

Early Cognitive Indicators of Dyslexia in Preliterate Children at
Genetic Risk

Annie-Lou Carn

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of New England

Date

June 2007

Certification

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree or qualification.

I certify that any help received in preparing this thesis and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of the author.

Annie-Lou Carn

*This thesis is dedicated to my father, John D. Carn,
who is my inspiration.*

Thank you

Acknowledgements

It takes a village to raise a child and I think that this expression applies to writing a thesis as well. A lot of 'behind the scenes' folk have 'suffered for my art', in the creation of this thesis. Most particularly I thank my immediate family; my partner Will Castle, and my children, Ben and Jeni, my Tamworth family; my mother Helen and her husband Geoff Bennett; my sister Katie and Steven Keir, especially for their help with respite and Ben's 'balancings'. My friends who gave me practical help and humour, Denny Sutherland, Al Sutherland, Ingrid Matthews, Kim Anderson, Cath Robinson, Peter Quain, Ken Carn, deserve a big cheer. Thanks also to the technical staff at UNE School of Psychology, Dean Davidson and Chris Lisle; who also doubled as a puppet king. Mel O'Shea who managed to be both a kookaburra and a frog. My colleagues and fellow students, particularly Mel, Peter, Navjot, Talei and Will. You meet some great people in the process who help in all sorts of funny little ways, Dr Don Martin, Dr Don Hine, Dr Rhonda Brown, Dr Sue Watt, Dr Graham Jamieson, Shonette Bridgeman. Maybe they had the right joke at the right time, an encouraging word, a printing tip or a SPSS hit. Peter Browne the artist, deserves thanks. I would also like to thank my secondary supervisor, Professor Brian Byrne. Most importantly I would like to thank my primary supervisor, Dr Bruce Stevenson, who I can't thank enough.

Thanks, gang!

A lot of people have gone out of their way to provide me with assistance especially the children who played with me for hours on end, their teachers who rearranged timetables and let me disrupt their day, their parents who invited me into their homes to drill them on their reading skills and who also willingly agreed to their child's participation. For some reading disabled parents this was quite an ordeal and I admire their ability to rise above their embarrassment and participate.

Thanks a million!

Early Cognitive Indicators of Dyslexia in Preliterate Children at Genetic Risk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	
CERTIFICATION	
DEDICATION	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	(i)
TABLE OF CONTENTS	(ii)
LIST OF APPENDICES	(iv)
LIST OF TABLES	(xx)
LIST OF FIGURES	(xxv)
ABSTRACT	(xxviii)

CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM OF DYSLEXIA

<i>The Acquisition of Reading Skills</i>	1
<i>Psychological and Social Costs of Reading Failure</i>	1
<i>Defining Dyslexia</i>	2
<i>A Biological Basis</i>	3
<i>The Exclusion of 'Non-Dyslexics'</i>	4
<i>Direct Comparisons Across Studies</i>	5
<i>The Impact of the Matthew Effect</i>	6
<i>Isolating the Deficit(s)</i>	7
<i>A Visual Deficit</i>	8
<i>A Verbal Deficit</i>	10
<i>A Phonological Deficit</i>	11
<i>A Sub-Lexical Deficit</i>	13
<i>Double Deficit Theory</i>	14

<i>Automatisation Deficit</i>	16
<i>Working Memory Deficit</i>	17
<i>Empirical Evidence of the Involvement of WM in Reading Disabilities</i>	19
<i>Predictive Evidence Supporting the Involvement of WM in Reading Disabilities</i>	20
<i>Getting Around the Problems</i>	21
<i>Genetic Components</i>	21
<i>Evidence from Molecular Genetics</i>	21
<i>Evidence from Twin Studies</i>	22
<i>Evidence from Pre-literate Studies</i>	23
<i>Importance of Early Intervention</i>	24
<i>Precursors of Dyslexia</i>	24
<i>Genetic Evidence Assists Early Detection</i>	26
<i>Chapter Summary</i>	26

CHAPTER TWO: WORKING MEMORY PROCESSES UTILISED FOR READING

<i>The General Process of Paired Associate Learning</i>	28
<i>PAL's Function in the Reading Acquisition Process</i>	29
<i>Evidence of a Deficit from the Dyslexia Literature</i>	30
<i>Domain General Functions: The Central Executive</i>	31
<i>Controlled Attention in the Reading Acquisition Process</i>	32
<i>Evidence of Deficit in Controlled Attention from the Dyslexia Literature</i>	32
<i>Inhibition and Interference</i>	34
<i>Inhibition and Interference in the Reading Process</i>	34
<i>Semantic Interference</i>	35
<i>Phonological Interference</i>	36

