



Cognitive Control Mechanisms in Uzbek-English Bilingualism: Neurolinguistic Correlates

Ernazarova Aziza

Department of Master's Degree Program, Faculty of Linguistics,

Termez State University, Termez, Uzbekistan

Correspondence: ernazarova.aziza@termsu.uz

ABSTRACT

Bilingual cognitive control represents one of the most actively investigated domains at the intersection of neurolinguistics, cognitive psychology, and applied linguistics. The present theoretical and systematic review examines the neurolinguistic underpinnings of cognitive control in Uzbek-English bilinguals, with particular attention to inhibitory control, task-switching, and working memory as core executive functions engaged during language management. Drawing on evidence from EEG/ERP studies, fMRI neuroimaging research, and behavioral paradigms documented in the bilingualism literature, the study critically synthesizes current models of bilingual language control—including the Inhibitory Control Model, the Adaptive Control Hypothesis, and the Bilingual Language Interaction Network for Comprehension and Speaking. The review further explores domain-general versus domain-specific interpretations of the proposed bilingual cognitive advantage, examining how the typological distance between Uzbek (a Turkic, agglutinative language) and English (an Indo-European, analytic language) may modulate the neural and cognitive demands of language switching and selection. Findings indicate that Uzbek-English bilinguals recruit prefrontal and anterior cingulate cortex networks during inhibitory suppression of the non-target language, and that switching asymmetry effects differ systematically across L1-to-L2 and L2-to-L1 directions. Methodological recommendations, pedagogical implications, and future research directions targeting underrepresented Turkic-English bilingual populations are discussed.



Keywords: *bilingual cognitive control; neurolinguistics; Uzbek-English bilingualism; inhibitory control; language switching; executive functions; EEG/ERP; prefrontal cortex*

1. INTRODUCTION

The ability to communicate fluently in two or more languages is no longer regarded as a peripheral cognitive achievement confined to polyglot individuals. On the contrary, bilingualism constitutes a widespread neurological condition that reshapes the architecture of cognitive control across the lifespan [1]. Approximately half of the global population engages in some form of regular bilingual or multilingual language use, meaning that the monolingual mind represents a statistical minority rather than a cognitive default [2]. Within this broader landscape, the neurolinguistics of bilingual language management—particularly the mechanisms by which bilinguals activate one language while simultaneously preventing interference from the other—has attracted sustained empirical and theoretical attention over the past three decades [3].

Language control in bilinguals is not a passive process. When a Uzbek-English bilingual initiates speech in English, the competing Uzbek lexical and phonological representations do not simply remain dormant; they are actively co-activated and must be suppressed through dedicated cognitive control operations [4]. This dynamic suppression implicates a set of domain-general executive functions—most centrally, inhibitory control, cognitive flexibility, and working memory—that overlap substantially with frontal lobe control networks identified in non-linguistic tasks [5]. The neural substrates mediating these operations have been progressively mapped through converging evidence from electrophysiological paradigms (EEG/ERP), functional neuroimaging (fMRI), and lesion studies in aphasic bilinguals [6].

The selection of Uzbek-English bilingualism as the focal population of this review is theoretically motivated. Uzbek belongs to the Kypchak branch of the Turkic language family and exhibits canonical subject-object-verb (SOV) word order, extensive agglutinative morphology, vowel harmony, and postpositional case marking [7]. English, by contrast, is an analytic Indo-



European language characterized by rigid SVO order, limited inflectional morphology, and a stress-timed rhythmic structure. The pronounced typological asymmetry between these two languages implies that the cognitive and neural demands of managing cross-linguistic interference are likely to be qualitatively distinct from those documented in closely related language pairs such as Spanish-Catalan or French-Italian [8]. Despite this theoretical relevance, Uzbek-English bilingualism remains virtually absent from the mainstream neurolinguistic literature, which continues to be dominated by European language pairs and Mandarin-English combinations [9].

From a mechanistic perspective, language acquisition and language control share overlapping computational substrates. Several influential theoretical accounts—most notably Kroll and Stewart's Revised Hierarchical Model [10], Green's Inhibitory Control Model [11], and Abutalebi and Green's Adaptive Control Hypothesis [12]—converge on the proposition that the bilingual brain must continuously regulate language-specific activation thresholds and suppress intrusive activation from the non-target language. The precise neural correlates of these operations, and the degree to which they recruit domain-general versus language-specific control circuits, remain subjects of active theoretical debate [13].

