

**Table 6**  
**Correlation Matrix of Dependent Variables Within English**

	% Valid	% Lex 1	% Lex 1-3	# Types	H Stat.	Sames	RT Total
% valid response	-						
% Lex 1 dominant	+.31‡	-					
% Lex 1-3 conceptual	+.42‡	+.72‡	-				
Number of types	-.47‡	-.74‡	-.65‡	-			
H statistics	-.41‡	-.95‡	-.75‡	+.88‡	-		
Items with same name	n.s.	-.13‡	n.s.	n.s.	+.11†	-	
RT total, mean	-.67‡	-.58‡	-.65‡	+.75‡	+.70‡	n.s.	-
RT target, mean	-.64‡	-.55‡	-.64‡	+.68‡	+.66‡	n.s.	+.98‡

† $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 7**  
**Correlation Matrix of Dependent Variables Within German**

	% Valid	% Lex 1	% Lex 1-3	# Types	H Stat.	Sames	RT Total
% valid response	-						
% Lex 1 dominant	+.34‡	-					
% Lex 1-3 conceptual	+.39‡	+.77‡	-				
Number of types	-.32‡	-.80‡	-.70‡	-			
H statistics	-.30‡	-.95‡	-.75‡	+.92‡	-		
Items with same name	n.s.	-.12‡	n.s.	n.s.	+.08*	-	
RT total, mean	-.65‡	-.63‡	-.61‡	+.70‡	+.67‡	n.s.	-
RT target, mean	-.68‡	-.58‡	-.58‡	+.61‡	+.59‡	n.s.	+.97‡

\* $p < .1$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 8**  
**Correlation Matrix of Dependent Variables Within Spanish**

	% Valid	% Lex 1	% Lex 1-3	# Types	H Stat.	Sames	RT Total
% valid response	-						
% Lex 1 dominant	+.51‡	-					
% Lex 1-3 conceptual	+.57‡	+.77‡	-				
Number of types	-.59‡	-.82‡	-.72‡	-			
H statistics	-.49‡	-.95‡	-.75‡	+.91‡	-		
Items with same name	n.s.	-.08*	n.s.	+.11‡	+.08*	-	
RT total, mean	-.74‡	-.70‡	-.68‡	+.80‡	+.77‡	n.s.	-
RT target, mean	-.70‡	-.67‡	-.63‡	+.76‡	+.73‡	+.08*	+.97‡

\* $p < .1$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 9**  
**Correlation Matrix of Dependent Variables Within Italian**

	% Valid	% Lex 1	% Lex 1-3	# Types	H Stat.	Sames	RT Total
% valid response	-						
% Lex 1 dominant	+.52‡	-					
% Lex 1-3 conceptual	+.58‡	+.74‡	-				
Number of types	-.48‡	-.78‡	-.67‡	-			
H statistics	-.44‡	-.95‡	-.71‡	+.89‡	-		
Items with same name	n.s.	-.11†	n.s.	+.09†	+.08*	-	
RT total, mean	-.74‡	-.69‡	-.71‡	+.73‡	+.71‡	n.s.	-
RT target, mean	-.72‡	-.63‡	-.68‡	+.65‡	+.63‡	n.s.	+.96‡

\* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 10**  
**Correlation Matrix of Dependent Variables Within Bulgarian**

	% Valid	% Lex 1	% Lex 1-3	# Types	H Stat.	Sames	RT Total
% valid response	–						
% Lex 1 dominant	+.48‡	–					
% Lex 1-3 conceptual	+.57‡	+.81‡	–				
Number of types	–.50‡	–.78‡	–.72‡	–			
H statistics	–.43‡	–.93‡	–.76‡	+.89‡	–		
Items with same name	n.s.	–.11†	n.s.	n.s.	+.09†	–	
RT total, mean	–.69‡	–.68‡	–.68‡	+.76‡	+.73‡	n.s.	–
RT target, mean	–.63‡	–.64‡	–.64‡	+.71‡	+.68‡	n.s.	+.96‡

