**Appendix A**

Fig. 1. How CS Fluency data was computed in Audacity.



**Appendix B**

Table 1. *Subset of sentences for Elicited Imitation in both languages.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No. | English | Chinese |
| 1 | Billy dropped the penny, when he saw the cat. [RB F Pron] | 当 他 看见 小 猫 的 时候, *when he see little cat PRT time* 哥哥 把 硬币 掉 了*elder brother VERB penny drop PRT*(When he saw the cat, elder brother dropped the penny.) [LB B Pron] |
| 2 | When he colored the books, Alex drank the milk.[LB B Pron] |  当 他 给 书 涂 颜色 的 时候, *When he give book paint color PRT time* 哥哥 喝 了 牛奶.*elder brother drink PRT milk.*(When older brother was coloring the book, he drank milk.) [LB B Pron] |
| 3 | Daddy, when singing the song, washed the baby.[LB F Null] | 爸爸, 当 唱 歌 的 时候, 洗洗 娃娃.*Dad, when sing song PRT time wash baby.*(When dad was singing the song, he washed the baby.) [LB F Null] |

*\*Key: PRT: particle, CLF: classifier, RB: Right-branching, LB: Left-branching, F: forward, B: backward, Pron: pronoun.*

**Appendix C**

***CS Performance across bilingual groups***

 We conducted one-way ANOVAs with the CS components – Discourse-level CS, Inter- and Intra-CS Fluency, Inter- and Intra-CS Insertion Frequency – as dependent variables, and Bilingual group (balanced high, balanced low, unbalanced) as the between-subjects factor. None of the results were significant, all all *p*’s > .10. All bilingual groups performed equivalently across all components of CS. Although we did not find significant differences, for discourse-level CS (i.e., percentage of trials with congruent-language responses), both groups of balanced bilinguals had higher proportion of congruent-language responses (Balanced high: *M* = 93.42% (*SD* = 10.52), Balanced low: *M* = 94.17% (*SD* = 10.52)) compared to the unbalanced bilinguals (*M* = 92.19%, *SD* = 9.30). As Fig. 1 summarizes, for Inter-CS Fluency, unbalanced bilinguals were fastest to respond, followed by balanced high and balanced low bilinguals. For Intra-CS Fluency, balanced low and balanced high bilinguals were slightly faster than the unbalanced bilinguals.

Fig. 1. Inter- and Intra-CS Fluency (RT) across 3 bilingual groups (bars represent 95% confidence intervals for each mean).

For Inter-CS Insertion Frequency (see Fig 2), unbalanced bilinguals had greater number of other-language insertions compared to the two balanced bilingual groups. For Intra-CS Insertion Frequency, balanced low bilinguals had the greatest number of other-language insertions, followed by balanced high and unbalanced bilinguals.

Fig. 2. Inter- and Intra-CS Insertion Frequency across 3 bilingual groups (bars represent 95% confidence intervals for each mean).