

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

Chapter 25

Language Processing in Bilingual Speakers

Ana I. Schwartz and Judith F. Kroll

We couldn't agree where we wanted to go on vacation, *y tuvimos una larga discusion*
[and we had a long argument]

In the border community of El Paso, Texas, it is not at all uncommon to hear code-switched phrases like the one above. English and Spanish conversations are heard throughout all contexts of the community, whether it be on a university campus, a small café, bus, or in a formal business meeting. What an interesting feat it is then for the typical, bilingual citizen of El Paso to comprehend the mixture of language that she may hear or read. How is it that bilinguals comprehend input from their two languages? At what point in comprehension is the language of the utterance identified? At what point, if at all, does a bilingual select one language over the other?

These questions seem particularly salient when one considers that most of the world's population is proficient in more than one language (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2004). However, it is important to point out that research on bilingualism is essential toward developing theories of language processing and cognition that extend beyond interests in bilingualism. For example, take the word "*discusión*" in the phrase quoted above. Although this is a Spanish word, it clearly looks like the word "discussion" in English, and this similarity makes the language membership of the word quite ambiguous. Furthermore, despite the high degree of superficial, form similarity between these two words, their meanings are actually quite distinct. In Spanish, "*discusión*" refers to a disagreement; whereas the meaning of the English word "*discussion*" does not include the same combative overtones. How do bilinguals disambiguate such words and apply the appropriate intended meaning? The issue of lexical disambiguation has been a focus in the development of psycholinguistic theories of language processing and has spurred considerable debate regarding the role of context in lexical access and the degree to which processes of language comprehension are modular vs. interactive. The study of bilingual language comprehension allows researchers to address these issues in ways that cannot be achieved through monolingual paradigms.

1 In this chapter, we review the recent literature on bilingual language comprehension
2 and production. We will focus in particular on issues related to cross-language interac-
3 tions that take place between a native language and a non-native language. Previous
4 research has examined both the interactions that occur as a new language is being
5 acquired as well as the interactions that take place during online language comprehen-
6 sion processes. In terms of the interactions that take place during acquisition, research
7 has demonstrated that linguistic characteristics of the native language (L1), such as how
8 phonologically or syntactically similar it is to the second language (L2) has an effect on
9 its acquisition (e.g., Bosch, Costa, & Sebastian-Galles, 2000; Fernández, 1998;
10 MacWhinney, 1997). Similarly, there is evidence that the process of acquiring an L2 also
11 has an impact on the L1. For example, studies of syntactic processing suggest that
12 parsing preferences that develop in L2 acquisition can transfer and modify the parsing
13 strategies used during L1 processing (Dussias, 2003). With respect to the interactions that
14 take place during online processing, research has provided compelling evidence that
15 bilinguals are unable to selectively activate one of their languages during either compre-
16 hension or production. Bilingual language comprehension appears to involve the parallel
17 activation of lexical information during both visual word recognition (Dijkstra, De
18 Bruijn, Schriefers, & Brinke, 2000; Dijkstra, Grainger, & Van Heuven, 1999; Jared &
19 Kroll, 2001; Jared & Szucs, 2002; Van Heuven, Dijkstra, & Grainger, 1998; Von Studnitz
20 & Green, 2002; and see Dijkstra, 2005 for a recent review) and auditory word recogni-
21 tion (e.g., Spivey & Marian, 1999). Likewise, the spoken production of words in even one
22 of the bilingual's two languages appears to activate lexical candidates in both languages
23 (e.g., Colomé, 2001; Costa, Miozzo, & Caramazza, 1999; Hermans, Bongaerts, De Bot,
24 & Schreuder, 1998).

AQ1

26 Only very recently have researchers begun to examine how language non-selectivity is
27 modified, if at all, by language or sentence context (e.g., De Bruijn, Dijkstra, Chwilla, &
28 Schriefers, 2001; Ju & Luce, 2004; Van Hell & De Groot, 1998). To the extent that the
29 target language cannot be immediately selected, there are also critical consequences for
30 the cognitive control that bilinguals must develop to negotiate the potential competition
31 across the two languages (e.g., Bialystok, Craik, Klein, & Viswanathan, 2004; Green,
32 1998). In this chapter, we will review these studies and discuss the implications for cur-
33 rent models of the bilingual lexicon in comprehension and production.

35 In the review that follows, we take an inclusive approach to consider bilinguals to be
36 anyone who actively uses two languages to some degree of proficiency. Bilinguals are
37 rarely equally proficient or balanced in their use of the two languages, rendering one of
38 the languages the more dominant language. Typically, the more dominant language will
39 be the first or native language, but for bilinguals who have lived in their L2 environment
40 for many years, the L2 may be functionally more dominant, at least for certain language-
41 processing tasks. Among the most commonly studied bilinguals (e.g., the Dutch-English
42 bilinguals in The Netherlands or the Catalan-Spanish bilinguals in Barcelona), many in-
43 dividuals are actually trilinguals. These contexts of language acquisition and use will
44 clearly have implications for comprehension although some of the consequences, partic-
45 ularly in studies of lexical access, have only recently begun to be explored systematically.

1 We discuss them in the cases in which there are documented consequences for process-
2 ing and where there is enough evidence to assess their contribution.
3

4 We begin the chapter with a review of models of the bilingual lexicon. Although the
5 issues we consider in this chapter extend beyond the lexical level, early models of cross-
6 language representation and processing focused extensively on the way in which words
7 and concepts are interconnected in the bilingual's two languages. These models provide
8 a starting point for understanding how a learner's cognitive system adapts to the pres-
9 ence of a second language. We then provide an overview of the recent research that has
10 examined the cross-language interactions that take place during comprehension and
11 production at the lexical and sub-lexical levels. These studies consider how single words
12 and sounds from a bilingual's two languages are identified and spoken. We then review
13 the evidence for cross-language interactions at the sentence/syntactic levels. Finally, we
14 examine a set of issues common to both the lexical and sentential level of processing
15 that include the cognitive factors that modulate L2 processing, the consequences of
16 cross-language similarity, the directionality of cross-language influences, and the more
17 general implications of research on bilingualism for theories of word recognition,
18 lexical access, and sentence processing. Although our review focuses primarily on be-
19 havioral evidence from studies of the performance of second language learners and
20 relatively proficient bilinguals, we also consider the emerging literature on the neural
21 basis of bilingualism.
22

23
24
25

1. MODELS OF THE BILINGUAL LEXICON

26 Early accounts of the bilingual's cognitive system examined the issue of how an adult
27 who already has a fully formed lexicon and conceptual system for their native language
28 represents newly acquired information in a second language. Potter, So, Von Eckardt, and
29 Feldman (1984) contrasted two alternative models for how a learner might integrate new
30 L2 knowledge into their existing L1 language system. The models are shown in Figure 1.
31 According to the Word Association model, new L2 words are represented by means of
32 associations to their translation equivalents. Thus, to learn that the word *kikker* in Dutch
33 means *frog* in English, the learner would form an association directly between *kikker* and
34 *frog*. On this view, L2 words access meaning indirectly via the L1. In contrast, the
35 Concept Mediation model assumes that L2 words have direct access to their respective
36 meanings. Potter et al. tested the two models in a series of experiments in which bilin-
37 guals named pictures and translated words. They reasoned that if words in the L2 were
38 lexically mediated via the L1, then translation into the L2 should be performed more
39 quickly than picture naming because the translation would be directly available without
40 conceptual processing. Picture naming would necessarily be slower than translation be-
41 cause to name a picture in L2 would require first accessing its meaning and name in L1,
42 and only then could the L2 name be retrieved by its association with the L1 translation.
43 However, if words in the L2 access their respective meanings directly, then all other
44 things being equal, picture naming in L2 and translation into the L2 should take about the
45 same amount of time. Potter et al. found support for the Concept Mediation predictions.

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





Figure 1. The Word Association and Concept Mediation models (adapted from Potter et al., 1984).

In two experiments, one with highly proficient Chinese–English bilinguals and the other with French–English second language learners, the time to name pictures and translate words was approximately the same. Contrary to the predictions of the Word Association model, the time to name pictures was, if anything, faster than the time to translate words. The results were counterintuitive because although the learners were slower in L2 than the proficient bilinguals, the pattern of results was the same, suggesting that even at early stages of L2 learning, individuals are able to access concepts directly.

The models shown in Figure 1 assume independent representations at the lexical level but a shared representation at the conceptual level. A question that we will return to is how the picture of cross-language activity suggested by the current research can be accommodated within this hierarchical framework. If even learners can access meaning directly for words in the L2 as the Potter et al. (1984) results suggest, then lexical-level interactions across languages might be expected to be quite limited. However, the immediate problem raised by the Potter et al. study was to understand why striking differences in L2 skill did not seem to influence the form of the connections between words and concepts in the bilingual’s mind. Two subsequent studies (Chen & Leung, 1989; Kroll & Curley, 1988) failed to replicate the Potter et al. results for the less-proficient L2 learners. In each of these studies, the performance of highly proficient bilinguals replicated the Concept Mediation model’s pattern, with similar latencies for naming pictures in the L2 and translating words into the L1. However, contrary to Potter et al., the performance of L2 learners followed the pattern predicted by the Word Association model, with translation into the L2 significantly faster than picture naming in the L2. The apparent discrepancy in the findings for L2 learners may be attributed to their level of proficiency. The learners in the Potter et al. study were high school students about to travel to France for a summer immersion experience. Although they were far from proficient in French, they were presumably highly motivated learners who were likely to have been beyond the very earliest stages of acquisition.

1 The results of Chen and Leung (1989) and Kroll and Curley (1988) suggested that
 2 learners initially associate new words in the L2 to their translation equivalents in the L1
 3 and only later become able to access concepts directly. To account for the change in the
 4 connections between words and concepts as L2 skill develops, Kroll and Stewart (1994)
 5 proposed the revised hierarchical model (RHM). The model, shown in Figure 2, inte-
 6 grates the Word Association and Concept Mediation models but, unlike the earlier mod-
 7 els, also makes assumptions about the strength of connections. At the lexical level, the
 8 RHM assumes that the connection from L2 to L1 is stronger than the connection from L1
 9 to L2. Because learners presumably access L1 translations during early stages of acqui-
 10 sition for the purpose of retrieving the meaning of new L2 words, the requirement to
 11 transfer information from L1 to L2 will create a strong lexical-level connection from L2
 12 to L1. With respect to the connections from words to concepts, the RHM proposes that
 13 the L1 is privileged with respect to accessing meaning and thus L1 connections to con-
 14 cepts will be stronger than those for L2 and only with increasing L2 proficiency will the
 15 L2 links to concepts begin to resemble those for L1.