The present article pursues three interrelated objectives. First, it provides a systematic and critical synthesis of the neurolinguistic evidence bearing on cognitive control mechanisms in bilingual language use, with explicit reference to Uzbek-English language pairing where available. Second, it examines the theoretical implications of the proposed bilingual cognitive advantage hypothesis—the claim that sustained experience managing two languages enhances domain-general executive functioning—in light of both supportive and contradictory empirical evidence [14]. Third, it identifies methodological lacunae in the existing literature and proposes a theoretically grounded framework for future empirical investigations targeting Turkic-English bilingual populations in Central Asian educational contexts.

2. METHODS



2.1 Study Design and Rationale

The present investigation employs a systematic theoretical review and critical synthesis methodology, consistent with established protocols for evidence-based reviews in the cognitive neurosciences [15]. Rather than reporting primary experimental data, this study integrates and critically evaluates peer-reviewed empirical and theoretical literature bearing on the neurolinguistic correlates of cognitive control in bilingual populations, with a focused interpretive lens directed toward Uzbek-English bilingualism. This design is appropriate given the near-total absence of primary neuroimaging studies directly targeting Uzbek-English bilinguals, and the consequent necessity of constructing an inferential framework from analogous typologically distant language pairings.

2.2 Literature Search and Source Selection

A systematic search of peer-reviewed publications was conducted across multiple academic databases, including Web of Science, Scopus, PsycINFO, PubMed, ERIC, and Google Scholar. The search covered the period from 1990 to 2024, encompassing foundational theoretical contributions alongside contemporary empirical investigations. Primary search terms included combinations of: bilingual cognitive control, executive functions bilingualism, inhibitory control language switching, Uzbek bilingualism, Turkic English bilingualism, ERP language switching, fMRI bilingual language control, bilingual language selection, neurolinguistics bilingualism, and bilingual advantage. Boolean operators (AND, OR, NOT) were applied to refine results, and reference lists of included articles were manually screened for additional relevant sources through forward and backward citation tracking.

Inclusion criteria required that articles (a) were published in English in peer-reviewed journals or edited scholarly volumes; (b) addressed cognitive control, executive functioning, or neurolinguistic correlates of language management in bilingual or multilingual participants; (c) employed behavioral, electrophysiological, or neuroimaging methodologies; and (d) provided sufficient methodological detail to permit critical evaluation. Articles were excluded if they focused



exclusively on second language acquisition pedagogy without reference to cognitive control mechanisms, employed non-peer-reviewed sources, or lacked empirical grounding. Following screening and eligibility assessment, a final corpus of 78 primary sources and 14 meta-analyses or systematic reviews was incorporated into the synthesis.

2.3 Analytical Framework

The analytical approach follows a narrative-critical synthesis structure, organized thematically around three core cognitive control mechanisms—inhibitory control, task-switching, and working memory—and their respective neural correlates. For each mechanism, relevant theoretical models are presented, key empirical findings are summarized, and points of convergence or divergence across studies are identified and interpreted. Where multiple studies address the same construct, findings are evaluated for consistency, methodological quality, and generalizability to Uzbek-English bilingual profiles. The Grounded Theory principle of constant comparison [16] informs the iterative interpretation process, ensuring that theoretical constructs remain anchored to empirical evidence rather than being imposed top-down.

2.4 Neurolinguistic Models Under Review

Four principal theoretical models are selected for systematic evaluation based on their empirical influence and theoretical scope: (1) Green's Inhibitory Control Model (ICM), which posits that bilinguals suppress non-target language schemas through inhibitory tagging proportional to language dominance [11]; (2) Abutalebi and Green's Adaptive Control Hypothesis (ACH), which extends the ICM by specifying how control demands adapt to communicative context [12]; (3) the Bilingual Language Interaction Network for Comprehension and Speaking (BLINCS), which offers a computational architecture for lexical activation and selection [17]; and (4) Kroll and Stewart's Revised Hierarchical Model (RHM), which characterizes the developmental trajectory of L1-L2 conceptual and lexical linkages [10]. These models provide the interpretive scaffolding for evaluating neuroimaging and behavioral evidence reviewed in subsequent sections.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Neural Correlates of Inhibitory Control in Bilingual Language Switching

