Appendix A.

Table 6. *Descriptive Statistics and Differences between Scheele (2010) and Messer (2010) at Age 4 and Age 6.*

	Scheele (*n* = 44)	Messer (*n* = 66)				
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	*df*	*t*	*p*	η^2
Age 4						
Age in months	52.60 (1.85)	51.77 (1.63)	107	-2.46	.02*	.05
Gender	1.55 (0.50)	1.44 (0.50)	108	-1.32	.19	.01
Vocabulary Dutch[c]	14.08 (4.93)	12.83 (5.17)	103	-1.32	.19	.01
Vocabulary Turkish[c]	15.02 (5.15)	12.82 (4.21)	104	-2.42	.02*	.05
Language Use Dutch[d]	0.98 (0.95)	0.80 (0.97)	107	-0.95	.35	.00
Language Use Turkish[d]	3.02 (1.02)	2.92 (0.93)	107	-0.58	.56	.00
SES[a]	3.22 (0.99)	2.40 (1.13)	102	-3.77	.00**	.11
Non-verbal intelligence[b]	13.02 (2.73)	12.11 (2.69)	105	-1.71	.09	.02
Age 6						
Age in months	71.24 (2.16)	71.53 (2.25)	104	0.68	.51	.00
Vocabulary Dutch[c]	21.43 (3.36)	21.64 (3.24)	100	0.32	.75	.00
Vocabulary Turkish[c]	19.35 (3.22)	19.96 (2.38)	100	1.11	.27	.00
Language Use Dutch[d]	1.33 (1.06)	1.26 (1.15)	98	-0.32	.75	.00
Language Use Turkish[d]	2.83 (1.06)	2.54 (1.10)	98	-1.36	.18	.01

* *p* <.05   ** *p* <.01   Effectsizes η^2 according to Cohen (1988): .01 = small effect, .06 = medium effect, .14 = large effect
[a] Socioeconomic Status, range 1- 6.   [b] Range 1- 36   [c] Range 1- 30
[d] The language use variables here are the mean of four distinct language use variables, range 0-5.

Appendix B.

Table 7. *Interaction Effects Family SES and Dataset on Outcome Variables*

	Sum of Squares	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
SES * Dataset					
L1 Proficiency Age 4	100.81	9	0.39	.94	.02
L2 Proficiency Age 4	194.15	9	0.84	.58	.04
L1 Use Age 4	17.56	9	0.99	.45	.05
L2 Use Age 4	22.63	9	1.25	.25	.06
L1 Proficiency Age 6	102.88	9	0.80	.62	.04
L2 Proficiency Age 6	76.42	9	0.78	.63	.04
L1 Use Age 6	11.42	9	0.73	.68	.04
L2 Use Age 6	9.75	9	0.64	.76	.03

Results from the multivariate regression analyses showed that there is no significant interaction effect between family SES and the dataset (Messer or Scheele) on the language use and language proficiency variables at both ages, $F_{(48, 289.45)} = 1.00$, $p = .47$, Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.47$, partial $\eta^2 = .12$. This seems to indicate that the two datasets do not differ in the way SES predicts the outcome variables.