

Evidence against a cognitive advantage in the older bilingual population

Journal:	<i>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Standard Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Papageorgiou, Andria; University College London Institute of Education Bright, Peter; Anglia Ruskin University - Cambridge Campus Periche Tomas, Eva; University College London Institute of Education Filippi, Roberto; University College London Institute of Education, Psychology and Human Development
Keywords:	Bilingualism, Executive Function, Working Memory, Cognitive Control, Cognitive Reserve, Bilingual Advantage

Evidence against a cognitive advantage in the older bilingual population

Andriani Papageorgiou¹, Peter Bright², Eva Periche-Tomas¹, and Roberto Filippi¹

¹ University College London, Institute of Education

² Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge

Corresponding author:

Andriani Papageourgiou
University College London – Institute of Education
Department of Psychology and Human Development
25, Woburn Square
London – WC1H 0AA

Contact details:

a.papageourgiou@ucl.ac.uk

Word count: 3972 (Ref. excl.)

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the Leverhulme Trust UK [RPG-2015-024] and the British Academy [SG162171]. A special thought goes to Prof. Annette Karmiloff-Smith who inspired our research.

Abstract

Recent evidence has challenged long-standing claims that multi-language acquisition confers long-term advantages in executive function and may protect against age-related cognitive deterioration. We assessed evidence for a bilingual advantage in older monolingual and bilingual residents matched on age, gender and socioeconomic status. A comprehensive battery of tests was administered to measure non-verbal reasoning, working memory capacity, visuo-spatial memory, response inhibition, problem-solving and language proficiency. Analyses revealed comparable performance in both groups, with no significant differences on any task (and the only trend, found for the Tower of London task performance, indicated a monolingual advantage). Overall, therefore, our findings run counter to the bilingual advantage hypothesis. We consider the implications of our study, and offer suggestions for future work in this area.

Keywords: bilingualism, executive function, working memory, cognitive control, ageing population, bilingual advantage, cognitive reserve.

Introduction

Scientific advances have led to a remarkable increase in life expectancy over the past century (Christensen, Doblhammer, Rau & Vaupel, 2009), with global predictions that, by 2050, one in six of us will be aged 65 or over (WHO, 2011). Nevertheless, quality of life has not kept pace with this increase in longevity, and the burden that age-related cognitive deterioration places on affected individuals, their families, and on healthcare provision is a major societal concern. There is clearly an urgent need to develop ways for protecting and managing cognitive health in the elderly population (Brookmeyer, Johnson, Ziegler-Graham, Arrighi, 2007). Recent research has suggested that factors such as continuing physical activity and cognitive effort may help promote “successful ageing” (Reed et al., 2011; Sattler et al., 2012; Cosco et al., 2014; Ngandu et al., 2015), although the viability of activities such as ‘working memory training’ for offsetting the effects of neurological impairment on cognition has been questioned (for a review see von Bastian & Oberauer, 2014).

One factor claimed to potentially reduce the deleterious effects of ageing on cognition is the process of becoming bilingual (e.g., Kave et al., 2008; Bak et al., 2014; Bialystok et al., 2016). This effect is thought to be driven by the increased inhibitory, attentional and working memory demands associated with operating effectively in bilingual relative to monolingual contexts, which may, over time, promote increased cognitive capacity or ‘reserve’ (Adesope et al., 2010; Bialystok et al., 2004; Salvatierra & Rosselli, 2010). Early evidence for the enhancement of cognitive reserve (CR) associated with bilingualism stems from retrospective age-of-diagnosis comparisons among bilingual and monolingual patient populations, with the latter reported to receive clinical diagnosis (typically of Alzheimer’s disease) approximately 4 years earlier (Bialystok et al., 2007; Craik et al., 2010; Schweizer et al., 2012). Other research indicates that this protective

1
2
3 effect may only operate in particular sections of society, such as immigrant groups
4
5 (Chertkow et al., 2010) or those who had received poor or limited education (Gollan et
6
7 al., 2011). More recently, however, Alladi et al. (2013) published a large-scale study of
8
9 over 600 patients in India indicating that bilingualism may substantially delay the onset of
10
11 a range of dementia types, irrespective of immigration status and education (see also
12
13 Woumans et al., 2015). These reports of positive effects, however, are balanced by others
14
15 producing null or inconsistent findings (e.g., Crane et al., 2010; Sanders et al., 2012;
16
17 Crane et al., 2014; Lawton et al., 2015; for a review see Calvo et al., 2015).

18
19
20 In addition to observations of cognitive benefits associated with bilingualism, there have
21
22 also been reports of neurological effects. For example, Luk et al. (2011) provide
23
24 evidence for less deterioration of white matter integrity and better anterior/posterior
25
26 functional connectivity in older bilinguals relative to age-matched monolinguals.
27
28 Similarly, increased tissue density in cortical areas associated with cognitive
29
30 control/conflict monitoring have been reported in older bilingual (relative to monolingual)
31
32 participants (e.g., Abutalebi et al., 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015; Zou et al., 2012). Conversely,
33
34 in bilingual Alzheimer patients with significant structural degeneration there is some
35
36 evidence for relatively preserved cognitive function, consistent with bilingualism offering
37
38 protection against progression of cortical atrophy (Schweizer et al., 2012; Gold et al.,
39
40 2013; Perani et al., 2016). The extent to which such findings may, at least in part, be
41
42 explained by systematic group differences on extraneous or inadequately controlled
43
44 covariates, however, remains an issue of ongoing debate (e.g., Kousaie and Phillips,
45
46 2012).

