

Supplementary File 6: Data set for Figure 8. Summary of L2 studies

This appendix includes data sources for Figure 8 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.

L2 studies often adopt pretest-posttest designs, in which they test the effects of instructional interventions. If the study specifically tested whether the learners were able to generalize their knowledge of ORCs to SRCs or vice versa, we indicate so with †. For studies that tested knowledge of other positions (usually object of comparison), we include only the pretest results for the sake of simplicity.

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 ‡.

If there are more than three L1s in the participant group, L1 background is noted as “various.” For children and adolescents, the age range is indicated in parentheses. Results from native speaker controls are not included in the following table but can be found in Supplementary Files 1 and 2 unless they performed at ceiling.

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

L2	Study	Domain	Method	L1	Population	Results
Dutch	Havik et al. 2009	C	self-paced reading	German	adults (high working memory)	S > O
		C	self-paced reading	German	adults (low working memory)	S = O
		C	self-paced reading	German	adults	S = O
	Jackson & Roberts 2010	C	self-paced reading	German	adults	S > O
		C	acceptability judgment	German	adults	S > O
German, Portuguese	Tarallo & Myhill 1983	C	grammatical judgment	English	adults	S > O

L2	Study	Domain	Method	L1	Population	Results
English	Cook 1973	C	elicited imitation	various	adults	S = O
	Ioup & Kruse 1977	C	grammaticality judgment	various	adults	S = O
	Gass 1979	P	sentence combination	various	adults	S > O
	Gass 1980	P	free composition	various	adults	S > O
		P	sentence combination	various	adults	S > O
	Schumann 1980)	P	spontaneous speech	Italian, Spanish	children (5–10), adolescents (13), adults	*S > O
	Gass 1982†	C	grammaticality judgment‡	various	adults	*S = O
		C	sentence combination	Arabic, Japanese, Spanish	adults	S > O
	Gass 1983	P	free composition (written narrative)	various	adults	S > O
		P	sentence combination	various	adults	S > O
	Pavesi 1986	P	elicited production	Italian	adults	S > O
	Eckman et al. 1988†	P	sentence combination	various	adults	S > O
	Hansen-Strain & Strain 1989	C	act out	various	adults	*S > O
		C	grammatical judgment	various	adults	*S = O
		P	elicited production	various	adults	*S > O
		P	oral retelling	various	adults	*S > O
		P	written retelling	various	adults	*S > O
		P	essay	various	adults	*S > O
		P	sentence combination	various	adults	*S > O
	Doughty 1991	C, P	grammatical judgment, sentence combination, sentence completion, oral production	various	adults	S > O
	Hamilton 1994†	P	sentence combination	not reported	adults	S = O
	Sadighi & Jafarpur 1994	C	multiple choice	Persian	adults	S > O
	Aarts & Schils 1995	P	sentence combination	Dutch	adults	O > S

L2	Study	Domain	Method	L1	Population	Results
English (cont'd)	Izumi 2003	C	grammatical judgment	various	adults	S > O
		P	sentence combination	various	adults	S > O
		P	picture selection	various	adults	S = O
	Chang 2004	P	free writing	Chinese	adults	O > S
	Ammar & Lightbown 2005†	C, P	grammatical judgment, sentence combination	Arabic	adults	S > O
	Mellow 2006	P	picture narration	Spanish	child (12)	S > O
	Packard 2008	C	self-paced reading	Mandarin	adults	S > O
	Marefat & Rahmany 2009	C	reading comprehension	Persian	adults	S > O
	Wang et al. 2011		self-paced reading	Mandarin	adults	S > O
	Abdolmanafi & Rahmani 2012	P	sentence combination test	Persian	adults	S > O
	Baek 2012	C	self-paced reading	Korean	adults	S > O
		C	self-paced reading	Korean	adults	S > O
		C	self-paced reading	Korean	adults	S > O
	Bulut et al. 2013	C	eye tracking while reading	Turkish	adults	S > O
	Duffeler & Coene 2014	C	character selection	French	adults	S = O
	Juffs & Rodriguez 2014	C	self-paced reading	Spanish	adults	S > O
		C	reading longer texts	Spanish	adults	S > O
	Hitz & Francis 2016	C	acceptability judgment	Chinese	adults	S = O
		C	acceptability judgment	Turkish	adults	S > O
	Kang 2016	C	grammaticality judgment	Korean	adults	S = O
		P	elicited imitation	Korean	adults	S > O
	Song 2016	C	grammaticality judgment	Mandarin	adults	*O > S
		P	sentence combination	Mandarin	adults	*O > S
	Choe & Deen 2020	C	self-paced reading	Korean	adults	S > O
	Malaiappan & Wong 2020	C	grammatical judgment	Mandarin	adults	S > O

