Supplementary material

Table S1. *Mean self-reported language proficiency ratings (and standard deviations) (Experiment 1: Turkish lexical decision).*

	Turkish	**Dutch**
Speaking	4 (0.82)	4.58 (0.61)
Listening	4.58 (0.61)	4.74 (0.56)
Writing	3.47 (1.22)	4.37 (0.76)
Reading	3.58 (1.07)	4.58 (0.84)
Pronunciation	4.05 (0.78)	4.68 (0.48)
Mean	3.94	4.59

Note: A score of 1 refers to ‘not good at all’ and a score of 5 to ‘very good’.

Table S2. *Turkish and Dutch BNT scores (Experiment 1: Turkish lexical decision).*

	Turkish BNT	**Dutch BNT**
Mean score	66.33	105.83
SD	17.35	19.94

Note: The maximum score was 162.

Table S3. *Mean frequency, duration (in ms), and number of phonemes of the items in the three stress conditions in Experiment 1 (Turkish lexical decision). Standard deviations appear in parentheses.*

	Cognates			**Non-cognates**			**Pseudo words**		
	PEN-PEN	**ULT-PEN**	**ULT-ULT**	**PEN-PEN**	**ULT-PEN**	**ULT-ULT**	**PEN-PEN**	**ULT-PEN**	**ULT-ULT**
Frequency				60 (183)	75 (214)	71 (182)			
Duration	714 (89)	705 (90)	714 (89)	691 (106)	700 (76)	706 (85)	711 (68)	722 (87)	701 (72)
Number of phonemes	4.96 (0.96)	5.57 (0.90)	5.13 (0.68)	4.53 (0.51)	5.03 (0.63)	5 (0.74)	4.88 (0.58)	4.93 (0.58)	4.97 (0.61)

Note: Turkish word frequencies are given in occurrences per million. They are based on a corpus of 32,981,882 words (Dave, 2012). The table does not include word frequencies for the Turkish cognates, because not all cognates included in the experiment appeared in the corpus. Independent t-tests showed that the words in ULT-PEN (with penultimate stress in Dutch) consisted of significantly more phonemes than the pseudo words (p = .005). Moreover, the cognates in PEN-PEN and ULT-PEN consisted of more phonemes than the non-cognates in these stress conditions (p = .035 and p = .011, respectively). Regarding the cognates, the items in ULT-PEN had significantly more phonemes than those in the PEN-PEN (p = .017) and ULT-ULT (p = .04) conditions. Similarly, the non-cognates in ULT-PEN consisted of significantly more phonemes than those in ULT-ULT (p = .006) and PEN-PEN (p = .001).

Table S4. *Mean subjective frequency rating, semantic similarity rating, and phonological similarity rating of the items in the three stress conditions in Experiment 1 (Turkish lexical decision). Standard deviations appear in parentheses.*

		PEN-PEN	**ULT-PEN**	**ULT-ULT**
Subjective frequency	Cognates	3.62 (1.07)	4.2 (1.12)	3.92 (1.02)
	Non-cognates	4.11 (1.69)	4.39 (1.46)	4.82 (1.38)
Semantic similarity	Cognates	6.82 (0.39)	6.77 (0.77)	6.56 (0.83)
Phonological similarity	Cognates	5.92 (0.87)	5.86 (0.61)	6.11 (0.83)

Note: In the frequency rating, 1 = 'absolutely never' and 7 = 'very often'. In the semantic similarity and the phonological similarity ratings, 1 = 'no similarity at all' and 7 = 'perfect similarity'.

Table S5. *Results of the generalized linear mixed model analysis with binomial accuracy as the dependent variable (Experiment 1: Turkish lexical decision).*

Fixed effect	***β***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
Intercept	1.91	0.61	3.12	.002
Cognate-r	-0.61	0.27	-2.24	.025
Ultimate stress in Turkish	0.54	0.30	1.84	.067
Pronunciation in Turkish	0.45	0.15	3.03	.002
Cognate-r * Ultimate stress in Turkish	0.15	0.58	0.26	.797

Note: The model had Subject and Item as random effects. Cognate-r is a factor residual Cognate Status, which was created to take out the contributions of duration and subjective frequency from the cognates. The factor Ultimate stress in Turkish combines the conditions ULT-PEN and ULT-ULT, i.e., all items that had ultimate stress in Turkish.

The accuracy data were analyzed using generalized linear mixed-effects models in R (R Core Team, 2014). The model that best fit the data (as determined by comparing the AIC of different models and by the *anova* function in R) had Cognate-r (1 = 'cognate', 0 = 'non-cognate'), Ultimate stress in Turkish (1= 'yes', 0 = 'no'), and Pronunciation in Turkish as fixed effects, and Subject and Item as random effects. The results showed a significant effect of Cognate-r (β = -0.61, *SE* = 0.27, *t* = -2.24, *p* = .025), indicating that responses were more accurate to non-cognates than to cognates. Moreover, we observed a significant effect of Pronunciation in Turkish (β = 0.45, *SE* = 0.15, *t* = 3.03, *p* = .002); participants with a higher self-rated pronunciation in Turkish were more accurate. Finally, there was a marginal effect of Ultimate stress in Turkish (β = 0.54, *SE* = 0.30, *t* = 1.84, *p* = .067), with a higher accuracy for items

that had ultimate stress in Turkish. These findings are generally in line with the results of the RT analysis reported in the main text.

