

Data trimming procedure can eliminate bilingual cognitive advantage

Zhou, Beinan; Krott, Andrea

DOI:

[10.3758/s13423-015-0981-6](https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-015-0981-6)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Zhou, B & Krott, A 2015, 'Data trimming procedure can eliminate bilingual cognitive advantage', *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-015-0981-6>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

PSYCHONOMIC
BULLETIN & REVIEW

Data Trimming Procedure Can Eliminate Bilingual Cognitive Advantage

Journal:	<i>Psychonomic Bulletin & Review</i>
Manuscript ID	PBR-BR-15-199.R1
Manuscript Type:	Brief Report
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Zhou, Beinan; University of Birmingham, Psychology Krott, Andrea; University of Birmingham, Psychology
Keywords:	Bilingual advantage, non-verbal interference tasks, data trimming, response time distribution

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 Data trimming procedure can eliminate bilingual cognitive advantage

28
29 Beinan Zhou, Andrea Krott

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Beinan Zhou, School of Psychology, University of Birmingham, UK; Andrea Krott,
39 School of Psychology, University of Birmingham, UK.
40
41

42
43 Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Andrea Krott, School of
44 Psychology, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK. Tele: (+44) 121 414
45
46
47
48 4903. E-mail address: a.krott@bham.ac.uk
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Bilingualism and its cognitive impacts have drawn increasing interest. Recently, inconsistencies in the findings have raised discussions on what might have caused such discrepancies and how evidence should be evaluated. This review tries to shed new light onto the reasons for the inconsistencies by taking a novel perspective. Motivated by the finding that bilingualism affects response time distribution profiles, particularly findings that suggest bilinguals have fewer long responses, we investigated the relation between maximum response times allowed/included in the analysis of an experiment and the finding of a bilingual advantage. We reviewed 68 experiments from 33 articles that compared monolingual and bilingual speakers' performance in three commonly used non-verbal interference tasks (Simon, Spatial Stroop and Flanker). We found that studies that included longer responses in their analysis were more likely to report a bilingualism effect. We conclude that seemingly insignificant details such as the data trimming procedure can have a potential impact on whether an effect is observed. We also discuss the implication of our findings and suggest the usefulness of more fine-grid analytical procedures.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Recent years have seen an ever-increasing interest in bilingualism, especially in how the bilingual experience leads to cognitive changes (Kroll & Bialystok, 2013). One of the key discoveries was the finding that the two languages of a bilingual speaker are always active, even if the speaker is using only one language in a particular situation (BijeljacBabic, Biardeau, & Grainger, 1997; Colome, 2001; Spivey & Marian, 1999; Wu & Thierry, 2010). Therefore, bilingual experience requires that the speaker constantly monitors and controls language choice. But the soaring interest in bilingualism rather stems from reports that the constant demand on control processes appears to lead to a bilingual cognitive control advantage (for a review see Bialystok, 2009). Possibly the most exciting finding was that the onset of dementia appears to be later for bilingual speakers than for monolingual speakers (Alladi et al., 2013; Bialystok, Craik, & Freedman, 2007), suggesting that bilingualism provides a cognitive reserve. Another reason for the interest in bilingualism is the fact that evidence regarding the bilingual cognitive advantage is inconclusive. Quite a large number of studies have reported a bilingual advantage in cognitive control. But recent developments in the field have suggested that the evidence concerning the bilingual advantage, especially in non-verbal inhibition tasks, is far from conclusive (Hilchey & Klein, 2011; Paap, 2014; Paap & Greenberg, 2013).

Evidence for and against bilingual advantage

Early studies investigating speakers' cognitive control abilities have reported a bilingual advantage. These studies utilized the Simon task (Simon & Rudell, 1967), a task

1
2
3 in which participants have to respond to a stimulus feature (e.g. respond according to the
4 colour of a stimulus, left hand for red, and right hand for blue). The position of the
5 stimulus could be either compatible or incompatible with the response hand. In this
6 paradigm, responses are typically slower when stimulus position and response hand are
7 incompatible. Bilingual speakers outperformed monolingual speakers in this task: they
8 showed smaller stimulus congruency effects and/or overall faster response times
9 (Bialystok, Craik, et al., 2005; Bialystok, Craik, Klein, & Viswanathan, 2004; Bialystok,
10 Martin, & Viswanathan, 2005). Using other variants of the Simon task (e.g., Spatial
11 Stroop task, Bialystok, 2006) or paradigms that also require interference
12 inhibition/conflict resolution (e.g., Flanker task, Eriksen & Eriksen, 1974), such bilingual
13 advantage over monolingual performance has been reported many times over the years
14 since the first report (e.g. Costa, Hernandez, Costa-Faidella, & Sebastian-Galles, 2009;
15 Costa, Hernandez, & Sebastian-Galles, 2008; Kapa & Colombo, 2013; Tao, Marzecova,
16 Taft, Asanowicz, & Wodniecka, 2011).

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

But the evidence is not consistent. While a bilingual advantage is often found, this is not always the case (for a review see Hilchey & Klein, 2011). Most strikingly, in a recent comprehensive study, Paap and Greenberg (2013) did not find any evidence for the bilingual advantage. They conducted a series of non-verbal conflict tasks that had commonly been used in previous studies, including the Simon task, with monolingual and bilingual college students. Bilingual speakers were neither less vulnerable in the conflict condition nor faster overall. On the contrary, the only group difference pointed to a bilingual disadvantage.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

These inconsistent findings have raised serious discussions about the nature of the bilingualism effect and thought-provoking debates on how the evidence should be evaluated (e.g. Kroll & Bialystok, 2013; Paap, 2014; Valian, 2015). Several reviews have drawn attention to the published and non-published null results regarding the bilingualism effect, arguing that one should not over-evaluate the significance of positive findings, and should not under-evaluate the meaning of null results. Others discussed methodological issues (Paap, Johnson, & Sawi, 2015), such as the appropriateness of using covariates to control for additional factors, and the convergent validity of tasks used to measure executive control, i.e. the lack of significant correlations between standard measures of inhibition. The series of discussions provided a great chance to reflect on the current status in this research field, and more importantly on where the field is heading. Bearing that in mind, one constructive way to enhance our understanding of the consequences of bilingualism is to understand what factor(s) drives the divergence of results. The focus of this article is to contribute to the discussion from a novel perspective, i.e. the impact of seemingly trivial data trimming procedures.

