Appendix B

Regression results predicting English paradigmatic percentage

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model |  | $$β$$ | *SE* | *t* |
| 1 | Age (in months) | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
|  | English NDW | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 |
|  | Cantonese NDW | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 |
|  | Cantonese Paradigmatic  | 1.64 | 1.27 | 1.30 |
|  | English Syntagmatic  | -0.14 | 0.16 | -0.87 |
|  | Cantonese Syntagmatic  | 0.70 | 1.28 | 0.55 |
|  | English unrelated distractor | -0.47 | 0.40 | -1.18 |
|  | English related distractor | 0.83 | 0.29 | 2.90\* |
|  | Cantonese Unrelated distractor | 0.00 | 0.42 | -0.01 |
|  | Cantonese related distractor | -0.05 | 0.34 | -0.14 |
| 2 | Age (in months) | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
|  | English NDW | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 |
|  | Cantonese NDW | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 |
|  | Cantonese Paradigmatic  | 1.64 | 1.24 | 1.32 |
|  | English Syntagmatic  | -0.14 | 0.16 | -0.89 |
|  | Cantonese Syntagmatic  | 0.70 | 1.26 | 0.56 |
|  | English unrelated distractor | -0.47 | 0.21 | -2.24 |
|  | English related distractor | 0.83 | 0.23 | 3.56\*\*\* |
|  | Cantonese related distractor | -0.05 | 0.22 | -0.22 |
| 3 | English NDW | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 |
|  | Cantonese NDW | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 |
|  | Cantonese Paradigmatic  | 1.63 | 1.22 | 1.34 |
|  | English Syntagmatic  | -0.14 | 0.16 | -0.91 |
|  | Cantonese Syntagmatic  | 0.69 | 1.24 | 0.56 |
|  | English unrelated distractor | -0.46 | 0.20 | -2.37\* |
|  | English related distractor | 0.83 | 0.22 | 3.71\*\*\* |
|  | Cantonese related distractor | -0.05 | 0.22 | -0.22 |
| 4 | English NDW | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 |
|  | Cantonese Paradigmatic  | 1.65 | 1.20 | 1.38 |
|  | English Syntagmatic  | -0.14 | 0.15 | -0.92 |
|  | Cantonese Syntagmatic  | 0.71 | 1.22 | 0.58 |
|  | English unrelated distractor | -0.47 | 0.19 | -2.40 |
|  | English related distractor | 0.83 | 0.22 | 3.78\*\*\* |
|  | Cantonese related distractor | -0.05 | 0.22 | -0.23 |
| 5 | Cantonese Paradigmatic  | 1.67 | 1.18 | 1.42 |
|  | English Syntagmatic  | -0.14 | 0.15 | -0.94 |
|  | Cantonese Syntagmatic  | 0.71 | 1.20 | 0.59 |
|  | English unrelated distractor | -0.47 | 0.19 | -2.56\* |
|  | English related distractor | 0.83 | 0.22 | 3.83\*\*\* |
|  | Cantonese related distractor | -0.05 | 0.21 | -0.24 |
| 6 | Cantonese Paradigmatic  | 1.70 | 1.15 | 1.48 |
|  | English Syntagmatic  | -0.14 | 0.15 | -0.95 |
|  | Cantonese Syntagmatic  | 0.75 | 1.17 | 0.64 |
|  | English unrelated distractor | -0.48 | 0.18 | -2.62\* |
|  | English related distractor | 0.82 | 0.21 | 3.98\*\*\* |
| 7 | Cantonese Paradigmatic  | 0.98 | 0.21 | 4.73\*\*\* |
|  | English Syntagmatic  | -0.11 | 0.14 | -0.78 |
|  | English unrelated distractor | -0.51 | 0.18 | -2.88\* |
|  | English related distractor | 0.83 | 0.20 | 4.06\*\*\* |
| 8 | Cantonese Paradigmatic  | 1.10 | 0.14 | 8.11\*\*\* |
|  | English unrelated distractor | -0.49 | 0.17 | -2.82\*\* |
|  | English related distractor | 0.82 | 0.20 | 4.04\*\*\* |

*Note.*

\**p*<.05 \*\**p*<.01 *p*<.001

NDW = number of different words.

All predictors from WAID and WAT, including paradigmatic, syntagmatic, related, and unrelated distractor conditions, were percent correct.