

Supplementary File 1: Data set for Figure 1. Summary of child L1 studies

This appendix includes data sources for Figure 1 in the main text, ordered alphabetically by language and chronologically by study. In the following table, each row represents a single experiment/task unless the study reports only combined results.

For studies that investigated different factors affecting subject/object asymmetry (e.g. animacy, matrix position, pronominality), we collapsed the results to indicate only the overall difference between subject and object relative clauses. We also interpreted the results maximally: if a subject/object preference was shown in even one of multiple measures (e.g. accuracy and reading times for self-paced reading) or one condition, we indicated the preference in the “Results” column. We indicate conflicting results from different conditions or measurements with “not clear.” Most of the results presented in the table are supported by the statistical tests used in the original study; for studies that did not report statistical results, we show the reported numerical preference, marked with *. When the original study claims marginal significance, ~ is used for notation.

Some studies reported subject/object preference in terms of pronoun retention; resumptive pronouns are more acceptable in lower positions in the accessibility hierarchy. These studies are marked with †.

The “Age” column reports age ranges, or, if age range information is not available, mean age.

Many studies included adult controls, but only the results from children are reported below. If the study also focused on adults, the relevant results are included in Supplementary File 2.

Abbreviations: C: comprehension, O > S: object preference, P: production, S > O: subject preference, S = O: no preference (no significant difference)

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Age	Method	Results	Domain
Arabic-Palestinian	postnominal	SVO	Botwinik et al. 2015	3;0–9;0	elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
Cantonese	prenominal	SVO	Lau 2016	4;05–7;08	character selection	S > O	C
					elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
			Chan et al. 2018	4;3–4;9	eye-tracking	not clear	C
Catalan	postnominal	SVO	Morrill & Gavarró 2010	3;5,9–6;2,30	character selection	S > O	C
			Gavarró et al. 2011	5;0,11–5;11,24	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P
			Gavarró et al. 2012	5;0,11–5;11,24	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Age	Method	Results	Domain
Danish	postnominal	SVO	de López et al. 2014	4;0–8;2	picture selection	S > O	C
				4;0–8;2	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P
English	postnominal	SVO	Brown 1971	3;0–5;9	picture selection	S > O	C
			Hatch 1971	not specified (kindergarten, 2nd grade)	picture selection	O > S	C
			Cook 1973	2;11–4;9	elicited imitation	S > O	P
			Sheldon 1974	3.8–5.5	act out	S = O	C
			Ferreiro et al. 1976	4–11	act out	not clear	C
			de Villiers et al. 1979	3–6	act out	S > O	C
			Tavakolian 1981	3–5	act out	*S > O	C
			Mann et al. 1984	8.95	act out	S > O	C
			Roth 1984	3;6–4;6	act out	S > O	C
			Romaine 1985	6–10	production	S > O	P
			Keenan & Hawkins 1987	10–11	sentence recall + digit memory	S > O	P
			Smith et al. 1989	97.05 months	act out	*S > O	C
					picture selection	*S > O	C
			Bar-Shalom et al. 1993	90.0 months	act out	S > O	C
					elicited production (preference)	*S > O	P
			McDaniel et al. 1998	3;5–11;11	elicited production (act out)	S > O	P
			McKee et al. 1998	2;2–3;10	elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
			Booth et al. 2000	8–11	self-paced reading	S > O	C
					self-paced listening	S > O	C
			Diessel & Tomasello 2000	1;9–5;2	spoken corpus	S > O	P
			McKee & McDaniel 2001†	3;5–8;11	grammaticality judgment	S > O	C
			Diessel 2004	1;8–5;1	spoken corpus	S > O	P
					child-directed speech	O > S	P
			Diessel & Tomasello 2005	4;3–4;9	elicited imitation	S > O	P

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Age	Method	Results	Domain
English (cont'd)	postnominal	SVO	Kidd et al. 2007	3;1–4;9	elicited imitation	S > O	P
			Brandt et al. 2009	2;7–3;4	character selection	S = O	C
			Zukowski 2009	4;6–7;6	Test for reception of grammar (TROG)	S > O	C
					elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
			Adani et al. 2014	6;0–8;11	picture selection	S > O	C
			MacDonald et al. 2020	4;5–6;4	picture selection (visual world paradigm)	S > O	C
				4;5–6;9	picture selection (visual world paradigm)	S > O	C
Finnish	postnominal	SVO	Kirjavainen & Lieven 2011	1;7–3;6	spoken corpus	S = O	P
					spoken corpus (child-directed speech)	S = O	P
			Kirjavainen et al. 2017	3;7–4;1	character selection	S = O	C
					elicited imitation	S = O	P
French	postnominal	SVO	Ferreiro et al. 1976	4–11	act out	* S > O	C
				5–7	narrative	* S > O	P
			Jisa & Kern 1998	5;0–11;8	narrative	S > O	P
			Guasti & Cardinaletti 2003	4;5–7;3	elicited production (act out)	S > O	P
			Durrleman et al. 2016	4.56–7.41	picture selection	S > O	C
			Guasti et al. 2018	5;5–7;4	character selection	S > O	C
			Bentea & Durrleman 2019	5;0–7;9	character selection	S > O	C
German	postnominal	V2	Diessel & Tomasello 2005	4;3–4;9	elicited imitation	S > O	P
			Kidd et al. 2007	3;3–4;8	elicited imitation	S = O	P
			Brandt et al. 2008	2;0–5;0	spoken corpus	S > O	P
			Arosio et al. 2012	84–95 months	picture selection	S > O	C
			Adani et al. 2016	4;0–9;8	elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
			Adani et al. 2017	0;1–4;3	corpus	O > S	P
				3;1–5;11	color naming	S > O	C

