Title
Visual Acuity does not Moderate Effect Sizes of Higher-Level Cognitive Tasks

Journal
Experimental Aging Research, 42(3)

ISSN
0361-073X

Authors
Houston, James R
Bennett, Ilana J
Allen, Philip A
et al.

Publication Date
2016-05-26

DOI
10.1080/0361073x.2016.1156964

Peer reviewed

Experimental Aging Research, 42: 221–263, 2016

ISSN: 0361-073X print/1096-4657 online
DOI: 10.1080/0361073X.2016.1156964

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

VISUAL ACUITY DOES NOT MODERATE EFFECT SIZES OF HIGHER-LEVEL COGNITIVE TASKS

James R. Houston

Department of Psychology, The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, USA

Ilana J. Bennett

Department of Neurobiology and Behavior, University of California, Irvine, Irvine California, USA

Philip A. Allen

Department of Psychology, The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, USA

David J. Madden

Brain Imaging and Analysis Center, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina, USA

Background/Study Context*: Declining visual capacities in older adults have been posited as a driving force behind adult age differences in higher-order cognitive functions (e.g., the "common cause" hypothesis of Lindenberger & Baltes, 1994,* Psychology and Aging, 9, *339–355). McGowan, Patterson, and Jordan (2013,* Experimental Aging Research, 39, *70–79) also found that a surprisingly large number of published cognitive aging studies failed to include adequate measures of visual acuity. However, a recent meta-analysis of three studies (La Fleur and Salthouse, 2014,* Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 21, *1202–1208) failed to find evidence that visual acuity moderated or mediated age differences in higher-level cognitive processes. In order to provide a more extensive test of whether visual acuity moderates age differences in higher-level cognitive processes, we conducted a more extensive meta-analysis of topic.*

Methods*: Using results from 456 studies, we calculated effect sizes for the main effect of age across four cognitive domains (attention, executive function, memory, and perception/language) separately for five levels of visual acuity criteria (no criteria, undisclosed criteria, self-reported acuity, 20/80–20/31, and 20/30 or better).*

Received 5 January 2015; accepted 2 March 2015.
Address correspondence to Philip Allen, Department of Psychology, University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-4301, USA. E-mail: paallen@uakron.edu

Results*: As expected, age had a significant effect on each cognitive domain. However, these age effects did not further differ as a function of visual acuity criteria.*

Conclusion*: The current meta-analytic, cross-sectional results suggest that visual acuity is not significantly related to age group differences in higher-level cognitive performance—thereby replicating La Fleur and Salthouse (2014). Further efforts are needed to determine whether other measures of visual functioning (e.g., contrast sensitivity, luminance) affect age differences in cognitive functioning.*

Recently, McGowan, Patterson, and Jordan (2013) noted concerns regarding the lack of visual acuity assessment in aging studies involving linguistic stimuli. By exploring the incidence of specific visual acuity criteria used, these researchers found that the majority of 240 studies using linguistic stimuli published from 2000 to 2010 in *Experiment Aging Research, Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences*, and *Psychology and Aging* either made no mention of the visual acuity of their participants (59%) or relied on self-report (8.8%). Furthermore, numerous studies documented visual acuity capacities with no mention of a specific assessment (17.9%), and just over 14% of articles had documented participants' visual abilities while also providing the specific assessment that was utilized. Thus, a concern in this paucity of visual acuity screening in studies of cognitive aging is that visual acuity deficits in older adults might be moderating or mediating age-related differences in higher-order cognitive performance (e.g., attention, executive function, memory, and perception/language).

Considering the widespread decline in visual sensory processing that is normative to the aging process (Lindenberger & Baltes, 1994), it is alarming that so many studies have not controlled for acuity in their comparisons between younger and older participants. Moreover, it is also conceivable that the wide array of inclusionary criteria (e.g., Snellen 20/20, Snellen 20/40, self-report) incorporated into studies across several domains of cognitive function may also have an impact on the interpretation of results. For example, numerous reports have provided evidence of a dissociation between subjective and objectively measured visual acuity (Friedman et al., 1999; Ross, Stelmack, Stelmack, Guihan, & Fraim, 1999; Warrian, Altangerel, & Spaeth, 2010). Although visual acuity assessment is time-consuming and requires trained examiners, there is evidence that that the large stimuli and proper lighting used in earlier studies may not preclude declining abilities from influencing performance (Skeel, Nagra, Van Voorst, & Olson, 2003; Skeel, Schutte, Van Voorst, & Nagra, 2006).

However, La Fleur and Salthouse (2014) recently reported a meta-analysis on three of Salthouse's past studies (Salthouse, Fristoe, McGuthry, & Hambrick, 1998; Salthouse, 2013, 2014) that examined the relationship between age-related differences in processing speed and memory with visual acuity. Two of these data sets were cross-sectional, and one was longitudinal. They stated: "In conclusion, although we confirmed prior findings of moderate relations between sensory ability and measures of cognitive functioning, our results are not consistent with the hypothesis that age-related declines in sensory ability contribute to age-related declines in cognitive functioning" (p. 1208). La Fleur and Salthouse made this conclusion because their mediation analyses were inconclusive and because their observed relations between visual acuity and processing speed and memory were constant across all adult ages. Consequently, we conducted the present more comprehensive meta-analysis to follow-up on the LaFleur and Salthouse meta-analysis to assess the generality of the earlier finding of no moderation of visual acuity on age-related differences in higher cognitive processes. We believe that it is important to replicate these earlier findings because of the importance of the common cause hypothesis originally proposed by Lindenberger and Baltes (1994) to theories of cognitive aging.

In the present project, we meta-analyzed the data from 456 cognitive aging studies published from 1995 to 2013 using the PubMed academic database, as well as searching the aforementioned cognitive aging journals. The major issue of interest was whether the effect size of age would vary as a function of visual acuity category and/or higher-level processing domain. If the common cause theory can be applied to visual acuity, we assumed that studies that did not assess visual acuity, or used self-report indices of visual acuity, or studies in which visual acuity ranges were lower (20/80–20/31) would have larger disparities between younger and older adults' higher-level cognitive performances than studies in which visual acuity was higher (20/30 or better). That is, if all participants (younger and older) were required to have 20/30 visual acuity, or better, than the average, age deficit in higher-level cognitive performance would be smaller than if participants were required to have a minimum of just 20/40 visual acuity, or higher (because the average visual acuity would have tended to be higher in younger adults). Building on this logic, we predicted that if visual acuity modulated age-related differences in higher cognitive function, then the effect size for age in meta-analyses should be greater for the three groups expected to have poorer visual acuity (e.g., see McGowan et al., 2013).

The Common Cause Theory of Cognitive Aging

Given that there is frequently a lack of consensus in the cross-sectional and longitudinal cognitive aging literature (e.g., is there general, process-specific, or domain-specific slowing?), part of this lack of consensus may be due to the potentially confounding effect of uncontrolled visual acuity differences across age. A critical theory related to this issue is the common cause theory (Baltes & Lindenberger, 1997; Lindenberger & Baltes, 1994) of cognitive aging. For example, Lindenberger and Baltes (1994) examined a sample of 156 older adults from the Berlin Aging Study (mean age = 84.9 years, range = 70–103 years). They found that visual and auditory acuity accounted for 93.1% of the age-related reliable variance in intelligence. This type of empirical evidence has led common cause advocates to hypothesize that underlying age-related differences in visual or auditory sensory function moderate (change the direction or intensity of the age effect) or mediate (cause) age-related differences across a wide number of cognitive domains (Baltes & Lindenberger, 1997; Li & Lindenberger, 2002; Lindenberger & Baltes, 1994; Lindenberger & Ghisletta, 2009). There is evidence for age-related declines in sensory function. Indeed, previous efforts have found significant adult age-related differences in visual acuity, contrast sensitivity, and visual field (e.g., Brabyn, Schneck, Haegerstrom-Portnoy, & Lott, 2001; Evans & Rowlands, 2004; Glass, 2007; Greene & Madden, 1987; Klein, Klein, Lee, Cruickshanks, & Gangnon, 2006; Lindenberger & Baltes, 1994; Madden & Greene, 1987). These differences have been found across multiple settings and even in participants using their current optical correction (Brabyn et al., 2001; Greene & Madden, 1987; Skeel et al., 2003). Other research groups have explored the impact of acuity in processing visually presented stimuli through the use of occlusion filters in younger adults (e.g., Gilmore, Spinks, & Thomas, 2006). However, findings under this framework have reached inconsistent conclusions, perhaps due to these blurring filters impeding the functionality of neural compensatory mechanisms in the visual processing of experimental stimuli (Bertone, Bettinelli, & Faubert, 2007). Regardless, dependent upon the requirements of the particular cognitive task, age-related deficits in visual information processing have been suggested in both the periphery as well as central processing areas (Berry et al., 2010; Elliott, Whitaker, & MacVeigh, 1990; Owsley, 2011; Zhang et al., 2008).

However, the literature is mixed with regard to whether sensory decrements are correlated with, moderate, or mediate age-related differences in higher cognitive function. For example, Lindenberger and Baltes (1994) and Baltes and Lindenberger (1997), Anstey, Lord, and Williams (1997), Anstey and Smith (1999), Salthouse, Fristoe, McGuthry, & Hambrick, (1998), and Salthouse, Hancock, Meinz, and Hambrick (1996) all reported evidence of sensory mediation of age-related differences in cognitive processing. However, Allen et al. (2001), Anstey, Luszcz, and Sanchez (2001), Baena, Allen, Kaut, and Hall (2010), Schmiedek and Li (2004), and Verhaeghen (2003, 2011) all found evidence of substantial indirect effects of age on higher-level cognitive variables that were not accounted for (mediated by) common causes such as sensory processes (e.g., visual acuity). Consequently, past results using causal modeling (structural equation modeling [SEM]) methods and meta-analysis have resulted in seemingly inconsistent results with regard to sensory effects accounting for age-related differences in higher-level processes. An important contribution of the present study is that we present a meta-analysis of data from a much larger sample of studies (456) than has been used in the past (e.g., La Fleur & Salthouse 2014; and past SEM studies). Our goal is to assess whether the effect size of age-related differences in four different cognitive domains for the present substantial set of experimental studies vary as a function of visual acuity in younger and older adults.

The Present Study

There are two reasons for reporting the present meta-analyses in spite of the fact that La Fleur and Salthouse (2014) recently reported a similar study. First, La Fleur and Salthouse reported results from just two cognitive domains (processing speed and memory), and our design includes four domains (attention, executive function, memory, and perception/language) as well as multiple visual acuity categories (no assessment of visual acuity, undisclosed visual acuity, self-reported assessment of visual acuity, 20/80–20/31, and 20/30 or better). Second, given the importance of the common cause hypothesis (Lindenberger & Baltes, 1994) to the cognitive aging field, it is important to replicate these earlier results with a larger set of studies. Consequently, the present meta-analysis of visual acuity levels and their relationship to age-related differences in higher-level cognitive function uses a sample 456 aging studies across four cognitive domains and four levels of visual acuity.

METHODS

Literature Search

To further the effort of McGowan et al. (2013) and La Fleur and Salthouse (2014), we surveyed the literature from the online PubMed academic database (PubMed.gov) in conjunction with the databases for three journals used by McGowan and colleagues: *Psychology and Aging, Experimental Aging Research*, and *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences & Social Sciences*, as well as many other journals. To be included in the meta-analysis, studies were required to (1) be cross-sectional in nature (because so few longitudinal studies on this topic have been published); (2) have documented at least one age group comparison as a main effect; (3) have documented raw statistics in the form of Pearson's r, regression coefficient R^2, variance F ratio, Student's

t, β, or Spearman's ρ; (4) involve cognitive tasks in which stimuli were presented visually and performance could be objectively measured (i.e., by reaction time, percentage correct, or overall task performance); and (6) for the circumstances in which multiple studies were incorporated into a single publication, contain an orthogonal sample with participants not participating in any other portion of the study. Data collection took place in two stages. Stage 1 involved collecting studies from the PubMed database and from the three journals dating back to 2002. After examining the characteristics of these studies, we then conducted an additional search in the three journals dating back to 1995, targeting only studies that incorporated objectively measured visual acuity criteria in order to evenly distribute our categorizations and allow for representative comparison across visual acuity criteria for each cognitive domain.

Coding Procedure

In total, 456 studies were incorporated into the statistical analyses. We categorized these studies by visual acuity criteria and four cognitive domains: attention, executive function, memory, and perception. Many studies recorded measures from more than one domain. However, to satisfy independence requirements for the meta-analysis, only measures from one category per study were added into the analysis. For these studies with multiple domains, domains were chosen based upon either the emphasis of the study or, and provided that no emphasis was apparent, we assigned studies by need of the statistical analysis (i.e., to evenly distribute category cell counts). Building upon the visual acuity criteria employed by McGowan et al. (2013), studies were assigned to seven separate visual acuity categories in the current protocol. However, it should be noted that we "oversampled" in certain categories so that we would have enough cases—so the present results cannot be directly compared with those of McGowan et al. The first and most frequently assigned category (36.4% of cases) included studies in which no visual acuity criterion was required for participation. Separate categories were also established for studies documenting self-reported visual acuity (5.9% of cases) and adequate visual acuity with no documentation of the specific acuity threshold required (23.0% of cases). The final two criteria incorporated studies that provided a specific acuity threshold required to participate. All presented visual acuity thresholds were converted to Snellen ratios and initially assigned to the categories of 20/80–20/41, 20/40–20/31, 20/30–20/21, or 20/20 or better. Due to a limited number of studies utilizing the thresholds of 20/80 and 20/20 or better, the visual acuity categories were reduced to two categories for analysis, 20/80–20/31 and 20/30 or better. The classification of studies to both cognitive domain and visual acuity category is presented in Table 1.

As with McGowan et al. (2013), we also examined the prevalence of studies that documented the use of a specific visual acuity screener instrument. For 158 studies in which a specific threshold was required for participation, 53.8% (85) of studies documented the utilized measure of visual acuity. For comparison, 41.9% (44) of studies omitting documentation of an acuity threshold listed a vision assessment tool. However, a chi-square test of independence between these two likelihoods failed to reach statistical significance, $\chi^2 = 3.58$, $p = .058$, thus providing evidence that researchers using a specific exclusionary criteria were no more likely to document an assessment tool than those not utilizing a specific visual acuity criteria.

Table 1. Categorical assignment of articles by visual acuity criteria and cognitive domain

	Cognitive domain				
Visual acuity criteria	Attention	Executive function	Memory	Perception/language	Overall
Unreported	15	68	65	18	166
Undisclosed	31	23	23	28	105
Self-reported	10	5	6	6	27
20/80–20/31	47	13	21	9	90
20/30 or above	20	8	10	30	68
Overall	123	117	125	91	456

Note. For a list of typical cognitive tasks assigned to each domain, see Appendix A.

Effect Size Calculation

For each study, the raw statistic characterizing the main effect of age group (r, R^2, F, t, β, or ρ) was converted to Fisher's Z (Z_r), weighted by the study sample size (Rosenthal & DiMatteo, 2001). When necessary, the sign of the raw statistics were adjusted such that positive Z_r values indicate better performance (i.e., higher accuracy, faster reaction time) in younger adults relative to older adults. We then averaged the Z_r values across studies, separately for each visual acuity criteria and cognitive domain, and then converted back to r values (see Hedges & Vevea, 1998).

RESULTS

The averaged effect sizes (r) are presented separately for each visual acuity criterion and cognitive domain in Table 2. We also calculated overall values for each visual acuity criterion by collapsing across the cognitive domains and for each cognitive domain by collapsing across visual acuity criteria. These moderate to large effect sizes (Cohen, 1988) indicate that, as expected, older adults performed significantly worse on all cognitive tasks than younger adults. Multiple Z tests of the weighted effect sizes (Z_r) further confirmed that the effect of age on cognitive performance was significant for each cognitive domain at each visual acuity criteria (Zs > 5.43, ps $< .001$).

Table 2. Average effect sizes for each visual acuity criteria and cognitive domain

	Cognitive domain				
Visual acuity criteria	Attention	Executive function	Memory	Perception/language	Overall
Unreported	0.49 [0.38, 0.57]	0.41 [0.37, 0.45]	0.42 [0.37, 0.47]	0.43 [0.33, 0.52]	0.44 [0.41, 0.47]
Undisclosed	0.47 [0.39, 0.55]	0.48 [0.41, 0.54]	0.45 [0.37, 0.53]	0.51 [0.43, 0.59]	0.48 [0.44, 0.52]
Self-reported	0.44 [0.40, 0.49]	0.47 [0.31, 0.60]	0.36 [0.20, 0.50]	0.58 [0.42, 0.71]	0.47 [0.43, 0.51]
20/80–20/31	0.56 [0.51, 0.61]	0.45 [0.35, 0.54]	0.51 [0.39, 0.62]	0.38 [0.32, 0.44]	0.48 [0.44, 0.51]
20/30 or above	0.63 [0.54, 0.71]	0.43 [0.30, 0.54]	0.49 [0.39, 0.59]	0.43 [0.36, 0.49]	0.50 [0.46, 0.54]
Overall	0.52 [0.50, 0.55]	0.45 [0.42, 0.48]	0.45 [0.41, 0.48]	0.47 [0.44, 0.50]	

Note. Average effect sizes (r) and 95% confidence intervals (in brackets) are presented as a function of the five visual acuity criteria and four cognitive domains. Overall values were calculated for each visual acuity criteria by collapsing across the cognitive domains and vice versa.

Additional Z tests of the differences between the weighted effect sizes revealed that the effect of age did not significantly differ across the visual acuity criteria for any cognitive domain (Zs $< |1.11|$, ps $> .13$). Similar nonsignificant differences were observed across the visual acuity criteria when using the overall cognitive measure (i.e., collapsed across domains) (Zs $< |0.49|$, ps $> .31$). See Appendix B for individual study categorizations with their associated weighted effect size values.

DISCUSSION

The main finding of the present meta-analysis of 456 cognitive aging studies across four domains was that there were no significant differences in effect size for age across the five categories of visual acuity in any of the four different cognitive domains. A key assumption was that if the visual acuity (VA) data supported the predictions of the common cause hypothesis, then there would be larger relative sensory decrements in the unreported VA, self-reported VA, and 20/80–20/31 visual acuity categories than in the 20/30 or above VA category (because this final category of the highest VA group required that younger and older adults had a minimum of 20/30 visual acuity). In the other groups, one would expect that older adults would have poorer visual acuity than younger adults in causes in which visual acuity was not controlled, and thus the effect size for age should largest in the groups with relatively larger age-related differences in VA. However, the effect sizes for age did not differ across the five VA groups in any of the four cognitive domains, or overall (i.e., when collapsing into a single cognitive domain). These results therefore suggest that one type of sensory effect, visual acuity, does not moderate age-related differences in higher cognitive processes, in seeming violation of the predictions of the common cause hypothesis (Baltes & Lindenberger, 1997; Lindenberger & Baltes, 1994).