Factors that potentially drive the inconsistency

In order to shed light onto the reasons for the inconsistencies in the literature, it is important to understand how other factors might interact with speakers' cognitive control ability. Quite a number of factors have been pointed out. It was evident from the beginning that bilingual research is challenging due to the diversity of speakers' linguistic profiles and experiences (Bialystok, 2001; Grosjean, 1998). Depending on their life experience, one bilingual speaker can differ from another one in many ways. Such

1
2
3 heterogeneity in linguistic experiences has been shown to have led to diverse cognitive
4
5 consequences, such as level of language proficiency (e.g. Mishra, Hilchey, Singh, &
6
7 Klein, 2012), stage of second language acquisition (early bilingual VS late bilingual,
8
9 Kalia, Wilbourn, & Ghio, 2014), the degree of bilingualism (dominant VS balanced
10
11 bilingual, Goral, Campanelli, & Spiro, 2015), pattern of language use, varying experience
12
13 with frequent language switch (Soveri, Rodriguez-Fornells, & Laine, 2011), the similarity
14
15 between a bilingual speakers' two languages (Coderre & van Heuven, 2014) and
16
17 multilingualism (Poarch & van Hell, 2012). In addition, there are factors that are closely
18
19 related to bilingualism or factors that drive the different language experiences, which at
20
21 the same time are related to general cognitive performances. These include social and
22
23 economic status (Morton & Harper, 2007), different cultural backgrounds (Yang, Yang,
24
25 & Lust, 2011) and immigration status. Last but not least there are factors that affect one's
26
27 general executive functioning and that probably affect monolingual and bilingual
28
29 speakers in the same way, such as age, education, exercise, music training, active video
30
31 game experience and others (for an overview see Valian, 2015). These latter factors
32
33 emphasize that cognitive control can be trained in other ways than by being bilingual and
34
35 that the populations of monolinguals and bilinguals can substantially overlap with regards
36
37 to their performance in cognitive tasks. Such an overlap would also explain why the
38
39 bilingualism effect has not been found in every study.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **A new proposal**

53
54
55 Another reason for the inconclusiveness of the literature might be the nature of
56
57 the bilingual cognitive effect, which is better described as a mixture of effects rather than
58
59
60

1
2
3 a single one. For instance, Hilchey and Klein (2011) differentiated between two patterns
4 of bilingual advantage, namely an inhibitory control advantage (i.e. bilinguals showing a
5 reduced conflict effect) and an overall response speed advantage. This distinction
6 suggests two routes through which bilingual experience could affect cognitive control:
7 inhibitory control and attentional control. While enhanced inhibitory control ability
8 should help to resolve conflict, resulting in a reduced conflict effect, enhanced attentional
9 control should help to maintain task goals, leading to an overall speed advantage. Due to
10 the general impurity of cognitive control tasks, a specific task does not provide a pure
11 measure of a single control ability, but draws on many aspects of cognitive control. Some
12 tasks might be more sensitive to participants' inhibitory control ability and some to their
13 attentional control ability. Therefore depending on the task, one might observe a result
14 pattern rather consistent with a bilingual inhibitory control advantage and/or bilingual
15 attentional control advantage.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 Tse and Altarriba (2012) utilized a novel analytical approach to the bilingual
35 advantage effect. They performed an ex-Gaussian analysis to investigate response time
36 distributions of bilingual speakers' performance in a Colour Stroop task. Response times
37 in cognitive experiments typically present themselves in a positively skewed distribution,
38 which can be approximated by an ex-Gaussian distribution (Heathcote, Popiel, &
39 Mewhort, 1991), i.e. a convolution of a Gaussian distribution (the mean of which is
40 captured by the parameter μ) and an exponential distribution (the mean and variance of
41 which are captured by the parameter τ). While the Gaussian component (the parameter μ)
42 can be understood as the main body of the distribution, the exponential component (the
43 parameter τ) captures the tail of the distribution, i.e. extremely slow responses. Tse and
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Altarriba (2012) suggested that the parameters of ex-Gaussian models of response time
4 distributions in a Colour Stroop experiment are differentially sensitive to inhibitory
5 control and attentional control. They argued that inhibitory control ability modulates the
6 Gaussian component (μ) because differences in inhibitory control would affect the ease
7 one resolves the competition between the two conflicting responses, leading to an overall
8 shift of the response distribution in the conflict condition as compared to the no-conflict
9 condition. In contrast, attentional control ability modulates the tail of the distribution (τ)
10 because lapses of attention should lead to extreme long responses independent of
11 condition. They found that more proficient speakers in L1/L2 showed a smaller
12 interference effect in μ , and also smaller τ independent of condition. This result is
13 important, first because it proposes a way to disentangle the contribution of inhibitory
14 and attentional control, and second because it suggests that what is usually treated as
15 unwanted responses (τ) conveys important information.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 One other study that has utilized the ex-Gaussian approach to examine response
35 time distributions is Calabria, Hernandez, Martin, and Costa (2011). They re-analyzed
36 results from an Attentional Network Task (ANT) originally reported in Costa et al.
37 (2008) and Costa et al. (2009). In the original studies, they tested participants' attentional
38 networks using the ANT, which generates measurements for three attentional networks:
39 an alerting network, an orienting network and an executive network. In their re-analysis,
40 they focused on the executive network, or more specifically, on response times for trials
41 with conflict stimuli versus trials with non-conflict stimuli (regardless of cue type).
42 Results revealed an overall speed advantage for bilinguals in both the Gaussian (μ) and
43 exponential (τ) components of the response distributions. Also, for an experiment that
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 contained only 25% inconsistent trials, i.e. under high monitoring demands, monolinguals
4
5 had significant longer distribution tails (larger τ) in the incongruent compared to the
6
7 congruent condition. This congruency effect was absent for bilinguals. These results
8
9 suggest that the conflict effect in interference tasks is at least partially located in the tail
10
11 of response distributions.
12
13

