The D(emonstrative)-construction: a newly-identified left-dislocated configuration in Spanish. Appendix C

Gabrielle Isgar
Florida State University
gisgar@fsu.edu

Antje Muntendam
Florida State University
amuntendam@fsu.edu

Lara Reglero
Florida State University
lreglero@fsu.edu

Received: 23-02-2024
Accepted: 11-04-2024
Published: 07-06-2024

How to cite: Isgar, Gabrielle, Muntendam, Antje & Lara Reglero. 2024. The D(emonstrative)-construction: a newly-identified left-dislocated configuration in Spanish. Appendix C. *Isogloss. Open Journal of Romance Linguistics* 10(1)/5, 1-11.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/isogloss.369

APPENDIX C

In this Appendix, we report the standardized *z*-scores (means and standard deviations) by participant for the role of the left dislocate, case connectivity, subject-verb inversion, embedding, recursivity, and sensitivity to syntactic island constraints. Positive average z-scores were interpreted as acceptance of a given property.

In order to determine whether there were significant differences between the average *z*-scores for the D-construction items (a) with fronted PPs vs. DPs for items with fronted objects

of prepositions, (b) with case connectivity vs. without case connectivity for items with fronted objects, and (c) with vs. without subject-verb inversion, we ran a series of one-sided independent samples *t*-tests for the group and then by participant. Only significant findings are reported. Cohen's *d* effect sizes were classified as small ($d = 0.2$), moderate/medium ($d = 0.5$) or large ($d \geq 0.8$). We did not conduct *t*-tests for embedding, recursivity and sensitivity to island constraints due to the limited number of items per condition ($n = 4$), and to the fact that we were not interested in mean comparisons based on construction type for these properties.

C.1. The role of the left dislocate: *z*-score analysis

Table 7 presents the standardized *z*-scores for the D-construction items designed to test for the role of the d-pronoun by participant (21 participants x 8 items = 168 tokens). Three out of 21 participants (14%) showed no differences in their ratings, 9 out of 21 participants (43%) demonstrated positive average *z*-scores for the D-construction items with fronted DPs (like HTLD), and 9 out of 21 participants (43%) demonstrated positive average *z*-scores for the D-construction items with fronted PPs (like CLLD).

Table 7. Standardized *z*-scores for the D-construction items with fronted DPs vs. fronted PPs per participant.

	Fronted DPs (*n* = 4)		**Fronted PPs (*n* = 4)**	
ID#	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***
N1	0.42	0.46	-0.42	1.28
N2	-0.36	1	0.36	0.99
N3	0.23	0.47	-0.23	1.4
N4	0.135	0.92	-0.135	1.2
N5	0.28	1.28	-0.28	0.71
N6	-0.11	1.33	0.11	0.73
N7	0	1.42	0	0.56
N8	0.42	0.54	-0.42	1.25
N9	0	1.04	0	1.12
N10	-0.13	1.46	0.13	0.41
N11	-0.504	1.1	0.50	0.67
N12	0.44	1.15	-0.44	0.68
N13	-0.72	0.97	0.72	0
N14	0.6	0.61	-0.6	1
N15	0.18	0.46	-0.18	1.43
N16	-0.44	0.29	0.44	1.32
N17	0.28	0.65	-0.28	1.3
N18	-0.25	1.12	0.25	0.96
N19	-1.37	0	-1.37	0
N20	-0.54	0.81	0.54	0.95
N21	-0.11	1.03	0.11	1.12

The differences were significant for N14 ($t(6) = 2.07$, $p = 0.047$, $d = 1.71$), who preferred fronted DPs, and N13 ($t(6) = -3$, $p = 0.029$, $d = 0.35$), who preferred fronted PPs. Overall, these findings, which show that the D-construction was accepted with both fronted DPs and PPs, are in line with those presented in the main text (Section 6.2.1).

C.2. Case connectivity: *z*-score analysis

Table 8 presents the standardized *z*-scores for the D-construction items designed to test for case connectivity by participant (21 participants x 23 items = 483 tokens). 11 out of 21 participants (53%) had positive average *z*-scores for the D-construction items without case connectivity (like HTLD), and 10 out of 21 participants (47%) had positive average z-scores for the D-construction items with case connectivity (like CLLD).

Table 8. Standardized *z*-scores for D-construction items with case connectivity vs. without case connectivity per participant.