With regard to the limitations of the current design, the most apparent consideration is that we drew our results from a single measure of visual functioning—visual acuity. This parameter was selected due to its ubiquity in the published cognitive aging literature. However, this meta-analysis does not rule out a potential moderation or mediation relationship between other measures of visual functioning, such as contrast sensitivity or visual field size (or measures of auditory sensory functioning), and differences in age-group comparisons of cognitive performance. Also, the present study consisted of a healthy aging sample. Thus, it could be that for, say, dementia patients that sensory decrements could moderate or mediate performance in higher-level cognition. Note that this is a particularly important possibility because the sample used in Lindenberger and Baltes (1994) was approximately 85 years of age, and the odds of dementia at this age is likely over 30% (Herbert, Weuve, Scherr, & Evans, 2013). Nevertheless, we argue that the lack of a sensory-cognition association as measured by the most ubiquitously reported measure of sensory function, visual acuity, provides an important consideration to the discussion of general and specific effects associated with cognitive aging. Namely, based on a meta-analysis of 456 studies, we could not detect significant age-related differences in overall visual acuity, and we found that different categories of visual acuity did not moderate age-related differences in higher-level cognitive function.

The independence of age-related visual sensory and cognitive effects is surprising in light of the common cause hypothesis. One possibility is that older adults compensate for sensory deficits using top-down processes (e.g., Madden, 2007) and/or increased bottom-up chunking skill and normalization (Allen et al., 2002c, 2011; see Stine-Morrow, Miller, & Hertzog, 2006, for an information-processing model of compensation). At a neural level, compensation is reflected in age-related differences in task-related functional brain activation, and perhaps in brain structure as well (e.g., white matter integrity), linked to age-related differences in behavioral performance (Cabeza, Anderson, Locantore, & McIntosh, 2002; Grady, 2012). The aspects of brain structure and function that define compensation, however, are not yet known entirely and appear to depend on many variables related to task demands and the overall level of task performance (Daselaar et al., 2013; Davis, Dennis, Daselaar, Fleck, & Cabeza, 2008; Logan, Sanders, Snyder, Morris, & Buckner, 2002). Alternatively, it may be the case that, for the types of cognitive measures reviewed here, the variance associated with computational (encoding), decision-related, and response-related aspects of the task is more relevant for age-related differences than the variance associated with visual acuity. Finally, as noted earlier, it could be that sensory moderation or mediation of age-related differences in higher-level cognitive function may not occur into much later (e.g., in the mid-80s—as in Lindenberger & Baltes, 1994). Consequently, other factors in addition to sensory decrements are important for a thorough understanding of age-related differences in cognitive processing. Although we in no way suggest that researchers should not screen for visual acuity, our meta-analysis results show that such a situation would probably not bias estimates of age-related differences in higher cognitive processing, although not screening for visual acuity could exacerbate age-related differences in visual acuity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Paul Verhaeghen for meta-analysis advice.

FUNDING

We gratefully acknowledge funding for this research by NIH grant AG039684 (to David J. Madden) and by NIA grant AG047334 (to Ilana J. Bennett).

REFERENCES

(Entries with asterisks are cited in the text of this paper.)

*Aizpurua, A., Garcia-Bajos, E., & Migueles, M. (2009). Memory for actions of an event: Older and younger adults compared. *The Journal of General Psychology*, *136*, 428–441. doi: 10.1080/00221300903269816

Aizpurua, A., Garcia-Bajos, E., & Migueles, M. (2011). False recognition and source attribution for actions of an emotional event in older and younger adults. *Experimental Aging Research*, *37*, 310–329. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.568829

Aizpurua, A., & Koutstaal, W. (2010). Aging and flexible remembering: Contributions of conceptual span, fluid intelligence, and frontal functioning. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 193–207. doi: 10.1037/a0018198

*Allen, P. A., Bucur, B., Grabbe, J., Work, T., & Madden, D. J. (2011). Influence of encoding difficulty, word frequency, and phonological regularity on age differences in word naming. *Experimental Aging Research*, *37*, 261–292. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.568805

Allen, P. A., Groth, K. E., Weber, T. A., & Madden, D. J. (1993a). Influence of response selection and noise similarity on age differences in the redundancy gain. *Journal of Gerontology*, *48*, 189–198. doi: 10.1093/geronj/48.4.P189

*Allen, P. A., Hall, R. J., Druley, J. A., Smith, A. F., Sanders, R. E., & Murphy, M. D. (2001). How shared are age-related influences on cognitive and noncognitive variables? *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 532–549. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.16.3.532

Allen, P. A., Kaufman, M., Smith, A. F., & Propper, R. E. (1998). A molar entropy model of age differences in spatial memory. *Psychology and Aging*, *13*, 501. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.13.3.501

Allen, P. A., Madden, D. J., & Crozier, L. C. (1991). Adult age differences in letter-level and word-level processing. *Psychology and Aging*, *6*, 261–271. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.6.2.261

Allen, P. A., Madden, D. J., Weber, T. A., & Groth, K. E. (1993b). Influence of age and processing stage on visual word recognition. *Psychology and Aging*, *8*, 274–282. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.8.2.274

Allen, P. A., Murphy, M. D., Kaufman, M., Groth, K. E., & Begovic, A. (2004). Age differences in central (semantic) and peripheral processing: The importance of considering both response times and errors. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *59*, 210–219. doi: 10.1093/geronb/59.5.P210

Allen, P. A., Ruthruff, E., Elicker, J. D., & Lien, M.-C. (2009a). Multisession, dual-task psychological refractory period practice benefits older and younger adults equally. *Experimental Aging Research*, *35*, 369–399. doi: 10.1080/03610730903175766

Allen, P. A., Sliwinski, M., & Bowie, T. (2002a). Differential age effects in semantic and episodic memory, Part II: Slope and intercept analyses. *Experimental Aging Research*, *28*, 111–142. doi: 10.1080/03610730252800157

Allen, P. A., Sliwinski, M., Bowie, T., & Madden, D. J. (2002b). Differential age effects in semantic and episodic memory. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *57*, 173–186. doi: 10.1093/geronb/57.2.P173

*Allen, P. A., Smith, A. F., Groth, K. E., Pickle, J. L., Grabbe, J. W., & Madden, D. J. (2002c). Differential age effects for case and hue mixing in visual word recognition. *Psychology and Aging*, *17*, 622–635. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.17.4.622

Allen, P. A., Smith, A. F., Jerge, K. A., & Vires-Collins, H. (1997). Age differences in mental multiplication: Evidence for peripheral but not central decrements. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *52*, 81–90. doi: 10.1093/geronb/52B.2.P81

Allen, P. A., Smith, A. F., Lien, M.-C., Kaut, K. P., & Canfield, A. (2009b). A multistream model of visual word recognition. *Attention, Perception & Psychophysics*, *71*, 281–296. doi: 10.3758/APP.71.2.281

Allen, P. A., Weber, T. A., & Madden, D. J. (1994). Adult age differences in attention: Filtering or selection? *Journal of Gerontology*, *49*, 213–222. doi: 10.1093/geronj/49.5.P213

Allen, P. A., Weber, T. A., & May, N. (1993c). Age differences in letter and color matching: Selective attention or internal noise? *Journal of Gerontology*, *48*, P69–P77. doi: 10.1093/geronj/48.2.P69

Anderson, B. A., Jacoby, L. L., Thomas, R. C., & Balota, D. A. (2011a). The effects of age and divided attention on spontaneous recognition. *Memory & Cognition*, *39*, 725–735. doi: 10.3758/s13421-010-0046-z

Andersen, G. J., Ni, R., Bower, J. D., & Watanabe, T. (2010). Perceptual learning, aging, and improved visual performance in early stages of visual processing. *Journal of Vision*, *10*, 4. doi: 10.1167/10.13.4

Anderson, M. C., Reinholz, J., Kuhl, B. A., & Mayr, U. (2011b). Intentional suppression of unwanted memories grows more difficult as we age. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 397–405. doi: 10.1037/a0022505

*Andrés, P., & Van der Linden, M. (2000). Age-related differences in supervisory attentional system functions. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *55*, 373–380. doi: 10.1093/geronb/55.6.P373

Anstey, K. J., Lord, S. R., & Williams, P. (1997). Strength in the lower limbs, visual contrast sensitivity, and simple reaction time predict cognition in older women. *Psychology and Aging*, *12*, 137–144. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.12.1.137

*Anstey, K. J., Luszcz, M. A., & Sanchez, L. (2001). A reevaluation of the common factor theory of shared variance among age, sensory function, and cognitive function in older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *56*, 3–11. doi: 10.1093/geronb/56.1.P3

*Anstey, K. J., & Smith, G. A. (1999). Interrelationships among biological markers of aging, health, activity, acculturation, and cognitive performance in late adulthood. *Psychology and Aging*, *14*, 605–618. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.14.4.605

Artistico, D., Cervone, D., & Pezzuti, L. (2003). Perceived self-efficacy and everyday problem solving among young and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *18*, 68–79. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.18.1.68

Ashendorf, L., & McCaffrey, R. J. (2008). Exploring age-related decline on the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, *22*, 262–272. doi: 10.1080/13854040701218436

Ashley, V., & Swick, D. (2009). Consequences of emotional stimuli: Age differences on pure and mixed blocks of the emotional Stroop. *Behavioral and Brain Functions*, *5*, 14. doi: 10.1186/1744-9081-5-14

Atchley, P., & Kramer, A. F. (2000). Age-related changes in the control of attention in depth. *Psychology and Aging*, *15*, 78–87. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.15.1.78

Badham, S. P., & Maylor, E. A. (2011). Age-related associative deficits are absent with nonwords. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 689–694. doi: 10.1037/a0022205

*Baena, E., Allen, P. A., Kaut, K. P., & Hall, R. J. (2010). On age differences in prefrontal function: The importance of emotional/cognitive integration. *Neuropsychologia*, *48*, 319–333. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.09.021

*Baltes, P. B., & Lindenberger, U. (1997). Emergence of a powerful connection between sensory and cognitive functions across the adult life span: A new window to the study of cognitive aging? *Psychology and Aging*, *12*, 12. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.12.1.12

Bannerman, R. L., Regener, P., & Sahraie, A. (2011). Binocular rivalry: A window into emotional processing in aging. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 372–380. doi: 10.1037/a0022029

Bartels, C., Wegrzyn, M., Wiedl, A., Ackermann, V., & Ehrenreich, H. (2010). Practice effects in healthy adults: A longitudinal study on frequent repetitive cognitive testing. *BMC Neuroscience*, *11*, 118. doi: 10.1186/1471-2202-11-118

Basak, C., & Verhaeghen, P. (2011). Aging and switching the focus of attention in working memory: Age differences in item availability but not in item accessibility. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *66*, 519–526. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbr028

Batsakes, P. J., & Fisk, A. D. (2000). Age-related differences in dual-task visual search: Are performance gains retained? *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *55*, 332–342. doi: 10.1093/geronb/55.6.P332

Baudouin, A., Clarys, D., Vanneste, S., & Isingrini, M. (2009). Executive functioning and processing speed in age-related differences in memory: Contribution of a coding task. *Brain and Cognition*, *71*, 240–245. doi: 10.1016/j.bandc.2009.08.007

Bayer, Z. C., Hernandez, R. J., Morris, A. M., Salomonczyk, D., Pirogovsky, E., & Gilbert, P. E. (2011). Age-related source memory deficits persist despite superior item memory. *Experimental Aging Research*, *37*, 473–480. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.590760

Beaunieux, H., Hubert, V., Pitel, A. L., Desgranges, B., & Eustache, F. (2009). Episodic memory deficits slow down the dynamics of cognitive procedural learning in normal ageing. *Memory*, *17*, 197–207. doi: 10.1080/09658210802212010

Bell, R., Buchner, A., & Mund, I. (2008). Age-related differences in irrelevant-speech effects. *Psychology and Aging*, *23*, 377–391. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.23.2.377

Bender, A. R., Naveh-Benjamin, M., & Raz, N. (2010). Associative deficit in recognition memory in a lifespan sample of healthy adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 940–948. doi: 10.1037/a0020595

Benjamin, A. S. (2011). Age differences in the use of beneficial and misleading cues in recall: With a comment on the measurement of between-group differences in accuracy. *Experimental Aging Research*, *37*, 63–75. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.536742

Bergerbest, D., Gabrieli, J. D. E., Whitfield-Gabrieli, S., Kim, H., Stebbins, G. T., Bennett, D. A., & Fleischman, D. A. (2009). Age-associated reduction of asymmetry in prefrontal function and preservation of conceptual repetition priming. *NeuroImage*, *45*, 237–246. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.10.019

*Berry, A. S., Zanto, T. P., Clapp, W. C., Hardy, J. L., Delahunt, P. B., Mahncke, H. W., & Gazzaley, A. (2010). The influence of perceptual training on working memory in older adults. *PLoS ONE*, *5*, e11537. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0011537

*Bertone, A., Bettinelli, L., & Faubert, J. (2007). The impact of blurred vision on cognitive assessment. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *29*, 467–476. doi: 10.1080/13803390600770793

Bertsch, K., Hagemann, D., Hermes, M., Walter, C., Khan, R., & Naumann, E. (2009). Resting cerebral blood flow, attention, and aging. *Brain Research*, *1267*, 77–88. doi: 10.1016/j.brainres.2009.02.053

Bo, J., Borza, V., & Seidler, R. D. (2009). Age-related declines in visuospatial working memory correlate with deficits in explicit motor sequence learning. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *102*, 2744–2754. doi: 10.1152/jn.00393.2009

Bock, O. (2005). Components of sensorimotor adaptation in young and elderly subjects. *Experimental Brain Research*, *160*, 259–263. doi: 10.1007/s00221-004-2133-5

Bock, O. (2008). Dual-task costs while walking increase in old age for some, but not for other tasks: An experimental study of healthy young and elderly persons. *Journal of Neuroengineering and Rehabilitation*, *5*, 27. doi: 10.1186/1743-0003-5-27

Bojko, A., Kramer, A. F., & Peterson, M. S. (2004). Age equivalence in switch costs for prosaccade and antisaccade tasks. *Psychology and Aging*, *19*, 226–234. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.19.1.226

Bopp, K. L., & Verhaeghen, P. (2009). Working memory and aging: Separating the effects of content and context. *Psychology and Aging*, *24*, 968–980. doi: 10.1037/a0017731

Borella, E., Ludwig, C., Dirk, J., & De Ribaupierre, A. (2011). The influence of time of testing on interference, working memory, processing speed, and vocabulary: Age differences in adulthood. *Experimental Aging Research*, *37*, 76–107. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.536744

Bowles, N. L. (1994). Age and rate of activation in semantic memory. *Psychology and Aging*, *9*, 414–429. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.9.3.414

Bowles, N. L., & Poon, L. W. (1981). The effect of age on speed of lexical access. *Experimental Aging Research*, *7*, 417–425. doi: 10.1080/03610738108259822

*Brabyn, J., Schneck, M., Haegerstrom-Portnoy, G., & Lott, L. (2001). The Smith-Kettlewell Institute (SKI) longitudinal study of vision function and its impact among the elderly: An overview. *Optometry & Vision Science*, *78*, 264–269. doi: 10.1097/00006324-200105000-00008

Brache, K., Scialfa, C., & Hudson, C. (2010). Aging and vigilance: Who has the inhibition deficit? *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 140–152. doi: 10.1080/03610731003613425

Brehmer, Y., Westerberg, H., & Bäckman, L. (2012). Working-memory training in younger and older adults: Training gains, transfer, and maintenance. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *6*, 63. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2012.00063

Briggs, S. D., Raz, N., & Marks, W. (1999). Age-related deficits in generation and manipulation of mental images: I. The role of sensorimotor speed and working memory. *Psychology and Aging*, *14*, 427–435. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.14.3.427

Brigman, S., & Cherry, K. E. (2002). Age and skilled performance: Contributions of working memory and processing speed. *Brain and Cognition*, *50*, 242–256. doi: 10.1016/S0278-2626(02)00510-9

Bryan, J., & Luszcz, M. A. (1996). Speed of information processing as a mediator between age and free-recall performance. *Psychology and Aging*, *11*, 3–9. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.11.1.3

Buchler, N. G., Faunce, P., Light, L. L., Gottfredson, N., & Reder, L. M. (2011). Effects of repetition on associative recognition in young and older adults: Item and associative strengthening. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 111–126. doi: 10.1037/a0020816

Bucur, B., Allen, P. A., Sanders, R. E., Ruthruff, E., & Murphy, M. D. (2005a). Redundancy gain and coactivation in bimodal detection: Evidence for the preservation of coactive processing in older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *60*, 279–282. doi: 10.1093/geronb/60.5.P279

Bucur, B., Madden, D. J., & Allen, P. A. (2005b). Age-related differences in the processing of redundant visual dimensions. *Psychology and Aging*, *20*, 435–446. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.20.3.435

Bugg, J. M., Zook, N. A., DeLosh, E. L., Davalos, D. B., & Davis, H. P. (2006). Age differences in fluid intelligence: Contributions of general slowing and frontal decline. *Brain and Cognition*, *62*, 9–16. doi: 10.1016/j.bandc.2006.02.006

Burke, D. M., White, H., & Diaz, D. L. (1987). Semantic priming in young and older adults: Evidence for age constancy in automatic and attentional processes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *13*, 79–88. doi: 10.1037/0096-1523.13.1.79

Burton-Danner, C., Owsley, G. K., & Jackson, G. R. (2001). Aging and feature search: The effect of search area. *Experimental Aging Research*, *27*, 1–18. doi: 10.1080/03610730125782

*Cabeza, R., Anderson, N. D., Locantore, J. K., & McIntosh, A. R. (2002). Aging gracefully: Compensatory brain activity in high-performing older adults. *Neuroimage*, *17*, 1394–1402. doi: 10.1006/nimg.2002.1280

Cabeza, R., Daselaar, S. M., Dolcos, F., Prince, S. E., Budde, M., & Nyberg, L. (2004). Task-independent and task-specific age effects on brain activity during working memory, visual attention and episodic retrieval. *Cerebral Cortex*, *14*, 364–375. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhg133

Cansino, S., Guzzon, D., Martinelli, M., Barollo, M., & Casco, C. (2011). Effects of aging on interference control in selective attention and working memory. *Memory & Cognition*, *39*, 1409–1422. doi: 10.3758/s13421-011-0109-9

Caplan, D., Dede, G., Waters, G., Michaud, J., & Tripodis, Y. (2011). Effects of age, speed of processing, and working memory on comprehension of sentences with relative clauses. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 439–450. doi: 10.1037/a0021837

Carp, J., Gmeindl, L., & Reuter-Lorenz, P. A. (2010). Age differences in the neural representation of working memory revealed by multi-voxel pattern analysis. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *4*, 217. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2010.00217

Ceponiene, R., Westerfield, M., Torki, M., & Townsend, J. (2008). Modality-specificity of sensory aging in vision and audition: Evidence from event-related potentials. *Brain Research*, *1215*, 53–68. doi: 10.1016/j.brainres.2008.02.010

Cerella, J., Onyper, S. V., & Hoyer, W. J. (2006). The associative-memory basis of cognitive skill learning: Adult age differences. *Psychology and Aging*, *21*, 483–498. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.21.3.483

Chaby, L., Narme, P., & George, N. (2011). Older adults' configural processing of faces: Role of second-order information. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 71–79. doi: 10.1037/a0020873

Chaparro, A., Wood, J. M., & Carberry, T. (2005). Effects of age and auditory and visual dual tasks on closed-road driving performance. *Optometry and Vision Science*, *82*, 747–754. doi: 10.1097/01.opx.0000174724.74957.45

Charness, N., Kelley, C. L., Bosman, E. A., & Mottram, M. (2001). Word-processing training and retraining: Effects of adult age, experience, and interface. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 110–127. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.16.1.110

Chein, J. M., & Morrison, A. B. (2010). Expanding the mind's workspace: Training and transfer effects with a complex working memory span task. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *17*, 193–199. doi: 10.3758/PBR.17.2.193

Chen, Y., Ma, X., & Pethtel, O. (2011). Age differences in trade-off decisions: Older adults prefer choice deferral. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 269–273. doi: 10.1037/a0021582

Cherry, K. E., Dokey, D. K., Reese, C. M., & Brigman, S. (2003). Pictorial illustrations enhance memory for sentences in younger and older adults. *Experimental Aging Research*, *29*, 353–370. doi: 10.1080/03610730303720

Cherry, K. E., & Jones, M. W. (1999). Age-related differences in spatial memory: Effects of structural and organizational context. *The Journal of General Psychology*, *126*, 53–73. doi: 10.1080/00221309909595351

Cherry, K. E., & LeCompte, D. C. (1999). Age and individual differences influence prospective memory. *Psychology and Aging*, *14*, 60–76. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.14.1.60

Cherry, K. E., & Park, D. C. (1993). Individual difference and contextual variables influence spatial memory in younger and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *8*, 517–526.

