The International Journal of Indian Psychology
ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print)
Volume 13, Issue 2, April- June, 2025
DIP: 18.01.411.20251302, DOI: 10.25215/1302.411
https://www.ijip.in

Research Paper

Written Word Processing: Neural Mechanisms

Arnisha Aman[1]*

ABSTRACT

The present study is a comprehensive review of Cognitive Neuroscience focusing on the neural mechanisms of written word processing. It integrates theoretical frameworks with empirical findings, by emphasizing the roles of neuroimaging studies. The paper also discusses key cognitive processes in both typical and atypical populations addressing the disorders that impact cognitive functions. The review contributes to clinical applications, with future prospect for neurorehabilitation strategies and cognitive interventions, Additionally, cognitive neuroscience has significant implications for Artificial Intelligence, brain-computer interfaces and educational practices by informing the development of cognitive models and adaptive learning systems. The interdisciplinary nature of this field bridges gaps between Cognitive Psychology, Computational Neuroscience and Neurotechnology, by advancing our understanding of the dynamic interactions between neural structures and behaviour.

Keywords: *Cognitive Neuroscience, Neural Substrates, Written Word Processing, Cognitive functions*

Written word processing refers to the cognitive and neural mechanisms involved in recognising, interpreting and making sense of written language. According to Staruss, Goodman and Paulson (2009), this process is not simply about converting letters into sounds, as posited by the traditional phonological processing models but rather a complex, meaning-driven activity that engages multiple levels of brain function. Multiple researches in this regard have argued that reading is fundamentally a process of meaning construction, where readers actively predict and confirm interpretations based on contextual cues rather than merely decoding individual phonemes (Strauss et al., 2009).

From a neuroscientific perspective, written word processing involves the interactions between different brain structures, particularly the cerebral cortex and the deeper subcortical regions like the thalamus. Traditional models suggested that the thalamus acts a s sensory gatekeeper, relaying visual and auditory information to the cortex. However, emerging research challenges this view, demonstrating that the cortex plays a dominant role in guiding perceptions by predicting and selectively processing incoming sensory information (Sherman & Guillery, 2006; Destexhe, 2000). This change in comprehension is consistent with the meaning-construction model of reading, which holds that more effective and

[1]Student, Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru, India
Orcid ID: [0009-0007-5743-3017]
*Corresponding Author

Received: March 29, 2025; Revision Received: June 26, 2025; Accepted: June 30, 2025

selective reading methods are made possible by higher cognitive functions that focus attention on pertinent linguistic clues (Paulson, 2002).

The significance of written word processing extends to both educational and theoretical domains. In education, it highlights the limitations of phonic-based instruction, which emphasises sound-letter correspondence, and instead supports whole language approaches that foster comprehension through contextual and semantic cues. This view is further supported by research on eye movement patterns, which demonstrate that skilled readers make predicted leaps based on syntactic and semantic comprehension rather than focussing on each word in turn (Rayner, 1997; Paulson & Goodman, 2008). This implies that meaning-making techniques should take precedence over rote phonological decoding in reading teaching.

Furthermore, written word processing has consequences for both neuroscience and cognitive psychology. Reading is not the only cognitive function that uses the idea of predictive processing, in which the brain anticipates sensory input and improves its comprehension through confirmation or correction (Hawkins, 2004). This perspective bridges the gap between neurobiology, linguistics and education by offering a more integrated understanding of how humans process written language. By recognising that reading is not a passive reception of text but an active cognitive construction, researchers and educators can aid in the development of more effective methods to support literacy and comprehension across diverse populations (Strauss et al., 2009).

Thus, processing written words is a dynamic and integrative function of the brain that is closely related to broader cognitive processes. It is significant because it refutes outdated reading theories, enhances instructional techniques, and contributes to a more thorough understanding of how the brain processes textual information.

Theoretical Background

According to Coltheart and colleagues (2001), the *Dual Route Cascaded (DRC)* model is a complex computational framework that comprehends both reading aloud and visual word identification. This model is grounded in the dual-route theory of reading, which posits that there are two distinct pathways through which readers can process written words: the lexical route and the non-lexical route. The DRC model provides important insights into the cognitive processes involved in reading comprehension by embracing the complexity of human reading behaviour. The lexical pathway offers direct access to a word's pronunciation and meaning based on visual representations.

