Orthographic Processing in Baboons (*Papio papio*)

Jonathan Grainger,* Stéphane Dufau, Marie Montant, Johannes C. Ziegler, Joël Fagot

Skilled readers use information about which letters are where in a word (orthographic information) in order to access the sounds and meanings of printed words. We asked whether efficient processing of orthographic information could be achieved in the absence of prior language knowledge. To do so, we trained baboons to discriminate English words from nonsense combinations of letters that resembled real words. The results revealed that the baboons were using orthographic information in order to efficiently discriminate words from letter strings that were not words. Our results demonstrate that basic orthographic processing skills can be acquired in the absence of preexisting linguistic representations.

eading is a complex process that starts with the extraction of detailed visual information, which is used to access the sounds (phonology) and the meanings (semantics) of words. Before they process the phonological and semantic information, readers of languages that use an alphabetic script must first process the elementary visual features of the word's constituent letters, and assign these different letter identities to specific positions in the word. The computation of letter identities and their relative positions is referred to as orthographic processing, and there is a large consensus today that such processing represents the first "language-specific" stage of the reading process that follows the operations involved in the control of eve movements (bringing words into the focus of central vision) and early visual processing (enabling visual feature extraction; Fig. 1A) (1-4). In the present study, we examined whether the ability to efficiently process orthographic information can operate in the absence of prior linguistic knowledge.

Orthographic processing lies at the interface between the visual processing and the linguistic processing involved in written language comprehension. The vast majority of research on visual word recognition, however, has ignored the status of printed words as visual objects, focusing mainly on how letter-level information maps onto higher-level linguistic properties (phonological, morphological, semantic, and syntactic) (5). The discovery that orthographic processing is achieved by neural structures in the left ventral occipitotemporal cortex (6, 7), a region that is bilaterally associated with object and face processing, has encouraged a reconsideration of the role of basic object identification processes in visual word recognition. In the light of this finding, Dehaene and colleagues proposed that skilled reading involves an adaptation of general object-identification processes in ventral occipitotemporal brain areas to the specific characteristics of printed words (8, 9).

However, according to the dominant theories of reading, orthographic processing is still primarily considered to be an extension of already established linguistic skills in the domain of spoken language processing (or sign language processing in hearing-impaired persons). Indeed, the task of learning to read a language with an alphabetic script is facilitated by the fact that individual letters and letter clusters (graphemes) can be associated with the elementary sounds of the language (phonemes) in order to recover a phonological representation of the word being read, and from there to understand its meaning (5). Such phonological recoding operations could well be a major constraint that forces the beginning reader to process individual letters rather than the word as a whole (10). Thus, it has typically been argued that orthographic processing is a predominantly linguistic skill, requiring the same cerebral predisposition as thought to be required for spoken and sign language processing, or at the least, prior exposure to the language in question.

We challenged the hypothesis that learning an orthographic code depends on preexisting linguistic knowledge by investigating whether nonhuman primates can learn this skill. Humans and nonhuman primates from the cercopithecidae family, such as macaques or baboons, have similar visual systems (11). However, the communicative system of cercopithecidae arguably lacks the structural complexity of human language (12) and certainly does not include any phonological representation of English words that could be associated with the printed forms of these words. Using a new testing procedure in which socially housed monkeys had free access to computercontrolled operant conditioning setups with touch screens (Fig. 1B) (13), we trained six baboons to



Fig. 1. Teaching baboons to recognize words. **(A)** Skilled readers use an orthographic code to recognize words, mapping elementary visual features, such as lines of different orientation (here features contained in the word "WASP"), onto whole-word orthographic representations via some form of letter-level code (1-4, 9). **(B** and **C)** While maintained in their social group, the baboons had free access to computer-controlled operant conditioning setups with touch screen technology (13). **(C)** The baboons were trained to recognize four-letter English words and distinguish them from strings of letters that are not English words, such as "STOD." Baboons responded by touching either the cross or the oval shape presented immediately after the word or nonword. After a correct response, a blank screen was presented and baboons received a food reward (dry wheat). A green screen was presented for 3 s after an incorrect response. We asked whether baboons would use an orthographic code, as described in (A), in order to discriminate words from nonwords.

CNRS and Aix-Marseille University Laboratoire de Psychologie Cognitive, Fédération de Recherche 3C, Brain and Language Research Institute, Aix-Marseille University and CNRS, 3 Place Victor Hugo, 13331 Marseille, France.

^{*}To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: i.jonathan.grainger@gmail.com

discriminate randomly selected real English words four letters in length from artificially generated four-letter strings of letters that were not real English words [henceforth, nonwords (Fig. 1C)]. All nonwords were formed of a vowel and three consonants and contained letter combinations (bigrams) that occurred in real words. Bigram frequency was minimized in the list of nonwords and maximized in the list of words (14), so that the word versus nonword discrimination could be made implicitly on the basis of statistical dependencies between letters. Words and nonwords were presented randomly in blocks of 100 trials. The 100-trial sessions were composed of 25 presentations of a novel word to learn, 25 presentations of words randomly selected from already learned words, and 50 nonword trials. Each new word was added to the ever-increasing pool of already learned words, once responses to that word exceeded 80% correct within the preceding session. Thus, in terms of explicit information available to the baboons, a word was defined as a string of letters that was repeatedly presented, whereas a nonword was rarely repeated. The baboons responded by touching one of two shapes shown on the touch screen and were given a food reward after a correct response (Fig. 1C) (see the supplementary materials for more details).