Table S6. *Effects in the three stress conditions, based on separate generalized linear mixed model analyses with binomial accuracy as the dependent variable (Experiment 1: Turkish lexical decision).*

	Fixed effect	***β***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
PEN-PEN	Intercept	-0.02	1.33	-0.02	.986
	Cognate-r	-0.74	0.95	-0.78	.436
	Pronunciation in Turkish	0.57	0.31	1.84	.066
ULT-PEN	Intercept	2.79	0.45	6.21	< .001
	Cognate-r	0.98	0.79	1.23	.218
ULT-ULT	Intercept	0.88	1.20	0.73	.465
	Cognate-r	-1.15	0.80	-1.45	.148
	Speaking in Turkish	0.54	0.29	1.87	.062

Note: The models had Subject and Item as random effects. Cognate-r is a factor residual Cognate Status, which was created to take out the contributions of duration and subjective frequency from the cognates.

We ran separate mixed-model analyses for each stress condition with binominal accuracy as the dependent variable in R. The initial model for each stress condition had Cognate-r as fixed effect and Subject and Item as random effects. Other factors (duration and proficiency measures) were then added one by one. By comparing different models based on AICs and with the *anova* function in R, we selected the best fitting model for each condition. Cognate-r had no significant effect in any of the conditions. There was a marginal effect of Pronunciation in Turkish (β = 0.57, SE = 0.31, t = 1.84, p = .066) in PEN-PEN and of Speaking in Turkish (β = 0.54,

SE = 0.29, *t* = 1.87, *p* = .062) in ULT-ULT, indicating that the participants with a higher self-rated proficiency in pronunciation or speaking in Turkish performed more accurately. These effects are in line with the RT analyses reported in the main text.

Table S7. *Results of the mixed-effects regression analysis with RTs as the dependent variable (Experiment 1: Turkish lexical decision).*

Fixed effect	***β***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
Intercept	1547.94	148.55	10.42	< .001
Cognate-r	1.64	11.67	0.14	.889
Ultimate stress in Turkish	-36.39	12.40	-2.94	.004
Subjective Frequency	-32.12	4.48	-7.16	< .001
Duration	0.43	0.06	6.75	< .001
Listening in Turkish	-114.33	32.15	-3.56	.002
Cognate-r * Ultimate stress in Turkish	-22.80	25.15	-0.91	.366

Note: The model had Subject and Item as random effects.

Table S8. *Effects in the three stress conditions, based on separate mixed-effects regression analyses with RTs as the dependent variable (Experiment 1: Turkish lexical decision).*

	Fixed effect	***β***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
PEN-PEN	Intercept	1053.73	26.07	40.43	< .001
	Cognate-r	46.64	25.27	1.85	.071
	Subjective Frequency	-21.25	8.39	-2.53	.015
	Duration	0.58	0.11	5.44	< .001
	Cognate-r * Subjective Frequency	46.11	20.77	2.22	.030
ULT-PEN	Intercept	1020.84	26.19	38.97	< .001
	Cognate-r	1.08	19.61	0.06	.956
	Subjective Frequency	-32.78	8.27	-3.96	< .001
	Duration	0.37	0.12	3.13	.003
	Cognate-r * Subjective Frequency	-20.56	14.60	-1.41	.164
ULT-ULT	Intercept	1008.65	25.79	39.11	< .001
	Cognate-r	-16.93	20.19	-0.84	.406
	Subjective Frequency	-35.69	7.56	-4.72	< .001
	Duration	0.37	0,11	3.36	.001

Note: The models had Subject and Item as random effects.

Table S9. *Mean self-reported language proficiency ratings (and standard deviations) (Experiment 2: Dutch lexical decision).*

	Turkish	**Dutch**
Speaking	4 (1.08)	4.60 (0.94)
Listening	4.40 (0.99)	4.70 (0.92)
Writing	3.75 (1.16)	4.40 (1)
Reading	3.90 (1.17)	4.70 (0.92)
Pronunciation	3.95 (1.19)	4.60 (0.94)
Mean	4	4.6

Note: A score of 1 refers to ‘not good at all’ and a score of 5 to ‘very good’.

Table S10. *Turkish and Dutch BNT scores (Experiment 2: Dutch lexical decision).*

	Turkish BNT	**Dutch BNT**
Mean score	67.35	107.42
SD	15.60	14.94

Note: The maximum score was 162.