14
15 These observations lead to a new proposal that we investigated in the present
16
17 study, namely that one reason for observing or not observing the bilingual advantage
18
19 might be how the data was handled with regards to slow responses. In a traditional central
20
21 tendency analysis, the typical procedure is to trim extreme responses, treating them as
22
23 outliers. This is problematic if long responses are most sensitive to the experimental
24
25 manipulation and/or group differences, as in studies where group/condition differences
26
27 only emerged in the tail of response distributions (e.g. Epstein et al., 2011; Hervey et al.,
28
29 2006). In other words, if a difference resides in the tail of the response distribution, by
30
31 trimming the tail one also trims the potential to observe an effect. For instance, Leth-
32
33 Steensen, Elbaz, and Douglas (2000) investigated response time distributions in a four-
34
35 choice reaction time task for a group of children diagnosed with ADHD and a matched
36
37 group with typical developing children. Using an ex-Gaussian analysis, they found that
38
39 the two groups' performances differed only in the τ parameter (the distribution tails), not
40
41 in the main part of the response time distribution. The authors concluded that data
42
43 trimming in this situation is equivalent to an artificial elimination of effects.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Meta-analysis**

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 In what follows, we present a new perspective on previous studies that compared
5 monolingual and bilingual performance in non-verbal inhibition tasks, investigating their
6 data trimming procedures. If bilingual advantages are at least partly located in the tails of
7 response distributions, i.e. in the slow responses as in Calabria et al. (2011), then one
8 would expect that cutting off slow responses would reduce the chance of finding such
9 advantages. We focused on three non-linguistic inhibition tasks that have been most
10 intensely used to investigate the bilingual advantage: the Simon task, the Spatial Stroop
11 task and the Flanker task (the latter sometimes embedded in an ANT). To ensure
12 comparability, some variations of the tasks were excluded (e.g. the Simon task with a
13 delay component in Martin-Rhee & Bialystok, 2008). We found 68 experiments taken
14 from 33 articles (see Table 1). Within these 68 experiments, 23 (34%) reported data
15 trimming procedures, 4 reported excluding very short responses but did not report
16 trimming of response distribution tails, 1 stated explicitly that long responses were not
17 trimmed and the remaining 40 did not mention whether or not they trimmed the data. For
18 the purpose of our analyses, we treated the latter studies as ones that did not trim the data.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 [Table 1 About Here]

40
41 Two issues need to be pointed out. First, for studies that did trim the data, the
42 practices differed. While some studies rejected long responses using standard deviations
43 (e.g. 2.5 *SD* in Paap & Greenberg, 2013, which was approximately 700 ms after stimulus
44 onset), others used a specific time cut-off (e.g. response times above 1700 ms). For
45 comparison purposes, we translated cut-offs based on standard deviations into time cut-
46 offs (using reported means and standard deviations). Second, for studies that did not trim
47 the data, there was a big variation in terms of the maximum time allowed for making a
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 response. For example, in Kousaie and Phillips (2012) 750 ms were allowed for making a
4
5 response, meaning that in this particular design it was not possible to observe responses
6
7 slower than 750 ms. This is equivalent to trimming the data at 750 ms. For these reasons,
8
9 we focused on maximum response times being included in analyses (Figure 1). For
10
11 studies that did report a data trimming procedure, this is either the explicitly stated cut-off
12
13 time or the RT calculated by the mean and *SD*. For studies that did not report a data
14
15 trimming procedure, this was the maximum time allowed for making a response. For
16
17 simplicity reasons, we will refer to both types of trimming as the maximum response time
18
19 allowance.
20
21
22
23

24
25 We acknowledge that data trimming and varying maximum time allowances are
26
27 not the same. Different maximum time allowances, but not data trimming, can lead to
28
29 different response strategies. For example, participants might not monitor their response
30
31 accuracy as thoroughly in an experiment with a response allowance of 1000 ms compared
32
33 to an experiment with a response allowance of 5000 ms and data trimming at 1000 ms.
34
35 However, in none of the 16 studies in the long allowance group data trimming was
36
37 applied, which means that this cannot have affected our results.
38
39
40

41
42 Some of the studies reviewed were not included into further analysis because
43
44 there was not adequate information about either the maximum time allowed or how the
45
46 data was treated (the 3rd study in Bialystok, Martin, et al., 2005, all studies in Gathercole
47
48 et al., 2014, Yang et al., 2011, and Mohades et al., 2014). Carlson and Meltzoff (2008)
49
50 was not included either because they did not report RTs. This led to 58 studies being
51
52 included in our statistical analysis.
53
54

55 [Figure 1 About Here]
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1 shows the number of experiments that did and did not find a bilingual advantage for the various maximum times allowed. A clear pattern emerges: the shorter the maximum response time allowance, the less likely that a bilingualism effect was found. In order to statistically test whether observing a bilingualism effect depends on the maximum time allowed, we grouped the experiments into three types of maximum time allowance: short allowance (below 1000ms), medium allowance (1001ms – 3000ms) and long allowance (above 3001ms; see Table 2). A chi-square test of independence confirmed that the result patterns differed for the three allowance groups, $\chi^2(2, N = 58) = 21.99, p < .001$. Thus, consistent with our hypothesis, studies with short response time allowance were more likely to report no group difference whereas studies with longer allowance were more likely to report a bilingualism effect.

[Table 2 About Here]

In a meta-analysis of the bilingual advantage literature, Donnelly, Brooks, & Homer (2015) reported an effect of research lab. They suggested that this effect might be due to lab differences in, for instance, access to bilingual populations. In our long allowance group (>3001 ms), many studies are from the same research group. In fact, 14 out of 16 data points are from a research group around one particular author. In order to rule out that the current result is driven by a potential effect of lab, we excluded all data point from this lab. This led to two data points in the long allowance group. We therefore focussed on the short and medium allowance group, which both constituted a mixed contribution from different labs, meaning that the new result could not have been driven by any lab effect. This analysis confirmed our original result. The likelihood of observing a bilingualism effect depended on RT allowance, $\chi^2(1, N = 42) = 12.14, p < .001$, with

1
2
3 the medium allowance group being more likely to observe a bilingualism effect than the
4
5 short allowance group.
6
7

