

Ageing with Bilingualism: Benefits and Challenges

Lyndsey Nickels^{1,2}, Solène Hameau^{1,2}, Vishnu KK Nair^{2,3}, Polly Barr^{2,4}, and Britta Biedermann^{2,5}

¹ Department of Cognitive Science, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

² ARC Centre of Excellence in Cognition and its Disorders, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

³ Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders, New York University, New York, USA

⁴ The Brain and Mind Centre, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

⁵ School of Occupational Therapy, Social Work and Speech Pathology, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Corresponding author:

Professor Lyndsey Nickels, Department of Cognitive Science, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia.

Email: lyndsey.nickels@mq.edu.au

Ageing with Bilingualism: Benefits and Challenges

Abstract

Much of the world's population speaks more than one language, and there has been a great deal of media attention given to the potential benefits of bilingualism. In this paper we provide a critical overview of the literature on bilingualism as it relates to older adults. We address whether there is indeed a cognitive advantage from speaking more than one language, and whether it can help preserve cognitive and linguistic function as we age, and potentially reduce the impact of dementia. We also focus on the patterns of language impairment after stroke (aphasia) in bilingual speakers and the issues relating to clinical management of bilingual aphasia.

Keywords: bilingualism, ageing, bilingual aphasia, bilingual dementia, cognitive reserve

Language users are diverse: there are over 5,000 to 8,000 distinct languages and they vary along many dimensions (Evans & Levinson, 2009). Moreover, many, if not most, people across the world know and use more than one language (van Hell & Tanner, 2012). Yet despite our increasingly multilingual world, it becomes apparent that, in many countries, the health care system is focused on monolingual services and, in addition, interpreter services are both less than ideal and under-utilised (e.g., Phillips & Travaglia, 2011; Roger, Code, & Sheard, 2000; Williams & McLeod, 2012). Moreover, the majority of research into language and language disorders focuses on monolingual speakers (Bialystok, 2001). Given an increasingly ageing population with older adults predicted to outnumber younger adults in many industrialised nations by 2050 (Statista, 2018), this means that there is a worrying mismatch between our service provision and research foci and the needs of the population (e.g., Stewart & Gonzalez, 2002). In this paper, we aim to discuss some key issues that are relevant to speakers of more than one language¹ and the health care professionals who interact with them as they age. Is it the case that, as they age, people benefit from speaking more than one language? Alternatively, does the presence of other languages overburden a cognitive system that is already struggling as we age, and could this be particularly problematic if there is also neurological impairment?

We do not aim to provide a comprehensive review, but rather focus on areas where misinformation and confusion seem particularly prevalent. For those readers who are interested in reading more on this topic, Bialystok & Sullivan's (2017) edited

¹ For conciseness, we will usually refer to speakers of more than one language as 'bilinguals' rather than, the more appropriate, multilingual or bilingual speakers. Unless specifically noted, or a point of contrast in the literature, we include within the scope of 'bilinguals', speakers of two languages and those who speak more than two.

volume '*Growing old with two languages*' is a good place to start (see also Antoniou, 2019; De Bot & Houtzager, 2018). We begin by discussing some issues that are not specific to older adults, but that cannot be ignored when considering the bilingual speaker at any age.

What is it to 'be bilingual'?

Bilingualism is no longer considered a binary variable, it is not that someone is or is not bilingual, instead participants and populations are considered on a spectrum of knowledge of two (or more) languages. This spectrum is most likely multidimensional with many different facets interacting to produce a complex picture. This means that care must be taken when evaluating the research literature as the populations of bilinguals participating in each study can be very different. In this section, we will briefly summarise some of the dimensions upon which bilinguals may differ from each other. These need to be taken into account when considering the characteristics of bilinguals and the impact of their bilingualism on their language and cognitive systems and when critically appraising the literature.

One obvious, and frequently, cited example of bilingual variability is in the age of acquisition of the second language. It is clear that this has important consequences, influencing, for example, the bilingual speaker's phonological and grammatical skills (see e.g., Hartshorne, Tenenbaum, & Pinker, 2018). For instance, after adolescence, learners are less likely to acquire a native-like accent (Moyer, 2004). However, evaluating the influence of age of acquisition is fraught with complexity (see e.g. Birdsong, 2018 for review), and, in particular, a simple distinction between early and late bilinguals is no longer felt to be tenable (e.g., Steinhauer, 2014): Factors like

duration of exposure to the second language, acquisition through full immersion in a natural language setting versus acquisition in a classroom setting may interact with age of acquisition and need to be considered (Bialystok, 2001).

Similarly, how often a language is used and what context it is used in (what environment and with which conversational partners) also influences the bilingual language system. For example, individuals may fluently use one language at home and fluently use another at work. Yet they may find it hard to use the appropriate vocabulary and phrasing to talk about work in their 'home' language, or find the words to talk about cooking ingredients in their 'work' language (Grosjean, 1997). As Grosjean (2010) noted, bilinguals do not necessarily use both their languages for the same purpose.

A related, and thorny, issue is that of dominance, which has often been confounded and confused with proficiency², which in turn is confounded with age of acquisition (Bedore et al., 2012; Grosjean, 2010). Dominance has been defined both as describing the relative proficiency of the speaker (Gathercole & Thomas, 2009), and as the language to which the speaker has had the most exposure (Grosjean, 2010). It is true that a speaker who acquires a second language in later life is likely to have achieved lower proficiency in this language than in their first language. However, if they are currently immersed in the second language environment, their second language may, nonetheless, be their dominant language: This can be common in the case of, for example, migrants who have partners, jobs and social lives that all involve speaking in the second language.

² Language Proficiency is usually defined as the extent to which a bilingual's skills in one or both of their languages meet age-based native speaker or monolingual expectations. Proficiency has been defined relative to a monolingual speaker's vocabulary size (Bialystok, Luk, Peets, & Yang, 2010) or grammatical skills (Windsor, Kohnert, Loxtercamp, & Kan, 2008).

A construct related to that of proficiency is language attrition. This term refers to “the non-pathological decrease in a language that had previously been acquired by an individual” (Köpke & Schmid, 2004 (p5); Schmid, 2008) a phenomenon that can be observed in both children and adults. It is now recognised that all bilingual speakers experience some change to their native language (Cook, 2003), through a combination of non-use and interference from the other language(s). For example, children who, prior to school entry, are fluently comprehending and speaking a language different from that of the community, may increasingly use the community language. Over time, while retaining comprehension of their first language, their ability to speak this language may reduce (e.g., Borland, 2006; Hemsley, Holm & Dodd, 2010). In adults who have fully acquired their native tongue, following consistent full immersion in another language, over time the grammatical structure and word choice in this native tongue may be affected. For example, a German speaker immersed in an English speaking environment may start using English grammatical and semantic structure, saying ‘How are you?’ in German as ‘Wie bist Du?’ rather than using the correct German phrase ‘Wie geht es Dir?’ (literally translated as ‘How does it go?’). Similarly, full immersion in a second language may affect word finding in the first language (e.g., longer search time, and code switching) or phonology (e.g., Bergmann, Nota, Sprenger, & Schmid, 2016; Flege & Hillenbrand, 1987; Mägiste, 1986)³.

Furthermore, although one might think that the similarity between the languages of a speaker may also influence the nature of their language system, this is an area that seems to have received relatively little attention. For example, acquiring two languages

³ For a very accessible discussion of language attrition see Monika Schmid’s website:

languageattrition.org

that are similar in phonology and syntax (e.g., Spanish and Italian), could result in a language system that is less diverse in its capabilities than results from acquiring very different languages (e.g. English and Mandarin). It could also be the case that processing may differ for two similar languages from two distinct languages, requiring either more resources because of more competition or fewer (e.g., Köpke, 2013; but for the (lack of) impact of structural similarity in bilingualism, see, for example, Blom, Boerma, Bosma, Cornips, & Everaert, 2017).

One further complexity that is too often ignored is that the history of bilingualism is deeply scarred with nationalism, politics and identity and has frequent reminders of how often language has been used to create hierarchy and power structures. Negative attitudes towards bilingualism have been particularly prevalent in combination with colonialism. For example, in the pre-colonial United States, over 500 languages were spoken, bilingualism was dominant and well respected (Fitzgerald, 1993). Although there were some efforts to protect bilingualism during colonial times, by the early 1990's there were strong sentiments against it (Fitzgerald, 1993). Similarly, in former European colonies such as Africa and India, the colonial language was favoured over native languages resulting in the suppression of indigenous languages (see Bisong, 1995; and Phillipson, 1992 for debates around this topic). In addition, there have often been policies that banned indigenous languages in education and replaced them with English. For example, in Western Australia, missionaries prohibited the use of Aboriginal languages until as late as the 1960s (Lavarch, 1995; for another example, see the 1835 English Education Act of the East India Company; Kachru, 1978).

Nevertheless, it is not always as simple as the imposition of a language by a ruling power. For example, even while Ireland was striving for independence and home rule,

from Great Britain, separatist Irish politicians considered the Irish language as backward, with English viewed as the language of opportunity (Tuathaigh, 1974).

Negative attitudes towards bilingualism remain even today (e.g., Titone et al., 2017) with populist politics also contributing to narrowing of societies from multilingual-multicultural to one state-one language identity (e.g., The Californian Proposition 227, which eliminated bilingual public education in 1998; Simon-Cerejido, 2018).

These socio-political issues have significant implications in a real-life clinical context. For example, if a language has a social stigma, individuals may be unwilling to acknowledge their extent of use of, and need for, that language. Moreover, the risk of unconscious bias in the clinical community, and amongst healthcare providers and funders, towards provision of speech-language pathology services in the dominant community language should not be underestimated⁴.

In sum, any answer to the question “What is it to ‘be bilingual’?” will be complex, and we still cannot be confident that we are able to identify all the relevant dimensions. While on the surface there is a clear definition of a bilingual speaker (a speaker of two or more languages), once one tries to characterise bilingual speakers in more detail, it is clear that they are so far from being a homogenous group, that it seems unreasonable to group them together. Given that ageing, and language impairment are also heterogeneous, our attempt to provide a general characterisation of bilingualism, ageing and language impairment may seem unwise! Consequently, the reader is requested to remain alert to the fact that much of what comes below should have a warning (with

⁴ For discussion of how, in clinical setting, to support languages other than the dominant language of the community see, for example, Kohnert., Yim, Nett, Kan and Duran (2005).

apologies to Abraham Lincoln): “This may be true for some of the people some of the time, but will not be for all of the people all of the time”! Nevertheless, this is a vital area to consider in both research and clinical practice related to language and language impairment.

Is bilingualism bad for you?

In 1923, D.J. Saer, a British school headmaster from Aberystwyth, Wales, claimed that bilingualism was detrimental to intelligence and bilingual children exhibit mental confusion. Thirty years after the study was published, Darcy (1953) reviewed a body of literature and reported that most studies examining the effects of bilingualism on measures of intelligence concluded that bilinguals suffer a ‘language handicap’ on verbal tests of intelligence. Indisputably, these early studies were poorly controlled on many key methodological factors such as socio-economic status, age and degree of bilingualism (Barac & Bialystok, 2011), nevertheless they created a negative attitude towards bilingualism among educators and general public alike.⁵

It is vital to note that much of this research (both for and against a (dis)advantage) fails to adequately acknowledge and/or control for the fact that bilinguals can differ in many dimensions from monolinguals with whom they are being compared. This includes differences in socio-economic status (in either direction depending on the particular communities; cf Asian migrants to Australia who tend to be of high socio-economic status, and migrant Mexican farm workers in the USA who are usually of low

⁵ Unfortunately, these negative stereotypes are still around today. Consider for example the title of this recent paper “Multilingualism was associated with lower cognitive outcomes in children who were born very and extremely preterm” (van Veen et al., 2018). Yet the children were compared on a test that would favour monolingual speakers (a Dutch assessment), unsurprisingly those children who spoke only another language at home, performed worse on this Dutch assessment.

socio-economic status) or educational level (e.g., Massey & Parr, 2012), or that bilingual children may lack proficiency in the dominant community language (the language in which testing is carried out). It is essential that when considering the alleged ‘disadvantages’ or ‘advantages’ of bilingualism across the lifespan, clinicians are aware of these potential sources of bias in such research.