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Age	Method	Results	Domain
Greek	postnominal	SVO	Guasti et al. 2008	4;5–5;6	character selection	S > O	C
				4;5–5;6	character selection	S > O	C
			Guasti, Stavrakaki & Arosio 2012	4.5–6.5	character selection	S > O	C
				4.5–6.5	character selection	S > O	C
			Varlokosta et al. 2015	4;0–6;4	picture selection	S > O	C
Greek-Cypriot	postnominal	SVO	Theodorou & Grohmann 2012	5;0–8;11	character selection	S > O	C
					elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
Hebrew	postnominal	SVO	Friedmann & Novogrodsky 2004	4;0–6;5	picture selection	S > O	C
			Arnon 2005	4;5–5;2	character selection	S > O	C
					elicited production (act out)	S = O	P
			Friedmann et al. 2009	3;7–5;0	picture selection	S > O	C
			Arnon 2010	3;6–5;3	picture selection	S > O	C
					elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
			Arnon 2011	2;2–6;3	spoken corpus	O > S	P
				4;6	character selection	S > O	C
			Belletti et al. 2012	3;9–5;5	picture selection	S > O	C
			Friedmann et al. 2015	7;4–17;0	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P
Hungarian	postnominal	SVO	Kas & Lukács 2012	4;11–11;4	act out	S > O	C
Indonesian (Jakarta)	postnominal	SVO	Tjung 2006	1;06–5;09	spoken corpus	S > O	P
				3;8–6;0	elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
Indonesian	postnominal	SVO	Nasanius et al. 2016	2;0–5;0	spontaneous data	S > O	P
Irish	postnominal	VSO	Goodluck et al. 2001	4;9–8;5	elicited production (picture)	S = O	P
			Goodluck et al. 2006	4–8	elicited production (picture)	S = O	P

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Age	Method	Results	Domain
Italian	postnominal	SVO	Guasti & Cardinaletti 2003	5;1–10;0	elicited production (act out)	S > O	P
			Utzeri 2007	6–11	elicited production (preference, picture description)	S > O	P
			Guasti et al. 2008	4;5–5;9	character selection	S > O	C
			Arosio et al. 2009	5–11	picture selection	S > O	C
			Volpato & Adani 2009	3;6–7;8	character selection	S > O	C
			Belletti & Contemori 2010	3;4–6;5	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P
			Contemori & Garraffa 2010	4;6–5;5	picture selection	S > O	C
				3;7–5;5	elicited production (picture, preference)	S > O	P
			Adani 2011	3;4–7;9	character selection	S > O	C
			Arosio et al. 2011	9;3.3	self-paced listening	S > O	C
			Belletti et al. 2012	3;9–5;3	picture selection	S > O	C
				3;9–5;3	picture selection	S > O	C
			Guasti, Branchini et al. 2012	5;0–9;9	elicited production (preference)	S > O	C
			Guasti, Stavrakaki et al. 2012	4;5–5;6	character selection	S > O	C
			Volpato & Vernice 2014	4;11–10;3	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P
			Hu & Guasti 2017	6;0–9;9	character selection (two characters)	S > O	C
			Volpato 2020	5;0–10;8	character selection	S > O	C
Japanese	prenominal	SOV	Hakuta 1981	5;3–6;2	act out	O > S	C
			Ozeki & Shirai (2007)	0;0–3;11	spoken corpus	S = O	P
					spoken corpus (child-directed speech)	S = O	P
			Suzuki 2011	5;1–6;8	picture selection	O ~> S	C
Korean	prenominal	SOV	Clancy et al. 1986	6;3–7;3	act out	*S > O	C
			Kim 1987	1;6–3;5	spoken corpus	S > O	P
			Lee 1991	1;4–3;9	spoken corpus	S > O	P
			Cho 1999	3–6	picture selection	S > O	C
				4–7	elicited production (picture)	S > O	P