47
48
49 Over the past decade, the bilingual advantage has been increasingly challenged, with a
50
51 large number of studies failing to support it (e.g., Morton & Harper, 2007; Paap &
52
53 Greenberg, 2013; Kirk et al., 2014; de Bruin, Treccani, & Della Sala, 2015; Anton et al.,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2016). Even when attempts have been made to carefully isolate various mechanisms associated with higher level cognitive control, comparable bilingual and monolingual performance on all measures has been reported (e.g., Dunabeitia, Hernandez, Anton, Macizo, Estevez, Fuentes, & Carreiras, 2014; Paap, Johnson, & Sawi, 2014). Overall, evidence for a bilingual advantage in conflict resolution (the central theoretical claim) is sporadic and sensible control for important potentially confounding covariates has been inconsistently applied (for reviews see Hilchey & Klein, 2011; Kousaie & Phillips, 2012; Paap et al., 2014). Furthermore, publication bias towards significant findings is an additional issue (de Bruin et al., 2015).

To date, the majority of studies supporting a bilingual advantage have employed a single test of inhibitory control, typically the Simon, Flanker or Stroop task. More specifically, the Simon task measures stimulus-response compatibility effects (Simon, 1969), the Flanker measures the effects of dimensional overlap between an irrelevant and a relevant stimulus (Eriksen & Eriksen, 1974) and the Stroop task measures effects of response conflict due to automatic processing of a task irrelevant stimulus feature (Stroop, 1935). More recently, however, studies have reported results from a wider range of tasks. For example, Paap & Sawi (2014) systematically compared bilinguals and monolingual university students on 13 different indices of executive function (derived from performance on four tasks). Although the bilinguals numerically outperformed monolinguals on six of the indices, none of these reached conventional significance. Conversely, monolinguals significantly outperformed bilinguals on three indices (including the Simon effect).

Against this debate about the existence, nature and strength of a bilingual cognitive advantage, the present study address performance in older adults, employing a broad range of tasks. English speaking monolingual adults were matched with bilinguals of

different linguistic backgrounds with respect to age, gender and socio-economic status (SES). The participants were assessed on typical tasks used in the literature as well as on tasks assessing verbal short-term and working memory, visuo-spatial working memory, reasoning, problem solving and intelligence. Given the current vigorous debate about the source of reported bilingual advantages, and challenges to its existence, we did not construct predictions about size or directionality of effects.

Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited through the University of the Third Age (U3A) in London and via additional opportunity sampling. Seventy-four healthy retired individuals were tested: 37 English monolinguals ($M = 69.4$ years old, $SD = 4.3$) and 37 bilinguals ($M = 70.6$ years old, $SD = 4.6$), matched on age ($t(72) = -1.21, p = .23$).

All participants completed a questionnaire providing biographical and linguistic information (Filippi et al., 2012; Filippi, Karaminis, & Thomas, 2015). Bilingual participants were highly proficient in both languages and reported their use in everyday life for over 50 years. Fifteen of them reported to know a third language and two participants reported to know a fourth (see Table 1). All monolingual participants were native English speakers with little or no exposure to a second language. All participants self-declared normal or corrected-to-normal vision and hearing.

With regard to language experience, bilingual participants reported they currently used English more ($M = 89\%$) than their other language ($M = 11\%$) on a daily basis and, on average, they had been exposed to their second language for 56 years. Eighteen bilingual participants reported to switch between languages in every day life.

In addition to age, the participants were matched on SES, measured via educational level and previous occupation. The educational level was scored from 0-6, with 0 representing the lowest (high school diploma) and 6 the highest (Doctorate/PhD) qualification. The occupational status was scored using the Standardized Occupational Classification 2010 (Office of National Statistics, 2010). An independent *t*-test performed on SES scores revealed that bilinguals and monolinguals had similar educational and occupational statuses ($t(72) = -1.59, p = .12$; , $t(72) = .17, p = .87$, respectively).

=====

ADD TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

=====

Materials and Procedure

Participants were individually tested in a quiet room at the Institute of Education (UCL), or in their own home, with the duration of each session averaging one hour.

After completing the background questionnaires (Filippi et al., 2012, 2015), all participants performed a battery of six tasks. These tasks measured vocabulary knowledge in the English language (British Picture Vocabulary Scale III), non-verbal reasoning (Raven’s Advanced Progressive Matrices), executive function (Simon Task), planning and problem solving (Tower of London), verbal working memory (Digit Span forwards and backwards) and visuo-spatial working memory (Change Blindness).¹

Each task was accompanied with detailed instructions in English and participants were given the opportunity to ask any questions prior to beginning the task. The Simon task

¹ For technical reasons, the change blindness task was administered only to a subset of the whole sample, N=26 monolinguals and N=22 bilinguals.

and the Tower of London were carried out on a Dell XPS 12, with 12.5-inch widescreen display and 1920 x 1080 pixels resolution.