The majority of researchers do *not* now hold the view that bilingualism is a disadvantage intellectually or linguistically (Titone et al., 2017), and indeed some argue that bilingualism may confer advantages (e.g. for phonological awareness – awareness that words are composed of individual sounds (e.g., Bialystok, Majumder, & Martin, 2003; Campbell & Sais, 1995); executive function - ability to ignore background or distracting information (e.g., Bialystok, Craik, & Ryan, 2006; Bialystok, Klein, Craik, & Viswanathan, 2004). Nevertheless, Bialystok, Craik, and Luk (2012), amongst others, note that teachers and clinicians continue to advise parents to ‘simplify’ their children’s linguistic environment by using a single language when there are signs of struggle with language or literacy.

Is bilingualism good for you?

Few people these days would contest that being bilingual has a host of benefits across personal, economic, social, and cultural dimensions. However, being bilingual has also been argued to have benefits for cognitive ability. Indeed, it has been suggested that cognitive ability is predicted better by bilingualism than by age, immigration, education or gender (Kavé, Eyal, Shorek, & Cohen-Mansfield, 2008; Mohamed Zied et al., 2004) across the lifespan (Green, 1998). For example, seminal work by Peal and Lambert (1962) demonstrated better performance for bilingual children than monolingual children on measures of verbal and non-verbal intelligence. Peal and

Lambert concluded: 'Intellectually [the bilingual child's] experience with two language systems seems to have left him with a mental flexibility, a superiority in concept formation, a more diversified set of mental abilities' (Peal & Lambert, 1962, p.20). Bialystok et al. (2012) suggest that the description of 'mental flexibility' fits the patterns found in the literature since then, showing that bilinguals have the ability to process information efficiently and adaptively. The source of this 'flexibility' has been argued to originate in the bilingual speaker's need to ensure that they use the appropriate language for every spoken interaction: They must choose the right words, the right sounds, the right grammar and more.

This requirement for 'language control' has been suggested to pose greater demands on selection, inhibition and monitoring than is the case for monolingual speakers (e.g., Green, 1998; Kroll & Bialystok, 2013; Kroll, Bobb, & Hoshino, 2014). This continual 'practice' is therefore proposed to result in bilinguals having an advantage in executive control abilities compared to monolinguals. While there is little consensus as to the precise components of executive control, the term is usually used to refer to higher order cognitive abilities that control a range of skills such as selective attention, problem solving, inhibition of irrelevant information, monitoring of goal driven behavioural responses and working memory (e.g., Mackie, Van Dam, & Fan, 2013; see Diamond, 2013 for a review). Tasks used to measure executive function in bilinguals usually involve some form of ignoring of an irrelevant piece of information or resolution of conflict when making a decision. For example in the Stroop task (Stroop, 1935), a colour word (e.g. RED) is written in either the same colour as its name (red) or a different colour (blue). The participant's task is to name the colour of the ink and the researcher examines whether there is a difference between how fast colour naming is when the word and the ink colour are the same (congruent) or different

(incongruent). Other tasks, where once again the key element is whether congruent and incongruent stimuli differ in speed and/or accuracy, involve, for example, arrows distracting the participant to the correct direction of the target (Flanker task, Eriksen & Eriksen, 1974), or response keys being on the same side or different side as the target (Simon task: Simon & Berbaum, 1990; Simon & Small, 1969; Simon & Wolf, 1963)

Strong claims have been made for a bilingual advantage in non-linguistic cognition on the basis of this literature. This is clearly summarised by Bialystok and colleagues, who observed that "... studies of executive function demonstrate a bilingual advantage, with bilinguals outperforming their monolingual counterparts on tasks that required ignoring irrelevant information, task switching, and resolving conflict" (Kroll & Bialystok, 2013, p.2; see also Bialystok et al., 2012). For example, Bialystok et al. (2004) reported the first study of a bilingual advantage (often explored in children) in older adults. They showed that older adult bilinguals were not only faster on the Simon task than monolinguals, but also showed relatively less interference from the incongruent condition, even though they were matched for educational and socio-economic status (although they did not share a culture: bilinguals from India and monolinguals from Canada).

More recently, strong counter claims have been made. These can be summed up by the titles of papers by Paap, Johnson, and Sawi (2015) "Bilingual advantages in executive functioning either do not exist or are restricted to very specific and undetermined circumstances" or Goldsmith and Morton (2018) "Time to disengage from the bilingual advantage hypothesis". Critically, several studies have been unable to replicate the positive effects (e.g., Kousaie & Phillips, 2012; Morton & Harper, 2007; Paap & Greenberg, 2013; also see Hilchey & Klein, 2011; Valian, 2015 for reviews). Studies reporting a bilingual advantage have been criticised for poor methodological

design, not adequately controlling for demographic variables such as education level or socio-economic status, and for confirmation bias (Morton & Harper, 2007; Paap & Liu, 2014; but see Antoniou & Wright, 2017). It has also been argued that bilingual advantages disappear when tested in large number of participants indicating that the effects are either non-existent or exist only in studies with a reduced sample size (Paap et al., 2015).

Recently, a number of meta-analysis have failed to confirm a robust bilingual advantage, suggesting a publication bias for studies with positive effects (de Bruin, Treccani, & Della Sala, 2015), and have argued that once a publication bias has been corrected for there may be no bilingual advantage (Lehtonen et al., 2018; but see Antoniou & Wright, 2017). Even when bilingual advantages have been demonstrated (i.e., overall faster responding for bilinguals compared to monolinguals), the results often do not show an effect consistent with improved cognitive *control* (e.g., Grundy, Chung-Fat-Yim, Friesen, Mak, & Bialystok, 2017; Nair, Biedermann, & Nickels, 2017): Bilinguals fail to show less of a difference between congruent and incongruent trials than monolinguals, as is predicted if bilinguals have a better ability to inhibit irrelevant or conflicting stimuli. This particular feature of the data is very often lacking in the literature (or appears in some tasks but not all, even within the same study, e.g., Bialystok, Craik, & Luk, 2008).

Such conflicting findings have often resulted in heated exchanges, and reviews have been often criticised for ignoring studies reporting bilingual advantages, selectively reporting findings from younger bilingual adults where the effects are most inconsistent, and dismissing studies that have carefully controlled for demographic variables such as socio-economic status (e.g., Bak, 2015; Titone et al., 2017). Suffice to say, the pattern is complex, and because of the heterogeneity of bilingualism designing

the definitive experiment is close to impossible. However, it is not just bilingualism that has been argued to have benefits for cognitive ability, other forms of expertise, such as musicianship, also have been suggested to have benefits (e.g., Bialystok & DePape, 2009).

An important aside at this point relates to the effect of bilingualism on the brain: It is clear that acquiring another language or being bilingual results in a change to the neural organisation of the brain (e.g., Perani & Abutalebi, 2005). It is well attested that the brain has what is known as ‘experience-dependent plasticity’ - neural organisation adapts depending on experience. A well-known example is that of London taxi drivers (who have to memorise every street in Greater London to get a licence) who show structural changes in the hippocampus compared to controls (Maguire et al., 2000). However, it is important to remember that we must be cautious, as a difference at the level of the bilingual brain does not necessarily map onto a behavioural difference (except for the obvious one that another language can be spoken), let alone a behavioural advantage, nor does it inform cognitive theory regarding the cognitive mechanism underpinning any such advantage (e.g., Duñabeitia & Carreiras, 2015).

In sum, it cannot be unambiguously stated that being bilingual is good for your cognitive abilities. However, it is also clear that being bilingual is certainly not cognitively detrimental.

Is bilingualism good for cognition in older adults?

Although, as discussed above, controversies are rife, it seems that bilingual advantages are most consistently reported in older adults. Bialystok et al. (2012) conclude that while bilingualism has a ‘muted’ effect in adulthood, its influence is

larger in older adults. They suggest that bilingualism protects against cognitive decline - that it provides 'cognitive reserve'. Cognitive reserve is defined as the ability to perform a task well by utilising the available brain reserve effectively (Steffener & Stern, 2012; Stern, 2002). Increased cognitive reserve has been associated with factors such as education and literacy, musical abilities, socio-economic status, physical activities, general intelligence and social networking abilities (Steffener & Stern, 2012; Titone et al., 2017). Several facets of cognitive function decline with increasing age (e.g., West, 1996), and those individuals with increased cognitive reserve, from whatever source, appear to show less age-related decline (e.g., Stern, 2002).

Bialystok and other authors have argued that active use of executive control abilities in bilinguals leads to increased cognitive reserve that, in turn, prevents cognitive decline (e.g., Bak, 2016; Baum & Titone, 2014; Bialystok et al., 2004). For example, in a large scale study with 853 participants Bak, Nissan, Allerhand, and Deary (2014) examined the effects of bilingualism on cognitive ageing in Scottish older adults and argued that bilingualism had a significant positive effect on general cognitive abilities, general intelligence and reading. This replicates the findings from earlier studies reporting an advantage in older bilingual adults compared to monolinguals and a buffer against cognitive ageing (also see Bak, 2016 for review). Bak et al. (2014) also found that speakers of three or more languages showed larger cognitive advantages than speakers of two languages. Kavé et al. (2008) also found that the more languages a person speaks the greater the advantage - multilingual participants (speakers of four or more languages) showed better cognitive ability than bilinguals or trilinguals. Moreover, these effects did not depend on the participants' literacy or their immigration status, and remained significant even after 90 years of age

Other studies have failed to show any such benefit (e.g., Zahodne, Schofield, Farrell, Stern, & Manly, 2014), and this has been corroborated in a meta-analysis (Mukadam, Sommerlad, & Livingston, 2017, but for critique see Woumans, Versijpt, Sieben, Santens, & Duyck, 2017). Mukadam, Jichi, Green, and Livingston's (2018) recent paper has its strength in using a longitudinal design. This allows the change in cognitive function over time to be measured and the rate of this change to be compared between monolinguals and bilinguals. The authors used data from the Australian Longitudinal Study of Ageing (2087 participants aged over 65 tested over 20 years; 111 participants by the final data point), which had the advantage that a large number of additional factors could be examined (e.g., language, cognition, mental health, social networks, physical health). In this study, cognitive decline did not differ between bilinguals (who spoke a different language at home to that of the community) and monolinguals - instead it was years of formal education that was predictive. However, Mukadam et al. remain cautious in their interpretation. While they conclude that simply speaking two languages is not protective, it could be that the pattern of language use in bilingual speakers may be critical. They note that in some studies showing cognitive protection in bilinguals (e.g., Kavé et al., 2008; Perquin et al., 2013), participants are immersed in a multilingual society. They suggest that perhaps more frequent language switching could have a more extensive (and hence more protective) effect on cognition than in those individuals who may restrict the use of languages depending on the environment.

Can bilingualism prevent dementia?

In 2007, in the first of a series of articles, Bialystok and her colleagues reported that being bilingual could delay the onset of dementia by up to five years (Bialystok,

Craik, & Freedman, 2007; Chertkow et al., 2010; Craik, Bialystok, & Freedman, 2010). This research sparked considerable interest in both the media and research communities and has continued to be influential. However, since then, once again, the picture has become less clear. A major issue is that of potential confounds - the protective effect of bilingualism has been suggested to be confounded with immigration status (migrant vs non migrant bilinguals; e.g., Fuller-Thomson & Kuh, 2014) and educational level (e.g., Gollan, Salmon, Montoya, & Galasko, 2011), amongst other potential confounding factors. This is far from trivial as a meta-analysis of factors influencing the onset of dementia concluded that higher levels of education, occupational complexity, and regular engagement in mentally stimulating leisure activities was associated with a 50% reduction in the incidence of dementia (Valenzuela & Sachdev, 2006).