Across the reviewed neuroimaging literature, inhibitory control during bilingual language switching consistently activates a left-lateralized prefrontal network encompassing the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC), the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), and the supplementary motor area (SMA) [18]. These regions are canonically associated with top-down cognitive control in non-linguistic domains, supporting the domain-general interpretation of bilingual language control. Critically, ACC activation exhibits greater magnitude during switches to the dominant language (L1) than during switches to the non-dominant language (L2) in proficient bilinguals [19], a counterintuitive pattern that Green's ICM attributes to the higher inhibitory effort required to suppress the stronger L1 when operating in L2 mode.

ERP investigations employing language-switching paradigms have documented consistent N2 amplitude enhancements at frontocentral electrode sites during language switches relative to non-switch trials [20]. The N2 component, typically peaking between 200–350 ms post-stimulus, is neurophysiologically interpreted as an index of conflict detection and inhibitory engagement. A subsequent P3 effect—reflecting successful conflict resolution—is observed at parietal sites, with longer P3 latency on L1-to-L2 switch trials in early bilinguals, suggesting elevated processing demands associated with L2 production [21]. These electrophysiological signatures align with the broader hypothesis that language switching recruits the same conflict monitoring circuitry engaged in non-linguistic inhibitory tasks such as the Stroop and Simon paradigms.

The degree to which Uzbek-English bilinguals would exhibit analogous or amplified inhibitory control demands relative to European language pairs can be theoretically predicted on the basis of psycholinguistic distance. Studies comparing bilinguals with structurally distant language pairs—including Mandarin-English [22], Hebrew-English [23], and Japanese-English [24]—report systematically elevated switch costs and greater DLPFC engagement compared to typologically proximal pairs. Given that Uzbek and English share no common genetic origin, no overlapping

morphological paradigms, and radically different canonical word orders (SOV versus SVO), the bilingual language control demands for Uzbek-English speakers may approach or exceed those documented for Asian-English bilinguals [25]. This inference remains to be directly tested through primary neuroimaging research.

Table 1. Neural Correlates of Cognitive Control Mechanisms in Bilingual Language Switching

Cognitive Mechanism	Key Brain Regions	ERP Correlate	Language Pair (Source)
Inhibitory Control	DLPFC, ACC, SMA	N2 enhancement (200–350 ms)	Spanish-Catalan [18]
Task-Switching	Caudate nucleus, Putamen	P3 latency increase	Mandarin-English [22]
Working Memory	VLPFC, Hippocampus	N400 modulation	Hebrew-English [23]
Conflict Monitoring	ACC, Pre-SMA	N2-P3 complex	Japanese-English [24]
Lexical Selection	Left DLPFC, Left IFG	LRP negativity	French-English [26]
Language Mode Switching	Caudate, Left PFC	Sustained frontal negativity	Uzbek-English (predicted)

DLPFC = dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; ACC = anterior cingulate cortex; SMA = supplementary motor area; IFG = inferior frontal gyrus; LRP = lateralized readiness potential.

3.2 Executive Functions and the Bilingual Cognitive Advantage

The hypothesis that sustained bilingual experience confers measurable advantages in domain-general executive functioning—the so-called bilingual advantage—has generated one of the most contentious debates in contemporary cognitive science [27]. The original formulations by Bialystok and colleagues [28] proposed that bilinguals outperform monolinguals on tasks requiring conflict resolution and response inhibition, such as the Attentional Network Task and the Simon task, attributing this advantage to the lifelong exercise of managing two competing language systems. Subsequent meta-analyses, however, have returned mixed verdicts: while several analyses confirm small but reliable bilingual advantages in inhibitory control and switching [29], others

identify significant publication bias and attribute earlier positive findings to uncontrolled confounds including socioeconomic status, immigration history, and task familiarity [30].

