*Table 1: Characteristics of the Stimuli and Audio raters*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Stimuli raters  (N – 20) | | Audio raters  (N – 10) | |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Age (years) | 23.41 | 2.60 | 22.10 | 2.92 |
| Age of acquisition of L1 (years) | 1.89 | 0.63 | 1.58 | 0.54 |
| Age of acquisition of L2 (years) | 5.67 | 2.51 | 5.01 | 1.33 |
| Current use of L1 | 6.62 | 1.37 | 6.26 | 1.18 |
| Current use of L2 | 6.81 | 0.88 | 6.88 | 0.67 |
| Self-rated proficiency in L1 | 7.80 | 1.35 | 8.00 | 1.24 |
| Self-rated proficiency in L2 | 8.43 | 0.75 | 8.53 | 0.83 |

*Table 2. Means and standard deviation (in parentheses) of raters and participants*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Stimuli raters  (N – 20) | Audio raters  (N – 10) | Experiment 1  (N – 44) | Experiment 2  (N – 40) |
| Telugu | 7.89 (1.35) | 8 (1.24) | 7.93 (1.40) | 8.04 (2.03) |
| English | 8.43 (0.83) | 8.5 (0.86) | 8.60 (0.96) | 8.52 (0.82) |

*Table 3: Characteristics of the High and Low-L2 proficient speakers (speech sample)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | High-L2 proficient speakers  (N – 2) | | Low-L2 proficient speakers  (N – 2) | | |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | |
| Age (years) | 19.50 | 2.12 | 20.50 | 2.12 | |
| Age of acquisition of L1 (years) | 1.75 | 0.35 | 1.75 | 0.35 | |
| Age of acquisition of L2 (years) | 5.50 | 0.70 | 9.5 | 0.70 | |
| Current use of L1 | 6.70 | 1.55 | 7.80 | 0.28 | |
| Current use of L2 | 7.10 | 0.14 | 3.83 | 0.70 | |
| Self-rated proficiency in L1 | 7.93 | 1.40 | 8.04 | 2.03 | |
| Self-rated proficiency in L2 | 8.5 | 0.70 4.71 0.33 | | |
| Lextale test score (L2) | 86 | 2.8 | 58 | 2.13 | |
| Semantic fluency score (L1) | 12.52 | 1.88 | 12.70 | 1.96 | |
| Semantic fluency score (L2) | 14.10 | 1.43 | 10.13 | 1.41 | |

**Comparisons between Experiment 1 and Control experiment 1**

To further reveal interlocutor effect the percentage of language choices in Telugu (L1) of Experiment 1 and control (no cartoon) were compared using one way ANOVA with cartoon conditions (high-L2 proficient, low-L2 proficient, neutral, no cartoon) as independent variable and percentage of choices in Telugu (L1) as dependent variable. The analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between the percentage of choices across conditions *F*(3,172) = 24.96, *p* < 0.001. Pairwise comparison from post-hoc Tukey HSD Test indicate that the percentage of choices in Telugu (L1) were significantly higher in the presence of low-L2 proficient cartoon (*M* = 58.52 %, *SE* = 3.30 %) when compared to neutral (*M* = 43.69 %, *SE* = 2.13 %, *p* < 0.001), high-L2 proficient cartoon (*M* = 28.06 %, *SE* = 2.98 %, *p* < 0.001) and no cartoon condition (control) (*M* = 34.61 %, *SE* = 1.87 %, *p* < 0.001). Similarly, one way ANOVA on switchrate of Telugu (L1) indicated the effect of language proficiency of the cartoon on Telugu (L1) language switches *F*(3,172) = 20.96, *p* < 0.001. Switches to Telugu were significantly higher in low-l2 proficient condition (*M* = 33.70%, *SE* = 1.99%) when compared to high-l2 (*M* = 16.51%, *SE* = 2.00%, *p* < 0.001), neutral (*M* = 25.04%, *SE* = 1.61%, *p* < 0.001) and no cartoon (M = 18.71 %, SD = 5.38%, *p* < 0.001). Analysis on naming latencies in Telugu, revealed that there was no significant difference between the latencies across the conditions by-subjects *F1*(3,172) = 0.33, *p* = 0.81, *n2*= 0.42.

**Comparisons between Experiment 2 and Control experiment 2**

The percentage of language choices in Telugu (L1) of Experiment 2 (high-L2 proficient, low-L2 proficient, neutral) and Control experiment 2 (no cartoon) were compared using one way ANOVA. The analysis revealed a significant difference between the percentage of choices across conditions *F*(3,156) = 45.06, *p* < 0.001. Similar to Experiment 1, pairwise comparison from post-hoc Tukey HSD Test show that the percentage of choices in Telugu (L1) were significantly higher in the presence of low-L2 proficient cartoon (*M* = 54.93 %, *SE* = 3.30 %) when compared to neutral (*M* = 31.93 %, *SE* = 2.13 %, *p* < 0.001), high-L2 proficient cartoon (*M* = 23.62 %, *SE* = 2.98 %, *p* < 0.001) and also no cartoon condition (control) (*M* = 38.93 %, *SE* = 1.87 %, *p* < 0.001). Similarly, one way ANOVA on switchrates of Telugu (L1) indicated the cartoons effects across conditions *F*(3,172) = 33.51, *p* < 0.001. Switches to Telugu (L1) were significantly higher in low-L2 proficient condition (*M* = 37.70 %, *SE* = 3.11 %) when comapred to high-L2 (*M* = 10.72 %, *SE* = 1.41 %, *p* < 0.001), neutral (*M* = 17 %, *SE* = 1.68 %, *p* = 0.008) and no cartoon (*M* = 18.89 %, *SD* = 4.27 %, *p* = 0.009). Analysis on naming latencies in Telugu (L1) showed that there was no significant difference between the latencies across conditions by-subject *F1*(3,156) = 1.11, *p* = 0.34, *n2*= 0.53.