Cherry, K. E., Park, D. C., Frieske, D. A., & Rowley, R. L. (1993). The effect of verbal elaborations on memory in young and older adults. *Memory & Cognition*, *21*, 725–738. doi: 10.3758/BF03202741

Cherry, K. E., & St Pierre, C. (1998). Age-related differences in pictorial implicit memory: Role of perceptual and conceptual processes. *Experimental Aging Research*, *24*, 53–62. doi: 10.1080/036107398244355

Clancy-Dollinger, S. M. (1995). Effect of degraded viewing on visual asymmetry patterns in older adults. *Experimental Aging Research*, *21*, 47–57. doi: 10.1080/03610739508254267

Clapp, W. C., Rubens, M. T., Sabharwal, J., & Gazzaley, A. (2011). Deficit in switching between functional brain networks underlies the impact of multitasking on working memory in older adults. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *108*, 7212–7217. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1015297108

Coeckelbergh, T. R. M., Cornelissen, F. W., Brouwer, W. H., & Kooijman, A. C. (2004). Age-related changes in the functional visual field: Further evidence for an inverse Age × Eccentricity effect. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *59*, 11–18. doi: 10.1093/geronb/59.1.P11

Cohen, G., & Faulkner, D. (1983). Age differences in performance on two information-processing tasks: Strategy selection and processing efficiency. *Journal of Gerontology*, *38*, 447–454. doi: 10.1093/geronj/38.4.447

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

*Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Colcombe, S. J., Kramer, A. F., Erickson, K. I., & Scalf, P. (2005). The implications of cortical recruitment and brain morphology for individual differences in inhibitory function in aging humans. *Psychology and Aging*, *20*, 363–375. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.20.3.363

Copeland, D. E., & Radvansky, G. A. (2007). Aging and integrating spatial mental models. *Psychology and Aging*, *22*, 569–579. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.22.3.569

Costello, M. C., Madden, D. J., Mitroff, S. R., & Whiting, W. L. (2010a). Age-related decline of visual processing components in change detection. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 356–368. doi: 10.1037/a0017625

Costello, M. C., Madden, D. J., Shepler, A. M., Mitroff, S. R., & Leber, A. B. (2010b). Age-related preservation of top-down control over distraction in visual search. *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 249–272. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2010.484719

Craik, F. I. M., & Schloerscheidt, A. M. (2011). Age-related differences in recognition memory: Effects of materials and context change. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 671–677. doi: 10.1037/a0022203

*Daselaar, S. M., Iyengar, V., Davis, S. W., Eklund, K., Hayes, S. M., & Cabeza, R. E. (2013). Less wiring, more firing: Low-performing older adults compensate for impaired white matter with greater neural activity. *Cerebral Cortex, 25*(4), 983–990.

*Davis, H. P., & Klebe, K. J. (2001). A longitudinal study of the performance of the elderly and young on the Tower of Hanoi puzzle and Rey recall. *Brain and Cognition*, *46*, 95–99. doi: 10.1006/brcg.2000.1269

Davis, S. W., Dennis, N. A., Daselaar, S. M., Fleck, M. S., & Cabeza, R. (2008). Que PASA? The posterior-anterior shift in aging. *Cerebral Cortex*, *18*, 1201–1209. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhm155

Deiber, M.-P., Rodriguez, C., Jaques, D., Missonnier, P., Emch, J., Millet, P., & Ibañez, V. (2010). Aging effects on selective attention-related electroencephalographic patterns during face encoding. *Neuroscience*, *171*, 173–186. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2010.08.051

Del Viva, M. M., & Agostini, R. (2007). Visual spatial integration in the elderly. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, *48*, 2940–2946. doi: 10.1167/iovs.06-0729

Denburg, N. L., Tranel, D., & Bechara, A. (2005). The ability to decide advantageously declines prematurely in some normal older persons. *Neuropsychologia*, *43*, 1099–1106. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2004.09.012

Denney, N. W., & Larsen, J. E. (1994). Aging and episodic memory: Are elderly adults less likely to make connections between target and contextual information? *Journal of Gerontology*, *49*, 270–275. doi: 10.1093/geronj/49.6.P270

Dew, I. T. Z., & Giovanello, K. S. (2010a). Differential age effects for implicit and explicit conceptual associative memory. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 911–921. doi: 10.1037/a0019940

Dew, I. T. Z., & Giovanello, K. S. (2010b). The status of rapid response learning in aging. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 898–910. doi: 10.1037/a0019430

Doose, G., & Feyereisen, P. (2001). Task specificity in age-related slowing: Word production versus conceptual comparison. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *56*, 85–87. doi: 10.1093/geronb/56.2.P85

Dorbath, L., Hasselhorn, M., & Titz, C. (2011). Aging and executive functioning: A training study on focus-switching. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *2*, 257. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00257

Doumas, M., Rapp, M. A., & Krampe, R. T. (2009). Working memory and postural control: Adult age differences in potential for improvement, task priority, and dual tasking. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *64B*, 193–201. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbp009

Dywan, J., Segalowitz, S. J., Webster, L., Hendry, K., & Harding, J. (2001). Event-related potential evidence for age-related differences in attentional allocation during a source monitoring task. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, *19*, 99–120. doi: 10.1207/S15326942DN1901_7

Eckert, M. A., Keren, N. I., Roberts, D. R., Calhoun, V. D., & Harris, K. C. (2010). Age-related changes in processing speed: Unique contributions of cerebellar and prefrontal cortex. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *4*, 10. doi: doi: 10.3389/neuro.09.010.2010

Einstein, G. O., Smith, R. E., McDaniel, M. A., & Shaw, P. (1997). Aging and prospective memory: The influence of increased task demands at encoding and retrieval. *Psychology and Aging*, *12*, 479–488. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.12.3.479

*Elliott, D., Whitaker, D., & MacVeigh, D. (1990). Neural contribution to spatiotemporal contrast sensitivity decline in healthy ageing eyes. *Vision Research*, *30*, 541–547. doi: 10.1016/0042-6989(90)90066-T

Elliott, S. L., Choi, S. S., Doble, N., Hardy, J. L., Evans, J. W., & Werner, J. S. (2009). Role of high-order aberrations in senescent changes in spatial vision. *Journal of Vision*, *9*, 24.1–16. doi: 10.1167/9.2.24

Elliott, S. L., Hardy, J. L., Webster, M. A., & Werner, J. S. (2007). Aging and blur adaptation. *Journal of Vision*, *7*, 8. doi: 10.1167/7.6.8

Elliott, S. L., & Werner, J. S. (2010). Age-related changes in contrast gain related to the M and P pathways. *Journal of Vision*, *10*, 4.1–4.15. doi: 10.1167/10.4.4

Ellis, R. D., Goldberg, J. H., & Detweiler, M. C. (1996). Predicting age-related differences in visual information processing using a two-stage queuing model. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *51*, 155–165. doi: 10.1093/geronb/51B.3.P155

Elwan, O., Hassan, A. A., Abdel Naseer, M., Fahmy, M., Elwan, F., Abel Kader, A., & Mahfouz, M. (1996). Brain aging in normal Egyptians: Neuropsychological, electrophysiological and cranial tomographic assessment. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*, *136*, 73–80. doi: 10.1016/0022-510X(95)00292-A

Emery, L., Hale, S., & Myerson, J. (2008). Age differences in proactive interference, working memory, and abstract reasoning. *Psychology and Aging*, *23*, 634–645. doi: 10.1037/a0012577

Emery, L., & Hess, T. M. (2011). Cognitive consequences of expressive regulation in older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 388–396. doi: 10.1037/a0020041

Esposito, G., Kirkby, B. S., Van Horn, J. D., Ellmore, T. M., & Berman, K. F. (1999). Context-dependent, neural system-specific neurophysiological concomitants of ageing: Mapping PET correlates during cognitive activation. *Brain*, *122*, 963–979. doi: 10.1093/brain/122.5.963

*Evans, B. J., & Rowlands, G. (2004). Correctable visual impairment in older people: A major unmet need. *Ophthalmic and Physiological Optics*, *24*, 161–180. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-1313.2004.00197.x

Fein, G., McGillivray, S., & Finn, P. (2007). Older adults make less advantageous decisions than younger adults: Cognitive and psychological correlates. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, *13*, 480–489. doi: 10.1017/S135561770707052X

Feld, J. E., & Sommers, M. S. (2009). Lipreading, processing speed, and working memory in younger and older adults. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *52*, 1555–1565. doi: 10.1044/1092-4388(2009/08-0137)

Feng, M. C., Courtney, C. G., Mather, M., Dawson, M. E., & Davison, G. C. (2011). Age-related affective modulation of the startle eyeblink response: Older adults startle most when viewing positive pictures. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 752–760. doi: 10.1037/a0023110

Fernandes, M., Ross, M., Wiegand, M., & Schryer, E. (2008). Are the memories of older adults positively biased? *Psychology and Aging*, *23*, 297–306. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.23.2.297

Ferraro, F. R., & Kellas, G. (1992). Age-related changes in the effects of target orientation on word recognition. *Journal of Gerontology*, *47*, 279–280. doi: 10.1093/geronj/47.4.P279

Fisk, A. D., Cooper, B. P., Hertzog, C., Anderson-Garlach, M. M., & Lee, M. D. (1995). Understanding performance and learning in consistent memory search: An age-related perspective. *Psychology and Aging*, *10*, 255–268. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.10.2.255

Fisk, A. D., & Rogers, W. A. (1991). Toward an understanding of age-related memory and visual search effects. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. General*, *120*, 131–149. doi: 10.1037/0096-3445.120.2.131

Fisk, A. D., Rogers, W. A., Cooper, B. P., & Gilbert, D. K. (1997). Automatic category search and its transfer: Aging, type of search, and level of learning. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *52*, 91–102. doi: 10.1093/geronb/52B.2.P91

Foos, P. W., & Goolkasian, P. (2010). Age differences and format effects in working memory. *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 273–286. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2010.484725

Ford, J. M., Askari, N., Mathalon, D. H., Menon, V., Gabrieli, J. D., Tinklenberg, J. R., & Yesavage, J. (2001). Event-related brain potential evidence of spared knowledge in Alzheimer's disease. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 161–176. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.16.1.161

*Friedman, S. M., Munoz, B., Rubin, G. S., West, S. K., Bandeen-Roche, K., & Fried, L. P. (1999). Characteristics of discrepancies between self-reported visual function and measured reading speed. Salisbury eye evaluation project team. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, *40*, 858–864.

Frings, L., Mader, I., & Hüll, M. (2010). Watching TV news as a memory task–brain activation and age effects. *BMC Neuroscience*, *11*, 106. doi: 10.1186/1471-2202-11-106

Gaesser, B., Sacchetti, D. C., Addis, D. R., & Schacter, D. L. (2011). Characterizing age-related changes in remembering the past and imagining the future. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 80–84. doi: 10.1037/a0021054

Gamboz, N., Borella, E., & Brandimonte, M. A. (2009). The role of switching, inhibition and working memory in older adults' performance in the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, *16*, 260–284. doi: 10.1080/13825580802573045

Gamboz, N., Russo, R., & Fox, E. (2000). Target selection difficulty, negative priming, and aging. *Psychology and Aging*, *15*, 542–550. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.15.3.542

Gamboz, N., Zamarian, S., & Cavallero, C. (2010). Age-related differences in the attention network test (ANT). *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 287–305. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2010.484729

Gardner, M. K., Hill, R. D., & Was, C. A. (2011). A procedural approach to remembering personal identification numbers among older adults. *PLoS ONE*, *6*, e25428. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0025428

Garnham, L., & Sloper, J. J. (2006). Effect of age on adult stereoacuity as measured by different types of stereotest. *The British Journal of Ophthalmology*, *90*, 91–95. doi: 10.1136/bjo.2005.077719

Georgiou-Karistianis, N., Tang, J., Mehmedbegovic, F., Farrow, M., Bradshaw, J., & Sheppard, D. (2006). Age-related differences in cognitive function using a global local hierarchical paradigm. *Brain Research*, *1124*, 86–95. doi: 10.1016/j.brainres.2006.09.070

Georgiou-Karistianis, N., Tang, J., Vardy, Y., Sheppard, D., Evans, N., Wilson, M., & Bradshaw, J. (2007). Progressive age-related changes in the attentional blink paradigm. *Neuropsychology, Development, and Cognition. Section B, Aging, Neuropsychology and Cognition*, *14*, 213–226. doi: 10.1080/13825580500320681

*Gilmore, G. C., Spinks, R. A., & Thomas, C. W. (2006). Age effects in coding tasks: Componential analysis and test of the sensory deficit hypothesis. *Psychology and Aging*, *21*, 7–18. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.21.1.7

Glahn, D. C., Gur, R. C., Ragland, J. D., Censits, D. M., & Gur, R. E. (1997). Reliability, performance characteristics, construct validity, and an initial clinical application of a visual object learning test (VOLT). *Neuropsychology*, *11*, 602–612. doi: 10.1037/0894-4105.11.4.602

Glass, J. M. (2007). Visual function and cognitive aging: Differential role of contrast sensitivity in verbal versus spatial tasks. *Psychology and Aging*, *22*, 233–238. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.22.2.233

Gopie, N., Craik, F. I. M., & Hasher, L. (2010). Destination memory impairment in older people. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 922–928. doi: 10.1037/a0019703

Gottlob, L. R. (2006). Age-related deficits in guided search using cues. *Psychology and Aging*, *21*, 526–534. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.21.3.526

Gottlob, L. R., Fillmore, M. T., & Abroms, B. D. (2007). Age-group differences in saccadic interference. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *62*, 85–89. doi: 10.1093/geronb/62.2.P85

*Grady, C. (2012). The cognitive neuroscience of ageing. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *13*, 491–505. doi: 10.1038/nrn3256

Grady, C. L., Bernstein, L. J., Beig, S., & Siegenthaler, A. L. (2002). The effects of encoding task on age-related differences in the functional neuroanatomy of face memory. *Psychology and Aging*, *17*, 7–23. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.17.1.7

Grady, C. L., Maisog, J. M., Horwitz, B., Ungerleider, L. G., Mentis, M. J., Salerno, J. A., & Haxby, J. V. (1994). Age-related changes in cortical blood flow activation during visual processing of faces and location. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *14*, 1450–1462.

Graham, E. R., & Burke, D. M. (2011). Aging increases inattentional blindness to the gorilla in our midst. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 162–166. doi: 10.1037/a0020647

*Greene, H. A., & Madden, D. J. (1987). Adult age differences in visual acuity, stereopsis, and contrast sensitivity. *American Journal of Optometry and Physiological Optics*, *64*, 749–753. doi: 10.1097/00006324-198710000-00006

Greenhut-Wertz, J., & Manning, S. K. (1995). Suffix effects and intrusion errors in young and elderly subjects. *Experimental Aging Research*, *21*, 173–190. doi: 10.1080/03610739508254276

Greenwood, P. M., & Parasuraman, R. (2004). The scaling of spatial attention in visual search and its modification in healthy aging. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *66*, 3–22. doi: 10.3758/BF03194857

Grunwald, J. E., Piltz, J., Patel, N., Bose, S., & Riva, C. E. (1993). Effect of aging on retinal macular microcirculation: A blue field simulation study. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, *34*, 3609–3613.