Readers usually use this method when they come across words they are familiar with. On the contrary, the non-lexical technique employs phonological decoding, where readers sound out unknown or non-words using their grapheme-to-phoneme correspondences. Reading aloud and word recognition can be done more efficiently since the model's architecture is designed to cascade these operations, allowing both paths to be used simultaneously.

The computational design of the DRC model is distinct from that of neural network models since it does not reliant on backpropagation learning methods. Rather, it is hand-wired, which means that the researchers specifically defined its architecture using the empirical data that is currently available regarding reading processes (Coltheart et al., 2001). The DRC model has practical applications in understanding how people perceive written language, which adds to its value beyond its theoretical implications. The DRC model offers a strong

foundation for examining how many factors affect reading performance by mimicking a variety of effects seen in human reading behaviour, such as lexical decision delays and pronunciation latencies. It also offers a clear framework for understanding why some individuals may struggle with specific aspects of reading while performing adequately in others (Morton, 1969).

Another theoretical framework that came in as contradiction to the dual-route model is that of the *Triangle Model*, developed by Seidenberg and McClelland (1989), which is a comprehensive framework for understanding the processes involved in reading and spelling. A more detailed description of how individuals view and use written language is made plausible by the Triangle Model, which holds that these three elements interact dynamically throughout written language processing.

At the core of the Triangle Model, reading is not merely defined as a linear process but rather a complex interaction between different cognitive factors. The model suggests that when a reader experiences a written word, they simultaneously activate its phonological, orthographic and semantic representation. Therefore, experiencing language can progressively strengthen the connections between these three levels to enhance reading comprehension and fluency (Poldrack & Wagner, 2004).

The significance of this model is widespread where at one stance, it provides insight into why individuals may experience different reading abilities or difficulties and at the same time by understanding this interconnected nature of reading components allows educators and practitioners to design targeted interventions.

Neural Mechanisms Involved in Written Word Processing

The neural mechanisms of written word processing involve both central and peripheral cognitive processes, as revealed through functional neuroimaging studies and meta analyses. According to Purcell and colleagues (2011), the production of written words engages a network of brain regions that are responsible for orthographic memory, phoneme-grapheme conversion and motor execution.

Central Processes of Written Word Processing

Central processes in written word production primarily involve orthographic long term memory (O-LTM), phoneme-grapheme (PG) conversion and orthographic working memory (O-WM). These processes allow an individual to retrieve or assemble the correct spelling of words. According to research, the inferior temporal gyrus (ITG) and left fusiform gyrus (FG) are essential for orthographic processing, especially when it comes to remembering and recovering word spellings (Purcell et al., 2011). This area, which also shares a same neural substrate for spelling and reading, is frequently called the Visual Word Form Area (VWFA).

Additionally, the left inferior frontal gyrus (IFG), particularly the posterior portion, is consistently activated in spelling tasks. The IFG has been associated with cognitive control and lexical selection, which are essential for retrieving orthographic representations and resolving competition among similar words (Brass & Cramon, 2002; Brass et al., 2005; Derrfuss et al., 2005). Another critical region, the left supramarginal gyrus (SMG), has been linked to PG conversion, a process required for spelling unfamiliar or pseudowords by applying phonological rules.

Another significant finding is the lack of consistent activation in the angular gyrus (AG) which has been associated with written word processing (Horwitz et al., 1998). Instead, a superior region, the left posterior intraparietal sulcus (IPS) was consistently activated, suggesting its involvement in orthographic working memory (Rumsey et al., 1999).

Peripheral Processes of Written Word Processing

Peripheral processes are responsible for converting abstract orthographic representations into motor commands for writing or typing. Studies (Gerloff et al., 1997) have shown that the left superior frontal sulcus (SFS), left precentral gyrus and left postcentral gyrus as key regions involved in motor planning ans execution. These areas are crucial for forming motor programs that guide handwriting movements and finger positioning for typing. Furthermore, the left dorsal premotor cortex and superior parietal lobule (SPL) are strongly associated with the coordination of hand movements and spatial orientation of writing. Damage to these regions have been linked to peripheral dysgraphia, a condition in which individuals struggle with the motor aspects of writing (Tohgi et al., 1995)

A significant finding of these research studies is the overlap between the neural substrates of spelling and reading. The left fusiform/inferior temporal gyrus and the left inferior frontal gyrus, both implicated in written word production, are also consistently activated in reading studies. This suggests that reading and writing share a common neurocognitive system, with differences emerging in the later stages of motor execution for writing.