L2	Study	Domain	Method	L1	Population	Results
English (cont'd)	Nasrollahi Shahri et al. 2020	C	self-paced reading	Farsi	adults	S > O
	Xia et al. 2020	C	picture selection	Mandarin	adults	S > O
		C	self-paced reading	Mandarin	adults	S > O
French	Hawkins 1989	P	cloze	English	adults	S > O
Hindi	Hansen 1986	C	act out	English	children (4–9), adults	S = O
Italian	Croteau 1995†	P	sentence combination / grammaticality judgment (post-test)	English	adults	S > O
Japanese	Roberts 2000	C	multiple choice	English, Marshallese, Portuguese	adults	O > S
		P	sentence combination	English, Marshallese, Portuguese	adults	S > O
	Hasegawa 2007	C	character selection	various	children, adolescents (10–17), adults	*O > S
		P	elicited production	various	children, adolescents (10–17), adults	*S > O
	Kanno 2007	C	character selection	Chinese, Sinhalese	adults	S = O
		C	character selection	Indonesian, Thai, Vietnamese	adults	S > O
	Ozeki and Shirai 2007	P	sentence combination	Cantonese	adults	S = O
		P	naturalistic speech (OPI)	Chinese, English	adults	O > S
		P	naturalistic speech (OPI)	Korean	adults	S > O
	Yabuki-Soh 2007	C	comprehension	various	adults	O > S
		P	sentence combination	various	adults	S > O
	Mitsugi et al. 2010	C	self-paced reading	English	adults	S = O
		C	self-paced reading	Korean	adults	S > O
	Kahraman 2012	C	self-paced reading	Turkish	adults	S > O
	Mitsugi & Shirai 2017	C	self-paced reading	English	adults	S = O
		C	self-paced reading	Korean	adults	S > O

L2	Study	Domain	Method	L1	Population	Results
Korean	O'Grady et al. 2000	C	character selection	English	adults	S > O
	O'Grady et al. 2001	C	character selection	English	adults	S > O
	O'Grady et al. 2003	C	character selection	English	adults	S > O
	Jeon & Kim 2007	P	elicited production	English	adults	S > O
Mandarin, Japanese, Persian	Tarallo & Myhill 1983	C	grammatical judgment	English	adults	O > S
Mandarin	Yuan & Zhao 2005‡	C	acceptability judgment	Arabic-Palestinian	adults	O > S
		C	acceptability judgment	English	adults	O > S
	Hu & Liu 2007	C	grammatical judgment	English, Korean	adults	O > S
	Packard 2008	C	self-paced reading	English	adults	O > S
	Cui 2013	C	self-paced reading	English, French, Spanish	adults	S > O
		C	self-paced reading	Japanese, Korean	adults	S = O
	Xu 2013	C	listening comprehension	English	adults	S > O
	Xu 2014a	C	sentence combination	English	adults	S = O
	Xu 2014b	C	timed reading + grammaticality judgment	English	adults	S > O
	Li et al. 2016	C	self-paced reading	various	adults	S > O
	Sung et al. 2016	C	eye-tracking while reading	Japanese	adults	O > S
	Lam 2017	C	picture selection	Written Chinese	children (6;11–12;8)	O < S
		C	dot connecting	Written Chinese	children (6;11–12;8)	O < S
		P	elicited production	Written Chinese	children (6;11–12;8)	S = O
	Yao 2018	C	self-paced reading	head-initial languages	adults	O > S
		C	self-paced reading	head-final languages	adults	O > S
Spanish	Sánchez-Walker & Montrul 2016	C	picture selection	English	adults	S = O
Swedish	Hyltenstam 1984‡	P	elicited production	various	adults	S > O