Guerreiro, M. J. S., Adam, J. J., & Van Gerven, P. W. M. (2012). Automatic selective attention as a function of sensory modality in aging. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *67B*, 194–202. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbr090

Guerreiro, M. J. S., & Van Gerven, P. W. M. (2011). Now you see it, now you don't: Evidence for age-dependent and age-independent cross-modal distraction. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 415–426. doi: 10.1037/a0021507

Habak, C., Wilkinson, F., & Wilson, H. R. (2009). Preservation of shape discrimination in aging. *Journal of Vision*, *9*, 18–18. doi: 10.1167/9.12.18

Hahn, S., & Kramer, A. F. (1995). Attentional flexibility and aging: You don't need to be 20 years of age to split the beam. *Psychology and Aging*, *10*, 597–609. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.10.4.597

Halamish, V., McGillivray, S., & Castel, A. D. (2011). Monitoring one's own forgetting in younger and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 631–635. doi: 10.1037/a0022852

Hale, S., Rose, N. S., Myerson, J., Strube, M. J., Sommers, M., Tye-Murray, N., & Spehar, B. (2011). The structure of working memory abilities across the adult life span. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 92–110. doi: 10.1037/a0021483

Halpern, D. F. (1984). Age differences in response time to verbal and symbolic traffic signs. *Experimental Aging Research*, *10*, 201–204. doi: 10.1080/03610738408258465

Hamami, A., Serbun, S. J., & Gutchess, A. H. (2011). Self-referencing enhances memory specificity with age. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 636–646. doi: 10.1037/a0022626

Hampshire, A., Gruszka, A., Fallon, S. J., & Owen, A. M. (2008). Inefficiency in self-organized attentional switching in the normal aging population is associated with decreased activity in the ventrolateral prefrontal cortex. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *20*, 1670–1686. doi: 10.1162/jocn.2008.20115

Hanna-Pladdy, B., & Choi, H. (2010). Age-related deficits in auditory confrontation naming. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 691–696. doi: 10.1037/a0019455

Hartley, A. A. (2001). Age differences in dual-task interference are localized to response-generation processes. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 47–54. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.16.1.47

Hartley, A. A., & Kieley, J. M. (1995). Adult age differences in the inhibition of return of visual attention. *Psychology and Aging*, *10*, 670–683. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.10.4.670

Hartley, A. A., Little, D. M., Speer, N. K., & Jonides, J. (2011). Input, retention, and output factors affecting adult age differences in visuospatial short-term memory. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *66*, 435–443. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbr020

Hartman, M., Bolton, E., & Fehnel, S. E. (2001). Accounting for age differences on the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test: Decreased working memory, not inflexibility. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 385–399. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.16.3.385

Hartman, M., Nielsen, C., & Stratton, B. (2004). The contributions of attention and working memory to age differences in concept identification. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *26*, 227–245. doi: 10.1076/jcen.26.2.227.28083

*Hasher, L., & Zacks, R. T. (1988). Working memory, comprehension and aging: A review and a new view. In G. H. Bower (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 22, pp. 193–225). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Head, D., Raz, N., Gunning-Dixon, F., Williamson, A., & Acker, J. D. (2002). Age-related differences in the course of cognitive skill acquisition: The role of regional cortical shrinkage and cognitive resources. *Psychology and Aging*, *17*, 72–84. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.17.1.72

*Hedges, L. V., & Vevea, J. L. (1998). Fixed-and random-effects models in meta-analysis. *Psychological Methods*, *3*, 486–504. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.3.4.486

Henkel, L. A., & Rajaram, S. (2011). Collaborative remembering in older adults: Age-invariant outcomes in the context of episodic recall deficits. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 532–545. doi: 10.1037/a0023106

Henninger, D. E., Madden, D. J., & Huettel, S. A. (2010). Processing speed and memory mediate age-related differences in decision making. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 262–270. doi: 10.1037/a0019096

*Herbert, L. E., Weuve, J., Scherr, P. A., & Evans, D. A. (2013). Alzheimer disease in the United States (2010–2050) estimated using the 2010 census. *Neurology*, *80*, 1778–1783. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0b013e31828726f5.

Hertzog, C., Cooper, B. P., & Fisk, A. D. (1996). Aging and individual differences in the development of skilled memory search performance. *Psychology and Aging*, *11*, 497–520. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.11.3.497

Hertzog, C., & Touron, D. R. (2011). Age differences in memory retrieval shift: Governed by feeling-of-knowing? *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 647–660. doi: 10.1037/a0021875

Hertzog, C., Touron, D. R., & Hines, J. C. (2007). Does a time-monitoring deficit influence older adults' delayed retrieval shift during skill acquisition? *Psychology and Aging*, *22*, 607–624. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.22.3.607

Hildebrandt, A., Wilhelm, O., Schmiedek, F., Herzmann, G., & Sommer, W. (2011). On the specificity of face cognition compared with general cognitive functioning across adult age. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 701–715. doi: 10.1037/a0023056

Hogan, M. J. (2003). Divided attention in older but not younger adults is impaired by anxiety. *Experimental Aging Research*, *29*, 111–136. doi: 10.1080/03610730303712

Hoyer, W. J., Cerella, J., & Buchler, N. G. (2011). A search-by-clusters model of visual search: Fits to data from younger and older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *66B*, 402–410. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbr022

Hugenschmidt, C. E., Mozolic, J. L., & Laurienti, P. J. (2009a). Suppression of multi-sensory integration by modality-specific attention in aging. *Neuroreport*, *20*, 349–353. doi: 10.1097/WNR.0b013e328323ab07

Hugenschmidt, C. E., Peiffer, A. M., McCoy, T. P., Hayasaka, S., & Laurienti, P. J. (2009b). Preservation of crossmodal selective attention in healthy aging. *Experimental Brain Research*, *198*, 273–285. doi: 10.1007/s00221-009-1816-3

Humphrey, D. G., & Kramer, A. F. (1997). Age differences in visual search for feature, conjunction, and triple-conjunction targets. *Psychology and Aging*, *12*, 704–717. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.12.4.704

Hunter, E. M., Phillips, L. H., & MacPherson, S. E. (2010). Effects of age on cross-modal emotion perception. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 779–787. doi: 10.1037/a0020528

Jäger, T., Mecklinger, A., & Kliegel, M. (2010). Associative recognition memory for faces: More pronounced age-related impairments in binding intra- than inter-item associations. *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 123–139. doi: 10.1080/03610731003613391

James, L. E., & Kooy, T. M. (2011). Aging and the detection of visual errors in scenes. *Journal of Aging Research*, *2011*, 1–6. doi: 10.4061/2011/984694

Jamieson, B. A., & Rogers, W. A. (2000). Age-related effects of blocked and random practice schedules on learning a new technology. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *55*, 343–353. doi: 10.1093/geronb/55.6.P343

Jenkins, L., Myerson, J., Joerding, J. A., & Hale, S. (2000). Converging evidence that visuospatial cognition is more age-sensitive than verbal cognition. *Psychology and Aging*, *15*, 157–175. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.15.1.157

Jennings, J. R., Mendelson, D. N., Redfern, M. S., & Nebes, R. D. (2011). Detecting age differences in resistance to perceptual and motor interference. *Experimental Aging Research*, *37*, 179–197. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.554512

Johnson, C. A., Adams, A. J., & Lewis, R. A. (1989). Evidence for a neural basis of age-related visual field loss in normal observers. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, *30*, 2056–2064.

Joy, S., Kaplan, E., & Fein, D. (2004). Speed and memory in the WAIS-III Digit Symbol–Coding subtest across the adult lifespan. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, *19*, 759–767. doi: 10.1016/j.acn.2003.09.009

Kadota, K., & Gomi, H. (2010). Implicit visuomotor processing for quick online reactions is robust against aging. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *30*, 205–209. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2599-09.2010

Kalisch, T., Kattenstroth, J.-C., Kowalewski, R., Tegenthoff, M., & Dinse, H. R. (2012). Cognitive and tactile factors affecting human haptic performance in later life. *PLoS ONE*, *7*, e30420. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0030420

Kaneko, R., Kuba, Y., Sakata, Y., & Kuchinomachi, Y. (2004). Aging and shifts of visual attention in saccadic eye movements. *Experimental Aging Research*, *30*, 149–162. doi: 10.1080/03610730490274176

Karas, R., & McKendrick, A. M. (2009). Aging alters surround modulation of perceived contrast. *Journal of Vision*, *9*, 11.1–11.9. doi: 10.1167/9.5.11

Karayanidis, F., Whitson, L. R., Heathcote, A., & Michie, P. T. (2011). Variability in proactive and reactive cognitive control processes across the adult lifespan. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *2, 318*. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00318

Karpel, M. E., Hoyer, W. J., & Toglia, M. P. (2001). Accuracy and qualities of real and suggested memories: Nonspecific age differences. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *56*, 103–110. doi: 10.1093/geronb/56.2.P103

Kavé, G., Knafo, A., & Gilboa, A. (2010). The rise and fall of word retrieval across the lifespan. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 719–724. doi: 10.1037/a0018927

Kemper, S., Schmalzried, R., Hoffman, L., & Herman, R. (2010). Aging and the vulnerability of speech to dual task demands. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 949–962. doi: 10.1037/a0020000

Kemps, E., & Newson, R. (2006). Comparison of adult age differences in verbal and visuo-spatial memory: The importance of "pure", parallel and validated measures. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *28*, 341–356. doi: 10.1080/13803390490918228

Kemtes, K. A., & Allen, D. N. (2008). Presentation modality influences WAIS Digit Span performance in younger and older adults. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *30*, 661–665. doi: 10.1080/13803390701641414

Kennedy, G. J., Tripathy, S. P., & Barrett, B. T. (2009). Early age-related decline in the effective number of trajectories tracked in adult human vision. *Journal of Vision*, *9*, 21.1–21.10. doi: 10.1167/9.2.21

Kennedy, K. M., & Raz, N. (2009). Aging white matter and cognition: Differential effects of regional variations in diffusion properties on memory, executive functions, and speed. *Neuropsychologia*, *47*, 916–927. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.01.001

Kieley, J. M., & Hartley, A. A. (1997). Age-related equivalence of identity suppression in the Stroop color-word task. *Psychology and Aging*, *12*, 22–29. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.12.1.22

Kim, S.-Y., & Giovanello, K. S. (2011). The effects of attention on age-related relational memory deficits: Evidence from a novel attentional manipulation. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 678–688. doi: 10.1037/a0022326

Kirasic, K. C., Allen, G. L., Dobson, S. H., & Binder, K. S. (1996). Aging, cognitive resources, and declarative learning. *Psychology and Aging*, *11*, 658. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.11.4.658

Kitzan, L. J., Ferraro, F. R., Petros, T. V., & Ludorf, M. (1999). The role of vocabulary ability during visual word recognition in younger and older adults. *The Journal of General Psychology*, *126*, 6–16. doi: 10.1080/00221309909595348

Klein, C., Fischer, B., Hartnegg, K., Heiss, W. H., & Roth, M. (2000). Optomotor and neuropsychological performance in old age. *Experimental Brain Research*, *135*, 141–154. doi: 10.1007/s002210000506

*Klein, R., Klein, B. E. K., Lee, K. E., Cruickshanks, K. J., & Gangnon, R. E. (2006). Changes in visual acuity in a population over a 15-year period: The Beaver Dam Eye Study. *American Journal of Ophthalmology*, *142*, 539–549.e2. doi: 10.1016/j.ajo.2006.06.015

Klistorner, A. I., & Graham, S. L. (2001). Electroencephalogram-based scaling of multifocal visual evoked potentials: Effect on intersubject amplitude variability. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, *42*, 2145–2152.

Kolarik, A. J., Margrain, T. H., & Freeman, T. C. A. (2010). Precision and accuracy of ocular following: Influence of age and type of eye movement. *Experimental Brain Research*, *201*, 271–282. doi: 10.1007/s00221-009-2036-6

Kornell, N., Castel, A. D., Eich, T. S., & Bjork, R. A. (2010). Spacing as the friend of both memory and induction in young and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 498–503. doi: 10.1037/a0017807

Kotary, L., & Hoyer, W. J. (1995). Age and the ability to inhibit distractor information in visual selective attention. *Experimental Aging Research*, *21*, 159–171. doi: 10.1080/03610739508254275

Kramer, A. F., & Atchley, P. (2000). Age-related effects in the marking of old objects in visual search. *Psychology and Aging*, *15*, 286–296. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.15.2.286

Kramer, A. F., Hahn, S., Irwin, D. E., & Theeuwes, J. (1999). Attentional capture and aging: Implications for visual search performance and oculomotor control. *Psychology and Aging*, *14*, 135–154. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.14.1.135

Kramer, A. F., Humphrey, D. G., Larish, J. F., Logan, G. D., & Strayer, D. L. (1994). Aging and inhibition: Beyond a unitary view of inhibitory processing in attention. *Psychology and Aging*, *9*, 491–512. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.9.4.491

Kramer, A. F., Martin-Emerson, R., Larish, J. F., & Andersen, G. J. (1996). Aging and filtering by movement in visual search. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *51*, 201–216. doi: 10.1093/geronb/51B.4.P201

Kramer, A. F., & Weber, T. A. (1999). Object-based attentional selection and aging. *Psychology and Aging*, *14*, 99–107. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.14.1.99

Krampe, R. T., Doumas, M., Lavrysen, A., & Rapp, M. (2010). The costs of taking it slowly: Fast and slow movement timing in older age. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 980–990. doi: 10.1037/a0020090

Kray, J., Lucenet, J., & Blaye, A. (2010). Can older adults enhance task-switching performance by verbal self-instructions? The influence of working-memory load and early learning. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, *2*, 147. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2010.00147

Krendl, A. C., & Ambady, N. (2010). Older adults' decoding of emotions: Role of dynamic versus static cues and age-related cognitive decline. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 788–793. doi: 10.1037/a0020607

Kurylo, D. D. (2006). Effects of aging on perceptual organization: Efficacy of stimulus features. *Experimental Aging Research*, *32*, 137–152. doi: 10.1080/03610730600553901

*La Fleur, C. G., & Salthouse, T. A. (2014). Out of sight, out of mind? Relations between visual acuity and cognition. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *21*, 1202–1208. doi: 10.3758/s13423-014-0594-5

Lamar, M., & Resnick, S. M. (2004). Aging and prefrontal functions: Dissociating orbitofrontal and dorsolateral abilities. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *25*, 553–558. doi: 10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2003.06.005

Lange, E. B., & Verhaeghen, P. (2009). No age differences in complex memory search: Older adults search as efficiently as younger adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *24*, 105–115. doi: 10.1037/a0013751

Langley, L. K., Fuentes, L. J., Vivas, A. B., & Saville, A. L. (2007). Aging and temporal patterns of inhibition of return. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *62*, 71–77. doi: 10.1093/geronb/62.2.P71

Langley, L. K., Rokke, P. D., Stark, A. C., Saville, A. L., Allen, J. L., & Bagne, A. G. (2008a). The emotional blink: Adult age differences in visual attention to emotional information. *Psychology and Aging*, *23*, 873–885. doi: 10.1037/a0013761

Langley, L. K., Saville, A. L., Gayzur, N. D., & Fuentes, L. J. (2008b). Adult age differences in attention to semantic context. *Neuropsychology, Development, and Cognition. Section B, Aging, Neuropsychology and Cognition*, *15*, 657–686. doi: 10.1080/13825580802036928

Langley, L. K., Vivas, A. B., Fuentes, L. J., & Bagne, A. G. (2005). Differential age effects on attention-based inhibition: Inhibitory tagging and inhibition of return. *Psychology and Aging*, *20*, 356–360. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.20.2.356

Lawson, A. L., Guo, C., & Jiang, Y. (2007). Age effects on brain activity during repetition priming of targets and distracters. *Neuropsychologia*, *45*, 1223–1231. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.10.014

Lesch, M. F., Horrey, W. J., Wogalter, M. S., & Powell, W. R. (2011). Age-related differences in warning symbol comprehension and training effectiveness: Effects of familiarity, complexity, and comprehensibility. *Ergonomics*, *54*, 879–890. doi: 10.1080/00140139.2011.606924

Li, J., Nilsson, L.-G., & Wu, Z. (2004). Effects of age and anxiety on episodic memory: Selectivity and variability. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *45*, 123–129. doi: 10.1111/sjop.2004.45.issue-2

Li, K. Z. H., & Lindenberger, U. (2002). Relations between aging sensory/sensorimotor and cognitive functions. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *26*, 777–783.

Li, R. W., Brown, B., Edwards, M. H., Ngo, C. V., Chat, S. W., & Levi, D. M. (2012). Reduced sampling efficiency causes degraded Vernier hyperacuity with normal aging: Vernier acuity in position noise. *Scientific Reports*, *2*, 300. doi: 10.1038/srep00300

Lien, M.-C., Gemperle, A., & Ruthruff, E. (2011). Aging and involuntary attention capture: Electrophysiological evidence for preserved attentional control with advanced age. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 188–202. doi: 10.1037/a0021073

Lin, C.-H. J., Wu, A. D., Udompholkul, P., & Knowlton, B. J. (2010). Contextual interference effects in sequence learning for young and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 929–939. doi: 10.1037/a0020196

*Lindenberger, U., & Baltes, P. B. (1994). Sensory functioning and intelligence in old age: A strong connection. *Psychology and Aging*, *9*, 339–355. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.9.3.339

*Lindenberger, U., & Ghisletta, P. (2009). Cognitive and sensory declines in old age: Gauging the evidence for a common cause. *Psychology and Aging*, *24*, 1–16. doi: 10.1037/a0014986

Löckenhoff, C. E., O'Donoghue, T., & Dunning, D. (2011). Age differences in temporal discounting: The role of dispositional affect and anticipated emotions. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 274–284. doi: 10.1037/a0023280

*Logan, J. M., Sanders, A. L., Snyder, A. Z., Morris, J. C., & Buckner, R. L. (2002). Under-recruitment and nonselective recruitment: Dissociable neural mechanisms associated with aging. *Neuron*, *33*, 827–840. doi: 10.1016/S0896-6273(02)00612-8

Lövdén, M., Schellenbach, M., Grossman-Hutter, B., Krüger, A., & Lindenberger, U. (2005). Environmental topography and postural control demands shape aging-associated decrements in spatial navigation performance. *Psychology and Aging*, *20*, 683–694. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.20.4.683

Luo, L., Hendriks, T., & Craik, F. I. M. (2007). Age differences in recollection: Three patterns of enhanced encoding. *Psychology and Aging*, *22*, 269–280. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.22.2.269

Madden, D. J. (1982). Age differences and similarities in the improvement of controlled search. *Experimental Aging Research*, *8*, 91–98. doi: 10.1080/03610738208258403

Madden, D. J. (1988). Adult age differences in the effects of sentence context and stimulus degradation during visual word recognition. *Psychology and Aging*, *3*, 167–172. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.3.2.167

Madden, D. J. (1992a). Four to ten milliseconds per year: Age-related slowing of visual word identification. *Journal of Gerontology*, *47*, P59–P68. doi: 10.1093/geronj/47.2.P59

Madden, D. J. (1992b). Selective attention and visual search: Revision of an allocation model and application to age differences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Human Perception and Performance*, *18*, 821–836. doi: 10.1037/0096-1523.18.3.821

*Madden, D. J. (2007). Aging and Visual Attention. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*, 70–74. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00478.x

*Madden, D. J., & Greene, H. A. (1987). From retina to response: Contrast sensitivity and memory retrieval during visual word recognition. *Experimental Aging Research*, *13*, 15–21. doi: 10.1080/03610738708259295

Madden, D. J., & Langley, L. K. (2003). Age-related changes in selective attention and perceptual load during visual search. *Psychology and Aging*, *18*, 54–67. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.18.1.54