8 As introduced, it has been pointed out that the age of the participants might play a
9
10 role in whether a bilingualism effect can be detected or not. More specifically, bilingual
11
12 elderly have been found to show the cognitive control advantage more consistently than
13
14 other age groups. In addition, elderly and children respond on average much slower than
15
16 adults. It might therefore be that our result arose because the group with long response
17
18 allowances might have consisted of studies with very young and very old populations.
19
20 We therefore tested the relationship between maximum response time allowance and the
21
22 likelihood of finding a bilingualism effect in children, adults and elderly participants
23
24 separately (see Table 2). A chi-square test of independence showed that while the
25
26 relationship was not significant for children, $\chi^2(2, N = 10) = 2.86, p = .24$, it was
27
28 significant for adults, $\chi^2(2, N = 37) = 13.40, p = .001$, and was marginally significant for
29
30 elderly participants, $\chi^2(2, N = 11) = 5.29, p = .071$. The non-significant result for the
31
32 children was likely driven by limited power due to small numbers, especially in the short
33
34 allowance category. Nevertheless, descriptively 83% (5 out of 6) of the studies in the
35
36 long allowance group versus 66% (2 out of 3) in the medium allowance group showed a
37
38 bilingualism effect. This result pattern is consistent with the conclusion that studies with
39
40 longer response allowances are more likely to show a bilingualism advantage. Similarly
41
42 in the elderly group, studies with longer allowances are more likely to report a
43
44 bilingualism effect descriptively. The marginal effect seems again be due to a small
45
46 sample size. In summary, it appears that data trimming reduces the likelihood of
47
48 observing a bilingualism effect regardless of age group. Also, the very robust finding for
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 adults showed that our overall result is not driven by the results for children or older
4
5 participants who tend to respond much slower than adult participants.
6
7
8
9

10 **Discussion**

11
12 Based on the assumption that the effect of bilingualism on cognitive control
13 resides at least partly in the tail of response distributions, we investigated a potential
14 relationship between data trimming procedures adopted and the likelihood of observing a
15 bilingualism effect by reviewing 68 experiments reported in 33 articles that compared
16 monolingual and bilingual speakers using non-verbal interference tasks. We found that
17 studies that included longer responses in their analysis were more likely to report a
18 bilingualism effect, either in the form of overall response speed advantage or in the form
19 of reduced interference effect. And this was also the case when the potential effect of lab
20 was eliminated. This is consistent with earlier findings that the bilingualism effect
21 emerges partially in the tail of response distributions (Abutalebi et al., 2015; Calabria et
22 al., 2011; Tse & Altarriba, 2012). It appears that, when these prolonged responses were
23 trimmed or not recorded, group differences might have also been eliminated.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 A further analysis showed that the general result pattern was true for studies
42 testing children, adults and elderly alike, even though significantly so only for adults,
43 suggesting that data trimming might be problematic independent of the age of the
44 participants and therefore independent of the average response times or the cognitive
45 abilities of the participants. It also showed that the overall result pattern was not caused
46 by studies with participant groups with very long responses times. There is unfortunately
47 an insufficient number of studies and/or information about the participants in studies
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 published to date to test whether data trimming procedure affects results independent of
4
5 other factors that have been suggested to interact with the bilingual advantage (such as
6
7
8 SES, immigrant status, language dominance, age of language acquisition, language usage
9
10 etc.) Future studies will need to disentangle the relevance of and the potential interplay of
11
12 all these factors.
13

14
15 This review provides some practical implications for future endeavours.
16
17 Employing a more fine-grid investigation approach might be useful, particularly in
18
19 situations where effects are subtle. As pointed out, one fruitful alternative to traditional
20
21 approaches of analysis is the ex-Gaussian analysis of response time distributions
22
23 (Abutalebi et al., 2015; Calabria et al., 2011). For instance, Abutalebi et al. (2015)
24
25 reported that a group of bilingual elderly showed advantage in the τ component in the
26
27 incongruent condition and the μ component in the congruent condition in a Flanker task,
28
29 supporting the notion that bilingual speakers have enhanced attentional control. It has to
30
31 be pointed out, though, that one needs to be cautious when interpreting the results from
32
33 ex-Gaussian parameters in terms of underlying cognitive processes, because there is no
34
35 one-to-one mapping between cognitive processes and those parameters (Matzke &
36
37 Wagenmakers, 2009).
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 An alternative approach to the ex-Gaussian analysis is a delta plot analysis, which
45
46 examines condition effects as a function of RT and which has been used in analysing
47
48 conflict tasks such as the Simon task and the Colour Stroop task (Ridderinkhof, 2002a,
49
50 2002b; Ridderinkhof, Wildenberg, Wijnen, & Burle, 2004). In delta plot analyses,
51
52 responses for each condition are grouped into bins according to their response times.
53
54
55 Condition differences are then calculated and plotted for these bins. Delta plots
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 prototypically have a positive slope due to effect sizes being larger for slower responses
5
6 (Roelofs, Piai, & Garrido Rodriguez, 2011). If one condition requires more inhibition
7
8 than the other, the difference between conditions does not linearly increase with RT, but
9
10 is reduced instead, resulting in ‘levelling-off’ of the delta plot in longer RTs. The
11
12 levelling-off has been explained by inhibition building up slowly (Ridderinkhof, 2002a).
13
14 The extent to which the plots level off can effectively reflect the amount of inhibition
15
16 involved. The stronger the inhibition is applied, the smaller the slope of the plot is. For
17
18 example, Ridderinkhof (2002b) observed that in a Simon task, delta plots for participants
19
20 with smaller Simon effect, who are believed to have more efficient inhibitory control,
21
22 levelled off more than those with larger Simon effect. Because a delta plot analysis is
23
24 most useful within the discussion of inhibitory control, this approach could be used to test
25
26 whether inhibition was applied equally fast and to the same degree in monolinguals and
27
28 bilinguals.
29
30
31
32
33

34 In conclusion, the current review adds to the discussion about the reality of the
35
36 bilingualism cognitive advantage in that seemingly insignificant details such as data
37
38 trimming and maximum time allowed for response might have a significant influence on
39
40 the findings. Therefore, it is important to take these into account in order to fully judge
41
42 the evidence for and against a bilingual cognitive effect, next to other factor already
43
44 pointed out in the literature. In addition, future studies are encouraged to report in detail
45
46 how data were handled and possibly use more fine-grid analyses of RT data to shed light
47
48 onto the effect of bilingualism on speakers’ cognitive control abilities.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Reported bilingual advantage for maximum response times included in the analyses in 58 non-verbal conflict experiments. * indicates that the cut-off time was estimated by the mean and *SD*.




