Supplementary File 2: Data set for Figure 2. Summary of adult L1 studies

This appendix includes data sources for Figure 2 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 †.

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	Method	Results	Domain
Cantonese	prenominal	SVO	Francis et al. 2015	grammaticality judgment	not clear	C
				sentence combination	O ~> S	P
			Huang & Donati 2019	TV data	S = O	P
				spoken corpus	O > S	P
				elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
				elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
Catalan	postnominal	SVO	Gavarró et al. 2011	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P
			Gavarró et al. 2012	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P
Chamorro	prenominal	VSO	Wagers et al. 2018	picture selection	O > S	C
	postnominal	VSO	Wagers et al. 2018	picture selection	S > O	C
Dutch	postnominal	SVO	Frazier 1987	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Kaan 2001	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Mak et al. 2002	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				eye-tracking reading	S > O	C

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Method	Results	Domain
Dutch (cont'd)	postnominal	SVO	Mak et al. 2006	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				self-paced reading	S > O	C
				eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
			Mak et al. 2008	self-paced reading	not clear	C
				self-paced reading	S > O	C
English	postnominal	SVO	Quirk 1957	spoken corpus	S > O	P
			Keenan & Comrie 1977	sentence recall + digit memory	S > O	P
			Wanner & Maratsos 1978	word-by-word reading + recall	S > O	C
			Ford 1983	continuous lexical decision	S > O	C
			Prideaux & Baker 1987	self-paced reading + recall	S > O	P
				Narrative	*S > O	P
				acceptability judgment	S > O	C
			Fox & Thompson 1990	spoken corpus	not clear	P
			King & Just 1991	self-paced reading + recall	S > O	C
			King & Kutas 1995	ERP	S > O	C
			Just et al. 1996	fMRI	S > O	C
			Bates et al. 1999	character selection (no picture)	S > O	C
			Caplan et al. 1999	PET (rCBF)	S > O	C
			Caplan et al. 2000	PET (rCBF)	O > S	C
			Caplan et al. 2001	fMRI + self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Cooke et al. 2001	fMRI	S > O	C
			Gordon et al. 2001	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				self-paced reading	S = O	C
				self-paced reading	S = O	C
			McKee & McDaniel 2001†	grammaticality judgment	S = O	C
			Waters & Caplan 2001	self-paced listening	S > O	C

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Method	Results	Domain
English (cont'd)	postnominal	SVO	Traxler et al. 2002	eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
				eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
				eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
			Constable et al. 2004	fMRI	S > O	C
			Gordon et al. 2004	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				self-paced reading	S > O	C
				self-paced reading	S > O	C
				self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Gibson et al. 2005	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Grodner & Gibson 2005	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Traxler et al. 2005	eye-tracking	S > O	C
			Weiss et al. 2005	ERP	S > O	C
			Gordon et al. 2006	eye-tracking	S > O	C
				eye-tracking	S > O	C
			Rol& et al. 2007	written corpus	S > O	P
				spoken corpus	O > S	P
			Wells et al. 2009	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Fedorenko et al. 2012	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Rol& et al. 2012	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Yang et al. 2013	eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
			Juffs & Rodriguez 2014	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Staub et al. 2017	eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
				eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
			Santi et al. 2019	self-paced reading	S ~> O	C
				planned production (reading)	S > O	C

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Method	Results	Domain
English (cont'd)	postnominal	SVO	MacDonald et al. 2020	picture selection (visual world paradigm)	S > O	C
				picture selection (visual world paradigm)	S > O	C
			Xia et al. 2020	self-paced reading	S > O	C
French	postnominal	SVO	Frauenfelder et al. 1980	phoneme detection	S > O	C
				phoneme detection	S = O	C
			Holmes & O'Regan 1981	eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
			Cohen & Mehler 1996	click detection	S > O	C
				click detection	S > O	C
				click detection	S = O	C
			Jisa & Kern 1998	narrative	S > O	P
			Schelstraete & Deg& 1998	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				self-paced reading	S = O	C
			Baudiffier et al. 2011	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
			Guasti et al. 2018	self-paced reading	S > O	C
German	postnominal	V2	Mecklinger et al. 1995	ERP	S > O	C
			Schriefers et al. 1995	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Bader & Meng 1999	speeded grammaticality judgment	S > O	C
			Havik et al. 2009	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				self-paced reading	S > O	C
Hungarian	postnominal	SVO	MacWhinney & Pléh 1988	timed reading comprehension	not clear	C
Indonesian	postnominal	SVO	Tjung 2006	spoken corpus	S > O	P
				elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
			Nasanius et al. 2016	spoken corpus	S > O	P
Irish	postnominal	VSO	Goodluck et al. 2001	elicited production (picture)	S = O	P
			Goodluck et al. 2006	elicited production (picture)	S = O	P
Italian	postnominal	SVO	Carminati et al. 2006	picture selection	S > O	C
			Utzeri 2007	elicited production (preference, picture description)	S > O	P