The pattern seems to be that retrospective studies (e.g., looking at the records of individuals referred to memory clinics) are more likely to show evidence of a protective effect of bilingualism for dementia even when confounds with education and immigration are better controlled for (e.g., Alladi et al., 2013; Woumans et al., 2015). However, the majority of *prospective* studies, where cognitively healthy individuals are followed over time have found no protective effect of bilingualism on cognitive decline once potentially confounding factors are controlled (e.g., Zahodne et al., 2014; see Fuller-Thomson, 2015 for a review). The contrast between methodologies is most likely because in prospective studies, individuals are their own controls and so initial cognitive ability can be precisely measured and accounted for in the analysis, which cannot occur in the retrospective studies.

In sum, the jury is still out on whether bilingualism delays the onset of dementia independently from other variables (e.g., Antoniou & Wright, 2017; see also Calvo,

García, Manóiloff & Ibáñez, 2016 for a critical review) and once again caution is required when claims are made.

Should older adults learn another language?

Antoniou, Gunasekera, and Wong, (2013; Antoniou & Wright, 2017) proposed that perhaps learning a foreign language would be beneficial in promoting healthy cognitive function and protection from decline⁶ and the benefits of bilingualism may indeed extend to late bilinguals (e.g., Nair, Biedermann, & Nickels, 2016). However, caution is urged: Those studies that have examined the issue show no clear picture: Bak (2016) found advantages as a result of language learning advantages for task switching while Ramos, Fernández García, Antón, Casaponsa, & Duñabeitia (2017) did not (see also Ware et al., 2017; see Klimova, 2018, for an overview of current studies in this field). Moreover, there is limited evidence that cognitive abilities in older adults benefit from cognitive training more broadly, beyond improvement on the practiced task (see e.g., Simons et al., 2016). Nevertheless, any activity that brings positivity and engagement is to be encouraged in older adults.

Do bilinguals have better language skills?

We have focused so far on the (non-verbal) cognitive skills of bilingual speakers, but what about their language skills - does speaking another language make you a more skilled language user? In terms of usage of any one language, most researchers would agree that bilinguals are, in some ways, less proficient than monolinguals, because of the necessity of managing two languages and having less practice with each than a monolingual (e.g., Bialystock, 2009; Kroll & Gollan, 2014). However, bilinguals do

⁶ Strauss (2015) noted that there is no surprise that this has not been done given the difficulty of designing and implementing such a study.

seem to have better metalinguistic skills, including for example, phonological (e.g., Campbell & Sais, 1995), morphological (e.g., Bialystok & Barac, 2012), grammatical awareness (e.g., Galambos & Goldin-Meadow, 1990) and word learning (Kaushanskaya & Marian, 2009).

Fluent bilinguals are known to show some degree of activation of both languages and some interaction between the languages at all times (e.g., Spivey & Marian, 1999). Even in contexts where only one language is suitable- they simply cannot just ‘turn off’ one of the languages (e.g., Kroll, Bobb, & Wodniecka, 2006). As discussed above, some authors argue that this leads to benefits for cognitive processing (e.g., Bialystok et al., 2012). For language processing, this activation of both languages might be expected to cause problems, although we should not forget that every speaker has some degree of competition, for example between registers (formal, colloquial, child-directed) or in their word choice (basic, subordinate or individual; e.g. dog vs collie vs Lassie). Nevertheless, for the bilingual, some authors suggest that the additional constraints of language choice and greater lexical choice have been suggested to be the source of linguistic costs (Costa & Santesteban, 2004; Gollan, Montoya, Cera, & Sandoval, 2008).

For example, bilinguals name pictures more slowly than monolinguals (e.g., Bialystok et al., 2008; Costa & Santesteban, 2004; Gollan, Montoya, Fennema-Notestine, & Morris, 2005) and less accurately (e.g., Roberts, Garcia, Desrochers, & Hernandez, 2002). This is often attributed to the fact that bilingual speakers have reduced use of words in each language (frequency lag: e.g., Gollan, Slattery, et al., 2011; Gollan et al., 2008) - they speak each language less than monolinguals who speak it all of the time. Consequently, words are relatively lower frequency in the bilingual lexicon and, given the well attested effect of frequency on word retrieval, therefore,

retrieved slower and less accurately. This account is supported by the fact that although bilinguals are more likely to have a tip-of-the-tongue (TOT) state, they perform similarly to monolinguals if credit is given for a name being produced either language (Gollan & Silverberg, 2001). Bilinguals also produce fewer words in category generation (especially semantic categories; e.g., Gollan, Montoya, & Werner, 2002; Rosselli et al., 2000), even if responses can be provided in either language (de Picciotto & Friedland, 2001; Gollan et al., 2002).

So, to summarise there seems to be some linguistic cost for the bilingual speaker, but this is almost entirely attributable to the inevitability of reduced time spent speaking each language.

Does bilingual language change with ageing?

Although language is relatively stable with ageing compared to many other aspects of cognition, both bilinguals and monolinguals show a generalised slowing in speech production, reduced verbal fluency and a high number of tip-of-the-tongue states with age - suggesting problems in lexical and phonological retrieval (Bialystok et al., 2008; Burke, MacKay, Worthley, & Wade, 1991; Burke & Shafto, 2008). However, it may not be the case that older bilinguals are always more affected. For example, Gollan and colleagues have found that older bilinguals retrieve low frequency words in their non-dominant language more easily than would be expected given their ability to retrieve higher frequency words (Gollan et al., 2008). The authors explain this by suggesting that this can be accounted for by an amelioration of the effect of frequency found in younger bilinguals - older bilinguals have simply used these words for longer than younger bilinguals and therefore increased their frequency and hence their accessibility.

Language switching:

When bilinguals converse with other bilinguals, they have the flexibility to choose the language in which to converse, and, moreover, commonly switch between languages (known as language switching or code switching; see e.g., Chan, 2008; Myers-Scotton, 2006, for review). Language switching does not only occur in spoken language but can also occur in informal writing such as emails and texts (Bautista, 2004). While occasionally switching may reflect relative lack of proficiency in a language, or the fact that a lexical item is only known in one language, it is important to understand that switching is more often a reflection of speakers being highly proficient in both languages (e.g., Poplack, 1980; Toribio, 2001)

Whether or not bilingual speakers switch is governed by a complex set of constraints such as length of language contact in the community, roles and status of each language, and speakers' relative proficiency in each (Bentahila & Davies, 1995). Bentahila and Davies also contrast conventionalised 'community' patterns of switching and individual 'invented' switching patterns. Furthermore, it is not that switching is random. There are clear structural and grammatical constraints governing at what point within a sentence (or even within a word) switching can occur (e.g., Miller Amberber, 2012; Myers-Scotton, 1998).

While some studies have found that older adults find language switching more difficult than young adults (Gollan & Ferreira, 2009; Hernandez & Kohnert, 1999, 2015; Weissberger, Wierenga, Bondi, & Gollan, 2012), Gollan & Ferreira (2009) found that when aging bilinguals were allowed to voluntarily choose which language to use to name pictures, aging-related switching difficulties were limited, and older adults chose to switch as often as young bilinguals.

Language attrition:

As noted above, it is now recognised that the constant interaction between languages in a bilingual's mind inevitably causes changes to those languages (Schmid, 2013; Schmid & Köpke, 2007; Weinreich, 1968). In attrition, the first language (L1) appears to become less easily accessible, and word-finding difficulties, intrusions from the second language (L2), and lexical and grammatical errors may begin to occur in L1 (Schmid & Keijzer, 2009). Schmid & Köpke (2018) suggest that there could be two mechanisms at play: a (long-term) deterioration of the L1 representations, and/or increased processing difficulties in L1 (in comprehension, production, etc), as a consequence of co-activation of L2. However, L1 attrition does not seem to be a linear trend over a lifetime: it is not the case that L1 abilities progressively decrease as L2 becomes more and more dominant. A commonly held view is that older adult bilinguals have a worsening in their second language skills and their first language improves (language reversion, e.g., De Bot & Clyne, 1989; Schmid & Keijzer, 2009). However, this pattern does not seem to be as systematic as is widely believed, and not much is known about the underlying processes and causes of any language reversion that may occur.

Schmid & Keijzer (2009) found that, in a group of immigrants (aged from mid forties to late seventies), those who were the most affected by attrition in their first language were around or just past retirement phase (age 68- 71), and that subsequently attrition was not as strong (indeed those aged over 72 performed better than those aged 68-71 on every measure). Schmid & Keijzer argue that there was, therefore, support for some degree of 'reversion' at least in terms of a reduction in first language attrition. They suggest that perhaps environmental factors may be at play, including, for example, more exposure to, and use of, L1 in the home environment rather than the work

environment following retirement. This could perhaps be in combination with increased personal motivation for the use of L1, including experiencing (self-reported) nostalgia, a longing for the “old” country. However, Schmid & Keijzer (2009) also suggested that sampling issues may be at play - those adults able to participate in this cross-sectional study after the age of 72 will be those with better physical health, and therefore better cognitive abilities, who may have been less affected by attrition.

In contrast to Schmid and Keijzer’s focus on L1, De Bot & Clyne (1989) examined L2 and also noted that social circumstances promoted language reversion for L2 in healthily ageing bilinguals. However, this mainly applied to those with low L2 proficiency who therefore only used their second language in a limited number of settings, such as in shops or restaurants. It was these individuals who were more likely to show to language reversion in terms of reduction in L2 ability.

In sum, some older adults may indeed show improved performance in their first language, and others a reduction of skill in their second language. However, this ‘reversion’ seems to be neither inevitable, nor common - hence its designation as a ‘myth’ (Schmid & Keijzer, 2009).

Bilingualism and Language Impairment in Older Adults

With ageing comes a higher incidence of acquired language disorder as a result of brain damage - either acutely through, for example, stroke, or in degenerative disorders such as dementia (including atypical dementias where language is the primary symptom - Primary Progressive Aphasia, Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011).

Bilingualism and Dementia

In line with the prevalence of the idea of reversion in healthily ageing bilinguals, it is commonly assumed that in individuals with dementia there is regression to the

language that is both first-learned and dominant (Ardila & Ramos, 2008). Mendez, Perryman, Pontón, and Cummings (1999) provide a typical example. In their study, caregivers of a group of 51 people with dementia (of various types) reported decreased conversation in L2, a greater preference for the patients' original languages, intrusions from L1 into L2 conversational speech and asymmetrical language impairment with preferential preservation and use of L1. Many recent experimental cross-sectional studies have also found that the non-dominant language is more affected (see Calabria et al., 2017, Table 1).

However, other reports suggest that the pattern is not uniform. For example, Manchon et al. (2015) found that a group of 13 late proficient bilinguals with Alzheimer's type dementia were equally impaired relative to matched controls in both of their languages suggesting parallel decline. Gollan, Salmon, Montoya, & da Pena (2010) found the same pattern of parallel decline in balanced bilinguals (see also Calabria et al., 2017; Costa et al., 2012; and, for comprehension, Nanchen et al., 2017). However, when Gollan et al. looked at bilinguals with one clearly more proficient language and early Alzheimer's disease, they found that, surprisingly, these individuals showed greater relative impairment in retrieving names in the dominant language than their non-dominant language. Gollan et al. suggested that perhaps this was not as counterintuitive as it at first appeared: the words that are hardest for a speaker to retrieve are those of lowest frequency and for bilinguals these very low frequency words will most probably belong to their dominant language (they simply won't ever have acquired them in their other language). Consequently, given that the first words that are affected in dementia are the least frequent, then the effects of dementia will be most apparent (relative to bilingual controls) for the low frequency words that are only known in the dominant language. Importantly, when Ivanova, Salmon, and Gollan

(2014) followed up these unbalanced bilingual speakers over time, the non-dominant language seemed to decline more steeply than the dominant language. Ivanova et al. suggest that rather than decline being a function of language, it instead reflected the robustness of the representation of specific lexical items - those items that are least securely represented will be lost first. Crucially, however, they point out that it is not the case that lexical items in the non-dominant language are all less robustly represented than those in the dominant language, but that there is a gradient both within and across languages. This results in the pattern where the lowest frequency words from the dominant language may be the most vulnerable to the effects of dementia, but the highest frequency words from this language may be the least vulnerable.