Table 1

Data Trimming Procedures and Results of Studies Using Non-verbal Interference Tasks in Bilingual Research

Study	Age Group (mean age)	Task	Trimming Procedure	Maximum Time Allowed	Results
Bialystok et al. (2004)	Adults (43)	Simon (study1)	-	Until Response	Overall/Effect ¹
	Elderly(71.9)	Simon (study 1)	-	Until Response	Overall/Effect
	Adults (42.6)	Simon (study 2)	-	Until Response	Overall/Effect
		Simon (4 colours)	-	Until Response	Overall/Effect
		Simon (study 2)	-	Until Response	Overall/Effect
	Elderly(70.3)	Simon (study 2)	-	Until Response	Overall/Effect
		Simon (4 colours)	-	Until Response	Overall/Effect
Adults (~39)	Simon	-	Until Response	Overall/Effect	
Bialystok, Martin, et al. (2005) ²	Children (5)	Simon (study 1)	-	5500	Overall
	Children (5)	Simon (study 2)	-	5500	Overall
	Young Adults (20-30)	Simon	-	Not mentioned	No group difference
Bialystok, Craik, et al. (2005)	Young Adults (29)	Simon	-	1800	No group difference
	Young Adults (29)	Simon	-	1800	Overall ³
Bialystok (2006)	Young Adults (~22)	Simon (low switch)	-	1000	No group difference
		Simon (high switch)	-	1000	No group difference

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

		Spatial Stroop (low switch)	-	1000	No group difference
		Spatial Stroop (high switch)	-	1000	Overall
Morton and Harper (2007)	Children (6.8)	Simon	None	Until Response ⁴	No group difference
Linck, Hoshino, and Kroll (2008)	Young Adults (~20)	Simon	-	Until Response ⁴	Effect
Martin-Rhee and Bialystok (2008) ⁵	Children (4.6)	Simon (study 1)	-	5000	Overall
	Children (4.2)	Simon (study 2)	-	5000	Overall
	Children (8)	Spatial Stroop	-	Until Response	Overall
Bialystok, Craik, and Luk (2008)	Young Adults (~20)	Spatial Stroop (high switch)	-	Until Response	No group difference
	Elderly (~68)	Spatial Stroop (high switch)	-	Until Response	Effect
Carlson and Meltzoff (2008)	Children (~6)	ANT	> 1700 ms	Not mentioned	N/A ⁶
Costa et al. (2008)	Young Adults (22)	ANT	-	1700	Overall/Effect
Costa et al. (2009)	Young Adults (~20)	ANT (92% cong)	>1200 ms	1700	No group difference
	Young Adults (~20)	ANT (8% cong)	>1200 ms	1700	No group difference
	Young Adults (~20)	ANT (50% cong)	>1200 ms	1700	Overall
	Young Adults (~20)	ANT (75% cong)	>1200 ms	1700	Overall/Effect (Block1)
Emmorey, Luk, Pyers, and Bialystok (2008)	Adults (46-50)	Flanker	none	2000	Overall (for unimodal bilingual, not bimodal)
Bialystok and DePape (2009)	Young Adults (~23)	Spatial Stroop	>2500 ms	Until Response	Overall (for no music)

					experience group)	
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7	Luk, Anderson, Craik, Grady, and	Young Adults (~21)	Flanker (with Go/No-Go	-	1300 ⁷	No group difference
8	Bialystok (2010)		element)			
9						
10	Tao et al. (2011)	Young Adults (~20)	Lateralized ANT	>1200 ms	1820	Effect
11						
12	Yang et al. (2011)	Children (~6.5)	ANT	-	Not mentioned	Overall
13		Children (~6.5)	ANT	-	Not mentioned	Overall
14		Children (~6.5)	ANT	-	Not mentioned	Overall
15						
16	Salvatierra and Rosselli (2011)	Young Adults (~26)	Simon	-	800	No group difference
17		Young Adults (~26)	Simon (4 colours)	-	800	No group difference
18		Elderly (~64)	Simon	-	800	Effect
19		Elderly (~64)	Simon (4 colours)	-	800	No group difference
20						
21	Yudes et al. (2011)	Young Adults (21-25)	Simon	>1200 ms	2000	No group difference ⁸
22						
23	Engel de Abreu, Cruz-Santos,	Children (~8.5)	Flanker	>3 <i>SD</i>	5000	Overall/Effect
24	Tourinho, Martin, and Bialystok					
25	(2012)					
26						
27	Kousaie and Phillips (2012)	Young Adults (~24)	Simon	-	750	No group difference
28		Young Adults (~24)	Flanker	-	750	No group difference
29						
30	Poarch and van Hell (2012)	Children (~7)	Simon (study1)	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	1000	No group difference ⁹
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						
36						
37						
38						
39						
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						
47						
48						
49						

						Overall (Monolingual
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						Overall (Monolingual
6						= Late bilingual >
7	Kapa and Colombo (2013)	Children (~9)	ANT	None	1700	Early bilingual)
8						
9						
10	Nicolay and Poncelet (2013)	Children (~8.5)	Flanker (50% cong)	-	1700 ¹⁰	No group difference
11						
12		Young Adults 1				
13	Paap and Greensberg (2013)	(students)	Simon1	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	Not mentioned	No group difference
14						
15		Young Adults 2				
16		(students)	Simon2	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	Not mentioned	No group difference
17						
18		Young Adults 3				
19		(students)	Simon3	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	Not mentioned	No group difference
20						
21		Young Adults 3				
22		(students)				
23						
24		Young Adults 3				
25		(students)	Flanker	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	1700	No group difference
26						
27						
28	Kirk, Scott-Brown, and Kempe					
29	(2014)	Elderly (~70.3)	Simon	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	1000	No group difference
30						
31						
32				None ¹¹	1000	No group difference
33						
34	Marzecova et al. (2013)	Young Adults (~21)	LANT	>1200 ms	2000	Effect
35						
36	Gathercole et al. (2014)	Children (~4)	Simon	-	Not mentioned	Monolingual advantage
37						
38		Grade Schoolers (~8)	Simon	-	Not mentioned	No group difference
39						
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						
47						
48						
49						

	Young Adults (~25)	Simon	-	Not mentioned	Monolingual advantage
	Elderly (~67)	Simon	-	Not mentioned	No group difference
Mohades et al. (2014)	Children (8~11)	Simon	-	Not mentioned	Monolingual advantage
Blumenfeld and Marian (2014) ¹²	Young Adults (~22)	Spatial Stroop (study1)	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	700	No group difference
	Young Adults (~22)	Simon (up/down arrow in study1)	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	700	No group difference
	Young Adults (~22)	Spatial Stroop (study2)	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	700	No group difference
	Young Adults (~22)	Simon (up/down arrow in study2)	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	700	No group difference
					Effect (Monolingual >
Pelham and Abrams (2014)	Young Adults (~20)	ANT	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	1700	Late bilingual = Early bilingual)
Kousaie, Sheppard, Lemieux, Monetta, and Taler (2014)	Young Adults (~21.5)	Spatial Stroop	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	Not mentioned	No group difference
	Elderly (~72.5)	Spatial Stroop	>2.5 <i>SD</i>	Not mentioned	No group difference
Grady, Luk, Craik, and Bialystok (2015)	Elderly (~70.5)	Simon	-	2550	No group difference
Abutalebi et al. (2015)	Elderly (~62)	Flanker	None	1700	Overall