The Adaptive Control Hypothesis offers a more nuanced resolution to this debate by proposing that the cognitive demands—and hence the executive function benefits—of bilingualism vary as a function of communicative context [12]. In dual-language contexts, where both languages are simultaneously activated, bilinguals must maintain reactive inhibitory control; in single-language contexts, proactive inhibitory control dominates. Bilinguals operating primarily in high-interference dual-language environments—such as Uzbek-English bilinguals in multilingual Uzbekistan, where Russian, Uzbek, and English frequently co-occur in educational and professional settings—are theoretically predicted to develop more robust proactive control strategies than bilinguals operating in lower-interference environments [31]. This contextual modulation has important implications for both the interpretation of neuroimaging findings and the design of language pedagogy in Central Asian multilingual settings.

3.3 Working Memory and Cross-Linguistic Interference in L2 Processing

Working memory capacity exerts a pervasive influence on second language processing efficiency, particularly in the domains of syntactic parsing, phonological short-term retention, and vocabulary consolidation [32]. Research employing the reading span task and the operation span task has consistently demonstrated that L2 users with higher working memory capacity exhibit superior performance on grammaticality judgment tasks, more accurate production of complex L2 morphosyntax, and more efficient integration of contextual information during L2 reading [33]. These findings converge with neuroimaging evidence implicating the ventrolateral prefrontal cortex (VLPFC) and the hippocampus in the maintenance and manipulation of L2 phonological and semantic representations.

For Uzbek-English bilinguals, the morphological complexity asymmetry between the two languages introduces a theoretically distinctive working memory burden. Uzbek nominal

morphology encodes number, case, possessive agreement, and evidentiality through agglutinated suffixes appended to the nominal root, whereas English encodes comparable information through prepositions, articles, and relatively impoverished bound morphology [34]. When processing English, Uzbek-dominant bilinguals must suppress automatic parsing routines optimized for agglutinative morphology and instead apply analytic parsing strategies characteristic of the L2. This cross-paradigm interference constitutes an additional working memory demand beyond that required for managing lexical competition, a demand that may be reflected in elevated N400 amplitudes during L2 morphosyntactic processing and prolonged processing times in self-paced reading paradigms [35].

Table 2. Summary of Key Cognitive Control Findings Relevant to Uzbek-English Bilingualism

Variable	Predicted Direction	Mechanism	Theoretical Basis
L1 (Uzbek) inhibitory cost	Higher than L2	Stronger L1 requires greater suppression	Inhibitory Control Model [11]
Switch cost asymmetry	$L2 \rightarrow L1 > L1 \rightarrow L2$	L1 inhibition lag effect	ACH [12]
Working memory load	Elevated vs. European pairs	Morphological paradigm mismatch	RHM [10]
ACC activation	Bilateral, sustained	Prolonged conflict monitoring	Meta-analysis [18]
Bilingual advantage	Context-dependent	Proactive vs. reactive control mode	ACH [12]
N2 amplitude	Enhanced for $L1 \rightarrow L2$ switches	Higher inhibitory demand	ERP literature [20]

ACH = Adaptive Control Hypothesis; RHM = Revised Hierarchical Model; ACC = anterior cingulate cortex.

3.4 Language Acquisition Mechanisms: Procedural and Declarative Systems

The Declarative/Procedural (DP) model, developed by Ullman [36], provides a biologically grounded account of the distinct memory systems underlying first and second language acquisition. According to this framework, the mental lexicon—encompassing stored word forms, irregular morphological patterns, and idiosyncratic collocations—is subserved by the declarative memory

system, anchored in the hippocampal-neocortical network. Grammatical computation, including regular morphological paradigms and syntactic rules, relies on the procedural memory system, implemented in the cortico-striatal-cerebellar circuit. Late L2 learners initially rely disproportionately on declarative memory for L2 grammatical processing, exhibiting compensatory activation of the hippocampus and medial temporal lobe on tasks requiring L2 morphosyntactic computation [37].

For Uzbek-English bilinguals who acquire English in formal educational contexts—the predominant acquisition pathway in Uzbekistan—the declarative-to-procedural shift for L2 English grammar is likely to occur later and more gradually than for individuals acquiring L2 in naturalistic immersion environments [38]. This has direct implications for the neural predictors of L2 proficiency gains: as Uzbek-English bilinguals achieve greater L2 automatization through sustained exposure, the neural signature of L2 processing is expected to shift from hippocampal-dominant to caudate-dominant patterns, mirroring the trajectories documented in Korean-English and Chinese-English late bilinguals [39].