Simon task

The design and procedure of this task was adapted from Prinz and Hommel (2002) and programmed in E-prime 2.0 [Schneider, Eschman & Zuccolotto, 2002]. Responses were recorded via a gamepad controller (Logitech F310 PC USB).

This task comprised of 36 trials. Each trial was initiated with the presentation of a fixation point (+) at the centre of the screen for 500ms. The fixation point was followed by the target stimulus which was either a filled blue or red star (height = 1.7cm, width = 1.8cm on screen) displayed 3.9° to the left or right of the fixation point (Figure 3). The left index finger was rested on the left key “LB” (assigned for the red star) and the right index finger rested on the right key “RB” (assigned for the blue star) of the controller. The goal was to press the corresponding key as quickly as possible according to the colour of the displayed star. During this task, a congruent trial was defined by the position of the star and the corresponding key being on the same side, while an incongruent trial involved the star and key being on opposite sides. Participants scored one point when they had correctly pressed the corresponding key. Reaction time (milliseconds) and accuracy (correct/incorrect) were automatically recorded by the software.

Tower of London

The design and procedure of this task was adopted from Shallice (1982). The 12-trial version, available as part of the open source PEBL battery [<http://pebl.sourceforge.net/>], was employed. Each trial comprised of two figures, one above the other. The top figure contained three columns of disks or 'stacks' (the target configuration), with a figure directly below containing the same disks but in a different arrangement across the three

columns (the starting configuration). In this version of the task, all problems had three disks (red, green, blue). To solve the trial, participants were required to move the discs from the lower, starting configuration to match the top configuration (using the mouse) as quickly but efficiently as possible (i.e., in the smallest number of moves). Constraints were that (a) there were a defined number of permitted moves to solution (ranging from 2 to 5), (b) participants could move only one disk at a time and (c) a limit was set on the possible height of each stack of disks. A trial was successfully completed if the solution was reached within these applied constraints. Reaction time (RT) in milliseconds was automatically recorded by the software at the point of pressing the right click of the mouse (first move RT) and at the end of all the trials (total RT). The first move RT provided an indication of initial planning/preparation time prior to executing the solution. The total RT indicated the time the required to complete the whole task.

Change Blindness

The design and procedure of this task was adapted from Kerrigan et al. (2016). Eighteen trials of everyday life scenes were presented to participants on the computer screen, each alternating at a rate of 250ms between an original and slightly modified version. Following each trial a black screen was presented for 1000ms. These alternations lasted for 1 minute. The aim of this task was “to spot the difference” by identifying one element that was different between the images. The difference could involve colour, spatial location or presence/absence of an object. Once identified, the space bar was pressed and the participants called out the difference. The experimenter recorded the responses and the software automatically recorded the RT and accuracy. Participants were first presented with three example images, followed by 18 test trials.

British Picture Vocabulary Scale III (BPVS III)

We employed Dunn and Dunn's (1997) version of this test of receptive vocabulary, with 14 sets of 12 slides. On each slide four pictures (one target and three foils) were presented simultaneously. The experimenter said a word corresponding to only one target picture. The participants were required to select the target.

All participants started from set 10, designated as suitable from the age of 14. Participants proceeded to the next set only if all items were correctly identified. If participants produced one or more errors in set 10, set 9 was instead presented. This rule was applied until all items in a set were correctly identified. The task was discontinued if a participant failed to correctly select 8 or more of the 12 target items in a given set. The ability score was computed by subtracting the number of errors from the highest possible score.

Raven's Progressive Matrices Task

This procedure employed the materials designed by Raven, Raven and Court (1998), comprising 12 increasingly complex trials in which participants were required to select the missing piece from a geometric design, given 8 possible choices (an example is provided in Figure 2). The test was originally designed to assess abstract reasoning, and is widely employed as a measure of fluid intelligence. It is untimed, with participants typically completing it within 5 minutes.

Digit Span Forward and Backward

This task contributes to the working memory index of Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (Wechsler, 2008). Participants were instructed to listen to a sequence of numerical digits. The aim was to repeat the sequence verbatim (forward) and in reverse order (backward) as instructed by the researcher. At the start, participants were presented with two trials of 2 digits in the forward condition. If at least one of these two sequences were repeated

correctly, two trials of N+1 digits were presented (with this process repeated up to the maximum of 9 digits). If both trials of a given digit length were failed, the condition was discontinued. The backward digit span was then administered using the same rules. Scores were recorded as total number of trials correct for both conditions.

Design

This study consisted of a matched-pairs mixed design, where the participants were matched according to gender, age, language group (monolinguals vs. bilinguals) and SES (education and occupation). All participants completed the full test battery.