1
2
3
4
5 Note: 1. Overall = Bilingual advantage in overall response speed (in both congruent and incongruent condition). Effect = Smaller
6 congruency effect for bilinguals. 2. Study 4 and 5 in this article were the same as in Bialystok (2004); therefore we do not
7 duplicate report here. 3. Bilingual overall advantage was found in the Cantonese/English bilingual group but not the
8 French/English bilingual group; this is represented as two separate comparisons here. 4. Not stated directly, but followed the
9 procedure by Bialystok et al. (2004). 5. Another two variations of the Simon task were conducted, with a short or a long delay.
10 These were not included here. 6. A bilingual advantage was reported for response accuracies. Information regarding response
11 speed is not available. 7. Assuming that responses can be made during the blank interval of 300 ms after the stimulus presentation
12 for 1000 ms. 8. Yudes et al. (2011) also tested a group of simultaneous interpreters. We only report the monolingual/bilingual
13 comparison. 9. A group of second language learners and a group of trilingual children were also tested. We only report the
14 monolingual/bilingual comparison. 10. Not stated directly, but followed the procedure by Costa et al. (2008). 11. Kirk (2013)
15 tested three monolingual control groups. We only report results regarding Anglo-English monolingual group which does not
16 speak another dialect. Kirk (2013) also reported analysis without removing outlying responses and found no group difference. 12.
17 Blumenfeld & Viorica (2014) also reported reverse efficiency scores which were based on both response latencies and accuracy
18 rates. This analysis yielded slightly different result patterns. We focus on response latencies for reasons of comparability.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 2

Number of Experiments with Short, Medium or Long Cut-offs / Maximum Allowed Times and Findings of Bilingual Advantage

Cut-off Group	Children		Adults		Elderly		Overall	
	No	Bilingual	No	Bilingual	No	Bilingual	No	Bilingual
	Difference	advantage	Difference	advantage	Difference	advantage	Difference	advantage
Short Allowance	1	0	16	2	3	1	20	3
Medium Allowance	1	2	5	8	2	1	8	11
Long Allowance	1	5	1	5	0	4	2	14
Column Total	3	7	22	15	5	5	30	28

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Abutalebi, J., Guidi, L., Borsa, V., Canini, M., Della Rosa, P. A., Parris, B. A., & Weekes, B. S. (2015). Bilingualism provides a neural reserve for aging populations. *Neuropsychologia*, *69*, 201-210. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.01.040
- Alladi, S., Bak, T. H., Duggirala, V., Surampudi, B., Shailaja, M., Shukla, A. K., . . . Kaul, S. (2013). Bilingualism delays age at onset of dementia, independent of education and immigration status. *Neurology*, *81*(22), 1938-1944.
- Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition*. : Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bialystok, E. (2006). Effect of bilingualism and computer video game experience on the Simon task. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology-Revue Canadienne de Psychologie Experimentale*, *60*(1), 68-79.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F., & Luk, G. (2008). Cognitive control and lexical access in younger and older bilinguals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology-Learning Memory and Cognition*, *34*(4), 859-873.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., & Freedman, M. (2007). Bilingualism as a protection against the onset of symptoms of dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *45*(2), 459-464. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.10.009
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., Grady, C., Chau, W., Ishii, R., Gunji, A., & Pantev, C. (2005). Effect of bilingualism on cognitive control in the Simon task: evidence from MEG. *NeuroImage*, *24*(1), 40-49.
- 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*(2), 290-303.

- 1
2
3 Bialystok, E., & DePape, A.-M. (2009). Musical Expertise, Bilingualism, and Executive
4
5 Functioning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology-Human Perception and Performance*,
6
7 35(2), 565-574. doi: 10.1037/a0012735
8
9
10 Bialystok, E., Martin, M. M., & Viswanathan, M. (2005). Bilingualism across the lifespan: The
11
12 rise and fall of inhibitory control. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9(1), 103-119.
13
14 doi: 10.1177/13670069050090010701
15
16 BijeljacBabic, R., Biardeau, A., & Grainger, J. (1997). Masked orthographic priming in bilingual
17
18 word recognition. *Memory & Cognition*, 25(4), 447-457.
19
20
21 Blumenfeld, H. K., & Marian, V. (2014). Cognitive control in bilinguals: Advantages in
22
23 Stimulus-Stimulus inhibition. *Bilingualism-Language and Cognition*, 17(3), 610-629.
24
25 doi: 10.1017/s1366728913000564
26
27
28 Calabria, M., Hernandez, M., Martin, C. D., & Costa, A. (2011). When the tail counts: the
29
30 advantage of bilingualism through the ex-Gaussian distribution analysis. *Frontiers in*
31
32 *Psychology*, 2, 8. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00250
33
34
35 Carlson, S. M., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2008). Bilingual experience and executive functioning in
36
37 young children. *Developmental Science*, 11(2), 282-298. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-
38
39 7687.2008.00675.x
40
41
42 Coderre, E. L., & van Heuven, W. J. B. (2014). The effect of script similarity on executive
43
44 control in bilinguals. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01070
45
46
47 Colome, À. (2001). Lexical Activation in Bilinguals' Speech Production: Language-Specific or
48
49 Language-Independent? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 45(4), 721-736.
50
51
52 Costa, A., Hernandez, M., Costa-Faidella, J., & Sebastian-Galles, N. (2009). On the bilingual
53
54 advantage in conflict processing: Now you see it, now you don't. *Cognition*, 113(2), 135-
55
56 149.
57
58
59 Costa, A., Hernandez, M., & Sebastian-Galles, N. (2008). Bilingualism aids conflict resolution:
60
61 Evidence from the ANT task. *Cognition*, 106(1), 59-86.