Finally, in an interesting study, Gollan, Stasenko, Li, and Salmon (2017) examined reading of paragraphs (written mostly in one language, but containing a few words from the other language) by bilingual speakers with Alzheimer's disease. Both the individuals with dementia and bilingual controls had more difficulty with reading in the non-dominant language. Moreover, the individuals with dementia produced more intrusions (and self-corrected less often) than the control participants. However, there was no consistent evidence to suggest that this difficulty was greater for the non-dominant language. Gollan et al. suggest that this provides clear evidence that individuals with Alzheimer's disease have intact ability to select a default language (with contextual support) and to switch languages, but an impaired ability to monitor language membership in this context.

In sum, for language decline in bilingual speakers with dementia, there is, once again, a mixed pattern. However, overall, given the less robust representation of the non-dominant language, over time it appears likely that most people with dementia will retain stronger linguistic abilities in their dominant (usually first) language. The

consequences of this change to language abilities can be dramatic. For example, Tipping & Whiteside (2015) report how this creates challenges for family members, particularly if they do not share the person's better preserved language. This raises the importance of multilingual community-based aged care services being available to offer support. However, as Tipping and Whiteside note, there may be barriers from negative past experiences, lack of communication, stigma, cultural understanding, and locality that need to be overcome.

Bilingualism and aphasia

When other factors are controlled, the frequency of aphasia post-stroke does not appear to differ between bilingual and monolingual speakers (Alladi et al., 2016). However, once again, there is debate as to whether the severity of the aphasia differs between bilingual and monolingual populations. For example, Penn, Frankel, Watermeyer and Russell (2010) argued that bilingual speakers with aphasia demonstrated superior conversational skills, and Paplikar et al. (2018) found that aphasia seemed to be less severe in bilingual speakers than monolingual speakers in an (Indian) non-migrant sample. In contrast, Hope et al. (2015) reported that bilingual (immigrant) non-native English speakers with aphasia performed more poorly on a range of language tasks administered both in English (which is probably unsurprising) and in their native language compared to monolinguals.

Recovery patterns

Much of the early research on bilingual aphasia focused on the study of recovery patterns (e.g., Obler & Park, 2012). As a general rule, the type of aphasia is the same in both languages, and degree of impairment is proportional to the degree of proficiency

pre-aphasia (e.g., Green, 2005; Paradis, 2001). Parallel recovery is experienced by between 40% (Franco Fabbro, 1999) and 70% (Paradis, 2001) of bilinguals with aphasia. However, there are many exceptions: Fabbro (1999) cited 32% of individuals reporting better recovery of L1, and 28% with better recovery of L2 (Franco Fabbro, 1999). For example, EM (Aglioti, Beltramello, Girardi, & Fabbro, 1996) selectively recovered L2 (standard Italian) while losing L1 (Venetian).

Factors that have been evoked as promoting differential recovery include, first language versus second language (Ribot, 1881), most used versus least used language (Pitres, 1895), emotional ties with each language (Krapf, 1955; Minkowski, 1963), usefulness of the language following the cerebral insult (Bay, 1964). However, none of these seem to explain differential recovery patterns completely. A more sophisticated specification of recovery patterns comes from Green and Abutalebi (2008). They suggest that selective recovery results from impaired control mechanisms or the inability to activate a language; parallel recovery from similar levels of inhibition of both L1 and L2; finally, alternating antagonistic recovery (where improvement in one language is paralleled by inaccessibility of the other, and then the pattern switches), was argued to be due to the inhibition of one language followed by a shift in inhibition to the other language.

It is also important to note that what may appear to be differential impairment in each language may in fact be a consequence of the differences between those languages. For example, cross-language differences in word frequency, orthographic rules, word structure complexity and syntax may result in the occurrence of specific errors in each language (Paradis, 2001).

Language switching in aphasia

There has been relatively little attention paid to language switching (code switching) in people with aphasia. As noted above, language switching itself is not a sign of lack of proficiency, consequently language switching in a person with aphasia should not immediately be considered to be a sign of impairment. Nevertheless, there are descriptions of individuals who show inappropriate and involuntary language switching following aphasia (e.g., language switching with monolingual speakers: Fabbro, Skrap, & Aglioti, 2000). However, it is of note that Muñoz, Marquardt, and Copeland (1999) found that bilingual speakers *without* aphasia also switched inappropriately with monolingual speakers. Grammatical impairment in within-sentence language switching (also known as language mixing), where switching occurs at points considered ungrammatical within a sentence, has received even less attention.

It is hard to be sure of the prevalence of ‘pathological’ language switching in aphasia, as many reports of bilingual aphasia do not mention the extent to which the person with aphasia uses language switching and how far this has changed post-stroke. It seems probable, however, that in these individuals, pathological language switching does not occur, suggesting that this pattern is not common. When it does occur it has been suggested to be more common when related to the degree of language similarity, and premorbid patterns of language use (e.g., Goral, Levy, Obler, & Cohen, 2006). Several authors have also suggested a link between language control (and pathological language switching) and broader impairments of cognitive control (e.g., Keane & Kiran, 2015; Kong, Abutalebi, Lam, & Weekes, 2014) and damage to subcortical networks (e.g., Abutalebi, Miozzo, & Cappa, 2000).

Importantly, a bilingual speaker with aphasia may use intact skills, or available lexical items, in either language in the face of language breakdown. Consequently

language switching may be a conscious or unconscious strategy used by the bilingual with aphasia to maximise communicative effectiveness to access the correct word in either language. Critically, language switching is an important part of communication for bilingual speakers. Consequently, the extent to which these patterns have reduced as well as increased need to be considered when investigating the language of bilingual speakers with aphasia.

Bilingualism and Primary Progressive Aphasia

Primary Progressive Aphasia (PPA; Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011) is an atypical dementia where language is the primary symptom, at least early in the disease process. There has been increasing attention paid to the clinical management of this disorder (for an overview, see e.g., Nickels & Croot, 2014, 2015). However, there has relatively little attention to whether there are particular considerations that hold for bilinguals who have PPA. Of the limited reported studies, as for post-stroke aphasia there are a variety of patterns reported: For example, similar decline in both languages (Gómez-Ruiz, Ávila, Bello, Maho, & Espasa, 2007), impairment in ‘L2’ (Druks & Weekes, 2010; Filley et al., 2006; Hernández et al., 2008; Machado, Rodrigues, Simões, Santana, & Soares-Fernandes, 2010; Zanini, Angeli, & Tavano, 2011) and impairment in the least used language (Filley et al., 2006; Friedman et al., 2010). Due to the limited number of cases (many of which are conference abstracts with limited information), it is not possible to determine whether bilingual speakers appear to be diagnosed with PPA later than monolingual speakers with PPA. However, investigating whether bilingualism is preventative of PPA will be plagued with the same issues as investigating this in other types of dementia (confounds with other factors) and bilingual research in general (what determines L1 and L2) as discussed earlier in this manuscript.

Given the limited information in the literature, clinicians are best advised to apply what is known from post-stroke aphasia and dementia to the bilingual individual with PPA while being mindful of the ways in which the different nature of the disorder will impact on presentation.

Considerations for clinical management of bilingual aphasia

First and foremost, it is vital for the clinician to acquire a detailed view of premorbid proficiency, to avoid attributing to aphasia what is in fact the result of pre-morbid bilingual features (Kiran & Tuchtenhagen, 2005). A certain “minimum” proficiency level is not required for a person to be considered bilingual (Muñoz & Marquardt, 2003). Moreover, being a bilingual does not imply knowing how to read / write in both languages (Nair et al., 2017).

As has been noted above, the dominant language does not need to be the one with highest proficiency, and bilingual competence is dynamic: patterns of language exposure can change radically over time. For example, after a stroke, the individual may retire from the workforce and hence be less exposed to the language of the community and more to the home language. This means that changes in language availability might not (or not only) be a direct result of brain damage.

It is also important for the clinician to be mindful that being fluent/proficient in a language does not necessarily imply that there will be, for example, native speaker-like grammar. Crucially, even the early bilingual is not two monolinguals in one (cf Grosjean, 1989): both the interaction between languages and language attrition causes systematic changes in an unimpaired bilingual’s languages.

Assessment considerations - Context: It is also important to be aware of the influence of the context on the bilingual speaker’s use of language. If the clinician is

also bilingual in both of the bilingual with aphasia's languages, this, perhaps surprisingly, may not be ideal for assessment of aphasia in each language independently: If the bilingual with aphasia is aware of the clinician's bilingual status, it might promote greater use of language switching, with a preference for the most easily accessible language. Ideally, for assessment of each language, the bilingual with aphasia should be in a monolingual context.

Assessment considerations - Linguistic & cultural equivalence of tests: Mere direct translation of standardised aphasia tests (perhaps using an interpreter) is often not appropriate. To give a, perhaps obvious, example, in the case of a phonological discrimination task, distinguishing between bat, mat, fat, bad in English would translate into French as chauve-souris, paillason, gras, mauvais, defeating the purpose of the assessment. It is important to have assessments that are directly comparable across languages. The Bilingual Aphasia Test aims to do just this (Paradis & Libben, 1987, available online: <https://www.mcgill.ca/linguistics/research/bat#ebate>), but note that even so, equivalence of item difficulty cannot be assured, making exact comparison of degree of impairment across languages imprecise.

Moreover, cultural differences may mean that even within the same language, assessments might have different degrees of difficulty depending on the dialect. For example, the Boston Naming Test (Kaplan, Goodglass, & Weintraub, 2001) has a cultural bias with lower accuracy in New Zealand speakers compared to American (Barker-Collo, 2001). Similarly, with the Spanish version of Boston Naming Test, it has been suggested that item order should be changed to reflect the different item difficulty in Spanish compared to English (Allegri et al., 1997).

Treatment

Traditionally, intervention plans have all too often excluded one language (Green, 2005; Paradis, 2001, 2004), with some authors suggesting that treating several languages at the same time might inhibit language recovery in general (e.g., Hilton, 1980; Lebrun, 1988, cited in Marangolo, Rizzi, Peran, Piras, & Sabatini, 2009; Wald, 1961, cited in Adrover-Roig, Marcotte, Scherer, & Ansaldo, 2012). All too often, language therapy is offered only in the language of the hospital, for practical reasons (Köpke & Prod'homme, 2009). It has also been suggested that (if feasible) clinicians choose to treat the language(s) that is (are) the most useful at that point in time for the individual to meet their goals (Gray, 2017). However, more recently some authors have suggested that treatment should exploit the fact that the bilingual language system comprises two language codes in one system with cross-linguistic links at the lexical, morphosyntactic and discourse levels (e.g., Adrover-Roig et al., 2012), and therefore treat in both languages. Adrover-Roig et al. (2012) go as far as to say that focusing on a single language of a bilingual with aphasia could be thought of as analogous to forcing a monolingual with aphasia to inhibit some aspects of language, in order to improve others.

This view is rooted in the belief that there may be transfer of therapy benefits from a treated to an untreated language (cross-language generalisation). While the assumption that language representations overlap across languages is consistent with the prediction that treating one language will benefit another, non-treated language, findings from treatment studies in bilingual aphasia do not systematically show such transfer (For an overview, see Table 1, Miller-Amberber, 2012; see also Ansaldo & Saidi, 2014; Faroqi-Shah, Frymark, Mullen, & Wang, 2010). For example, Meinzer, Streiftau, and Rockstroh (2007) and Miller-Amberber (2012) found no transfer from L2 to L1, and Croft, Marshall, Pring, and Hardwick (2011) no transfer from L1 to L2. It is

important to note that this mirrors the pattern in monolingual aphasia where generalisation is the exception rather than the norm.