Table S11. *Mean frequency, duration (in ms) and number of phonemes of the items in the three stress conditions in Experiment 2 (Dutch lexical decision). Standard deviations appear in parentheses.*

	Cognates			**Non-cognates**			**Pseudo words**		
	PEN-PEN	**ULT-PEN**	**ULT -ULT**	**PEN-PEN**	**ULT-PEN**	**ULT-ULT**	**PEN-PEN**	**ULT-PEN**	**ULT-ULT**
Frequency	2.14 (0.46)	2.15 (0.57)	2.11 (0.54)	2.17 (0.54)	2.18 (0.48)	2.14 (0.53)			
Duration	585 (78)	593 (81)	634 (72)	608 (95)	609 (85)	631 (58)	714 (89)	702 (92)	729 (64)
Number of phonemes	5.04 (0.96)	5.6 (0.93)	5.23 (0.63)	5.47 (0.78)	5.37 (0.85)	5.72 (0.92)	5.28 (0.83)	5.38 (0.64)	5.48 (0.70)

Note: Frequency is based on the Log10 frequency in SUBTLEX-NL (Keuleers, Brysbaert & New, 2010).

Regarding duration, independent t-tests revealed that the words (cognates and non-cognates) were significantly longer than the pseudo words ($p < .001$). Moreover, the cognates in ULT-ULT were significantly longer than those in PEN-PEN ($p = .017$) and ULT-PEN ($p = .044$). Regarding the number of phonemes, the cognates in ULT-ULT contained significantly fewer phonemes than the non-cognates in that stress condition ($p = .02$). In addition, the items in PEN-PEN contained significantly fewer phonemes than those in ULT-PEN ($p = .027$).

Table S12. *Mean subjective frequency rating, semantic similarity rating, and phonological similarity rating of the items in the three stress conditions in Experiment 2 (Dutch lexical decision). Standard deviations appear in parentheses.*

		PEN-PEN	**ULT-PEN**	**ULT-ULT**
Subjective frequency	Cognates	3.93 (1.13)	4.42 (1.24)	4.35 (1.13)
	Non-cognates	4 .29(1.51)	3.82 (1.44)	3.92 (1.45)
Semantic similarity	Cognates	6.76 (0.53)	6.72 (0.57)	6.34 (1.04)
Phonological similarity	Cognates	5.93 (0.80)	5.96 (0.60)	6.12 (0.91)

Note: In the frequency rating, 1 = 'absolutely never' and 7 = 'very often'. In the semantic similarity and the phonological similarity ratings, 1 = 'no similarity at all' and 7 = 'perfect similarity'

Table S13. *Results of the generalized linear mixed model analysis with binomial accuracy as the dependent variable (Experiment 2: Dutch lexical decision)*

Fixed effect	***β***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
Intercept	4.00	0.46	8.77	< .001
Cognate-r	-1.31	0.78	-1.67	.094
Stress condition ULT-PEN (intercept: PEN-PEN)	0.86	0.57	1.52	.128
Stress condition ULT-ULT (intercept: PEN-PEN)	0.09	0.55	0.16	.871
Cognate-r * Stress condition ULT-PEN (intercept: PEN-PEN)	1.97	1.14	1.72	.085
Cognate-r * Stress condition ULT-ULT (intercept: PEN-PEN)	2.67	1.13	2.36	.018

Note: The model had Subject and Item as random effects. Cognate-r is a factor residual Cognate Status, which was created to take out the contributions of duration and subjective frequency from the cognates.

The accuracy data were analyzed using generalized linear mixed-effects models in R (R Core Team, 2014). The model that best fit the data (as determined by comparing the AIC of different models and by the *anova* function in R) had Cognate-r (1 = 'cognate', 0 = 'non-cognate'), Stress condition ('PEN-PEN', 'ULT-PEN', and 'ULT-ULT') as fixed effects, and Subject and Item as random effects. The results showed a weak trend for Cognate-r (β = -1.31, *SE* = 0.78, *t* = -1.67, *p* = .094): Non-cognates received more accurate responses than non-cognates. There were no differences

between the three stress conditions. However, there were significant interactions between the Cognate-r and Stress condition. Both ULT-PEN (β = 1.97, *SE* = 1.14, *t* = 1.72, *p* = .085) and ULT-ULT (β = 2.67, *SE* = 1.13, *t* = 2.36, *p* = .018) differed in their cognate effects from PEN-PEN, although the effect was only marginal for ULT-PEN. ULT-PEN and ULT-ULT did not differ. As shown in Table 3 in the main text, cognates in ULT-PEN and ULT-ULT were responded to more accurately than those in PEN-PEN. These findings are in line with the results of the RT analysis reported in the main text.