Results

Analyses of background measures

Both groups performed comparatively on measures of non-verbal reasoning (Raven's matrices), $t(72) = .27, p = .79$, fluency in the English language (BPVS), $t(72) = 1.59, p = .12$ and working memory (Digit Span forward: $t(72) = .38, p = .70$, and backward: $t(72) = .15, p = .88$).

These data suggest that any differences obtained from the main experimental tasks are unlikely to be attributable to group differences in general cognitive functioning and SES. Table 2 summarises the results of these analyses.

=====

ADD TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

=====

Effect of language group on Executive Functioning Tasks

For the Simon task, a 2x2 mixed ANOVA with *Group* as the between-subject factor (Monolinguals/Bilinguals) and *Congruency* as the within-subject factor (Congruent/Incongruent trials) was carried out on accuracy and on RT for correct responses (Table 3).

=====

ADD TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

=====

For RT the main effect of *Group* on RT was not significant, $F(1,72) = 1.18, p = .28, \eta_p^2 = .02$, but there was a significant main effect of *Congruency*, $F(1,72) = 136.66, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .66$, indicating faster performance on congruent trials (Monolinguals: $M = 537\text{ms}$, $SD = 77.5$; Bilinguals: $M = 533\text{ms}$, $SD = 83.5$), than incongruent trials, (Monolinguals: $M = 608\text{ms}$; $SD = 74.0$; Bilinguals: $M = 620\text{ms}$; $SD = 83.0$). There was a non-significant interaction between *Group* and *Congruency*, $F(1,72) = .39, p = .54, \eta_p^2 = .01$, indicating similar patterns of response time performance in monolinguals and bilinguals.

For accuracy, the main effect of *Group* was not significant, $F(1,72) = .62, p = .43, \eta_p^2 = .01$. Nevertheless, there was a significant main effect of *Congruency*, $F(1,72) = 21.50, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .23$, revealing better accuracy on congruent trials. The *Group* x *Congruency* effect was non-significant, $F(1,72) = .29, p = .59, \eta_p^2 = .01$, indicating similar patterns of accuracy performance in monolinguals and bilinguals.

For the Tower of London task an independent *t*-test revealed statistically equivalent group performance on correct trial completions, $t(72) = 1.58, p = .12$.

Despite similar level of accuracy, monolinguals were on average 6 seconds faster than bilinguals in deciding the first move, and 8 seconds faster in completing the trial.

Further independent *t*-tests on response times revealed statistical trends for first move RT ($t(72) = -1.10, p = .051$) and trial completion times ($t(72) = -1.73, p = .09$) between the groups (see Table 4).

=====

ADD TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

=====

Visuo-spatial skills in the elderly population

On the Change Blindness task, an independent *t*-test performed on a subset of the sample (N=26 monolinguals and N=22 bilinguals) revealed that no significant effects for accuracy, $t(46) = -.33, p = .74$, or RT, $t(46) = -.48, p = .63$, indicating comparable visuo-spatial memory abilities in the monolingual and bilingual groups.(Table 5).

=====

ADD TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

=====

Discussion

The primary rationale for this study was to assess the viability of claims that bilingualism confers a cognitive advantage in older age and, therefore, to contribute to the current debate about the possible protective effects of multi-language acquisition against age-related cognitive deterioration. In order to address these issues, older bilinguals were compared with native age-matched English monolingual speakers on a series of cognitive

tasks. The measures used included non-verbal abstract reasoning, working memory, visuo-spatial working memory, inhibition, planning and problem solving tasks.

Across our tasks, the only evidence for a group difference indicated a trend towards a bilingual *disadvantage* in response times in the Tower of London task (i.e., bilingual participants took longer to respond despite eliciting statistically equivalent accuracy performance to monolinguals). These findings therefore run counter to the argument that bilingualism offers cognitive advantage throughout the lifespan and/or protection from ageing effects (e.g., Bialystok et al., 2004; Bak et al., 2014) and are more consistent with claims that the proposed bilingual advantage might be better explained by systematic group differences on demographic/background variables such as socioeconomic status (e.g., Goldsmith & Morton, 2018; Morton & Harper, 2007).

Much of the evidence base for the bilingual advantage has been based on the Simon task, but the findings have lacked consistency. For example, Bialystok, Craik and Luk, (2008) demonstrated a bilingual inhibitory advantage in an older sample (Mean age = 68), but this appeared to be driven by overall performance rather than specifically by an advantage on the trials requiring inhibition (which would be predicted by the bilingual advantage theory as originally proposed). Other studies, however, have supported a *monolingual* advantage on this task. For example, Salvatierra and Rosselli (2011) reported a significant monolingual advantage in congruent trials of the Simon task, and Schroeder and Marian (2012) also report a numeric (but not significant) advantage in this condition. In another study, Billig and Scholl (2011) reported that monolinguals elicited longer response times on congruent trials but were faster overall over the two conditions as well as being more accurate than bilinguals. Paap and colleagues have also reported a monolingual advantage on the Simon task, suggesting that the bilinguals might respond more slowly in the congruent condition because they are comparatively primed for response conflict, and

1
2
3 therefore take longer to adjust their response when this stimulus/response conflict is
4
5 absent (Paap & Greenberg, 2013; Paap & Sawi, 2014). In response, some authors have
6
7 argued that the Simon task is not sufficiently sensitive to reliably detect a bilingual
8
9 advantage in executive function (e.g., Costa et al., 2009), but this claim cannot easily be
10
11 reconciled with the evidence base for the bilingual advantage hypothesis, much of which
12
13 derives from observations of Simon task performance (for a review see Filippi, D'Souza
14
15 & Bright, 2018).