Factors that may influence cross-language transfer include the relative proficiency of treated vs untreated language: One theory of bilingual language processing, the Revised Hierarchical Model (Kroll & Stewart, 1994), has been used to predict more transfer from the weaker to the stronger language (e.g., Edmonds & Kiran, 2006). This is because, in this (translation-based) theory a weaker language is accessed via a more proficient language. Indeed some studies do show this pattern of transfer from weaker to stronger language (Edmonds & Kiran, 2006; Goral, Rosas, Conner, Maul, & Obler, 2012). However, there are other instances when treating the weaker language appears to lead to stronger inhibition of the more proficient language post treatment (although these effects might be transient and/or restricted to components that were targeted in the treatment; e.g., Abutalebi, Tettamanti, & Green, 2009; Faroqi-Shah et al., 2010; Goral, 2012; Goral, Naghibolhosseini, & Conner, 2013).

It also seems reasonable to assume that areas of similarity between languages may be the best targets for cross-language transfer. For example, stimulation of shared semantic knowledge may activate corresponding phonological representations in both languages and result in improvement of word-finding abilities in both languages (e.g., Ansaldo & Marcotte, 2007; Ansaldo & Saidi, 2014). Similarly, in their review, Faroqi-Shah et al. (2010) observe that transfer in bilingual aphasia treatment is more typically observed when comprehension is targeted rather than production.

At the lexical level, there has been a focus on words that are similar across languages (cognates: e.g., tomato (English)/ tomate (French/German)). While some authors have claimed cross-language transfer for cognates (e.g., Goral et al., 2012; Kohnert, 2004) others have not (e.g., Hameau & Köpke, 2015: even though lexical

transfer was observed from L2 to L1 there was no difference between cognates and noncognates) and some have even found inhibition for cognates as a result of treatment (Kurland & Falcon, 2011)

In sum, it seems that the factors that explain the occurrence of cross-language transfer are still not fully understood, and, clinicians should be aware that transfer cannot be guaranteed.

Summary & Conclusions

Speaking more than one language opens up a world of experiences both linguistic and cultural, and there is no doubt that this benefits the individual and the community and some have asserted that bilingualism is a human right (Simon-Cerejido, 2018). However, in terms of research there have been many claims made regarding the cognitive and linguistic costs and benefits of being bilingual throughout the lifespan and particularly in older age - often on the basis of research that has not sufficiently considered the complexities of the differences between bilingual and monolingual populations.

We do know that bilingual speakers must have differences in their language systems and language skills to monolingual speakers, but perhaps this is more on a spectrum rather than a divide. This may range from monolingual speakers who have to choose between synonyms and control the speech register (formal, informal, etc.) and make lexical choice dependent on this register, through monolinguals who speak different dialects of a language (e.g., British English vs Australian English) and therefore also have to ensure they control the dialect, to those who may have limited proficiency in a second language (e.g., 'Holiday Italian'), and speakers who are fluent in typologically similar languages to those who are fluent in typologically distinct

languages. The skills are the same, but the extent to which there are different lexical and grammatical choices changes along the continuum. There are then further complexities depending on how frequently each language (or dialect or register) is spoken and in what circumstances, and the other cognitive advantages or disadvantages that a speaker may have (given natural variability in these skills).

For researchers and clinicians it is vital to be aware of the heterogeneity of the populations under consideration and read the literature in this light. For clinicians, it is important that they have awareness and understanding of social and political factors such as the status of the individual's other language(s) in the society, the nature of bilingual community of the speaker, language (bilingual/monolingual/formal/informal) mode and interactional context of bilingualism. Similarly, clinicians should not neglect cultural factors in their assessment and treatment of bilinguals with aphasia (Holland & Penn, 1995). Clinicians should also be aware of the potential limitations of their assessment tools, particularly those language and cognitive assessments with monolingual norms (for discussion see Anderson, Saleemi, & Bialystok, 2017).

All these considerations are vital in order to ensure that clinicians' treatment and management are optimal for bilingual individuals with language impairment⁷. It is the responsibility of speech-language pathologists to support and protect bilingual individuals' rights to express themselves in all their languages in accordance with Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948).

Although professional organisations such as American Speech, Language and Hearing Association (ASHA) and Speech Pathology Australia (SPA) have position

⁷See Grosjean (1989) and Abutalebi et al. (2013) for a detailed account of how the social or interactional context of the language community affects bilinguals' language control and cognitive abilities.

statements and guidelines for working with culturally and linguistically diverse individuals (ASHA, 2017; SPA, 2016), individuals with language impairment remain at risk of receiving speech-language pathology services only in the dominant national language (Simon-Cereijido, 2018). It is hoped that this paper will provide speech-language pathologists some further insights into issues associated with bilingualism and thereby help us move towards better informed services for bilingual speakers.

References

- Abutalebi, J., Della Rosa, P. A., Ding, G., Weekes, B., Costa, A., & Green, D. W. (2013). Language proficiency modulates the engagement of cognitive control areas in multilinguals. *Cortex*, *49*(3), 905–911.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CORTEX.2012.08.018>
- Abutalebi, J., Della Rosa, P. A., Tettamanti, M., Green, D. W., & Cappa, F. S. (2009). Bilingual aphasia and language control: A follow-up fMRI and intrinsic connectivity study. *Brain and Language*, *109*(2-3):141-56. doi: 10.1016/j.bandl.2009.03.003.
- Abutalebi, J., Miozzo, A., & Cappa, S. F. (2000). Do subcortical structures control “language selection” in polyglots? evidence from pathological language mixing. *Neurocase*, *6*(1), 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13554790008402757>
- Adrover-Roig, D., Marcotte, K., Scherer, L. C., & Ansaldo, A. I. (2012). Bilingual aphasia: Neural plasticity and considerations for recovery. In M. R. Gitterman, M. Goral, & L. K. Obler (Eds.), *Aspects of multilingual aphasia* (pp. 16–33). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Aglioti, S., Beltramello, A., Girardi, F., & Fabbro, F. (1996). Neurolinguistic and follow-up study of an unusual pattern of recovery from bilingual subcortical aphasia. *Brain*, *119*(5), 1551–1564. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/119.5.1551>
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000436620.33155.a4>
- Alladi, S., Bak, T. H., Mekala, S., Rajan, A., Chaudhuri, J. R., Mioshi, E., ... Kaul, S.

- (2016). Impact of Bilingualism on Cognitive Outcome After Stroke. *Stroke*, 47(1), 258–261. <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.115.010418>
- Allegri, R. F., Villavicencio, A. F., Taragano, F. E., Rymberg, S., Mangone, C. A., & Baumann, D. (1997). Spanish boston naming test norms. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 11(4), 416–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13854049708400471>
- Anderson, J.A.E., Saleemi, S., & Bialystok, E. (2017). Neuropsychological assessments of cognitive aging in monolingual and bilingual older adults, *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 43 (A),17-27, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2016.08.001>.
- Ansaldò, A. I., & Marcotte, K. (2007). Language Switching in the Context of Spanish-English Bilingual Aphasia. In J. G. Centeno, R. T. Anderson, & L. K. Obler (Eds.), *Communication disorders in Spanish speakers : theoretical, research and clinical aspects* (pp. 214–230). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ansaldò, A. I., & Saidi, L. G. (2014). Aphasia therapy in the age of globalization: cross-linguistic therapy effects in bilingual aphasia. *Behavioural Neurology*, 2014, 603085. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/603085>
- Antoniou, M. (2019). The Advantages of Bilingualism Debate. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 5(1), 1264439784. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011718-011820>
- Antoniou, M., Gunasekera, G. M., & Wong, P. C. M. (2013). Foreign language training as cognitive therapy for age-related cognitive decline: A hypothesis for future research. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 37(10), 2689–2698. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUBIOREV.2013.09.004>
- Antoniou, M., & Wright, S. M. (2017). Uncovering the Mechanisms Responsible for Why Language Learning May Promote Healthy Cognitive Aging. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 2217. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02217>

- Ardila, A., & Ramos, E. (2008). Normal and abnormal aging in bilinguals. *Dementia & Neuropsychologia*, 2(4), 242–247. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1980-57642009DN20400002>
- ASHA. (2017). *Issues in Ethics: Cultural and Linguistic Competence*. retrieved from <https://www.asha.org/Practice/ethics/Cultural-and-Linguistic-Competence/>. Retrieved from <https://www.asha.org/Practice/ethics/Cultural-and-Linguistic-Competence/>
- Bak, T. H. (2015). Beyond a simple “yes” and “no.” *Cortex*, 73, 332–333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2015.08.003>
- Bak, T. H. (2016). The impact of bilingualism on cognitive ageing and dementia: Finding a path through a forest of confounding variables. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 6(1–2), 205–226. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.15002.bak>
- Bak, T. H., Nissan, J. J., Allerhand, M. M., & Deary, I. J. (2014). Does bilingualism influence cognitive aging? *Annals of Neurology*, 75(6), 959–963. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.24158>
- Barac, R., & Bialystok, E. (2011). Cognitive development of bilingual children. *Language Teaching*, 44(1), 36–54. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000339>
- Barker-Collo, S. L. (2001). The 60-Item Boston Naming Test: Cultural bias and possible adaptations for New Zealand. *Aphasiology*, 15(1), 85–92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687040042000124>
- Baum, S., & Titone, D. (2014). Moving toward a neuroplasticity view of bilingualism, executive control, and aging. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 35(5), 857–894. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716414000174>
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2004). Tagalog-english code switching as a mode of discourse. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 5(2), 226–233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03024960>

- Bay, E. (1964). Present concepts of aphasia. *Geriatrics*, *19*, 319–331. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14158621>
- Bedore, L. M., Peña, E. D., Summers, C. L., Boerger, K. M., Resendiz, M. D., Greene, K., ... Gillam, R. B. (2012). The measure matters: Language dominance profiles across measures in Spanish-English bilingual children. *Bilingualism*, *15*(3), 616–629. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728912000090>
- Bentahila, A., & Davies, E. E. (1995). Patterns of code-switching and patterns of language contact. *Lingua*, *96*(2–3), 75–93. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(94\)00035-K](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(94)00035-K)
- Bergmann, C., Nota, A., Sprenger, S. A., & Schmid, M. S. (2016). L2 immersion causes non-native-like L1 pronunciation in German attriters. *Journal of Phonetics*, *58*, 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WOCN.2016.07.001>
- Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in Development: Language, Literacy, and Cognition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bialystok, E. (2009). Bilingualism: The good, the bad, and the indifferent. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *12*(1), 3–11.
- Bialystok, E., & Barac, R. (2012). Emerging bilingualism: Dissociating advantages for metalinguistic awareness and executive control. *Cognition*, *122*(1), 67–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COGNITION.2011.08.003>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUROPSYCHOLOGIA.2006.10.009>
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., & Luk, G. (2012). Bilingualism: consequences for mind and brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *16*(4), 240–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TICS.2012.03.001>

- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., & Ryan, J. (2006). Executive control in a modified antisaccade task: Effects of aging and bilingualism. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *32*(6), 1341–1354.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.32.6.1341>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.34.4.859>
- Bialystok, E., & DePape, A.-M. (2009). Musical expertise, bilingualism, and executive functioning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *35*(2), 565–574. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012735>
- Bialystok, E., Klein, R., Craik, F. I. M., & Viswanathan, M. (2004). Bilingualism, aging, and cognitive control: Evidence from the Simon task. *Psychology and Aging*, *19*(2), 290–303. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.19.2.290>
- Bialystok, E., Luk, G., Peets, K. F., & Yang, S. (2010). Receptive vocabulary differences in monolingual and bilingual children. *Bilingualism*, *13*(4), 525–531.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728909990423>
- Bialystok, E., Majumder, S., & Martin, M. M. (2003, March 21). Developing phonological awareness: Is there a bilingual advantage? *Applied Psycholinguistics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S014271640300002X>
- Bialystok, E., & Sullivan, M. D. (Eds.). (2017). *Growing old with two languages : Effects of bilingualism on cognitive ageing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Birdsong, D. (2018). Plasticity, Variability and Age in Second Language Acquisition and Bilingualism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*, 81.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00081>