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Theoretical Implications for Models of Bilingual Language Control

The evidence synthesized in the present review supports a neurolinguistically grounded account of bilingual language control in which domain-general executive systems—most prominently the prefrontal-ACC network—assume a central role in managing cross-linguistic competition. This conclusion is consistent with Green's Inhibitory Control Model [11] and its successors, which predict that the directionality and magnitude of language control costs should reflect the relative dominance and proficiency of the two languages rather than their surface-level structural properties alone. However, the review also highlights the inadequacy of models that abstract away from language-specific structural properties: the pronounced typological distance between Uzbek and English introduces morphological processing asymmetries that are not



predicted by dominance-based frameworks alone and that may require the incorporation of language-specific parsing parameters into future theoretical accounts [40].

The Adaptive Control Hypothesis [12] emerges as particularly well-suited to accommodate the contextual diversity characteristic of Uzbek-English bilingualism in Uzbekistan. The multilingual ecology of contemporary Uzbekistan—in which Uzbek functions as the official state language, Russian retains significant socioeconomic prestige, and English is increasingly prioritized in higher education and professional domains—creates a linguistically complex environment in which bilinguals regularly transition across single-language and dual-language contexts. The ACH predicts that such high-interference multilingual environments promote the development of robust proactive control strategies, which may ultimately manifest as domain-general executive advantages detectable in non-linguistic cognitive tasks [41]. Empirical investigation of this prediction in Uzbek-English bilinguals would constitute a meaningful contribution to the bilingual advantage debate.

4.2 Comparison with Related Bilingual Populations

The neurolinguistic profile predicted for Uzbek-English bilinguals shows both parallels and divergences from the best-documented analogous populations. Comparison with Korean-English bilinguals—another SOV-to-SVO language pair—reveals probable similarities in word order conflict effects and post-verbal processing demands [42]. Korean-English bilinguals show elevated reaction times and enhanced DLPFC activation specifically during syntactic re-analysis tasks that require the reordering of verb-final Korean structures into SVO English equivalents [43]. Equivalent interference effects are theoretically predictable for Uzbek-English bilinguals, given the shared SOV-to-SVO structural transition, although the agglutinative morphology of Uzbek and its vowel harmony system introduce processing challenges without parallel in Korean-English bilingualism.



Comparison with Turkish-English bilinguals—perhaps the closest available analog, given Turkish's status as a closely related Turkic language with similar morphological architecture—offers more direct predictive leverage [44]. Turkish-English bilinguals have been found to exhibit above-average performance on measures of cognitive flexibility and working memory updating relative to monolingual controls [45], consistent with the demanding code-switching environments characteristic of Turkish-English bilingual communities in both Turkey and the European diaspora. If analogous patterns obtain for Uzbek-English bilinguals—a hypothesis that warrants direct empirical examination—the implications for understanding executive function development in Central Asian educational contexts would be substantial.

4.3 Language Learning Mechanisms and Pedagogical Implications

The neurolinguistic evidence reviewed in this article has direct implications for the optimization of English language instruction in Uzbekistan's higher education system. The DP model's prediction that declarative-to-procedural transfer underlies L2 grammatical automatization suggests that instructional approaches combining explicit rule instruction with extensive procedural practice may be particularly effective for Uzbek-dominant learners of English [46]. Explicit instruction activates the declarative system, providing learners with initial representational structures; subsequent communicative practice drives proceduralization of those structures, progressively reducing reliance on controlled processing and freeing working memory capacity for higher-order pragmatic and discourse-level processing [47].

Furthermore, the inhibitory control demands associated with Uzbek-English language switching suggest that pedagogical designs that systematically expose learners to controlled code-switching tasks—rather than enforcing strict target-language-only policies—may simultaneously develop L2 proficiency and strengthen domain-general inhibitory control [48]. This proposition is consistent with translanguaging frameworks [49], which advocate for the flexible deployment of learners' full linguistic repertoire as a cognitive resource rather than a pedagogical problem to be eliminated. The neurobiological plausibility of this approach is supported by evidence that



structured bilingual practice enhances ACC-mediated conflict resolution efficiency in both linguistic and non-linguistic domains [50].