16
17
18 Our findings add to the weight of evidence against the claim that bilingualism offers
19
20 protection against the effects of ageing on cognition, and that there is a straightforward
21
22 cognitive advantage associated with multi-language acquisition more generally.
23
24 However, the contradictions in the field remain difficult to reconcile. We welcome the
25
26 drive towards acknowledgement and better experimental control of potential biases and
27
28 confounds in the field (e.g., Hilchey & Klein, 2011; Paap, Johnson, & Sawi, 2015) and
29
30 encourage further development of theoretical models. Given the difficulty in ensuring
31
32 like-for-like comparisons across bilingual and monolingual groups, such that the range of
33
34 possible alternative explanatory variables is adequately-controlled, the level of dispute in
35
36 the field is perhaps unsurprising. There are also likely to be different, dynamically
37
38 interacting covariates operating across stages of development from childhood through to
39
40 the final years of life. In our view, carefully controlled developmental work is needed in
41
42 order to clarify specific mechanisms responsible for observed bilingual cognitive
43
44 advantages, and we must recognize that the balance of cognitive control mechanisms
45
46 operating towards the later stages of life may not be the same as that operating at other
47
48 stages of life – and this has potential implications for whether - and the extent to which -
49
50 there is an operational bilingual cognitive advantage.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For the present study we controlled for a range of possible confounding covariates, including socioeconomic status, frequently highlighted as particularly problematic in this field of study (e.g., Antón et al., 2014; Morton & Harper, 2007; Mueller-Gathercole et al., 2010). However, there were some study limitations. The mean acquisition of the second language in our bilingual group was 15 years old, raising the possibility that a multilingual environment during infancy and early childhood is crucial for offsetting cognitive deterioration in later life. However, recent research has indicated that second language acquisition later in life is likely to ‘exercise’ inhibitory control mechanisms more substantially than when both languages are experienced from birth (Bak et al., 2014; Tao, Marzecova, Taft, Asanowicz, & Wodniecka, 2011). Our sample also primarily employed English (89% of the time) rather than the second/other language, and it is possible that more balanced day-to-day use of two or more languages might be associated with a different pattern of findings. Moreover, only 46% of the bilingual participants reported regularly switching between two languages and 37% of the participants stated that they regularly substitute words from one language to another frequently. Further work should compare evidence for a bilingual advantage between bilinguals who switch and do not switch languages during their everyday life.

To conclude, we suspect that publication bias against reporting null results is particularly problematic in the evidence base on the bilingual advantage, and we offer the present null findings as a cautionary note against recent reports that bilingualism protects against age-related cognitive (and neurological) deterioration. In our study, in which we controlled for a range of potential confounding covariates, we found no reliable evidence to support the possibility that being bilingual or multilingual compensates for cognitive decline in later life.

References

Adesope, O., Lavin, T., Thompson, T., & Ungerleider, C. (2010). A systematic review and Meta-Analysis of the Cognitive Correlates of Bilingualism. *Review of Educational Research*, 80(2), 207- 245.

Antón, E., Duñabeitia, J. A., Estévez, A., Hernández, J. A., Castillo, A., Fuentes, L. J., ... & Carreiras, M. (2014). Is there a bilingual advantage in the ANT task? Evidence from children. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 398.

Bak, T., & Alladi, S. (2016). Bilingualism, dementia and the tale of many variables: why we need to move beyond the Western World. *Cortex*, 74, 315–317

Bak, T. H., Nissan, J. J., Allerhand, M. M. & Deary, I. J. (2014). Does bilingualism influence cognitive ageing? *Annals of Neurology*, 75, 959–963

Ben-Zeev S. (1977). The influence of bilingualism on cognitive strategy and cognitive development. *Child Development*, 48, 1009–1018

Bialystok, E. (1992). Attentional Control in Children’s Metalinguistic Performance and Measures of Field Independence. *Developmental Psychology*, 28 (4), 654-664.

Bialystok, E., & Majumder, S. (1998). The relationship between bilingualism and the development of cognitive processes in problem solving. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 19, 69-85.

Bialystok, E., & Luk, G. (2012). Receptive vocabulary differences in monolingual and bilingual adults. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 15(2), 397-401.

Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., Klein, R., & Viswanathan, M. (2004). Bilingualism, aging, and cognitive control: Evidence from the Simon task. *Psychology and Aging*, 19, 290–303.