Over a period of a month and a half, baboons learned to discriminate dozens of words (the count was 81 xxxxxxx and 307 xxxxxx) from among a total of 7832 nonwords at nearly 75% accuracy (Fig. 2 and table S1). This in itself is a remarkable result, given the level of orthographic similarity between the word and nonword stimuli. More detailed analyses revealed that baboons were not simply memorizing the word stimuli but had learned to discriminate words from nonwords on the basis of differences in the frequency of letter combinations in the two categories of stimuli (i.e., statistical learning). Indeed, there was a significant correlation between mean bigram frequency and word accuracy [correlation coefficient (r) = 0.51 for xxxxxx and 0.80 for xxxxxxx; P < 0.05]. More importantly, words that were seen for the first time triggered significantly fewer "nonword" responses than did the nonword stimuli (Fig. 3). This implies that the baboons had extracted knowledge about what statistical properties characterize words and nonwords and used this information to make their word versus nonword decision without having seen the specific examples before. In the absence of such knowl-

word decision without having seen the specific examples before. In the absence of such knowledge, words seen for the first time should have been processed like nonwords. Figure 3 shows that this was clearly not the case. Even more striking is the strong linear rela-

F4 tion, shown in Fig. 4, between accuracy in response to nonword stimuli and their orthographic similarity to words that the baboons had already learned. The more similar a nonword was to a known word, the more false positive responses it produced. Orthographic similarity was measured with a standard edit distance used in information theory and computer science (15). For each non-

word we counted the number of letter insertions, letter deletions, and letter substitutions required to transform the nonword into a known word, and we retained the average of the 20 lowest values as the OLD20 value of that nonword (16). Thus, the smaller the OLD20 value, the greater the orthographic similarity between the nonword and the set of known words. This standard measure of orthographic similarity was found to have a quasi-linear relationship with the accuracy of responses to nonwords [xxxxxxxx (R^2) = 0.76 for xxxxxxx and 0.91 for xxxxxxx; see supplementary materials]. Exactly the same quasilinear relationship was found in an analysis of the accuracy of human responses to nonwords in a large-scale lexical decision experiment (17). This finding implies that the baboons were sensitive to the orthographic characteristics of word and nonword stimuli in a way that mimics the sensitivity to orthographic similarity seen in skilled human readers.

Our results indicate that baboons were coding the word and nonword stimuli as a set of letter identities arranged in a particular order. Baboons had learned to discriminate different letters from each other (letter identity) and to associate those letter identities with positional information. Their coding of the statistical dependencies between position-coded letters is reflected in (i) their ability to discriminate novel words from nonwords (i.e., generalization), (ii) the significant correlation between bigram frequency and the accuracy



Fig. 2. Successful word-nonword discrimination in baboons. (A) Accuracy for words (e.g., DONE, LAND, THEM, VAST) and (**B**) nonwords (e.g., DRAN, LONS, TELK, VIRT) was calculated for blocks of 2000 consecutive trials (except for the last block) separately for each baboon (here and in Figs. 3 and 4, baboons are indicated by their abbreviated names: DAN, ART, CAU, DOR, VIO, and ARI). The results of a signal detection analysis are shown in (**C**) (sensitivity: baboons' ability to discriminate words from nonwords) and (**D**) (bias: baboons' inclination to answer "word" or "nonword"). During the first block of 2000 trials, numerical estimates of bias show that each baboon predominantly chose one of the two possible responses resulting in a "word" or "nonword" bias and low sensitivity [xxxxxxxx statistic (*d'*) close to zero]. After 2000 trials, the baboons started to perform accurate word-nonword classification by responding "word" to repeated stimuli and "nonword" to novel stimuli as shown by above-zero sensitivities and bias values close to zero. Baboons attained an accuracy level of about 75%. Error bars in (A) and (B) correspond to the 95% binomial confidence interval, which are also displayed in gray for chance performance (see supplementary materials for more details).

MONTH 2012 VOL 000 SCIENCE www.sciencemag.org

F2

F3

of responses to words, and (iii) the increase in errors in response to nonword stimuli that were orthographically more similar to known words. Thus, our results support the conclusion that the baboons were computing an orthographic code in order to accurately discriminate words from nonwords. Prior linguistic knowledge is therefore not a necessary prerequisite in order to achieve humanlike orthographic processing. Our findings have two important theoretical implications. First, they suggest that statistical learning is a powerful universal (i.e., cross-species) mechanism that might well be the basis for learning higher-order (linguistic) categories that facilitate the evolution of natural language (18, 19). Second, our results suggest that orthographic processing may, at least partly, be constrained by general principles of visual object processing



Fig. 3. Percentage of nonword responses on trials corresponding to words seen for the first time as compared to the first nonword stimuli after these particular trials. Performance on trials corresponding to the first presentation of words is of particular interest, because any divergence from performance to nonword stimuli is an indication that the baboons have learned general statistical properties of the two classes of stimuli. All six baboons showed such a divergence for both the total number of first word trials (**A**) and the last 50 first word trials (**B**), as revealed in the differences in the percentage of nonword responses to first words and nonwords (all *P* values < 0.01).



