



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

### *ResearchSpace@Auckland*

#### **Copyright Statement**

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

#### **General copyright and disclaimer**

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the Library Thesis Consent Form.



# **A behavioural and functional imaging investigation of Stroop task performance in late proficient bilinguals**

Gjurgjica Badzakova-Trajkov

Department of Psychology, The University of Auckland,  
Auckland, New Zealand

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy, The University of Auckland, 2008

## Abstract

In this thesis, Stroop task performance was investigated (using behavioural, electrophysiological and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) techniques) in late and proficient adult bilinguals currently living in the second language (L2) environment. Monolingual participants, matched for age and handedness, were recruited as controls. The Stroop colour-word task was considered an appropriate tool to test the general hypothesis that bilingualism might influence executive or cognitive control processes.

In Study One, a dual-task paradigm was used for assessing the lateralisation of language functions (given the linguistic nature of the Stroop paradigm used here) in the bilinguals (Macedonian-English/M-E). Bilinguals showed a more bilateral hemispheric involvement, for both languages, compared to monolinguals. These findings also provided supporting evidence for the hypothesis of greater right-hemispheric involvement for language in bilinguals.

In Study Two, two behavioural Stroop task paradigms (manual and verbal) were used in order to assess the magnitude of the Stroop effect between the groups. Bilinguals (M-E, German-English/G-E) showed a trend of smaller interference scores across both languages compared to monolinguals.

In Study Three, manual Stroop task performance with concurrent electroencephalograph (EEG) recording revealed that bilinguals had temporal shifts in the N400 component (of about 30-40 ms) for the interference comparison for both languages compared to monolinguals. Also, relative to monolinguals, M-E bilinguals (for both L1 and L2) and G-E bilinguals (for L2) had fewer electrodes over frontal and central sites with a significant amplitude difference in the interference comparison (i.e., a reduced interference effect).

In Study Four, the neural substrates engaged during Stroop task performance were investigated using fMRI. In general, monolinguals showed greater activation in regions such as the prefrontal cortex and anterior cingulate (regions associated with good executive control). This suggested that relative to bilinguals, monolinguals require more neural resources to accomplish conflict resolution.

Taken together, Stroop task performance in late and proficient bilinguals currently living in the L2 environment differed from that of monolinguals across all methods of investigation. It appears that cognitive processing changes at the executive level can be observed as a result of bilingualism. The results also provide some evidence for changes in L1 processing following late L2 acquisition, as similar results across both languages and tasks were observed for the M-E bilinguals. It is also possible

that slight modifications to cerebral laterality as a result of the late learning of (and continuous exposure to) a second language could contribute to these differences in executive functioning. The language environment might therefore be a major factor in the lateralisation of language processing and executive functioning in bilinguals. These conclusions, though tentative and require further investigation, have important implications for language and executive processing in general and for theories regarding cognitive flexibility in bilinguals.

*To my Father, George*

## Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisors, Dr Karen Waldie and Dr Ian Kirk, for being exceptionally supportive throughout my PhD as both supervisors and dear friends. I am extremely grateful for your constant encouragements and for making me believe in myself as a researcher.

I would like to thank all the people, my colleagues, in the department who have become my friends as well, and have helped me out in any way possible. A special thanks to Branka Milivojevic for generously giving up her time and sharing her EEG and fMRI knowledge with me.

On a personal level, the unwavering support of my family has guided me through this long process. To my husband Vane, thank you for being the voice of reason in the most difficult of times and for believing in me. To my beautiful daughter Anastasia, my mother Ubavka, my sister Dobrila, my mother-in-law Elica, and the rest of the family and friends, thank you for being there for me. Finally, to my late father, who has been my inspiration, I hope I made you proud.

The following thesis was made possible by the University of Auckland Doctoral Scholarship and all the people who unselfishly participated in my experiments.

# Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements .....	v
Table of Contents .....	vi
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Figures.....	xii
List of Abbreviations.....	xiv
List of Publications.....	xv
List of Conference Abstracts.....	xv
Preface .....	1
CHAPTER 1: Introduction .....	4
What is bilingualism?.....	4
Techniques used in earlier research.....	5
Language representation in bilinguals.....	11
Language lateralisation in general.....	12
Right-hemisphere involvement in language for bilinguals .....	17
Left Hemisphere for Language in Bilinguals too? .....	27
Language switching and executive functions in bilinguals.....	39
Language switching hypotheses.....	40
Factors that affect language switching ability .....	42
Executive functions in bilinguals .....	46
The current research .....	49
CHAPTER 2: General methods.....	52
Participants .....	52
Screening assessment .....	53
Proficiency assessment.....	53
Handedness.....	55
Experimental tasks.....	58
Dual-task.....	58
Stroop Colour-Word Task (Verbal Version).....	59
Stroop Colour-Word Task (Manual Version One).....	60
Stroop Colour-Word Task (Manual Version Two) .....	61
General Testing Procedure .....	62
Screening assessment .....	62
Experimental tasks.....	63
General Data Analysis.....	63
Behavioural data.....	63
Electrophysiological data .....	64
fMRI data.....	65
CHAPTER 3: Dual-task performance in late proficient bilinguals.....	67
Abstract.....	67

Introduction .....	68
Method.....	73
Participants .....	73
Stimuli and Procedure .....	75
Data Analysis.....	76
Results .....	77
Discussion.....	81
CHAPTER 4: Stroop colour-word task performance in late proficient bilinguals: a behavioural study .....	85
Abstract.....	85
Introduction .....	86
Experiment 1 .....	90
Method.....	90
Results .....	93
Experiment 2 .....	98
Method.....	98
Results .....	101
Discussion.....	105
CHAPTER 5: Stroop colour-word task performance in late proficient bilinguals: an ERP study .....	110
Abstract.....	110
Introduction .....	111
Method.....	115
Participants .....	115
Stimuli .....	116
Procedure.....	116
EEG Apparatus and ERP Averaging.....	117
Results .....	119
Behavioural results .....	119
EEG results.....	125
Discussion.....	139
CHAPTER 6: Stroop colour-word task performance in late proficient bilinguals: an fMRI study .....	145
Abstract.....	145
Introduction .....	147
Method.....	152
Participants .....	152
Stimuli .....	153
Procedure.....	154
Image acquisition.....	155
Image pre-processing and analysis.....	155
Results .....	157
Behavioural results .....	157
fMRI results.....	160
Discussion.....	172
CHAPTER 7: General discussion.....	180
Lateralisation of language processing in late and proficient bilinguals .....	184

The effects of bilingualism on executive functions: evidence from Stroop task performance .....	186
The effect of bilingualism on L1 processing.....	191
Implications, limitations, and future research .....	193
Conclusions .....	196
Appendix A- Language Background Questionnaire .....	198
Appendix B- Edinburgh Handedness Inventory.....	200
Appendix C- Verbal Version of the Stroop Task .....	201
Appendix D- Descriptive statistics for the interference scores based on language and order for Study Two and Three .....	208
Appendix E- Diagram showing the response choices paradigm for the fMRI study.....	211
References .....	212

## List of Tables

Table 1	
<i>Mean scores (standard deviation in parenthesis) for the descriptive measures (age, Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (EHI)) for each group based on the total sample. Gender balance is also presented for both groups. Quick Placement Test (QPT) scores and reading age (RA) are also presented for the bilingual groups.</i>	57
Table 2	
<i>Mean (standard deviation in parenthesis) for starting age of L2 acquisition, and self-reported proficiency in L1 and L2 for the bilingual participants based on the total sample. Percentage of bilinguals participants based on type of L2 learning history, language of thought, and frequency of use at time of recruitment are also presented.</i>	57
Table 3	
<i>Percentage of bilingual participants reporting specific contexts of use for L1 and L2 based on the total sample. The other category represents social outings, shopping, and/or university.</i>	58
Table 4	
<i>Descriptive statistics for the Quick Placement Test (QPT) proficiency level and scores, starting age of L2 acquisition, age of immersion in L2 environment, time spent in L2 environment, and self-reported written/oral proficiency in L1 and L2 for the bilingual participants from Study One.</i>	74
Table 5	
<i>Interference data (in percentages) for both monolinguals and bilinguals across each language, tapping finger and reading condition from Study One.</i>	77
Table 6	
<i>Mean median reaction times (RTs) in milliseconds and mean accuracy for each condition (congruent, congruent, incongruent) for each group in English for the manual version of the Stroop colour-word task from Study Two. Standard deviations are shown in parenthesis.</i>	94
Table 7	
<i>Mean median reaction times (RTs) in milliseconds and mean accuracy for each condition (congruent, control, incongruent) for each group in L1 for the manual version of the Stroop colour-word task from Study Two. Standard deviations are shown in parenthesis.</i>	96