16
 17 The RHM can account for an asymmetry observed in the previous studies such that
 18 translation in the forward direction, from L1 to L2, is typically slower and more error-
 19 prone than translation in the backward direction, from L2 to L1. According to the model,
 20 L2 to L1 translation can be performed by retrieving lexical-level associations that provide
 21 a direct route to the translation, whereas translation from L1 to L2 is more likely to en-
 22 gage concept processing and subsequent lexicalization by virtue of the strong connec-
 23 tions between L1 words and their respective meanings. The translation asymmetry is
 24 consistent with this account but can also be attributed to difficulties in accessing the
 25 phonology of the weaker L2. To provide a more critical test of the RHM, Kroll and
 26 Stewart (1994) examined the translation performance of relatively proficient
 27 Dutch–English bilinguals in contexts in which the words to be translated appeared in
 28 semantically categorized lists or in lists that were semantically mixed. If only translation
 29 from L1 to L2 engages meaning, then only translation in that direction should be
 30 influenced by the semantic organization of the list context. The results confirmed this
 31 prediction. Translation from L1 to L2 was slower in the semantically categorized lists
 32



33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45 Figure 2. The Revised Hierarchical Model (adapted from Kroll & Stewart, 1994).

1 than in the mixed lists but translation from L2 to L1 was unaffected by this manipulation.
 2 The fact that semantically categorized lists induced interference was attributed to likely
 3 competition during L2 production (see Kroll, Bobb, & Wodniecka, in press for a recent
 4 discussion of this issue).

5
 6 If conceptual processing in the L2 is a function of proficiency, then why did the
 7 Dutch–English bilinguals in the Kroll and Stewart (1994) study, who are relatively skilled
 8 speakers of English, show an asymmetry for the two directions of translation? One
 9 possibility is that the words to be translated included items that were relatively low
 10 frequency, making it more likely that the L2 would revert to reliance on the L1
 11 translation. A number of recent studies have suggested that weighting of interlanguage
 12 connections is affected not only by the proficiency of the bilingual speaker but also by
 13 the nature of the words and concepts that are translated (e.g., Francis, Tokowicz, & Kroll,
 14 2003). When a small set of items are well learned or highly practiced, even relative
 15 novices may appear to conceptually process words in the L2 (e.g., Altarriba & Mathis,
 16 1997). However, under other circumstances, the development of L2 proficiency appears
 17 to shift from reliance on lexical cross-language connections to reliance on conceptual
 18 interconnections with increasing skill (e.g., Kroll, Michael, Tokowicz, & Dufour, 2002;
 19 Talamas, Kroll, & Dufour, 1999). Although there is controversy with respect to the issue
 20 of whether highly proficient bilinguals ever revert to lexical mediation during translation
 21 (e.g., Duyck & Brysbaert, 2004; La Heij, Hooglander, Kerling, & Van der Velden, 1996),
 22 the evidence on L2 learners suggests that there is an early stage of acquisition in which
 23 L1 translations are highly active (Sunderman & Kroll, in press).

24
 25 The RHM and the earlier Concept Mediation model share an implicit assumption that
 26 once individuals achieve sufficient expertise in the L2, the L2 can function autonomously of
 27 the L1 (but see Kroll & De Groot, 1997, for a distributed model at both the lexical and **AQ2**
 28 conceptual levels). As we will see in the remainder of this chapter, it is this assumption
 29 that has been challenged in the recent literature in which cross-language activity has been
 30 observed for even highly proficient bilinguals. While no one would dispute the fact that
 31 bilinguals gain automaticity in processing the L2 with increasing skill (e.g., Segalowitz &
 32 Hulstijn, 2005), recent studies suggest that proficiency does not imply an ability to use
 33 each of the languages autonomously, as if the bilingual were functionally monolingual.
 34 However, a recent study (Sunderman & Kroll, in press) demonstrated that at the lexical
 35 level, it is the activity of the translation equivalent that changes with increasing
 36 proficiency, but not the activity of lexical form relatives. As we will review below in the
 37 section on lexical-level cross-language interaction, when bilinguals read or hear words in
 38 one language, there is activation of related information in the other language. However,
 39 what is active for proficient bilinguals is the orthographic and phonological information
 40 present in words in the two languages, not the translation equivalent itself. Thus the word
 41 *man* might be briefly activated in English when an English–Spanish bilingual reads the
 42 word *mano*, meaning hand in Spanish. These words are semantically unrelated but share
 43 similar lexical form. Sunderman and Kroll showed this type of cross-language activity
 44 occurred regardless of L2 proficiency. In contrast, activation of information related to the
 45 translation equivalent (e.g., the word *hambre*, meaning hunger in Spanish, resembles

1 *hombre*, the translation of man) occurred only for learners at relatively early stages of L2
 2 acquisition. The account provided by the RHM with respect to lexical mediation thus
 3 appears characterize the performance of learners who still depend on the L1 to access
 4 meaning and more proficient bilinguals who may revert to this strategy when the words to
 5 be translated are relatively low frequency in the L2, as seen in Kroll and Stewart (1994).
 6

7 A comprehensive bilingual model will require that distinctions be made between
 8 those aspects of cross-language representation and processing that change dynami-
 9 cally with changes in proficiency and language use, and those that reflect the way in
 10 which the linguistic structure of the bilingual's two languages imposes constraints that
 11 are relatively stable (see Kroll & Tokowicz, 2005 for a discussion of these issues).
 12 Furthermore, it will require that a principled account of the relation between sub-lex-
 13 ical, lexical, semantic, and syntactic processes. In the sections that follow we report
 14 the recent evidence at each of these levels of language processing and further consider
 15 the manner in which context and skill and modulate the observed cross-language
 16 interactions.
 17

18 **2. CROSS-LANGUAGE INTERACTIONS AT THE LEXICAL AND SUB-** 19 **LEXICAL LEVELS**

20 **2.1. The Perception of Speech in Two Languages**

21
 22
 23 A focus of contemporary psycholinguistic research on both monolinguals and bilin-
 24 guals concerns the mechanisms that allow individuals to perceive and uniquely identify
 25 the sounds and words of their languages. Indeed, one of the first tasks faced by all
 26 language learners is the identification of his/her native language(s) and all of its distinct
 27 sounds. In the earliest days of life, newborns are able to discriminate between unfamil-
 28 iar languages, particularly if these languages belong to different rhythmic classes (e.g.,
 29 Mehler et al., 1988). What about infants who are raised in multilingual environments?
 30 Recent findings suggest that bilingual infants might have enhanced language-discrimi-
 31 nation abilities. Infants raised in bilingual environments show an early ability to
 32 discriminate languages; even those that are from the same rhythmic class (Bosch &
 33 Sebastián-Gallés, 2001).
 34

35 In addition to making cross-language distinctions, young language learners must learn
 36 to identify and discriminate sounds within their native language(s). Research on
 37 monolingual language acquisition has demonstrated that within the first year of life
 38 monolingual infants are sensitive to the phonotactic patterns of their native language. For
 39 example, as early as nine months of age they are able to discriminate phonological
 40 sequences (e.g., CV structure) that conform to the regularities of the language from pat-
 41 terns that do not (e.g., Jusczyk, Goodman, & Baumann, 1999; Sebastián-Gallés & Bosch,
 42 2002). How do the early sensitivities of infants exposed to multiple languages compare
 43 to those of infants raised in monolingual contexts? Recent evidence suggests that infants
 44 who are exposed simultaneously to two languages develop phonotactic sensitivities at the
 45 same rate as monolinguals. More interestingly, the degree of this sensitivity increases as

1 a function of the relative exposure to a given language; thus even at this early stage of life
2 infants' perceptual abilities can reflect a perceptual dominance for the language to which
3 they are most often exposed (Sebastián-Gallés & Bosch, 2002). This perceptual domi-
4 nance of one language over another has been shown to persist into adulthood. It has been
5 found that even highly proficient bilinguals apply one set of segmentation rules exclu-
6 sively from the language to which they were most often exposed when parsing speech
7 (e.g., Cutler, Mehler, Norris, & Seguí, 1989).
8

9 During the early months of life, infants are also developing cognitive representations
10 of the different sounds or phonemes that make up their native language (Kuhl, Williams,
11 Lacerda, & Stevens, 1992; Marean, Werner, & Kuhl, 1992; Werker & Lalonde, 1988).
12 The perceptual system is quite flexible, allowing very young infants to make non-native
13 phonemic contrasts. Remarkably, within just 6–12 months of age, there is a significant
14 re-organization in which perceptual processes become specifically tuned to the native
15 language and infants' ability to discriminate non-native phonemic contrasts diminishes
16 (Werker & Lalonde, 1988). With increasing age and linguistic exposure, this language-
17 specific tuning acts as a filter through which a non-native language is perceived. As a
18 consequence, two phonemes that are contrastive within a second or less familiar language
19 may be perceived as the same phoneme if the L1 does not distinguish between these
20 sounds. For example, adult native Japanese speakers often have great difficulty in distin-
21 guishing between the /r/ and /l/ English phonemes, which are not contrastive in Japanese
22 and both phonemes tend to be perceived as /l/.
23

24 This L1 filtering effect has been observed even for highly proficient bilinguals who
25 have had long lifetime experiences and seemingly equal command of both languages
26 (e.g., Pallier, Colomé, & Sebastián-Gallés, 2001; Pallier, Bosch, & Sebastián-Gallés,
27 1997; Sebastián-Gallés, Echeverría, & Bosch, 2005). For example, highly proficient
28 Spanish–Catalan speakers performing an auditory lexical decision in their L2 showed
29 repetition priming for Catalan words that differed only by a single vowel contrast that
30 does not exist in Spanish. These priming effects suggested that the bilinguals were
31 perceiving the minimal pairs as the same entity. A separate group of Catalan-dominant
32 bilinguals did not show these priming effects. These results were particularly remark-
33 able since the two bilingual groups were both early bilinguals who were living in the
34 same city and had received the same bilingual education. Indeed, the Spanish-domi-
35 nant group was distinguished based only on the fact that they had been raised in
36 Spanish monolingual homes during their earliest childhood prior to entering school
37 (Pallier et al., 2001).
38

39 However, it is important to note that the perceptual system does not ever completely
40 lose its ability to perceive new phonemes and distinguish new contrasts. Furthermore,
41 non-native speakers vary greatly in their ability to discriminate L2 contrasts (e.g.,
42 Strange, 1995). The relative ease with which non-native phonemes are perceived and
43 contrasted depends critically on several factors, including the phonetic similarity of the
44 native and non-native languages and the age at which the second language was acquired
45 (e.g., Flege, 1995).

2.2. Recognizing Words in Two Languages when they are Read or Spoken

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

The studies reviewed thus far highlight the ways in which the acquisition of a native language has a fundamental and long-lasting effect on how the sub-lexical and lexical units of a new language are perceived and acquired. There is also evidence for cross-language interactions that occur during the online comprehension of language, and there is now a large body of literature demonstrating that when recognizing words bilinguals activate lexical and sub-lexical units from both of their languages in parallel (e.g., Dijkstra et al., 1999; Dijkstra et al., 2000; Jared & Kroll, 2001; Ju & Luce, 2004; Marian & Spivey, 2003; Van Heuven et al., 1998).