	Without case connectivity (*n* = 12)		**With case connectivity (*n* = 11)**	
ID#	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***
N1	-0.05	0.84	0.06	1.19
N2	-0.11	1.07	0.13	0.95
N3	0.12	1.02	-0.14	1
N4	0.11	1.06	-0.12	0.96
N5	0.21	1.07	-0.23	0.91
N6	-0.19	0.87	0.21	1.12
N7	-0.16	0.93	0.18	1.12
N8	-0.08	0.99	0.09	1.06
N9	0.08	1.06	-0.09	0.97
N10	-0.39	0.51	0.43	1.24
N11	0.19	1.16	-0.2	0.79
N12	0.1	1.09	-0.1	0.93
N13	-0.01	1.05	0.014	0.99
N14	0.23	0.95	-0.23	1.04
N15	0.08	0.99	-0.09	1.06
N16	-0.14	1.04	0.15	0.98
N17	0.2	1.05	-0.2	0.94
N18	0.11	1.12	-0.12	0.88
N19	-0.1	0.85	0.11	1.17
N20	-0.25	0.96	0.27	1.02
N21	0.09	1.07	-0.1	0.96

The difference in mean *z*-scores was only significant for N10, who demonstrated higher ratings for D-construction items without case connectivity ($t(21) = -2.03$, $p = 0.03$, $d = 1.83$). Overall, the findings revealed that D-construction items were accepted both with and without case connectivity and that there was individual variation, in line with the findings presented in the main text (Section 6.2.2).

C.3. Subject-verb inversion: *z*-score analysis

Table 9 presents the standardized *z*-scores for the D-construction items designed to test for subject-verb inversion by participant (21 participants x 8 items = 168 tokens). Two out of 21 (9.5%) participants gave an average *z*-score of 0 to items testing for subject-verb inversion, showing no preference. Four out of 21 participants (19.5%) had positive average *z*-scores for the D-construction items with subject-verb order (like HTLD and CLLD), and 15 out of 21 participants (71%) had positive average *z*-scores for the D-construction items with verb-subject order (like FF).

Table 9. Standardized *z*-scores for D-construction items with verb-subject vs. subject-verb order per participant.

	VS (*n* = 4)		**SV (*n* = 4)**	
ID#	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***
N1	0.32	0.65	-0.32	1.27
N2	0.29	1.23	-0.29	0.76
N3	-0.05	1.12	0.05	1.03
N4	0.5	1.04	-0.5	0.77
N5	0.13	1.27	-0.13	0.82
N6	-0.21	1.42	0.21	0.42
N7	0.38	0.97	-0.38	1.01
N8	-0.15	1.43	0.15	0.49
N9	0	1.42	0	0.56
N10	0.32	0.81	-0.32	1.19
N11	0.43	1.17	-0.43	0.69
N12	0.5	1.29	-0.5	0
N13	0.25	1.47	-0.25	0
N14	0	1.46	0	0.44
N15	0.43	1.08	-0.43	0.82
N16	0.08	1.07	-0.08	1.08
N17	0.25	0.76	-0.25	1.26
N18	-0.19	0.49	0.19	1.41
N19	0.35	1.41	-0.35	0
N20	0.19	1.36	-0.19	0.63

N21	0.14	1.05	-0.14	1.09

An independent samples *t*-test with all participants' data combined revealed significant differences in the average *z*-score ratings for the D-construction items with SV vs. VS order ($t(174) = 2.9$, $p = 0.002$, $d = 0.92$), with higher ratings for VS ($M = 0.2$, $SD = 1.04$) than SV ($M = -0.2$, $SD = 0.78$).

It should be noted that the items designed to test for this property also varied in case connectivity. Based on an independent samples t-test, group ratings were significantly higher ($t(86) = 4.03$, $p < 0.001$, $d = 0.96$) for items with VS order without case connectivity ($M = 0.61$, $SD = 1.16$) than for items with SV order without case connectivity ($M = -0.21$, $SD = 0.71$). This signaled a global preference for D-construction items with VS order when the left dislocate was a hanging topic.

Overall, these results revealed a preference for D-construction items with inversion (i.e., verb-subject order) that was not attested in Section 6.2.3. At the same time, the fact that some participants accepted the D-construction without subject-verb inversion confirmed that this may not be required, which does support the findings in Section 6.2.3. Further investigation of the D-construction with more items per condition, considering both subject-verb inversion and case connectivity, is needed.