Madden, D. J., Spaniol, J., Bucur, B., & Whiting, W. L. (2007). Age-related increase in top-down activation of visual features. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *60*, 644–651. doi: 10.1080/17470210601154347

Madden, D. J., Turkington, T. G., Provenzale, J. M., Denny, L. L., Langley, L. K., Hawk, T. C., & Coleman, R. E. (2002). Aging and attentional guidance during visual search: Functional neuroanatomy by positron emission tomography. *Psychology and Aging*, *17*, 24–43. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.17.1.24

Madden, D. J., Whiting, W. L., Spaniol, J., & Bucur, B. (2005). Adult age differences in the implicit and explicit components of top-down attentional guidance during visual search. *Psychology and Aging*, *20*, 317–329. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.20.2.317

Maddox, G. B., Balota, D. A., Coane, J. H., & Duchek, J. M. (2011). The role of forgetting rate in producing a benefit of expanded over equal spaced retrieval in young and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 661–670. doi: 10.1037/a0022942

Maguinness, C., Setti, A., Burke, K. E., Kenny, R. A., & Newell, F. N. (2011). The effect of combined sensory and semantic components on audio–visual speech perception in older adults. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, *3,* 19. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2011.00019

Maintenant, C., Blaye, A., & Paour, J.-L. (2011). Semantic categorical flexibility and aging: Effect of semantic relations on maintenance and switching. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 461–466. doi: 10.1037/a0021686

Malania, M., Devinck, F., Knoblauch, K., Delahunt, P. B., Hardy, J. L., & Werner, J. S. (2011). Senescent changes in photopic spatial summation. *Journal of Vision*, *11*, 15. doi: 10.1167/11.10.15

Malmstrom, T., & LaVoie, D. J. (2002). Age differences in inhibition of schema-activated distractors. *Experimental Aging Research*, *28*, 281–298. doi: 10.1080/03610730290080335

Mani, T. M., Bedwell, J. S., & Miller, L. S. (2005). Age-related decrements in performance on a brief continuous performance test. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, *20*, 575–586. doi: 10.1016/j.acn.2004.12.008

Maquestiaux, F., Laguë-Beauvais, M., Ruthruff, E., Hartley, A., & Bherer, L. (2010). Learning to bypass the central bottleneck: *Declining automaticity with advancing age*. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 177–192. doi: 10.1037/a0017122

Masunaga, H., & Horn, J. (2001). Expertise and age-related changes in components of intelligence. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 293–311. doi: 10.1037//0882-7974.16.2.293

Mata, R., Von Helversen, B., & Rieskamp, J. (2010). Learning to choose: Cognitive aging and strategy selection learning in decision making. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 299–309. doi: 10.1037/a0018923

Mather, M., & Schoeke, A. (2011). Positive outcomes enhance incidental learning for both younger and older adults. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *5*, 129. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2011.00129

Maury, P., Besse, F., & Martin, S. (2010). Age differences in outdated information processing during news reports reading. *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 371–392. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2010.511962

Maylor, E. A., Birak, K. S., & Schlaghecken, F. (2011). Inhibitory motor control in old age: Evidence for de-automatization? *Frontiers in Psychology*, *2*, 132. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00132

Maylor, E. A., & Lavie, N. (1998). The influence of perceptual load on age differences in selective attention. *Psychology and Aging*, *13*, 563–573. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.13.4.563

Mayr, U. (2001). Age differences in the selection of mental sets: The role of inhibition, stimulus ambiguity, and response-set overlap. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 96–109. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.16.1.96

McAuley, J. D., Miller, J. P., Wang, M., & Pang, K. C. H. (2010). Dividing time: Concurrent timing of auditory and visual events by young and elderly adults. *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 306–324. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2010.484744

McDowd, J. M., & Craik, F. I. (1988). Effects of aging and task difficulty on divided attention performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Human Perception and Performance*, *14*, 267–280. doi: 10.1037/0096-1523.14.2.267

McDowd, J. M., & Oseas-Kreger, D. M. (1991). Aging, inhibitory processes, and negative priming. *Journal of Gerontology*, *46*, 340–345. doi: 10.1093/geronj/46.6.P340

McGillivray, S., & Castel, A. D. (2010). Memory for age-face associations in younger and older adults: The role of generation and schematic support. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 822–832. doi: 10.1037/a0021044

McGillivray, S., & Castel, A. D. (2011). Betting on memory leads to metacognitive improvement by younger and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 137–142. doi: 10.1037/a0022681

*McGowan, V. A., Paterson, K. B., & Jordan, T. R. (2013). Age-related visual impairments and perceiving linguistic stimuli: The rarity of assessing the visual abilities of older participants in written language research. *Experimental Aging Research*, *39*, 70–79. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2013.741997

McKendrick, A. M., Sampson, G. P., Walland, M. J., & Badcock, D. R. (2007). Contrast sensitivity changes due to glaucoma and normal aging: Low-spatial-frequency losses in both magnocellular and parvocellular pathways. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, *48*, 2115–2122. doi: 10.1167/iovs.06-1208

McKendrick, A. M., Weymouth, A. E., & Battista, J. (2010). The effect of normal aging on closed contour shape discrimination. *Journal of Vision*, *10*, 1.1–1.9. doi: 10.1167/10.2.1

McLaughlin, P. M., & Murtha, S. J. E. (2010). The effects of age and exogenous support on visual search performance. *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 325–345. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2010.484752

McLaughlin, P. M., Szostak, C., Binns, M. A., Craik, F. I. M., Tipper, S. P., & Stuss, D. T. (2010). The effects of age and task demands on visual selective attention. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie Expérimentale*, *64*, 197–207. doi: 10.1037/a0020650

McLellan, J. S., Marcos, S., & Burns, S. A. (2001). Age-related changes in monochromatic wave aberrations of the human eye. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, *42*, 1390–1395.

Mell, T., Wartenburger, I., Marschner, A., Villringer, A., Reischies, F. M., & Heekeren, H. R. (2009). Altered function of ventral striatum during reward-based decision making in old age. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *3*, 34. doi: 10.3389/neuro.09.034.2009

Mienaltowski, A., Corballis, P. M., Blanchard-Fields, F., Parks, N. A., & Hilimire, M. R. (2011). Anger management: Age differences in emotional modulation of visual processing. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 224–231. doi: 10.1037/a0021032

Mikels, J. A., Larkin, G. R., Reuter-Lorenz, P. A., & Carstensen, L. L. (2005). Divergent trajectories in the aging mind. *Psychology and Aging*, *20*, 542–553. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.20.4.542

Miles, J. R., & Stine-Morrow, E. A. L. (2004). Adult age differences in self-regulated learning from reading sentences. *Psychology and Aging*, *19*, 626–636. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.19.4.626

Mill, A., Allik, J., Realo, A., & Valk, R. (2009). Age-related differences in emotion recognition ability: A cross-sectional study. *Emotion*, *9*, 619–630. doi: 10.1037/a0016562

Miller, L. M. S., & West, R. L. (2010).). The effects of age, control beliefs, and feedback on self-regulation of reading and problem solving. *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 40–63. doi: 10.1080/03610730903418380

Moffat, S. D., Kennedy, K. M., Rodrigue, K. M., & Raz, N. (2007). Extrahippocampal contributions to age differences in human spatial navigation. *Cerebral Cortex*, *17*, 1274–1282. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhl036

Morrone, I., Declercq, C., Novella, J.-L., & Besche, C. (2010). Aging and inhibition processes: The case of metaphor treatment. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 697–701. doi: 10.1037/a0019578

Morrow, D. G., Menard, W. E., Stine-Morrow, E. A., Teller, T., & Bryant, D. (2001). The influence of expertise and task factors on age differences in pilot communication. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 31–46. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.16.1.31

Müller-Oehring, E. M., Schulte, T., Raassi, C., Pfefferbaum, A., & Sullivan, E. V. (2007). Local–global interference is modulated by age, sex and anterior corpus callosum size. *Brain Research*, *1142*, 189–205. doi: 10.1016/j.brainres.2007.01.062

Mund, I., Bell, R., & Buchner, A. (2010). Age differences in reading with distraction: Sensory or inhibitory deficits? *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 886–897. doi: 10.1037/a0019508

Murray, B. D., Muscatell, K. A., & Kensinger, E. A. (2011). Effects of emotion and age on performance during a think/no-think memory task. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 940–955. doi: 10.1037/a0023214

Nagel, I. E., Chicherio, C., Li, S.-C., Von Oertzen, T., Sander, T., Villringer, A., & Lindenberger, U. (2008). Human aging magnifies genetic effects on executive functioning and working memory. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *2*, 1. doi: 10.3389/neuro.09.001.2008

Nashiro, K., & Mather, M. (2011). How arousal affects younger and older adults' memory binding. *Experimental Aging Research*, *37*, 108–128. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.536746

Naveh-Benjamin, M., & Craik, F. I. (1995). Memory for context and its use in item memory: Comparisons of younger and older persons. *Psychology and Aging*, *10*, 284–293. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.10.2.284

Neider, M. B., Gaspar, J. G., McCarley, J. S., Crowell, J. A., Kaczmarski, H., & Kramer, A. F. (2011). Walking and talking: Dual-task effects on street crossing behavior in older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 260–268. doi: 10.1037/a0021566

Neider, M. B., & Kramer, A. F. (2011). Older adults capitalize on contextual information to guide search. *Experimental Aging Research*, *37*, 539–571. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.619864

Nemeth, D., & Janacsek, K. (2011). The dynamics of implicit skill consolidation in young and elderly adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *66*, 15–22. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbq063

Nguyen-Tri, D., Overbury, O., & Faubert, J. (2003). The role of lenticular senescence in age-related color vision changes. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, *44*, 3698–3704. doi: 10.1167/iovs.02-1191

Ni, R., Kang, J. J., & Andersen, G. J. (2010). Age-related declines in car following performance under simulated fog conditions. *Accident; Analysis and Prevention*, *42*, 818–826. doi: 10.1016/j.aap.2009.04.023

Nielson, K. A., Langenecker, S. A., & Garavan, H. (2002). Differences in the functional neuroanatomy of inhibitory control across the adult life span. *Psychology and Aging*, *17*, 56–71. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.17.1.56

Norman, J. F., Norman, H. F., Pattison, K., Taylor, M. J., & Goforth, K. E. (2007). Aging and the depth of binocular rivalry suppression. *Psychology and Aging*, *22*, 625–631. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.22.3.625

O'Connor, E., Margrain, T. H., & Freeman, T. C. A. (2010). Age, eye movement and motion discrimination. *Vision Research*, *50*, 2588–2599. doi: 10.1016/j.visres.2010.08.015

Orgeta, V. (2010). Effects of age and task difficulty on recognition of facial affect. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *65B*, 323–327. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbq007

Ostreicher, M. L., Moses, S. N., Rosenbaum, R. S., & Ryan, J. D. (2010). Prior experience supports new learning of relations in aging. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *65B*, 32–41. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbp081

Overman, A. A., & Becker, J. T. (2009). The associative deficit in older adult memory: Recognition of pairs is not improved by repetition. *Psychology and Aging*, *24*, 501–506. doi: 10.1037/a0015086

*Owsley, C. (2011). Aging and vision. *Vision Research*, *51*, 1610–1622. doi: 10.1016/j.visres.2010.10.020

Owsley, C., Burton-Danner, K., & Jackson, G. R. (2000). Aging and spatial localization during feature search. *Gerontology*, *46*, 300–305. doi: 10.1159/000022181

Owsley, C., Sekuler, R., & Boldt, C. (1981). Aging and low-contrast vision: Face perception. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, *21*, 362–365.

Park, D. C., Cherry, K. E., Smith, A. D., & Lafronza, V. N. (1990). Effects of distinctive context on memory for objects and their locations in young and elderly adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *5*, 250–255. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.5.2.250

Park, D. C., Polk, T. A., Hebrank, A. C., & Jenkins, L. J. (2010). Age differences in default mode activity on easy and difficult spatial judgment tasks. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *3*, 75. doi: 10.3389/neuro.09.075.2009

Peltz, C. B., Gratton, G., & Fabiani, M. (2011). Age-related changes in electrophysiological and neuropsychological indices of working memory, attention control, and cognitive flexibility. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *2*, 190. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00190

Perry, M. E., McDonald, C. R., Hagler, D. J., Gharapetian, L., Kuperman, J. M., Koyama, A. K., & McEvoy, L. K. (2009). White matter tracts associated with set-shifting in healthy aging. *Neuropsychologia*, *47*, 2835–2842. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.06.008

Phillips, L. H., Kliegel, M., & Martin, M. (2006). Age and planning tasks: The influence of ecological validity. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, *62*, 175–184. doi: 10.2190/EM1W-HAYC-TMLM-WW8X

Phillips, L. H., Smith, L., & Gilhooly, K. J. (2002). The effects of adult aging and induced positive and negative mood on planning. *Emotion*, *2*, 263–272. doi: 10.1037/1528-3542.2.3.263

Plude, D. J., & Doussard-Roosevelt, J. A. (1989). Aging, selective attention, and feature integration. *Psychology and Aging*, *4*, 98–105. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.4.1.98

Prado, J. M., Stoffregen, T. A., & Duarte, M. (2007). Postural sway during dual tasks in young and elderly adults. *Gerontology*, *53*, 274–281. doi: 10.1159/000102938

Quigley, C., Andersen, S. K., Schulze, L., Grunwald, M., & Müller, M. M. (2010). Feature-selective attention: Evidence for a decline in old age. *Neuroscience Letters*, *474*, 5–8. doi: 10.1016/j.neulet.2010.02.053

Radvansky, G. A., Curiel, J. M., Zwaan, R. A., & Copeland, D. E. (2001). Situation models and aging. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 145–160. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.16.1.145

Rayner, K., Castelhano, M. S., & Yang, J. (2009). Eye movements and the perceptual span in older and younger readers. *Psychology and Aging*, *24*, 755–760. doi: 10.1037/a0014300

Rayner, K., Reichle, E. D., Stroud, M. J., Williams, C. C., & Pollatsek, A. (2006). The effect of word frequency, word predictability, and font difficulty on the eye movements of young and older readers. *Psychology and Aging*, *21*, 448–465. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.21.3.448

Rayner, K., Yang, J., Castelhano, M. S., & Liversedge, S. P. (2011). Eye movements of older and younger readers when reading disappearing text. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 214–223. doi: 10.1037/a0021279

Redmond, T., Zlatkova, M. B., Garway-Heath, D. F., & Anderson, R. S. (2010). The effect of age on the area of complete spatial summation for chromatic and achromatic stimuli. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, *51*, 6533–6539. doi: 10.1167/iovs.10-5717

Reese, C. M., & Cherry, K. E. (2002). The effects of age, ability, and memory monitoring on prospective memory task performance. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, *9*, 98–113. doi: 10.1076/anec.9.2.98.9546

Rémy, P., Taconnat, L., & Isingrini, M. (2008). Effects of aging and attention-demanding tasks on false recognition induced by photographs: Differences between conceptually and perceptually modified lures. *Experimental Aging Research*, *34*, 220–231. doi: 10.1080/03610730802070118

Richmond, L. L., Morrison, A. B., Chein, J. M., & Olson, I. R. (2011). Working memory training and transfer in older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 813–822. doi: 10.1037/a0023631

Ridderinkhof, K. R., Span, M. M., & Van der Molen, M. W. (2002). Perseverative behavior and adaptive control in older adults: Performance monitoring, rule induction, and set shifting. *Brain and Cognition*, *49*, 382–401. doi: 10.1006/brcg.2001.1506

Ridderinkhof, K. R., & Wijnen, J. G. (2011). More than meets the eye: Age differences in the capture and suppression of oculomotor action. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *2*, 267. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00267

Risse, S., & Kliegl, R. (2011). Adult age differences in the perceptual span during reading. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 451–460. doi: 10.1037/a0021616

Robert, C., & Mathey, S. (2007). Aging and lexical inhibition: The effect of orthographic neighborhood frequency in young and older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *62*, 340–342. doi: 10.1093/geronb/62.6.P340

Rogers, W. A., & Gilbert, D. K. (1997). Do performance strategies mediate age-related differences in associative learning? *Psychology and Aging*, *12*, 620–633. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.12.4.620

Rosa, N. M., & Gutchess, A. H. (2011). Source memory for action in young and older adults: Self vs. close or unknown others. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 625–630. doi: 10.1037/a0022827

Rose, N. S., Myerson, J., Sommers, M. S., & Hale, S. (2009). Are there age differences in the executive component of working memory? Evidence from domain-general interference effects. *Neuropsychology, Development, and Cognition. Section B, Aging, Neuropsychology and Cognition*, *16*, 633–653. doi: 10.1080/13825580902825238

Rose, N. S., Rendell, P. G., McDaniel, M. A., Aberle, I., & Kliegel, M. (2010). Age and individual differences in prospective memory during a "Virtual Week": The roles of working memory, vigilance, task regularity, and cue focality. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 595–605. doi: 10.1037/a0019771

*Rosenthal, R., & DiMatteo, M. R. (2001). Meta-analysis: Recent developments in quantitative methods for literature reviews. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*, 59–82. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.59

*Ross, C. K., Stelmack, J. A., Stelmack, T. R., Guihan, M., & Fraim, M. (1999). Development and sensitivity to visual impairment of the Low Vision Functional Status Evaluation (LVFSE). *Optometry and Vision Science*, *76*, 212–220. doi: 10.1097/00006324-199904000-00024

Ross, J. E., Clarke, D. D., & Bron, A. J. (1985). Effect of age on contrast sensitivity function: Uniocular and binocular findings. *The British Journal of Ophthalmology*, *69*, 51–56. doi: 10.1136/bjo.69.1.51

Roux, F., & Ceccaldi, M. (2001). Does aging affect the allocation of visual attention in global and local information processing? *Brain and Cognition*, *46*, 383–396. doi: 10.1006/brcg.2001.1296

Ruffman, T., Sullivan, S., & Dittrich, W. (2009). Older adults' recognition of bodily and auditory expressions of emotion. *Psychology and Aging*, *24*, 614–622. doi: 10.1037/a0016356

Rutledge, P. C., Hancock, R. A., & Walker, L. (1997). Effects of retention interval length on young and elderly adults' memory for spatial information. *Experimental Aging Research*, *23*, 163–177. doi: 10.1080/03610739708254031

Ryan, M., Murray, J., & Ruffman, T. (2010). Aging and the perception of emotion: Processing vocal expressions alone and with faces. *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 1–22. doi: 10.1080/03610730903418372

Rypma, B., Prabhakaran, V., Desmond, J. E., & Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2001). Age differences in prefrontal cortical activity in working memory. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 371–384. doi: 10.1037//0882-7974.16.3.371

