S2 Table. Statistical results comparing DDDs.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **EOG\_BS vs. ET\_BS** | | | | | | **EOG\_BS vs. EOG\_GCA** | | | | | |
|  | **quiet** | | | **mod. noise** | | | **quiet** | | | **mod. noise** | | |
|  | **Z** | **p** | **r** | **Z** | **p** | **r** | **Z** | **p** | **r** | **Z** | **p** | **r** |
| **SVO** | -1.708 | .091 | -.43 | -1.506 | .139 | -.38 | -2.586 | .008 | -.65 | -.052 | .980 | -.01 |
| **OVS** | -0.511 | .639 | -.13 | -0.795 | .454 | -.20 | -1.345 | .188 | -.34 | -1.138 | .269 | -.28 |
| **ambOVS** | -0.313 | .772 | -.07 | -1.165 | .257 | -.29 | -.545 | .604 | -.14 | -1.535 | .135 | -.38 |

Z-score, p-value, and effect size r for statistical analysis between DDDs for all three sentence structures in both listening conditions. DDDs recorded with EOG and analyzed with bootstrapping are compared to DDDs recorded with ET and DDDs recorded with EOG and modeled with GCA.