- 1
2
3 Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., & Luk, G. (2008). Cognitive control and lexical access in
4
5 younger and older bilinguals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,*
6
7 *Memory, and Cognition*, 34, 859–873
8
9 Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., Green, D., W., & Gollan, T., H. (2009). Bilingual minds.
10
11 *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 10, 89–129
12
13 Billig, J., D., & Scholl, A., P. (2011). The impact of bilingualism and aging on inhibitory
14
15 control and working memory. *Organon*, 39-52
16
17 Bloomfield, L. (1935). *Language*. London: Allen and Unwin.
18
19 Breen, M., & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in
20
21 language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 89-112
22
23 Carey, S. (1988). Conceptual differences between children and adults. *Mind & Language*,
24
25 3 (3), 167-181
26
27 Costa, A., & Santesteban, M. (2004). Lexical access in bilingual speech production:
28
29 Evidence from language switching in highly proficient bilinguals and L2 learners.
30
31 *Journal of Memory and Language*, 50, 491-511.
32
33 Cox, S. R., Bak, T. H., Allerhand, M., Redmond, P., Starr, J. M., Deary, I. J., &
34
35 MacPherson, S. E. (2016). Bilingualism, social cognition and executive functions:
36
37 A tale of chickens and eggs. *Neuropsychologia*, 91, 299-306.
38
39 de Bruin, A., Treccani, B., & Della-Sala, S. (2015). Cognitive advantage in bilingualism:
40
41 an example of publication bias? *Psychological Science*, 26(1), 99-107.
42
43 Dunn, M., & Dunn, L. M. (1997). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test—3*. Circle Pines,
44
45 MN: AGS.
46
47 Duñabeitia J. A., Hernández J. A., Antón E., Macizo P., Estévez A., Fuentes L. J., &
48
49 Carreiras, M. (2014). The inhibitory advantage in bilingual children revisited.
50
51 *Experimental Psychology*, 61, 234–251
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

European Commission (2012). *Special Eurobarometer 386: Europeans and their Languages* (PDF) [Retrieved February 1, 2017]; Europa web portal. http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf.

Filippi, R., D’Souza, D., & Bright, P. (2018). A developmental approach to bilingual research: The effects of multi-language experience from early infancy to old age. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 1367006917749061.

Filippi, R., Leech, R., Thomas, M. S., Green, D. W., & Dick, F. (2012). A bilingual advantage in controlling language interference during sentence comprehension. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 15(4), 858–872.

Filippi, R., Karaminis, T., & Thomas, M. S. (2014). Language switching in bilingual production: Empirical data and computational modelling. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 17(2), 294–315

Filippi, R., Morris, J., Richardson, F. M., Bright, P., Thomas, M. S., Karmiloff-Smith, A., & Marian, V. (2015). Bilingual children show an advantage in controlling verbal interference during spoken language comprehension. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 18(3), 490–501.

Friedman N. P., Miyake A. (2004). The relations among inhibition and interference control functions: a latent-variable analysis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 133, 101–135

Galván A. (2010). Neural plasticity of development and learning. *Human Brain Mapping*, 31, 879–890.

Goldsmith, S. F., & Morton, J. B. (2018). Time to disengage from the bilingual advantage hypothesis.

- Gollan, T. H., Montoya, R. I., Fennema-Notestine, C., & Morris, S. K. (2005). Bilingualism affects picture naming but not picture classification. *Memory & Cognition*, 33(7), 1220-1234.
- Gollan, T., H., Montoya, R., I., & Werner, G., A. (2002). Semantic and letter fluency in Spanish-English bilinguals. *Neuropsychology*, 16, 562–576
- Green, D. W. (1986). Control, activation, and resource: A framework and a model for the control of speech in bilinguals. *Brain and language*, 27(2), 210-223.
- Green, D. W. (1998). Mental control of the bilingual lexico-semantic system. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1, 67–81.
- Green, D., W. (2011). Language control in different contexts: The behavioral ecology of bilingual speakers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, 103.
- Grosjean, F. (1994). Individual bilingualism. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press,
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Grundy, E., & Holt, G. (2001). The socioeconomic status of older adults: How should we measure it in studies of health inequalities? *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 55(12), 895-904
- Guzmán-Vélez, E. & Tranel, D. (2015). Does bilingualism contribute to cognitive reserve? Cognitive and neural perspectives. *Neuropsychology*, 29(1), 139–150
- Hakuta, K. & Diaz, R. (1985). *The relationship between degree of bilingualism and cognitive ability: a critical discussion and some new longitudinal data*. In K. E. Nelson (Ed.), *Children's Language*, Volume 5 (pp. 319-344). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hartsuiker, R., J. (2015). Why it is pointless to ask under which specific circumstances the bilingual advantage occurs? *Cortex*, 73.