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Method	Results	Domain
Italian (cont'd)	postnominal	SVO	Di Domenico & Di Matteo 2009	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				self-paced reading	O > S	C
			Belletti & Contemori 2010	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P
			Guasti et al. 2018	self-paced reading	S > O	C
Japanese	prenominal	SOV	Miyamoto & Nakamura 2003	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Ozeki & Shirai 2007	spoken corpus	S > O	P
			Ueno & Garnsey 2008	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				ERP	S > O	C
			Mitsugi et al. 2010	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Kahraman 2012	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Yabuki-Soh 2013	composition	S > O	P
			Mitsugi & Shirai 2017	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Mansbridge & Tamaoka 2019	eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
				eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
				acceptability judgment	S > O	C
Korean	prenominal	SOV	Kwon et al. 2006	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Kwon et al. 2010	eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
				eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
			Kwon et al. 2013	ERP	S > O	C
Mandarin	prenominal	SVO	Hsiao & Gibson 2003	self-paced reading	O > S	C
			Cao et al. 2005	act out	O > S	C
				act out	O > S	C
			Yuan & Zhao 2005†	acceptability judgment	S > O	C
			Lin & Bever 2006	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Yang & Perfetti 2006	ERP	not clear	C
				ERP	not clear	C
			Pu 2007	spoken, written narrative	S > O	P
			Chen et al. 2008	self-paced reading	O > S	C

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Method	Results	Domain
Mandarin (cont'd)	prenominal	SVO	Li et al. 2010	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Yang et al. 2010	ERP	O > S	C
			Lin & Garnsey 2011	self-paced reading	O > S	C
			Packard et al. 2011	ERP	O > S	C
			Wu et al. 2011	corpus	S > O	P
			Qiao et al. 2012	G-maze reading	O > S	C
				L-maze reading	O > S	C
			Wu et al. 2012	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Cui 2013	self-paced reading	O > S	C
			Gibson & Wu 2013	self-paced reading	O > S	C
			Vasishth et al. 2013	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Jäger et al. 2015	self-paced reading	S > O	C
				eye-tracking	S > O	C
			Hitz & Francis 2016	acceptability judgment	S > O	C
			Hu et al. 2016	character selection	S = O	C
			Sun et al. 2016	ERP	O > S	C
			Sung et al. 2016	eye-tracking	O > S	C
			Wu & Juffs 2016	self-paced reading	O > S	C
			He et al. 2017	self-paced reading	O > S	C
				self-paced reading	S = O	C
			Mansbridge et al. 2017	eye-tracking reading	not clear	C
				eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
			Wang et al. 2017	ERP	O > S	C
			Bulut et al. 2018	ERP	not clear	C
			Cheng et al. 2018	self-paced listening + digit-load	not clear	C
			Yao 2018	self-paced reading	S = O	C
			Xiong et al. 2019	ERP	S > O	C
			Xu et al. 2019	self-paced reading	O > S	C

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Method	Results	Domain
Mandarin (cont'd)	prenominal	SVO	Xu & Duann 2020	fMRI	O > S	C
			Yang & He 2020	eye-tracking reading	O > S	C
				eye-tracking reading	O > S	C
Otomanguean (Ixcatec)	postnominal	SVO	Adamou 2017	picture selection	S > O	C
				free speech corpus	S = O	P
Portuguese-Brazilian	postnominal	SVO	Forster & Corrêa 2017	eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
Portuguese-European	postnominal	SVO	Costa et al. 2011	picture selection	S = O	C
				elicited production (preference)	S > O	P
			Costa et al. 2012	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Lobo & Vaz 2017	elicited production (preference)	not clear	P
Quechua-Conchucos	prenominal	SOV	Courtney 2006	elicited production (act out)	S = O	P
			Courtney 2011	elicited production (act out)	S = O	P
Quechua-Cusco	prenominal	SOV	Courtney 2011	elicited production (act out)	* S > O	P
Russian	postnominal	SVO	Polinsky 2011	picture selection	S = O	C
			Levy et al. 2013	self-paced reading	S = O	C
				self-paced reading	S = O	C
			Rakhlin et al. 2016	picture selection	S > O	C
			Price & Witzel 2017	unspecified corpus	S > O	P
				self-paced reading	S > O	C
				self-paced reading	S > O	C
				eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
Serbo-Croatian	postnominal	SVO	Goodluck & Stojanović 1996	elicited production (picture)	*S = O	P
Spanish	postnominal	SVO	Betancort et al. 2009	eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
				reading (eye-tracking)	S > O	C
			del Rio et al. 2012	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Reali 2014	spoken corpus	S > O	P
			Checa-Garcia 2019	spoken corpus	S > O	P