Saimpont, A., Pozzo, T., & Papaxanthis, C. (2009). Aging affects the mental rotation of left and right hands. *PLoS ONE*, *4*, e6714. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0006714

Salthouse, T. A. (1992). Influence of processing speed on adult age differences in working memory. *Acta Psychologica*, *79*, 155–170. doi: 10.1016/0001-6918(92)90030-H

*Salthouse, T. A. (2013). Effects of age and ability on components of cognitive change. *Intelligence*, *41*, 501–511. doi: 10.1016/j.intell.2013.07.005

*Salthouse, T. A. (2014). Correlates of cognitive change. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *143*, 1026–1048. doi: 10.1037/a0034847

*Salthouse, T. A., Fristoe, N., McGuthry, K. E., & Hambrick, D. Z. (1998). Relation of task switching to speed, age, and fluid intelligence. *Psychology and Aging*, *13*, 445. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.13.3.445

*Salthouse, T. A., Hancock, H. E., Meinz, E. J., & Hambrick, D. Z. (1996). Interrelations of age, visual acuity, and cognitive functioning. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *51*, 317–330. doi: 10.1093/geronb/51B.6.P317

Sambataro, F., Murty, V. P., Callicott, J. H., Tan, H.-Y., Das, S., Weinberger, D. R., & Mattay, V. S. (2010). Age-related alterations in default mode network: Impact on working memory performance. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *31*, 839–852. doi: 10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2008.05.022

Sander, M. C., Werkle-Bergner, M., & Lindenberger, U. (2011). Binding and strategic selection in working memory: A lifespan dissociation. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 612–624. doi: 10.1037/a0023055

Scheibe, S., & Blanchard-Fields, F. (2009). Effects of regulating emotions on cognitive performance: What is costly for young adults is not so costly for older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *24*, 217–223. doi: 10.1037/a0013807

*Schmiedek, F., & Li, S.-C. (2004). Toward an alternative representation for disentangling age-associated differences in general and specific cognitive abilities. *Psychology and Aging*, *19*, 40–56. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.19.1.40

Schmitz, T. W., Cheng, F. H. T., & De Rosa, E. (2010). Failing to ignore: Paradoxical neural effects of perceptual load on early attentional selection in normal aging. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *30*, 14750–14758. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2687-10.2010

Scialfa, C. T., & Hamaluk, E. (2001). Aging, texture segmentation, and exposure duration: Evidence for a deficit is preattentive processing. *Experimental Aging Research*, *27*, 123–135. doi: 10.1080/036107301750073971

Scialfa, C. T., Hamaluk, E., Skaloud, P., & Pratt, J. (1999). Age differences in saccadic averaging. *Psychology and Aging*, *14*, 695–699. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.14.4.695

Scialfa, C. T., & Thomas, D. M. (1994). Age differences in same-different judgments as a function of multidimensional similarity. *Journal of Gerontology*, *49*, 173–178. doi: 10.1093/geronj/49.4.P173

Shafto, M. A. (2010). Orthographic error monitoring in old age: Lexical and sublexical availability during perception and production. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 991–1001. doi: 10.1037/a0020117

Shan, I.-K., Chen, Y.-S., Lee, Y.-C., & Su, T.-P. (2008). Adult normative data of the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test in Taiwan. *Journal of the Chinese Medical Association*, *71*, 517–522. doi: 10.1016/S1726-4901(08)70160-6

Shih, S.-I., Meadmore, K. L., & Liversedge, S. P. (2012). Aging, eye movements, and object-location memory. *PLoS ONE*, *7*, e33485. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0033485

Silver, H., Goodman, C., Gur, R. C., Gur, R. E., & Bilker, W. B. (2011). "Executive" functions and normal aging: Selective impairment in conditional exclusion compared to abstraction and inhibition. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders*, *31*, 53–62. doi: 10.1159/000322568

Simon, J. R., Howard, J. H., & Howard, D. V. (2010). Age differences in implicit learning of probabilistic unstructured sequences. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *66*, 32–38. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbq066

*Skeel, R. L., Nagra, A., Van Voorst, W., & Olson, E. (2003). The relationship between performance-based visual acuity screening, self-reported visual acuity, and neuropsychological performance. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, *17*, 129–136. doi: 10.1076/clin.17.2.129.16509

*Skeel, R. L., Schutte, C., Van Voorst, W., & Nagra, A. (2006). The relationship between visual contrast sensitivity and neuropsychological performance in a healthy elderly sample. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *28*, 696–705. doi: 10.1080/13803390590954173

Skinner, E. I., & Fernandes, M. A. (2009). Age-related changes in the use of study context to increase recollection. *Neuropsychology, Development, and Cognition. Section B, Aging, Neuropsychology and Cognition*, *16*, 377–400. doi: 10.1080/13825580802573052

Slessor, G., Laird, G., Phillips, L. H., Bull, R., & Filippou, D. (2010). Age-related differences in gaze following: Does the age of the face matter? *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *65*, 536–541. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbq038

Smith, A. D., Park, D. C., Earles, J. L., Shaw, R. J., & Whiting, W. L. (1998). Age differences in context integration in memory. *Psychology and Aging*, *13*, 21–28. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.13.1.21

Smith, R. E. (2011). Providing support for distinctive processing: The isolation effect in young and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 744–751. doi: 10.1037/a0022715

Smyth, A. C., & Shanks, D. R. (2011). Aging and implicit learning: Explorations in contextual cuing. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 127–132. doi: 10.1037/a0022014

Solbakk, A.-K., Fuhrmann Alpert, G., Furst, A. J., Hale, L. A., Oga, T., Chetty, S., & Knight, R. T. (2008). Altered prefrontal function with aging: Insights into age-associated performance decline. *Brain Research*, *1232*, 30–47. doi: 10.1016/j.brainres.2008.07.060

Sorond, F. A., Schnyer, D. M., Serrador, J. M., Milberg, W. P., & Lipsitz, L. A. (2008). Cerebral blood flow regulation during cognitive tasks: Effects of healthy aging. *Cortex*, *44*, 179–184. doi: 10.1016/j.cortex.2006.01.003

Spaniol, J., Voss, A., Bowen, H. J., & Grady, C. L. (2011). Motivational incentives modulate age differences in visual perception. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 932–939. doi: 10.1037/a0023297

Speranza, F., Moraglia, G., & Schneider, B. A. (2001). Binocular detection of masked patterns in young and old observers. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 281–292. doi: 10.1037//0882-7974.16.2.281

Stern, Y., Zarahn, E., Habeck, C., Holtzer, R., Rakitin, B. C., Kumar, A., & Brown, T. (2008). A common neural network for cognitive reserve in verbal and object working memory in young but not old. *Cerebral Cortex*, *18*, 959–967. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhm134

*Stine-Morrow, E. A., Milinder, L., Pullara, O., & Herman, B. (2001). Patterns of resource allocation are reliable among younger and older readers. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 69–84. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.16.1.69

Stine-Morrow, E. A. L., Miller, L. M. S., & Hertzog, C. (2006). Aging and self-regulated language processing. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*, 582–606. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.132.4.582

Strobach, T., Frensch, P., Müller, H. J., & Schubert, T. (2012). Testing the limits of optimizing dual-task performance in younger and older adults. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *6*. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2012.00039

Sullivan, S., Ruffman, T., & Hutton, S. B. (2007). Age differences in emotion recognition skills and the visual scanning of emotion faces. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *62*, P53–P60. doi: 10.1093/geronb/62.1.P53

Thompson, L., Garcia, E., & Malloy, D. (2007). Reliance on visible speech cues during multimodal language processing: Individual and age differences. *Experimental Aging Research*, *33*, 373–397. doi: 10.1080/03610730701525303

Titz, C., Behrendt, J., & Hasselhorn, M. (2010). Tomatoes and apples or red and green lines: Are age-related interference effects based on competition among concepts or percepts? *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 346–358. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2010.484763

Toth, J. P., Daniels, K. A., & Solinger, L. A. (2011). What you know can hurt you: Effects of age and prior knowledge on the accuracy of judgments of learning. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 919–931. doi: 10.1037/a0023379

Touron, D. R., & Hertzog, C. (2009). Age differences in strategic behavior during a computation-based skill acquisition task. *Psychology and Aging*, *24*, 574–585. doi: 10.1037/a0015966

Touron, D. R., Hertzog, C., & Frank, D. (2011). Eye movements and strategy shift in skill acquisition: Adult age differences. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *66*, 151–159. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbq076

Touron, D. R., Hoyer, W. J., & Cerella, J. (2004). Cognitive skill learning: Age-related differences in strategy shifts and speed of component operations. *Psychology and Aging*, *19*, 565–580. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.19.4.565

Trick, L. M., Perl, T., & Sethi, N. (2005). Age-related differences in multiple-object tracking. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *60*, 102–105. doi: 10.1093/geronb/60.2.P102

Troyer, A. K., D'Souza, N. A., Vandermorris, S., & Murphy, K. J. (2011). Age-related differences in associative memory depend on the types of associations that are formed. *Neuropsychology, Development, and Cognition. Section B, Aging, Neuropsychology and Cognition*, *18*, 340–352. doi: 10.1080/13825585.2011.553273

Tse, C.-S., Balota, D. A., & Roediger, H. L. (2010). The benefits and costs of repeated testing on the learning of face-name pairs in healthy older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 833–845. doi: 10.1037/a0019933

Tucker, A. M., Basner, R. C., Stern, Y., & Rakitin, B. C. (2009). The variable response-stimulus interval effect and sleep deprivation: An unexplored aspect of psychomotor vigilance task performance. *Sleep*, *32*, 1393–1395.

Tun, P. A., Wingfield, A., Stine, E. A., & Mecsas, C. (1992). Rapid speech processing and divided attention: Processing rate versus processing resources as an explanation of age effects. *Psychology and Aging*, *7*, 546–550. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.7.4.546

Tye-Murray, N., Sommers, M., Spehar, B., Myerson, J., & Hale, S. (2010). Aging, audiovisual integration, and the principle of inverse effectiveness. *Ear and Hearing*, *31*, 636–644. doi: 10.1097/AUD.0b013e3181ddf7ff

Tye-Murray, N., Sommers, M., Spehar, B., Myerson, J., Hale, S., & Rose, N. S. (2008). Auditory-visual discourse comprehension by older and young adults in favorable and unfavorable conditions. *International Journal of Audiology*, *47*(Suppl 2), S31–S37. doi: 10.1080/14992020802301662

Vakil, E., & Agmon-Ashkenazi, D. (1997). Baseline performance and learning rate of procedural and declarative memory tasks: Younger versus older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *52*, 229–234. doi: 10.1093/geronb/52B.5.P229

Vallesi, A., Hasher, L., & Stuss, D. T. (2010). Age-related differences in transfer costs: Evidence from go/nogo tasks. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 963–967. doi: 10.1037/a0020300

Van Gerven, P. W. M., & Murphy, D. R. (2010). Aging and distraction by irrelevant speech: Does emotional valence matter? *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *65*, 667–670. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbq048

Veiel, L. L., Storandt, M., & Abrams, R. A. (2006). Visual search for change in older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *21*, 754–762. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.21.4.754

*Verhaeghen, P. (2003). Aging and vocabulary scores: A meta-analysis. *Psychology and Aging*, *18*, 332–339. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.18.2.332

*Verhaeghen, P. (2011). Aging and executive control: Reports of a demise greatly exaggerated. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*, 174–180. doi: 10.1177/0963721411408772

Verhaeghen, P., Cerella, J., & Basak, C. (2006). Aging, task complexity, and efficiency modes: The influence of working memory involvement on age differences in response times for verbal and visuospatial tasks. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, *13*, 254–280. doi: 10.1080/138255890969267

Verhaeghen, P., & Hoyer, W. J. (2007). Aging, focus switching, and task switching in a continuous calculation task: Evidence toward a new working memory control process. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, *14*, 22–39. doi: 10.1080/138255890969357

Viggiano, M. P., Galli, G., La Corte, V., & Ragazzoni, A. (2010). Temporal dynamics of memory-related effects in older and young adults: An event-related potential study. *Experimental Aging Research*, *36*, 206–229. doi: 10.1080/03610731003613821

Wang, W.-C., Dew, I. T. Z., & Giovanello, K. S. (2010). Effects of aging and prospective memory on recognition of item and associative information. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 486–491. doi: 10.1037/a0017264

Warrian, K. J., Altangerel, U., & Spaeth, G. L. (2010). Performance-based measures of visual function. *Survey of Ophthalmology*, *55*, 146–161. doi: 10.1016/j.survophthal.2009.06.006

Werheid, K., Gruno, M., Kathmann, N., Fischer, H., Almkvist, O., & Winblad, B. (2010). Biased recognition of positive faces in aging and amnestic mild cognitive impairment. *Psychology and Aging*, *25*, 1–15. doi: 10.1037/a0018358

West, R. (2004). The effects of aging on controlled attention and conflict processing in the Stroop task. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *16*, 103–113. doi: 10.1162/089892904322755593

West, R. L., Welch, D. C., & Thorn, R. M. (2001). Effects of goal-setting and feedback on memory performance and beliefs among older and younger adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *16*, 240–250. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.16.2.240

Westbury, C., & Titone, D. (2011). Idiom literality judgments in younger and older adults: Age-related effects in resolving semantic interference. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 467–474. doi: 10.1037/a0022438

Whiting, W. L., Madden, D. J., & Babcock, K. J. (2007). Overriding age differences in attentional capture with top-down processing. *Psychology and Aging*, *22*, 223–232. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.22.2.223

Whiting, W. L., Madden, D. J., Pierce, T. W., & Allen, P. A. (2005). Searching from the top down: Ageing and attentional guidance during singleton detection. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology. A, Human Experimental Psychology*, *58*, 72–97. doi: 10.1080/02724980443000205

Wiggs, C. L., & Martin, A. (1994). Aging and feature-specific priming of familiar and novel stimuli. *Psychology and Aging*, *9*, 578–588. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.9.4.578

Wilson, H. R., Mei, M., Habak, C., & Wilkinson, F. (2011). Visual bandwidths for face orientation increase during healthy aging. *Vision Research*, *51*, 160–164. doi: 10.1016/j.visres.2010.10.026

Winneke, A. H., & Phillips, N. A. (2011). Does audiovisual speech offer a fountain of youth for old ears? An event-related brain potential study of age differences in audiovisual speech perception. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 427–438. doi: 10.1037/a0021683

Wood, S., Busemeyer, J., Koling, A., Cox, C. R., & Davis, H. (2005). Older adults as adaptive decision makers: Evidence from the Iowa gambling task. *Psychology and Aging*, *20*, 220–225. doi: 10.1037/0882-7974.20.2.220

Wood, S., Hanoch, Y., Barnes, A., Liu, P.-J., Cummings, J., Bhattacharya, C., & Rice, T. (2011). Numeracy and Medicare Part D: The importance of choice and literacy for numbers in optimizing decision making for Medicare's prescription drug program. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*, 295–307. doi: 10.1037/a0022028

Zamarian, L., Sinz, H., Bonatti, E., Gamboz, N., & Delazer, M. (2008). Normal aging affects decisions under ambiguity, but not decisions under risk. *Neuropsychology*, *22*, 645–657. doi: 10.1037/0894-4105.22.5.645

Zanto, T. P., Toy, B., & Gazzaley, A. (2010). Delays in neural processing during working memory encoding in normal aging. *Neuropsychologia*, *48*, 13–25. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.08.003

*Zhang, C., Hua, T., Li, G., Tang, C., Sun, Q., & Zhou, P. (2008). Visual function declines during normal aging. *Current Science (00113891)*, *95*(11).

Appendix A. Common tasks representing cognitive domains

Attention	Executive function	Memory	Perception
Asynchronous Dual-task	Driving	Metaphor Completion	Binocular Rivalry
Attentional Blink	Fluency	Non-partisan lookup	Circle Discrimination
Change Detection	Image Generation	Object Naming	Embedded Figures
Continuous Performance Task	Intelligence	Paired Associates	Emotion Identification
Error Detection	Letter-Number Sequencing	Repetition Priming	Face Discrimination
Flanker	Mental Rotation	Rote Recall	Face Encoding
Go/No Go	N-back	Rote Recognition	Face/Location Matching
Letter Identity	Span	Semantic Priming	Fragmented Picture Naming
Negative Priming	Stroop	Semantic-judgment	Haylings Test
Novelty Oddball	Tower of (Hanoi, London, etc.)	Sentence Completion	Letter Detection
Simultaneous Dual-task	Trailmaking B	Vocabulary	Lexical Decision
Stimulus Suffix	Virtual Maze		National Adult Reading Test
Tap	Wisconsin Card Sorting Test		Object Tracking
Visual Search	Working Memory		Reading
			Texture Discrimination
			Visual Field Sensitivity

Appendix B. Individual study citations with sample sizes and weighted age-related effect sizes

Study	*N*	Cognitive domain	Visual acuity criteria	Weighted average Fisher's *Z*
Bartels, Wegrzyn, Wiedl, Ackermann, and Ehrenreich (2010)	36	Attention	Unreported	8.55
Gamboz, Russo, and Fox (2000)	48	Attention	Unreported	11.77
Greenhut-wertz and Manning (1995)	32	Attention	Unreported	18.41
Malmstrom and LaVoie (2002)	48	Attention	Unreported	40.24
Maylor and Lavie (1998)	30	Attention	Unreported	26.72
Mienaltowski, Corballis, Blanchard-Fields, Parks, and Hilimire (2011)	31	Attention	Unreported	19.90
Plude and Doussard-Roosevelt (1989)	24	Attention	Unreported	14.30
Salthouse (1992) – 2	100	Attention	Unreported	25.12
Smyth and Shanks (2011) – 1	40	Attention	Unreported	18.39
Sorond, Schnyer, Serrador, Milberg, and Lipsitz (2008)	29	Attention	Unreported	10.22
Vallesi, Hasher, and Stuss (2010)	40	Attention	Unreported	22.63
Verhaeghen, Cerella, and Basak (2006)	62	Attention	Unreported	9.75
Bertsch et al. (2009)	56	Attention	Undisclosed	22.90
Bock (2008) – 1	33	Attention	Undisclosed	13.92
Bock (2008) – 2	32	Attention	Undisclosed	11.49
Brache, Scialfa, and Hudson (2010)	35	Attention	Undisclosed	15.10
Ceponiene, Westerfield, Torki, and Townsend (2008)	38	Attention	Undisclosed	16.31
Dywan, Segalowitz, Webster, Hendry, and Harding (2001)	61	Attention	Undisclosed	35.08
Gamboz, Zamarian, and Cavallero (2010)	135	Attention	Undisclosed	58.61
Georgiou-Karistianis et al. (2006)	60	Attention	Undisclosed	−4.12
Guerriero, Adam, and Van Gerven (2012)	55	Attention	Undisclosed	45.45
Hartley and Kieley (1995) – 1	34	Attention	Undisclosed	24.12
Hartley and Kieley (1995) – 2	40	Attention	Undisclosed	29.66
Hartley and Kieley (1995) – 3	34	Attention	Undisclosed	6.98
Hartley and Kieley (1995) – 4	32	Attention	Undisclosed	11.59
Hartley (2001)	44	Attention	Undisclosed	21.81
James and Kooy (2011) – 1	36	Attention	Undisclosed	16.24
James and Kooy (2011) – 2	40	Attention	Undisclosed	18.06
Kennedy and Raz (2009)	52	Attention	Undisclosed	16.56
Maylor, Birak, and Schlaghecken (2011)	47	Attention	Undisclosed	26.03
McDowd and Oseas-Kreger (1991)	40	Attention	Undisclosed	19.18
McLaughlin and Murtha (2010)	50	Attention	Undisclosed	42.00
McLaughlin et al. (2010)	60	Attention	Undisclosed	29.80
Müller-Oehring et al. (2007)	37	Attention	Undisclosed	13.17

