**Appendix A.** *Items used in Experiments 1 and 2.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | English | Spanish |
| body parts | arm | brazo |
| body parts | tongue | lengua |
| body parts | nose | nariz |
| body parts | eye | ojo |
| animals | cow | vaca |
| animals | horse | caballo |
| animals | dog | perro |
| animals | bird | pájaro |
| furniture | table | mesa |
| furniture | mirror | espejo |
| furniture | bed | cama |
| furniture | door | puerta |
| clothing | shoes | zapatos |
| clothing | skirt | falda |
| clothing | dress | vestido |
| clothing | shirt | camisa |
| kitchenware | glass | vaso |
| kitchenware | spoon | cuchara |
| kitchenware | fork | tenedor |
| kitchenware | napkin | servilleta |
| foods | cheese | queso |
| foods | strawberry | fresa |
| foods | meat | carne |
| foods | watermelon | sandía |
| school items | pencil | lápiz |
| school items | backpack | mochila |
| school items | ruler | regla |
| school items | book | libro |
| tools | hammer | martillo |
| tools | saw | sierra |
| tools | shovel | pala |
| tools | scissors | tijeras |

Appendix B.

**Experiment 1.** Bilinguals named pictures 136 ms slower in mixed-language response conditions compared to single-language response conditions, *F1*(1,35) = 173.48, *MSE* = 996,638, *p* < .001, *F2*(1,20) = 606.32, *MSE* = 285,607, *p* < .001. Bilinguals responded fastest with control and translation distractors and slowest with semantic distractors, a main effect of distractor type, *F1*(3,126) = 138.17, *MSE* =173.962, *p* < .001, *F2*(3,81) = 52.74, *MSE* = 456,709, *p* < .001. Bilinguals named pictures equally quickly in their two languages, a nonsignificant effect of language dominance(*F*s < 1). Distractor type effects were generally bigger in the non-dominant than in the dominant language, an interaction between dominance and distractor type, *F1*(3,134) = 8.85, *p* < .001, *MSE* = 78,351, *F2*(3,89) = 4.55, *MSE* = 147,408, *p* = .005. Additionally, the non-dominant language typically elicited slower responses in the single-language response block, but in the mixed-language response blocks bilinguals exhibited reversed language dominance effects (i.e., they named pictures more quickly in the language that is usually non-dominant),an interaction between dominance and block type, *F1*(1,43) = 13.45, *MSE* =157,629, *p* < .001, *F2*(1,28) = 8.68, *MSE* = 226,498, *p* = .006. Distractor type effects were generally bigger in the single-language response blocks, an interaction between distractor type and block type *F1*(3,131) = 12.60, *MSE* = 67,638, *p* < .001, *F2*(3,86) = 2.78, *MSE* = 318,561, *p* =.046. Finally, distractor type effects were bigger in the non-dominant language in the single-language response blocks, but bigger in the dominant language and the mixed-language response blocks, a 3-way interaction between language dominance, block type, and distractor type that was a significant by subjects but not by items (but see below), *F1*(3,138) = 4.02, *MSE* = 82.783, *p* = .008, *F2*(3,93) = 1.89, *MSE* = 163,050, *p* = .14.

**Experiment 2.** When considering all distractor types in a model, bilinguals named pictures 136 ms slower in mixed-language response conditions compared to single-language response conditions, *F1*(1,36) = 123.51, *MSE* = 1,191,655, *p* < .001, *F2*(1,20) = 545.66, *MSE* = 272,749, *p* < .001. Responses were fastest with control and translation conditions and slowest with semantic distractors, a main effect of distractor type, *F1*(3,129) = 230.65, *MSE* = 99,224 *p* < .001, *F2*(3,81) = 47.54, *MSE* = 479,383, *p* < .001. Bilinguals named pictures equally quickly in their two languages, a nonsignificant effect of language dominance(*F*s < 1). Additionally, the non-dominant language typically elicited slower responses in the single-language response block, but in the mixed-language response blocks bilinguals exhibited reversed language dominance effects (i.e., they named pictures more quickly in the language that is usually non-dominant),an interaction between dominance and block type in the by-subject analysis, *F1*(3,137) = 3.94, *MSE* = 101,744, *p* = .010, *F2*(3,89) = 2.45, *MSE* = 171,196, *p* = .070. Unlike in Experiment 1, neither the language mixing by dominance, nor the three-way interaction were significant (*p*s > .49).