Language	RC order	Word order	Study	Method	Results	Domain
Tagalog	prenominal	VSO/VOS	Pizarro-Guevara 2020	character selection	S > O	C
				character selection	S > O	C
				character selection	S > O	C
	postnominal	VSO/VOS	Bondoc et al. 2018	character selection	S > O	C
				elicited imitation	S > O	P
				elicited production (picture)	S = O	P
			Tanaka et al. 2019	character selection	S = O	C
			Pizarro-Guevara 2020	character selection	S > O	C
				character selection	S > O	C
				character selection	S > O	C
			Pizarro-Guevara & Wagers 2020	stop-making-sense	S > O	C
Tok Pisin	postnominal	SVO	Romaine 1992	spoken & written corpus	S > O	P
Turkish	prenominal	SOV	Kahraman et al. 2010	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Özge et al. 2009	character selection	S > O	C
			Özge et al. 2010	elicited production (picture)	S > O	P
			Kahraman 2015	self-paced reading	S > O	C
			Özge et al. 2015	self-paced listening	S = O	C
			Hitz & Francis 2016	acceptability judgment	S > O	C
			Bulut et al. 2019	eye-tracking reading	S > O	C
				spoken & written corpus	S > O	P
Wenzhounese	prenominal	SVO	Hu et al. 2018	elicited production (preference)	S > O	P

References

Adamou, Evangelia. 2017. Subject preference in Ixcatec relative clauses (Otomanguean, Mexico). *Studies in Language* 41(4). 872–913. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.16055.ada

Bader, Markus & Michael Meng. 1999. Subject-object ambiguities in German embedded clauses: An across-the-board comparison. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 28(2). 121–143. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023206208142

Bates, Elizabeth, Antonella Devescovi & Simona D'Amico. 1999. Processing complex sentences: A cross-linguistic study. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 14(1). 69–123. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/016909699386383

Baudiffier, Vanessa, David Caplan, Daniel Gaonac'h & David Chesnet. 2011. The effect of noun animacy on the processing of unambiguous sentences: Evidence from French relative clauses. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 64(10). 1896–1905. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2011.608851

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.

Betancort, Moisés, Manuel Carreiras & Patrick Sturt. 2009. The processing of subject and object relative clauses in Spanish: An eye-tracking study. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 62(10). 1915–1929. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/17470210902866672

Bondoc, Ivan Paul, William O'Grady, Kamil Deen & Nozomi Tanaka. 2018. Agrammatism in Tagalog: Voice and relativisation. *Aphasiology* 32(5). 598–617. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2017.1366417

Bulut, Talat, Shih-Kuen Cheng, Kun-Yu Xu, Daisy L. Hung & Denise H. Wu. 2018. Is there a processing preference for object relative clauses in Chinese? Evidence from ERPs. *Frontiers in Psychology* 9. 995. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00995

Bulut, Talat, Emine Yarar & H. H. Iris Wu. 2019. Comprehension of Turkish relative clauses: Evidence from eye-tracking and corpus analysis. *Dil, Konuşma ve Yutma Araştırmaları Dergisi [Journal of Language, Speech and Swallowing Research]* 2(3). 211–246.

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.