- Hilchey M. D., Klein R. M. (2011). Are there bilingual advantages on nonlinguistic interference tasks? Implications for plasticity of executive control processes. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 18, 625–658
- Kaushanskaya M., Blumenfeld H. K., Marian V. (2011). The relationship between vocabulary and short-term memory measures in monolingual and bilingual speakers. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15, 408–425.
- Kerrigan, L., Thomas, M. S., Bright, P., & Filippi, R. (2016). Evidence of an advantage in visuo-spatial memory for bilingual compared to monolingual speakers. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1 -11
- Keysar, B., Hayakawa, S. L., & Gyu An, S. (2012). The Foreign-Language effect. *Psychological Science*, 23(6), 661-668.
- Kousaie S., & Phillips N. A. (2012). Conflict monitoring and resolution: are two languages better than one? Evidence from reaction time and event-related brain potentials. *Brain Research*, 1446, 71–90
- Li, P., & Grant, A. (2015). Second language learning success revealed by brain networks. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 19(4), 657-664
- Ljungberg J. K., Hansson P., Andrés P., Josefsson M., & Nilsson L. G. (2013). A longitudinal study of memory advantages in bilinguals. *PLoS ONE* 8:e73029 10.1371/journal.pone.0073029
- Luo, L., Luk, G., & Bialystok, E. (2010). Effect of language proficiency and executive control on verbal fluency performance in bilinguals. *Cognition*, 114, 29–41.
- Malenka, R. C., Nestler, E. J., & Hyman, S. E., (2009). *Widely projecting systems: Monoamines, acetylcholine, and orexin*, in A. Sydor & R.Y. Brown, Molecular neuropharmacology: A foundation for clinical neuroscience, 2nd ed., pp. 155–157, NY: McGraw-Hill Medical.

- Michael, E. B., & Gollan, T. H. (2005). *Being and becoming bilingual: Individual differences and consequences for language production*. In J.F. Kroll & A.M.B. de Groot (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches* (pp. 389–407). NY: Oxford University Press.
- Miyake A., & Friedman N. P. (2012). The nature and organization of individual differences in executive functions: four general conclusions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21, 8–14.
- Miyake A., Friedman N. P., Emerson M. J., Witzki A. H., Howerter A., & Wager T. D. (2000). The unity and diversity of executive functions and their contribution to complex “frontal lobe” tasks: a latent variable analysis. *Cognitive Psychology*, 41, 49–100.
- Morton, J. B., & Harper, S. N. (2007). What did Simon say? Revisiting the bilingual advantage. *Developmental Science*, 10, 719–726.
- Mueller Gathercole, V. C., Thomas, E. M., Jones, L., Guasch, N. V., Young, N., & Hughes, E. K. (2010). Cognitive effects of bilingualism: digging deeper for the contributions of language dominance, linguistic knowledge, socio-economic status and cognitive abilities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(5), 617-664.
- Novak, V., & Hajjar, I. (2010). The relationship between blood pressure and cognitive function. *Nature Reviews Cardiology*, 7(12), 686-698.
- Office for National Statistics (2010). *Standard occupational classification 2010*. [Retrieved February 1, 2017]; Open Government License. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/standardoccupationalclassificationsoc/soc2010>

- Ott, B. R., Daiello, L. A., Dahabreh, I. J., Springate, B. A., Bixby, K., Murali, M., & Trikalinos, T. A. (2015). Do statins impair cognition? A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 30, 348-358
- Paap, K. R., Greenberg Z. I. (2013). There is no coherent evidence for a bilingual advantage in executive processing. *Cognitive Psychology*, 66, 232–258
- Paap, K. R., & Sawi, O. (2014). Bilingual advantages in executive functioning: problems in convergent validity, discriminant validity and the identification of the theoretical constructs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 962.
- Paap K. R., Johnson H. A., Sawi O. (2014). Are bilingual advantages dependent upon specific tasks or specific bilingual experiences? *Cognitive Psychology*, 26, 615–639
- Paap, K. R., Johnson, H. A., & Sawi, O. (2015). Bilingual advantages in executive functioning either do not exist or are restricted to very specific and undetermined circumstances. *Cortex*, 69, 265-278
- Peal, E., & Lambert, W. (1962). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs*, 76, 1–23
- Prinz, W., & Hommel, B. (2002). *Attention and performance XIX: Common mechanisms in perception and action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prior, A., & Gollan, T. (2011). Good language-switchers are good task-switchers: Evidence from Spanish–English and Mandarin – English bilinguals. *Journal of International Neuropsychological Society*, 17, 1–10.
- Raven, J., Raven, J. C., & Court, J. H. (1998). *Manual for Raven’s progressive matrices and vocabulary scales. Section 1: General overview*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Psychologists Press; San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.