Neuroimaging Studies & Evidence

Several studies were conducted to understand the different underpinnings of written word processing using neuroimaging techniques to identify different neural substrates involved in word recognition.

A study was conducted to identify the neural correlates of emotional label and emotional laden words processing in late bilinguals using Event Related Potential (Tang et al., 2024). The study identified distinct neural processing patterns between the two conditions. It was observed that during the early stages of word recognition, the N170 emotion effect was observed, but it emerged only for first language negative emotion laden words and second language negative emotion label words. Additionally, it was also observed that early posterior negativity (EPN), which is also associated with automatic attention allocation to emotionally salient stimuli, was more pronounced for emotion-laden words than for emotion-label words. This finding indicates that emotion laden words may have stronger automatic emotional impact on bilingual readers, regardless of their language.

Moreover, in the later stages of word processing, the N400 component which is linked to semantic processing and integration, showed an emotion effect for first language emotion words. The findings of this study reinforce the idea that emotion-laden words may trigger stronger early neural responses than emotion-label words, suggesting a difference in automatic attentional capture. Therefore, the absence of an N400 effect in the second language of bilinguals supports the hypothesis that emotional processing in the second language is less semantically integrated than in the native language.

As previous research in this field demonstrated adults exhibited reduced N400 amplitudes for emotion-label words compared to emotion-alden words across both positive and negative valence conditions, similar studies conducted with children and adolescents (Ye et al., 2023) displayed similar displayed similar scalp distributions of neural activity as adults indicating

the basic neural mechanisms for differentiating emotional-label and emotion-laden words are already in place by late adulthood. However, younger participants exhibited more prolonged processing of all emotional words as reflected in an extended N400 response. This suggested that children and adolescents require more cognitive efforts to process the meaning and emotional significance of words compared to adults.

Another key research in this field investigated how domain knowledge influences sentence comprehension and word processing, specifically examining how prior knowledge of the fictional world affects the neural processes to unknown information (Troyer et al., 2023). The study found that participants with greater knowledge of a particular fictional character exhibited reduced N400 amplitudes when reading unknown words and completing fictional sentences. Since, the N400 is typically associated with semantic retrieval, this suggests that individuals with stronger domain knowledge can more efficiently integrate related concepts, even in the absence of direct factual recall. The finding supports the idea of graded preactivation- the notion that semantic features and conceptual relations are activated in a predictive manner during language processing, even when explicit lexical prediction is not possible.

Disorder and Deficits Affecting Word Recognition

Alexia, commonly referred to as acquired dyslexia, is a reading disorder that results from brain damage, typically following a stroke or traumatic brain injury. Unlike developmental dyslexia, which occurs from early childhood and is linked to differences in brain development, alexia is an acquired condition that affects previously intact reading abilities. Individuals with alexia struggle with recognizing words, decoding letters into meaningful language, and linking them to lexical and semantic knowledge. The severity and nature of these reading difficulties depend on the specific neural structures affected.

Alexia is frequently caused by damage to the left hemisphere of the brain, specifically to areas linked to language processing. When the left occipitotemporal cortex, which includes the visual word form area (VWFA), is damaged, people with pure alexia are unable to recognise words as complete units and must instead use sluggish, letter-by-letter reading techniques. People who have a lesion that affects the left angular gyrus and the parietotemporal regions around it may suffer phonological or profound alexia, which makes it difficult to relate the sounds and meanings of written words. Reading difficulties can also be caused by damage to the left inferior frontal gyrus, which includes Broca's region. This damage mostly affects comprehension and the integration of words into intelligible sentences. Therefore Cherney (2014) posits that reading is a complex cognitive process that requires the cooperation of multiple brain regions, and the precise expression of alexia depends on the location and severity of the neurological lesion.