Caplan, David, Nathaniel Alpert & Gloria Waters. 1999. PET studies of syntactic processing with auditory sentence presentation. *Neuroimage* 9. 343–351. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.1998.0412

Caplan, David, Nathaniel Alpert, Gloria Waters & Anthony Olivieri. 2000. Activation of Broca's area by syntactic processing under conditions of concurrent articulation. *Human Brain Mapping* 9(2). 65–71. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0193(200002)9:2<65::AID-HBM1>3.0.CO;2-4

Caplan, David, Sujith Vijayan, Gina Kuperberg, Caroline West, Gloria Waters, Doug Greve & Anders M. Dale. 2001. Vascular responses to syntactic processing: Event-related potential fMRI study of relative clauses. *Human Brain Mapping* 15(1). 26–38. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.1059

Carminati, Sara, Maria Teresa Guasti, Hans Schadee & Claudio Luzzatti. 2006. Subject and object relative clauses in Italian: Normal subjects and an agrammatic patient. *Brain and Language* 99(1–2). 164–165. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.1059

Checa-Garcia, Irene. 2019. Resumptive elements in Spanish relative clauses and processing difficulties: A multifactorial analysis. *Folia Linguistica* 53(2). 479–517. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/flin-2019-2018

Chen, Baoguo, Aihua Ning, Hongyan Bi & Susan Dunlap. 2008. Chinese subject-relative clauses are more difficult to process than the object-relative clauses. *Acta Psychologica* 129(1). 61–65. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2008.04.005

Cheng, Tuyuan, Jei-Tun Wu & Shuanfan Huang. 2018. Use of memory-load interference in processing spoken Chinese relative clauses. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 47(5). 1035–1055. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-018-9576-5

Cohen, Laurent & Jacques Mehler. 1996. Click monitoring revisited: An on-line study of sentence comprehension. *Memory & Cognition* 1996(24). 94–102. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03197275

Constable, R. Todd, Kenneth R. Pugh, Ella Berroya, W. Einar Mencl, Michael Westerveld, Weijia Ni & Donald Shankweiler. 2004. Sentence complexity and input modality effects in sentence comprehension: An fMRI study. *Neuroimage* 22(1). 11–21. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.01.001

Cooke, Ayanna, Edgar B. Zurif, Christian DeVita, David Alsop, Phyllis Koenig, John Detre, James Gee, Maria Piñango, Jennifer Balogh & Murray Grossman. 2001. Neural basis for sentence comprehension: Grammatical and short-term memory components. *Human Brain Mapping* 15(2). 80–94. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.10006

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). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cui, Yaqiong. 2013. L2 processing of relative clauses in Mandarin. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching* 20. 20–39.

del Rio, David, Ramón López-Higes & María Teresa Martín-Aragoneses. 2012. Canonical word order and interference-based integration costs during sentence comprehension: The case of Spanish subject- and object-relative clauses. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 65(11). 2108–2128. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2012.674951

Di Domenico, Alberto & Rosalia Di Matteo. 2009. Processing Italian relative clauses: Working memory span and word order effects on RTs. *The Journal of General Psychology: Experimental, Psychological, and Comparative Psychology* 136(4). 387–406. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00221300903266671

Fedorenko, Evelina, Steve Piantadosi & Edward Gibson. 2012. Processing relative clauses in supportive contexts. *Cognitive Science* 36(3). 471–497. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-6709.2011.01217.x

Ford, Marilyn. 1983. A method for obtaining measures of local parsing complexity throughout sentences. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 22(2). 203–218. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(83)90156-1

Forster, Renê & Letícia Maria Sicuro Corrêa. 2017. On the asymmetry between subject and object relative clauses in discourse context. *Revista de Estudos da Linguagem* 25(3). 1225–1254. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17851/2237-2083.25.3.1225-1254

Fox, Barbara A. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1990. A discourse explanation of the grammar of relative clauses in English conversation. *Language* 66(2). 297–316. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/414888

Francis, Elaine J., Charles Lam, Carol Chun Zheng, John Hitz & Stephen Matthews. 2015. Resumptive pronouns, structural complexity, and the elusive distinction between grammar and performance: Evidence from Cantonese. *Lingua* 162. 56–81. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2015.04.006

Frauenfelder, Ulrich Hans, Juan Segui & Jacques Mehler. 1980. Monitoring around the relative clause. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 19(3). 328–337. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(80)90257-1

Frazier, Lyn. 1987. Syntactic processing: Evidence from Dutch. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 5(4). 519–559. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138988

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: Cascadilla 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

Gibson, Edward, Timothy Desmet, Daniel Grodner, Duane Watson & Kara Ko. 2005. Reading relative clauses in English. *Cognitive Linguistics* 16(2). 313–353. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.2005.16.2.313

Gibson, Edward & H. H. Iris Wu. 2013. Processing Chinese relative clauses in context. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 28(1–2). 37–41. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01690965.2010.536656

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 Stojanovič. 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