Many of the studies that have looked at these online interactions have focused on visual word recognition tasks such as lexical decision and naming. The general strategy has consisted of presenting bilinguals with words in one language that share some lexical property or properties with words from their other language. For example, in a lexical decision task bilinguals may be presented with non-words (blart) and two types of words: Words that share lexical form and meaning with the non-target language (e.g., the cognate *piano* in English and Spanish) or control words that do not share any lexical property with the non-target language (e.g., *pencil*). One can then compare the bilinguals' word recognition performance, in terms of latency and/or accuracy, for these critical words relative to control words that do not share lexical properties (e.g., *pencil* in English and Spanish). If bilinguals are able to selectively activate a single language during word recognition, then whether the word shares lexical properties with the non-target language should be of no consequence. If, on the other hand, there is parallel activation of both languages then the processing time and/or accuracy of performance should differ from control words.

The evidence has consistently demonstrated that bilingual word recognition involves the parallel, non-language-selective activation of both languages. For example, the processing of cognates is consistently facilitated relative to non-cognate control words across a wide variety of tasks including translation (Kroll & Stewart, 1994); word association (Van Hell & De Groot, 1998) and lexical decision (Dijkstra, Van Jaarsveld, & Ten Brinke, 1998). In translation, it is perhaps not surprising to find cognate facilitation because both languages are required to be active. However, in within-language lexical decision, it should be possible to function selectively, yet even under these circumstances there are robust effects of the non-target language. Cognate facilitation is obtained when bilinguals perform visual lexical decision in their native language with no expectation that the L2 will be used, suggesting that these effects are not simply a reflection of the stronger L1 influencing the weaker L2 (e.g., Van Hell & Dijkstra, 2002). Furthermore, evidence of non-selectivity persists irrespective of the surrounding language context, task instructions, or participant expectations to process one or multiple languages (Dijkstra, Timmermans, & Schriefers, 2000; Dijkstra & Van Hell, 2003).


It is important to note that the nature of the effects of non-selective activation depends on the relative match of the lexical codes (orthographic, phonological, and semantic)

1 across languages. While cognate facilitation has been observed across a variety of
2 different tasks, the effects of inter-lingual findings regarding interlingual homographs,
3 words that share form but not semantics (e.g., *fin* in Spanish means “end”) have not been
4 nearly as consistent. Some studies have demonstrated inhibitory effects associated with
5 homograph status (Dijkstra et al., 1998; Jared & Szucs, 2002; Von Studnitz & Green,
6 2002), while others have failed to find any effects at all (Dijkstra et al., 1998; Gerard &
7 Scarborough, 1989). Furthermore, the specific nature of homograph effects, whether they
8 are inhibitory or facilitative in nature has varied as a consequence of differences in task
9 demands, the salience of the non-target language, and the relative frequency of the ho-
10 mographs’ lexical representations across languages (Dijkstra et al., 2000a; Dijkstra et al.,
11 2000b; Dijkstra et al., 1998).

12
13 In a recent study, Schwartz, Kroll, and Diaz (in press) found further evidence that
14 bilingual lexical processing of cognates is influenced by the relative match in ortho-
15 graphic and phonological codes across languages. In that study, English–Spanish bilin-
16 guals named cognates (e.g., *piano*) and non-cognate control words (e.g., *lapiz/pencil*)
17 in their L1 and L2. The cognates were classified according to the relative orthographic
18 and phonological similarity across English and Spanish. To illustrate, the
19 English–Spanish cognate *base* maps on to very distinct pronunciations ([bas] vs.
20 [báse]) and was classified as +O–P, whereas *piano* is pronounced much more simi-
21 larly ([piæ’nou] vs. [pi’a’no]) and was classified as +O+P. The authors predicted that
22 in the presence of highly similar orthography (e.g., *piano/piano*; *basel/base*), the acti-
23 vation of the cross-language phonological representations would be particularly strong.
24 When these representations were more distinct (e.g., [bas] vs. [báse]) the resulting
25 competition would inhibit performance. The findings supported this prediction, the
26 +O+P cognates (e.g., *piano*) were named faster and more accurately than the +O–P
27 cognates (e.g., *base*) in both the L1 and L2 of the participants. This suggests that not
28 only is lexical access non-selective across bilinguals’ two languages, but that the sub-
29 tle interactions between the activated codes determine the manner in which cross-lan-
30 guage competition is manifest.

31
32 The studies reviewed above all focused on cross-language activation that occurs dur-
33 ing the recognition of visually presented words. In these studies, effects of cross-lan-
34 guage activation may have been particularly robust since the visual input (i.e., a string of
35 letters) can be completely language neutral (e.g., *fin* in English and Spanish), at least in
36 the case in which languages share the same script. It should be noted that cross-language
37 activation has also been observed for words that are not identical. For example, the iden-
38 tification of cross-language neighbors, words that share all but one letter across lan-
39 guages (e.g., *cinel/dine* in Spanish and English), has been shown to be slower and more
40 error-prone relative to control words in lexical decision (Van Heuven et al., 1998) and
41 naming (Jared & Kroll, 2001). There is also facilitation for recognizing cognates even
42 when the cognates are non-identical (Van Hell & Dijkstra, 2002). Furthermore, there is
43 evidence that even when the languages do not share the same script (e.g., Hebrew and
44 English or Chinese and English), cross-language priming effects can be observed (e.g.,
45 Gollan, Forster, & Frost, 1997; Jiang, 1999).

1 Parallel activation of information in each of the bilingual's languages during visual
 2 word recognition has been modeled in a variant of McClelland and Rumelhart's (1981)
 3 Interactive Activation model for monolingual word recognition called the Bilingual
 4 Interactive Activation model, or BIA (Dijkstra et al., 1998). The model is shown in
 5 Figure 3. Like the monolingual model, BIA assumes that there is parallel activation of
 6
 7
 8
 9



45 Figure 3. The Bilingual Interactive Activation Model (adapted from Dijkstra et al., 1998).

1 letter features, letters, and words, with information similar to the input string activated to
2 some degree and producing competition across alternative candidates. However, unlike
3 the monolingual model, BIA includes a layer of language nodes which serve to represent
4 the top-down contextual biases and subsequently inhibit the bottom-up activation of the
5 non-target language. In this scheme, the inhibitory effects occur relatively late in
6 processing, once the initial components of word recognition are set in motion for all possible
7 solutions in either of the bilingual's two languages. BIA has been implemented as
8 a computer model and does an excellent job of simulating bilingual word recognition
9 performance under conditions in which the words to be recognized differ in their within
10 and across-language orthographic properties (Van Heuven et al., 1998). At the end of the
11 chapter, we describe an updated version of the BIA model that includes phonology and
12 semantics as well as orthography, and also makes some different assumptions about the
13 way in which language selection is controlled.
14

15 The observation of parallel activity across the two languages during visual word recog-
16 nition does not necessarily suggest that similar cross-language activation occurs during au-
17 ditory processing of the speech signal. Since languages differ in their component sounds
18 it can be argued that within the speech signal there are language-specific cues that are not
19 as readily available within printed text. There have been a few studies that have examined
20 cross-language interaction during speech processing. In a seminal study, Spivey and
21 Marian (1999) asked Russian–English bilinguals to view an array of objects as they listened
22 to instructions in either their L1 or L2 which indicated an object that they should select
23 (e.g., “pick up the marker”). On critical trials the instructions indicated a target object
24 whose phonological onset was the same as that of another object *in the non-target lan-*
25 *guage* (e.g., “stamp” in Russian is “marka”). To test whether the non-target lexical repre-
26 sentation of the object was activated, the authors monitored the bilinguals' eye-movements
27 as they surveyed the array of objects and listened to the instructions. When the instructions
28 indicated an object whose phonological onset was shared across languages, participants
29 initially looked toward the object that shared this onset in the non-target language. This in-
30 dicated that upon hearing the initial, shared phoneme, the bilinguals activated lexical candi-
31 dates from both of their languages (and see Marian & Spivey, 2003).
32

33 Using a very different paradigm, Colomé (2001) found converging evidence that bilin-
34 guals activate phonemic representations from both languages in a non-selective manner.
35 In that study highly proficient Spanish–Catalan bilinguals performed a phoneme moni-
36 toring task in their L2, in which they decided whether the name of a visually presented
37 picture (e.g., a table) contained a target phoneme (e.g., /m/). On critical trials, the
38 bilinguals had to reject phonemes that were not part of the Catalan name (e.g., /m/ is not
39 present in the Catalan word *taula*) but *were* part of the contextually irrelevant Spanish
40 translation of that object (e.g., *mesa*). The bilinguals took significantly longer to reject
41 phonemes contained in the Spanish translation relative to phonemes that were not part of
42 the picture's name in either language (e.g., /s/).
43

44 Subsequent studies have demonstrated that aspects of the linguistic input itself may
45 make it possible to constrain the parallel activation of the non-target language when
processing spoken language. Weber and Cutler (2004), testing Dutch–English bilinguals

1 with an eye-tracking paradigm very similar to Marian and Spivey (2003), found signifi-
 2 cant cross-language effects from the L1 to the L2 (i.e., when bilinguals were processing
 3 the spoken targets in the non-native language) but not from the L2 to L1. Likewise, Ju
 4 and Luce (2004) replicated the basic pattern of cross-language phonological competitor
 5 effects, but then went on to demonstrate that cross-language competitor activation could
 6 be eliminated when the VOTs of the initial phonemes were spoken like the L1. That is, **AQ3**
 7 L2 competitors were no longer activated when the target words were perceived to be
 8 native-like speech. These results contrast with results from experiments using written stim-
 9 uli and illustrate the critical role that access codes play in the activation of lexical and
 10 sub-lexical representations in bilingual language comprehension.

11
 12

13 **2.3. Cross-Language Lexical Access in Context**

14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22

Two types of studies have examined cross-language influences on lexical access in
 context. One adapts the standard semantic priming paradigm (e.g., Meyer &
 Schvaneveldt, 1971) to ask whether semantically related words prime target words when
 the primes and targets appear in different languages. The other asks whether the parallel
 activation of lexical alternatives in both languages is modulated by the presence of sen-
 tence context and whether lexical access within each language is open to the semantic
 and syntactic influences of sentence context in the other language. We consider briefly
 the evidence from each of these areas of research.

23
 24
 25

23 *2.3.1. Semantic context*


26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45

Early research on the bilingual lexicon used the semantic priming paradigm as a means
 to test the independence of representations across the bilingual's two languages (e.g.,
 McCormack, 1977; Snodgrass, 1984). In semantic priming, a prime word is typically pre-
 sented briefly and then followed by a target word for lexical decision. When the prime
 word is semantically related to the target word, lexical decision time is facilitated relative
 to conditions in which the prime is unrelated to the target (Meyer & Schvaneveldt, 1971).
 A series of studies using variants of the semantic priming paradigm (e.g., Altarriba, 1990;
 Chen & Ng, 1989; De Groot & Nas, 1991; Kirsner, Smith, Lockhart, King, & Jain, 1984;
 Meyer & Ruddy, 1974; Schwanenflugel & Rey, 1986; Tzelgov & Eben-Ezra, 1992)
 demonstrated that it was possible to observe semantic priming across as well as within lan-
 guages. The result of these studies suggested that bilinguals access semantic representa-
 tions that are shared across the two languages (and see Dufour & Kroll, 1995, for related
 evidence from a categorization paradigm). Although some of these studies attempted to
 control the methodology of the priming paradigm to ensure that any observed priming
 could be attributed to automatic processes, many of the early studies can be criticized on
 methodological grounds because they included a high proportion of related trials and a
 long interstimulus interval between prime and target words that may have encouraged sub-
 jects to develop expectations for the upcoming targets (see Neely, 1991). The use of long
 prime-to-target intervals in the bilingual experiments is particularly problematic because
 in some of these experiments subjects may have been encouraged to translate the prime
 and/or target into the same language. If primes can be translated, even on a small

1 proportion of trials, then the observed cross-language effects may reflect only the presence
 2 of within-language priming in the cross-language conditions.