Table S14. *Effects in the three stress conditions, based on separate generalized linear mixed model analyses with binomial accuracy as the dependent variable (Experiment 2: Dutch lexical decision)*

	Fixed effect	***β***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
PEN-PEN	Intercept	5.56	1.04	5.35	< .001
	Cognate-r	-1.21	0.74	-1.64	.102
	Speaking in Turkish	-0.40	0.22	-1.84	.065
ULT-PEN	Intercept	4.87	0.68	7.17	< .001
	Cognate-r	0.65	0.85	0.76	.445
ULT-ULT	Intercept	7.21	1.44	5.01	< .001
	Cognate-r	1.48	0.88	**1.68**	.094
	Listening in Turkish	-0.64	0.28	-2.28	.023

Note: The random factors in the model were Subject and Item. Cognate-r is a factor residual Cognate Status, which was created to take out the contributions of duration and subjective frequency from the cognates.

We ran separate mixed-model analyses with binominal accuracy as the dependent variable in R. The initial model for each stress condition had Cognate-r as fixed effect and Subject and Item as random effects. Other factors (duration and proficiency measures) were then added one by one. By comparing different models based on AICs and with the *anova* function in R, we selected the best fitting model for each condition. There was no significant effect for Cognate-r in any of the conditions. There was a marginally significant effect of Speaking in Turkish (β = -0.40, *SE* = 0.22, *t* = -1.84, *p* = .065) in PEN-PEN and a significant effect of Listening in

Turkish (β = -0.64, SE = 0.28, t = -2.28, p = .023) in ULT-ULT, indicating that the participants with a higher self-rated proficiency in speaking or listening in Turkish performed less accurately in the Dutch lexical decision task.

Table S15. *Results of the mixed-effects regression analysis with RTs as the dependent variable (Experiment 2: Dutch lexical decision).*

Fixed effect	***β***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
Intercept	1018.81	87.72	11.61	< .001
Cognate-r	33.26	18.30	1.82	.071
Stress condition ULT-PEN (intercept: PEN-PEN)	-22.87	12.71	-1.80	.074
Stress condition ULT-ULT (intercept: PEN-PEN)	-14.79	13.02	-1.14	.258
Subjective Frequency	-27	4.07	-6.63	< .001
Duration	0.65	0.07	9.63	< .001
BNT in Turkish	-1.54	1.26	-1.22	.238
Cognate-r * Stress condition ULT-PEN (intercept: PEN-PEN)	-63.59	25.59	-2.49	.014
Cognate-r * Stress condition ULT-ULT (intercept: PEN-PEN)	-65.93	25.74	-2.56	.011

Note: The model had Subject and Item as random effects.

Table S16. *Effects in the three stress conditions, based on separate mixed-effects regression analyses with RTs as the dependent variable (Experiment 2: Dutch lexical decision)*

	Fixed effect	**β**	***SE***	***t***	***p***
PEN-PEN	Intercept	914.93	19.66	46.55	< .001
	Cognate-r	27.87	16.53	1.69	.098
	Subjective Frequency	-24.11	6.43	-3.75	< .001
	Duration	0.72	0.1	7.27	< .001
	Cognate-r * Duration	-0.53	0.2	-2.66	.011
ULT-PEN	Intercept	891.39	21.73	41.02	< .001
	Cognate-r	-29.70	15.91	-1.87	.068
	Subjective Frequency	-27.69	6.06	-4.57	< .001
	Duration	0.64	0.1	6.52	< .001
ULT-ULT	Intercept	904.75	23.02	39.3	< .001
	Cognate-r	-28.91	20.81	-1.39	.171
	Subjective Frequency	-33.59	8.5	-3.95	< .001
	Duration	0.45	0.16	2.74	.008

Note: The random factors in the model were Subject and Item.

Table S17. *Stimulus materials for the cognates in Experiment 1 (Turkish lexical decision)*

PEN-PEN			**ULT-PEN**			**ULT-ULT**		
bingo	/ˈbiŋgo/	‘bingo’	albüm	/alˈbym/	‘album’	alarm	/aˈlaɾm/	‘alarm’
kokteyl	/ˈkʰoktʰejl/	‘cocktail’	asfalt	/asˈfaɬtʰ/	‘asphalt’	bale	/baˈle/	‘ballet’
kola	/ˈkʰoła/	‘coke’	atlas	/atˈłas/	‘atlas’	balon	/baˈłon/	‘balloon’
koma	/ˈkʰoma/	‘coma’	kampüs	/kʰamˈpʰys/	‘campus’	beton	/beˈtʰon/	‘concrete’
korpus*	/ˈkʰoɾpʰus/	‘corpus’	disko	/disˈko/	‘disco’	buket	/buˈk̟ʰetʰ/	‘bouquet’
dogma*	/ˈdogma/	‘dogma’	doktor	/dokʰˈtoɾ/	‘doctor’	butik	/buˈtʰikʰ/	‘boutique’
firma	/ˈfiɾma/	‘firm’	faktör	/fakʰˈtøɾ/	‘factor’	büfe	/byˈɸe/	‘buffet’
gala	/ˈgała/	‘gala’	jüri	/ʒyˈɾi/	‘jury’	şoför	/ʃoˈɸøɾ/	‘driver’
gangster	/ˈgaŋgstæɾ/	‘gangster’	kermes	/kæɾˈmes/	‘fair’	klişe	/kliˈʃe/	‘cliche’
kasa	/ˈkasa/	‘cash register’	krater	/kʰɾaˈtæɾ/	‘crater’	krosan	/kɾoˈsan/	‘croissant’