Gordon, Peter C., Randall Hendrick & Marcus Johnson. 2001. Memory interference during language processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 27(6). 1411–1423. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.27.6.1411

Gordon, Peter C., Randall Hendrick & Marcus Johnson. 2004. Effects of noun phrase type on sentence complexity. *Journal of Memory and Language* 51(1). 97–114. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2004.02.003

Gordon, Peter C., Randall Hendrick, Marcus Johnson & Yoonhyoung Lee. 2006. Similarity-based interference during language comprehension: Evidence from eye tracking during reading. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 32(6). 1304–1321. DOI: https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0278-7393.32.6.1304

Grodner, Daniel & Edward Gibson. 2005. Consequences of the serial nature of linguistic input for sentential complexity. *Cognitive Science* 29(2). 261–290. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog0000_7

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

Havik, Else, Leah Roberts & Robert Schreuder. 2009. Processing subject-object ambiguities in the L2: A self-paced reading study with German L2 learners of Dutch. *Language Learning* 59(1). 73–112. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00501.x

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

Hitz, John & Elaine Francis. 2016. On the usefulness of formal judgment tasks in syntax and in second-language research: The case of resumptive pronouns in English, Turkish, and Mandarin Chinese. *Linguistics* 54(6). 1241–1280. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2016-0033

Holmes, Virginia M. & J. Kevin O'Regan. 1981. Eye fixation patterns during the reading of relative-clause sentences. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 20(4). 417–430. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(81)90533-8

Hsiao, Franny & Edward Gibson. 2003. Processing relative clauses in Chinese. *Cognition* 90(1). 3–27. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(03)00124-0

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

Huang, Jiaying & Caterina Donati. 2019. Subject-object asymmetry in the production of relative clauses in Cantonese. *Studies in Chinese Linguistics* 40(2). 167–202. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2478/scl-2019-0006

Jäger, Lena, Zhong Chen, Qiang Li, Chien-Jer Charles Lin & Shravan Vasishth. 2015. The subject-relative advantage in Chinese: Evidence for expectation-based processing. *Journal of Memory and Language* 79–80. 97–120. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2014.10.005

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

Juffs, Alan & Guillermo A. Rodriguez. 2014. Processing relative clauses in a second language. In Alan Juffs & Guillermo A. Rodriguez (eds.), *Second language sentence processing*, 139–190. New York & Oxford: Routledge.

Just, Marcel Adam, Patricia A. Carpenter, Timothy A. Keller, William F. Eddy & Keith R. Thulborn. 1996. Brain activation modulated by sentence comprehension. *Science* 274(5284). 114–116. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.274.5284.114

Kaan, Edith. 2001. Effects of NP type on the resolution of word-order ambiguities. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 30(5). 529–547. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010417614058

Kahraman, Barış. 2012. Sentence processing of nominative-genitive conversion in Japanese by Turkish speaking learners and native speakers. In Yukio Otsu (ed.), *Proceedings of the 13th Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*, 81–102. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Kahraman, Barış. 2015. Processing Turkish relative clauses in context. In Deniz Zeyrek, Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek, Ufuk Ataş & Jochen Rehbein (eds.), *Ankara Papers in Turkish and Turkic Linguistics. Series Turcologica*, 98–109. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kahraman, Barış, Atsushi Sato, Hajime Ono & Hiromu Sakai. 2010. Relative clauses processing before the head noun: Evidence for strong forward prediction in Turkish. In Hiroki Maezawa & Azusa Yokogoshi (eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL6)*, 155–170. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Keenan, Edward L. & Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(1). 63–99.

King, Jonathan & Marcel Adam Just. 1991. Individual differences in syntactic processing: The role of working memory. *Journal of Memory and Language* 30(5). 580–602. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(91)90027-H

King, Jonathan W. & Marta Kutas. 1995. Who did what and when? Using word- and clause-level ERPs to monitor working memory usage in reading. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 7(3). 376–395. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.1995.7.3.376

Kwon, Nayoung, Peter C. Gordon, Yoonhyoung Lee, Robert Kluender & Maria Polinsky. 2010. Cognitive and linguistic factors affecting subject/object asymmetry: An eye-tracking study of prenominal relative clauses in Korean. *Language* 86(3). 546–582. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2010.0006

Kwon, Nayoung, Robert Kluender, Marta Kutas & Maria Polinsky. 2013. Subject/object processing asymmetries in Korean relative clauses: Evidence from ERP data. *Language* 89(3). 537–585. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/lan.2013.0044