3
 4 Subsequent cross-language semantic priming studies attempted to control for these
 5 factors with the result that cross-language priming was obtained but only under some
 6 conditions. For example, using a masked priming paradigm (see Figure 4 for an illustration)
 7 (in which participants cannot consciously report the prime information and are
 8 therefore not even aware of the bilingual nature of the task, De Groot and Nas (1991)
 9 found evidence for cross-language associative priming only when translation equivalents
 10 in the two languages were cognates, sharing lexical form as well as meaning. Keatley,
 11 Spinks, and De Gelder (1994) reported that even when bilinguals are highly proficient in
 12 both languages there are asymmetries in the magnitude of semantic priming, with signif-
 13 icant facilitation only with L1 primes and L2 targets (see also Altarriba, 1990, and
 14 Tzelgov & Eben-Ezra, 1992).

15
 16 Recent studies of cross-language priming have reported mixed results with respect to
 17 the conditions under which priming is observed. On one hand, a series of masked priming
 18 studies (e.g., Gollan et al., 1997; Jiang, 1999) has shown that cross-language priming
 19 is observed in lexical decision for translation equivalents even when the two languages
 20 involved do not use the same script (Hebrew–English and Chinese–English), but is only
 21 consistently reliable with L1 primes and L2 targets (and see Grainger & Frenck-Mestre,
 22 1998, for evidence that priming is observed in semantic categorization but not in lexical
 23 decision). Finding cross-language masked priming is particularly striking because
 24 participants are unaware of the prime words. When experiments are designed so that the
 25 language of target words is blocked, the experiment can be functionally performed in
 26 “monolingual mode” (Grosjean, 2001), thus reducing the likelihood that a translation
 27



28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42 Figure 4. Schematic illustration of the masked priming procedure. In this example, a Spanish prime
 43 word (*justo* meaning “just”) is preceded and followed by a forward and backward visual mask. An
 44 English target word (*just*) is then presented. The combination of the brief presentation of the prime
 45 word in addition to the masking stimuli minimizes conscious processing of the prime word.

1 strategy can account for the observed priming. However, other studies suggest that there
2 are limits to the degree of cross-language priming that reflect constraints in the nature of
3 bilingual language representations attributable to the age at which individuals acquired
4 the L2 (e.g., Kotz & Elston-Güttler, 2004; Silverberg & Samuel, 2004) and the amount
5 and kind of semantic information that is accessed for each language (e.g., Finkbeiner,
6 Forster, Nicol, & Nakamura, 2004; Kotz & Elston-Güttler, 2004). The constraints ob-
7 served in cross-language priming also appear to reflect the degree of proficiency in the
8 L2. For example, Kotz and Elston-Güttler found that late L2 learners were able to exploit
9 associative but not categorical relatedness, whereas early bilinguals were able to use both
10 types of information. Although the earlier research was largely compatible with a model
11 of the lexicon in which the two languages access the same semantic information (see
12 Francis, 2005, for a review), the recent studies support a mixed model in which some
13 semantic information is shared and other semantic information is distinct (see De Groot,
14 1993, and Van Hell, 1998, for models of partly shared cross-language semantics). It re-
15 mains to be seen to what extent the type of bilingualism determines the ability to acquire
16 all of the subtle nuances of meaning in the L2 that are available in the highly skilled L1
17 (see Segalowitz & Hulstijn, 2005, for a discussion of issues of automaticity in the L2).

18
19
20

2.3.2. *Sentence context*

21 The findings from research on both auditory speech and text comprehension are com-
22 patible with a fairly open lexical system in which information activation flows across
23 both languages. However, as mentioned previously, most of these findings stem from
24 studies in which stimuli were presented in fairly de-contextualized conditions, such as
25 single-word naming and lexical decision. Is the cross-language flow of activation at all
26 constrained when there is a context such as a sentence that provides additional semantic
27 information? To date there have been very few studies that have addressed this question
28 directly (Elston-Güttler, 2000; Greenberg & Saint-Aubin, 2004; Schwartz & Kroll, 2006;
29 Van Hell, 1998). Findings from these studies suggest that cross-language activation can
30 be indeed constrained by the presence of a sentence context, allowing the system to
31 operate in a more language-selective manner. For example, both Schwartz and Kroll
32 (2006) and Van Hell (1998) found that although lexical access for cognates was facili-
33 tated in low-constraint sentences, this facilitation was eliminated when the same cognates
34 were in high-constraint sentences.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

What is the mechanism that allows processing to proceed in a more language-selective manner in high-constraint sentences? According to Schwanenflugel and colleagues (e.g., Schwanenflugel, 1991; Schwanenflugel & LaCount, 1988; Schwanenflugel & Shoben, 1985; but cf. Traxler & Foss, 2000), sentence constraint influences lexical activation through a set of feature restrictions that readers generate as they comprehend sentences. With increasing constraint, an increasing number of restrictions are generated. Lexical entries that conflict with these constrictions are inhibited. Thus, in the bilingual case increasing sentence constraint would lead to the generation of language-specific lexical feature restrictions which would inhibit lexical entries from the non-target language. Support for this account was observed in an eye-movement monitoring

1 study of Spanish–English bilinguals’ reading of code-switched sentences (Altarriba,
 2 Kroll, Sholl, & Rayner, 1996). The eye-movements of Spanish–English bilinguals were
 3 monitored as they read high-and low-constraint sentences in English. On half of the tri-
 4 als, one word in each sentence was a code-switched word from the non-target language,
 5 Spanish [e.g., He wanted to deposit all of his dinero (money) in the credit union].
 6 Critically, this code-switched word was either a high-frequency word or a low-fre-
 7 quency word in Spanish. Analyses of the first fixation durations on the code-switched
 8 words revealed an interaction between sentence constraint and word frequency, such
 9 that fixation durations were elevated in high-constraint sentences when the code-
 10 switched word was of a high lexical frequency. This suggests that the participants gen-
 11 erated both semantic and lexical-level feature restrictions when reading high constraint
 12 sentences. That is, when presented with the high frequency, code-switched word (e.g.,
 13 *dinero*), processing was inhibited because the word met all of the semantic but not the
 14 lexical feature restrictions. However, it should be noted that effects of sentence con-
 15 straint appear to operate at a later point, once processes of initial lexical access have
 16 been completed (Greenberg & Saint-Aubin, 2004). In other words, the studies to date
 17 cannot rule out an initial non-selective activation of lexical candidates from the non-tar-
 18 get language followed by a subsequent inhibition.

19
 20 An interesting feature of the results on the effects of sentence context, is that a similar
 21 pattern has been observed in studies that have examined the effects of non-linguistic
 22 factors on cross-language activation, such as instructions, expectations, and working
 23 memory resources (e.g., De Bruijn et al., 2001; Dijkstra et al., 2000; Michael, Dijkstra,
 24 & Kroll, 2006; Van Hell & Dijkstra, 2002). Just as the results on sentence context sug-
 25 gest that knowing the language of the sentence has little effect on constraining lexical al-
 26 ternatives in the non-target language, the effects of single word context or expectations
 27 appear not to restrict the influence of the other language, at least for the recognition of
 28 visually presented words.

31 3. CROSS-LANGUAGE INTERACTIONS AT THE SENTENCE LEVEL

32
 33 Far fewer studies have examined sentence processing in bilinguals relative to the sub-
 34 stantial literature on word recognition and lexical processing. Much of the research on
 35 sentence processing in non-native speakers has focused on issues of acquisition, asking
 36 either to what extent access to the grammar of the L2 is mediated by transfer from the
 37 more highly skilled L1 (e.g., MacWhinney, 1997, 2005) or by the age of acquiring the L2
 38 (e.g., Hahne & Friederici, 2001; Johnson & Newport, 1989; Weber-Fox & Neville, 1996).
 39 Only a small number of studies have addressed the issue of how language-specific con-
 40 straints and biases in one of the bilingual’s languages affect processing in the other lan-
 41 guage (for recent reviews, see Frenck-Mestre, 2005; Kroll & Dussias, 2004).

42
 43 Although there is a rich history in psycholinguistics of using cross-linguistic evidence
 44 to assess the universality of language processing mechanisms (e.g., Bates, Devescovi, &
 45 Wulfeck, 2001; Cuetos & Mitchell, 1988; Vigliocco, Hartsuiker, Jarema, & Kolk, 1996)

1 only a small number of studies have asked directly how sentence processing is accom-
2 modated to the presence of two languages. Two types of experiments have been
3 conducted to address these issues. In one, grammatical constructions that differ across
4 language are the focus. The question is then how the bilingual resolves the potential con-
5 flict between the two alternatives in one and the same mind (e.g., Dussias, 2001, 2003;
6 Fernández, 1998, 2003; Frenck-Mestre, 2005). In the other, a priming paradigm has been
7 used to determine whether structural repetitions that typically facilitate performance
8 within language, also facilitate performance across languages (e.g., Hartsuiker,
9 Pickering, & Veltkamp, 2004; Loebell & Bock, 2003).

10
11

12 **3.1. Cross-Language Parsing**

13
14

15 If a bilingual's two languages follow different syntactic arrangements and if those dif-
16 ferences give rise to distinct parsing preferences, then bilingualism potentially poses a
17 problem for language processing if the two languages are not represented and accessed
18 independently. A number of solutions to this problem are available in theory. One possi-
19 bility is that the two languages are treated independently and the parsing preferences
20 associated with each language are engaged appropriately as a function of the language
21 context. As the literature on bilingual word recognition makes clear, there is very little
22 evidence at the lexical level that the two languages function independently. Although it
23 might seem that at the level of the grammar it might be easier to separate the two lan-
24 guages, our brief review of sentence context effects on lexical processing suggests that
25 bilinguals do not use the language of a sentence itself as a strong cue to differentiate the
26 two languages. As we will discuss later, bilinguals are also prepared to code switch with
27 other similarly bilingual individuals and to understand code-switched utterances, sug-
28 gesting the grammars of both languages are available and engaged.

29
30

31 A second solution to the problem is to bias parsing toward the native or more domi-
32 nant language. This is a solution that has been discussed in detail in the literature on
33 second language acquisition where there is a great deal of empirical support for transfer
34 from the L1 to the L2 (e.g., see MacWhinney, 1997, 2005 for an illustration of this
35 approach embodied within the Competition Model). However, even a strong transfer
36 account such as the Competition Model includes a developmental component whereby
37 successful L2 learners eventually acquire the cues for the weaker L2. The degree of trans-
38 fer will depend on the relative proficiency of the bilinguals, with greater L1 influence for
39 less than for more proficient bilinguals.