<i>Evidence of an Inhibition Deficit in the Dyslexic Literature</i>	36
<i>Speed of Processing</i>	38
<i>Naming Speed and the Reading Process</i>	39
<i>Evidence of a Naming Speed Deficit in the Dyslexic Literature</i>	39
<i>Capacity Explanations</i>	40
<i>Span and the Reading Process</i>	42
<i>Evidence of a Span Deficit in the Dyslexic Literature</i>	42
<i>Domain Specific Functions: The Phonological Loop</i>	43
<i>Phonological Loop Functions and the Reading Process</i>	44
<i>Evidence of a Phonological Deficit in the Dyslexic Literature</i>	44
<i>Overall Design</i>	
<i>Measures Used in this Study</i>	46
<i>Participants</i>	47
<i>Test Time</i>	48
<i>Place of Testing</i>	49
<i>Adaptation of Measures</i>	49
<i>Initial Visit and Daily Procedure</i>	50
<i>Test Refusal</i>	50
<i>Feedback to Parents</i>	51
<i>Place of Parent Testing</i>	51
<i>Chapter Summary</i>	52
CHAPTER THREE: CLASSIFICATION OF CHILDREN	
<i>Rationale</i>	53
<i>Establishing NEAR and FAR Status: A Discrete Factor Versus A Continuum</i>	53

Study 1: Exploring Children's Measures and Establishing Child Risk Factors

<i>Participants</i>	55
<i>Materials and Procedure</i>	55
<i>Letter Name Recognition</i>	57
<i>Procedure</i>	59
<i>Letter Sound Recognition</i>	59
<i>Procedure</i>	60
<i>Phonological Awareness Measures</i>	60
<i>Sound Matching: Initial and Final Sounds Procedure</i>	61
<i>Rhyme and Final Sound Procedure</i>	61
<i>Syllable and Phoneme Blending Procedure</i>	62
<i>Syllable and Phoneme Elision Procedure</i>	62
<i>Word Blending Procedure</i>	62
<i>Word Elision Procedure</i>	63
<i>Lexical Access Naming</i>	63
<i>Rapid Automated Naming (RAN)</i>	63
<i>RAN Procedure</i>	65
<i>The Boston Naming Test</i>	65
<i>Boston Naming Procedure</i>	66
<i>Non-Verbal Ability</i>	67
<i>Block Design Subtest of the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of</i>	
<i>Intelligence</i>	67
<i>Block Design Procedure</i>	67
<i>Overall Procedure</i>	69

<i>Results</i>	69
<i>Scoring of Standardized Measures</i>	69
<i>Correlations for Data Reduction Considerations</i>	69
<i>Factor Analyses for Data Reduction</i>	74
<i>Discussion</i>	76
<i>Study 2: Exploring the Parents' Measures and Establishing Parent Risk Factors</i>	
<i>Participants</i>	81
<i>Materials and Procedure</i>	82
<i>Test of Word Reading Efficiency</i>	82
<i>Procedure</i>	82
<i>Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests (Form G): Word Attack Subtest</i>	83
<i>Procedure</i>	83
<i>Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test</i>	84
<i>Procedure</i>	84
<i>Results</i>	85
<i>Continuous Parents' Risk Factors Based on Regression Analyses</i>	90
<i>Continuous Parents' Risk Factors Based on Factorial Analyses</i>	92
<i>Continuous Combined Parent Risk Factors</i>	93
<i>Parents' Dichotomous Factors</i>	93
<i>Are There Differences in NEAR and FAR Children's Performance When the Parent Risk Factors are used to Predict Membership?</i>	95
<i>Discussion</i>	99
<i>General Discussion</i>	102