Kwon, Nayoung, Maria Polinsky & Robert Kluender. 2006. Subject preference in Korean. In Donald Baumer, David Montero & Michael Scanlon (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 1–14. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. http://www.lingref.com/cpp/wccfl/25/paper1429.pdf

Levy, Roger, Evelina Fedorenko & Edward Gibson. 2013. The syntactic complexity of Russian relative clauses. *Journal of Memory and Language* 69(4). 461–495. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2012.10.005

Li, Qiang, Jian Zhang & Wei Yue. 2010. Chinese relative clauses processing in supportive context removing ambiguity. *Studies in Literature and Language* 1(4). 12–19. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/n

Lin, Chien-Jer Charles & Thomas G. Bever. 2006. Subject preference in the processing of relative clauses in Chinese. In Donald Baumer, David Montero & Michael Scanlon (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 25)*, 254–260. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. http://www.lingref.com/cpp/wccfl/25/paper1456.pdf

Lin, Yowyu & Susan M. Garnsey. 2011. Animacy and the resolution of temporary ambiguity in relative clause comprehension in Mandarin. In Hiroko Yamashita, Yuki Hirose & Jerome L. Packard (eds.), *Processing and producing head-final structures* (Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics), 241–275. Dordrecht: Springer.

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/matraga.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

MacWhinney, Brian & Csaba Pléh. 1988. The processing of restrictive relative clauses in Hungarian. *Cognition* 29(2). 95–141. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(88)90034-0

Mak, Willem M., Wietske Vonk & Herbert Schriefers. 2002. The influence of animacy on relative clause processing. *Journal of Memory and Language* 47(1). 50–68. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.2001.2837

Mak, Willem M., Wietske Vonk & Herbert Schriefers. 2006. Animacy in processing relative clauses: The hikers that rocks crush. *Journal of Memory and Language* 54(4). 466–490. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2006.01.001

Mak, Willem M., Wietske Vonk & Herbert Schriefers. 2008. Discourse structure and relative clause processing. *Memory & Cognition* 36(1). 170–181. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3758/MC.36.1.170

Mansbridge, Michael P. & Katsuo Tamaoka. 2019. Ambiguity in Japanese relative clause processing. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 35(1). 75–136. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/jjl-2019-2005

Mansbridge, Michael P., Katsuo Tamaoka, Kexin Xiong & Rinus G. Verdonschot. 2017. Ambiguity in the processing of Mandarin Chinese relative clauses: One factor cannot explain it all. *PLoS ONE* 12(10). e0186618. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186618

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

Mecklinger, Axel, Herbert Schriefers, Karsten Steinhauer & Angela D. Friederici. 1995. Processing relative clauses varying on syntactic and semantic dimensions: An analysis with event-related potentials. *Memory & Cognition* 23(4). 477–494. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03197249

Mitsugi, Sanako, Brian MacWhinney & Yasuhiro Shirai. 2010. Cue-based processing of relative clauses in L2 Japanese. In Matthew T. Prior, Yukiko Watanabe & Sang-Ki Lee (eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 2008 Second Language Research Forum*, 123–138. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Mitsugi, Sanako & Yasuhiro Shirai. 2017. L1-L2 asymmetry in animacy effects in the processing of Japanese relative clause. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 31(1). 3–30. http://www.lingref.com/cpp/slrf/2008/paper2389.pdf

Miyamoto, Edson T. & Michiko Nakamura. 2003. Subject/object asymmetries in the processing of relative clauses in Japanese. In Gina Garding & Mimu Tsujimura (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22ⁿᵈ West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 22)*, 342–355. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla Press.

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

Ozeki, Hiromi & Yasuhiro Shirai. 2007. Does the noun phrase accessibility hierarchy predict the difficulty order in the acquisition of Japanese relative clauses? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 29(2). 169–196. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263107070106

Özge, Duygu, Theodoros Marinis & Deniz Zeyrek. 2009. Comprehension of subject and object relative clauses in monolingual Turkish children. In Sıla 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/bucld/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

Packard, Jerome L., Zheng Ye & Xiaolin Zhou. 2011. Filler-gap processing in Mandarin relative clauses: Evidence from event-related potentials. In Hiroko Yamashita, Yuki Hirose & Jerome L. Packard (eds.), *Processing and producing head-final structures* (Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics 38), 219–240. Dordrecht: Springer.