Table 8	
	<i>Mean median reaction times (RTs) in milliseconds and mean accuracy for each condition (congruent, control, incongruent) for L1 and L2 for the bilinguals for the manual version of the Stroop colour-word task from Study Two. Standard deviations are shown in parenthesis.</i>
Table 9	
	<i>Interference scores in percentages for monolinguals and bilinguals across language for the manual version of the Stroop-colour word task from Study Two. Standard deviations are shown in parenthesis.</i>
	.....98
Table 10	
	<i>Mean reaction times in seconds for the difference score, ratio index of interference, and interference score for each language across group for the verbal version of the Stroop colour-word task from Study Two. Standard deviations are shown in parenthesis.</i>
	..... 104
Table 11	
	<i>Mean median reaction times in milliseconds and mean accuracy for each group across each condition in English from Study Three. Standard deviations are shown in parenthesis.</i>
	..... 121
Table 12	
	<i>Mean median reaction times in milliseconds and mean accuracy for each group across each condition in L1 from Study Three. Standard deviations are shown in parenthesis.</i>
	..... 123
Table 13	
	<i>Mean median reaction times (RTs) in milliseconds and mean accuracy for each condition (congruent, control, semantically incongruent, response incongruent) for monolinguals and bilinguals (in both languages) from Study Four. Standard deviations are shown in parenthesis.</i>
	..... 159
Table 14	
	<i>Brain regions showing significant differences between the Groups for the contrasts of interest in English. Cluster extent in mm<sup>3</sup>, with Talairach coordinates for the peak activation voxel, corresponding summary statistics (F- and uncorrected p-values), Brodmann area (BA) and direction of difference are also shown. More than one local maxima more than 8mm apart are shown where appropriate. Note that a single voxel extent is 45mm<sup>3</sup>.</i>
	..... 161
Table 15	
	<i>Brain regions showing significant differences between the Groups for the contrasts of interest in L1. Cluster extent in mm<sup>3</sup>, with Talairach coordinates for the peak activation voxel, corresponding summary statistics (F- and uncorrected p-values), Brodmann area (BA) and direction of difference are also shown. More than one local maxima more than 8mm apart are shown where appropriate. Note that a single voxel extent is 45mm<sup>3</sup>.</i>
	..... 165
Table 16	
	<i>Brain regions showing significant differences between the languages for the contrasts of interest in bilinguals. Cluster extent in mm<sup>3</sup>, with Talairach coordinates for the peak activation voxel, corresponding summary statistics (F- and uncorrected p-values), Brodmann</i>

*area (BA) and direction of difference are also shown. More than one local maxima more than 8mm apart are shown where appropriate. Note that a single voxel extent is 45mm<sup>3</sup>. .....169*

Table 17

*Interference for each language based on order in which the languages were performed across group for the manual version of the Stroop colour-word task from Study Two. Standard deviations are shown in parenthesis..... 208*

Table 18

*Interference for each language based on order in which the languages were performed across group for the verbal version of the Stroop colour-word task from Study Two. Standard deviations are shown in parenthesis.....209*

Table 19

*Interference for each language based on order in which the languages were performed across group for the manual version of the Stroop colour-word task from Study Three. Standard deviations are shown in parenthesis.....210*

## List of Figures

*Figure 1.* (A) A high density geodesic sensor map displaying the 129 electrode locations (Medial Frontal-MF; Lateral Frontal-LF; Central-C; Anterior Temporal-AT; Parietal-P; Posterior Temporal-PT; Occipital-O). (B) Idealized waveform of the computer-averaged auditory event-related potential (ERP) to brief auditory sound. The ERPs cannot be detected in the raw EEG (top) and it requires averaging over many one second epochs of EEG to view them (bottom). A logarithmic scale is used to present the different ERP components (early brain stem waves I-VI), midlatency component (N0, P0, Na, Pa, Nb), vertex potentials (P1, N1, P2), and task-related endogenous components (Nd, N2, P300, and slow wave-SW; Hillyard & Kutas, 1983). ..... 9

*Figure 2.* A diagram of the four major brain lobes (A) and numbered Brodmann areas (B-lateral view, C-medial view) (Images obtained online at [www.stanford.edu/.../braintut/f\\_ab11lobes.gif](http://www.stanford.edu/.../braintut/f_ab11lobes.gif) and <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Image:Gray726-Brodman.png> on 15 October 2007)..... 15

*Figure 3.* A diagram showing the classical perisylvian language areas (Broca’s and Wernicke’s areas) along with other language associated brain regions (Pinel, 2000). ..... 17