kozmos	/ˈkozmos/	‘cosmos’	mermer	/mærˈmæɾ/	‘marble’	dikte	/dic̬ˈtʰe/	‘dictate, dictation’
maske	/ˈmaske/	‘mask’	mentol	/menˈtol/	‘menthol’	gitar	/g̬iˈtʰaɾ/	‘guitar’
metro	/ˈmetʰɾo/	‘metro, subway’	mikser	/mikʰˈsæɾ/	‘mixer’	otel	/oˈtʰæl/	‘hotel’
naylon	/ˈnaj̬lon/	‘nylon’	motor	/moˈtoɾ/	‘engine, motor’	kanal	/kʰaˈnaɬ/	‘canal, channel’
poker	/ˈpokæɾ/	‘poker’	panter	/panˈtæɾ/	‘panther’	masör	/maˈsøɾ/	‘masseur’
prizma	/ˈpʰɾizma/	‘prism, prisma’	penguen	/peŋˈguæn/	‘penguin’	matros	/maˈtɾos/	‘sailor’
radar	/ˈɾadaɾ/	‘radar’	pizza	/piˈz:a/	‘pizza’	piyon	/pʰiˈjo̯n/	‘pawn’
rota	/ˈɾota/	‘route’	plastik	/pʰlasˈtic̬/	‘plastic’	profil	/proˈɸil/	‘profile’
soda	/ˈsoda/	‘soda, sparkling water’	puding	/puˈdiŋg/	‘pudding’	raket	/ɾaˈk̬ʰetʰ/	‘rocket’

spektrum	/ˈspekʰtɾum/	‘spectrum’	piton	/piˈton/	‘python’	rapor	/ɾaˈpʰoɾ/	‘report’
tango	/ˈtaŋgo/	‘tango’	robot	/ɾoˈbot/	‘robot’	rejim	/ɾeˈʒim/	‘regime, diet’
tempo	/ˈtempo/	‘pace’	standart	/stanˈdaɾt/	‘standard, norm’	rövanş	/ɾøˈʊanʃ/	‘revenge’
tenis	/ˈtenis/	‘tennis’	taksi	/takʰˈsi/	‘cab, taxi’	roman	/ɾoˈman/	‘novel’
veto	/ˈveto/	‘veto’	tonik	/toˈniḳ/	‘tonic (water)’	salon	/saˈɬon/	‘hall, living room, saloon’
villa	/ˈvilɬa/	‘villa’	traktör	/tʰɾakʰˈtøɾ/	‘tractor’	sufle	/suˈɸle/	‘souffle’
virüs	/ˈviɾys/	‘virus’	tisört	/tiˈsøɾt/	‘t-shirt’	stajyer	/stʰaˈʒjæɾ/	‘trainee, intern’
vize	/ˈvize/	‘visa’	tünel	/tyˈnæl/	‘tunnel’	tabu	/tʰaˈbu/	‘taboo’
viski	/ˈviski/	‘whiskey’	futbol	/ɸutʰˈboɬ/	‘soccer, football’	teknik	/tʰeḳˈnikʰ/	‘technique’
votka	/ˈβotʰka/	‘vodka’	yoga	/joˈga/	‘yoga’	tayfun	/tʰaˈjˈɸun/	‘typhoon’

zombi	/ˈzombi/	‘zombie’	zebra	/zeˈbɾa/	‘zebra’	volkan	/βoɬˈkʰan/	‘volcano’

Note: The items marked with an asterisk were excluded from the RT analysis.

Table S18. *Stimulus materials for the non-cognates in Experiment 1 (Turkish lexical decision)*

PEN-PEN			**ULT-PEN**			**ULT-ULT**		
abla	/ˈabɬa/	‘big sister’	adam	/aˈdam/	‘man’	ada	/aˈda/	‘island’
amca	/ˈamdʒa/	‘uncle’	barış	/baˈrɪʂ/	‘peace’	akşam	/akˈʃam/	‘evening’
anne	/ˈan:e/	‘mother’	bodrum	/boˈdrum/	‘basement’	ayna	/a̟jˈna/	‘mirror’
banyo	/ˈbanjo̟/	‘bath, bathroom’	bölge	/bølˈge̟/	‘region, area’	bayan	/ba̟ˈja̟n/	‘woman’
çanta	/ˈʧʰantʰa/	‘case, bag’	çamur	/ʧʰaˈmuɾ̥/	‘mud’	bina	/biˈna/	‘building’
çapa	/ˈʧʰapʰa/	‘anchor’	çivi	/ʧʰiˈvi/	‘nail’	çekiç	/ʧʰeˈk̟ʰitʃʰ/	‘hammer’
çete	/ˈʧʰetʰe/	‘gang’	damla	/damˈɬa/	‘drop, bead’	cephe	/dʒepˈhe/	‘front, side’
çıta	/ˈʧʰitʰa/	‘lath, stick’	dişler	/diʃˈlæɾ/	‘teeth’	dikkat	/dik̟ˈkʰatʰ/	‘care, attention’
filo	/ˈfilo/	‘fleet’	dünya	/dynˈja̟/	‘world’	dolgu	/doɬˈgu/	‘filling’