L2	Study	Domain	Method	L1	Population	Results
Turkish	Altan 2016	P	free writing / speech	European	adults	S > O
	Aydin 2007	C	character selection	Japanese, Korean, English	adults	S > O
		C	character selection	Japanese, Korean, English	adults	S = O

References

- Aarts, Flor & Erik Schils. 1995. Relative clauses, the accessibility hierarchy and the contrastive analysis hypothesis. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 33(1). 47–63. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1995.33.1.47>
- Abdolmanafi, Seyed Jalal & Zeinolabedin Rahmani. 2012. An investigation of the learnability of relative clauses by EFL learners. *World Journal of English Language* 2(3). 29–37. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v2n3p29>
- Altan, Aslı. 2016. Relative clauses in L2 Turkish. *Mersin University Journal of Linguistics and Literature* 13(1). 1–39.
- Ammar, Ahlem & Patsy M. Lightbown. 2005. Teaching marked linguistic structures: More about the acquisition of relative clauses by Arab learners of English. In Alex Housen & Michael Pierrard (eds.), *Investigations in instructed second language learning*, 167–198. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197372.2.167>
- Aydin, Özgür. 2007. The comprehension of Turkish relative clauses in second language acquisition and agrammatism. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 28(2). 295–315. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716407070154>
- Baek, Soondo. 2012. *Processing of English relative clauses by adult L2 learners*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign dissertation.
- Bulut, Talat, Huseyin Uysal & Denise Hsien Wu. 2013. Processing asymmetry between subject and object relative clauses in English as a second language. *Dilbilim Dergisi [Journal of Linguistics]* 29(1). 45–68.
- Chang, Yuh-Fang. 2004. Second language relative clause acquisition: An examination of cross-linguistic influences. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Portland, 1–4 May 2004. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED491511>
- Choe, Jinsun & Kamil Deen. 2020. Pronoun advantage in L2 relative clause processing. In Megan M. Brown & Alexandra Kohut (eds.), *Proceedings of the 44th Boston University Conference on Language Development (BUCLD)*, 105–113. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadia Press. <http://www.lingref.com/buclid/44/BUCLD44-09.pdf>
- 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>
- Croteau, Karen C. 1995. Second language acquisition of relative clause structures by learners of Italian. In Fred R. Eckman, Diane Highland, Peter W. Lee, Jean Milham & Rita Rutkowski Weber (eds.), *Second language acquisition theory and pedagogy*, 115–128. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315044903>
- Cui, Yaqiong. 2013. L2 Processing of relative clauses in Mandarin. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching* 39. 20–39.

