**Level 2 model with four profiles**

As previously explained, although we decided to explore the five-profile model for exploration based on the BIC and AIC fit indices, the Lo–Mendell–Rubin likelihood ratio test (LMR) indicated that models with more than four profiles no longer provided significant improvements in model fit. For comparison, we therefore report and briefly discuss the four-profile model below.

Table S1. *Estimates of mean proportions of activities per class for Level 2 four-profile solution.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***P1*** | ***P2*** | ***P3*** | ***P4*** |
|  | ***EN work & conversations, L1 leisure*** | ***Challenging LML work***  | ***L1/EN leisure, challenging EN work*** | ***Challenging LML/L1 activities*** |
| *npart* Study 1 [% row total] | 33 [83%] | 1 [3%] |  6 [15%] | 0 [%] |
| *npart* Study 2 [% row total] | 23 [56%] | 15 [37%] | 1 [2%] | 2 [5%] |
| *Npart* Total [% row total] | 56 [69%] | 16 [20%] | 7 [9%] | 2 [2%] |
| **MEANS** [95%CIs] |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion of Class 1 activities**Easy LML work & study** | **16.15**[10.28, 22.02] | **12.53**[5.53, 19.53] | **0.59**[-0.02, 1.20] | **6.23**[0.83, 11.63] |
|  Proportion of Class 2 activities **Challenging LML work & study** | **9.42**[5.67, 13.17] | **60.24**[48.77, 71.70] | **7.66**[1.75, 13.57] | **10.20**[9.41, 10.98] |
| Proportion of Class 3 activities **Challenging EN work & study** | **14.58**[9.83, 19.24] | **1.25**[-0.52, 3.02] | **18.60**[11.56, 25.64] | **0** |
| Proportion of Class 4 activities **Easy EN study & conversation** | **26.54**[19.90, 33.18] | **2.07**[-0.38, 4.51] | **9.47**[4.86, 14.07] | **0** |
| Proportion of Class 5 activities **L1 leisure & conversation** | **25.33**[20.13, 30.52] | **8.72**[1.30, 16.14] | **8.96**[3.33, 14.58] | **1.09**[-0.18, 2.35] |
| Proportion of Class 6 activities **L1/EN leisure & conversation** | **4.72**[3.07, 6.37] | **2.49**[1.07, 3.92] | **54.08**[46.39, 61.76] | **0** |
| Proportion of Class 7 activities **Very Challenging LML/L1 activities** | **2.05**[1.15, 2.95] | **12.71**[6.68, 18.73] | **0.65**[0.01, 1.30] | **82.49**[75.04, 81.93] |

The four-profile solution closely corresponds to the five-profile solution described in the main manuscript: The profiles P3 and P4 in this solution are equivalent to P3 and P5 respectively in the five-profile solution, with the same estimated means and number of participants. Similarly, P2 in this solution resembles P4 in the five-profile model, except that the current model assigns five fewer participants to this group, which also results in slight changes in the estimated mean values.

Thus, it appears that P1 in the four-profile solution, which was assigned 69% of the participants, was split into two groups, P1 and P2, in the five-profile model. In the four-profile model, the activities of the participants assigned to P1 therefore appear to be relatively evenly distributed across the classes C1–C4. When this group is split in the five-factor model, the main distinguishing factor between those two profiles was the relative frequency of using the LML vs. the English language in work and stud contexts (i.e., relative proportion of C1/C2 vs. C3/C4 activities). The slightly higher proportion of English-language activities (C3/C4) in the four profile P1 mirrors the finding that more participants are assigned to the larger, English-dominant group of language users (P2) in the five-profile solution.