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Introduction
Contrary to first languages (L1) learning, second language (L2) learning is a school context is characterized by the predominance of the written modality – over the oral modality. Therefore, one might expect a modest effect of word recognition, with written words being more accurately recognized than spoken ones, among low to moderate proficiency L2 learners [19]. Furthermore, we would like to explore the links between written and oral forms of words, and thus highlight a possible transfer of one modality to the other. This kind of transfer could result in a better recognition of words in one modality (written or oral) if they have been recognized beforehand in the other.

Objective A
To highlight a modality effect in L2 word recognition and a possible transfer from one modality to the other

A second objective of this experiment is to ask whether modality effect and transfer are typical of schooling in general characterized by a continual exposure to the written modality, and also appear in L1 exposure with rare words, more often encountered in written documents than in spoken language.

Objective B
To determine if modality effect and transfer could also appear in L1

Method
N = 32
French native speakers, secondary school students, who learned English as L2 is a school context

Dyslexic students
N = 16
Mean age: 177 months
Control students
N = 16
Mean age: 175 months

Dyslexic students
N = 16
Mean age: 177 months
Control students
N = 16
Mean age: 175 months

Background Measures:
- On-line questionnaire [4,7] – Reading habits, experience with different languages, Schooling, Socio-economic level
- English-language proficiency test (Dialang) [5]
- Reading-related tasks [2,8]: EFL/ELT-phonological, reading and spelling skills
- NEPFL: nonword reading
- Neuropsychological tests [3]: Non Visual Intelligence Test

Statistical Analyses
- Linear Mixed-effect Modeling, using gmer function from lme4 package with R Software

Hypotheses
Objective A
Hypothesis 1: Modality effect
- Written words (THINGS) are more accurately recognized than Spoken words (REP) in dyslexia
- Transfer from one modality to the other
- 4 possible kind of influence

Objective B
Hypothesis 2: Exploratory experiment for control students: Modality effect?

Results

Limitations
- These results are preliminary. We expect to reach a double sample size. The current small sample entails a lack of power to find effects, and thus limits to generalisability.

No interaction time analysis

Conclusion
In L1, the written modality is so dominant that spoken words are more difficult to process for all students, even those with reading difficulties.
In L1, students do not display modality effects, except when they suffer reading difficulties and show poor recognition of written low frequency words.

Discourse
As expected, control students presented a modality effect in L2, written words being more accurately recognized than spoken ones.
Is this due to the predominance of written materials during L2 learning in a school context?
Moreover, we failed to highlight a unilingual transfer as expected. In fact, we found a tendency to a lexical transfer between modalities.
This means: Better recognition of written words already recognized in oral modality AND Better recognition of spoken words already recognized in written modality.
Does it mean that English teachers in France have to adjust their pedagogical strategies, mainly by presenting a new word in both modalities, in order to help their students to grasp a robust lexical representation of this word?
In a very interesting way, dyslexic students showed a similar pattern of results to control students, suggesting that even for those who have reading difficulties, the written modality is L2 so dominant that spoken words are more difficult to process.
Interestingly, the results were completely different in L1, in both groups.
In L1, dyslexic students showed a modality effect, with spoken words better recognized than written ones, as expected, because of their specific difficulties, preventing them from taking advantage of reading for low frequency word recognition. In contrast, control students had similar results in both modalities.
No transfer between modalities was highlighted, regardless of the group.

Thus, what about:
- a different learning context (French expatriates in English-speaking country; learning English by immersion);
- specific words (taught concept words) [2], which share part of orthography between French and English?
- a more advanced stage of L2 learning (with University students), thus a developmental aspect of L2 learning?
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