CHAPTER FOUR: PAIRED ASSOCIATE LEARNING

<i>Aim</i>	103
<i>Rationale</i>	103
<i>One Modality Versus Two Modalities</i>	105
<i>Effects With Words</i>	106
<i>Effects With Non-Words</i>	108
<i>The Impact of Phonological Stimuli</i>	109
<i>Main Study Hypotheses</i>	112
<i>Pilot PAL 1</i>	
<i>Aim</i>	113
<i>Participants</i>	114
<i>Materials</i>	114
<i>Item Considerations</i>	114
<i>Initial Design</i>	116
<i>Procedure</i>	117
<i>Procedural Considerations</i>	119
<i>Results</i>	120
<i>Discussion</i>	120
<i>Pilot PAL 2</i>	
<i>Aim</i>	121
<i>Participants</i>	122
<i>Materials</i>	122
<i>Procedure</i>	122
<i>Results</i>	122
<i>Discussion</i>	122

Study 1 and 2: PAL Tasks Visual/Non-Word, Visual/Synthesised Sound

<i>Aim</i>	123
<i>Participants</i>	124
<i>Materials</i>	124
<i>Procedure</i>	124
<i>Results</i>	125
<i>Data Cleaning</i>	125
<i>FAR Categorical Analyses</i>	126
<i>Acquisition</i>	127
<i>Retention</i>	128
<i>FAR and CAR Continuous Analyses</i>	130
<i>Discussion</i>	132
<i>Chapter Summary</i>	136

CHAPTER FIVE: MEASURING INHIBITION: THE FLANKER TASK AND THE ALTERNATIVE

<i>Aim</i>	137
<i>Rationale</i>	137
<i>Explanations of Negative Priming</i>	140
<i>Negative Priming in Sub-Populations</i>	141
<i>Flanker Designs</i>	142
<i>Study 1: Measuring Inhibition Using the Flanker Paradigm</i>	
<i>Hypotheses</i>	144
<i>Participants</i>	145
<i>Materials</i>	145
<i>Item Considerations</i>	145

<i>Item Choice for Conditions</i>	147
<i>Design Considerations</i>	148
<i>The Problem of Leakage Across Conditions</i>	149
<i>Design</i>	150
<i>Procedure</i>	151
<i>Results</i>	154
<i>Data Cleaning</i>	154
<i>Evidence of Priming Effects</i>	155
<i>Dichotomous FAR Measure as a Predictor Of Each Priming Effect</i>	156
<i>NEAR Group</i>	156
<i>FAR Group</i>	157
<i>Relationships Among Response Times, Across Conditions and Groups</i>	158
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	158
<i>Continuous FAR Measure as a Predictor of Each Priming Effect</i>	159
<i>NEAR Group</i>	159
<i>FAR Group</i>	160
<i>Continuous CAR Factors as a Predictor of Each Priming Effect</i>	160
<i>NEAR Group</i>	160
<i>FAR Group</i>	160
<i>Continuous CAR Variables as Predictor of Each Priming Effect</i>	161
<i>Are There Group Differences in Exposure Time?</i>	163
<i>Discussion</i>	163
<i>Evidence of Sub-Groups</i>	167

Study 2: Alternative Flanker Study: The RAN Flanker

<i>Rationale</i>	167
<i>Hypotheses</i>	168
<i>Participants</i>	169
<i>Materials</i>	169
<i>Design</i>	170
<i>Item Consideration</i>	171
<i>Procedure</i>	172
<i>Results</i>	173
<i>Evidence of Interference Effects</i>	174
<i>Dichotomous FAR Measure as a Predictor Of Each Priming Type</i>	175
<i>NEAR Group</i>	175
<i>FAR Group</i>	177
<i>NEAR and Far Groups</i>	178
<i>Relationships Among Inhibition Effects Across Conditions and Groups</i>	178
<i>Continuous FAR Factors and Variables as Predictors of Each Inhibition Effect</i>	179
<i>Continuous CAR Factors as Predictors of Each Inhibition Effect</i>	180
<i>NEAR & FAR Groups</i>	180
<i>Continuous CAR Variables as a Predictor of Each Inhibition Effect</i>	180
<i>Continuous CAR Variables as a Predictor of Each Interference Condition</i>	181
<i>Discussion</i>	181
<i>Parent and Child Measures</i>	183
<i>Children's Measures</i>	183
<i>General Discussion</i>	184