hala	/ˈhała/	‘paternal aunt’	duygu	/duȷˈgu/	‘feeling, emotion’	dükkân	/dyķˈcʰạːn/	‘shop’
kanca	/ˈkʰandʒa/	‘hook’	duyma	/duȷˈma/	‘hearing, audition’	hardal	/haɾˈdał/	‘mustard’
kışla	/ˈkʰɯʃła/	‘barracks, military post’	elma	/elˈma/	‘apple’	kalem	/kʰaˈlem/	‘pen’
kukla	/ˈkʰukła/	‘puppet’	fincan	/findˈʒan/	‘cup’	kaplan	/kʰapˈłan/	‘tiger’
olta	/ˈołtʰa/	‘fishing rod’	haydut	/hạjˈdutʰ/	‘bandit’	kaşık	/kʰaˈʃɯkʰ/	‘spoon’
palto	/ˈpʰałtʰo/	‘coat’	kasap	/kʰaˈsapʰ/	‘butcher’	kazan	/kʰaˈzan/	‘boiler, kettle, vessel’
pide	/ˈpʰide/	‘round and flat bread’	keder	/ķʰeˈdæɾ/	‘sorrow’	koza	/kʰoˈza/	‘cocoon’
ranza	/ˈɾanza/	‘bunk bed’	kıyma	/kʰɯjˈma/	‘minced meat’	kunduz	/kʰunˈduz/	‘beaver’
salya	/ˈsalja̱/	‘saliva’	kıymık*	/kʰɯjˈmɯkʰ/	‘splinter’	mutfak	/mutˈfakʰ/	‘kitchen’

sedye	/ˈsedje/	‘stretcher’	kova	/kʰoˈʊa/	‘bucket’	namaz	/naˈmaz/	‘prayer’
soba	/ˈsoba/	‘stove’	maymun	/maˌjˈmun/	‘monkey’	omuz	/oˈmuz/	‘shoulder’
sopa	/ˈsopʰa/	‘bat, stick’	midye	/midˈje/	‘mussel’	öykü	/øjˈkˌʰy/	‘tale, narrative’
tarla	/ˈtʰarɬa/	‘field’	mühlet	/myçˈletʰ/	‘notice, delay’	perde	/pʰærˈde/	‘curtain’
tenya	/ˈtʰenjaˌ/	‘tapeworm’	önem	/øˈnæm/	‘importance, significance’	sabır	/saˈbɯr/	‘patience’
teyze	/ˈtʰejze/	‘maternal aunt’	sabah	/saˈbah/	‘morning’	sargı	/sarˈgɯ/	‘dressing, bandage’
tuğla	/ˈtʰuːɬa/	‘brick’	tayın	/tʰaˌˈjɯn/	‘ration’	seçim	/setˈʃʰim/	‘election’
turna	/ˈtʰurna/	‘crane’	tüfek	/tʰyˈɸekʰ/	‘rifle’	sevgi	/sevˈgˌi/	‘love’
vida	/ˈvida/	‘screw’	yağmur	/jaˌː ˈmur/	‘rain’	şiddet	/ʃiˈdːetʰ/	‘violence’
yayla	/ˈjaˌjla/	‘highland’	yakut	/jaˌˈkʰutʰ/	‘ruby’	tavçan	/tʰavˈʃan/	‘rabbit’

yenge	/ˈjeŋ̟ge/	‘aunt-in-law’	zehir	/zeˈçɪr/	‘poison’	tehdit	/tʰehˈditʰ/	‘threat, danger’
zımba	/ˈzɯmba/	‘stapler’	zihin	/ziˈçin/	‘mind’	zeytin	/zejˈtʰin/	‘olive’

Note: The items marked with an asterisk were excluded from the RT analysis.