- Doughty, Catherine. 1991. Second language instruction does make a difference: Evidence from an empirical study of SL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13(4). 431–469. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100010287>
- Duffeler, Marie-Anne & Martine Coene. 2014. Comprehension of relative clauses by L2 learners of English: No asymmetry and puzzling prepositions. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 2. 119–132.
- Eckman, Fred R., Lawrence Bell & Diane Nelson. 1988. On the generalization of relative clause instruction in the acquisition of English as a second language. *Applied Linguistics* 9(1). 1–20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/9.1.1>
- Gass, Susan. 1979. Language transfer and universal grammatical relations. *Language Learning* 29(2). 327–344. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1979.tb01073.x>
- Gass, Susan. 1980. An investigation of syntactic transfer in adult L2 learners. In Robin C. Scarcella & Stephen D. Crain (eds.), *Research in second language acquisition: Selected papers of the Los Angeles Second Language Acquisition Research Forum*, 132–141. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Gass, Susan. 1982. From theory to practice. In Mary Hines & William E. Rutherford (eds.), *On TESOL '81: Selected papers from the Fifteenth Annual Conference of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages*, 129–139. Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Gass, Susan. 1983. Second-language acquisition and language universals. In Robert J. Di Pietro, William Frawley & Alfred Wedel (eds.), *The First Delaware Symposium on Language Studies: Selected papers*, 249–260. Newark, New Jersey: Associated Presses.
- Hamilton, Robert L. 1994. Is implicational generalization unidirectional and maximal? Evidence from relativization instruction in a second language. *Language Learning* 44(1). 123–157. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01451.x>
- Hansen, Lynne. 1986. Universals in relative clause acquisition: Evidence from child and adult L1 and L2 learners of Hindi-Urdu. *Language Learning* 36(2). 143–157. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1986.tb00376.x>
- Hansen-Strain, Lynne & Jeris E. Strain. 1989. Variation in the relative clauses of Japanese learners. *Journal of the Japan Association of Language Teachers* 11(2). 211–237.
- Hasegawa, Tomomi. 2007. *The critical period hypothesis in very early child L2 acquisition of Japanese: The uninevitability of native-like attainment*. Honolulu, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa dissertation.
- 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>
- Hawkins, Roger. 1989. Do second language learners acquire restrictive relative clauses on the basis of relational or configurational information? The acquisition of French subject, direct object and genitive restrictive relative clauses by second language learners. *Second Language Research* 5(2). 156–188. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/026765838900500204>
- 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>
- Hu, Xiaoling & Chuanping Liu. 2007. Restrictive relative clauses in English and Korean learners' second language. *Second Language Research* 23(3). 263–287. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658307077642>