- 1
2
3 de Bruin, A., Treccani, B., & Della Sala, S. (2015). Cognitive Advantage in Bilingualism: An
4
5 Example of Publication Bias? *Psychological Science*, 26(1), 99-107. doi:
6
7 10.1177/0956797614557866
8
9
10 Donnelly, S., Brooks, P.J., & Homer, B.D. (2015). Examining the Bilingual Advantage on
11
12 Conflict Resolution Tasks: A Meta-Analysis. *The Annual Meeting of the Cognitive*
13
14 *Science Society*.
15
16 Emmorey, K., Luk, G., Pyers, J. E., & Bialystok, E. (2008). The Source of Enhanced Cognitive
17
18 Control in Bilinguals: Evidence From Bimodal Bilinguals. *Psychological Science*,
19
20 19(12), 1201-1206. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02224.x
21
22
23 Engel de Abreu, P., Cruz-Santos, A., Tourinho, C. J., Martin, R., & Bialystok, E. (2012).
24
25 Bilingualism Enriches the Poor: Enhanced Cognitive Control in Low-Income Minority
26
27 Children. *Psychological Science*, 23(11), 1364-1371. doi: 10.1177/0956797612443836
28
29
30 Epstein, J. N., Langberg, J. M., Rosen, P. J., Graham, A., Narad, M. E., Antonini, T. N., . . .
31
32 Altaye, M. (2011). Evidence for Higher Reaction Time Variability for Children With
33
34 ADHD on a Range of Cognitive Tasks Including Reward and Event Rate Manipulations.
35
36 *Neuropsychology*, 25(4), 427-441. doi: 10.1037/a0022155
37
38 Eriksen, B. A., & Eriksen, C. W. (1974). Effects of Noise Letters Upon Identification of A Target
39
40 Letter in A Nonsearch Task. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 16(1), 143-149.
41
42
43 Gathercole, V. C. M., Thomas, E. M., Kennedy, I., Prys, C., Young, N., Guasch, N. V., . . . Jones,
44
45 L. (2014). Does language dominance affect cognitive performance in bilinguals?
46
47 Lifespan evidence from preschoolers through older adults on card sorting, Simon, and
48
49 metalinguistic tasks. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 14. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00011
50
51
52 Goral, M., Campanelli, L., & Spiro, A. (2015). Language dominance and inhibition abilities in
53
54 bilingual older adults. *Bilingualism-Language and Cognition*, 18(1), 79-89. doi:
55
56 10.1017/s1366728913000126
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Grady, C. L., Luk, G., Craik, F. I. M., & Bialystok, E. (2015). Brain network activity in
4 monolingual and bilingual older adults. *Neuropsychologia*, *66*, 170-181. doi:
5
6 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.10.042
7
8
9
10 Grosjean, F. (1998). Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues. *Bilingualism:*
11
12 *Language and Cognition*, *1*(02), 131-149. doi: doi:10.1017/S136672899800025X
13
14 Heathcote, A., Popiel, S. J., & Mewhort, D. J. K. (1991). Analysis of Response - Time
15
16 Distributions - An Example Using the Stroop Task. *Psychological Bulletin*, *109*(2), 340-
17
18 347. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.109.2.340
19
20
21 Hervey, A. S., Epstein, J. N., Curry, J. F., Tonev, S., Arnold, L. E., Conners, C. K., . . .
22
23 Hechtman, L. (2006). Reaction time distribution analysis of neuropsychological
24
25 performance in an ADHD sample. *Child Neuropsychology*, *12*(2), 125-140. doi:
26
27 10.1080/09297040500499081
28
29
30 Hilchey, M. D., & Klein, R. M. (2011). Are there bilingual advantages on nonlinguistic
31
32 interference tasks? Implications for the plasticity of executive control processes.
33
34 *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *18*(4), 625-658.
35
36
37 Kalia, V., Wilbourn, M. P., & Ghio, K. (2014). Better early or late? Examining the influence of
38
39 age of exposure and language proficiency on executive function in early and late
40
41 bilinguals. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *26*(7), 699-713. doi:
42
43 10.1080/20445911.2014.956748
44
45
46 Kapa, L. L., & Colombo, J. (2013). Attentional control in early and later bilingual children.
47
48 *Cognitive Development*, *28*(3), 233-246. doi: 10.1016/j.cogdev.2013.01.011
49
50
51 Kirk, N. W., Fiala, L., Scott-Brown, K. C., & Kempe, V. (2014). No evidence for reduced Simon
52
53 cost in elderly bilinguals and bidialectals. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology (Hove,*
54
55 *England)*, *26*(6), 640–648. <http://doi.org/10.1080/20445911.2014.929580>
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kousaie, S., & Phillips, N. A. (2012). Conflict monitoring and resolution: Are two languages
4 better than one? Evidence from reaction time and event-related brain potentials. *Brain*
5
6 *Research, 1446*, 71-90. doi: 10.1016/j.brainres.2012.01.052
7
8
9
10 Kousaie, S., Sheppard, C., Lemieux, M., Monetta, L., & Taler, V. (2014). Executive function and
11 bilingualism in young and older adults. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience, 8*. doi:
12 10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00250
13
14
15
16 Kroll, J. F., & Bialystok, E. (2013). Understanding the consequences of bilingualism for language
17 processing and cognition. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology, 25*(5), 497-514. doi:
18 10.1080/20445911.2013.799170
19
20
21
22
23 Leth-Steensen, C., Elbaz, Z. K., & Douglas, V. I. (2000). Mean response times, variability, and
24 skew in the responding of ADHD children: a response time distributional approach. *Acta*
25 *Psychologica, 104*(2), 167-190. doi: 10.1016/s0001-6918(00)00019-6
26
27
28
29 Linck, J. A., Hoshino, N., & Kroll, J. F. (2008). Cross-language lexical processes and inhibitory
30 control. *Ment Lex, 3*(3), 349-374. doi: 10.1075/ml.3.3.06lin
31
32
33
34 Luk, G., Anderson, J. A. E., Craik, F. I. M., Grady, C., & Bialystok, E. (2010). Distinct neural
35 correlates for two types of inhibition in bilinguals: Response inhibition versus
36 interference suppression. *Brain and Cognition, 74*(3), 347-357. doi:
37 10.1016/j.bandc.2010.09.004
38
39
40
41
42 Martin-Rhee, M. M., & Bialystok, E. (2008). The development of two types of inhibitory control
43 in monolingual and bilingual children. *Bilingualism-Language and Cognition, 11*(1), 81-
44 93.
45
46
47
48
49 Marzecova, A., Asanowicz, D., Kriva, L., & Wodniecka, Z. (2013). The effects of bilingualism
50 on efficiency and lateralization of attentional networks. *Bilingualism-Language and*
51 *Cognition, 16*(3), 608-623. doi: 10.1017/s1366728912000569