CHAPTER SIX: ENUMERATION TASK AND DISCRIMINATION TASKS

<i>Rationale</i>	185
<i>Enumeration Tasks</i>	185
<i>Discrimination Tasks</i>	189
<i>Properties of Targets and Distracters</i>	190
<i>Pilot Enumeration</i>	
<i>Aim</i>	192
<i>Participants</i>	192
<i>Materials</i>	192
<i>Design Considerations</i>	193
<i>Procedure</i>	193
<i>Results</i>	195
<i>Discussion</i>	198
<i>Pilot Multi-Item Discrimination</i>	
<i>Aim</i>	200
<i>Participants</i>	200
<i>Materials</i>	200
<i>Item Considerations</i>	200
<i>Design Considerations</i>	201
<i>Procedure</i>	202
<i>Results</i>	204
<i>Discussion</i>	208
<i>Pilot Single Item Discrimination</i>	
<i>Aim</i>	210
<i>Participants</i>	210

<i>Materials</i>	210
<i>Item Considerations</i>	210
<i>Procedure</i>	211
<i>Design Considerations</i>	211
<i>Results</i>	212
<i>Discussion</i>	215
<i>Study 1: The Enumeration Task</i>	
<i>Hypotheses</i>	215
<i>Participants</i>	216
<i>Materials</i>	216
<i>Stimuli</i>	216
<i>Design Considerations</i>	217
<i>Procedure</i>	218
<i>Results</i>	220
<i>Data Cleaning</i>	220
<i>Evidence of the Dichotomous Pattern</i>	221
<i>Dichotomous FAR Measure as a Predictor of Performance</i>	221
<i>Relationships Amongst Conditions for Each Risk Group</i>	223
<i>Continuous FAR Measure as a Predictor of Span, Speed and Controlled Attention</i>	224
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	225
<i>Continuous CAR Factors as Predictors of Span, Speed and Controlled Attention</i>	227
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	227
<i>Continuous CAR Variables as Predictors of Span, Speed and Controlled Attention</i>	227
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	228
<i>How do Span, Speed and Controlled Attention Correlate With Flanker Inhibitions?</i>	228

<i>Discussion</i>	230
<i>Study 2: The Discrimination Task</i>	
<i>Hypotheses</i>	232
<i>Participants</i>	233
<i>Materials</i>	233
<i>Design Considerations</i>	233
<i>Procedure</i>	234
<i>Results</i>	235
<i>Data Cleaning</i>	235
<i>Evidence of the Dichotomous Pattern</i>	235
<i>Dichotomous FAR Measures as a Predictor of Performance</i>	237
<i>Continuous FAR Measure as Predictors of Speed and Controlled Attention</i>	238
<i>Continuous CAR Factors as Predictors of Speed and Controlled Attention</i>	239
<i>Continuous CAR Variables as a Predictors of Speed and Controlled Attention</i>	239
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	240
<i>How Do Speed and Controlled Attention Correlate With the PAL Task?</i>	242
<i>How Do Speed and Controlled Attention Correlate With the Flanker Measures?</i>	242
<i>How Do Speed and Controlled Attention in the Discrimination Task Correlate With Enumeration Speed and Controlled Attention?</i>	243
<i>Discussion</i>	243
<i>No Subitizing Range</i>	243
<i>Evidence of a Speed of Processing Deficit</i>	244
<i>Predictive Value of Parent Measures</i>	244
<i>Predictive Value of Children's Risk Factors</i>	244
<i>Predictive Value of Children's Risk Variables</i>	245

<i>Does Discrimination Speed and CA Correlate With Other Tasks?</i>	246
<i>General Discussion</i>	246
CHAPTER SEVEN: MEASURES OF DOMAIN SPECIFIC CAPACITY	
<i>Aim</i>	249
<i>Theories of WM Capacity</i>	249
<i>Resource Sharing Model</i>	250
<i>Inhibition Based Model</i>	250
<i>Measurement Issues</i>	250
<i>Digit Span Measures</i>	251
<i>Span Measure Considerations</i>	253
<i>Pilot 1: Identifying the Appropriate Items</i>	
<i>Aim</i>	256
<i>Participants</i>	256
<i>Materials</i>	256
<i>Procedure</i>	256
<i>Results and Discussion</i>	257
<i>Pilot 2: Identifying the Appropriate Procedure</i>	
<i>Aim</i>	257
<i>Participants</i>	257
<i>Materials</i>	258
<i>Design Considerations</i>	258
<i>Procedure</i>	259
<i>Results</i>	260
<i>Discussion</i>	260

