	7
			a	22	10
certainly	ə / ə	e	i	22	7
			a	22	10
	ɜː / U2 + E5	er	yr	15	1
			or	15	2
colorful	ə / ə	ai	ae	22	2
			ao	22	1
	ʌ / U3	o	u	6	9
			i	6	7
comfort	ə / ə	u	o	22	11
			i	22	7
	ʌ / U3	o	u	6	9
			a	6	10
consensus	əɪ / U2 + E5	or	er	15	3
			ar	15	2
	e / E3	e	y	13	5
			o	13	11
	ə / ə	o	u	22	9

Unseen Target	Misspelled Phoneme (IPA/Hanna)	Correctly Spelled as	Misspelled as	FB Consistency Index	FF Consistency Index
container	eɪ / A	ai	a	22	10
			ay	16	4
			ao	16	1
			u	22	9
			e	22	10
covering	ʌ / U3	o	u	6	9
			a	6	10
			y	22	5
			u	22	9
determine	ɜː / U2 + E5	er	ur	15	1
			or	15	2
			i	22	7
			o	22	11
dirtier	ɜː / U2 + E5	ir	er	15	3
			ar	15	2
			yr	15	1
			ar	15	2
discover	ʌ / U3	o	u	6	9
			e	6	10
			y	22	5
			o	22	11
divergent	ɜː / U2 + E5	er	ir	15	2
			ar	15	2
			y	14	5
			u	14	9
divergent	ɜː / U2 + E5	er	ir	15	2
			ar	15	2
			y	14	5
			u	14	9
diversion	ɜː / U2 + E5	er	ir	15	2
			ar	15	2
			y	14	5
			o	14	11

Unseen Target	Misspelled Phoneme (IPA/Hanna)	Correctly Spelled as	Misspelled as	FB Consistency Index	FF Consistency Index
divulge	ʌ / U3	u_e	o_e	6	8
			y_e	6	2
	ɪ / I3	i	e	22	10
			o	22	11
dynamite	aɪ / I	y	i	14	7
			u	14	9
	aɪ / I	i_e	y_e	14	5
			a_e	14	8
easily	iɪ/ E	ea	ee	16	3
			eo	16	2
	ə / ə	i	e	22	10
			o	22	11
governor	ʌ / U3	o	u	6	9
			i	6	7
	əɪ / U2 + E5	er	ur	15	1
			or	15	2
interpret	ɜɪ/ U2 + E5	er	ir	15	2
			or	15	2
	ə / ə	e	y	22	5
			a	22	10
language	æ / A3	a	e	3	10
			o	3	11
	ɪ / I3	a	e	22	10
			o	22	11
lovingly	ʌ/ U3	o	u	6	9
			e	6	10
	ɪ / I3	i	y	22	5
			a	22	10
machine	iɪ/ E	i_e	e_e	16	9
			o_e	16	8
	ɪ / I3	a	e	22	10
			y	22	5

Unseen Target	Misspelled Phoneme (IPA/Hanna)	Correctly Spelled as	Misspelled as	FB Consistency Index	FF Consistency Index
motherly	ʌ / U3	o	u	6	9
			e	6	10
	/ U2 + E5	er	ur	15	1
			ar	15	2
movement	u: / O6	o_e	u_e	16	8
			e_e	16	9
	ə / ə	e	i	22	7
			o	22	11
mystical	ɪ / I3	y	i	22	7
			o	22	11
	ə / ə	a	u	22	9
			i	22	7
percolate	ɜ: / U2 + E5	er	ir	15	2
			or	15	2
	ə / ə	o	u	22	9
			i	22	7
physical	ɪ / I3	y	i	22	7
			o	22	11
	ɪ / I3	i	y	22	5
			o	22	11
prettiest	ɪ / I3	e	i	22	7
			o	22	11
	I / E	i	y	16	5
			u	16	9
prevail	er / A	ai	ei	16	8
			oi	16	1
	ɪ / I3	e	i	22	7
			u	22	9
purpose	ɜ: / U2 + E5	ur	er	15	3
			ar	15	2
	ə / ə	o_e	u_e	22	8
			a_e	22	8
refurbish	ɜ: / U2 + E5	ur	er	15	3

Unseen Target	Misspelled Phoneme (IPA/Hanna)	Correctly Spelled as	Misspelled as	FB Consistency Index	FF Consistency Index
retreat	<hr/> I / E	e	or	15	2
			i	16	7
			o	16	11
	<hr/> i: / E	ea	ee	16	3
			eu	16	5
			i	16	7
service	<hr/> I / E	e	o	16	11
			ir	15	2
			or	15	2
	<hr/> ɜ: / U2 + E5	er	y	22	5
			a	22	10
			ur	15	3
surgery	<hr/> ɜ: / U2 + E5	ur	er	15	3
			or	15	2
			u	22	9
	<hr/> ə / ə	e	o	22	11
			e	9	10
			o	9	11
various	<hr/> I / E	i	y	16	5
			u	16	9
			ei	8	0
	<hr/> ɪ / E2	ei	oi	8	1
			y	22	5
			a	22	10
wonderful	<hr/> Λ/ U3	o	u	6	9
			e	6	10
			o	22	11
	<hr/> ə / ə	u	y	22	5
			er	15	3
			ar	15	2
worthless	<hr/> ɜ: / U2 + E5	or	i	22	7
			o	22	11
			e	22	7
	<hr/> ə / ə	e	i	22	7

Figure 1.

Predicted probability of correct response in spelling decision task by participant given phoneme-grapheme contingency (FB consistency) of a misspelling. Light-gray diamonds represent participants with an offline spelling d' of less than two, and dark-gray triangles represents participants with an offline spelling d' of two or greater. The dark- and light-gray lines represent a linear fit of the predicted values for better spellers and poorer spellers, respectively.

Table 1

Online and Offline Performance Outcomes.

Measure	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
Experimental Task	d'	1.42	5.61	2.93
	Accuracy (%)	68.00	100.00	92.13
	Response Times (ms)	527	1264	856
Offline Spelling Assessment	d'	1.06	2.94	1.90
				.39

N=143 for experimental measures and N=142 for offline measure.

Table 2

LME Regression Results for Response Times

Fixed effects	B	Std. Error	z	p
Spelling d'	-.053	.043	-1.23	.219
Log FF consistency	-.028	.015	-1.86	.063
Log FB consistency	-.004	.015	-0.28	.778
Spelling d' * log FF consistency	.013	.007	1.86	.063
Spelling d' * log FB consistency	-.002	.007	-0.24	.811
Constant	6.819	.086	79.12	<.001*
<hr/>				
Log restricted likelihood	51.16			
No. observations	2236			

* Significant p-values are indicated with an asterisk

Table 3

LME Logistic Regression Results for Accuracy

Fixed effects	Odds Ratio	Std. Error	z	p
Spelling d'	13.42	7.65	4.56	< .001 *
Log FF consistency	.59	.15	-2.03	.04 *
Log FB consistency	1.95	.52	2.52	.01 *
Spelling d' * log FF consistency	1.38	.18	2.43	.02 *
Spelling d' * log FB consistency	.72	.10	-2.35	.02 *
Log likelihood	-670.22			
No. observations	2466			

* Significant p-values are indicated with an asterisk