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Age	Method	Results	Domain
Malay	postnominal	SVO	Chong 2018	3;9–8;6	picture selection	S > O	C
				3;9–8;6	elicited production (picture)	S = O	P
Mandarin	prenominal	SVO	Lee 1992	4–8	act out	S > O	C
				4–5	act out	S = O	C
			Cao et al. 2005	4;1–6;1	act out	O > S	C
				5;7	act out	O > S	C
			Hsu et al. 2009	4;8	elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
			Chen & Shirai 2015	3;0–8;11	spoken corpus	O > S	P
					child-directed speech	O > S	P
			Hu et al. 2016	3;0–8;11	character selection	S > O	C
			He et al. 2017	3;6–6;6	picture selection	O > S	C
			Hu & Guasti 2017	6;1–9;11	character selection	S > O	C
			Tsoi et al. 2019	4;3–5;10	character selection	S > O	C
			Yang et al. 2020	not specified	child-directed speech	not clear	P
				4;3–4;9	character selection + eye-tracking	not clear	C
Persian	postnominal	SVO	Rahmany et al. 2011	2;6–7;5	picture selection	S > O	C
			Rahmany et al. 2014	3;2–6;0	character selection (act out)	S = O	C
				4;9–5;2	spoken corpus	S > O	P
					child-directed speech	S = O	P
Polish	postnominal	SVO	Pecters-Podgaevskaja et al. 2020	3;6–6;6	elicited imitation	S > O	P
Portuguese-Brazilian	postnominal	SVO	Corrêa 1995	2.6–6.5	act out	S > O	C
Portuguese-European	postnominal	SVO	Costa et al. 2011	3;9–6;2	picture selection	S > O	C
				3;9–6;2	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P
			Costa et al. 2012	4;0–5;11	picture selection	S > O	C
			Lobo & Vaz 2017	1;6–3;10	spoken corpus	S > O	P
				4;0–6;7	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Age	Method	Results	Domain
Portuguese-European (cont'd)	postnominal	SVO	Martins et al. 2018	3–11	act out	S > O	C
				3–11	reference judgment	S > O	C
Quechua-Conchucos	prenominal	SOV	Courtney 2006	2;8–4;10	elicited production (act out)	S = O	P
			Courtney 2011	2;8–4;0	elicited production (act out)	S = O	P
Quechua-Cusco	prenominal	SOV	Courtney 2011	5–7	elicited production (act out)	* S > O	P
Romanian	postnominal	SVO	Bențea 2012a	4;0–6;10	character selection	S > O	C
			Bențea 2012b	4;6–6;3	character selection (act out)	S > O	C
			Sevcenco & Avram 2012	2;11–7;5	picture selection	S > O	C
Russian	postnominal	SVO	Polinsky 2011	6;6	picture selection	S = O	C
			Rakhlin et al. 2016	7;08–15;25	picture selection	S > O	C
			Peeters-Podgaevskaja et al. 2020	3;6–6;6	elicited imitation	S > O	P
Serbo-Croatian	postnominal	SVO	Goodluck & Stojanović 1996	4–6	act out	* S = O	C
				4–6	elicited production (picture)	* S > O	P
Spanish	postnominal	SVO	Ferreiro et al. 1976	4–10	act out	not clear	C
					narrative	* S > O	P
					elicited production (act out)	* S > O	P
					elicited production (act out)	* S > O	P
			Ezeizabarrena 2012	4;10–7;2	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P
Tagalog	postnominal	VSO/VO S	Tanaka et al. 2019	4;8–5;9	character selection	S > O	C
Tamil	prenominal	SOV	Lakshmanan 2000	2;11–6;6	elicited production (picture)	* S > O	P
Tok Pisin	postnominal	SVO	Romaine 1992	5–17	spoken corpus	S > O	P
Turkish	prenominal	SOV	Slobin 1986	2;4–4;8	spoken corpus	S > O	P
			Özcan 1997	3–7	picture selection	not clear	C
			Özge et al. 2009	5–8	character selection	S > O	C
			Özge et al. 2010	5–8	elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
			Özge et al. 2015	5–8	self-paced listening	S = O	C

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Age	Method	Results	Domain
Turkish (cont'd)	prenominal	SOV	Altınkamış & Altan 2016	00;09–03;06	spoken corpus	S > O	P
					spoken corpus (child-directed speech)	O > S	P
			Uzundag & Küntay 2019	8–36 months	spoken corpus	S = O	P
				43–64 months	spoken corpus	S = O	P
Wenzhounese	prenominal	SVO	Hu et al. 2018	3;0–6;10	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P

