

BALANCE AND COGNITION:
RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND ITS CONTROL
IN YOUNG AND OLDER ADULTS

Albina Bondar

Dissertationsschrift zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophie
am Fachbereich Erziehungswissenschaft und Psychologie
der Freien Universität Berlin

Berlin 2002

Disputation: 11. Februar 2003

Gutachter:

Prof. Dr. Paul B. Baltes

Prof. Dr. Ralf Schwarzer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VI
ABSTRACT	VII
ZUSAMMENFASSUNG.....	VIII
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.....	3
2.1 DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE ON RESOURCE ALLOCATION	3
2.1.1 The SOC-Model: An Approach for Understanding Adaptive Development.....	5
2.1.1.1 Empirical Evidence	7
2.1.2 Implications for the Present Study.....	9
2.2 COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE ON RESOURCE ALLOCATION	11
2.2.1 Resource Theories	12
2.2.1.1 Unitary-Resource Theory.....	12
2.2.1.2 Resource Theories' Experimental Techniques.....	14
2.2.1.3 Empirical Evidence: Resource Allocation in Adulthood.....	19
2.2.2 Implications for the Present Study.....	21
2.3 COGNITIVE AGING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION.....	23
2.3.1. Empirical Evidence: Are there Age-Related Differences in Resource Allocation?.....	26
2.3.2 Potential Reasons for Inconsistent Findings on Age-Related Differences in Resource Allocation	29
2.3.3 Implications for the Present Study.....	32
2.4 SENSORIMOTOR AGING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION	33
2.4.1 Balance and the Balance System	34
2.4.2 Age-Related Changes in the Balance System	35
2.4.3 Empirical Evidence: Age-Related Differences in Balance Behavior.....	38
2.4.3.1 Single-Task Situations	38
2.4.3.2 Dual-Task Situations.....	40
2.4.4 Implications for the Present Study.....	43
3. OUTLINE OF THE STUDY	45

4. METHOD	51
4.1 PARTICIPANTS	51
4.1.1 Recruitment Process.....	51
4.1.2 Socio-Demographic Characteristics	51
4.1.3 Psychological Assessment of Individual Resources	52
4.1.3.1 Cognitive Status	55
4.1.3.2 Health Status.....	55
4.1.3.3 Life Management	57
4.1.3.4 Comparison With the “Young Old” Participants of BASE.....	58
4.2 APPARATUS AND EXPERIMENTAL TASKS	61
4.2.1 Apparatus.....	61
4.2.2 Experimental Tasks.....	63
4.2.2.1 Balance Task	63
4.2.2.2 Reaction-Time (RT) Task	63
4.2.2.3 Single- and Dual-Task Condition	64
4.3 DESIGN.....	66
4.4 PROCEDURE	67
5. RESULTS	68
5.1 GENERAL STATISTICAL PROCEDURES.....	68
5.2 HOW DO INDIVIDUALS ALLOCATE RESOURCES IN DUAL-TASK SITUATIONS?.....	70
5.2.1 Single-Task Baseline Performance.....	70
5.2.2 Domain-Specific Asymmetry in Resource Allocation	73
5.2.2.1 Analyses of Raw Scores.....	73
5.2.2.2 Computation of Dual-Task Costs	76
5.2.2.3 Analyses of Dual-Task Costs.....	77
5.2.3 Age-Related Differences.....	78
5.2.3.1 Analyses of Raw Scores.....	78
5.2.3.2 Analyses of Dual-Task Costs.....	83
5.2.4 Summary: Domain-Specific Asymmetry and Age-Related Differences	86
5.3 CAN INDIVIDUALS DELIBERATELY CONTROL RESOURCE ALLOCATION?.....	87
5.3.1 Deliberate Control is Limited in Challenging Situations and in the Balance Domain	87
5.3.1.1 POC Evaluation.....	88
5.3.1.2 Analyses of Raw Scores.....	92
5.3.1.3 Analyses of Dual-Task Costs.....	95
5.3.2 Age-Related Differences.....	98

5.3.2.1 POC Evaluation.....	99
5.3.2.2 Analyses of Raw Scores.....	102
5.3.2.3 Analyses of Dual-Task Costs.....	110
5.3.2.4 Additional Analyses.....	114
5.3.3 Summary: Deliberate Control of Resource Allocation and Age-Related Differences	117
6. DISCUSSION.....	120
6.1 MAJOR FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS.....	120
6.1.1 Evidence Supporting Domain-Specific Resource Allocation and Its Control.....	121
6.1.1.1 Alternative Interpretations	124
6.1.2 Evidence Supporting Age-Related Differences in Resource Allocation.....	128
6.1.2.1 Alternative Interpretations	130
6.2 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND RESULTS AWAITING EXPLANATION	133
6.2.1 Was the Difficult Condition Resource Demanding?.....	133
6.2.2 Why Could Older Adults Adjust Their Reaction Times According to Instructions?.....	136
6.3 CONCLUSIONS.....	140
6.4 OUTLOOK.....	143
7. REFERENCES	145
8. APPENDICES	164