- Bisong, J. (1995). Language choice and cultural imperialism: a Nigerian perspective. *ELT Journal*, 49(2), 122–131. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.2.122>
- Blom, E., Boerma, T., Bosma, E., Cornips, L., & Everaert, E. (2017). Cognitive advantages of bilingual children in different sociolinguistic contexts. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(APR), 552. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00552>
- Borland, H. (2006). Intergenerational language transmission in an established Australian migrant community: What makes the difference? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 180, 23–41. doi:10.1515/IJSL.2006.038
- Burke, D. M., MacKay, D. G., Worthley, J. S., & Wade, E. (1991). On the tip of the tongue: What causes word finding failures in young and older adults? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 30(5), 542–579. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X\(91\)90026-G](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(91)90026-G)
- Burke, D. M., & Shafto, M. A. (2008). Language and Aging. In F. I. M. Craik & T. A. Salthouse (Eds.), *The Handbook of Aging and Cognition: Third Edition*. (pp. 373–444). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Calabria, M., Cattaneo, G., Marne, P., Hernández, M., Juncadella, M., Gascón-Bayarri, J., ... Costa, A. (2017). Language deterioration in bilingual Alzheimer's disease patients: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 43, 59–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2016.06.005>
- Calvo, N., García, A. M., Manoilloff, L. M., & Ibáñez, A. (2015). Bilingualism and cognitive reserve: A critical overview and a plea for methodological innovations. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, 2, 249. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2015.00249>
- Campbell, R., & Sais, E. (1995). Accelerated metalinguistic (phonological) awareness in bilingual children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 13(1), 61–68.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-835X.1995.tb00664.x>

Chan, B. H.-S. (2008). Code-switching, word order and the lexical/functional category distinction. *Lingua*, *118*(6), 777–809.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LINGUA.2007.05.004>

Chertkow, H., Whitehead, V., Phillips, N., Wolfson, C., Atherton, J., & Bergman, H. (2010). Multilingualism (But Not Always Bilingualism) Delays the Onset of Alzheimer Disease: Evidence From a Bilingual Community. *Alzheimer Disease & Associated Disorders*, *24*(2), 118–125.

<https://doi.org/10.1097/WAD.0b013e3181ca1221>

Cook, V. (2003). *Effects of the second language on the first*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Costa, A., Calabria, M., Marne, P., Hernandez, M., Juncadella, M., Gascon-Bayarri, J., ... Blesa, R. (2012). On the parallel deterioration of lexico-semantic processes in the bilinguals' two languages: Evidence from Alzheimer's disease. *Neuropsychologia*, *50*(5), 740–753.

<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.01.008>

Costa, A., & Santesteban, M. (2004). Lexical access in bilingual speech production: Evidence from language switching in highly proficient bilinguals and L2 learners. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *50*(4), 491–511.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JML.2004.02.002>

Craik, F. I. M., Bialystok, E., & Freedman, M. (2010). Delaying the onset of Alzheimer disease: bilingualism as a form of cognitive reserve. *Neurology*, *75*(19), 1726–1729. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181fc2a1c>

Croft, S., Marshall, J., Pring, T., & Hardwick, M. (2011). Therapy for naming difficulties in bilingual aphasia: Which language benefits? *International Journal of*

- Language & Communication Disorders*, 46(1), 48–62.
- Darcy, N. T. (1953). A Review of the Literature on the Effects of Bilingualism upon the Measurement of Intelligence. *The Pedagogical Seminary and Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 82(1), 21–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856559.1953.10533654>
- De Bot, K., & Clyne, M. (1989). Language reversion revisited. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11(2), 167–177.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100000590>
- De Bot, K., & Houtzager, N. (2018). Multilingualism Processing and Aging. In J. Altarriba & R. R. Heredia (Eds.), *An Introduction to Bilingualism : Principles and Processes*. (pp. 109–122). Neaw York, USA: Routledge.
- de Bruin, A., Treccani, B., & Della Sala, S. (2015). Cognitive Advantage in Bilingualism. *Psychological Science*, 26(1), 99–107.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614557866>
- de Picciotto, J., & Friedland, D. (2001). Verbal fluency in elderly bilingual speakers: normative data and preliminary application to Alzheimer’s disease. *Folia Phoniatica et Logopaedica*, 53(3), 145–152. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000052669>
- Diamond, A. (2013). Executive Functions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64(1), 135–168. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143750>
- Druks, J., & Weekes, B. S. (2010). The decline of lexical and grammatical knowledge over time in bilingual nonfluent Primary Progressive Aphasia (nfPPA). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 6, 217–218.
- Duñabeitia, J. A., & Carreiras, M. (2015). The bilingual advantage: Acta est fabula? *Cortex*, 73, 371–372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2015.06.009>
- Edmonds, L. A., & Kiran, S. (2006). Effect of Semantic Naming Treatment on Crosslinguistic Generalization in Bilingual Aphasia. *Journal of Speech Language*

- and Hearing Research*, 49(4), 729. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2006/053\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2006/053))
- Eriksen, B. A., & Eriksen, C. W. (1974). Effects of noise letters upon the identification of a target letter in a nonsearch task. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 16(1), 143–149. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03203267>
- Evans, N., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32(5), 429. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999094X>
- Fabbro, F. (1999). *The neurolinguistics of bilingualism*. Hove, East Sussex: Psychology.
- Fabbro, F., Skrap, M., & Aglioti, S. (2000). Pathological switching between languages after frontal lesions in a bilingual patient. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, 68(5), 650–652. <https://doi.org/10.1136/JNNP.68.5.650>
- Faroqi-Shah, Y., Frymark, T., Mullen, R., & Wang, B. (2010). Effect of treatment for bilingual individuals with aphasia: A systematic review of the evidence. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 23(4), 319–341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JNEUROLING.2010.01.002>
- Filley, C. M., Ramsberger, G., Menn, L., Wu, J., Reid, B. Y., & Reid, A. L. (2006). Primary Progressive Aphasia in a Bilingual Woman. *Neurocase*, 12(5), 296–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13554790601126047>
- Fitzgerald, J. (1993). Views on bilingualism in the United States: A selective historical review. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 17(1–2), 35–36.
- Flege, J. E., & Hillenbrand, J. (1987). A differential effect of release bursts on the stop voicing judgments of native French and English listeners. *Journal of Phonetics*, 15(2), 203–208.
- Friedman, R., Carney, A., Lott, S. N., Snider, S., Uimch, L., & Eckmann, C. (2010). Longitudinal decline of language in a bilingual patient with logopenic variant

primary progressive aphasia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 6, 215–216.

Fuller-Thomson, E. (2015). Emerging evidence contradicts the hypothesis that bilingualism delays dementia onset. A Commentary on “Age of dementia diagnosis in community dwelling bilingual and monolingual Hispanic Americans” by Lawton et al., 2015. *Cortex*, 66, 170–172.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2015.01.024>

Fuller-Thomson, E., & Kuh, D. (2014). The healthy migrant effect may confound the link between bilingualism and delayed onset of Alzheimer’s disease. *Cortex*, 52, 128–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2013.08.009>

Galambos, S. J., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (1990). The effects of learning two languages on levels of metalinguistic awareness. *Cognition*, 34(1), 1–56.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(90\)90030-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(90)90030-N)

Gathercole, V. C. M., & Thomas, E. M. (2009). Bilingual first-language development: Dominant language takeover, threatened minority language take-up. *Bilingualism*, 12(2), 213–237. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728909004015>

Goldsmith, S. F., & Morton, J. B. (2018). Time to disengage from the bilingual advantage hypothesis. *Cognition*, 170, 328–329.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2017.09.011>

Gollan, T. H., & Ferreira, V. S. (2009). Should I stay or should I switch? A cost–benefit analysis of voluntary language switching in young and aging bilinguals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 35(3), 640–665.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014981>

Gollan, T. H., Montoya, R. I., Cera, C., & Sandoval, T. C. (2008). More use almost always means a smaller frequency effect: Aging, bilingualism, and the weaker

- links hypothesis. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 58(3), 787–814.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JML.2007.07.001>
- Gollan, T. H., Montoya, R. I., Fennema-Notestine, C., & Morris, S. K. (2005). Bilingualism affects picture naming but not picture classification. *Memory and Cognition*, 33(7), 1220–1234. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193224>
- Gollan, T. H., Montoya, R. I., & Werner, G. A. (2002). Semantic and letter fluency in Spanish-English bilinguals. *Neuropsychology*, 16(4), 562–576.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.16.4.562>
- Gollan, T. H., Salmon, D. P., Montoya, R. I., & da Pena, E. (2010). Accessibility of the nondominant language in picture naming: A counterintuitive effect of dementia on bilingual language production. *Neuropsychologia*, 48(5), 1356–1366.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.12.038>
- Gollan, T. H., Salmon, D. P., Montoya, R. I., & Galasko, D. R. (2011). Degree of bilingualism predicts age of diagnosis of Alzheimer’s disease in low-education but not in highly educated Hispanics. *Neuropsychologia*, 49(14), 3826–3830.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUROPSYCHOLOGIA.2011.09.041>
- Gollan, T. H., & Silverberg, N. B. (2001). Tip-of-the-tongue states in Hebrew–English bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 4(1), 63–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S136672890100013X>
- Gollan, T. H., Slattery, T. J., Goldenberg, D., Van Assche, E., Duyck, W., & Rayner, K. (2011). Frequency drives lexical access in reading but not in speaking: The frequency-lag hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 140(2), 186–209. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022256>
- Gollan, T. H., Stasenko, A., Li, C., & Salmon, D. P. (2017). Bilingual language intrusions and other speech errors in Alzheimer’s disease. *Brain and Cognition*,

118, 27–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BANDC.2017.07.007>

- Gómez-Ruiz, M., Ávila, A., Bello, J., Maho, P., & Espasa, M. (2007). Primary progressive aphasia in a bilingual patient: A case report. In *the Mid-Year Meeting of the Internacional Neuropsychological Society (INS)*. Bilbao, SP.
- Goral, M. (2012). Cross-Language Treatment Effects in Multilingual Aphasia. In M. R. Gitterman, M. Goral, & L. K. Obler (Eds.), *Aspects of multilingual aphasia* (pp. 106–121). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Goral, M., Levy, E. S., Obler, L. K., & Cohen, E. (2006). Cross-language lexical connections in the mental lexicon: Evidence from a case of trilingual aphasia. *Brain and Language*, 98(2), 235–247.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BANDL.2006.05.004>
- Goral, M., Naghibolhosseini, M., & Conner, P. S. (2013). Asymmetric inhibitory treatment effects in multilingual aphasia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 30(7–8), 564–577. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643294.2013.878692>
- Goral, M., Rosas, J., Conner, P. S., Maul, K. K., & Obler, L. K. (2012). Effects of language proficiency and language of the environment on aphasia therapy in a multilingual. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 25(6), 538–551.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JNEUROLING.2011.06.001>
- Gorno-Tempini, M. L., Hillis, A. E., Weintraub, S., Kertesz, A., Mendez, M., Cappa, S. F., ... Grossman, M. (2011). Classification of primary progressive aphasia and its variants. *Neurology*, 76(11), 1006–1014.
<https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e31821103e6>
- Gray, T. (2017). Bilingual Aphasia: An Intervention Roadmap and the Dynamic Interplay Between Lexical Access and Language Control. In *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups 2, SIG 2*, 2(1), 15–22.