References

- Adani, Flavia. 2011. Rethinking the acquisition of relative clauses in Italian: Towards a grammatically based account. *Journal of Child Language* 38(1). 141–165. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000909990250>
- Adani, Flavia, Matteo Forgiarini, Maria Teresa Guasti & Heather K. J. Van Der Lely. 2014. Number dissimilarities facilitate the comprehension of relative clauses in children with (Grammatical) Specific Language Impairment. *Journal of Child Language* 41(4). 811–841. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000913000184>
- Adani, Flavia, Maja Stegenwallner-Schütz, Yair Haendler & Andrea Zukowski. 2016. Elicited production of relative clauses in German: Evidence from typically developing children and children with specific language impairment. *First Language* 36(3). 203–227. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723716648842>
- Adani, Flavia, Maja Stegenwallner-Schütz & Talea Niesel. 2017. The peaceful co-existence of input frequency and structural intervention effects on the comprehension of complex sentences in German-speaking children. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8. 1590. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01590>
- Altınkamış, Feyza & Asli Altan. 2016. A usage-based approach into the acquisition of relative clauses in Turkish. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi* 27(1). 69–91. <http://hdl.handle.net/1854/LU-8099252>
- Arnon, Inbal. 2005. Relative clause acquisition in Hebrew: Towards a processing-oriented account. In Alejna Brugos, Manuella R. Clark-Cotton & Seungwan Ha (eds.), *Proceedings of the 29th Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 37–48. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Arnon, Inbal. 2010. Rethinking child difficulty: The effect of NP type on children's processing of relative clauses in Hebrew. *Journal of Child Language* 37(1). 27–57. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S030500090900943X>
- Arnon, Inbal. 2011. Relative clause acquisition in Hebrew and the learning of constructions. In Evan Kidd (ed.), *Acquisition of relative clauses: Processing, typology and function*, 81–106. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Arosio, Fabrizio, Flavia Adani & Maria Teresa Guasti. 2009. Grammatical features in the comprehension of Italian relative clauses by children. In José Brucart, Anna Gavarró & Jaume Solá (eds.), *Merging features: Computation, interpretation, and acquisition*, 138–156. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Arosio, Fabrizio, Maria Teresa Guasti & Natale Stucchi. 2011. Disambiguating information and memory resources in children's processing of Italian relative clauses. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 40(2). 137–154. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-010-9160-0>

- Arosio, Fabrizio, Kazuko Yatsushiro, Matteo Forgiarini & Maria Teresa Guasti. 2012. Morphological information and memory resources in children's processing of relative clauses in German. *Language Learning and Development* 8(4). 340–364. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2011.634691>
- Bar-Shalom, Eva G., Stephen Crain & Donald Shankweiler. 1993. A comparison of comprehension and production abilities of good and poor readers. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 14(2). 197–227. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400009553>
- Belletti, Adriana & Carla Contemori. 2010. Intervention and attraction: On the production of subject and object relatives by Italian (young) children and adults. In João Costa, Ana Castro, Maria Lobo & Fernanda Pratas (eds.), *Language acquisition and development: Proceedings of GALA 2009*, 39–52. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.
- Belletti, Adriana, Naama Friedmann, Dominique Brunato & Luigi Rizzi. 2012. Does gender make a difference? Comparing the effect of gender on children's comprehension of relative clauses in Hebrew and Italian. *Lingua* 122(10). 1053–1069. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2012.02.007>
- Bentea, Anamaria. 2012a. Does “case” matter in the acquisition of relative clauses in Romanian? In Alia Biller, Esther Chung & Amelia Kimball (eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th Boston University Conference on Language Development (BUCLD) Online Proceedings Supplement*. <http://www.bu.edu/buclD/files/2012/07/Bentea-36.pdf>
- Bentea, Anamaria. 2012b. Subject vs. object relatives: What can Romanian children tell us about their acquisition? *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 57(2). 203–218. <https://www.lingv.ro/RRL%20202012%20art06Bentea.pdf>
- Bentea, Anamaria & Stephanie Durrleman. 2019. Topichood and the comprehension of relative clauses in French. In Megan M. Brown & Brady Dailey (eds.), *Proceedings of the 43rd Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 57–68. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Press. <http://www.lingref.com/buclD/43/BUCLD43-05.pdf>
- Booth, James R., Brian MacWhinney & Yasuaki Harasaki. 2000. Developmental differences in visual and auditory processing of complex sentences. *Child Development* 71(4). 981–1003. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00203>
- Botwinik, Irena, Reem Bshara & Sharon Armon-Lotem. 2015. Children's production of relative clauses in Palestinian Arabic: Unique errors and their movement account. *Lingua* 156. 40–56. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2014.10.007>
- Brandt, Silke, Holger Diessel & Michael Tomasello. 2008. The acquisition of German relative clauses: A case study. *Journal of Child Language* 35(2). 325–348. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000907008379>
- Brandt, Silke, Evan Kidd, Elena Lieven & Michael Tomasello. 2009. The discourse bases of relativization: An investigation of young German and English-speaking children's comprehension of relative clauses. *Cognitive Linguistics* 20(3). 539–570. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/COGL.2009.024>
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1971. Children's comprehension of relativized English sentences. *Child Development* 42(6). 1923–1936. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1127595>
- Cao, Shane Xuexin, Helen Goodluck & Xiangyuan Shan. 2005. Double-gapped relative clauses in Chinese: Grammar and processing. In Yukio Otsu (ed.), *Proceedings of the Sixth Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*, 53–68. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