Study 1: Sentence Completion Span

<i>Hypotheses</i>	261
<i>Participants</i>	262
<i>Materials</i>	262
<i>Design Considerations</i>	262
<i>Procedure</i>	263
<i>Scoring</i>	264
<i>Results</i>	265
<i>Relationships Among Conditions</i>	266
<i>Dichotomous FAR Measures as a Predictor of Span Size</i>	267
<i>Continuous FAR Measures as Predictors of SC Span and SC Interference</i>	267
<i>NEAR Group</i>	267
<i>FAR Group</i>	267
<i>Continuous CAR Factors as Predictors of SC Span and Proactive Interference</i>	268
<i>NEAR Group</i>	268
<i>FAR Group</i>	268
<i>Continuous CAR Variables as Predictors of SC Span and SC Interference</i>	29
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	270
<i>Continuous CAR Variables & SC Interference</i>	271
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	271
<i>How do SC Span and SC Interference Correlate with PAL Measures?</i>	272
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	272
<i>How do SC Span and SC Interference Correlate with Flanker Measures?</i>	272
<i>How do SC Span and SC Interference Correlate with Enumeration Span, Speed and Controlled Attention?</i>	273

<i>NEAR Group</i>	273
<i>FAR Group</i>	274
<i>Discussion</i>	274
<i>Study 2: Gesture Span</i>	
<i>Aim</i>	275
<i>Participants</i>	276
<i>Materials</i>	276
<i>Item Consideration</i>	276
<i>Procedure</i>	277
<i>Scoring</i>	278
<i>Results</i>	278
<i>Relationships Among Conditions</i>	279
<i>Dichotomous FAR Measures as a Predictor of Span Size</i>	279
<i>Continuous FAR Measures as Predictors of Gesture Span</i>	280
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	280
<i>Continuous CAR Factors as Predictors of Gesture Span</i>	280
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	280
<i>Continuous CAR Variables as Predictors of Gesture Span</i>	280
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	281
<i>Did Gesture Span Correlate With PAL Measures?</i>	281
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	281
<i>Did Gesture Span Correlate With Flanker Measures?</i>	281
<i>Does Gesture Span Correlate with Enumeration Span, Speed and Controlled Attention?</i>	282
<i>What is the Relationship Between SC Span and Gesture Span?</i>	282
<i>Discussion</i>	283

<i>Evidence of Sub-Groups</i>	284
<i>General Discussion</i>	284

CHAPTER EIGHT: MEASURING THE PHONOLOGICAL LOOP

<i>Rationale</i>	286
<i>Hypotheses</i>	289
<i>Participants</i>	290
<i>Materials</i>	290
<i>Item Considerations</i>	290
<i>Design Considerations</i>	291
<i>Procedure</i>	291
<i>Results</i>	293
<i>Relationships Among Conditions</i>	294
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	295
<i>Dichotomous FAR Measures as a Predictor of Lexical and Similarity Effect</i>	295
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	296
<i>Continuous FAR Measures as Predictors of Each Phonological Span</i>	297
<i>Continuous CAR Factors as Predictors of Each Phonological Span</i>	297
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	298
<i>Continuous CAR Variables as Predictors of Each Phonological Span</i>	298
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	299
<i>How do Phono. Span Measures and Phono. Effect Measures Correlate with PAL Performance?</i>	300
<i>NEAR and FAR Groups</i>	301

<i>How do Phono. Span Measures and Phono. Effect Measures Correlate with Flanker Measures?</i>	301
<i>How do Phono. Span Measures and Phono. Effect Measures Correlate with Enumeration Span, Speed and Controlled Attention?</i>	301
<i>How do Phono. Span Measures and Phono. Effect Measures Correlate with Discrimination Speed and Controlled Attention</i>	302
<i>How do Phono. Span Measures and Phono. Effect Measures Correlate with SC Span and Gesture Span?</i>	302
<i>Discussion</i>	302

CHAPTER NINE: GENERAL DISCUSSION

<i>Aim</i>	305
<i>The Predictive Power of Standardised Children's Measures</i>	305
<i>Suggestions for Future Research</i>	306
<i>A Link Between Hereditary Aspects of Dyslexia and Domain General WM Processes</i>	306
<i>Parents as Predictors of Dyslexia</i>	306
<i>Suggestions for Future Research</i>	307
<i>Binding of Associates in WM</i>	308
<i>Suggestions for Future Research</i>	310
<i>CE Function of Cognitive Inhibition</i>	311
<i>Inhibition of Interference in a Discrete Task</i>	311
<i>Inhibition of Interference in a Continuous Task</i>	313
<i>Suggestions for Future Research</i>	312
<i>CE Functions; Span, Speed and Controlled Attention</i>	314
<i>The Enumeration Speed</i>	314
<i>The Discrimination Speed</i>	315