† $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 11**  
**Correlation Matrix of Dependent Variables Within Hungarian**

	% Valid	% Lex 1	% Lex 1-3	# Types	H Stat.	Sames	RT Total
% valid response	–						
% Lex 1 dominant	+.48‡	–					
% Lex 1-3 conceptual	+.58‡	+.69‡	–				
Number of types	–.52‡	–.77‡	–.75‡	–			
H statistics	–.42‡	–.94‡	–.71‡	+.88‡	–		
Items with same name	–.08*	–.09†	n.s.	n.s.	+.07*	–	
RT total, mean	–.70‡	–.68‡	–.74‡	+.79‡	+.73‡	n.s.	–
RT target, mean	–.68‡	–.63‡	–.70‡	+.70‡	+.66‡	n.s.	+.95‡

\* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 12**  
**Correlation Matrix of Dependent Variables Within Chinese**

	% Valid	% Lex 1	% Lex 1-3	# Types	H Stat.	Sames	RT Total
% valid response	–						
% Lex 1 dominant	+.52‡	–					
% Lex 1-3 conceptual	+.57‡	+.81‡	–				
Number of types	–.52‡	–.81‡	–.70‡	–			
H statistics	–.42‡	–.94‡	–.76‡	+.91‡	–		
Items with same name	–.28‡	–.22‡	–.23‡	+.26‡	+.24‡	–	
RT total, mean	–.76‡	–.69‡	–.70‡	+.76‡	+.71‡	+.39‡	–
RT target, mean	–.74‡	–.63‡	–.65‡	+.69‡	+.64‡	+.39‡	+.96‡

‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 15**  
**Correlations of Lexical Code 1 and Lexical Codes 1-3 Across Languages**

	US	GE	SP	IT	BU	HU	CH
English	–	+.42‡	+.56‡	+.51‡	+.43‡	+.49‡	+.48‡
German	+.35‡	–	+.37‡	+.51‡	+.57‡	+.61‡	+.35‡
Spanish	+.46‡	+.33‡	–	+.59‡	+.47‡	+.49‡	+.48‡
Italian	+.39‡	+.41‡	+.50‡	–	+.51‡	+.57‡	+.44‡
Bulgarian	+.34‡	+.47‡	+.37‡	+.48‡	–	+.62‡	+.41‡
Hungarian	+.40‡	+.46‡	+.33‡	+.46‡	+.47‡	–	+.41‡
Chinese	+.39‡	+.30‡	+.35‡	+.31‡	+.37‡	+.33‡	–

Note—%Lex 1-3 correlations, upper triangle; %Lex 1 correlations, lower triangle. ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 16**  
**Correlations of Number of Types and H Statistics Across Languages**

	US	GE	SP	IT	BU	HU	CH
English	–	+.44‡	+.53‡	+.44‡	+.44‡	+.50‡	+.47‡
German	+.45‡	–	+.41‡	+.50‡	+.50‡	+.54‡	+.36‡
Spanish	+.53‡	+.43‡	–	+.56‡	+.44‡	+.42‡	+.41‡
Italian	+.44‡	+.54‡	+.53‡	–	+.53‡	+.53‡	+.36‡
Bulgarian	+.43‡	+.52‡	+.47‡	+.53‡	–	+.55‡	+.41‡
Hungarian	+.46‡	+.55‡	+.46‡	+.54‡	+.60‡	–	+.41‡
Chinese	+.48‡	+.36‡	+.48‡	+.36‡	+.38‡	+.43‡	–

Note—H statistics correlations, upper triangle; number of types correlations, lower triangle. ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 17**  
**Correlations of Items With Same Name (0,1) Across Languages**