The objective of a study (Hux et al., 2024) was to examine the reading challenges faced by patients with aphasia-based alexia, a type of alexia that manifests in those who have aphasia, a more general language disability frequently brought on by a left-hemisphere stroke. The researchers specifically aimed to determine how eye-gaze behaviours during reading vary between neurotypical adults and those with aphasia-based alexia. The findings showed that, in contrast to neurotypical readers, people with aphasia-based alexia displayed noticeably altered eye-gaze behaviours. Their total reading times were longer, they fixated on a higher percentage of words, and they demonstrated longer fixation durations—both for initial word processing and cumulative word reprocessing. This implies that individuals have difficulty

in effectively identifying and processing written words, which makes decoding and comprehension more cognitively demanding.

Recent Advances and Future Directions

The field of written word processing has made great advancements in recent years, according to interdisciplinary research and technological advancements. In addition to improving our knowledge of how people interpret written language, these advancements have produced useful applications that raise writing proficiency and accessibility (Hellstrom, 2023).

When compared to traditional handwriting techniques, the study found that students were able to produce higher percentages of legible words and correct spellings when they used word processors with word prediction capabilities. Furthermore, the development of cloud computing has facilitated the growth of collaborative writing spaces. With the use of tools like Google Docs, many people can edit texts simultaneously, increasing writing productivity and encouraging collaborative learning environments. Compared to traditional, standalone software, this shift to cloud-based word processing gives consumers greater accessibility and flexibility (Gaskell & Ellis, 2009).

Text generation has been transformed by large language models (LLMs), such as ChatGPT, which enable machines to generate language that is comparable to that of humans.The ability of these AI-driven chatbots to produce content that is both comprehensible and contextually relevant challenges conventional notions of authorship and creativity. However, this finding also calls into question the accuracy of AI-generated content as well as the potential decline in human writing skills. As AI becomes more prevalent in text production, these issues must be resolved to guarantee that technology is used responsibly in written communication (Hellstrom, 2023). This information has significance for both optimising educational practices in language learning and creating focused therapies to support people with language impairments (Rapp et al., 2023).

CONCLUSION

Our knowledge of how the brain interprets, integrates, and processes written language has been improved thanks to research on neural systems and written word processing. The left occipitotemporal cortex's visual word form area (VWFA) for word recognition, the left inferior frontal gyrus (IFG) for semantic and phonological integration, and the posterior parietal cortex for working memory and attentional control are among the important areas implicated in various processing stages that have been identified by research employing neuroimaging techniques like fMRI and ERP. The scattered yet interrelated structure of the brain systems underlying reading and writing is shown by these studies. Further understanding of how brain activation patterns differ depending on language experience and cognitive demands has also been gained from research on emotional word processing, bilingualism, and alexia. Furthermore, research on emotional word processing, bilingualism, and alexia has shed light on how different linguistic experiences and cognitive demands affect the patterns of brain activation. In order to improve literacy interventions and comprehend the adaptability of the reading brain, it will be essential to integrate machine learning, neuroplasticity studies, and language rehabilitation strategies as future study delves further into the complexities of written word processing.

REFERENCES

Alain Destexhe. (2000). Modelling corticothalamic feedback and the gating of the thalamus by the cerebral cortex. *Journal of Physiology-Paris*, *94*(5-6), 391–410. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0928-4257(00)01093-7

Brass, M. (2002). The Role of the Frontal Cortex in Task Preparation. *Cerebral Cortex*, *12*(9), 908–914. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/12.9.908

Brass, M., Derrfuss, J., Forstman, B., & Cramon, D. (2005). The role of the inferior frontal junction area in cognitive control. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *9*(7), 314–316. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2005.05.001

Coltheart, M., Rastle, K., Perry, C., Langdon, R., & Ziegler, J. (2001). DRC: A dual route cascaded model of visual word recognition and reading aloud. *Psychological Review*, *108*(1), 204–256. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.108.1.204

Derrfuss, J., Brass, M., Neumann, J., & von Cramon, D. Y. (2005). Involvement of the inferior frontal junction in cognitive control: Meta-analyses of switching and Stroop studies. *Human Brain Mapping*, *25*(1), 22–34. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.20127