40
41

42 A third solution to the problem is to assume that the bilingual develops a set of pars-
43 ing strategies that are uniquely bilingual, in that they represent a mix of the preferences
44 used within each language by native speakers. This is an instance of Grosjean's (1989)
45 well-known admonition that the bilingual is not two monolinguals in one. Recent studies
46 of linguistic convergence (e.g., Bullock & Toribio, 2004; Malt & Sloman, 2003) provide
47 support for the claim that language contact produces a pattern of language use that is dis-
48 tinctly bilingual at all levels of linguistic description.

1 Although research on bilingual parsing is at an early stage of investigation, recent find-
2 ings suggest that although it is sometimes possible for advanced L2 learners and profi-
3 cient bilinguals to acquire native-like parsing preferences for the L2 (e.g., Frenck-Mestre
4 & Pynte, 1997), they may also be slower to process L2 than L1 sentences (e.g., Hoover
5 & Dwivedi, 1998), and more likely to recruit additional working memory resources (e.g.,
6 Hasegawa, Carpenter, & Just, 2002; Miyake & Friedman, 1998). What is not yet clear
7 within this emerging body of research is whether the demands on working memory are
8 related to the presence of structural differences between the bilingual's two languages.
9 That is, it may be more difficult to acquire a new form in L2 when it does not exist in the
10 L1 or when the L1 requires distinctions that are not functional in the L2 (e.g., see Juffs,
11 1998 for an illustration of how otherwise proficient L2 speakers may be limited by these
12 cross-language distinctions in the case of causative-inchoative constructions, and Jiang
13 (2004), who shows that highly proficient Chinese-English bilinguals are restricted in
14 their ability to comprehend subject-verb agreement in their L2 in an online task although
15 they are able to recognize the correct English forms in an offline measure).

16
17 The experiments on sentence parsing that are perhaps most critical to a model of bilin-
18 gual comprehension are those in which structural preferences in the two languages are in
19 conflict. For example, Dussias (2001, 2003) has examined the resolution of such a cross-
20 language conflict in the case of attachment preferences for temporally ambiguous sen-
21 tences containing a relative clause. Dussias (2003) uses the sentence below to illustrate
22 how native speakers of English and Spanish make distinct structural commitments.

23
24 Peter fell in love with the daughter of the psychologist who studied in California.

25
26 Native speakers of English prefer to attach the relative clause, *who studied in*
27 *California*, to the immediately preceding noun, *psychologist*. Thus, in response to the
28 question, "Who studied in California?" a native English speaker would respond, the "psy-
29 chologist." This preference has been called low attachment (e.g., Frazier & Rayner,
30 1982). In contrast, native Spanish speakers prefer high attachment, so their answer to the
31 same question would be, "the daughter" (but see also Gilboy, Sopena, Clifton, & Frazier,
32 1995). Carreiras, Salillas, and Barber (2004) recently provided evidence for the high-at-
33 tachment preferences of native monolingual Spanish readers in an ERP study. They found
34 a P600 effect, typically observed in ERP studies of sentence processing in response to a
35 syntactic violation, when Spanish readers processed a sentence that was consistent with
36 low attachment, contrary to their ordinary bias. What happens when both languages are
37 available to highly proficient bilinguals? Dussias reports that Spanish-English bilinguals
38 prefer the low-attachment strategy even when they are reading in Spanish, their native
39 language. That is, the preference for high attachment appears to change once a high level
40 of proficiency is achieved in the L2 (i.e., English). Like the results reviewed earlier on
41 bilingual word recognition, these findings suggest that not only does the L1 affect the L2,
42 but the L2 can come to influence the L1, even at the level of the grammar. Dussias con-
43 sideres the possibility that the dramatic shift to low attachment for the native Spanish
44 speaking bilinguals may be due to nature of their exposure to English in a predominantly
45 English-speaking environment in the US. A critical question, and one currently under

1 investigation, is whether the frequency of exposure to the L2 or proficiency in the L2 per
2 se is the key factor determining this pattern of performance.

3
4 A summary of the results on bilingual sentence parsing at this early stage in the
5 research program suggests that almost all of the possible outcomes can be obtained.
6 Bilinguals can sometimes adopt L2 structures as if they were native speakers of the L2,
7 but in other contexts they are influenced by transfer from the L1 or the L1 itself is mod-
8 ified by the use of the L2. A clear goal in the next stage of research will be to identify the
9 range of factors that modulates these different patterns and particularly the linguistic
10 constraints associated with each outcome. There are a number of existing results that are
11 apparently conflicting and the resolution of these differences will be important to the
12 development of a comprehensive model of bilingual sentence processing. For example,
13 the studies that have examined the effects of age of acquisition on sensitivity to syntax in
14 the L2 (e.g., Hahne & Friederici, 2002; Johnson & Newport, 1989; Weber-Fox & Neville,
15 1996), suggest that there is a limit to the extent that late second language learners can
16 fully acquire the syntax of the L2, even those who are highly proficient in the L2 and have
17 lived in the L2 environment for many years. However, the bilinguals in the studies we
18 have reported typically acquired their L2 late and yet were able to adopt native-like
19 processing preferences in the L2 or, even more dramatically, to have the L1 take on the
20 properties of the L2. It remains to be seen whether the degree of constraint in L2 sentence
21 processing is determined by the type of structures that have been examined, by the degree
22 of proficiency of the bilinguals, a factor that is difficult to assess perfectly, or by other
23 contextual factors that influence the degree to which the native language is maintained
24 actively when bilinguals live in an L2 environment. However these issues are resolved,
25 however, the fact that it is possible to demonstrate that the L2 can influence the L1 is
26 again consistent with the view that the bilingual's two languages are open to interactions
27 and that some of those interactions may have long-term consequences.

28 29 **3.2. Cross-Language Syntactic Priming**

30
31 Although most syntactic priming studies examine production rather than comprehen-
32 sion, we describe the main results of these studies briefly because those results converge
33 closely with the evidence reviewed above on parsing. Syntactic priming is the phenome-
34 non whereby the production of a target sentence is influenced by the syntactic form of a
35 previously produced prime sentence (Bock, 1986). For example, for a monolingual
36 speaker of English, the probability of producing a sentence describing a picture in active
37 vs. passive voice is a function of whether a spoken prime sentence is active or passive. In
38 the bilingual research, the question has been whether a switch of language, and therefore
39 syntax, from prime to target sentence, will disrupt priming relative to the monolingual
40 case. The few studies that have examined cross-language syntactic priming have reported
41 effects of priming that are very similar to those found within language, suggesting that
42 there is a common basis for this effect across languages (e.g., Hartsuiker et al., 2004),
43 although there are some suggestions as well that the range of priming may be more lim-
44 ited across than within languages (e.g., Loebell & Bock, 2003). Recent work has shown
45 that structural priming can be observed in cases in which lexical priming alone cannot

1 account for the results and that lower frequency or less-dominant structures are more sus-
2 ceptible to priming (e.g., Scheepers, 2003). In the cross-language case, this means that
3 syntactic priming will be more likely from L1 to L2, the more dominant to the less-dom-
4 inant language (Flett, Branigan, Pickering, & Sorace, 2005). Hartsuiker et al. argue that
5 the syntactic representations computed for each of the bilingual's two languages access
6 the same abstract information, rendering the syntactic level integrated across languages
7 and open to code switching, the topic to which we turn next.
8
9

10 **3.3. Other Approaches to Bilingual Sentence Processing**

11 *3.3.1. Understanding code-switched sentences*

12
13 A surprising gap in the literature on bilingual sentence processing is that very few stud-
14 ies have investigated the comprehension of spoken code switches between languages.
15 Code switching is a phenomenon common within bilingual communities. However, most
16 of the research on this topic has been conducted from a linguistic rather than psycholin-
17 guistic perspective, with the goal to elucidate the syntactic constraints that govern
18 allowable switches (e.g., Muysken, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 2002). The few studies that
19 have examined the consequences of code switching for language processing have focused
20 on processes occurring primarily at the lexical level rather than the syntactic level. A
21 number of studies have examined lexical-level code switching while bilinguals read sen-
22 tences (e.g., Altarriba et al., 1996; Moreno, Federmeier, & Kutas, 2002). Although lan-
23 guage switching in comprehension tasks is an interesting phenomenon in and of itself for
24 what it tells us about how effectively bilinguals can use expectations about the language
25 they are processing to control subsequent language selection (e.g., Thomas & Allport,
26 2000), it can be argued that mixed language presentations during reading are rare,
27 whereas code switches in spoken discourse are common. It would therefore seem critical
28 to investigate this issue in spoken language contexts. Again, the few studies that have
29 examined code switches in speech, have also focused at the lexical level. To illustrate,
30 a number of experiments have asked how bilinguals comprehend a guest word spoken in
31 the non-target language (i.e., not in the language of a preceding sentence context). The
32 results of these studies support the conclusions of the word recognition research reviewed
33 earlier in showing that information about the non-target language is available even during
34 sentence processing, but demonstrate that the scope of activation of non-target alterna-
35 tives is constrained to some degree by cues available to the listener (e.g., Li, 1996;
36 Grosjean, 1988; Soares & Grosjean, 1984). An interesting observation is that code
37 switches in written sentence contexts are in some respects less disruptive to reading than
38 within-language lexical switches. Moreno et al. (2002) showed that the typical N400
39 effect observed in the ERP record when a lexical violation is encountered is greater when
40 within-language synonyms are presented than when a cross-language translation appears.
41 One interpretation of this result is that code switching is a relatively natural phenomenon,
42 a conclusion that is compatible with the high degree of parallel activity observed across
43 languages. It will be critical in the next phase of research to begin to examine syntactic-
44 level constraints in the online comprehension of code switches, particularly under cir-
45 cumstances in which the bilingual's two languages differ syntactically.

3.3.2. *Reading for translation*

A final area of research in which sentence processing has been examined in bilinguals concerns the processes that are engaged when a translator is comprehending a sentence in one language for the purpose of producing it in the other language. The processes that support proficient translators in achieving real time simultaneous translation and interpretation are fascinating in and of themselves because they represent an extraordinary feat of cognition (see Christoffels & De Groot, 2005 for a recent review of the psycholinguistics of translation and interpretation). For present purposes, the question of interest with respect to translation, is how incoming material is comprehended as a function of how it will be used. Earlier research on sentence comprehension within the native language (e.g., Aaronson & Ferres, 1986) has shown that comprehension strategies are adapted to the goals of the task. Macizo and Bajo (in press) showed that when translators read for the purpose of translation, there is activation of information in the target language to be spoken during the comprehension process. When they read only for the subsequent task of repeating what they have read, there is little evidence of cross-language activation. These results suggest that task goals influence the degree to which both languages are active. Of particular interest is that translation makes greater demands on working memory resources than simple reading and those demands are reflected during the comprehension process, prior to actual production. One implication of the findings with translators is that the degree to which the other language is required in the larger discourse context appears to influence sensitivity to both languages during initial comprehension (see Grosjean, 2001 for a related argument about language mode). For translators, that context may be the likelihood of having to produce the currently processed sentence in the other language. For ordinary bilinguals, it may be related to the likelihood that they will interact with other bilinguals who are likely to switch into the other language completely or in part in code switched exchanges.

4. FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE BILINGUAL COMPREHENSION

In each area of research reviewed above, we focused on the performance of highly proficient bilinguals. However, comprehension is also open to the influence of a variety of factors that are likely to modulate performance. One factor includes the individual differences that affect the cognitive resources that are available to be recruited during language processing (see Perfetti, this volume for a review of this work within the native language). As we noted in the review of research on bilingual sentence processing, a great deal of evidence suggests that the L2 makes greater demands on memory and attention than the L1, even for relatively skilled bilinguals (e.g., Miyake & Friedman, 1998).

Another factor is the similarity between the two languages. Languages differ syntactically, morphologically, and phonologically and those differences are likely to affect the ease of cross-language comprehension in both listening and reading. In reading, languages also differ with respect to whether they are alphabetic and use the same or a

1 different script. A Dutch–English bilingual may easily mistake a written word in English
2 for Dutch, but a Chinese–English bilingual will never make that mistake. Although
3 differences across languages at each level modulate the pattern of processing (e.g.,
4 MacWhinney, 1997; Thomas & Allport, 2000; Vaid & Frenck-Mestre, 2002), there is
5 very little evidence that suggests that once an individual becomes relatively proficient in
6 the L2 they restrict the degree of cross-language interaction at either the lexical, sub-lex-
7 ical, or sentence levels or serve as a cue to maintain greater separation across the bilin-
8 9
9 gual’s two languages.

10 If language status does not readily enable language selection, then how do profi-
11 12
12 cient bilinguals effectively use the intended language without frequent intrusions from
13 the unintended language? In this chapter, we have focused our review on comprehen-
14 sion but there is also a recent literature on bilingual production that demonstrates that
15 language non-selectivity is not restricted to comprehension alone. Although spoken
16 production in bilinguals is initiated by an idea to be expressed in words and sentences,
17 a picture to be named or described, and words or sentences to be translated, the concep-
18 tually driven nature of production does not itself appear to restrict activation to the
19 target language alone (e.g., Costa, 2005; Kroll et al., in press). The presence of mutual
20 activity across the bilingual’s two languages in both comprehension and production
21 suggests that another mechanism must be in place to allow attention to be appropri-
22 ately directed so that the correct language choices are made and, at the same time, that
23 systematic code-switching can be accommodated without incurring a significant pro-
24 cessing cost.

25 One solution to this apparent problem is to hypothesize that cognitive mechanisms
26 outside the linguistic representations themselves function to resolve the observed
27 cross-language competition, either by modulating the relative activation of the unin-
28 tended language or by actively inhibiting candidates from the non-target language
29 (e.g., see Green, 1998 for an illustration of how such an inhibitory mechanism might
30 operate in production). A model that incorporates an extra-linguistic mechanism for
31 bilingual word recognition has been described by Dijkstra and Van Heuven (2002).
32 The BIA+ model, shown in Figure 5, includes both a lexical identification system and
33 a task schema system. The lexical identification system, an embellishment of the BIA
34 model seen in Figure 3, represents lexical and sub-lexical information in each lan-
35 guage and their interactions. The lexical system is hypothesized to be encapsulated in
36 the sense that language-specific selection within the lexical system itself is possible
37 in response to linguistic context but not affected directly by more cognitive, non-lin-
38 guistic factors, such as expectations and instructions. On this view, bilingual word
39 recognition is fundamentally a data-driven process that is uninfluenced by top-down
40 factors until quite late in the process. The task schema system controls not only the
41 output of the lexical identification system with respect to the mapping of language
42 output to response processes, but also the manner in which language output is
43 weighted with respect to decision criteria. As such, the model can account for many
44 of the word-level phenomena we have reported. Bilingual word recognition is funda-
45 mentally language non-selective and even sentence context per se does not appear to

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




Figure 5. The BIA+ Model (adapted from Dijkstra & Van Heuven, 2002).

override the parallel activity across the two languages (see the earlier section on lexical access).

There remains a great deal of work to be done to determine to what extent the principles embodied within a model like BIA+ will serve as a general foundation on which a more comprehensive account of bilingual comprehension can be developed. However, it provides a useful basis on which to begin to identify those factors that constrain the basic architecture of the bilingual's language system and those that reflect the manner in which bilingualism affects cognitive control. The recent work by Bialystok and colleagues (e.g., Bialystok, 2005; Bialystok et al., 2004) provides compelling evidence for the positive cognitive consequences that bilingualism appears to confer to young bilingual children and to elderly bilinguals in the realm of executive function. Bilinguals are not cognitively superior to monolinguals in general, but quite specifically in tasks that require inhibitory control in which irrelevant information or responses must be ignored. It is tempting to speculate that the control mechanisms of the sort included in Dijkstra and Van Heuven's (2002) BIA+ model, required to

1 modulate proficient performance, may contribute to the development of the enhanced
2 executive function in bilinguals.

3 4 5 **5. CONCLUSIONS**

6 In this chapter, we reviewed some of the recent research on the processing of words
7 and sentences by bilingual speakers. The picture presented by our review suggests a
8 language system that is highly permeable across the bilingual's two languages, with
9 information about words and grammatical structures activated concurrently even
10 while a bilingual is reading text or listening to speech in one of his or her two lan-
11 guages alone. A very counterintuitive aspect of this body of research is that the activ-
12 ity of the unintended languages is not simply a matter of proficiency. Both languages
13 appear to be active in even highly proficient bilinguals. Although much of this
14 research is at a very early stage of development, it holds important implications for
15 characterizing bilingual performance and for the way in which bilingualism provides
16 a model more generally for investigating constraints and plasticity in language pro-
17 cessing. At the heart of this review is the observation that bilinguals themselves are
18 not special. To the contrary, more of the world's population is bilingual than not and
19 most of the cross-language interactions we have reviewed are related to phenomena
20 observed within language in the presence of ambiguity. However, the presence of two
21 active and competing languages makes the bilingual an especially informative source
22 for psycholinguists interested in how cognitive systems compete and in how the re-
23 sulting competition is resolved. We are confident that the contribution of this approach
24 will be increasingly valuable in mapping the relations between language and cogni-
25 tion and their neural underpinnings.

26 27 28 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

29
30 The writing of this chapter was supported in part by NSF Grant BCS-0418071 and
31 NIH Grant R01MH62479 to Judith F. Kroll.

32 33 34 **REFERENCES**

- 35
36 Aaronson, D., & Ferres, S. (1986). Reading strategies for children and adults: A quantitative model.
37 *Psychological Review*, 93, 89–112.
- 38 Altarriba, J. (1990). *Constraints on interlingual facilitation effects in priming in Spanish–English*
39 *bilinguals*. Unpublished dissertation, Vanderbilt University. **AQ7**
- 40
41 Altarriba, J., Kroll, J. F., Sholl, A., & Rayner, K. (1996). The influence of lexical and conceptual
42 constraints on reading mixed-language sentences: Evidence from eye-fixation and naming times.
43 *Memory and Cognition*, 24, 477–492.
- 44
45 Altarriba, J., & Mathis, K. M. (1997). Conceptual and lexical development in second language
acquisition. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 36, 550–568.

- 1 Bates, E., Devescovi, A., & Wulfeck, B. (2001). Psycholinguistics: A cross-language perspective.
2 *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 369–396.
- 3
4 Best, C. T. (1995) A direct realist view of cross-language speech perception. In: W. Strange (Ed.),
5 *Speech perception and linguistic experience* (pp. 171–206). Baltimore: York Press.
- 6
7 Bhatia, T. K., & Ritchie, W. C. (2004). Introduction. In: T. K. Bhatia, & W. C. Ritchie (Eds).
8 *Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 1–2). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- 9
10 Bialystok, E. (2005). Consequences of bilingualism for cognitive development. In: J. F. Kroll,
11 & A. M. B. De Groot (Eds). Lexical access in bilingual production. *Handbook of Bilingualism:*
12 *Psycholinguistic Approaches* (pp. 417–432). New York: Oxford University Press.
- 13
14 Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., Klein, R., & Viswanathan, M. (2004). Bilingualism, aging, and cog-
15 nitive control: Evidence from the Simon Task. *Psychology and Aging*, 19, 290–303.
- 16
17 Bock, J. K. (1986). Syntactic persistence in language production. *Cognitive Psychology*, 18, 355–387.
- 18
19 Bosch, L., Costa, A., & Sebastian-Galles, N. (2000). First and second language vowel perception
20 in early bilinguals. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 12, 189.
- 21
22 Bosch, L., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2001). Evidence of early language discrimination abilities in
23 infants from bilingual environments. *Infancy*, 2, 29–49.
- 24
25 Bullock, B. E., & Toribio, A. J. (2004). Introduction: Convergence as an emergent property in bilin-
26 gual speech. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7, 91–93.
- 27
28 Carreiras, M., Salillas, E., & Barber, H. (2004). Event-related potentials elicited during parsing of
29 ambiguous relative clauses in Spanish. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 20, 98–105.
- 30
31 Chen, H. -C., & Leung, Y. -S. (1989). Patterns of lexical processing in a nonnative language.
32 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 15, 316–325.
- 33
34 Chen, H. -C., & Ng, M. -L. (1989). Semantic facilitation and translation priming effects in Chinese-
35 English bilinguals. *Memory and Cognition*, 17, 454–462.
- 36
37 Christoffels, I. K., & De Groot, A. M. B. (2005). Simultaneous interpreting: A cognitive perspec-
38 tive. In: J. F. Kroll, & A. M. B. de Groot (Eds), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic ap-*
39 *proaches* (pp. 326–348). New York: Oxford University Press.
- 40
41 Colomé, A. (2001). Lexical activation in bilinguals' speech production: language-specific or lan-
42 guage-independent? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 45, 721–736.
- 43
44 Costa, A. (2005). Lexical access in bilingual production. In: J. F. Kroll, & A. M. B. De Groot (Eds),
45 *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches* (pp. 308–325). New York: Oxford
University Press.
- 46
47 Costa, A., Caramazza, A., & Sebastian-Galles, N. (2000). The cognate facilitation effect:
Implications for models of lexical access. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory,
and Cognition*, 26, 1283–1296.

