Supplemental Material S1.

Table S1

Inter-item and item-total correlations

	Item0	*Item1*	*Item2*	*Item3*	*Item4*	*Item5*	*Item6*	*Item7*	*Item8*	*Item9*	*Item10*	*Item11*	*Item12*	*Total*	*If dropped*
Item0	1.00	.06	.17	.42	.12	.39	.14	.25	.20	.26	.11	.25	.36	.56	.43
Item1	.06	1.00	.41	.03	.03	.30	.54	.31	.12	.21	.37	.16	.19	.49	.41
Item2	.17	.41	1.00	.24	.09	.18	.35	.44	.41	.41	.32	.05	.31	.59	.5
Item3	.42	.03	.24	1.00	.29	.37	.27	.30	.03	.20	.24	.11	.27	.57	.44
Item4	.12	.03	.09	.29	1.00	.32	.08	.14	.37	.15	.28	.27	.25	.47	.36
Item5	.39	.30	.18	.37	.32	1.00	.38	.38	.17	.36	.33	.01	.48	.69	.58
Item6	.14	.54	.35	.27	.08	.38	1.00	.23	.25	.26	.10	.12	.17	.54	.42
Item7	.25	.31	.44	.30	.14	.38	.23	1.00	.16	.68	.30	.09	.41	.67	.58
Item8	.20	.12	.41	.03	.37	.17	.25	.16	1.00	.35	.09	.16	-.06	.40	.32
Item9	.26	.21	.41	.20	.15	.36	.26	.68	.35	1.00	.32	-.03	.32	.64	.53
Item10	.11	.37	.32	.24	.28	.33	.10	.30	.09	.32	1.00	.10	.29	.55	.43
Item11	.25	.16	.05	.11	.27	.01	.12	.09	.16	-.03	.10	1.00	-.05	.30	.17
Item12	.36	.19	.31	.27	.25	.48	.17	.41	-.06	.32	.29	-.05	1.00	.60	.47
Total	.56	.49	.59	.57	.47	.69	.54	.67	.40	.64	.55	.30	.60	1.00	—

Note. The inter-item correlations display the correlations of the particular items. Total: correlation of the item with the total score of all items; If dropped: correlation of the item with the total score of all other items if that item is dropped from the total score.

We used the alpha() function from the *psych* package in R to calculate item statistics and Cronbach's alpha. Table S1 displays the inter-item as well as item-total correlations on the basis of the data of all 54 participants of the study. We consider item-total correlations (when the item under investigation has been dropped from the total score) > 0.3 as unproblematic. The table shows that all items except for one (Item 11) meet the requirements. One anonymous reviewer raised the concern that Item 5 and Item 12 display a local syntactic ambiguity and as such may be problematic. In order to address this concern, we computed alpha scores of each item (displayed in Table S2). This analysis shows that when these two items are dropped, this provokes a decrease of internal consistency of the test. Therefore, we opted for not excluding the two items.

Table S2

Alpha scores associated with the remaining test items once a specific item is dropped.

	Alpha
Item0	0.79
Item1	0.79
Item2	0.78
Item3	0.79
Item4	0.79
Item5	0.77
Item6	0.79
Item7	0.78
Item8	0.8
Item9	0.78
Item10	0.79
Item11	0.81
Item12	0.78

Cronbach's alpha of all items is 0.8. Therefore, we conclude, on the basis of the study data, that the test has acceptable internal consistency. Further reliability measures of the test can be found in Siegmüller et al. (2011).

Reference

Siegmüller, J., Kauschke, C., van Minnen, S., & Bittner, D. (2011). *n. Test zum Satzverstehen von Kindern. Eine profilorientierte Diagnostik der Syntax* [lit. Test of children's sentence comprehension. A profile-based assessment of syntax]. Elsevier.