	US	GE	SP	IT	BU	HU	CH
English	–						
German	+.27‡	–					
Spanish	+.20‡	+.21‡	–				
Italian	+.19‡	+.28‡	+.16‡	–			
Bulgarian	+.20‡	+.30‡	+.19‡	+.41‡	–		
Hungarian	+.13‡	+.24‡	+.16‡	+.17‡	+.39‡	–	
Chinese	+.19‡	+.22‡	+.14‡	+.11‡	+.29‡	+.26‡	–

† $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 18**  
**Correlations of Total and Target Naming Latencies Across Languages**

	US	GE	SP	IT	BU	HU	CH
English	–	+.69‡	+.77‡	+.72‡	+.66‡	+.70‡	+.73‡
German	+.67‡	–	+.68‡	+.77‡	+.80‡	+.83‡	+.69‡
Spanish	+.76‡	+.63‡	–	+.78‡	+.71‡	+.70‡	+.72‡
Italian	+.71‡	+.75‡	+.74‡	–	+.74‡	+.80‡	+.71‡
Bulgarian	+.65‡	+.75‡	+.68‡	+.69‡	–	+.82‡	+.69‡
Hungarian	+.65‡	+.77‡	+.64‡	+.74‡	+.75‡	–	+.69‡
Chinese	+.70‡	+.68‡	+.70‡	+.72‡	+.67‡	+.63‡	–

Note—RT total correlations, upper triangle; RT target correlations, lower triangle. ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 21**  
**Correlations Among Independent Variables Within English**

	Syll	Syll Type	Char	Complex	Fric	Frequency	Goodness
Length in syllables	–						
Syllable type frequency	–.93‡	–					
Length in characters	+.82‡	–.75‡	–				
Word complexity	+.37‡	–.32‡	+.59‡	–			
Initial frication	n.s.	n.s.	+.06*	n.s.	–		
Word frequency	–.46‡	+.39‡	–.53‡	–.48‡	n.s.	–	
Goodness of depiction	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	–
Visual complexity	+.12‡	–.11‡	+.11‡	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	+.08‡

\* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 22**  
**Correlations Among Independent Variables Within German**

	Syll	Syll Type	Char	Complex	Fric	Frequency
Length in syllables	–					
Syllable type frequency	–.34‡	–				
Length in characters	+.76‡	–.36‡	–			
Word complexity	+.44‡	–.12‡	+.59‡	–		
Initial frication	–.10†	n.s.	+.15‡	+.08*	–	
Word frequency	–.48‡	n.s.	–.46‡	–.34‡	n.s.	–
Goodness of depiction	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	+.07*	n.s.
Visual complexity	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

\* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 23**  
**Correlations Among Independent Variables Within Spanish**

	Syll	Syll Type	Char	Complex	Fric	Frequency
Length in syllables	–					
Syllable type frequency	–.76‡	–				
Length in characters	+.90‡	–.71‡	–			
Word complexity	+.37‡	–.32‡	+.44‡	–		
Initial frication	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	–	
Word frequency	–.26‡	+.19‡	–.27‡	n.s.	n.s.	–
Goodness of depiction	n.s.	–.10‡	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	+.06*
Visual complexity	+.09	–.08†	n.s.	+.09†	n.s.	n.s.

\* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 24**  
**Correlations Among Independent Variables Within Italian**

	Syll	Syll Type	Char	Complex	Fric	Frequency
Length in syllables	–					
Syllable type frequency	–.75‡	–				
Length in characters	+.91‡	–.68‡	–			
Word complexity	+.49‡	–.45‡	+.51‡	–		
Initial frication	–.11‡	+.06‡	n.s.	n.s.	–	
Word frequency	–.28‡	+.22‡	–.30‡	–.24‡	n.s.	–
Goodness of depiction	n.s.	n.s.	+.07*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Visual complexity	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	+.12‡	n.s.	n.s.

\* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 25**  
**Correlations Among Independent Variables Within Bulgarian**

	Syll	Syll Type	Char	Complex	Fric	Frequency
Length in syllables	–					
Syllable type frequency	–.45‡	–				
Length in characters	+.87‡	–.47‡	–			
Word complexity	+.42‡	–.24‡	+.42‡	–		
Initial frication	n.s.	–.06*	+.11†	+.06*	–	
Word frequency	–.08*	n.s.	–.07*	n.s.	+.10†	–
Goodness of depiction	+.06*	–.11‡	+.07*	+.06*	n.s.	n.s.
Visual complexity	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	–.08†	n.s.

\* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 26**  
**Correlations Among Independent Variables Within Hungarian**

	Syll	Syll Type	Char	Complex	Fric	Frequency
Length in syllables	–					
Syllable type frequency	–.40‡	–				
Length in characters	+.87‡	–.36‡	–			
Word complexity	+.56‡	–.39‡	+.58‡	–		
Initial frication	n.s.	n.s.	+.07*	+.07*	–	
Word frequency	–.40‡	n.s.	–.40‡	–.29‡	n.s.	–
Goodness of depiction	n.s.	–.07*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Visual complexity	n.s.	+.06*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

\* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 27**  
**Correlations Among Independent Variables Within Chinese**

	Syll	Syll Type	Fric	Frequency
Length in syllables	–			
Syllable type frequency	–.20‡	–		
Initial frication	n.s.	n.s.	–	
Word frequency	–.41‡	n.s.	+.09†	–
Goodness of depiction	n.s.	–.07*	n.s.	+.06*
Visual complexity	+.11‡	–.09†	+.12‡	+.10†

\* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 31**  
**Correlations of Independent With Dependent Variables in English**

	% Lex 1	# Types	Sames	RT Target	Naming Disparity	RT Disparity
Length in syllables	–.09†	+.10†	–.13‡	+.16‡	n.s.	n.s.
Syllable type frequency	n.s.	–.08*	+.12‡	–.13‡	n.s.	n.s.
Length in characters	–.16‡	+.15‡	–.09†	+.20‡	–.11†	+.11‡
Word complexity	–.19‡	+.15‡	–.10†	+.12‡	–.11†	n.s.
Initial frication	+.08*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Word frequency	+.21‡	–.19‡	+.14‡	–.34‡	n.s.	n.s.
Goodness of depiction	+.39‡	–.48‡	n.s.	–.57‡	+.15‡	–.16‡
Visual complexity	n.s.	n.s.	–.06*	n.s.	n.s.	–.09†

Note—Positive naming disparity and negative RT disparity = greater advantage in English. \* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 32**  
**Correlations of Independent With Dependent Variables in German**

	% Lex 1	# Types	Sames	RT Target	Naming Disparity	RT Disparity
Length in syllables	n.s.	n.s.	-.17‡	+.16‡	n.s.	n.s.
Syllable type frequency	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Length in characters	-.08*	+.08*	-.12‡	+.17‡	n.s.	n.s.
Word complexity	n.s.	n.s.	-.13‡	+.09‡	+.09‡	n.s.
Initial frication	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	+.12‡
Word frequency	+.20‡	-.18‡	+.14‡	-.32‡	n.s.	n.s.
Goodness of depiction	+.27‡	-.37‡	n.s.	-.49‡	n.s.	n.s.
Visual complexity	n.s.	n.s.	-.09‡	n.s.	-.08*	+.08*

Note—Positive naming disparity and negative RT disparity = greater advantage in German. \* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 33**  
**Correlations of Independent With Dependent Variables in Spanish**

	% Lex 1	# Types	Sames	RT Target	Naming Disparity	RT Disparity
Length in syllables	-.13‡	+.12‡	-.12‡	+.13‡	-.12‡	n.s.
Syllable type frequency	+.12‡	-.11‡	+.12‡	-.13‡	+.14‡	-.11‡
Length in characters	-.13‡	+.14‡	-.12‡	+.13‡	-.13‡	+.08*
Word complexity	-.19‡	+.19‡	-.07*	+.14‡	-.15‡	+.14‡
Initial frication	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Word frequency	+.14‡	-.17‡	+.16‡	-.24‡	n.s.	n.s.
Goodness of depiction	+.25‡	-.34‡	n.s.	-.45‡	n.s.	n.s.
Visual complexity	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Note—Positive naming disparity and negative RT disparity = greater advantage in Spanish. \* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 34**  
**Correlations of Independent With Dependent Variables in Italian**