Fig. 4. Performance in response to nonwords depends on their orthographic similarity to learned words for both monkeys and humans. (**A**) For each of the last 20,000 nonword trials, the orthographic Levenshtein distance (OLD20) (*15, 16*) was computed between the corresponding nonword and each of the words learned at that time, separately for each baboon. The average accuracy corresponding to each unique value of OLD20 was then calculated. The graph shows that baboons responded less accurately to more wordlike nonwords (smaller OLD20 values). Errors bars correspond to the 95% binomial confidence interval. (**B**) For comparison, humans show a similar sensitivity to orthographic distance to known words when responding to nonwords (see supplementary text).

shared by monkeys and humans. One such principle most likely concerns the use of feature combinations to identify visual objects (20), which would be analogous to the use of letter combinations in recent accounts of orthographic processing (4, 9, 21). Given the evidence that baboons process individual features or their combinations in order to discriminate visual objects (22), we suggest that similar mechanisms were used to distinguish words from nonwords in the current study. Our study may therefore help explain the success of the human cultural choice of visually representing words using combinations of aligned, spatially compact, ordered sequences of symbols. The primate brain might therefore be better prepared than previously thought to process printed words, hence facilitating the initial steps toward mastering one of the most complex of human skills: reading.

References and Notes

- 1. J. L. McClelland, D. E. Rumelhart, *Psychol. Rev.* 88, 375 (1981).
- 2. S. Dehaene, *Reading in the Brain* (Penguin Viking, Xxxxx, XX, 2009).
- 3. J. Grainger, A. M. Jacobs, Psychol. Rev. 103, 518 (1996).
 - 4. J. Grainger, J. C. Ziegler, Front. Psychology 2, 54 (2011).
 - 5. J. C. Ziegler, U. C. Goswami, Psychol. Bull. 131, 3 (2005).
 - 6. L. Cohen et al., Brain 123, 291 (2000).
 - 7. S. Dehaene, L. Cohen, Trends Cogn. Sci. 15, 254 (2011).
 - 8. S. Dehaene, L. Cohen, Neuron 56, 384 (2007).
 - 9. S. Dehaene, L. Cohen, M. Sigman, F. Vinckier,
 - Trends Cogn. Sci. 9, 335 (2005).
- 10. K. Nation, Q. J. Exp. Psychol. 61, 1121 (2008).
- J. L. Fobes, L. E. King, in *Primate Behavior*, J. L. Fobes, J. E. King, Eds. (Academic Press, New York, 1982), pp. 219–243.
- 12. R. M. Seyfarth, D. L. Cheney, Brain Lang. 115, 92 (2010).
- 13. J. Fagot, E. Bonté, Behav. Res. Methods 42, 507 (2010).
- 14. Materials and methods are available as supplementary material on *Science* Online.
- 15. V. I. Levenshtein, Sov. Phys. Dokl. 10, 707 (1966).
- T. Yarkoni, D. A. Balota, M. J. Yap, *Psychon. Bull. Rev.* 15, 971 (2008).
- 17. E. Keuleers, P. Lacey, K. Rastle, M. Brysbaert, *Behav. Res.* Methods 44, 287 (2012).
- F. Ramus, M. D. Hauser, C. Miller, D. Morris, J. Mehler, Science 288, 349 (2000).
- J. R. Saffran, R. N. Aslin, E. L. Newport, Science 274, 1926 (1996).
- 20. S. L. Brincat, C. E. Connor, Neuron 49, 17 (2006).
- 21. C. Whitney, Psychon. Bull. Rev. 8, 221 (2001).
- 22. C. Parron, J. Fagot, Learn. Behav. 38, 374 (2010).

Acknowledgments: J.G. was supported by the European Research Council (ERC grant 230313). J.F. was supported by research grant Volet Exploratoire 2008 from the Provence regional council. The authors thank the staff of the Primatology Center in Rousset sur Arc, France, for technical support. Data are available at (dryad/science Supporting Online Material). J.G., J.F., and J.C.Z. conceived the study and designed the experiment; J.F., M.M., and S.D. implemented the experiment; S.D. analyzed the data; J.F. wrote the test program and conducted the experiment; J.G. wrote the first draft and all authors contributed equally to latter versions of this article.

Supplementary Materials

www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/[vol]/[issue no.]/[page]/ DC1

Materials and Methods Supplementary Text Tables S1 and S2 Reference (*23*) 19 December 2011; accepted 28 February 2012

10.1126/science.1218152