- Hyltenstam, Kenneth. 1984. The use of typological markedness conditions as predictors in second language acquisition: The case of pronominal copies in relative clauses. In Roger W. Andersen (ed.), *Second languages: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 39–58. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Ioup, Georgette & Anna Kruse. 1977. Interference versus structural complexity as a predictor of second language relative clause acquisition. In Carol Alice Henning (ed.), *Proceedings of the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum*, 48–60. Los Angeles: University of California Los Angeles.
- Izumi, Shinichi. 2003. Processing difficulty in comprehension and production of relative clauses by learners of English as a second language. *Language Learning* 53(2). 285–323. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00218>
- Jackson, Carrie N. & Leah Roberts. 2010. Animacy affects the processing of subject-object ambiguities in the second language: Evidence from self-paced reading with German second language learners of Dutch. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 31(4). 671–691. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716410000196>
- Jeon, K. Seon & Hae-Young Kim. 2007. Development of relativization in Korean as a foreign language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 29(2). 253–276. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263107070131>
- 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. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203096147>
- Kahraman, Barış. 2012. Sentence processing of nominative-genitive conversion in Japanese by Turkish speaking learners and native speakers. In Yukio Otsu (ed.), *Proceedings of 13th Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
- Kang, Hyun Sook. 2016. Subject-object asymmetry in the second language acquisition of English relatives and embedded *wh*-questions. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 45(6). 1389–1406. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-015-9410-2>
- Kanno, Kazue. 2007. Factors affecting the processing of Japanese relative clauses by L2 learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 29(2). 197–218. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263107070118>
- Lam, Scholastica Wai Sze. 2017. Acquisition of Chinese relative clauses by deaf children in Hong Kong. *Language and Linguistics* 18(1). 72–115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/lali.18.1.03lam>
- Li, Qiang, Xiaoyu Guo, Yiru Yao & Nicole Müller. 2016. Relative clause preference in learners of Chinese as a second language. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics* 39(2). 199–215. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/cjal-2016-0013>
- Malaiappan, Vignesuvary & Bee Eng Wong. 2020. Acquisition of English relative clauses by Malaysian L1 Tamil speakers. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities* 28(1). 121–142.
- Marefat, Hamideh & Ramin Rahmany. 2009. Acquisition of English relative clauses by Persian EFL learners. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 5(2). 21–48.
- Mellow, J. Dean. 2006. The emergence of second language syntax: A case study of the acquisition of relative clauses. *Applied Linguistics* 27(4). 645–670. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml031>
- 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: Cascadia 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. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/jjl-2015-0102>
- Nasrollahi Shahri, Navid, Masoud Motamedynia & Mohammad Ghazanfari. 2020. An investigation of accuracy and response time regarding processing mechanism of English relative clauses in EFL contexts. *Studies in English Language and Education* 7(1). 129–140. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i1.15350>
- O’Grady, William, Miseon Lee & Miho Choo. 2000. The acquisition of relative clauses in Korean as a second language. *The Korean Language in America* 5(2). 345–356.
- O’Grady, William, Miseon Lee & Miho Choo. 2001. The acquisition of relative clauses by heritage and non-heritage learners of Korean as a second language: A comparative study. *Journal of Korean Language Education* 12. 283–294.
- O’Grady, William, Miseon Lee & Miho Choo. 2003. A subject-object asymmetry in the acquisition of relative clauses in Korean as a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 25(3). 433–448. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263103000172>
- 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. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263107070106>
- Packard, Jerome L. 2008. Relative clause processing in L2 speakers of Mandarin and English. *Zhongguo yu wen jiao shi xue hui xue bao [Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association]* 43(2). 107–146.
- Pavesi, Maria. 1986. Markedness, discoursal modes, and relative clause formation in a formal and an informal context. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 8(1). 38–55. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100005829>
- Roberts, Michael A. 2000. *Implicational markedness and the acquisition of relativization by adult learners of Japanese as a foreign language*. Honolulu, Hawai‘i: University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa dissertation.
- Sadighi, Firooz & Abdoljavad Jafarpur. 1994. Is there a role for learner treatment in comprehending relative clauses? *RELC Journal* 25(1). 56–74. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829402500103>
- Sánchez-Walker, Noelia & Silvina A. Montrul. 2016. Comprehension of subject and object relative clauses by second language learners of Spanish. In Anahí Alba de la Fuente, Elena Valenzuela & Cristina Martínez Sanz (eds.), *Language acquisition beyond parameters: Studies in honour of Juana M. Licerias* (Studies in Bilingualism), 149–185. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.51.07san>
- Schumann, John H. 1980. The acquisition of English relative clauses by second language learners. In Robin C. Scarcella & Stephen D. Krashen (eds.), *Research in second language acquisition: Selected papers from the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Song, Tiehua. 2016. Study on Chinese college EFL learners’ comprehension and production of English relative clauses: Testing three hypotheses. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics* 39(1). 26–37. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/cjal-2016-0002>
- 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: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00004>

- Tarallo, Fernando & John Myhill. 1983. Interference and natural language processing in second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 33(1). 55–76. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1983.tb00986.x>
- Wang, Huili, Lijing Yin & Qiang Li. 2011. Research into processing mechanism of English relative clause by Chinese English learners. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 2(21). 49–58.
- 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>
- Xu, Yi. 2013. Acquisition of Chinese relative clauses at the initial stage. In István Kecskés (ed.), *Research in Chinese as a second language* (Trends in Applied Linguistics), 215–234. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614512554>
- Xu, Yi. 2014a. Evidence of the accessibility hierarchy in relative clauses in Chinese as a second language. *Language and Linguistics* 15(3). 435–464. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1606822X14520666>
- Xu, Yi. 2014b. Processing relative clauses in Chinese as a second language. *Second Language Research* 30(4). 439–461. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658313511485>
- Yabuki-Soh, Noriko. 2007. Teaching relative clauses in Japanese: Exploring alternative types of instruction and the projection effect. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 29(2). 219–252. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s027226310707012x>
- 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. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351208673-6>
- 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>