- 1
2
3 Rensink, R. A., O'Regan, J. K., & Clark, J. J. (1997). To see or not to see: the need for
4
5 attention to perceive changes in scenes. *Psychological Science*, 8, 368–73
6
7 Roberts, P. M., Garcia, L. J., Desrochers, A., & Hernandez, D. (2002). English
8
9 performance of proficient bilingual adults on the Boston Naming Test.
10
11 *Aphasiology*, 16, 635–645
12
13 Rosselli, M., Ardila, A., Araujo, K., Weekes, V. A., Caracciola, V., Padilla, M., &
14
15 Ostrosky-Solis, F. (2000). Verbal fluency and repetition skills in healthy older
16
17 Spanish-English bilinguals. *Applied Neuropsychology*, 7, 17–24
18
19 Saer, D. J. (1923). The effect of bilingualism on intelligence. *British Journal of*
20
21 *Psychology*, 14(1), 25-38
22
23
24 Salvatierra, J. L., & Rosselli, M. (2011). The effect of bilingualism and age on inhibitory
25
26 control. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15, 26-37
27
28 Schneider, W., Eschman, A., & Zuccolotto, A. (2002). *E-Prime (Version 2.0)*. [Computer
29
30 software and manual]. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychology Software Tools Inc.
31
32 Schroeder, S. R., & Marian, V. (2012). A bilingual advantage for episodic memory in
33
34 older adults. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 24(5), 591-601
35
36 Shallice, T. (1982). Specific impairments of planning. *Philosophical transactions of the*
37
38 *Royal Society of London, Series B, Biological Sciences*, 298(1089), 199-209.
39
40 Shao, Z., Janse, E., Visser, K., & Meyer, A., S. (2014). What do verbal fluency tasks
41
42 measure? Predictors of verbal fluency performance in older adults. *Frontiers in*
43
44 *Psychology*, 5, 772.
45
46 Stins J. F., Polderman J. C., Boomsma D. I., & de Geus J. C. (2005). Response
47
48 interference and working memory in 12-year-old children. *Child Neuropsychology*
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Tao, L., Marzecova, A., Taft, M., Asanowicz, D., & Wodniecka, Z. (2011). The efficiency of attentional networks in early and late bilinguals: The role of age acquisition. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, 123.

Thomas, M. S. C., & Allport, A. (2000). Language-switching costs in bilingual visual word recognition. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 43, 44–66

Treccani, B., & Mulatti, C. (2015). No matter who, no matter how... and no matter whether the white matter matters. Why theories of bilingual advantage in executive functioning are so difficult to falsify. *Cortex*, 73

van Heuven, W. J. B., & Coderre, E. L. (2015). A call for sophisticated statistical approaches and neuroimaging techniques to study the bilingual advantage *Cortex*, 73, 330-331.

von Bastian, C. C., & Oberauer, K. (2014). Effects and mechanisms of working memory training: a review. *Psychological Research*, 78(6), 803-820.

Wechsler D. (2008). *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale–Fourth Edition*. Pearson: TX

Weinreich, U. 1953. *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.

Yashima, T., Zenuk-Nishide, L. & Shimizu, K. (2004).The influence of attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language communication. *Language Learning*, 54, 119-152.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. *Bilingual participants' language information.*

Linguistic Background	(in addition to English)	Bengali (n = 1) Bulgarian (n = 1) Burmese (n = 1) Arabic (n = 1) German (n = 2) Greek (n = 2) Hungarian (n = 1) Norwegian (n = 2) Polish (n = 1) Russian (n = 1) Chinese (n = 1) French (n = 17) Italian (n = 3) Spanish (n = 3)
	Third language	French (n = 5) German (n = 2) Greek (n = 1) Italian (n = 2) Spanish (n = 3) Portuguese (n = 1) Vietnamese (n = 1)
	Fourth language	Spanish (n = 1) German (n = 1)
Other linguistic background information	Age of acquisition	M = 15.03; SD = 14.8
	Switch languages*	Yes = 18; No = 19
	Substitute words**	Yes = 14; No = 23
	English usage (%)	89%

Table 2. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation – SD) for control measure of monolingual and bilingual participants. Non-verbal reasoning maximum score that could be obtained is equal to 12. Working memory maximum score that could be obtained is equal to 30. Language proficiency maximum score that could be obtained is equal to 168.

	Monolinguals		Bilinguals	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Age	69.4	4.3	70.6	4.6
Non-verbal Reasoning	8.2	2.4	8.0	2.8
Working Memory	19.6	4.6	19.2	4.6
Language proficiency	166.7	1.6	165.3	5.1
Education	3.7	1.1	4.1	0.9
Occupation	2.0	1.06	2.0	1.02

Table 3. Reaction times and percent correct responses in the Simon task for congruent and incongruent trials. Standard deviations in brackets.

	Monolinguals		Bilinguals	
	RT	CR	RT	CR
Simon Task Congruent Trials	537 (77.5)	96% (.07)	553 (83.5)	94% (.07)
Simon Task Incongruent Trials	608 (74.0)	90% (.09)	620 (83.0)	90% (.08)

Table 4. Mean reaction times (in seconds) and percent correct responses in the Tower of London task. Standard deviations in brackets.

	Monolinguals		Bilinguals	
RT first move	21	(9.5)	27	(17)
RT Trial completion	32	(17)	40	(20)
Accuracy	74%	(.17)	68%	(.20)

Table 5. Mean reaction times (in seconds) and percent correct responses in the Change Blindness task. Standard deviations in brackets.

	Monolinguals		Bilinguals	
RT	12	(5)	13	(4)
Accuracy	87%	(.12)	88%	(.06)