(*Continued*)

Appendix B. (Continued)

Study	*N*	Cognitive domain	Visual acuity criteria	Weighted average Fisher's *Z*
Neider and Kramer (2011) – 1	48	Attention	Undisclosed	20.02
Neider and Kramer (2011) – 2	24	Attention	Undisclosed	9.13
Prado, Stoffregen, and Duarte (2007)	24	Attention	Undisclosed	13.42
Roux and Ceccaldi (2001) – 1	34	Attention	Undisclosed	15.95
Roux and Ceccaldi (2001) – 2	37	Attention	Undisclosed	16.63
Sander, Werkle-Bergner, and Lindenberger (2011) – 1	80	Attention	Undisclosed	98.68
Schmitz, Cheng, and De Rosa (2010)	27	Attention	Undisclosed	13.46
Tucker, Basner, Stern, and Rakitin (2009)	43	Attention	Undisclosed	3.78
Van Gerven and Murphy (2010)	96	Attention	Undisclosed	33.08
Allen et al. (1993a) – 1	40	Attention	Self-reported	19.34
Allen et al. (1993a) – 2	40	Attention	Self-reported	20.62
Allen, Weber, and Madden (1994)	40	Attention	Self-reported	17.32
Lien, Gemperle, and Ruthruff (2011) – 1	32	Attention	Self-reported	18.18
Lien et al. (2011) – 2	30	Attention	Self-reported	22.44
Maquestiaux, Laguë-Beauvais, Ruthruff, Hartley, and Bherer (2010)	32	Attention	Self-reported	22.28
Quigley, Andersen, Schulze, Grunwald, and Müller (2010)	19	Attention	Self-reported	7.38
Solbakk et al. (2008)	25	Attention	Self-reported	10.88
Strobach, Frensch, Müller, and Schubert (2012)	19	Attention	Self-reported	10.35
Titz, Behrendt, and Hasselhorn (2010)	80	Attention	Self-reported	32.32
Allen, Kaufman, Smith, and Propper (1998) – 1	40	Attention	20/40	18.85
Allen et al. (1998) – 2	40	Attention	20/40	28.18
Allen et al. (2009a)	36	Attention	20/40	21.04
Allen, Weber, and May (1993) – 1	40	Attention	20/40	17.40
Allen et al. (1993a) – 2	40	Attention	20/40	24.28
Atchley and Kramer (2000) – 1	24	Attention	20/40	14.46
Atchley and Kramer (2000) – 2	24	Attention	20/40	14.05
Batsakes and Fisk (2000)	48	Attention	20/40	60.40
Bojko, Kramer, and Peterson (2004)	31	Attention	20/40	19.65
Bucur et al. (2005a)	40	Attention	20/40	31.07
Bucur, Madden, and Allen (2005b)	40	Attention	20/40	23.19
Coeckelbergh, Cornelissen, Brouwer, and Kooijman (2004)	14	Attention	20/40	15.77
Costello et al. (2010a) – 1	48	Attention	20/40	28.85
Costello et al. (2010a) – 2	48	Attention	20/40	31.94
Costello et al. (2010b)	48	Attention	20/40	28.82

Gottlob (2006)	30	Attention	20/40	14.85
Graham and Burke (2011)	112	Attention	20/40	48.14
Greenwood and Parasuraman (2004) – 1	32	Attention	20/40	12.12
Hugenschmidt et al. (2009b)	52	Attention	20/40	10.66
Jennings, Mendelson, Redfern, and Nebes (2011)	98	Attention	20/40	41.23
Kramer, Hahn, Irwin, and Theeuwes (1999) – 1	16	Attention	20/40	11.56
Kramer et al. (1999) – 2	16	Attention	20/40	10.80
Langley, Fuentes, Vivas, and Saville (2007) – 1	64	Attention	20/40	30.79
Langley et al. (2007) – 2	56	Attention	20/40	27.26
Langley et al. (2008a) – 1	60	Attention	20/40	45.01
Langley et al. (2008a) – 3	60	Attention	20/40	55.84
Madden and Langley (2003) – 1	48	Attention	20/40	33.93
Madden and Langley (2003) – 2	64	Attention	20/40	24.53
Madden and Langley (2003) – 3	48	Attention	20/40	28.91
Madden (1982) – 1	96	Attention	20/40	29.58
Madden (1982) – 2	72	Attention	20/40	27.94
Madden (1992a) – 1	48	Attention	20/40	43.26
Madden (1992a) – 2	24	Attention	20/40	18.85
Madden et al. (2002)	24	Attention	20/40	13.06
Madden, Whiting, Spaniol, and Bucur (2005) – 1	48	Attention	20/40	49.16
Madden et al. (2005) – 2	48	Attention	20/40	28.57
Madden, Spaniol, Bucur, and Whiting (2007)	48	Attention	20/40	37.93
Mani, Bedwell, and Miller (2005)	32	Attention	20/40	10.36
Nielson, Langenecker, and Garavan (2002) – 1	34	Attention	20/40	14.45
Veiel, Storandt, and Abrams (2006) – 1	80	Attention	20/40	41.29
Veiel et al. (2006) – 2	60	Attention	20/40	29.87
Whiting, Madden, Pierce, and Allen (2005) – 1	48	Attention	20/40	35.37
Whiting et al. (2005) – 2	48	Attention	20/40	34.14
Whiting et al. (2005) – 3	48	Attention	20/40	30.05
Whiting, Madden, and Babcock (2007)	48	Attention	20/40	18.68
Colcombe, Kramer, Erickson, and Scalf (2005)	60	Attention	20/30	29.54
Fisk and Rogers (1991) – 1	95	Attention	20/30	3.14
Fisk and Rogers (1991) – 2	85	Attention	20/30	39.14
Hogan (2003)	172	Attention	20/30	149.98
Hoyer, Cerella, and Buchler (2011)	36	Attention	20/30	31.26
Humphrey and Kramer (1997)	30	Attention	20/30	21.72
Kotary and Hoyer (1995)	40	Attention	20/30	30.29
Kramer and Atchley (2000) – 1	48	Attention	20/30	45.63

(*Continued*)

Appendix B. (Continued)

Study	*N*	Cognitive domain	Visual acuity criteria	Weighted average Fisher's *Z*
Kramer and Atchley (2000) – 2	24	Attention	20/30	21.21
Kramer and Weber (1999) – 1	36	Attention	20/30	29.37
Kramer and Weber (1999) – 2	32	Attention	20/30	15.84
Kramer, Martin-Emerson, Larish, and Andersen (1996) – 1	29	Attention	20/30	22.52
Kramer et al. (1996) – 2	34	Attention	20/30	33.26
Ellis, Goldberg, and Detweiler (1996)	24	Attention	20/29	23.73
Burton-Danner, Owsley, and Jackson (2001)	40	Attention	20/25	33.12
Owsley, Burton-Danner, and Jackson (2000)	40	Attention	20/25	20.03
Hahn and Kramer (1995)	20	Attention	20/24	14.51
Georgiou-Karistianis et al. (2007)	50	Attention	20/20	18.15
Norman, Norman, Pattison, Taylor, and Goforth (2007) – 1	16	Attention	20/20	6.73
Scialfa and Thomas (1994)	40	Attention	20/18.9	33.23
Anderson et al. (2011a)	80	Executive	Unreported	21.50
Andrés and Van der Linden (2000)	95	Executive	Unreported	27.25
Artistico, Cervone, and Pezzuti (2003)	60	Executive	Unreported	30.55
Ashendorf and McCaffrey (2008)	44	Executive	Unreported	27.50
Ashley and Swick (2009)	40	Executive	Unreported	8.01
Baudouin, Clarys, Vanneste, and Isingrini (2009)	100	Executive	Unreported	70.84
Beaunieux, Hubert, Pitel, Desgranges, and Eustache (2009)	100	Executive	Unreported	42.72
Bell, Buchner, and Mund (2008) – 3	91	Executive	Unreported	27.77
Bock (2005)	24	Executive	Unreported	14.01
Bopp and Verhaeghen (2009) – 1	96	Executive	Unreported	57.04
Bopp and Verhaeghen (2009) – 2	50	Executive	Unreported	30.08
Bopp and Verhaeghen (2009) – 3	62	Executive	Unreported	38.86
Borella, Ludwig, Dirk, and De Ribaupierre (2011)	79	Executive	Unreported	43.88
Brehmer, Westerberg, and Bäckman (2012)	55	Executive	Unreported	29.58
Briggs, Raz, and Marks (1999)	85	Executive	Unreported	30.12
Bugg, Zook, DeLosh, Davalos, and Davis (2006)	196	Executive	Unreported	119.70
Chen, Ma, and Pethtel (2011)	184	Executive	Unreported	37.50
Copeland and Radvansky (2007) – 1	72	Executive	Unreported	39.87
Copeland and Radvansky (2007) – 2	72	Executive	Unreported	41.15
Copeland and Radvansky (2007) – 3	60	Executive	Unreported	27.49
Davis and Klebe (2001)	23	Executive	Unreported	11.80
Denburg, Tranel, and Bechara (2005)	80	Executive	Unreported	29.35

Dorbath, Haselhorn, and Titz (2011)	176	Executive	Unreported	45.58
Doumas, Rapp, and Krampe (2009)	18	Executive	Unreported	12.95
Eckert, Keren, Roberts, Calhoun, and Harris (2010)	42	Executive	Unreported	23.81
Einstein, Smith, McDaniel, and Shaw (1997) – 1	64	Executive	Unreported	29.06
Einstein et al. (1997) – 2	128	Executive	Unreported	41.45
Elwan et al. (1996)	88	Executive	Unreported	57.60
Emery, Hale, and Myerson (2008)	134	Executive	Unreported	49.40
Esposito, Kirkby, Van Horn, Ellmore, and Berman (1999)	41	Executive	Unreported	−1.37
Fein, McGillivray, and Finn (2007)	164	Executive	Unreported	50.67
Ferraro and Kellas (1992)	48	Executive	Unreported	30.68
Foos and Goolkasian (2010)	45	Executive	Unreported	16.02
Hale et al. (2011)	388	Executive	Unreported	168.02
Hampshire, Gruszka, Fallon, and Owen (2008)	32	Executive	Unreported	8.75
Head, Raz, Gunning-Dixon, Williamson, and Acker (2002)	68	Executive	Unreported	14.66
Henninger, Madden, and Huettel (2010)	112	Executive	Unreported	6.09
Kemper, Schmalzried, Hoffman, and Herman (2010)	197	Executive	Unreported	76.18
Krampe, Doumas, Lavrysen, and Rapp (2010)	44	Executive	Unreported	17.65
Kray, Lucenet, and Blaye (2010)	85	Executive	Unreported	53.01
Lamar and Resnick (2004)	43	Executive	Unreported	24.37
Lange and Verhaeghen (2009) – 2	48	Executive	Unreported	34.81
Lesch, Horrey, Wogalter, and Powell (2011)	101	Executive	Unreported	38.50
Löckenhoff, O'Donogue, and Dunning (2011)	98	Executive	Unreported	23.41
Maintenant, Blaye and Paour (2011)	121	Executive	Unreported	49.96
Masunaga and Horn (2001)	263	Executive	Unreported	34.78
Mata, Von Helversen, and Rieskamp (2010)	100	Executive	Unreported	55.45
Mather and Schoeke (2011)	86	Executive	Unreported	−22.12
Maury, Besse, and Martin (2010) – 2	72	Executive	Unreported	50.05
Mayr (2001) – 1	48	Executive	Unreported	29.87
Mayr (2001) – 2	72	Executive	Unreported	31.43
McAuley, Miller, Wang, and Pang (2010)	79	Executive	Unreported	56.46
McDowd and Craik (1988)	32	Executive	Unreported	24.11
Mell et al. (2009)	28	Executive	Unreported	24.98
Miller and West (2010)	95	Executive	Unreported	41.51
Morrow, Menard, Stine-Morrow, Teller, and Bryant (2001)	182	Executive	Unreported	41.74
Perry et al. (2009)	24	Executive	Unreported	15.60
Phillips, Kliegel, and Martin (2006)	78	Executive	Unreported	36.33
Phillips, Smith, and Gilhooly (2002)	96	Executive	Unreported	34.92
Radvansky, Curiel, Zwaan, and Copeland (2001) – 1	96	Executive	Unreported	22.30

(*Continued*)

Appendix B. (Continued)

Study	*N*	Cognitive domain	Visual acuity criteria	Weighted average Fisher's *Z*
Radvansky et al. (2001) – 2	144	Executive	Unreported	71.23
Richmond, Morrison, Chein, and Olson (2011) with additional data from Chein and Morrison (2010)	35	Executive	Unreported	15.42
Rypma, Prabhakaran, Desmond and Gabrieli (2001)	12	Executive	Unreported	4.78
Salthouse (1992) – 1	180	Executive	Unreported	79.52
Scheibe and Blanchard-Fields (2009)	142	Executive	Unreported	92.70
Shafto (2010)	72	Executive	Unreported	28.44
Shan, Chen, Lee, and Su (2008)	475	Executive	Unreported	95.98
Silver, Goodman, Gur, Gur, and Bilker (2011)	134	Executive	Unreported	48.82
West (2004)	28	Executive	Unreported	15.37
Wood, Busemeyer, Koling, Cox, and Davis (2005)	155	Executive	Unreported	27.43
Wood et al. (2011)	121	Executive	Unreported	41.17
Bell et al. (2008) – 1	104	Executive	Undisclosed	44.84
Bo, Borza, and Seidler (2009)	50	Executive	Undisclosed	30.10
Carp, Gmeindl, and Reuter-Lorenz (2010)	41	Executive	Undisclosed	26.76
Chaparro, Wood, and Carberry (2005)	28	Executive	Undisclosed	11.64
Clapp, Rubens, Sabharwal, and Gazzaley (2011)	37	Executive	Undisclosed	9.80
Gamboz, Borella, and Brandimonte (2009)	80	Executive	Undisclosed	25.69
Guerreiro and Van Gerven (2011)	60	Executive	Undisclosed	33.35
Kemtes and Allen (2008)	60	Executive	Undisclosed	16.16
Kieley and Hartley (1997) – 1	32	Executive	Undisclosed	9.97
Kieley and Hartley (1997) – 2	85	Executive	Undisclosed	19.50
Maury et al. (2010) – 1	50	Executive	Undisclosed	38.57
Morrone, Declercq, Novella, and Besche (2010)	60	Executive	Undisclosed	19.71
Mund, Bell, and Buchner (2010) – 1	96	Executive	Undisclosed	56.37
Mund et al. (2010) – 2	157	Executive	Undisclosed	72.21
Nagel et al. (2008)	318	Executive	Undisclosed	234.18
Neider et al. (2011)	36	Executive	Undisclosed	8.67
Ni, Kang, and Andersen (2010)	16	Executive	Undisclosed	7.40
Peltz, Gratton, and Fabiani (2011)	58	Executive	Undisclosed	42.48
Ridderinkhof, Span, and Van der Molen (2002) – 1	40	Executive	Undisclosed	21.54
Rose, Myerson, Sommers, and Hale (2009)	48	Executive	Undisclosed	36.98
Rose, Rendell, McDaniel, Aberle, and Kliegel (2010)	106	Executive	Undisclosed	79.11
Sambataro et al. (2010)	57	Executive	Undisclosed	20.02

Zamarian, Sinz, Bonatti, Gamboz, and Delazer (2008)	85	Executive	Undisclosed	28.53
Hartman, Bolton, and Fehnel (2001) – 1	161	Executive	Self-reported	49.94
Hartman et al. (2001) – 2	96	Executive	Self-reported	33.06
Hartman, Nielsen, and Stratton (2004)	72	Executive	Self-reported	43.45
Karayanidis, Whitson, Heathcote, and Michie (2011)	95	Executive	Self-reported	42.61
Saimpont, Pozzo, and Papaxanthis (2009)	39	Executive	Self-reported	34.28
Touron and Hertzog (2009)	124	Executive	20/50	49.31
Allen, Smith, Jerge, and Vires-Collins (1997) – 1	40	Executive	20/40	19.48
Allen et al. (1997) – 2	48	Executive	20/40	11.39
Basak and Verhaeghen (2011)	55	Executive	20/40	27.94
Feld and Sommers (2009)	81	Executive	20/40	41.96
Hertzog, Cooper, and Fisk (1996)	201	Executive	20/40	128.44
Jamieson and Rogers (2000)	80	Executive	20/40	48.41
Kirasic, Allen, Dobson, and Binder (1996)	477	Executive	20/40	94.23
Kramer, Humphrey, Larish, Logan, and Strayer (1994)	62	Executive	20/40	21.96
Langley, Vivas, Fuentes, and Bagne (2005)	48	Executive	20/40	23.01
Trick, Perl, and Sethi (2005) – 1	38	Executive	20/40	27.71
Trick et al. (2005) – 2	40	Executive	20/40	23.38
Zanto, Toy, and Gazzaley (2010)	43	Executive	20/40	12.95
Brigman and Cherry (2002)	40	Executive	20/30	19.51
Cherry and Park (1993)	194	Executive	20/30	70.89
Reese and Cherry (2002)	128	Executive	20/30	40.46
Touron, Hoyer, and Cerella (2004)	60	Executive	20/30	55.18
Verhaeghen and Hoyer (2007)	48	Executive	20/30	27.22
Cansino, Guzzon, Martinelli, Barollo, and Casco (2011)	50	Executive	20/20	19.11
Risse and Kliegle (2011)	80	Executive	20/20	17.13
Aizpurua, Garcia-Bajos, and Migueles (2009)	68	Memory	Unreported	27.99
Aizpurua, Garcia-Bajos, and Migueles (2011) – 1	65	Memory	Unreported	28.36
Aizpurua, Garcia-Bajos, and Migueles (2011) – 2	67	Memory	Unreported	21.80
Anderson et al. (2011a) – 1	60	Memory	Unreported	31.74
Anderson et al. (2011b) – 2	63	Memory	Unreported	33.83
Badham and Maylor (2011)	108	Memory	Unreported	67.70
Bayer et al. (2011)	40	Memory	Unreported	4.52
Bell et al. (2008) – 2	99	Memory	Unreported	50.05
Benjamin (2011)	79	Memory	Unreported	18.22
Bryan and Luszcz (1996)	72	Memory	Unreported	34.46
Buchler, Faunce, Light, Gottfredson, and Reder (2011)	60	Memory	Unreported	8.95
Cabeza et al. (2004)	40	Memory	Unreported	11.80