Pizarro-Guevara, Jed Sam. 2020. *When human universal meets language specific*. Santa Cruz, CA: University of California Santa Cruz dissertation.

Pizarro-Guevara, Jed Sam & Matthew Wagers. 2020. The predictive value of Tagalog voice morphology in filler-gap dependency formation. *Frontiers in Psychology* 11. 517. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00517

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

Price, Iya K. & Jeffrey Witzel. 2017. Sources of relative clause processing difficulty: Evidence from Russian. *Journal of Memory and Language* 97. 208–244. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2017.07.013

Prideaux, Gary D. & William J. Baker. 1987. *Strategies and structures: The processing of relative clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pu, Ming-Ming. 2007. The distribution of relative clauses in Chinese discourse. *Discourse Processes* 43(1). 25–53. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530709336892

Qiao, Xiaomei, Liyao Shen & Kenneth Forster. 2012. Relative clause processing in Mandarin: Evidence from the maze task. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 27(4). 611–630. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01690965.2011.578394

Quirk, Randolph. 1957. Relative clauses in educated spoken English. *English Studies* 38. 97–109.

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

Reali, Florencia. 2014. Frequency affects object relative clause processing: Some evidence in favor of usage-based accounts. *Language Learning* 64(3). 685–714. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2006.08.014

Roland, Douglas, Frederic Dick & Jeffrey L. Elman. 2007. Frequency of basic English grammatical structures: A corpus analysis. *Journal of Memory and Language* 57(3). 348–379. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2007.03.002

Roland, Douglas, Gail Mauner, Carolyn O'Meara & Hongoak Yun. 2012. Discourse expectations and relative clause processing. *Journal of Memory and Language* 66(3). 479–508. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2011.12.004

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.16.1.06rom

Santi, Andrea, Nino Grillo, Emilia Molimpakis & Michael Wagner. 2019. Processing relative clauses across comprehension and production: Similarities and differences. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience* 34(2). 170–189. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2018.1513539

Schelstraete, Marie-Anne & Liesbeth Degand. 1998. Assignment of grammatical functions in French relative clauses. *Language Science* 29(2). 163–188. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001(97)00031-4

Schriefers, Herbert, Angela D. Friederici & Katja Kühn. 1995. The processing of locally ambiguous relative clauses in German. *Journal of Memory and Language* 34(4). 499–520. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1995.1023

Staub, Adrian, Brian Dillon & Charles Clifton, Jr. 2017. The matrix verb as a source of comprehension difficulty in object relative sentences. *Cognitive Science* 41(Suppl. 6). 1353–1376. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12448

Sun, Xiaoxia, Roeland Hancock, Thomas G. Bever, Xiaoguang Cheng, Lüder Schmidt & Uwe Seifert. 2016. Processing relative clauses in Chinese: Evidence from event-related potentials. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics* 39(1). 92–114. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/cjal-2016-0006

Sung, Yao-Ting, Jung-Yueh Tu, Jih-Ho Cha & Ming-Da Wu. 2016. Processing preference toward object-extracted relative clauses in Mandarin Chinese by L1 and L2 speakers: An eye-tracking study. *Frontiers in Psychology* 7. 4. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00004

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

Tjung, Yassir. 2006. *The formation of relative clauses in Jakarta Indonesian: A subject-object asymmetry*. University of Delaware doctoral thesis.

Traxler, Matthew J., Robin K. Morris & Rachel E. Seely. 2002. Processing subject and object relative clauses: Evidence from eye movements. *Journal of Memory and Language* 47(1). 69–90. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.2001.2836

Traxler, Matthew J., Rihana S. Williams, Shelley A. Blozis & Robin K. Morris. 2005. Working memory, animacy, and verb class in the processing of relative clauses. *Journal of Memory and Language* 53(2). 204–224. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2005.02.010

Ueno, Mieko & Susan M. Garnsey. 2008. An ERP study of the processing of subject and object relative clauses in Japanese. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 23(5). 646–688. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01690960701653501

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

Vasishth, Shravan, Zhong Chen, Qiang Li & Gueilan Guo. 2013. Processing Chinese relative clauses: Evidence for the subject-relative advantage. *PLoS ONE* 8(10). e77006. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077006

Wagers, Matthew W., Manuel F. Borja & Sandra Chung. 2018. Grammatical licensing and relative clause parsing in a flexible word-order language. *Cognition* 178. 207–221. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.05.006