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure 1.</i>	Hypothetical Performance-Operating-Characteristic (POC) Function	17
<i>Figure 2.</i>	Comparison of the Older Subsample of the Present Study with the “Young Old” Participants of BASE: Age Distribution	59
<i>Figure 3.</i>	Comparison of the Older Subsample of the Present Study with the “Young Old” Participants of BASE: Perceptual-Motor Speed	59
<i>Figure 4.</i>	Comparison of the Older Subsample of the Present Study with the “Young Old” Participants of BASE: Auditory Acuity	60
<i>Figure 5.</i>	Comparison of the Older Subsample of the Present Study with the “Young Old” Participants of BASE: Visual Acuity	60
<i>Figure 6.</i>	Schematic Diagram of the Components of the Ground Reaction Force (Left Panel) and the Experimental Apparatus (Right Panel) Showing the Motor- Driven Force Platform in the Center of a Raised Plinth.....	62
<i>Figure 7.</i>	An Example of a Small (Left Panel) and a Large (Right Panel) Area of the COP Movement.....	62
<i>Figure 8.</i>	The Experimental Setup Showing an Older Adult Performing a Dual Task.....	65

<i>Figure 9.</i>	Reaction-Time and Balance Performance as a Function of Task and Difficulty	75
<i>Figure 10.</i>	Dual-Task Costs are Higher in the Cognitive than in the Balance Domain.....	77
<i>Figure 11.</i>	Reaction-Time Performance as a Function of Age Group, Task, and Difficulty	79
<i>Figure 12.</i>	Balance Performance as a Function of Age Group, Task, and Difficulty.....	82
<i>Figure 13.</i>	Dual-Task Costs are Higher in Older than in Younger Adults	84
<i>Figure 14.</i>	Balance Domain: Decrement in Dual-Task Costs through Training	85
<i>Figure 15.</i>	Cognitive Domain: Decrement in Dual-Task Costs through Training	86
<i>Figure 16.</i>	POC for Raw Scores in Reaction-Time and Balance Task under Easy and Difficult Condition.....	89
<i>Figure 17.</i>	POC for Dual-Task Costs in Reaction-Time and Balance Task under Easy and Difficult Condition.....	91
<i>Figure 18.</i>	Sensitivity of Reaction-Time and Balance Performance to Instructional Manipulation as a Function of Difficulty	95
<i>Figure 19.</i>	Sensitivity of Dual-Task Costs to Instructional Manipulation as a Function of Domain and Difficulty	96
<i>Figure 20.</i>	Sensitivity of Dual-Task Costs to Instructional Manipulation as a Function of Difficulty	98
<i>Figure 21.</i>	POCs for Raw Scores in Reaction Times and Areas of COP as a Function of Age Group and Difficulty	100
<i>Figure 22.</i>	POCs for Raw Scores in Percentage of Errors and Areas of COP as a Function of Age Group and Difficulty.....	101
<i>Figure 23.</i>	POCs for Dual-Task Costs in Reaction Times and Areas of COP as a Function of Age Group and Difficulty.....	103
<i>Figure 24.</i>	POCs for Dual-Task Costs in Percentage of Correct Responses and Areas of COP as a Function of Age Group and Difficulty	104
<i>Figure 25.</i>	Sensitivity of Reaction-Time Performance to Instructional Manipulation as a Function of Age Group and Difficulty	105
<i>Figure 26.</i>	Age-Group Differences in Frequencies of “Time-Out” Errors in Dual-Task Condition	108
<i>Figure 27.</i>	Sensitivity of Balance Performance to Instructional Manipulation as a Function of Age Group and Difficulty	109
<i>Figure 28.</i>	Sensitivity of Dual-Task Costs to Instructional Manipulation in Cognitive Domain as a Function of Age Group and Difficulty.....	110
<i>Figure 29.</i>	Sensitivity of Dual-Task Costs to Instructional Manipulation in Balance Domain as a Function of Age Group and Difficulty.....	113
<i>Figure 30.</i>	Performance under Emphasis Instructions Relative to “Equal Emphasis” as a Function of Age Group, Difficulty, and Domain.....	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	<i>Socio-Demographic Sample Characteristics</i>	52
Table 2.	<i>List of Measures</i>	53
Table 3.	<i>Individual Resources: Cognitive Status as a Function of Age Group</i>	55
Table 4.	<i>Individual Resources: Health Status as a Function of Age Group</i>	56
Table 5.	<i>Individual Resources: Life-Management as a Function of Age Group</i>	57
Table 6.	<i>Design of the Study</i>	66
Table 7.	<i>Single-Task Baseline Performance as a Function of Task, Sample, and Difficulty</i>	71
Table 8.	<i>Means (SD) in Errors (%) and Correlations among RTs (ms) and Errors (%) as a Function of Difficulty and Task</i>	74
Table 9.	<i>Means (SD) in Errors (%) as a Function of Sample, Difficulty, and Task</i>	80
Table 10.	<i>Correlations among RTs (ms) and Errors (%) as a Function of Sample, Difficulty, and Task</i>	81
Table 11.	<i>Means and SD in Errors (%) and Correlations among RTs (ms) and Errors (%) as a Function of Difficulty, and Instruction</i>	94
Table 12.	<i>Means (SD) in Errors (%) as a Function of Sample, Difficulty, and Instruction</i>	106
Table 13.	<i>Correlations among RTs (ms) and Errors (%) as a Function of Sample, Difficulty, and Instruction</i>	107
Table 14.	<i>Means (SD) in DTCs for Percentage of Correct Responses as a Function of Sample, Difficulty, and Instruction</i>	111
Table 15.	<i>Summary of Hypotheses and Results</i>	118