(*Continued*)

Appendix B. (Continued)

Study	N	Cognitive domain	Visual acuity criteria	Weighted average Fisher's Z
Charness, Kelley, Bosman, and Mottram (2001) – 1	72	Memory	Unreported	70.78
Charness et al. (2001) – 2	48	Memory	Unreported	20.58
Craik and Schloerscheidt (2011) – 2	32	Memory	Unreported	23.21
Denney and Larsen (1994)	80	Memory	Unreported	29.45
Dew and Giovanello (2010a) – 1	48	Memory	Unreported	23.18
Dew and Giovanello (2010a) – 2	60	Memory	Unreported	44.40
Dew and Giovanello (2010b) – 2	64	Memory	Unreported	36.31
Doose and Feyereisen (2001)	59	Memory	Unreported	39.53
Emery and Hess (2011)	101	Memory	Unreported	16.22
Ford et al. (2001)	26	Memory	Unreported	8.53
Frings, Mader, and Hüll (2010)	17	Memory	Unreported	12.14
Gardner, Hill, Was (2011)	92	Memory	Unreported	42.06
Glahn, Gur, Ragland, Censits, and Gur (1997)	181	Memory	Unreported	53.39
Grady, Bernstein, Beig, and Siegenthaler (2002)	44	Memory	Unreported	27.39
Halamish, McGillivray, and Castel (2011)	40	Memory	Unreported	15.89
Hamami, Serbun, and Gutchess (2011) – 2	54	Memory	Unreported	21.49
Hanna-Pladdy and Choi (2010)	135	Memory	Unreported	31.66
Henkel and Rajaram (2011)	192	Memory	Unreported	61.81
Hertzog and Touron (2011)	152	Memory	Unreported	121.83
Jäger, Mecklinger, and Kliegel (2010)	40	Memory	Unreported	21.76
Joy, Kaplan, and Fein (2004)	950	Memory	Unreported	467.05
Kavé, Knafo, and Gilboa (2010)	1145	Memory	Unreported	104.58
Kim and Giovanello (2011) – 2	24	Memory	Unreported	13.63
Kitzan, Ferraro, Petros, and Ludorf (1999)	88	Memory	Unreported	39.67
Kornell, Castel, Eich, and Bjork (2010)	112	Memory	Unreported	44.11
Li, Nilsson, and Wu (2004)	98	Memory	Unreported	37.74
Luo, Hendriks, and Craik (2007) – 1	64	Memory	Unreported	23.93
Luo et al. (2007) – 2	52	Memory	Unreported	13.23
Luo et al. (2007) – 3	36	Memory	Unreported	27.80
Luo et al. (2007) – 4	64	Memory	Unreported	17.45
Maddox, Balota, Coane, and Duchek (2011) – 1	60	Memory	Unreported	44.87
Maddox et al. (2011) – 2	78	Memory	Unreported	39.09
McGillivray and Castel (2010)	50	Memory	Unreported	20.63
McGillivray and Castel (2011)	52	Memory	Unreported	27.18

Moffat, Kennedy, Rodrigue, and Raz (2007)	68	Memory	Unreported	39.55
Nashiro and Mather (2011)	48	Memory	Unreported	17.38
Naveh-Benjamin and Craik (1995)	50	Memory	Unreported	9.48
Nemeth and Janacsek (2011)	129	Memory	Unreported	65.66
Ostreicher, Moses, Rosenbaum, and Ryan (2010)	32	Memory	Unreported	12.04
Overman and Becker (2009)	151	Memory	Unreported	−42.60
Rosa and Gutchess (2011)	90	Memory	Unreported	38.81
Simon, Howard, and Howard (2010)	30	Memory	Unreported	16.22
Smith (2011) – 1	256	Memory	Unreported	62.99
Smith (2011) – 2	70	Memory	Unreported	24.44
Stern et al. (2008) – 1	68	Memory	Unreported	25.19
Stern et al. (2008) – 2	45	Memory	Unreported	17.27
Toth, Daniels, and Solinger (2011)	72	Memory	Unreported	19.50
Troyer, D'Souza, Vandermorris, and Murphy (2011)	40	Memory	Unreported	23.38
Tse, Balota, and Roediger (2010) – 1	96	Memory	Unreported	27.35
Tse et al. (2010) – 2	44	Memory	Unreported	12.36
Wang, Dew, and Giovanello (2010)	112	Memory	Unreported	51.52
West, Welch, and Thorn (2001)	218	Memory	Unreported	128.68
Wiggs and Martin (1994) – 1	32	Memory	Unreported	12.12
Wiggs and Martin (1994) – 2	64	Memory	Unreported	22.15
Bender, Naveh-Benjamin, and Raz (2010)	278	Memory	Undisclosed	62.13
Bergerbest et al. (2009)	30	Memory	Undisclosed	12.13
Craik and Schloerscheidt (2011) – 1	50	Memory	Undisclosed	26.94
Craik and Schloerscheidt (2011) – 2	64	Memory	Undisclosed	10.98
Fernandes, Ross, Wiegand, and Schryer (2008)	95	Memory	Undisclosed	45.01
Gaesser, Sacchetti, Addis, and Schacter (2011) – 1	32	Memory	Undisclosed	20.32
Gaesser et al. (2011) – 2	30	Memory	Undisclosed	14.16
Glass (2007)	345	Memory	Undisclosed	240.43
Gopie, Craik, and Hasher (2010) – 1	40	Memory	Undisclosed	13.88
Gopie et al. (2010) – 2	40	Memory	Undisclosed	11.69
Hartley, Little, Speer, and Jonides (2011) – 1	48	Memory	Undisclosed	20.98
Hartley et al. (2011) – 2	46	Memory	Undisclosed	16.24
Kemps and Newson (2006)	96	Memory	Undisclosed	45.27
Lin, Wu, Udompholkul, and Knowlton (2010)	60	Memory	Undisclosed	8.59
Lövdén, Schellenbach, Grossman-Hutter, Krüger, and Lindenberger (2005)	32	Memory	Undisclosed	36.13
Murray, Muscatell, and Kensinger (2011) – 1	48	Memory	Undisclosed	26.03
Murray et al. (2011) – 2	78	Memory	Undisclosed	54.06
Murray et al. (2011) – 3	40	Memory	Undisclosed	11.45

(*Continued*)

Appendix B. (Continued)

Study	*N*	Cognitive domain	Visual acuity criteria	Weighted average Fisher's *Z*
Shih, Meadmore, and Liversedge (2012)	90	Memory	Undisclosed	29.41
Skinner and Fernandes (2009) – 1	30	Memory	Undisclosed	11.73
Skinner and Fernandes (2009) – 2	32	Memory	Undisclosed	7.74
Vakil and Agmon-Ashkenazi (1997)	50	Memory	Undisclosed	29.13
Viggiano, Galli, La Corte, and Ragazzoni (2010)	30	Memory	Undisclosed	22.49
Aizpurua and Koutstaal (2010)	71	Memory	Self-reported	27.87
Feng, Courtney, Mather, Dawson, and Davison (2011)	85	Memory	Self-reported	7.63
Hamami et al. (2011) – 1	64	Memory	Self-reported	22.34
Rémy, Taconnat, and Isingrini (2008)	60	Memory	Self-reported	38.58
Stine-Morrow et al. (2006)	73	Memory	Self-reported	14.60
Tun, Wingfield, Stine, and Mecsas (1992)	50	Memory	Self-reported	25.47
Hertzog, Touron, and Hines (2007) – 1	103	Memory	20/50	33.71
Hertzog et al. (2007) – 2	84	Memory	20/50	30.48
Hertzog et al. (2007) – 3	86	Memory	20/50	4.70
Touron, Hertzog, and Frank (2011) – 1	40	Memory	20/50	14.34
Allen et al. (2002b)	80	Memory	20/40	26.77
Allen et al. (2011) – 1	40	Memory	20/40	28.37
Allen et al. (2011) – 2	120	Memory	20/40	69.53
Bowles (1994)	64	Memory	20/40	53.84
Fisk, Cooper, Hertzog, Anderson-Garlach, and Lee (1995)	201	Memory	20/40	172.35
Fisk, Rogers, Cooper, and Gilbert (1997) – 1	174	Memory	20/40	220.04
Fisk et al. (1997) – 2	48	Memory	20/40	41.89
Jenkins, Myerson, Joerding, and Hale (2000)	32	Memory	20/40	25.52
Langley et al. (2008b) – 1	72	Memory	20/40	19.25
Langley et al. (2008b) – 2	68	Memory	20/40	22.16
Langley et al. (2008b) – 3	64	Memory	20/40	17.72
Lawson, Guo, and Jiang (2007)	28	Memory	20/40	15.28
Rogers and Gilbert (1997) – 1	32	Memory	20/40	20.68
Rogers and Gilbert (1997) – 2	32	Memory	20/40	19.80
Rogers and Gilbert (1997) – 3	32	Memory	20/40	20.36
Rogers and Gilbert (1997) – 4	32	Memory	20/40	17.62
Rutledge, Hancock, and Walker (1997)	93	Memory	20/40	32.37
Cerella, Onyper, and Hoyer (2006)	98	Memory	20/30	48.05
Cherry and Jones (1999) – 1	144	Memory	20/30	58.92

Cherry and Jones (1999) – 2	144	Memory	20/30	70.19
Cherry and LeCompte (1999)	96	Memory	20/30	18.63
Cherry and St. Pierre (1998)	64	Memory	20/30	24.86
Cherry, Dokey, Reese, and Brigman (2003) – 1	96	Memory	20/30	75.94
Cherry et al. (2003) – 2	96	Memory	20/30	81.94
Karpel, Hoyer, and Toglia (2001)	122	Memory	20/30	44.99
Park, Cherry, Smith, and Lafronza (1990) – 1	84	Memory	20/30	20.92
Park et al. (1990) – 2	128	Memory	20/30	28.05
Smith, Park, Earles, Shaw, and Whiting (1998) – 1	76	Memory	20/30	55.84
Smith et al. (1998) – 2	48	Memory	20/30	26.04
Bowles and Poon (1981)	43	Perception	Unreported	20.78
Cohen and Faulkner (1983)	24	Perception	Unreported	9.29
Elliott, Hardy, Webster, and Werner (2007)	20	Perception	Unreported	5.97
Grady et al. (1994)	32	Perception	Unreported	21.46
Hildebrandt, Wilhelm, Schmiedek, Herzmann, and Sommer (2011)	448	Perception	Unreported	26.76
Hunter, Phillips, and MacPherson (2010) – 1	50	Perception	Unreported	19.45
Hunter et al. (2010) – 2	40	Perception	Unreported	13.83
Kalisch, Kattenstroth, Kowalewski, Tegenthoff, and Dinse (2012)	81	Perception	Unreported	38.28
Krendl and Ambady (2010) – 1	78	Perception	Unreported	48.26
Krendl and Ambady (2010) – 2	80	Perception	Unreported	37.08
Lange and Verhaeghen (2009) – 1	48	Perception	Unreported	45.44
McLellan, Marcos, and Burns (2001)	38	Perception	Unreported	13.45
Mikels, Larkin, Reuter-Lorenz, and Carstensen (2005)	40	Perception	Unreported	15.62
Mill, Allik, Realo, and Valk (2009)	607	Perception	Unreported	245.57
Park, Polk, Hebrank, and Jenkins (2010)	38	Perception	Unreported	17.19
Stine-Stine-Morrow, Milinder, Pullara, and Herman (2001)	243	Perception	Unreported	96.94
Westbury and Titone (2011)	68	Perception	Unreported	23.08
Allen, Madden, and Crozier (1991)	48	Perception	Undisclosed	38.13
Andersen, Ni, Bower, and Watanabe (2010) – 1	18	Perception	Undisclosed	14.37
Andersen et al. (2010) – 3	16	Perception	Undisclosed	0.14
Bannerman, Regener, and Sahraie (2011)	60	Perception	Undisclosed	23.87
Burke, White, and Diaz (1987)	64	Perception	Undisclosed	25.45
Caplan, Dede, Waters, Michaud, and Tripodis (2011)	200	Perception	Undisclosed	56.57
Chaby, Narme, and George (2011)	66	Perception	Undisclosed	36.33
Deiber et al. (2010)	56	Perception	Undisclosed	25.77
Del Viva and Agostini (2007)	32	Perception	Undisclosed	35.54
Halpern (1984)	40	Perception	Undisclosed	38.81
Kadota and Gomi (2010)	32	Perception	Undisclosed	24.75

(*Continued*)

Appendix B. (Continued)

Study	N	Cognitive domain	Visual acuity criteria	Weighted average Fisher's Z
Kennedy, Tripathy, and Barrett (2009)	169	Perception	Undisclosed	85.83
Klein, Fischer, Hartnegg, Heiss, and Roth (2000)	36	Perception	Undisclosed	23.93
Kolarik, Margrain, and Freeman (2010)	39	Perception	Undisclosed	8.72
Madden (1992b)	108	Perception	Undisclosed	50.38
O'Connor, Margrain, and Freeman (2010) – 1	39	Perception	Undisclosed	10.11
Orgeta (2010)	80	Perception	Undisclosed	25.73
Owsley, Sekuler, and Boldt (1981)	27	Perception	Undisclosed	27.24
Ridderinkhof and Wijnen (2011)	40	Perception	Undisclosed	35.46
Slessor, Laird, Phillips, Bull, and Filippou (2010)	59	Perception	Undisclosed	60.72
Spaniol, Voss, Bowen, and Grady (2011)	53	Perception	Undisclosed	16.66
Speranza, Moraglia, and Schneider (2001) – 1	22	Perception	Undisclosed	6.35
Speranza et al. (2001) – 2	22	Perception	Undisclosed	6.36
Speranza et al. (2001) – 3	22	Perception	Undisclosed	17.97
Speranza et al. (2001) – 4	22	Perception	Undisclosed	1.75
Werheid, Gruno, and Kathman, et al. (2010) – 1	40	Perception	Undisclosed	14.89
Werheid et al. (2010) – 2	40	Perception	Undisclosed	16.83
Winneke and Phillips (2011)	34	Perception	Undisclosed	6.33
Allen, Madden, Weber, and Groth (1993b) – 1	40	Perception	Self-reported	28.14
Allen et al. (1993b) – 2	40	Perception	Self-reported	26.98
Allen et al. (1993b) – 3	40	Perception	Self-reported	16.88
Madden (1988)	48	Perception	Self-reported	36.64
Maguinness, Setti, Burke, Kenny, and Newell (2011)	41	Perception	Self-reported	37.43
Robert and Mathey (2007)	54	Perception	Self-reported	13.45
Allen, Sliwinski, and Bowie (2002a) – 1	67	Perception	20/40	30.70
Allen et al. (2002a) – 2	84	Perception	20/40	27.23
Allen et al. (2002a) – 3	40	Perception	20/40	17.88
Allen, Murphy, Kaufman, Groth, and Begovic (2004)	193	Perception	20/40	68.19
Gottlob, Fillmore, and Abroms (2007)	40	Perception	20/40	8.60
Hugenschmidt, Mozolic, and Laurienti (2009a)	41	Perception	20/40	28.79
Tye-Murray et al. (2008)	86	Perception	20/40	35.28
Tye-Murray, Sommers, Spehar, Myerson, and Hale (2010)	106	Perception	20/40	37.61
Scialfa, Hamaluk, Skaloud, and Pratt (1999)	36	Perception	20/33	15.88
Clancy-Dollinger (1995)	24	Perception	20/30	18.58
Garnham and Sloper (2006)	60	Perception	20/30	22.40

Johnson, Adams, and Lewis (1989)	62	Perception	20/30	39.22
Klistorner and Graham (2001)	100	Perception	20/30	5.06
Kurylo (2006)	26	Perception	20/30	18.20
McKendrick, Weymouth, and Battista (2010)	43	Perception	20/30	11.53
Nguyen-Tri, Overbury, and Faubert (2003)	102	Perception	20/30	31.84
Redmond, Zlatkova, Garway-Heath, and Anderson (2010)	68	Perception	20/30	7.02
Ross, Clarke, and Bron (1985)	70	Perception	20/30	45.89
Ruffman, Sullivan, and Dittrich (2009) – 1	60	Perception	20/30	26.10
Ruffman et al. (2009) – 2	79	Perception	20/30	26.08
Ryan, Murray, and Ruffman (2010)	80	Perception	20/30	25.40
Scialfa and Hamaluk (2001)	20	Perception	20/30	12.07
Sullivan, Ruffman, and Hutton (2007) – 1	60	Perception	20/30	19.58
Sullivan et al. (2007) – 2	54	Perception	20/30	22.40
Elliott and Werner (2010)	26	Perception	20/25	13.59
Elliott et al. (2009)	20	Perception	20/25	6.36
Grunwald, Piltz, Patel, Bose, and Riva (1993)	33	Perception	20/25	19.62
Habak, Wilkinson, and Wilson (2009)	36	Perception	20/25	7.45
Karas and McKendrick (2009)	35	Perception	20/25	10.73
McKendrick, Sampson, Walland, and Badcock (2007)	28	Perception	20/25	23.94
Li et al. (2012)	38	Perception	20/24	21.50
Kennedy et al. (2009)	22	Perception	20/20	10.70
Rayner, Reichle, Stroud, Williams, and Pollatsek (2006)	32	Perception	20/20	10.16
Rayner, Castelhano, and Yang (2009) – 1	48	Perception	20/20	11.95
Rayner et al. (2009) – 2	24	Perception	20/20	15.62
Rayner, Yang, Castelhano, and Liversedge (2011)	32	Perception	20/20	12.97
Thompson, Garcia, and Malloy (2007)	80	Perception	20/20	45.85
Wilson, Mei, Habak, and Wilkinson (2011)	30	Perception	20/20	13.11
Malania et al. (2011)	19	Perception	20/15	9.40