Table S19. *Stimulus materials for the cognates in Experiment 2 (Dutch lexical decision)*

PEN-PEN			**ULT-PEN**			**PEN-PEN**		
bingo	/ˈbɪŋgo/	‘bingo’	album	/ˈɑlbʏm/	‘album’	alarm	/aˈlɑrm/	‘alarm’
cocktail	/ˈkɔktel/	‘cocktail’	asfalt	/ˈɑsfɑlt/	‘asphalt’	ballet	/bɑˈlɛt/	‘ballet’
cola	/ˈkola/	‘coke’	atlas	/ˈɑtlɑs/	‘atlas’	ballon	/bɑˈlɔn/	‘balloon’
coma	/ˈkoma/	‘coma’	campus	/ˈkɑmpʏs/	‘campus’	beton	/bəˈtɔn/	‘concrete’
corpus*	/ˈkɔrpəs/	‘corpus’	disco	/ˈdɪsko/	‘disco’	boeket	/buˈkɛt/	‘bouquet’
dogma*	/ˈdɔxma/	‘dogma’	dokter	/ˈdɔktər/	‘doctor’	boetiek	/buˈtik/	‘boutique’
firma	/ˈfɪrma/	‘firm’	factor	/ˈfɑktɔr/	‘factor’	buffet	/byˈfɛt/	‘buffet’
gala	/ˈxala/	‘gala’	jury	/ˈʒyri/	‘jury’	chauffeur	/ʃoˈfør/	‘driver’
gangster	/ˈgɛŋstər/	‘gangster’	kermis	/ˈkɛrmɪs/	‘fair’	cliché	/kliˈʃe/	‘cliche’
kassa	/ˈkɑsa/	‘cash register’	krater	/ˈkratər/	‘crater’	croissant	/krwɑˈsɑ̃/	‘croissant’

kosmos	/ˈkɔsmɔs/	‘cosmos’	marmer	/'mɑrmər/	‘marble’	dictee	/dɪkˈte/	‘dictate, dictation’
masker	/'mɑskər/	‘mask’	menthol	/'mɛntɔl/	‘menthol’	gitaar	/xiˈtar/	‘guitar’
metro	/'metro/	‘metro, subway’	mixer	/'mɪksər/	‘mixer’	hotel	/hoˈtɛl/	‘hotel’
nylon	/ˈnɛilɔn/	‘nylon’	motor	/ˈmotər/	‘engine, motor’	kanaal	/kaˈnal/	‘canal, channel’
poker	/ˈpokər/	‘poker’	panter	/ˈpɑntər/	‘panther’	masseur	/mɑ'sør/	‘masseur’
prisma	/'prɪsma/	‘prism, prisma’	pinguïn	/ˈpɪŋgwɪn/	‘penguin’	matroos	/ma'tros/	‘sailor’
radar	/ˈradɑr/	‘radar’	pizza	/ˈpitsa/	‘pizza’	pion	/piˈjɔn/	‘pawn’
route	/ˈrutə/	‘route'	plastic	/ˈplɛstɪk/	‘plastic’	profiel	/proˈfil/	‘profile’
soda	/ˈsoda/	‘soda, sparkling water’	pudding	/ˈpʏdɪŋ/	‘pudding’	raket	/raˈkɛt/	‘rocket’

spectrum	/ˈspɛktrʏm/	‘spectrum’	python	/'pitɔn/	‘python’	rapport	/rɑˈpɔrt/	‘report’
tango	/ˈtɑŋgo/	‘tango’	robot	/ˈrobɔt/	‘robot’	regime	/rəˈʒim/	‘regime, diet’
tempo	/ˈtɛmpo/	‘pace’	standaard	/ˈstɑndart/	‘standard, norm’	revanche	/rə'vɑ̃ʃ/	‘revenge’
tennis	/ˈtɛnəs/	‘tennis’	taxi	/ˈtɑksi/	‘cab, taxi’	roman	/roˈmɑn/	‘novel’
veto	/'veto/	‘veto’	tonic	/ˈtɔnɪk/	‘tonic (water)’	salon	/saˈlɔn/	‘hall, living room, saloon’
villa	/'vila/	‘villa’	tractor	/ˈtrɑktər/	‘tractor’	soufflé	/su'fle/	‘souffle’
virus	/'virʏs/	‘virus’	t-shirt	/ˈtiʃərt/	‘t-shirt’	stagiair	/staˈʒɛːr/	‘trainee, intern’
visum	/'vizʏm/	‘visa’	tunnel	/ˈtʏnəl/	‘tunnel’	taboe	/taˈbu/	‘taboo’
whisky	/'wɪski/	‘whiskey’	voetbal	/'vudbɑl/	‘soccer, football’	techniek	/tɛxˈnik/	‘technique’
wodka	/'wɔtka/	‘vodka’	yoga	/ˈjoxa/	‘yoga’	tyfoon	/ti'fon/	‘typhoon’

zombie	/'zɔmbi/	‘zombie’	zebra	/ˈzebra/	‘zebra’	vulkaan	/vʏl'kan/	‘volcano’

Note: Items marked with an asterisk were excluded from the RT analysis.