- Chan, Angel, Wenchun Yang, Franklin Chang & Evan Kidd. 2018. Four-year-old Cantonese-speaking children's online processing of relative clauses: A permutation analysis. *Journal of Child Language* 45(1). 174–203. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000917000198>
- Chen, Jidong & Yasuhiro Shirai. 2015. The acquisition of relative clauses in spontaneous child speech in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Child Language* 42(2). 394–422. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000914000051>
- Cho, Sookeun. 1999. *The acquisition of relative clauses: Experimental studies on Korean*. Honolulu, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Chong, Peter. 2018. Production and comprehension of Malay relative clauses by L1 children. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 49(6). 1–10. <http://ling.hawaii.edu/wp-content/uploads/wp-Chong.pdf>
- Clancy, Patricia M., Hyeonjin Lee & Myeong-Han Zoh. 1986. Processing strategies in the acquisition of relative clauses: Universal principles and language-specific realizations. *Cognition* 24(3). 225–262. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277\(86\)80003-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(86)80003-8)
- Contemori, Carla & Maria Garraffa. 2010. Comparison of modalities in SLI syntax: A study on the comprehension and production of non-canonical sentences. *Lingua* 120(8). 1940–1955. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2010.02.011>
- Cook, Vivian J. 1973. The comparison of language development in native children and foreign adults. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 11(1). 13–28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1973.11.1-4.13>
- Corrêa, Leticia M. Sicuro. 1995. An alternative assessment of children's comprehension of relative clauses. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 24(3). 183–203. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02145355>
- Costa, João, Maria Lobo & Carolina Silva. 2011. Subject-object asymmetries in the acquisition of Portuguese relative clauses: Adults vs. children. *Lingua* 121(6). 1083–1100. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2011.02.001>
- Costa, João, Nino Grillo & Maria Lobo. 2012. Minimality beyond lexical restrictions: Processing and acquisition of free wh-dependencies in European Portuguese. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 57(2). 143–160. <https://www.lingv.ro/RRL%202%202012%20art03Costa.pdf>
- Courtney, Ellen H. 2006. Adult and child production of Quechua relative clauses. *First Language* 26(3). 317–338. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723706062677>
- Courtney, Ellen H. 2011. Learning to produce Quechua relative clauses. In Evan Kidd (ed.), *The acquisition of relative clauses: Processing, typology and function* (Trends in Language Acquisition Research 8), 141–172. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- de López, Kristine Jensen, Lone Sundahl Olsen & Vasiliki Chondrogianni. 2014. Annoying Danish relatives: Comprehension and production of relative clauses by Danish children with and without SLI. *Journal of Child Language* 41(1). 51–83. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000912000517>
- de Villiers, Jill G., Helen B. Tager Flusberg, Kenji Hakuta & Michael Cohen. 1979. Children's comprehension of relative clauses. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 8(5). 499–518. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01067332>
- Diessel, Holger. 2004. Relative clauses. In Holger Diessel (ed.), *The acquisition of complex sentences* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics), 116–148. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diessel, Holger & Michael Tomasello. 2000. The development of relative clauses in spontaneous child speech. *Cognitive Linguistics* 11(1–2). 131–151. DOI: <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1515/cogl.2001.006>

- Diessel, Holger & Michael Tomasello. 2005. A new look at the acquisition of relative clauses. *Language* 81(4). 882–906. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2005.0169>
- Durrleman, Stephanie, Theodoros Marinis & Julie Franck. 2016. Syntactic complexity in the comprehension of wh-questions and relative clauses in typical language development and autism. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 37(6). 1501–1527. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716416000059>
- Ezeizabarrena, María José. 2012. Children do not substitute object relatives with subject relatives in every Romance language: The case of Spanish. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 57(2). 161–181. <https://www.lingv.ro/RRL%202%202012%20art04Ezeizabarrena.pdf>
- Ferreiro, Emilia, Christine Othenin-Girard, Harold Chipman & Hermine Sinclair. 1976. How do children handle relative clauses? A study in comparative developmental psycholinguistics. *Archives de Psychologie* 44(172). 229–266.
- Friedmann, Naama, Adriana Belletti & Luigi Rizzi. 2009. Relativized relatives: Types of intervention in the acquisition of A-bar dependencies. *Lingua* 119(1). 67–88. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.09.002>
- Friedmann, Naama & Rama Novogrodsky. 2004. The acquisition of relative clause comprehension in Hebrew: A study of SLI and normal development. *Journal of Child Language* 31(3). 661–681. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000904006269>
- Friedmann, Naama, Maya Yachini & Ronit Szterman. 2015. Relatively easy relatives: Children with syntactic SLI avoid intervention. In Elisa Di Domenico, Cornelia Hamann & Simona Matteini (eds.), *Structures, Strategies and Beyond: Studies in honour of Adriana Belletti*, 303–320. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gavarró, Anna, Arnau Cunill, Míriam Muntané & Marc Reguant. 2011. Catalan child relative contrasts as a processing effect. In Mihaela Pirvulescu, María Cristina Cuervo, Ana T. Pérez-Leroux, Jeffrey Steele & Nelleke Strik (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition North America (GALANA)*. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadia Proceedings Project. <http://www.lingref.com/cpp/galana/4/paper2584.pdf>
- Gavarró, Anna, Arnau Cunill, Míriam Muntané & Marc Reguant. 2012. The acquisition of Catalan relatives: Structure and processing. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 57(2). 183–201. <https://www.lingv.ro/RRL%202%202012%20art05Gavarro.pdf>
- Goodluck, Helen, Eithne Guilfoyle & Síle Harrington. 2001. Acquiring subject and object relatives: Evidence from Irish. *Journal of Celtic Language Learning* 6. 21–33. http://naaclt.org/resources/JCLL_2001_vol6_p21-33.pdf
- Goodluck, Helen, Eithne Guilfoyle & Síle Harrington. 2006. Merge and binding in child relative clauses: The case of Irish. *Journal of Linguistics* 42(3). 629–661. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002222670600421X>
- Goodluck, Helen & Danijela Stojanović. 1996. The structure and acquisition of relative clauses in Serbo-Croatian. *Language Acquisition* 5(4). 285–315. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327817la0504_2
- Guasti, Maria Teresa, Chiara Branchini, Fabrizio Arosio & Mirta Vernice. 2012. A developmental study of subject and object relative clauses in Italian. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 57(2). 105–116. <https://www.lingv.ro/RRL%202%202012%20art01Guasti.pdf>
- Guasti, Maria Teresa & Anna Cardinaletti. 2003. Relative clause formation in Romance children's production. *Probus* 15(1). 47–89. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.2003.005>
- Guasti, Maria Teresa, Stavroula Stavrakaki & Fabrizio Arosio. 2008. Number and case in the comprehension of relative clauses: Evidence from Italian and Greek. *Studies in Linguistics* 2. 101–118.