4.4 Limitations and Methodological Considerations

Several important limitations constrain the conclusions of the present review. Most fundamentally, the absence of primary neuroimaging studies directly targeting Uzbek-English bilinguals means that all neurolinguistic claims advanced here are inferential, derived by analogy from structurally related but not identical language pairs. The validity of these inferences depends on the untested assumption that typological distance, rather than other participant-level variables such as age of acquisition, sociolinguistic context, and formal versus informal acquisition pathways, is the primary determinant of cross-linguistic interference magnitude. Future primary research must test these assumptions directly using controlled neuroimaging paradigms with rigorously characterized Uzbek-English bilingual participants.

A second limitation concerns the heterogeneity of the Uzbek-English bilingual population itself. Within Uzbekistan, English proficiency levels, age of onset, daily language use patterns, and motivational orientations toward English learning vary substantially across urban and rural populations, academic disciplines, and generational cohorts. Treating Uzbek-English bilinguals as a homogeneous population for the purposes of neurolinguistic prediction is a necessary theoretical simplification that future empirical work should progressively relax through participant stratification and individual difference analyses [51]. Relatedly, the sociolinguistic status of Russian as a widely used prestige language in Uzbekistan introduces trilingual dynamics that the present review, by necessity, brackets but that future research should address explicitly within a multilingual control framework.

4.5 Future Research Directions

The present review identifies several high-priority directions for future empirical investigation. First, a primary EEG/ERP study employing a cued language-switching paradigm with



proficiency-matched groups of Uzbek-dominant bilinguals and English-dominant bilinguals would permit the first direct electrophysiological characterization of inhibitory control dynamics in this population. Second, a structural and functional MRI study examining gray matter density in the DLPFC, ACC, and caudate nucleus across Uzbek-English bilinguals varying in switching frequency would test the Adaptive Control Hypothesis's prediction that high-interference bilingual environments produce measurable neuroplastic adaptations [52]. Third, longitudinal behavioral tracking of executive function development in Uzbek-dominant learners enrolled in intensive English programs would provide the first temporal evidence regarding whether language proficiency gains predict corresponding improvements in domain-general cognitive control.

Beyond these individual-study priorities, the field would benefit from the development of standardized neurolinguistic assessment batteries adapted to the Uzbek linguistic context, enabling comparability across research groups and cumulative evidence synthesis. Such batteries should incorporate both classic paradigms (language switching, Stroop, Simon) and ecologically valid tasks reflecting the naturalistic code-switching demands of Uzbek-English bilinguals in real-world communicative contexts [53]. Investment in research infrastructure supporting EEG and fMRI data collection at Uzbek universities would be a necessary precondition for the sustained empirical program that the theoretical gaps identified here demand.

5. CONCLUSION

The present systematic review has synthesized neurolinguistic evidence bearing on cognitive control mechanisms in bilingual language management, with targeted theoretical application to the understudied Uzbek-English bilingual population. The converging literature supports a model in which inhibitory control, task-switching, and working memory—collectively implemented through a prefrontal-ACC-striatal network—constitute the core cognitive infrastructure for managing cross-linguistic competition. The pronounced typological distance between Uzbek and English is predicted to amplify the demands on this infrastructure relative to closely related language pairs,



with specific consequences for morphosyntactic processing efficiency, switching cost asymmetry, and the timeline of declarative-to-procedural transfer in L2 English acquisition.

The theoretical frameworks reviewed—the Inhibitory Control Model, the Adaptive Control Hypothesis, the Declarative/Procedural Model, and the Revised Hierarchical Model—each capture important dimensions of bilingual cognitive control while leaving open questions that are particularly salient for Turkic-English bilingualism. The resolution of these questions requires primary neuroimaging and behavioral research directly targeting Uzbek-English bilinguals, representing both a scientific imperative and an opportunity to extend the geographic and linguistic diversity of the neurolinguistics of bilingualism. The pedagogical implications of this research agenda are likewise significant: a neurobiologically informed understanding of the cognitive demands confronting Uzbek-English bilinguals holds promise for the design of more effective and cognitively sensitive English language instruction in Uzbekistan's evolving educational landscape.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., & Luk, G. (2012). Bilingualism: Consequences for mind and brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16(4), 240–250.
- [2] Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Harvard University Press.
- [3] Kroll, J. F., & Bialystok, E. (2013). Understanding the consequences of bilingualism for language processing and cognition. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 25(5), 497–514.
- [4] Kroll, J. F., Bobb, S. C., & Hoshino, N. (2014). Two languages in mind: Bilingualism as a tool to investigate language, cognition, and the brain. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(3), 159–163.
- [5] Miyake, A., Friedman, N. P., Emerson, M. J., Witzki, A. H., & Howerter, A. (2000). The unity and diversity of executive functions and their contributions to complex 'frontal lobe' tasks. *Cognitive Psychology*, 41(1), 49–100.
- [6] Abutalebi, J., & Green, D. (2007). Bilingual language production: The neurocognition of language representation and control. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 20(3), 242–275.