- Green, D. W. (1998). Mental control of the bilingual lexico-semantic system. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1(2), 67–81.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728998000133>
- Green, D. W. (2005). The neurocognition of recovery patterns in bilingual aphasics. In J. F. Kroll & A. M. B. De Groot (Eds.), *Handbook of Bilingualism. Psycholinguistic Approaches* (pp. 516–530). New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Green, D. W., & Abutalebi, J. (2008). Understanding the link between bilingual aphasia and language control. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 21(6), 558–576.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2008.01.002>
- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36(1), 3–15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X\(89\)90048-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(89)90048-5)
- Grosjean, F. (1997). The bilingual individual. *Interpreting*, 2(1–2), 163–187.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.2.1-2.07gro>
- Grosjean, F. (2010). Bilingual: Life and Reality. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 6, 595–602.
<https://doi.org/10.1558/sols.v6i3.595>
- Grundy, J. G., Chung-Fat-Yim, A., Friesen, D. C., Mak, L., & Bialystok, E. (2017). Sequential congruency effects reveal differences in disengagement of attention for monolingual and bilingual young adults. *Cognition*, 163, 42–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COGNITION.2017.02.010>
- Hameau, S., & Köpke, B. (2015). Cross-language transfer for cognates in aphasia therapy with multilingual patients: a case study. *Aphasie Und Verwandte Gebiete (Internet)*, 2015(3), 13–19.
- Hartshorne, J. K., Tenenbaum, J. B., & Pinker, S. (2018). A critical period for second

- language acquisition: Evidence from 2/3 million English speakers. *Cognition*, 177, 263–277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COGNITION.2018.04.007>
- Hemsley, G., Holm, A., & Dodd, B. (2010). Patterns in diversity: lexical learning in Samoan-English bilingual children. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 12: 362–374. DOI: 10.3109/17549501003721064
- Hernandez, A. E., & Kohnert, K. J. (1999). Aging and Language Switching in Bilinguals. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, 6(2), 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.1076/anec.6.2.69.783>
- Hernandez, A. E., & Kohnert, K. J. (2015). Investigations into the locus of language-switching costs in older adult bilinguals. *Bilingualism*, 18(1), 51–64. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S136672891300045X>
- Hernández, M., Caño, A., Costa, A., Sebastián-Gallés, N., Juncadella, M., & Gascón-Bayarri, J. (2008). Grammatical category-specific deficits in bilingual aphasia. *Brain and Language*, 107(1), 68–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BANDL.2008.01.006>
- Hilchey, M. D., & Klein, R. M. (2011). Are there bilingual advantages on nonlinguistic interference tasks? Implications for the plasticity of executive control processes. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 18(4), 625–658. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-011-0116-7>
- Hilton, L. M. (1980). Language rehabilitation strategies for bilingual and foreign-speaking aphasics. *Aphasia, Apraxia, Agnosia*, 3, 7–12.
- Holland, A. L., & Penn, C. (1995). Inventing Therapy for Aphasia. In L. Menn (Ed.), *Non-fluent aphasia in a multilingual world* (pp. 144–155). Amsterdam, NL: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Hope, T. M. H., Parker Jones, ‘Ōiwi, Grogan, A., Crinion, J., Rae, J., Ruffle, L., ...

- Green, D. W. (2015). Comparing language outcomes in monolingual and bilingual stroke patients. *Brain*, *138*(4), 1070–1083. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awv020>
- Ivanova, I., Salmon, D. P., & Gollan, T. H. (2014). Which Language Declines More? Longitudinal versus Cross-sectional Decline of Picture Naming in Bilinguals with Alzheimer's Disease. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, *20*(5), 534–546. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617714000228>
- Kachru, B. B. (1978). English in South Asia. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism* (pp. 477–552). The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kaplan, E., Goodglass, H., & Weintraub, S. (2001). Boston naming test. Pro-ed.
- Kaushanskaya, M., & Marian, V. (2009). The bilingual advantage in novel word learning. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *16*(4), 705–710.
- Kavé, G., Eyal, N., Shorek, A., & Cohen-Mansfield, J. (2008). Multilingualism and cognitive state in the oldest old. *Psychology and Aging*, *23*(1), 70–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.23.1.70>
- Keane, C., & Kiran, S. (2015). The nature of facilitation and interference in the multilingual language system: insights from treatment in a case of trilingual aphasia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *32*(3–4), 169–194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643294.2015.1061982>
- Kiran, S., & Tuchtenhagen, J. (2005). Imageability effects in normal Spanish–English bilingual adults and in aphasia: Evidence from naming to definition and semantic priming tasks. *Aphasiology*, *19*(3–5), 315–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687030444000778>
- Klimova, B. (2018). Learning a Foreign Language: A Review on Recent Findings About Its Effect on the Enhancement of Cognitive Functions Among Healthy Older Individuals. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *12*, 305.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00305>

Kohnert, K. (2004). Cognitive and cognate-based treatments for bilingual aphasia: A case study. *Brain and Language*, *91*(3), 294–302.

<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2004.04.001>

Kohnert, K., Yim, D., Nett, K., Kan, P. F., & Duran, L. (2005). Intervention with linguistically diverse preschool children: A focus on developing home language (s). *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *36*(3), 251-263.

Kong, A. P.-H., Abutalebi, J., Lam, K. S.-Y., & Weekes, B. (2014). Executive and language control in the multilingual brain. *Behavioural Neurology*, *2014*, 527951.

<https://doi.org/10.3233/BEN-120331>

Köpke, B. (2013). Bilinguisme et aphasie. *Rééducation Orthophonique*, *253*(Les pathologies acquises du langage chez le patient bilingue ou multilingue), 5–29.

Köpke, B., & Prod'homme, K. (2009). L'évaluation de l'aphasie chez le bilingue: une étude de cas. *Glossa*, *107*, 39–50.

Köpke, B. & Schmid, M. S. (2004). First language attrition: The next phase. In M. S. Schmid, B. Köpke, M. Keijzer & L. Weile-mar, L. (Eds), *First Language Attrition: Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues* (pp. 1-43). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kousaie, S., & Phillips, N. A. (2012). Ageing and bilingualism: Absence of a “bilingual advantage” in Stroop interference in a nonimmigrant sample. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *65*(2), 356–369.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2011.604788>

Krapf, E. E. (1955). The Choice of Language in Polyglot Psychoanalysis. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, *24*(3), 343–357.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/21674086.1955.11925990>

- Kroll, J. F., & Bialystok, E. (2013). Understanding the consequences of bilingualism for language processing and cognition. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 25(5), 497–514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20445911.2013.799170>
- Kroll, J. F., Bobb, S. C., & Hoshino, N. (2014). Two Languages in Mind. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(3), 159–163. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414528511>
- Kroll, J. F., Bobb, S. C., & Wodniecka, Z. (2006). Language selectivity is the exception, not the rule: Arguments against a fixed locus of language selection in bilingual speech. *Bilingualism*, 9(2), 119–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728906002483>
- Kroll, J. F., & Gollan, T. H. (2014). Speech planning in two languages: What bilinguals tell us about language production. In M. Goldrick, V. Ferreira, & M. Miozzo (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language production* (pp. 165-181). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Kroll, J. F., & Stewart, E. (1994). Category Interference in Translation and Picture Naming: Evidence for Asymmetric Connections Between Bilingual Memory Representations. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 33(2), 149–174. <https://doi.org/10.1006/JMLA.1994.1008>
- Kurland, J., & Falcon, M. (2011). Effects of cognate status and language of therapy during intensive semantic naming treatment in a case of severe nonfluent bilingual aphasia. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 25(6–7), 584–600. <https://doi.org/10.3109/02699206.2011.565398>
- Lavarch, M. (1995). *Bringing them Home Report*. Australian Human Rights Commission. Sydney, AU.
- Lebrun, Y. (1988). Multilinguisme et aphasie. *Revue de Laryngologie*, 109, 299–306.
- Lehtonen, M., Soveri, A., Laine, A., Järvenpää, J., de Bruin, A., & Antfolk, J. (2018). Is

- bilingualism associated with enhanced executive functioning in adults? A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(4), 394–425.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000142>
- Machado, Á., Rodrigues, M., Simões, S., Santana, I., & Soares-Fernandes, J. (2010). The Portuguese Who Could No Longer Speak French: Primary Progressive Aphasia in a Bilingual Man. *The Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 22(1), 123.e31-123.e32.
<https://doi.org/10.1176/jnp.2010.22.1.123.e31>
- Mackie, M.-A., Van Dam, N. T., & Fan, J. (2013). Cognitive control and attentional functions. *Brain and Cognition*, 82(3), 301–312.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BANDC.2013.05.004>
- Mägiste, E. (1986). Selected issues in second and third language learning. In J. Vaid (Ed.), *Language Processing in Bilinguals: Psycholinguistic and neuropsychological perspectives*. (pp. 97–122). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Maguire, E., Gadian, D., Johnsrude, I., Good, C., Ashburner, J., Frackowiak, R., & Frith, C. (2000). Navigation-related structural change in the hippocampi of taxi drivers. *PNAS*, 97(8), 4398–4403.
- Manchon, M., Buetler, K., Colombo, F., Spierer, L., Assal, F., & Annoni, J. M. (2015). Impairment of both languages in late bilinguals with dementia of the Alzheimer type. *Bilingualism*, 18(1), 90–100. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728914000194>
- Marangolo, P., Rizzi, C., Peran, P., Piras, F., & Sabatini, U. (2009). Parallel recovery in a bilingual aphasic: a neurolinguistic and fMRI study. *Neuropsychology*, 23(3), 405–409. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014824>
- Massey, S. J. L., & Parr, N. (2012). The socio-economic status of migrant populations in regional and rural Australia and its implications for future population policy.

Journal of Population Research, 29(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12546-011-9079-9>

Meinzer, M., Streiftau, S., & Rockstroh, B. (2007). Intensive language training in the rehabilitation of chronic aphasia: Efficient training by laypersons. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 13(5), 846–853.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617707071111>

Mendez, M. F., Perryman, K. M., Pontón, M. O., & Cummings, J. L. (1999). Bilingualism and Dementia. *The Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 11(3), 411–412. <https://doi.org/10.1176/jnp.11.3.411>

Miller-Amberber, A. (2012). Language intervention in French-English bilingual aphasia: Evidence of limited therapy transfer. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 25(6), 588–614. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2011.10.002>

Miller Amberber, A. (2012). *Language switching, language selection and intervention in bilingual aphasia*. Unpublished PhD Thesis: Macquarie University, Sydney, AU.

Minkowski, M. (1963). On aphasia in polyglots. In *Problems of dynamic neurology* (pp. 119–161). Jerusalem: Hebrew University.