Wang, Hui-Li, Wei Yue, Qiang Li & Jian-Rong Li. 2017. An ERP study of the object preference in processing Chinese relative clauses. *Journal of Electronic Science and Technology* 15(1). 5–19. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.11989/JEST.1674-862X.6051833

Wanner, Eric & Michael Maratsos. 1978. An ATN approach to comprehension. In Joan Bresnan, George Armitage Miller & Morris Halle (eds.), *Linguistic theory and psychological reality*, 119–161. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Waters, Gloria S. & David Caplan. 2001. Age, working memory, and on-line syntactic processing in sentence comprehension. *Psychology and Aging* 16(1). 128–144. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.16.1.128

Weiss, Sabine, Horst M. Mueller, Baerbel Schack, Jonathan W. King, Martha Kutas & Peter Rappelsberger. 2005. Increased neuronal communication accompanying sentence comprehension. *International Journal of Psychophysiology* 57(2). 129–141. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2005.03.013

Wells, Justine B., Morten H. Christiansen, David S. Race & Maryellen C. MacDonald. 2009. Experience and sentence processing: Statistical learning and relative clause comprehension. *Cognitive Psychology* 58(2). 250–271. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2008.08.002

Wu, Fuyun, Elsi Kaiser & Elaine Andersen. 2011. Subject preference, head animacy and lexical cues: A corpus study of relative clauses in Chinese. In Hiroko Yamashita, Yuki Hirose & Jerome L. Packard (eds.), *Processing and producing head-final structures*, 173–193. Dordrecht: Springer.

Wu, Fuyun, Elsi Kaiser & Elaine Andersen. 2012. Animacy effects in Chinese relative clause processing. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 27(10). 1489–1524. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01690965.2011.614423

Wu, Zhaohong & Alan Juffs. 2016. What kind of priming is most effective in the processing of relative clauses in context? In Patrick Farrell (ed.), *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America Annual Meeting (LSA), vol 1,* 37:1–15. Washington DC: Linguistic Society of America. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v1i0.3728

Xia, Vera Yunxiao, Lydia White, Natália Brambatti Guzzo. 2020. Intervention in relative clauses: Effects of relativized minimality on L2 representation and processing. *Second Language Research. OnlineFirst.* DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658320958742

Xiong, Yanyu, Laurent Dekydtspotter & Sharlene Newman. 2019. When embeddedness matters: Electrophysiological evidence for the role of head noun position in Chinese relative clause processing. *Journal of Neurolinguistics* 51. 236–257. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2019.03.005

Xu, Kunyu & Jeng-Ren Duann. 2020. Brain connectivity in the left frontotemporal network dynamically modulated by processing difficulty: Evidence from Chinese relative clauses. *PLoS ONE* 15(4). e0230666. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0230666

Xu, Kunyu, Jeng-Ren Duann, Daisy L. Hung & Denise H. Wu. 2019. Preference for object relative clauses in Chinese sentence comprehension: Evidence from online self-paced reading time. *Frontiers in Psychology* 10. 2210. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02210

Yabuki-Soh, Noriko. 2013. Types of Japanese noun-modifying clauses used in JFL textbooks. *American Association of Teachers of Japanese* 47(1). 59–92.

Yang, Chin Lung & Charles A. Perfetti. 2006. Contextual constraints on the comprehension of relative clause sentences in Chinese: ERPs evidence. *Language and Linguistics* 7(3). 697–730. http://www.ling.sinica.edu.tw/Files/LL/Docments/Journals/7.3/j2006_3_05_2853.pdf

Yang, Chin Lung, Charles A. Perfetti & Ying Liu. 2010. Sentence integration processes: An ERP study of Chinese sentence comprehension with relative clauses. *Brain and Language* 112(2). 85–100. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2009.10.005

Yang, Fang, Lun Mo & Max M. Louwerse. 2013. Effects of local and global context on processing sentences with subject and object relative clauses. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 42(3). 227–237. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-012-9215-5

Yang, Xie-lan & Wen-guang He. 2020. Argument ambiguities make subject relative clause more difficult to process than object relative clause in Mandarin. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies* 10(2). 102–113. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5836/2020.02.003

Yao, Yun. 2018. Processing relative clauses in Chinese as a second language. In Xiaohong Wen & Xin Jiang (eds.), *Studies on learning and teaching Chinese as a second language*, 105–128. London: Routledge.

Yuan, Boping & Yang Zhao. 2005. Resumptive pronouns in English-Chinese and Arabic-Chinese interlanguages. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 43(3). 219–237. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2005.43.3.219