**Appendix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A.** Raw counts and percentages (% in brackets) of syntactic packaging (simple vs. complex responses) by language acquisition type and age. | | | | | |
| **age** | **syntactic packaging** | **English monolingual**  **(n = 24)** | **English bilingual (n = 24)** | **French monolingual (n = 24)** | **French bilingual**  **(n = 24)** |
| 4-5 years | simple | 376 (99.2) | 380 (99) | 352 (92.4) | 368 (96) |
| complex | 3 (0.8) | 4 (1) | 29 (7.6) | 15 (4) |
| total | 379 (100) | 384 (100) | 381 (100) | 383 (100) |
| 6-7 years | simple | 370 (96.3) | 380 (99) | 322 (83.8) | 351 (91.4) |
| complex | 14 (3.7) | 4 (1) | 62 (16.2) | 33 (8.6) |
| total | 384 (100) | 384 (100) | 384 (100) | 384 (100) |
| 8-9 years | simple | 363 (95.3) | 375 (97.6) | 237 (61.8) | 319 (83.1) |
| complex | 18 (4.7) | 9 (2.4) | 147 (38.2) | 65 (16.9) |
| total | 381 (100) | 384 (100) | 384 (100) | 384 (100) |
| 10-11 years | simple | 361 (94) | 361 (94) | 172 (44.8) | 296 (77.1) |
| complex | 23 (6) | 23 (6) | 212 (55.2) | 88 (22.9) |
| total | 384 (100) | 384 (100) | 384 (100) | 384 (100) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B1.** Pairwise comparisons between language acquisition groups in **four-year-olds** for the use of complex responses (i.e., using subordination). | | | | | |
| **Contrast** | **Estimate** | ***SE*** | ***Z*** | ***p*-value** |  |
| English monolingual - English bilingual | -0.501 | 1.174 | -0.427 | .974 |  |
| English monolingual - French bilingual | -1.199 | 1.123 | -1.067 | .71 |  |
| English monolingual - French monolingual | -2.516 | 1.085 | -2.319 | .094 | . |
| English bilingual - French bilingual | -0.698 | 1.062 | -0.657 | .913 |  |
| English bilingual - French monolingual | -2.015 | 0.996 | -2.022 | .18 |  |
| French bilingual - French monolingual | -1.317 | 0.967 | -1.362 | .523 |  |

Results are given on the log odds ratio (not the response) scale. Results are obtained using emmeans function with Tukey *p*-value adjustments. Significance codes: ‘\*\*\*’: *p* < .001; ‘\*\*’: *p* < .01; ‘\*’: *p* < .05; ‘.’: *p* < .1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B2.** Pairwise comparisons between language acquisition groups in **six-year-olds** for the use of complex responses (i.e., using subordination). | | | | | |
| **Contrast** | **Estimate** | ***SE*** | ***Z*** | ***p*-value** |  |
| English monolingual - English bilingual | 0.761 | 1.34 | 0.568 | .942 |  |
| English monolingual - French bilingual | -1.499 | 1.21 | -1.237 | .603 |  |
| English monolingual - French monolingual | -3.152 | 1.21 | -2.609 | .045 | \* |
| English bilingual - French bilingual | -2.260 | 1.28 | -1.764 | .291 |  |
| English bilingual - French monolingual | -3.913 | 1.28 | -3.059 | .012 | \* |
| French bilingual - French monolingual | -1.653 | 1.10 | -1.497 | .439 |  |

Results are given on the log odds ratio (not the response) scale. Results are obtained using emmeans function with Tukey *p*-value adjustments. Significance codes: ‘\*\*\*’: *p* < .001; ‘\*\*’: *p* < .01; ‘\*’: *p* < .05; ‘.’: *p* < .1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B3.** Pairwise comparisons between language acquisition groups in **eight-year-olds** for the use of complex responses (i.e., using subordination). | | | | | |
| **Contrast** | **Estimate** | ***SE*** | ***Z*** | ***p*-value** |  |
| English monolingual - English bilingual | 0.159 | 0.941 | 0.169 | .998 |  |
| English monolingual - French bilingual | -2.604 | 0.866 | -3.006 | .014 | \* |
| English monolingual - French monolingual | -4.125 | 0.872 | -4.731 | < .001 | \*\*\* |
| English bilingual - French bilingual | -2.763 | 0.854 | -3.236 | .007 | \*\* |
| English bilingual - French monolingual | -4.284 | 0.856 | -5.005 | < .001 | \*\*\* |
| French bilingual - French monolingual | -1.521 | 0.699 | -2.175 | .13 |  |

Results are given on the log odds ratio (not the response) scale. Results are obtained using emmeans function with Tukey *p*-value adjustments. Significance codes: ‘\*\*\*’: *p* < .001; ‘\*\*’: *p* < .01; ‘\*’: *p* < .05; ‘.’: *p* < .1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B4.** Pairwise comparisons between language acquisition groups in **ten-year-olds** for the use of complex responses (i.e., using subordination). | | | | | |
| **Contrast** | **Estimate** | ***SE*** | ***Z*** | ***p*-value** |  |
| English monolingual - English bilingual | -0.743 | 0.707 | -1.051 | .72 |  |
| English monolingual - French bilingual | -2.386 | 0.681 | -3.501 | .003 | \*\* |
| English monolingual - French monolingual | -4.232 | 0.688 | -6.148 | < .001 | \*\*\* |
| English bilingual - French bilingual | -1.643 | 0.610 | -2.691 | .036 | \* |
| English bilingual - French monolingual | -3.489 | 0.606 | -5.754 | < .001 | \*\*\* |
| French bilingual - French monolingual | -1.846 | 0.564 | -3.272 | .006 | \*\* |

Results are given on the log odds ratio (not the response) scale. Results are obtained using emmeans function with Tukey *p*-value adjustments. Significance codes: ‘\*\*\*’: *p* < .001; ‘\*\*’: *p* < .01; ‘\*’: *p* < .05; ‘.’: *p* < .1