

### Supplementary File 7. Data set for Figure 9. Summary of studies on heritage languages

This appendix includes data sources for Figure 9 in the main text, ordered alphabetically by heritage language. 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. The results reported below reflect the results supported by the statistical tests used in the original study.

Children’s age information is reported in parentheses. Results of non-heritage controls, if any, 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)

Heritage language	Majority language	Study	Domain	Method	Population	Results
Arabic-Egyptian	English	Albirini & Benmamoun 2014	P	narrative	adults	S > O
Arabic-Palestinian	English	Albirini & Benmamoun 2014	P	narrative	adults	S > O
Arabic-Levantine	English	Albirini 2018	C	picture selection	children (5;03–5;09)	S > O
Korean	English	O’Grady et al. 2001	C	character selection	adults	S > O
		Lee-Ellis 2011	P	elicited production	adults	S = O
Russian	English	Polinsky 2008	C	picture selection	adults	S > O
					children ( $M = 7;5$ )	ceiling
		Polinsky 2011	C	picture selection	adults	S > O
					children ( $M = 6.2$ )	ceiling
Spanish	English	Stern et al. 2019	C	picture selection (VWP)	adults	S > O

### References

- Albirini, Abdulkafi. 2018. The role of age of exposure to English in the development of Arabic as a heritage language in the United States. *Language Acquisition* 25(2). 178–196. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10489223.2016.1234620>
- Albirini, Abdulkafi & Elabbas Benmamoun. 2014. Aspects of second-language transfer in the oral production of Egyptian and Palestinian heritage speakers. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 18(3). 244–273. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263110000768>

- Lee-Ellis, Sunyoung. 2011. The elicited production of Korean relative clauses by heritage speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 33(1). 57–89. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263110000537>
- 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.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2008. Relative clauses in heritage Russian: Fossilization or divergent grammar. In Andrei Antonenko, John F. Bailyn & Christina Y. Bethin (eds.), *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Stony Brook Meeting 2007*, 333–358. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- 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>
- Stern, Michael C., Christen N. Madsen, LeeAnn M. Stover, Cass Lowry & Gita Martohardjono. 2019. Language history attenuates syntactic prediction in L1 processing. *Journal of Cultural Cognitive Science* 3(2). 235–255. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41809-019-00048-y>