Gaskell, M. G., & Ellis, A. W. (2009). Word learning and lexical development across the lifespan. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *364*(1536), 3607–3615. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2009.0213

Gerloff, C. (1997). Stimulation over the human supplementary motor area interferes with the organization of future elements in complex motor sequences. *Brain*, *120*(9), 1587–1602. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/120.9.1587

Hellström, T. (2024). AI and its consequences for the written word. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1326166

Horwitz, B., Rumsey, J. M., & Donohue, B. C. (1998). Functional connectivity of the angular gyrus in normal reading and dyslexia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *95*(15), 8939–8944. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.95.15.8939

Hux, K., Knollman-Porter, K., Bevelhimer, A., & Wallace, S. E. (2023). Variations in Eye-Gaze Behaviors Evident When Five Adults with Aphasia-Based Alexia Read Multisentence Passages. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *33*(1), 173–188. https://doi.org/10.1044/2023_ajslp-23-00160

Morton, J. (1969). Interaction of information in word recognition. *Psychological Review*, *76*(2), 165–178. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0027366

Paulson, E. J. (2002). Are Oral Reading Word Omissions and Substitutions Caused by Careless Eye MOVEMENTS? *Reading Psychology*, *23*(1), 45–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/027027102317345402

Paulson, E. J., & Goodman, K. S. (2020). Re-Reading Eye-Movement Research Support for Transactional Models of Reading. *Routledge EBooks*, 25–48. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003064329-5

Poldrack, R. A., & Wagner, A. D. (2004). What Can Neuroimaging Tell Us About the Mind? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *13*(5), 177–181. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00302.x

Rapp, C., Heilmann, T., & Kruse, O. (2023). Beyond MS Word: Alternatives and Developments. *Springer EBooks*, 33–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36033-6_3

Rayner, K. (1997). Understanding Eye Movements in Reading. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *1*(4), 317–339. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532799xssr0104_2

Reiff Cherney, L. (2004). Aphasia, Alexia, and Oral Reading. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*, *11*(1), 22–36. https://doi.org/10.1310/vupx-wdx7-j1eu-00tb

Rumsey, J. M., Horwitz, B., Donohue, B. C., Nace, K. L., Maisog, J. M., & Andreason, P. (1999). A Functional Lesion in Developmental Dyslexia: Left Angular Gyral Blood

Flow Predicts Severity. *Brain and Language*, *70*(2), 187–204. https://doi.org/10.1006/brln.1999.2158

Seidenberg, M. S., & McClelland, J. L. (1989). A distributed, developmental model of word recognition and naming. *Psychological Review*, *96*(4), 523–568. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.96.4.523

Sherman, S. M., & Guillery, R. W. (2006). *Exploring the thalamus and its role in cortical function, 2nd ed.*

Strauss, S. L., Goodman, K. S., & Paulson, E. J. (2009). Brain research and reading: How emerging concepts in neuroscience support a meaning construction view of the reading process. *Educational Research Review*, *4*(2), 021–033. https://doi.org/10.5897/err.9000065

Tang, D., Li, X., Fu, Y., Wang, H., Li, X., Tiina Parviainen, & Tommi Kärkkäinen. (2024). Neural correlates of emotion-label vs. emotion-laden word processing in late bilinguals: evidence from an ERP study. *Cognition & Emotion*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2024.2352584

Tohgi, H., Saitoh, K., Takahashi, S., Takahashi, H., Utsugisawa, K., Yonezawa, H., Hatano, K., & Sasaki, T. (1995). Agraphia and acalculia after a left prefrontal (F1, F2) infarction. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, *58*(5), 629–632. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.58.5.629

Troyer, M., Kutas, M., Batterink, L., & McRae, K. (2023). Nuances of knowing: Brain potentials reveal implicit effects of domain knowledge on word processing in the absence of sentence-level knowledge. *Psychophysiology*, *61*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.14422

Yeh, P.-W., Lee, C.-Y., Cheng, Y.-Y., & Chiang, C.-H. (2023). Neural correlates of understanding emotional words in late childhood. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *183*, 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2022.11.007

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Arnisha, A. (2025). Written Word Processing: Neural Mechanisms. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *13*(2), 4652-4659. DIP:18.01.411.20251302, DOI:10.25215/1302.411