Mohamed Zied, K., Phillipe, A., Karine, P., Valerie, H.-T., Ghislaine, A., Arnaud, R., & Gall Didier, L. (2004). Bilingualism and adult differences in inhibitory mechanisms: Evidence from a bilingual stroop task. *Brain and Cognition*, 54(3), 254–256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BANDC.2004.02.036>

Morton, J. B., & Harper, S. N. (2007). What did Simon say? Revisiting the bilingual advantage. *Developmental Science*, 10(6), 719–726. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2007.00623.x>

Moyer, A. (2004). *Age, accent, and experience in second language acquisition : an*

integrated approach to critical period inquiry. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Mukadam, N., Jichi, F., Green, D., & Livingston, G. (2018). The relationship of bilingualism to cognitive decline: The Australian Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *33*(2), e249–e256.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.4778>
- Mukadam, N., Sommerlad, A., & Livingston, G. (2017). The Relationship of Bilingualism Compared to Monolingualism to the Risk of Cognitive Decline or Dementia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, *58*(1), 45–54. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-170131>
- Muñoz, M. L., Marquardt, T. P., & Copeland, G. (1999). A Comparison of the Codeswitching Patterns of Aphasic and Neurologically Normal Bilingual Speakers of English and Spanish. *Brain and Language*, *66*(2), 249–274.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/BRLN.1998.2021>
- Muñoz, M., & Marquardt, T. (2003). Picture naming and identification in bilingual speakers of Spanish and English with and without aphasia. *Aphasiology*, *17*(12), 1115–1132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687030344000427>
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1998). Code Switching. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (p. 532). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). Natural codeswitching knocks on the laboratory door. *Bilingualism*, *9*(2), 203–212. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728906002549>
- Nair, V. K., Biedermann, B., & Nickels, L. (2016). Consequences of late bilingualism for novel word learning: Evidence from Tamil–English bilingual speakers. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *20*(4), 473–487.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006914567005>

- Nair, V. K. K., Biedermann, B., & Nickels, L. (2017). Effect of socio-economic status on cognitive control in non-literate bilingual speakers. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 20(5), 999–1009. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728916000778>
- Nanchen, G., Abutalebi, J., Assal, F., Manchon, M., Démonet, J.-F., & Annoni, J.-M. (2017). Second language performances in elderly bilinguals and individuals with dementia: The role of L2 immersion. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 43, 49–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JNEUROLING.2016.09.004>
- Nickels, L. A., & Croot, K. (2015). *Clinical perspectives on primary progressive aphasia*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Nickels, L., & Croot, K. (2014). Understanding and living with primary progressive aphasia: Current progress and challenges for the future. *Aphasiology*, 28(8–9), 885–899. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2014.933521>
- Obler, L. K., & Park, Y. (2012). The Study of Bilingual Aphasia: The Questions Addressed. In M. R. Gitterman, M. Goral, & L. K. Obler (Eds.), *Aspects of multilingual aphasia* (pp. 3–15). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Paap, K. R., & Greenberg, Z. I. (2013). There is no coherent evidence for a bilingual advantage in executive processing. *Cognitive Psychology*, 66(2), 232–258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COGLING.2012.12.002>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CORTEX.2015.04.014>
- Paap, K. R., & Liu, Y. (2014). Conflict resolution in sentence processing is the same for bilinguals and monolinguals: The role of confirmation bias in testing for bilingual advantages. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 27(1), 50–74.

- <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JNEUROLING.2013.09.002>
- Paplikar, A., Mekala, S., Bak, T. H., Dharamkar, S., Alladi, S., & Kaul, S. (2018). Bilingualism and the severity of poststroke aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2017.1423272>
- Paradis, M. (2001). Bilingual and polyglot aphasia. In R. S. Berndt (Ed.), *Handbook of neuropsychology (2nd ed.)* (pp. 69–91). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Paradis, M. (2004). *A neurolinguistic theory of bilingualism*. Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.
- Paradis, M., & Libben, G. (1987). *The Assessment of Bilingual Aphasia*. New York, USA: Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315802138>
- Peal, E., & Lambert, W. E. (1962). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 76(27), 1–23.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093840>
- Penn, C., Frankel, T., Watermeyer, J., & Russell, N. (2010). Executive function and conversational strategies in bilingual aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 24(2), 288–308.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02687030902958399>
- Perani, D., & Abutalebi, J. (2005). The neural basis of first and second language processing. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 15(2), 202–206.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CONB.2005.03.007>
- Perquin, M., Vaillant, M., Schuller, A.-M., Pastore, J., Dartigues, J.-F., Lair, M.-L., ... Group, on behalf of the M. (2013). Lifelong Exposure to Multilingualism: New Evidence to Support Cognitive Reserve Hypothesis. *PLoS ONE*, 8(4), e62030.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0062030>
- Phillips, C. B., & Travaglia, J. (2011). Low levels of uptake of free interpreters by Australian doctors in private practice: secondary analysis of national data.

- Australian Health Review*, 35(4), 475–479. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AH10900>
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pitres, A. (1895). Etude sur l'aphasie chez les polyglottes. *Revue de Médecine*, 15, 873–899.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18(7–8), 581–618. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581>
- Ramos, S., Fernández García, Y., Antón, E., Casaponsa, A., & Duñabeitia, J. A. (2017). Does learning a language in the elderly enhance switching ability? *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 43, 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JNEUROLING.2016.09.001>
- Ribot, T.-A. (1881). *Les Maladies de la Mémoire [English translation: Diseases of memory]*. New York, USA: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Roberts, P. M., Garcia, L. J., Desrochers, A., & Hernandez, D. (2002). English performance of proficient bilingual adults on the Boston Naming Test. *Aphasiology*, 16(4–6), 635–645. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687030244000220>
- Roger, P., Code, C., & Sheard, C. (2000). Assessment and management of aphasia in a linguistically diverse society. *Asia Pacific Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing*, 5(1), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.1179/136132800807547573>
- Rosselli, M., Ardila, A., Araujo, K., Weekes, V. A., Caracciolo, V., Padilla, M., & Ostrosky-Solís, F. (2000). Verbal Fluency and Repetition Skills in Healthy Older Spanish-English Bilinguals. *Applied Neuropsychology*, 7(1), 17–24. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324826AN0701_3
- Schmid, M.S. (2008). Defining language attrition. *Babylonia*. 2008(2), 9-12.
- Schmid, M. S. (2013). First language attrition. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 3(1), 94–115. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.3.1.05sch>

- Schmid, M. S., & Keijzer, M. (2009). First language attrition and reversion among older migrants. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2009(200), 83–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/IJSL.2009.046>
- Schmid, M. S., & Köpke, B. (2007). Bilingualism and attrition. In B. Köpke, M. S. Schmid, M. Keijzer, & S. Dostert (Eds.), *Language attrition : theoretical perspectives* (pp. 1–7). Amsterdam, NL: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Schmid, M. S., & Köpke, B. (2018). The relevance of first language attrition to theories of bilingual development. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 7(6), 637–667.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.17058.sch>
- Simon-Cereijido, G. (2018). Bilingualism, a human right in times of anxiety: Lessons from California. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 20(1), 157–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17549507.2018.1392610>
- Simon, J. R., & Berbaum, K. (1990). Effect of conflicting cues on information processing: The “Stroop effect” vs. the “Simon effect.” *Acta Psychologica*, 73(2), 159–170. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918\(90\)90077-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918(90)90077-S)
- Simon, J. R., & Small, A. M. (1969). Processing auditory information: Interference from an irrelevant cue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 53(5), 433–435.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0028034>
- Simon, J., & Wolf, J. D. (1963). Choice Reaction Time As A Function Of Angular Stimulus-Response Correspondence And Age. *Ergonomics*, 6(1), 99–105.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00140136308930679>
- Simons, D. J., Boot, W. R., Charness, N., Gathercole, S. E., Chabris, C. F., Hambrick, D. Z., & Stine-Morrow, E. A. L. (2016). Do “Brain-Training” Programs Work? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 17(3), 103–186.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100616661983>

- Speech Pathology Australia. (2016). *Working in a culturally and linguistically diverse society. Position statement*. Melbourne, Australia: Speech Pathology Australia.
- Spivey, M. J., & Marian, V. (1999). Cross talk between native and second languages: Partial activation of an irrelevant lexicon. *Psychological Science*, 10(3), 281-284.
- Statista. (2018). Retrieved September 13, 2018, from <https://www.statista.com/>
- Steffener, J., & Stern, Y. (2012). Exploring the neural basis of cognitive reserve in aging. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Molecular Basis of Disease*, 1822(3), 467–473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BBADIS.2011.09.012>
- Steinhauer, K. (2014). Event-related Potentials (ERPs) in Second Language Research: A Brief Introduction to the Technique, a Selected Review, and an Invitation to Reconsider Critical Periods in L2. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(4), 393–417. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu028>
- Stern, Y. (2002). What is cognitive reserve? Theory and research application of the reserve concept. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 8(3), 448–460. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617702813248>
- Stewart, S. R., & Gonzalez, L. S. (2002). Serving a Diverse Population: The Role of Speech-Language Pathology Professional Preparation Programs. *Journal of Allied Health*, 31(4), 204–216.
- Strauss, S. (2015). Does bilingualism delay dementia? *CMAJ: Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 187(7), E209-10. <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.109-5022>
- Stroop, J. R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 18(6), 643–662. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054651>
- Tipping, S. A., & Whiteside, M. (2015). Language Reversion among People with Dementia from Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Backgrounds: The Family Experience. *Australian Social Work*, 68(2), 184–197.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2014.953187>

Titone, D., Gullifer, J., Subramaniapillai, S., Rajah, N., Baum, S., & 2017, undefined.

(2017). History-inspired reflections on the Bilingual Advantages Hypothesis. In E. Bialystok & M. D. Sullivan (Eds.), *Growing Old with Two Languages* (pp. 265–296). Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Toribio, A. J. (2001). On the emergence of bilingual code-switching competence.

Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 4(3), 203–231.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728901000414>

Tuathaigh, G. Ó. (1974). Gaelic Ireland, Popular Politics and Daniel O’Connell. *Journal*

of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society. Galway Archaeological & Historical Society. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25535454>

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Retrieved from

<http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html>

Valenzuela, M. J., & Sachdev, P. (2006). Brain reserve and dementia: A systematic

review. *Psychological Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291705006264>

Valian, V. (2015). Bilingualism and cognition. *Bilingualism*, 18(1), 3–24.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728914000522>

van Hell, J. G., & Tanner, D. (2012). Second Language Proficiency and Cross-

Language Lexical Activation. *Language Learning*, 62, 148–171.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00710.x>

van Veen, S., Remmers, S., Aarnoudse-Moens, C. S. H., Oosterlaan, J., van Kaam, A.

H., & van Wassenaer-Leemhuis, A. G. (2018). Multilingualism was associated with lower cognitive outcomes in children who were born very and extremely preterm. *Acta Paediatrica*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apa.14516>

Wald, I. (1961). Problema afazii polyglotov. In *Voprosy Kliniki i Patofiziologii Afazii*

(pp. 140–176). Moscow.

Ware, C., Damnee, S., Djabelkhir, L., Cristancho, V., Wu, Y.-H., Benovici, J., ...

Rigaud, A.-S. (2017). Maintaining Cognitive Functioning in Healthy Seniors with a Technology-Based Foreign Language Program: A Pilot Feasibility Study.

Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience, 9, 42. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2017.00042>

Weinreich, U. (1968). *Languages in contact : findings and problems*. The Hague, NL:

Mouton Publishers.

Weissberger, G. H., Wierenga, C. E., Bondi, M. W., & Gollan, T. H. (2012). Partially overlapping mechanisms of language and task control in young and older

bilinguals. *Psychology and Aging*, 27(4), 959–974.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028281>

West, R. L. (1996). An application of prefrontal cortex function theory to cognitive

aging. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120(2), 272–292. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.120.2.272)

[2909.120.2.272](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.120.2.272)

Williams, C. J., & McLeod, S. (2012). Speech-language pathologists' assessment and intervention practices with multilingual children. *International Journal of Speech-*

Language Pathology, 14(3), 292–305.

<https://doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2011.636071>

Windsor, J., Kohnert, K., Loxtercamp, A. L., & Kan, P. F. (2008). Performance on nonlinguistic visual tasks by children with language impairment. *Applied*

Psycholinguistics, 29(2), 237–268. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716407080113>

Woumans, E., Santens, P., Sieben, A., Versijpt, J., Stevens, M., & Duyck, W. (2015).

Bilingualism delays clinical manifestation of Alzheimer's disease. *Bilingualism*,

18(3), 568–574. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S136672891400087X>

Woumans, E., Versijpt, J., Sieben, A., Santens, P., & Duyck, W. (2017). Bilingualism

and Cognitive Decline: A Story of Pride and Prejudice. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, 60(4), 1237–1239. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-170759>

Zahodne, L. B., Schofield, P. R. W., Farrell, M. T., Stern, Y., & Manly, J. J. (2014). Bilingualism Does Not Alter Cognitive Decline or Dementia Risk among Spanish-Speaking Immigrants, 28(2), 238–246. <https://doi.org/10.7916/D864127M>

Zanini, S., Angeli, V., & Tavano, A. (2011). Primary progressive aphasia in a bilingual speaker: a single-case study. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 25(6–7), 553–564. <https://doi.org/10.3109/02699206.2011.566464>