C.4. Embedding: *z*-score analysis

Table 10 presents the standardized *z*-scores for the D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in embedded contexts by participant (21 participants x 13 items = 273 tokens). Four out of 21 (19.5%) participants had positive average *z*-scores for D-construction items in embedded contexts. 19 out of 21 (90%) participants had positive average *z*-scores for embedded instances of CLLD, 7 out of 21 (33%) participants had positive average *z*-scores for HTLD in embedded contexts, and 5 out of 21 (24%) participants had positive average *z*-scores for FF in embedded contexts. Overall, CLLD may be embedded, but not the D-construction, HTLD nor FF. These results are in line with the analysis presented in Section 6.2.4 for all constructions.

Table 10. Standardized *z*-scores for D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in embedded contexts per participant.

	D-construction (*n* = 4)		**CLLD (*n* = 3)**		**HTLD (*n* = 3)**		**FF (*n* = 3)**	
ID#	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***
N1	-0.61	0.24	1.01	1.53	-0.26	0.82	0.06	0.73
N2	-0.21	0.32	0.17	0.37	0.17	0.74	-0.05	2.23
N3	-0.32	0.91	-0.02	0.84	-0.5	0.73	0.95	1.26
N4	-0.51	1	0.81	0.58	-0.55	0.68	0.42	1.22
N5	-0.64	0	0.98	1.75	0.05	0.69	-0.18	0.4
N6	0.37	0.5	0.42	0.8	-0.99	0.3	0.07	1.7
N7	0.26	0.54	0.48	1.39	0.03	1.02	-0.85	1.02

N8	-0.4	0.87	1.12	0.49	-0.01	0.98	-0.58	0.98
N9	-0.21	1.08	1.05	0.62	-0.21	1.08	-0.57	0.62
N10	-0.41	0	1.37	1.54	-0.41	0	-0.41	0
N11	-0.58	0	1.02	0.39	-1.03	0.79	0.79	0.68
N12	0.42	0.76	0.9	1.28	-0.73	0.51	-0.73	0.26
N13	0.24	1.05	-0.11	1.27	0.17	0.48	-0.39	1.45
N14	-0.19	0.49	1.23	1.52	-0.19	0	-0.79	0
N15	-0.78	0.36	1.06	0.22	0.31	0.94	-0.32	1.30
N16	-0.34	0.73	1.07	1.22	-0.06	1.12	-0.55	0.28
N17	-0.29	0.4	0.31	1.37	0.31	1.37	-0.22	1.21
N18	-0.32	0.9	0.62	1	0.19	0.9	-0.39	1.39
N19	-0.34	0.56	1.65	0	-0.6	0.23	-0.6	0.23
N20	-0.54	0.56	1.42	0.26	-0.65	0	-0.06	1.11
N21	-0.37	1	0.91	1.02	-0.21	0.67	-0.21	1.16

C.5. Recursivity: *z*-score analysis

Table 11 presents the standardized *z*-scores for the D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in recursive contexts by participant (21 participants x 11 items = 231 tokens). Two out of 21 participants (10%) demonstrated positive average *z*-scores for recursive instances of the D-construction, and 19 out of 21 (90%) participants demonstrated positive average *z*-scores for recursive instances of CLLD. For recursive instances of HTLD, two out of 21 participants (10%) had an average *z*-score of 0, and 9 out of 21 (43%) participants demonstrated positive average *z*-scores. Finally, 13 out of 21 participants (62%) demonstrated positive average *z*-scores for recursive instances of FF. Based on this analysis, both CLLD and FF are recursive, whereas HTLD is close to our threshold of 50% acceptance. The D-construction is non-recursive.

The findings for FF differ from those based on the analysis presented in Section 6.2.5, where FF was not found to be recursive. The relatively high acceptance of FF in recursive contexts by some participants could be due to the complexity and length of some of the FF items in our study. Specifically, it could be that some participants did not interpret the two fronted elements in some of these items as contrastive focus elements.

Table 11. Standardized z-scores for D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in recursive contexts per participant.