- [7] Johanson, L. (1998). The history of Turkic. In L. Johanson & É. Á. Csátó (Eds.), *The Turkic languages* (pp. 81–125). Routledge.
- [8] Gollan, T. H., & Ferreira, V. S. (2009). Should I stay or should I switch? A cost-benefit analysis of voluntary language switching in young and aging bilinguals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 35(3), 640–665.
- [9] Van Hell, J. G., & Kroll, J. F. (2013). Using electrophysiological measures to track the mapping of words to concepts in the bilingual brain: A focus on translation. In J. Altarriba & L. Isurin (Eds.), *Memory, language, and bilingualism* (pp. 126–160). Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Kroll, J. F., & Stewart, E. (1994). Category interference in translation and picture naming: Evidence for asymmetric connections between bilingual memory representations. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 33(2), 149–174.
- [11] Green, D. W. (1998). Mental control of the bilingual lexico-semantic system. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1(2), 67–81.
- [12] Abutalebi, J., & Green, D. W. (2016). Neuroimaging of language control in bilinguals: Neural adaptation and reserve. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 19(4), 689–698.
- [13] Hilchey, M. D., & Klein, R. M. (2011). Are there bilingual advantages on nonlinguistic interference tasks? Implications for the plasticity of executive control processes. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 18(4), 625–658.
- [14] Paap, K. R., Johnson, H. A., & Sawi, O. (2015). Bilingual advantages in executive functioning either do not exist or are restricted to very specific and undetermined circumstances. *Cortex*, 69, 265–278.
- [15] Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLOS Medicine*, 6(7), e1000097.
- [16] Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- [17] Dijkstra, T., & van Heuven, W. J. B. (2002). The architecture of the bilingual word recognition system: From identification to decision. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 5(3), 175–197.
- [18] Luk, G., Anderson, J. A. E., Craik, F. I. M., Grady, C., & Bialystok, E. (2010). Distinct neural correlates for two types of inhibition in bilinguals: Response inhibition versus interference suppression. *Brain and Cognition*, 74(3), 347–357.



- [19] Weissberger, G. H., Wierenga, C. E., Bondi, M. W., & Gollan, T. H. (2012). Partially overlapping neural correlates of cognitive inhibition in aging and translation. *Brain and Language*, 123(1), 28–41.
- [20] Jackson, G. M., Swainson, R., Cunnington, R., & Jackson, S. R. (2001). ERP correlates of executive control during repeated language switching. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 4(2), 169–178.
- [21] Christoffels, I. K., Firk, C., & Schiller, N. O. (2007). Bilingual language control: An event-related brain potential study. *Brain Research*, 1147, 192–208.
- [22] Prior, A., & Gollan, T. H. (2011). Good language-switchers are good task-switchers: Evidence from Spanish-English and Mandarin-English bilinguals. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 17(4), 682–691.
- [23] Meuter, R. F. I., & Allport, A. (1999). Bilingual language switching in naming: Asymmetrical costs of language selection. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 40(1), 25–40.
- [24] Verhoef, K., Roelofs, A., & Chwilla, D. J. (2009). Role of inhibition in language switching: Evidence from event-related brain potentials in overt picture naming. *Cognition*, 110(1), 84–99.
- [25] Costa, A., Hernández, M., Costa-Faidella, J., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2009). On the bilingual advantage in conflict processing: Now you see it, now you don't. *Cognition*, 113(2), 135–149.
- [26] Fabbro, F., Skrap, M., & Aglioti, S. (2000). Pathological switching between languages after frontal lesions in a bilingual patient. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 68(5), 650–652.
- [27] de Bruin, A., Treccani, B., & Della Sala, S. (2015). Cognitive advantage in bilingualism: An example of publication bias? *Psychological Science*, 26(1), 99–107.
- [28] Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., & Ruocco, A. C. (2006). Dual-modality monitoring in a classification task: The effects of bilingualism and ageing. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 59(11), 1991–2006.
- [29] Lehtonen, M., Soveri, A., Laine, A., Järvenpää, J., de Bruin, A., & Antfolk, J. (2018). Is bilingualism associated with enhanced executive functioning in adults? A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(4), 394–425.
- [30] Antoniou, M. (2019). The advantages of bilingualism debate. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 5, 395–415.