- Guasti, Maria Teresa, Stavroula Stavrakaki & Fabrizio Arosio. 2012. Cross-linguistic differences and similarities in the acquisition of relative clauses: Evidence from Greek and Italian. *Lingua* 122(6). 700–713. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2012.02.001>
- Guasti, Maria Teresa, Mirta Vernice & Julie Franck. 2018. Continuity in the adult and children's comprehension of subject and object relative clauses in French and Italian. *Languages* 3(3). 24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages3030024>
- Hakuta, Kenji. 1981. Grammatical description versus configurational arrangement in language acquisition: The case of relative clauses in Japanese. *Cognition* 9(3). 197–236. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(81\)90001-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(81)90001-9)
- Hatch, Evelyn. 1971. The young child's comprehension of relative clauses. *Technical Note 2-71-16*. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- He, Wenguang, Na Xu & Runqing Ji. 2017. Effects of age and location in Chinese relative clauses processing. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 46(5). 1067–1086. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-017-9480-4>
- Hsu, Chun-Chieh Natalie, Gabriella Hermon & Andrea Zukowski. 2009. Young children's production of head-final relative clauses: Elicited production data from Chinese children. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 18(4). 323–360. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-009-9047-y>
- Hu, Shenai, Carlo Cecchetto & Maria Teresa Guasti. 2018. A new case for structural intervention: Evidence from Wenzhounese relative clauses. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 27(3). 247–273. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-018-9182-4>
- Hu, Shenai, Anna Gavarró, Mirta Vernice & Maria Teresa Guasti. 2016. The acquisition of Chinese relative clauses: Contrasting two theoretical approaches. *Journal of Child Language* 43(1). 1–21. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000914000865>
- Hu, Shenai & Maria Teresa Guasti. 2017. Complexity in the acquisition of relative clauses: Evidence from school-age sequential Mandarin-Italian bilingual children. *Journal of International Chinese Education* 2. 121–156.
- Jisa, Harriet & Sophie Kern. 1998. Relative clauses in French children's narrative texts. *Journal of Child Language* 25(3). 623–652. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000998003523>
- Kas, Bence & Ágnes Lukács. 2012. Processing relative clauses by Hungarian typically developing children. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 27(4). 500–538. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01690965.2011.552917>
- Keenan, Edward L. & Sarah Hawkins. 1987. The psychological validity of the accessibility hierarchy. In Edward L. Keenan (ed.), *Universal Grammar: 15 essays* (Croom Helm Linguistics Series), 60–85. London: Croom Helm.
- Kidd, Evan, Silke Brandt, Elena Lieven & Michael Tomasello. 2007. Object relatives made easy: A cross-linguistic comparison of the constraints influencing young children's processing of relative clauses. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 22(6). 860–897. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01690960601155284>
- Kim, Young-Joo. 1987. *The acquisition of relative clauses in English and Korean: Development in spontaneous production*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University dissertation.
- Kirjavainen, Minna, Evan Kidd & Elena Lieven. 2017. How do language-specific characteristics affect the acquisition of different relative clause types? Evidence from Finnish. *Journal of Child Language* 44(1). 120–157. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000915000768>
- Kirjavainen, Minna & Elena Lieven. 2011. Acquisition of relative clauses in Finnish: The effect of input. In Evan Kidd (ed.), *Acquisition of relative clauses: Processing, typology, and function*, 107–139. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Lakshmanan, Usha. 2000. The acquisition of relative clauses by Tamil children. *Journal of Child Language* 27(3). 587–617. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900004293>
- Lau, Elaine. 2016. The role of resumptive pronouns in Cantonese relative clause acquisition. *First Language* 36(4). 355–382. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0142723716648840>
- Lee, Kwee-Ock. 1991. *On the first language acquisition of relative clauses in Korean: The universal structure of Comp*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University dissertation.
- Lee, Thomas Hun-tak. 1992. The inadequacy of processing heuristics: Evidence from relative clause acquisition in Mandarin Chinese. In Thomas Hun-tak Lee (ed.), *Research in Chinese linguistics in Hong Kong*, 47–85. Hong Kong: Linguistic Society of Hong Kong.
- Lobo, Maria & Stéphanie Vaz. 2017. Does the animacy of the antecedent play a role in the production of relative clauses? *Matraga—Revista do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras da UERJ* 24(41). 266–287. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12957/matraca.2017.28710>
- MacDonald, Ross, Silke Brandt, Anna Theakston, Elena Lieven & Ludovica Serratrice. 2020. The role of animacy in children's interpretation of relative clauses in English: Evidence from sentence-picture matching and eye movements. *Cognitive Science* 44(8). e12874. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12874>
- Mann, Virginia A., Donald Shankweiler & Suzanne T. Smith. 1984. The association between comprehension of spoken sentences and early reading ability: The role of phonetic representation. *Journal of Child Language* 11(3). 627–643. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900005997>
- Martins, Alexandrina, Ana Lúcia Santos & Inês Duarte. 2018. Comprehension of relative clauses vs. control structures in SLI and ASD. In Anne B. Bertolini & Maxwell J. Kaplan (eds.), *BUCLD 42: Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 493–506. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadia Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900005997>
- McDaniel, Dana, Cecile McKee & Judy B. Bernstein. 1998. How children's relatives solve a problem for minimalism. *Language* 74(2). 308–334. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/417869>
- McKee, Cecile & Dana McDaniel. 2001. Resumptive pronouns in English relative clauses. *Language Acquisition* 9(2). 113–156. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327817LA0902_01
- McKee, Cecile, Dana McDaniel & Jesse Snedeker. 1998. Relatives children say. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 27(5). 573–596. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024901029643>
- Morrill, Glyn & Anna Gavarró. 2010. Categorical complexity of relativisation and child Romance performance. In Pedro Guijarro-Fuentes & Laura Domínguez (eds.), *New Directions in Language Acquisition: Romance Languages in the Generative Perspective*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Nasanius, Yassir, Peter Cole & Gabriella Hermon. 2016. The formation of relative clauses in Jakarta Indonesian: Data from adults and children. *NUSA: Linguistic Studies of Languages in and around Indonesia* 61. 1–18. <http://hdl.handle.net/10108/89602>
- Özcan, F. Hülya. 1997. Comprehension of relative clauses in the acquisition of Turkish. In Kamile Imer & N. Engin Uzun (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, 149–155. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.