	D-construction (*n* = 4)		**CLLD (*n* = 2)**		**HTLD (*n* = 2)**		**FF (*n* = 3)**	
ID#	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***
N1	-0.53	0.00	1.09	2.30	-0.21	0.46	0.12	0.65
N2	-0.79	0	1.19	1.68	0	0	0.26	0.91

N3	-0.96	0.42	0.93	0.63	-0.40	0.63	0.93	0.44
N4	-0.98	0.32	1.11	0	0.79	0.45	0.04	0.98
N5	-0.67	0	0.55	1.72	0.55	0	0.15	1.41
N6	-1.05	0	1.43	0	-0.02	0.88	0.46	0.24
N7	-0.11	1.04	1.10	1.47	0.06	0	-0.63	0.69
N8	-0.55	0.66	1.10	0.93	0.22	0.93	-0.15	1.27
N9	-0.51	0.52	1.26	0.39	0.17	1.93	-0.28	0.63
N10	-0.49	0	1.12	2.27	-0.49	0	0.23	0.62
N11	-0.75	0.86	1.12	0.53	0	0	0.25	1.14
N12	-0.53	0.55	1.41	0	0.85	0.78	-0.8	0
N13	0.17	0.74	1.28	1.05	-0.20	1.05	-0.94	0
N14	0.25	0.92	0.79	2.06	-0.66	0	-0.42	0.42
N15	-0.55	0.23	-0.43	0.32	0.47	1.60	0.70	1.36
N16	-0.48	0.36	1.52	0	-0.66	0	0.07	1.26
N17	-0.90	1.13	0.79	0	0.22	0.80	0.53	0.22
N18	-0.49	0.26	0.70	0.37	-0.36	0.37	0.43	1.84
N19	-0.44	0	2	0.49	-0.44	0	-0.44	0
N20	-0.85	0	1.50	0.47	-0.18	0.95	0.26	0.78
N21	-0.3	0	-0.3	0	1.36	2.35	-0.3	0

C.6. Sensitivity to syntactic island constraints: *z*-score analysis

Table 12 presents the standardized *z*-scores for the D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in *wh*-island contexts by participant. 15 out of 21 participants (71%) had positive average *z*-scores for instances of the D-construction in *wh*-island contexts, and 20 out of 21 (95%) participants had positive average *z*-scores for instances of CLLD in *wh*-island contexts. Moreover, 12 out of 21 participants (57%) had positive average *z*-scores for instances of HTLD in *wh*-island contexts, and 15 out of 21 participants (71%) had positive average *z*-scores for instances of FF in *wh*-island contexts. Overall, all constructions were insensitive to *wh*-islands. In Section 6.2.6, FF was found to be sensitive to *wh*-islands, as expected. The unexpected insensitivity of the FF items to *wh*-islands observed in the *z*-score analysis of some participants could be due to an issue with the interpretation of some of the FF items explained above.

Table 12. Standardized *z*-scores for D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in *wh*-island contexts per participant.

	D-construction (*n* = 4)		**CLLD (*n* = 3)**		**HTLD (*n* = 3)**		**FF (*n* = 3)**	
ID#	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***
N1	0.90	1.25	1.78	0	0.46	1.14	0.46	0.44
N2	0.80	0.60	0.96	1.78	0.33	0.51	0.54	2.02
N3	0.18	0.48	0.06	0.71	0.31	1.26	-0.11	1.04
N4	0.02	0.69	1.64	0.51	0.20	1.25	-0.39	0.42
N5	-0.30	0.41	1.83	0.50	-0.65	0	0.53	1.47
N6	0.95	0.39	0.85	0	-0.16	0.96	0.31	0.84
N7	0.40	0.41	1.11	0.50	-0.85	1.21	-0.67	0.71
N8	0.13	1.03	1.64	0	0.13	0.96	0.25	1.39
N9	0.60	1.18	1.10	0.35	0.23	1.10	0.02	1.25
N10	0.47	1.17	0.89	1.76	-0.36	0	1.30	2.88
N11	-0.53	0.42	0.92	1.77	-0.95	1.05	0.51	0.83
N12	0.32	1.26	-0.31	0	-0.69	0.25	-0.14	0.77
N13	-0.20	0.70	1.21	2.49	0.33	1.33	-0.32	0.81
N14	0.81	0.97	1.28	0.99	-0.24	0.59	0.11	1.62
N15	0.15	1.24	0.98	0.33	-0.44	1.12	-0.05	1.19
N16	0.39	0.96	0.55	1.81	-0.41	0.37	0.55	1.69
N17	0.12	0.32	0.6	0	0.12	0.61	0.6	0
N18	0.06	0.70	1.08	0	0.25	0.97	0.09	1.13
N19	-0.40	0.27	2.46	0.38	-0.13	0.82	0.55	1.88
N20	-0.45	0.49	0.95	1.80	-0.45	0.25	0.70	1.34
N21	-0.69	0	2.29	0	-0.24	0.57	0.30	0.34

Table 13 presents the standardized *z*-scores for the D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in complex NP island contexts by participant. 18 out of 21 participants (86%) had positive average *z*-scores for instances of the D-construction related to complex NPs, and 17 out of 21 (81%) participants had positive average *z*-scores for instances of CLLD related to complex NPs. In addition, 19 out of 21 participants (90%) had positive average *z*-scores for instances of HTLD related to complex NPs, and 11 out of 21 participants (52%) showed positive average *z*-scores for instances of FF related to complex NPs. In sum, all constructions were insensitive to complex NP islands. This differs from the results presented in Section 6.2.6 in that FF is also insensitive to complex NP islands.