- 1 Costa, A., Miozzo, M., Caramazza, A. (1999). Lexical selection in bilinguals: Do words in the
2 bilingual's two lexicons compete for selection? *Journal of Memory and Language*, *41*, 365–397.
- 3
4 Cuetos, F., & Mitchell, D. C. (1988). Cross-linguistic differences in parsing: Restrictions on the use
5 of the Late Closure strategy in Spanish. *Cognition*, *30*, 73–105.
- 6
7 Cutler, A., Mehler, J., Norris, D., & Seguí, J. (1989). Limits on bilingualism. *Nature*, *320*, 229–230.
- 8
9 De Bruijn, E. R. A., Dijkstra, T., Chwilla, D. J., & Schriefers, H. J. (2001). Language context ef-
10 fects on interlingual homograph recognition: Evidence from event-related potentials and response
11 times in semantic priming. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *4*, 155–168.
- 12
13 De Groot, A. M. B. (1993). Word-type effects in bilingual processing tasks: Support for a mixed-
14 representational system. In: R. Schreuder, & B. Weltens (Eds), *The bilingual lexicon* (pp. 27–51).
15 Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- 16
17 De Groot, A. M. B., & Nas, G. L. J. (1991). Lexical representation of cognates and noncognates in
18 compound bilinguals. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *30*, 90–123.
- 19
20 Dijkstra, T. (2005). Bilingual word recognition and lexical access. In: J. F. Kroll, & A. M. B. De
21 Groot (Eds), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches* (pp. 179–201). New York:
22 Oxford University Press.
- 23
24 Dijkstra, T., De Bruijn, E., Schriefers, H., & Brinke, S. T. (2000a). More on interlingual homograph
25 recognition: Language intermixing versus explicitness of instruction. *Bilingualism: Language and
26 Cognition*, *3*, 69–78.
- 27
28 Dijkstra, T., Grainger, J., & Van Heuven, W. J. B. (1999). Recognition of cognates and interlingual
29 homographs: The neglected role of phonology. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *41*, 496–518.
- 30
31 Dijkstra, T., Timmermans, M., & Schriefers, H. (2000b). On being blinded by your other language:
32 Effects of task demands on interlingual homograph recognition. *Journal of Memory and Language*,
33 *42*, 445–464.
- 34
35 Dijkstra, T., & Van Hell, J. G. (2003). Testing the language mode hypothesis using trilinguals.
36 *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *6*, 2–16.
- 37
38 Dijkstra, A., Van Jaarsveld, H., & Ten Brinke, S. (1998). Interlingual homograph recognition:
39 Effects of task demands and language intermixing. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *1*,
40 51–66.
- 41
42 Dufour, R., & Kroll, J. F. (1995). Matching words to concepts in two languages: A test of the con-
43 cept mediation model of bilingual representation. *Memory and Cognition*, *23*, 166–180.
- 44
45 Dussias, P. E. (2001). Bilingual sentence parsing. In: J. L. Nicol (Ed.), *One Mind, two languages:
Bilingual language processing* (pp. 159–176). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

- 1 Dussias, P. E. (2003). Syntactic ambiguity resolution in L2 learners: Some effects of bilinguality on
2 LI and L2 processing strategies. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 529–557.
- 3
4 Duyck, W., & Brysbaert, M. (2004). Forward and backward number translation requires concep-
5 tual mediation in both balanced and unbalanced bilinguals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
6 *Human Perception and Performance*, 30, 889–906.
- 7
8 Elston-Güttler, K. (2000). *An enquiry into cross-language differences in lexical-conceptual rela-*
9 *tionships and their effect on L2 lexical processing*. Unpublished dissertation, University of
10 Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
- 11
12 Fernández, E. M. (1998). Language dependency in parsing: Evidence from monolingual and bilin-
13 gual processing. *Psychologica Belgica*, 38, 197–230.
- 14
15 Fernández, E. M. (2003). *Bilingual sentence processing: Relative clause attachment in English and*
16 *Spanish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publisher.
- 17
18 Finkbeiner, M., Forster, K., Nicol, J., & Nakamura, K. (2004). The role of polysemy in masked
19 semantic and translation priming. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 51, 1–22.
- 20
21 Flege, J. E. (1995). Second language speech learning: Theory, findings and problems. In:
22 W. Strange (Ed.), *Speech perception and linguistic experience* (pp. 233–272). Baltimore: York
23 Press.
- 24
25 Flett, S., Branigan, H., Pickering, M., & Sorace, A. (2005). Syntactic processing in second language pro-
26 duction. Paper presented at the 5th international symposium on bilingualism, Barcelona, Spain, March.
- 27
28 Francis, W. S. (2005). Bilingual semantic and conceptual representation. In: J. F. Kroll, & A. M. B.
29 De Groot (Eds), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches* (pp. 251–267). New
30 York: Oxford University Press.
- 31
32 Francis, W. S., Tokowicz, N., & Kroll, J. F. (2003). *Translation priming as a function of bilingual*
33 *proficiency and item difficulty*. Poster presented at the 4th international symposium on bilingu-
34 *alism*, Tempe, AZ, April.
- 35
36 Frazier, L., & Rayner, K. (1982). Making and correcting errors during sentence comprehension: Eye
37 movements in the analysis of structurally ambiguous sentences. *Cognitive Psychology*, 14, 178–210.
- 38
39 Frenck-Mestre, C. (2005). Ambiguities and anomalies: What can eye movements and event-related
40 potentials reveal about second language sentence processing? In: J. F. Kroll, & A. M. B. De Groot
41 (Eds), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches* (pp. 268–281). New York: Oxford
42 University Press.
- 43
44 Frenck-Mestre, C., & Pynte, J. (1995). Lexical influences on parsing strategies: Evidence from eye
45 movements. In: J. M. Findlay, R. W. Kentridge, & R. Walker (Eds), *Eye movement research:*
Mechanisms, processes and applications (pp. 433–444). Amsterdam: Elsevier, North Holland.
- 46
47 Frenck-Mestre, C., & Pynte, J. (1997). Syntactic ambiguity resolution while reading in second and
48 native languages. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 50A, 119–148.

- 1 Gerard, L. D., & Scarborough, D. L. (1989). Language-specific lexical access of homographs by
2 bilinguals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, *15*, 305–313.
- 3
4 Gilboy, E., Sopena, J. -M., Clifton, C. Jr., & Frazier, L. (1995). Argument structure and association
5 preferences in Spanish and English complex NPs. *Cognition*, *54*, 131–167.
- 6
7 Gollan, T. H., Forster, K. I., & Frost, R. (1997). Translation priming with different scripts: Masked
8 priming with cognates and noncognates in Hebrew-English bilinguals. *Journal of Experimental*
9 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *23*, 1122–1139.
- 10
11 Grainger, J., & Frenck-Mestre, C. (1998). Masked priming by translation equivalents in proficient
12 bilinguals. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, *13*, 601–623.
- 13
14 Green, D. W. (1998). Mental control of the bilingual lexico-semantic system. *Bilingualism:*
15 *Language and Cognition*, *1*, 67–81.
- 16
17 Greenberg, S. N., & Saint-Aubin, J. (2004). Letter detection for homographs with different mean-
18 ings in different language texts. *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition*, *7*, 241–253.
- 19
20 Grosjean, F. (1988). Exploring the recognition of guest words in bilingual speech. *Language and*
21 *Cognitive Processes*, *3*, 233–274.
- 22
23 Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person.
24 *Brain and Language*, *36*, 3–15.
- 25
26 Grosjean, F. (2001). The bilingual's language modes. In: J. L. Nicol (Ed.), *One mind, two lan-*
27 *guages: Bilingual language processing* (pp. 1–22). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- 28
29 Hahne, A., & Friederici, A.D. (2001). Processing a second language: late learners' comprehension
30 mechanisms as revealed by event-related brain potentials. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*,
31 *4*, 123–142.
- 32
33 Hartsuiker, R. J., Pickering, M. J., & Veltkamp, E. (2004). Is syntax separate or shared between lan-
34 guages? *Psychological Science*, *15*, 409–414.
- 35
36 Hasegawa, M., Carpenter, P. A., & Just, M. A. (2002). An fMRI study of bilingual sentence com-
37 prehension and workload. *Neuroimage*, *15*, 647–660.
- 38
39 Hermans, D., Bongaerts, T., De Bot, K., & Schreuder, R. (1998). Producing words in a foreign lan-
40 guage: Can speakers prevent interference from their first language? *Bilingualism: Language and*
41 *Cognition*, *1*, 213–229.
- 42
43 Hoover, M. L., & Dwivedi, V. D. (1998). Syntactic processing by skilled bilinguals. *Language*
44 *Learning*, *48*, 1–29.
- 45
46 Jared, D., & Kroll, J. F. (2001). Do bilinguals activate phonological representations in one or both
47 of their languages when naming words? *Journal of Memory and Language*, *44*, 2–31.

- 1 Jared, D., & Szucs, C. (2002). Phonological activation in bilinguals: Evidence from interlingual
2 homograph naming. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 5, 225–239.
- 3
4 Jiang, N. (1999). Testing processing explanations for the asymmetry in masked cross-language
5 priming. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 2, 59–75.
- 6
7 Jiang, N. (2004). Morphological insensitivity in second language processing. *Applied*
8 *Psycholinguistics*, 25, 603–634.
- 9
10 Johnson, J. S., & Newport, E. L. (1989). Critical period effects in second language learning: The
11 influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language. *Cognitive*
12 *Psychology*, 21, 60–99.
- 13
14 Ju, M., & Luce, P. A. (2004). Falling on sensitive ears: Constraints on bilingual lexical activation.
15 *Psychological Science*, 15, 314–318.
- 16
17 Juffs, A. (1998). Some effects of first language argument structure and morphosyntax on second
18 language sentence processing. *Second Language Research*, 14(4), 406–424.
- 19
20 Jusczyk, P. W., Goodman, M. B., & Baumann, A. (1999). Nine-month-olds' attention to sound sim-
21 ilarities in syllables. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 40, 62–82.
- 22
23 Keatley, C., Spinks, J., & de Gelder, B. (1994). Asymmetrical semantic facilitation between lan-
24 guages. *Memory and Cognition*, 22, 70–84.
- 25
26 Kirsner, K., Smith, M. C., Lockhart, R. S., King, M. L., & Jain, M. (1984). The bilingual lexicon:
27 Language-specific units in an integrated network. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*,
28 23, 519–539.
- 29
30 Kotz, S. A., & Elston-Güttler, K. (2004). The role of proficiency on processing categorical and
31 associative information in the L2 as revealed by reaction times and event-related brain potentials.
32 *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 17, 215–235.
- 33
34 Kroll, J. F., Bobb, S., & Wodniecka, Z. (in press). Language selectivity is the exception, not the
35 rule: Arguments against a fixed locus of language selection in bilingual speech. *Bilingualism:*
36 *Language and Cognition*. **AQ9**
- 37
38 Kroll, J. F., & Curley, J. (1988). Lexical memory in novice bilinguals: The role of concepts in
39 retrieving second language words. In: M. Gruneberg, P. Morris, & R. Sykes (Eds), *Practical aspects*
40 *of memory* (Vol. 2, pp. 389–395). London: Wiley.
- 41
42 Kroll, J. F., & Dussias, P. (2004). The comprehension of words and sentences in two languages.
43 In: T. K. Bhatia, & W. C. Ritchie (Eds), *Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 169–200). Cambridge,
44 MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- 45
46 Kroll, J. F., Michael, E., Tokowicz, N., & Dufour, R. (2002). The development of lexical fluency
47 in a second language. *Second Language Research*, 18, 137–171.