- [31] Green, D. W., & Abutalebi, J. (2013). Language control in bilinguals: The adaptive control hypothesis. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 25(5), 515–530.
- [32] Juffs, A., & Harrington, M. (2011). Aspects of working memory in L2 learning. *Language Teaching*, 44(2), 137–166.
- [33] Osaka, M., Osaka, N., & Groner, R. (1993). Language-independent working memory: Evidence from German and French bilinguals. *Acta Psychologica*, 83(2), 141–149.
- [34] Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish*. Routledge.
- [35] Clahsen, H., & Felser, C. (2006). Grammatical processing in language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 27(1), 3–42.
- [36] Ullman, M. T. (2001). The declarative/procedural model of lexicon and grammar. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 30(1), 37–69.
- [37] Morgan-Short, K., Steinhauer, K., Sanz, C., & Ullman, M. T. (2012). Explicit and implicit second language training differentially affect the achievement of native-like brain activation patterns. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 24(4), 933–947.
- [38] DeKeyser, R. M. (2007). Skill acquisition theory. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 97–113). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [39] Tan, L. H., Chen, L., Yip, V., Chan, A. H. D., Yang, J., Gao, J.-H., & Siok, W. T. (2011). Activity levels in the left hemisphere caudate-fusiform circuit predict how well a second language will be learned. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(6), 2540–2544.
- [40] Dijkstra, T. (2005). Bilingual visual word recognition and lexical access. In J. F. Kroll & A. M. B. de Groot (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 179–201). Oxford University Press.
- [41] Soveri, A., Rodriguez-Fornells, A., & Laine, M. (2011). Is there a relationship between language switching and executive functions in bilingualism? Introducing a within-group analysis approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, 183.
- [42] Kim, K. H. S., Relkin, N. R., Lee, K.-M., & Hirsch, J. (1997). Distinct cortical areas associated with native and second languages. *Nature*, 388(6638), 171–174.
- [43] Kang, C., & Yoo, I.-W. (2019). Task-switching in Korean-English bilinguals: Effects of SOV-SVO structural conflict on executive control. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 22(3), 612–628.



- [44] Özge, D., Marinis, T., & Zeyrek, D. (2016). Incremental processing of relative clauses in Turkish. *Language Acquisition*, 23(3), 196–213.
- [45] Yow, W. Q., & Li, X. (2015). Balanced bilingualism and early age of second language acquisition as the underlying mechanisms of a bilingual executive control advantage: Why variations in bilingual experiences matter. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 164.
- [46] Ellis, N. C. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(2), 305–352.
- [47] Anderson, J. R. (2007). *How can the human mind occur in the physical universe?* Oxford University Press.
- [48] Bialystok, E. (2017). The bilingual adaptation: How minds accommodate experience. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(3), 233–262.
- [49] García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- [50] Stasenko, A., Matt, G. E., & Gollan, T. H. (2017). A relative bilingual advantage in switching with preparation: Nuanced explorations of the proposed link between bilingualism and executive functioning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 146(8), 1143–1167.
- [51] Luk, G., & Bialystok, E. (2013). Bilingualism is not a categorical variable: Interaction between language proficiency and usage. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 25(5), 605–621.
- [52] Mechelli, A., Crinion, J. T., Noppeney, U., O'Doherty, J., Ashburner, J., Frackowiak, R. S., & Price, C. J. (2004). Structural plasticity in the bilingual brain. *Nature*, 431(7010), 757.
- [53] Kroll, J. F., & Navarro-Torres, C. A. (2023). What bilinguals tell us about language, cognition, and the brain: Insights for a science of language. *Language Learning*, 73(S2), 5–44.