Table 13. Standardized *z*-scores for D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in complex NP island contexts per participant.

	D-construction (*n* = 4)		**CLLD (*n* = 3)**		**HTLD (*n* = 3)**		**FF (*n* = 3)**	
ID#	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***
N1	0.68	0.92	0.46	1.16	0.60	0.51	-0.42	0.76
N2	0.65	1.09	0.96	0.63	1.17	0.96	-0.71	0.36
N3	0.69	1.11	1.06	0.50	1.23	0.58	0.89	0.58
N4	-0.33	0.69	0.80	1.50	0.32	1.10	1.52	0.42
N5	0.06	0.82	1.47	2.12	0.29	1.64	0.76	0
N6	0.85	0.33	1.12	0.23	0.99	0.23	0.99	0.47
N7	0.22	1.07	0.28	0.41	0.99	0.41	0.04	1.23
N8	0.59	0.23	0.40	1.42	1.17	0.80	-0.06	1.49
N9	-0.02	0.63	1.18	0.29	0.85	0.50	0.85	0.99
N10	0.26	1.25	0.75	1.92	-0.08	0.48	-0.08	0.48
N11	0.30	0.42	0.78	1.27	0.78	0.48	1.62	0.48
N12	1.21	1.09	0.03	1.46	0.20	1.75	-0.48	0.29
N13	0.50	0.41	-0.32	0.81	1.09	0.81	0.15	1.86
N14	0.93	0.88	-0.05	1.35	1.51	0	-0.67	0.27
N15	1.21	0	0.74	0.47	0.43	0.98	-0.20	1.25
N16	0.39	1.09	0.77	1.33	0.55	1.11	0.77	1.33
N17	0.44	0.32	0.6	0	0.6	0	-0.89	2.05
N18	0.16	1.11	-0.03	0.98	0.34	1.28	0.46	1.07
N19	-0.40	0.27	1.10	1.09	0.55	1.44	0.19	0.83
N20	0.06	1.13	-0.49	0.29	-0.49	0.29	-0.57	0.36
N21	0.65	1.23	0.30	1.72	1.30	0.69	-0.49	0.34

Table 14 presents the standardized *z*-scores for the D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in relative clause island contexts by participant. None of the participants showed positive average *z*-scores for instances of the D-construction related to relative clauses. Moreover, only 2 out of 21 (10%) participants had positive average *z*-scores for instances of CLLD related to relative clauses, 2 out of 21 participants (10%) showed positive average *z*-scores for instances of HTLD related to relative clauses, and 1 out of 21 participants (5%) had positive average *z*-scores for instances of FF related to relative clauses. Overall, all constructions were sensitive to relative clause islands. These findings correspond to those presented in Section 6.2.6 for all four constructions in relative clause island contexts.

Table 14. Standardized *z*-scores for D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in relative clause island contexts per participant.