*Figure 4.* Bar graph showing interference scores (error bars represent +1SE) for English during concurrent reading for each hand separately as a function of Group from Study One.. 78

*Figure 5.* Bar graph showing interference scores (error bars represent +1SE) for L1 for each interference condition separately as a function of Group from Study One. .... 79

*Figure 6.* Bar graph showing interference scores (error bars represent +1SE) during concurrent reading for the bilingual group for each hand separately as a function of Language from Study One. .... 80

*Figure 7.* Median reaction times (in ms) (error bars represent +1SD) for each condition in English for each group separately from a manual version of the Stroop colour-word task from Study Two. .... 94

*Figure 8.* Median reaction times (in ms) (error bars represent +1SD) for each condition in L1 for each group separately from a manual version of the Stroop colour-word task from Study Two. .... 95

*Figure 9.* Median reaction times (in ms) (error bars represent +1SD) for each condition in L1 and L2 for bilinguals from a manual version of the Stroop colour-word task from Study Two. .... 97

<i>Figure 10</i> . Mean reaction times (in seconds) (error bars represent +1SD) for each condition in L1 and L2 for bilinguals from a verbal version of the Stroop colour-word task from Study Two.....	105
<i>Figure 11</i> . Interference scores for each group and language from Study Three. Error bars represent +1 SE.....	125
<i>Figure 12</i> . Headmap showing the electrode locations of interest. Average waveforms also presented for the conditions of interest (congruent, incongruent) for Nz, Fz*, Cz and Pz* electrode locations for each group and language separately from Study Three. The electrode labels correspond to electrodes 17, 11, 129 and 62. Labels are according to the international 10-20 system.....	129
<i>Figure 13</i> . Headmap showing the seven selected areas for analysis on each side (Medial Frontal-MF; Lateral Frontal-LF; Central-C; Anterior Temporal-AT; Parietal-P; Posterior Temporal-PT; Occipital-O) from Study Three. Electrodes included in each area are also shown.....	133
<i>Figure 14</i> . Headmaps showing the areas of significant amplitude differences between the incongruent and congruent conditions for monolinguals in English, M-E bilinguals across both languages, G-E Bilinguals across both languages, and across all groups in English and L1 from Study Three. Red indicates a significant positive difference, blue indicates a significant negative difference. ....	134
<i>Figure 15</i> . (A) The GFP for the incongruent and congruent Stroop task conditions with difference wave plotted for each group and language separately; (B) The scalp topography of the difference wave at its maximum. Blue is negative potential, red is positive; (C) The scalp distribution of the significant electrodes for the incongruent-congruent comparison. The significant differences between the ERPs are seen in the marked time windows.....	138
<i>Figure 16</i> . Significant differences between the groups in English for each Stroop task contrast of interest displayed on a cortical surface rendering and glass brain SPMs. Selected peak voxels within the clusters shown on the SPMs. Labels for shown voxels are presented in Table 14. Red numbers indicate regions of greater activation for monolinguals, whereas blue indicate greater activation for bilinguals.....	163
<i>Figure 17</i> . Significant differences between the groups in L1 for each Stroop task contrast of interest displayed on a cortical surface rendering and glass brain SPMs. Selected peak voxels within the clusters shown on the SPMs. Labels for shown voxels are presented in Table 15. Red numbers indicate regions of greater activation for monolinguals, whereas blue indicate greater activation for bilinguals.....	167
<i>Figure 18</i> . Significant differences between the languages in bilinguals for each Stroop task contrast of interest displayed on a cortical surface rendering and glass brain SPMs. Selected peak voxels within the clusters shown on the SPMs. Labels for shown voxels are presented in Table 16. Red numbers indicate regions of greater activation for L1, whereas blue indicate greater activation for L2. ....	171

## List of Abbreviations

ACC – Anterior Cingulate Cortex  
ANOVA – Analysis of Variance  
BA – Brodmann Area  
DLPFC – Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex  
EEG – Electroencephalography  
EHI – Edinburgh Handedness Inventory  
ERP – Event Related Potential  
fMRI – functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging  
G-E – German-English  
L1 – First Language  
L2 – Second Language  
LVF – Left Visual Field  
M-E – Macedonian-English  
PCA – Principal Components Analysis  
PET – Positron Emission Tomography  
QPT – Quick Placement Test  
RT – Reaction Time  
RVF – Right Visual Field  
SPM – Statistical Parametric Mapping