<i>Suggestions for Future Research</i>	316
<i>Domain General Span</i>	316
<i>Susceptibility to Proactive Interference</i>	316
<i>Non-Verbal Span</i>	318
<i>Suggestions for Future Research</i>	319
<i>Domain Specific Span</i>	319
<i>A Speed of Processing Deficit and The Matthew Effect</i>	320
<i>Summary</i>	320
REFERENCES	322

APPENDICES

<i>A. Information Sheet for Participants</i>	366
<i>Consent Form</i>	367
<i>Letter to Parents</i>	368
<i>Background and Contact Information</i>	369
<i>B. List of Participating Preschools and Schools</i>	370
<i>C. Letter Name Knowledge Test</i>	371
<i>Letter Sound Knowledge Test</i>	372
<i>D. Stanford Speed Reading Test</i>	373
<i>E. Paired Associate Task</i>	374
<i>F. Pictures used in Flanker Task</i>	376
<i>G. Flanker Task: The Forty Prime/Probe Pairs and Conditions</i>	383
<i>H. Flanker Task Phase 1 Items</i>	386
<i>I. Alternative Picture Flanker</i>	387
<i>J. Alternative Flanker Sheets</i>	388
<i>K. A Black and White Copy of CTOPP RANO for Comparison with the Flanker RAN Task</i>	397
<i>L. Icon Items used in the Multiple Discrimination Pilot Study with their Corresponding Name and Feature Manipulation</i>	400
<i>M. Sentence Completion Span Instructions and Data Collection Instrument</i>	401
<i>N. Gesture Repetition Instructions and Data Collection Instrument</i>	407
<i>O. Data Collection Measure for Non and Real Word Repetition Study</i>	409
<i>P. List of Words and Non-Words Generated for Phonological Span Measures</i>	411
<i>Q. Matrices for Similarity and Dissimilarity Ratings</i>	412

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Age and Gender Differences Across Demographic Areas	48
Table 2: All Partial Correlations for Children’s Standardized Measures, Using Age as a Covariate	73
Table 3: Factor Loadings for the Age Adjusted Residuals Used in the Factor Analysis on Each of the Three Children’s Risk Factors	75
Table 4: Correlations Between the Four Parents’ Variables	86
Table 5: Correlations Between Parents’ Variables for Mothers and for Fathers	87
Table 6: Correlations Between the Mean Parents’ Performance and Children’s Performance	89
Table 7: Correlations Between the Mean Parents’ Performance and Children’s Risk Factors	89
Table 8: Significant Best and Worst Parents’ SDRT Predictors of Child Variables and Factors	91
Table 9: Cut Off Criteria for the Creation of Dichotomous Parent Status Factors for Raw Scores.	94
Table 10: Using Each of the Three Parent Dichotomous Factors, T-Tests Compared the NEAR and FAR Groups on each of the Children’s Performance Variables and Children’s Risk Factors, With Age Co-Varied	96
Table 11: Number of Participants Classified as NEAR or FAR, Based on the USA FAR Factor and the Parent Report Factor	97
Table 12: Means (Standard Deviations) for Each of the Children’s Variables, Using Parent Report to Define NEAR and FAR Status	99
Table 13: Number of PAL Trials To Criterion for Each Reading Group and Each Stimulus Type	120

Table 14: Group Means (Standard Deviations) for the Number of Trials to Criterion, for Each of the Four PAL Conditions	125
Table 15: NEAR and FAR Group Means (Standard Deviations) for the Number of Trials to Criterion for Each Condition, in the Acquisition Session	126
Table 16: NEAR and FAR Group Means (Standard Deviations) for the Number of Trials to Criterion Required for Each Condition, in the Retention Session	128
Table 17: Savings From Acquisition Session to Retention Session, for Each Risk Group	129
Table 18: An Example of One Set of Flanker Trials with Fictitious Response Times	139
Table 19: An Example of a Prime Probe Pair for Each Condition	148
Table 20: The Latin Squares Design Distribution of Prime/Probe Pairs Across the Five Stimulus Lists	149
Table 21: Priming Effects for Each Type of Interference, Expressed in Milliseconds	156
Table 22: Probe Mean Response Times for the NEAR Group, for Each Interference Type	156
Table 23: Probe Mean Response Times for the FAR Group, for Each Condition and Priming Effect	157
Table 24: Partial Correlations Between Flanker Conditions for the NEAR and FAR Groups	159
Table 25: Correlations Between RTs for Each Flanker Condition and Children's Variables, for the NEAR and FAR Groups	162
Table 26: Group Means for Each Flanker Interference Type and Interference Presentation	174
Table 27: Mean RTs for the NEAR Group for Each Interference Type and Each Interference Presentation	176