	D-construction (*n* = 4)		**CLLD (*n* = 3)**		**HTLD (*n* = 3)**		**FF (*n* = 2)**	
ID#	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***
N1	-0.31	0.83	-0.86	0	-0.86	0	-0.86	0
N2	-0.92	0	-0.30	0.63	-0.51	0.36	-0.92	0
N3	-0.69	0.96	-0.27	1.26	-0.61	0.29	-1.19	0.35
N4	-0.51	0.93	-0.87	0	-0.16	0.72	-0.87	0
N5	-0.65	0	-0.65	0	-0.42	0.41	-0.30	0.50
N6	-1.18	0	-0.37	1.40	-1.04	0.23	-1.18	0
N7	-1.03	0.92	0.04	1.23	0.04	1.23	-0.67	1.01
N8	-0.80	0.70	-0.22	0	-0.53	0.54	0.01	1.64
N9	-1.02	0.25	-0.81	0.29	-0.64	0.86	-1.14	0
N10	-0.36	0	-0.36	0	-0.36	0	-0.36	0
N11	-0.12	0.42	-0.05	0.48	-1.16	0.83	-0.33	2.35
N12	-0.31	0.41	-0.31	0	-0.64	0.29	-0.56	0.36
N13	-0.38	0.35	-0.08	0.41	-0.08	0.41	-0.91	0.50
N14	-0.24	0.88	-0.51	0.27	-0.82	0	-0.59	0.33
N15	-0.56	1.05	-0.36	0.54	-0.20	1.25	-0.91	1.00
N16	-0.57	0.32	-0.09	1.11	-0.73	0	-0.73	0
N17	-1.31	1.38	0.39	0.37	0.18	0.74	-0.36	0.45
N18	-0.49	1.06	-0.40	1.28	-0.40	1.28	-0.03	1.57
N19	-0.53	0	-0.35	0.31	-0.53	0	-0.53	0
N20	-0.83	0	-0.49	0.29	-0.49	0.29	-0.57	0.36
N21	-0.69	0	-0.09	0.60	-0.69	0	-0.69	0

Table 15 presents the standardized *z*-scores for the D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in adjunct island contexts by participant. 8 out of 21 participants (38%) demonstrated positive average *z*-scores for instances of the D-construction in adjunct island contexts, and 4 out of 21 (19%) participants demonstrated positive average *z*-scores for instances of CLLD in adjunct island contexts. Moreover, 7 out of 21 participants (33%) demonstrated positive average *z*-scores for instances of HTLD in adjunct island contexts, and 5 out of 21 participants (24%) demonstrated positive average *z*-scores for instances of FF in adjunct island contexts. As a whole, all constructions were sensitive to adjunct island contexts. These findings are in line with those presented in Section 6.2.6 for all constructions in adjunct island contexts.

Considering all four island contexts, the findings from the *z*-score analysis only differ from those presented in Section 6.2.6. regarding FF in weak island contexts. In the main text, all four constructions were sensitive to strong islands only. Considering their descriptions within the literature regarding sensitivity to various island constraints, this ‘selective’ island

sensitivity is typical of CLLD, but not HTLD or FF; HTLD is typically insensitive to all syntactic islands and FF is typically sensitive to all islands. As previously noted for FF, the observed discrepancies may be attributed to an issue with the interpretation of these items.

Table 15. Standardized *z*-scores for D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in adjunct island contexts per participant.

	D-construction (*n* = 4)		**CLLD (*n* = 3)**		**HTLD (*n* = 3)**		**FF (*n* = 3)**	
ID#	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***	***Mean***	***SD***
N1	0.02	1.25	-0.57	0.51	-0.86	0	-0.86	0
N2	-0.30	0.73	-0.92	0	-0.09	0.36	-0.92	0
N3	0.43	0.95	-0.94	0.50	-0.94	0	-0.78	0.29
N4	-0.87	0	0.32	0.83	0.32	0.42	-0.39	1.50
N5	-0.30	0.41	-0.18	0.82	0.06	1.23	-0.42	0.41
N6	-0.26	1.07	-0.23	0.47	-1.04	0.23	-0.77	0.70
N7	0.22	1.21	0.52	0.41	0.52	0.41	-0.67	1.23
N8	-0.45	1.10	-0.37	0.96	-0.22	0.46	-0.99	0.27
N9	-0.15	1.22	-0.31	0.76	0.35	0.86	-0.97	0.29
N10	-0.36	0	-0.36	0	-0.36	0	-0.36	0
N11	0.09	0.48	-0.05	0.48	-0.88	0.96	-0.33	0
N12	-0.43	0.48	0.37	1.17	0.37	1.62	0.03	1.05
N13	0.15	1.52	-0.32	0.41	-0.08	1.08	-0.79	0.81
N14	0.23	1.23	-0.51	0.54	-0.82	0	-0.67	0.27
N15	0.03	1.12	-0.20	1.42	-0.20	0.82	-0.52	0.54
N16	0.07	1.21	-0.73	0	-0.73	0	-0.09	1.11
N17	-1.63	1.22	0.39	0.37	0.6	0	0.39	0.37
N18	-0.21	0.93	-0.40	1.28	-1.14	0	1.08	0
N19	-0.53	0	-0.35	0.31	-0.53	0	0.74	1.75
N20	-0.32	0.41	-0.83	0	-0.66	0.29	1.20	1.34
N21	-0.39	0.34	-0.69	0	0.90	1.50	-0.09	1.03