Table S20. *Stimulus materials for the non-cognates in Experiment 2 (Dutch lexical decision)*

PEN-PEN			**ULT-PEN**			**ULT-ULT**		
anker	/ˈɑŋkər/	‘anchor’	akker	/ˈɑkər/	‘field’	abuis	/aˈbœys/	‘mistake, error’
bende	/ˈbɛndə/	‘gang’	appel	/ˈɑpəl/	‘apple’	banaan	/baˈnan/	‘banana’
bever	/ˈbevər/	‘beaver’	beving	/ˈbevɪŋ/	‘trembling’	beschuit	/bəˈsxœyt/	‘rusk’
blunder	/ˈblʏndər/	‘gaffe’	bloesem	/ˈblusəm/	‘blossom’	beslag	/bəˈslɑx/	‘batter, mounting’
dienaar	/ˈdinar/	‘servant’	bodem	/ˈbodəm/	‘bottom, floor, soil’	boerin	/burˈɪn/	‘farmer’s wife’
drukte	/ˈdrʏktə/	‘rush, bustle’	borrel	/ˈbɔrəl/	‘drink’	brancard	/brɑŋˈkar/	‘stretcher’
eenling	/ˈenlɪŋ/	‘individual’	dreiging	/ˈdrɛixɪŋ/	‘threat’	cadeau	/kaˈdo/	‘present, gift’
emmer	/ˈɛmər/	‘bucket’	droogte	/ˈdroxtə/	‘dryness’	excuus	/ɛksˈkys/	‘excuse’

gilde	/ˈxɪldə/	‘guild, corporation’	druppel	/ˈdrʏpəl/	‘drop’	fornuis	/fɔrˈnœys/	‘stove’
groente	/ˈxruntə/	‘vegetable’	eland	/ˈelɑnt/	‘moose’	gebak	/xəˈbɑk/	‘pastry, cake’
hinde	/ˈhɪndə/	‘hind, doe’	ezel	/ˈezəl/	‘donkey’	gehoor	/xəˈhor/	‘hearing’
jager	/ˈjaxər/	‘hunter’	gordel	/ˈxɔrdəl/	‘belt’	gelaat	/xəˈlat/	‘face’
kachel	/ˈkɑxəl/	‘stove’	hanger	/ˈhɑŋər/	‘(coat-)hanger’	gelid	/xəˈlɪt/	‘joint, rank’
keuring	/ˈkørɪŋ/	‘examination, inspection’	haven	/ˈhavən/	‘harbor, port’	gerucht	/xəˈrʏxt/	‘rumor’
kikker	/ˈkɪkər/	‘frog’	heimwee	/ˈhɛimwe/	‘homesickness’	gezeur	/xəˈzør/	‘bother, twaddle’
korting	/ˈkɔrtɪŋ/	‘reduction’	kapper	/ˈkɑpər/	‘hair dresser’	gordijn	/xɔrˈdɛin/	‘curtain’
leegte	/ˈlextə/	‘emptiness’	ketter	/ˈkɛtər/	‘heretic’	harpoen	/hɑrˈpun/	‘harpoon’
leerling	/ˈlerlɪŋ/	‘pupil, student’	knuppel	/ˈknʏpəl/	‘cudgel, stick’	kabaal	/kaˈbal/	‘racket, row’
liefde	/ˈlivdə/	‘love’	lepel	/ˈlepəl/	‘spoon’	kalkoen	/kɑlˈkun/	‘turkey’

mantel	/'mɑntəl/	‘coat’	monster	/ˈmɔnstər/	‘monster’	lantaarn	/lɑnˈtarn/	‘lantern’
modder	/ˈmɔdər/	‘mud’	nevel	/ˈnevəl/	‘haze’	patat	/paˈtɑt/	‘French fries’
oorsprong	/ˈorsprɔŋ/	‘origin’	oven	/ˈovən/	‘oven’	respijt*	/rɛˈspɛit/	‘notice, delay’
slager	/ˈslaxər/	‘butcher’	pauze	/ˈpɑuzə/	‘break’	scharnier	/sxɑrˈnir/	‘hinge’
slungel	/ˈslʏŋəl/	‘lout, gawk’	schakel	/ˈsxakəl/	‘link’	verbond	/vərˈbɔnt/	‘alliance’
speeksel	/ˈspeksəl/	‘saliva’	spetter	/'spɛtər/	‘splash’	verdrag	/vərˈdrɑx/	‘treaty, pact’
staking	/ˈstakɪŋ/	‘strike’	spijker	/ˈspɛikər/	‘nail’	verdriet	/vərˈdrit/	‘sorrow’
tante	/ˈtɑntə/	‘aunt’	splinter	/ˈsplɪntər/	‘splinter’	verlies	/vərˈlis/	‘loss’
vleugel	/'vløxəl/	‘wing’	vlakte	/'vlɑktə/	‘plain, level’	vermaak	/vərˈmak/	‘amusement, entertainment’
wimpel	/ˈwɪmpəl/	‘pennant, streamer’	vlinder	/'vlɪndər/	‘butterfly’	vervolg	/vər'vɔlx/	‘continuation’
wissel	/ˈwɪsəl/	‘switch’	zenuw	/ˈzenyw/	‘nerve’	voogdij	/vox'dɛi/	‘custody’

Note: Items marked with an asterisk were excluded from the RT analysis.