- Ozeki, Hiromi & Yasuhiro Shirai. 2007. The consequence of variation in the acquisition of relative clauses: An analysis of longitudinal production data from five Japanese children. In Yoshiko Matsumoto, David Y. Oshima, Orrin R. Robinson & Peter Sells (eds.), *Diversity in language: Perspectives and implications*, 243–270. Stanford, California: CSLI.
- Özge, Duygu, Theodoros Marinis & Deniz Zeyrek. 2009. Comprehension of subject and object relative clauses in monolingual Turkish children. In Sila Ay, Özgür Aydın, İclâl Ergenç, Seda Gökmen, Selçuk İşsever & Dilek Peçenek (eds.), *Essays on Turkish linguistics: Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 6–8, 2008 (Turcologica)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Özge, Duygu, Theodoros Marinis & Deniz Zeyrek. 2010. Production of relative clauses in monolingual Turkish children. In Katie Franich, Kate Mesh Iserman & Lauren Keil (eds.), *Proceedings of the 34th Boston University Conference on Language Development (BUCLD) Online Proceedings Supplement*. <http://www.bu.edu/buclid/files/2011/05/34-Ozge-et-al.pdf>
- Özge, Duygu, Theo Marinis & Deniz Zeyrek. 2015. Incremental processing in head-final child language: Online comprehension of relative clauses in Turkish-speaking children and adults. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience* 30(9). 1230–1243. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2014.995108>
- Peeters-Podgaevskaja, Alla V., Bibi E. Janssen & Anne E. Baker. 2020. The acquisition of relative clauses in Russian and Polish in monolingual and bilingual children. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 10(2). 216–248. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.17031.pee>
- Polinsky, Maria. 2011. Reanalysis in adult heritage language: New evidence in support of attrition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 33(2). 305–328. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226311000077X>
- Rahmany, Ramin, Hamideh Marefat & Evan Kidd. 2011. Persian speaking children's acquisition of relative clauses. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology* 8(3). 367–388. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2010.509056>
- Rahmany, Ramin, Hamideh Marefat & Evan Kidd. 2014. Resumptive elements aid comprehension of object relative clauses: Evidence from Persian. *Journal of Child Language* 41(4). 937–948. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000913000147>
- Rakhlin, Natalia, Sergey A. Kornilov, Tatiana V. Kornilova & Elena L. Grigorenko. 2016. Syntactic complexity effects of Russian relative clause sentences in children with and without developmental language disorder. *Language Acquisition* 23(4). 333–360. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10489223.2016.1179312>
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1985. Relative clauses in child language, pidgins and creoles. *Papers in Pidgin and Creole Linguistics* 4(2). 1–23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268608408599327>
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1992. The evolution of complexity in a creole language: Acquisition of relative clauses in Tok Pisin. *Studies in Language* 16(1). 139–182. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.16.1.06ro>
- Roth, Froma P. 1984. Accelerating language learning in young children. *Journal of Child Language* 11(1). 89–107. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900005602>
- Sevcenco, Anca & Larisa Avram. 2012. Romanian-speaking children's comprehension of relatives. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 57(2). 219–239. <https://www.lingv.ro/RRL%202012%20art07Sevcenco.pdf>
- Sheldon, Amy. 1974. The role of parallel function in the acquisition of relative clauses in English. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 13(3). 272–281. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(74\)80064-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(74)80064-2)