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Matzke, D., & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2009). Psychological interpretation of the ex-Gaussian and
4 shifted Wald parameters: A diffusion model analysis. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*,
5 16(5), 798-817. doi: 10.3758/pbr.16.5.798
6
7
8
9
10 Mezzacappa, E. (2004). Alerting, orienting, and executive attention: Developmental properties
11 and sociodemographic correlates in an epidemiological sample of young, urban children.
12 *Child Development*, 75(5), 1373-1386. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00746.x
13
14
15
16 Mishra, R. K., Hilchey, M. D., Singh, N., & Klein, R. M. (2012). On the time course of
17 exogenous cueing effects in bilinguals: Higher proficiency in a second language is
18 associated with more rapid endogenous disengagement. *Quarterly Journal of*
19 *Experimental Psychology*, 65(8), 1502-1510. doi: 10.1080/17470218.2012.657656
20
21
22
23
24
25 Miyake, A., Emerson, M. J., Padilla, F., & Ahn, J. C. (2004). Inner speech as a retrieval
26 aid for task goals: the effects of cue type and articulatory suppression in the
27 random task cuing paradigm. *Acta Psychologica*, 115(2-3), 123-142. doi:
28 10.1016/j.actpsy.2003.12.004
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 Mohades, S. G., Struys, E., Van Schuerbeek, P., Baeken, C., Van De Craen, P., & Luypaert, R.
36 (2014). Age of second language acquisition affects nonverbal conflict processing in
37 children: an fMRI study. *Brain and Behavior*, 4(5), 626-642. doi: 10.1002/brb3.246
38
39
40
41 Morton, J. B., & Harper, S. N. (2007). What did Simon say? Revisiting the bilingual advantage.
42 *Developmental Science*, 10(6), 719-726.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Paap, K. R., Darrow, J., Dalibar, C., & Johnson, H. A. (2015). Effects of script similarity on
4
5 bilingual advantages in executive control are likely to be negligible or null. *Frontiers in*
6
7 *Psychology*, 5. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01539
8
9
10 Paap, K.P., Johnson, H.A., & Sawi, O. (2015). Bilingual advantages in executive functioning
11
12 either do not exist or are restricted to very specific and undetermined circumstances.
13
14 *Cortex*, 69, 265-278
15
16
17 Paap, K. R., & Greenberg, Z. I. (2013). There is no coherent evidence for a bilingual advantage in
18
19 executive processing. *Cognitive Psychology*, 66(2), 232-258. doi:
20
21 10.1016/j.cogpsych.2012.12.002
22
23
24 Pelham, S. D., & Abrams, L. (2014). Cognitive Advantages and Disadvantages in Early and Late
25
26 Bilinguals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology-Learning Memory and Cognition*, 40(2),
27
28 313-325. doi: 10.1037/a0035224
29
30
31 Poarch, G. J., & van Hell, J. G. (2012). Executive functions and inhibitory control in multilingual
32
33 children: Evidence from second-language learners, bilinguals, and trilinguals. *Journal of*
34
35 *Experimental Child Psychology*, 113(4), 535-551. doi: 10.1016/j.jecp.2012.06.013
36
37
38 Ridderinkhof, K. R. (2002a). *Activation and suppression in conflict tasks: empirical clarification*
39
40 *through distributional analyses.*
41
42
43 Ridderinkhof, K. R. (2002b). Micro- and macro-adjustments of task set: activation and
44
45 suppression in conflict tasks. *Psychological Research-Psychologische Forschung*, 66(4),
46
47 312-323.
48
49
50 Ridderinkhof, K. R., Wildenberg, v., Wijnen, J., & Burle, B. s. (2004). *Response Inhibition in*
51
52 *Conflict Tasks Is Revealed in Delta Plots.* Paper presented at the British Journal of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Roelofs, A., Piai, V. r., & Garrido Rodriguez, G. (2011). Attentional inhibition in bilingual
4
5 naming performance: Evidence from delta-plot analyses. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2. doi:
6
7 10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00184
8
9
10 Salvatierra, J. L., & Rosselli, M. (2011). The effect of bilingualism and age on inhibitory control.
11
12 *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15(1), 26-37. doi: 10.1177/1367006910371021
13
14 Simon, J. R., & Rudell, A. P. (1967). Auditory S-R Compatibility - Effect of An Irrelevant Cue
15
16 on Information Processing. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51(3), 300-304.
17
18
19 Soveri, A., Rodriguez-Fornells, A., & Laine, M. (2011). Is there a relationship between language
20
21 switching and executive functions in bilingualism? Introducing a within-group analysis
22
23 approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, 8. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00183
24
25 Spivey, M. J., & Marian, V. (1999). Cross talk between native and second languages: Partial
26
27 activation of an irrelevant lexicon. *Psychological Science*, 10(3), 281-284.
28
29
30 Tao, L., Marzecova, A., Taft, M., Asanowicz, D., & Wodniecka, Z. (2011). The efficiency of
31
32 attentional networks in early and late bilinguals: the role of age of acquisition. *Frontiers*
33
34 *in Psychology*, 2, 19. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00123
35
36
37 Tse, C. S., & Altarriba, J. (2012). The effects of first- and second-language proficiency on
38
39 conflict resolution and goal maintenance in bilinguals: Evidence from reaction time
40
41 distributional analyses in a Stroop task. *Bilingualism-Language and Cognition*, 15(3),
42
43 663-676. doi: 10.1017/s1366728912000077
44
45
46 Valian, V. (2015). Bilingualism and cognition. *Bilingualism-Language and Cognition*, 18(1), 3-
47
48 24. doi: 10.1017/s1366728914000522
49
50
51 Wu, Y.J., & Thierry, G. (2010). Chinese-English bilinguals reading English hear Chinese. *Journal*
52
53 *of Neuroscience*. 30 (22), 7646-7651.
54
55
56 Yang, S. J., Yang, H. J., & Lust, B. (2011). Early childhood bilingualism leads to advances in
57
58 executive attention: Dissociating culture and language. *Bilingualism-Language and*
59
60 *Cognition*, 14(3), 412-422. doi: 10.1017/s1366728910000611

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Yudes, C., Macizo, P., & Bajo, T. (2011). The influence of expertise in simultaneous interpreting on non-verbal executive processes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, 9. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00309

For Review Only