Table 28: Mean RTs for the FAR Group for Each Interference Type and Each Interference Presentation	177
Table 29: Correlational Relationships Between Interference Effects for the Total Group and for NEAR and FAR Groups	179
Table 30: Significant Correlational Relationships Between the RAN Flanker Conditions and the Children's Variables	181
Table 31: Span, Speed and Controlled Attention RT Means for Pilot Enumeration	198
Table 32: Results of the Four Trend Analyses Examining the Linear Function Created By the Use of Different Sets of Icons	208
Table 33: Speed, Span and Controlled Attention RT Means for Pilot Discrimination	214
Table 34: Speed, Span and Controlled Attention RT Means for Children's Enumeration Task	222
Table 35: Frequency Distribution of Enum. Spans for Both the NEAR and FAR Group	223
Table 36: All Parent Performance Measures That Correlated With Enumeration CE Measures	225
Table 37: All Parent Performance Measures That Correlated With Enumeration CE Measures for the NEAR and FAR Groups	226
Table 38: Speed and Controlled Attention RT Means (in ms) for the Discrim. Task	237
Table 39: Means (Standard Deviations) for CA and Speed for the Discrimination Task for NEAR and FAR Groups	238
Table 40: Correlational Relationships Between Children's Variables and Speed and Controlled Attention for the Discrimination Task	240
Table 41: Correlational Relationships Between Children's Variables, Speed and Controlled Attention for the FAR Group Only	241

Table 42: An Example of Short, Medium and Long Sentence Completion Norms for Adults and Their Corresponding Response Time for Each Derivative	255
Table 43: Frequency Distribution of Spans Across the Whole Group and NEAR and FAR Groups	266
Table 44: Correlational Relationships Between Children's Variables and SC Span and SC Interference	269
Table 45: Correlational Relationships Between SC Span and Children's Variables for NEAR and FAR Groups	270
Table 46: Frequency Distributions of Gesture Spans Across the Whole Group and NEAR and FAR Groups	279
Table 47: Frequency Distributions of Phono. Spans Across Conditions, for the Whole Group	293
Table 48: Means (Standard Deviations) for the Four Conditions, for the Whole Group and for NEAR and FAR Groups	294
Table 49: Correlational Relationships Between Lexical and Similarity Effects for NEAR and FAR Groups	296
Table 50: Correlational Relationships Between the Children's Risk Factors and Phono. Spans	297
Table 51: Correlational Relationships Between the Children's Risk Factors and the Phono. Conditions for the NEAR Group	298
Table 52: Correlational Relationships Between the Children's Performance Variables and Phono. Span and Effects	299
Table 53: Correlational Relationships Between the Children's Performance Variables and Phono. Spans for NEAR and FAR Groups	300

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Diagrammatical Presentation of the Sampling Window	165
Figure 2: The Six Items From the Phon. Condition, Demonstrating a Bunched Presentation	171
Figure 3: The Six Items From the Phon. Condition, Demonstrating a Bunched Presentation	171
Figure 4: The Pattern of Counting Time Observed in a Standard Enumeration Task, Expressed in Milliseconds, as a Function of the Number of Icons Presented On Any One Screen	186
Figure 5: A Typical Counting Array Screen Used in the Pilot Enumeration Task	194
Figure 6: A Typical Response Recording Screen Used in the Pilot Enumeration Task	195
Figure 7: The Pattern of Counting Time Expressed in Milliseconds for the Pilot Enumeration Task, as a Function of the Number of Icons in an Array	197
Figure 8: A Multi-Item Discrimination ‘Different’ Screen	203
Figure 9: A Series of Graphs Displaying the Pattern of Mean RTs for Each Icon Set Including the Type of Manipulation Used for Each Set	205
Figure 10: Patterns of RTs Depending on Either the Orientation, Movement Or Feature Differences of Sets of Icons	207
Figure 11: A Single Item Discrimination ‘Different’ Screen	211
Figure 12: The Pattern of Counting Time Expressed in Milliseconds for the Pilot Discrimination Task, as a Function of the Number of Icons in an Array	213
Figure 13: Response Screen for Child Enumeration Task	219
Figure 14: A Line Graph Visually Displaying the Groups’ Performance on the Enumeration Task	221