	% Lex 1	# Types	Sames	RT Target	Naming Disparity	RT Disparity
Length in syllables	-.18‡	+.13‡	n.s.	+.14‡	-.18‡	+.18‡
Syllable type frequency	+.14‡	-.09‡	n.s.	-.16‡	+.14‡	-.10‡
Length in characters	-.18‡	+.13‡	n.s.	+.14‡	-.20‡	+.21‡
Word complexity	-.21‡	+.15‡	n.s.	+.14‡	-.19‡	+.15‡
Initial frication	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Word frequency	+.22‡	-.19‡	+.10‡	-.33‡	+.15‡	-.19‡
Goodness of depiction	+.22‡	-.29‡	n.s.	-.44‡	-.11‡	+.10‡
Visual complexity	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Note—Positive naming disparity and negative RT disparity = greater advantage in Italian. † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 35**  
**Correlations of Independent With Dependent Variables in Bulgarian**

	% Lex 1	# Types	Sames	RT Target	Naming Disparity	RT Disparity
Length in syllables	n.s.	n.s.	-.16‡	n.s.	n.s.	+.09‡
Syllable type frequency	n.s.	n.s.	+.08*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Length in characters	-.07*	n.s.	-.13‡	+.10‡	-.09‡	+.10‡
Word complexity	n.s.	n.s.	-.12‡	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Initial frication	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	+.15‡
Word frequency	+.10‡	n.s.	+.21‡	-.27‡	n.s.	n.s.
Goodness of depiction	+.27‡	-.37‡	+.09‡	-.49‡	n.s.	n.s.
Visual complexity	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	+.08*

Note—Positive naming disparity and negative RT disparity = greater advantage in Bulgarian. \* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 36**  
**Correlations of Independent With Dependent Variables in Hungarian**

	% Lex 1	# Types	Sames	RT Target	Naming Disparity	RT Disparity
Length in syllables	-.15‡	n.s.	-.15‡	+.18‡	-.09†	+.07*
Syllable type frequency	+.15‡	-.10‡	n.s.	-.10†	+.13‡	n.s.
Length in characters	-.16‡	n.s.	-.12‡	+.21‡	-.09†	+.10†
Word complexity	-.18‡	n.s.	-.09†	+.15‡	-.13‡	n.s.
Initial frication	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Word frequency	+.13‡	-.10†	+.25‡	-.27‡	n.s.	n.s.
Goodness of depiction	+.26‡	-.37‡	+.08*	-.46‡	n.s.	n.s.
Visual complexity	+.08*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Note—Positive naming disparity and negative RT disparity = greater advantage in Hungarian. \* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .

**Table 37**  
**Correlations of Independent With Dependent Variables in Chinese**

	% Lex 1	# Types	Sames	RT Target	Naming Disparity	RT Disparity
Length in syllables	n.s.	n.s.	-.18‡	+.17‡	n.s.	n.s.
Syllable type frequency	+.06*	n.s.	n.s.	-.13‡	n.s.	-.15‡
Initial frication	+.11†	-.09*	-.10†	n.s.	+.08*	n.s.
Word frequency	+.26‡	-.28‡	n.s.	-.39‡	+.11†	-.13‡
Goodness of depiction	+.35‡	-.39‡	n.s.	-.52‡	+.08*	n.s.
Visual complexity	+.09*	n.s.	-.17‡	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Note—Positive naming disparity and negative RT disparity = greater advantage in Chinese. \* $p < .1$ . † $p < .05$ . ‡ $p < .01$ .