- 1 Kroll, J. F., & Stewart, E. (1994). Category interference in translation and picture naming:
2 Evidence for asymmetric connection between bilingual memory representations. *Journal of*
3 *Memory and Language*, 33, 149–174.
- 4
5 Kroll, J. F., & Tokowicz, N. (2005). Models of bilingual representation and processing. In: J. F.
6 Kroll, & A. M. B. De Groot (Eds), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches* (pp.
7 531–553). New York: Oxford University Press.
- 8
9 Kuhl, P. K., Williams, K. A., Lacerda, F., & Stevens, K. N. (1992). Linguistic experience alters pho-
10 netic perception in infants by 6 months of age. *Science*, 255, 606–608.
- 11
12 La Heij, W., Hooglander, A., Kerling, R., & Van der Velden, E. (1996). Nonverbal context effects
13 in forward and backward word translation: Evidence for concept mediation. *Journal of Memory*
14 *and Language*, 35, 648–665.
- 15
16 Li, P. (1996). Spoken word recognition of code-switched words by Chinese-English bilinguals.
17 *Journal of Memory and Language*, 35, 757–774.
- 18
19 Loebell, H., & Bock, K. (2003). Structural priming across languages. *Linguistics*, 41, 791–824.
- 20
21 Macizo, P., & Bajo, M. T. (in press). Reading for repetition and reading for translation: Do they in-
22 volve the same processes? *Cognition*. **AQ10**
- 23
24 MacWhinney, B. (1997). Second language acquisition and the competition model. In: A. M. B. De
25 Groot, & J. F. Kroll (Eds), *Tutorials in bilingualism: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 113–142).
26 Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- 27
28 MacWhinney, B. (2005). A unified model of language acquisition. In: J. F. Kroll, & A. M. B. De
29 Groot (Eds), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches* (pp. 49–67). New York:
30 Oxford University Press.
- 31
32 Malt, B. C., & Sloman, S. A. (2003). Linguistic diversity and object naming by non-native speak-
33 ers of English. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 6, 47–67.
- 34
35 Marean, G. C., Werner, L. A., & Kuhl, P. K. (1992). Vowel categorization by very young infants.
36 *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 396–405.
- 37
38 Marian, V., & Spivey, M. J. (2003). Competing activation in bilingual language processing: Within-
39 and between-language competition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 6, 97–115.
- 40
41 McClelland, J. L., & Rumelhart, D. E. (1981). An interactive activation model of context effects in
42 letter perception, Part 1: An account of basic findings. *Psychological Review*, 88, 375–405.
- 43
44 McCormack, P. D. (1977). Bilingual linguistic memory: The independence–interdependence issue
45 revisited. In: P. A. Hornby (Ed.), *Bilingualism: Psychological, social, and educational implica-*
tions. New York: Academic Press.
- 46
47 Mehler, J., Jusczyk, P., Lambertz, G., Halsted, N., Bertocini, J., & Amiel-Tison, C. (1988). A pre-
48 cursor of language acquisition in young infants. *Cognition*, 29, 143–178.

- 1 Meyer, D. E., & Ruddy, M. G. (1974). Bilingual word recognition: Organization and retrieval of
2 alternative lexical codes. Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association meeting,
3 Philadelphia, PA, April.
- 4 Meyer, D. E., & Schvaneveldt, R. W. (1971). Facilitation in recognizing pairs of words: Evidence
5 of a dependence between retrieval operations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *90*, 227–234.
- 6
7 Michael, E., Dijkstra, T., & Kroll, J. F. (2006). *Individual differences in memory span do not modu-*
8 *late the degree of language nonselectivity in bilingual word recognition*. Manuscript in preparation.
- 9
10 Miyake, A., & Friedman, N. P. (1998). Individual differences in second language proficiency: The
11 role of working memory. In: A. F. Healy, & L. E. Bourne, Jr. (Eds), *Foreign language learning:*
12 *Psycholinguistic studies on training and retention* (pp. 339–364). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
13 Associates.
- 14 Moreno, E. M., Federmeier, K. D., & Kutas, M. (2002). Switching languages, switching palabras
15 (words): An electrophysiological study of code switching. *Brain and Language*, *80*, 188–207.
- 16
17 Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press. **AQ11**
- 18
19 Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*.
20 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 21
22 Neely, J. H. (1991). Semantic priming effects in visual word recognition: A selective review of cur-
23 rent findings and theories. In: D. Besner, & G. W. Humphreys (Eds), *Basic processes in reading:*
24 *Visual word recognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 25
26 Pallier, C., Bosch, L., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (1997). A limit on behavioral plasticity in vowel ac-
27 quisition. *Cognition*, *64*, B9–B17.
- 28
29 Pallier, C., Colomé, A., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2001). The influence of native-language phonology
30 on lexical access: Exemplar-based versus abstract lexical entries. *Psychological Science*, *12*, 445.
- 31
32 Potter, M. C., & Faulconer, B. A. (1975). Time to understand pictures and words. *Nature*, *253*, 437–438.
- 33
34 Potter, M. C., So, K. -F., Von Eckardt, B., & Feldman, L. B. (1984). Lexical and conceptual repre-
35 sentation in beginning and more proficient bilinguals. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal*
36 *Behavior*, *23*, 23–38.
- 37
38 Scheepers, C. (2003). Syntactic priming of relative clause attachments: Persistence of structural
39 configuration in sentence production. *Cognition*, *89*, 179–205.
- 40
41 Schwanenflugel, P. J. (1991). Contextual constraint and lexical processing. In: G. B. Simpson
42 (Ed.), *Understanding word and sentence. Advances in psychology* (Vol. 77, pp. 23–45).
43 Amsterdam, Netherlands: North-Holland/Elsevier Science Publishers.
- 44
45 Schwanenflugel, P. J., & LaCount, K. L. (1988). Semantic relatedness and the scope of facilitation
46 for upcoming words in sentences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
47 *Cognition*, *14*, 344–354.

- 1 Schwanenflugel, P. J., & Rey, M. (1986). Interlingual semantic facilitation: Evidence for a com-
 2 mon representational system in the bilingual. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 25, 605–618.
- 3
 4 Schwanenflugel, P. J., & Shoben, E. J. (1985). The influence of sentence constraint on the scope
 5 of facilitation for upcoming words. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 24, 232–252.
- 6
 7 Schwartz, A. I., & Kroll, J. F. (2006). *Bilingual lexical activation in sentence context*. Submitted
 8 manuscript.
- 9
 10 Schwartz, A. I., Kroll, J. F., & Diaz, M. (in press). Reading words in Spanish and English: Mapping **AQ12**
 11 orthography to phonology in two languages. *Language and Cognitive Processes*.
- 12
 13 Sebastián-Gallés, N., & Bosch, L. (2002). Building phonotactic knowledge in bilinguals: Role of
 14 early exposure. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 28,
 15 974–989.
- 16
 17 Sebastián-Gallés, N., Echeverría, S., & Bosch, L. (2005). The influence of initial exposure on lex-
 18 ical representation: Comparing early and simultaneous bilinguals. *Journal of Memory and*
 19 *Language*, 52, 240–255.
- 20
 21 Segalowitz, N., & Hulstijn, J. (2005). Automaticity in bilingualism and second language learning.
 22 In: J. F. Kroll, & A. M. B. De Groot (Eds), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches*
 23 (pp. 371–388). New York: Oxford University Press.
- 24
 25 Silverberg, S., & Samuel, A. G. (2004). The effect of age of second language acquisition on the
 26 representation and processing of second language words. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 51,
 27 381–398.
- 28
 29 Snodgrass, J. G. (1984). Concepts and their surface representations. *Journal of Verbal Learning*
 30 *and Verbal Behavior*, 23, 3–22.
- 31
 32 Soares, C., & Grosjean, F. (1984). Bilinguals in a monolingual and a bilingual speech mode: The
 33 effect on lexical access. *Memory and Cognition*, 12, 380–386.
- 34
 35 Spivey, M. J., & Marian, V. (1999). Cross talk between native and second languages: Partial acti-
 36 vation of an irrelevant lexicon. *Psychological Science*, 10, 281–284.
- 37
 38 Strange, W. (Ed.). (1995). *Speech perception and linguistic experience*. Baltimore, MD: York Press.
- 39
 40 Sunderman, G., & Kroll, J. F. (in press). First language activation during second language lexical **AQ13**
 41 processing: An investigation of lexical form, meaning, and grammatical class. *Studies in Second*
 42 *Language Acquisition*.
- 43
 44 Talamas, A., Kroll, J. F., & Dufour, R. (1999). Form related errors in second language learning:
 45 A preliminary stage in the acquisition of L2 vocabulary. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*,
 2, 45–58.
- 46
 47 Thomas, M. S. C., & Allport, A. (2000). Language switching costs in bilingual visual word recog-
 48 nition. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 43, 44–66.

- 1 Traxler, M. J., & Foss, D. J. (2000). Effects of sentence constraint on priming in natural language
2 comprehension. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *26*,
3 1266–1282.
- 4 Tzelgov, J., & Eben-Ezra, S. (1992). Components of the between-language semantic priming
5 effect. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *4*, 253–272.
- 6
7 Van Hell, J.G. (1998). *Cross-language processing and bilingual memory organization*.
8 Unpublished dissertation, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- 9
10 Van Hell, J.G., & De Groot, A. M. B. (1998). Conceptual representation in bilingual memory:
11 Effects of concreteness and cognate status in word association. *Bilingualism: Language and*
12 *Cognition*, *1*, 193–211.
- 13
14 Van Hell, J.G., & Dijkstra, A. (2002). Foreign language knowledge can influence native language
15 performance in exclusively native contexts. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, *9*, 780–789.
- 16
17 Vaid, J., & Frenck-Mestre, C. (2002). Do orthographic cues aid language recognition? A laterality
18 study with French-English bilinguals. *Brain and Language*, *82*, 47–53.
- 19
20 Van Heuven, W. J. B., Dijkstra, T., & Grainger, J. (1998). Orthographic neighborhood effects in
21 bilingual word recognition. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *39*, 458–483.
- 22
23 Vigliocco, G., Hartsuiker, R. J., Jarema, G., & Kolk, H. H. J. (1996). One or more labels on the bot-
24 tles? Notional concord in Dutch and French. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, *11*, 407–442.
- 25
26 Von Studnitz, R. E., & Green, D. (2002). Interlingual homograph interference in German–English
27 bilinguals: Its modulation and locus of control. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *5*, 1–23.
- 28
29 Weber, A., & Cutler, A. (2004). Lexical competition in non-native spoken-word recognition.
30 *Journal of Memory and Language*, *50*, 1–25.
- 31
32 Weber-Fox, C., & Neville, H. J. (1996). Maturational constraints on functional specializations for
33 language processing: ERP and behavioral evidence in bilingual speakers. *Journal of Cognitive*
34 *Neuroscience*, *8*, 231–256.
- 35
36 Werker, J. F., & Lalonde, C. E. (1988). Cross-language speech perception: Initial capabilities and
37 developmental change. *Developmental Psychology*, *24*, 672–683.
- 38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45