Figure 15: Two Line Graphs Visually Displaying the NEAR and FAR Groups’ Performance on the Enumeration Task	222
Figure 16: The Pattern of Mean Counting Time Expressed in Milliseconds, as a Function of the Number of Icons Presented on Any One Screen	236

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis was to assess a sample of 81 preliterate children (3 to 5 years old) who were from a Family At Risk of dyslexia (FAR) or Not Easily Associated with Risk (NEAR) in respect to a range of working memory and standardised language tasks (children's measures) in an attempt to identify cognitive features that might be implicated in dyslexia. Because dyslexia appears to have hereditary components, parent's performance on a range of reading related tasks was also correlated with children's performance to assess which tasks were most predictive of risk status.

Utilising information gained by previous longitudinal studies, standardized tasks provided a continuous classification of the children's likely risk status based on their own performance. Three factors were gleaned from a factorial analysis, component manipulation ability, rapid automatised naming, and letter knowledge, and this accords with current research (Bishop, 2003) suggesting that these three factors are good predictors of future reading success. In terms of the children's non-standardised measures, the ability to pair visual stimuli with articulated and synthesised sounds was investigated. Measures of central executive functions (cognitive inhibition, susceptibility to interference, various span measures, speed, and controlled attention) were also examined. Tasks were adapted, or developed, specifically to meet the attentional, knowledge and skill levels of these young children.

Children were categorised in terms of risk status using two methods based upon their parent's literacy performance. Firstly, several continuous predictors were identified. Of these, the worst parent's comprehension score was the best predictor of children's performance and supports the idea that the hereditary component of dyslexia appears more likely to involve central executive functions, like speed, and possibly central coherence, which in turn impact on phonological processing. The second method produced the discrete

categories of family at risk (FAR) and not easily associated with risk (NEAR). This method proved to be most informative when categorisation was based on self-report by the parents concerning their past competence in reading.

The only performance differences between NEAR and FAR groups, in terms of paired associate learning was when the FAR group out performed the NEAR group when the sound was synthesised. It is suggested that this may be the result of enhanced perceptual discrimination for acoustic input, with reduced likelihood of language-specific categorical (phonological) processing.

Two measures of cognitive inhibition were designed using picture flanker tasks. Overall, the results suggested that the FAR children were more likely to interpret pictures semantically, relying on a more literal perceptual interpretation, rather than assigning a quick linguistic label. The use of this strategy would require greater reliance on an eidetic memory and thus accords well with their performance on the paired associate tasks.

Using an enumeration task, there were no group differences on the basis of span or controlled attention, yet the FAR group showed a speed of processing deficit supporting similar results for individuals with dyslexia (e.g., Bowers, 1995). Similarly, using a discrimination task, the FAR group demonstrated a trend towards slower response times. The results of the enumeration and discrimination tasks, in conjunction with performance on some of the standardised tasks, highlight a critical role for processing speed.

A sentence completion active span task demonstrated no group differences in span sizes, but FAR children were more susceptible to proactive interference from previous trials and lower span in this group predicted proactive interference. This susceptibility to interference may have a genetic component, where poor sight word reading ability displayed by the parents with the worst reading skills was strongly associated with greater susceptibility to interference for the children.

For simple word span, the NEAR group demonstrated a larger span size for similar real words relative to the FAR group. This provides tentative support that a deficit may lie in the distinctiveness of the phonological representation at a lexical level, leading to difficulty when it comes to retrieval. It is highly possible that if a deficit occurred here, a strategy to overcome this deficit may be to focus on acoustic properties at the time of encoding in order to improve their performance.

Overall, the performance of FAR children would suggest a primary speed of processing deficit that may have a cascading effect. Speed deficits contributed to poor performance not just in tasks that were timed (e.g., rapid automatized naming tasks), but also in tasks requiring the segmentation of speech stream (e.g., rhyme awareness, word blending ability and word elision skills). The pattern of associations between children's measures reported throughout the thesis would suggest that the Matthew Effect is indeed impacting way *before* the reading acquisition process even begins, emphasizing the need for further investigation in the preliterate population.