- Slobin, Dan I. 1986. The acquisition and use of relative clauses in Turkic and Indo-European languages. In Dan I. Slobin & Karl Zimmer (eds.), *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*, 273–294. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Smith, Suzanne T., Paul Macaruso, Donald Shankweiler & Stephen Crain. 1989. Syntactic comprehension in young poor readers. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 10(4). 429–454. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400009012>
- Suzuki, Takaaki. 2011. A case-marking cue for filler-gap dependencies in children's relative clauses in Japanese. *Journal of Child Language* 38(5). 1084–1095. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000910000553>
- Tanaka, Nozomi, William O'Grady, Kamil Deen & Ivan Paul Bondoc. 2019. An asymmetry in the acquisition of relative clauses: Evidence from Tagalog. *First Language* 39(6). 618–632. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723719859090>
- Tavakolian, Susan L. 1981. The conjoined-clause analysis of relative clauses. In Susan Tavakolian (ed.), *Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory*, 167–187. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Theodorou, Eleni & Kleanthes K. Grohmann. 2012. The acquisition of relative clauses in Cypriot Greek: Production and comprehension. *Revista Diacritica* 26(1). 269–298. <http://www.scielo.mec.pt/pdf/dia/v26n1/v26n1a12.pdf>
- Tjung, Yassir. 2006. *The formation of relative clauses in Jakarta Indonesian: A subject-object asymmetry*. University of Delaware doctoral thesis.
- Tsoi, Elaine Yee Ling, Wenchun Yang, Angel Chan & Evan Kidd. 2019. Mandarin-English speaking bilingual and Mandarin speaking monolingual children's comprehension of relative clauses. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 40(4). 933–964. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716419000079>
- Utzeri, Irene. 2007. The production and the acquisition of subject and object relative clauses in Italian: A comparative experimental study. *Nanzan Linguistics: Special Issue* 3(1). 283–313. https://www.ic.nanzan-u.ac.jp/LINGUISTICS/publication/pdf/NLSI3_1-11-utzeri.pdf
- Uzundag, Berna A. & Aylin C. Kuntay. 2019. The acquisition and use of relative clauses in Turkish-learning children's conversational interactions: A cross-linguistic approach. *Journal of Child Language* 46(6). 1142–1168. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S030500091900045X>
- Varlokosta, Spyridoula, Michaela Nerantzini & Despina Papadopoulou. 2015. Comprehension asymmetries in language acquisition: A test for relativized minimality. *Journal of Child Language* 42(3). 618–661. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000914000257>
- Volpato, Francesca. 2020. Verbal working memory resources and comprehension of relative clauses in children with cochlear implants. *First Language OnlineFirst*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723719900739>
- Volpato, Francesca & Flavia Adani. 2009. The subject/object relative clause asymmetry in Italian hearing-impaired children: Evidence from a comprehension task. *Studies in Linguistics* 3. 269–281.
- Volpato, Francesca & Mirta Vernice. 2014. The production of relative clauses by Italian cochlear-implanted and hearing children. *Lingua* 139. 39–67. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2013.10.010>
- Yang, Wenchun, Angel Chan, Franklin Chang & Evan Kidd. 2020. Four-year-old Mandarin-speaking children's online comprehension of relative clauses. *Cognition* 196. 104103. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2019.104103>
- Zukowski, Andrea. 2009. Elicited production of relative clauses in children with Williams syndrome. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 24(1). 1–43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01690960801966118>