ARTICLE

Cross-Linguistic Influence on Relative Clause Structure: An Experimental Study of Resumptive Pronouns in an Arab ESL Speaker

Khalid M. Alotaibi ⓘ

Unit of Scientific Research, Applied College, Qassim University, Buraydah 52571, Saudi Arabia

ABSTRACT

This study examines the influence of first language (L1) on the use of resumptive pronouns (RPs) in English by an Arab second language (L2) learner. Specifically, it investigates whether the participant's grammatical judgments and preferences in English relative clauses (RCs) reflect transfer from Arabic. The study involved a grammaticality/preference task, where the informant, an Arab female studying English in the United States, was presented with a series of sentences containing resumptive pronouns. She was asked to identify the correct or most preferable sentence structures. The results indicate a tendency to favor English RCs that resemble Arabic structures in their use of RPs, suggesting cross-linguistic influence. Notably, the participant demonstrated a preference for structures where resumptive pronouns appeared in object and prepositional positions, aligning with Arabic syntactic norms. These findings contribute to the broader understanding of syntactic transfer in second language acquisition, particularly in relation to learners whose native languages permit resumptive pronouns in contexts where they are ungrammatical in English. The study highlights the necessity for targeted instructional strategies in ESL classrooms to address such transfer issues, emphasizing explicit awareness of RC structures across languages. Future research should explore larger populations and additional syntactic environments to further investigate the scope of cross-linguistic influence on relative clause formation among Arab ESL learners.

Keywords: English as a Second Language (ESL); First Language (L1); Resumptive Pronouns (RPs); Second Language (L2); Teaching

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Khalid M. Alotaibi, Unit of Scientific Research, Applied College, Qassim University, Buraydah 52571, Saudi Arabia; Email: k.alotaibi@qu.edu.sa

1. Introduction and Literature Review

One of the main aspects of second language (L2) acquisition is understanding how sentences are syntactically structured and to what extent the first (native) language (L1) plays a role in L2 sentence structure. Much of the research in this area has targeted the mechanisms governing the use of resumptive pronouns (RPs), which differ cross-linguistically. Arab speakers of English as a second language (ESL) face difficulties in using English RPs, and the current study seeks to explore whether this is attributable to the L1 influence.

1.1. Resumptive Pronouns in English

The use of English RPs has gained much scholarly attention in the context of both theoretical and experimental syntax. RPs in English are pronouns that appear inside a relative clause (RC) and refer back to an antecedent, which can be a subject or an object. McCloskey[1] defined RPs as "pronouns which appear in a position in which, under other circumstances, a gap would appear" (p. 26). Thus, RPs are pronouns that fill in the subject or object gap in an RC to increase its acceptability. The following example from McKee and McDaniel[2] is illustrative:

(1a) This is the boy that whenever it rains cries.
(1b) This is the boy that whenever it rains *he* cries.

These sentences differ in their degrees of acceptability. Sentence (1b) is more syntactically and semantically acceptable than (1a). The RP "he" is used to avoid potential ambiguity inherent in the structure of the sentence. However, native speakers often find that RPs are grammatically incorrect in many instances because they are not related to the same binding domain or clause as the pronoun they are referring to[2]. A binding domain is the syntactic region where a particular element, usually a pronoun, is connected to its antecedent such as a noun phrase or a quantifier. Additionally, what appears to have the most impact on the distribution of resumptives in English is whether a trace is acceptable. In general, a "trace" is the empty syntactic position that remains when a phrase or other element is moved inside a single sentence. So, RPs appear in a sentence to "resumptively" refer back to the trace and basically fill the gap left by the moved element. Therefore, RPs typically have complementary distributions with traces. In sentence (2) below, the RP is considered ungrammatical where the trace is possible (McKee and McDaniel[2] in Hazem[3]):

(2a) That's the girl that I like. (Trace)
(2b) *That's the girl that I like *her*.

There is a consensus in the literature that the grammaticality of RPs differs among languages (McCloskey[4], Sells[5]). RPs are permitted in some languages (including Chinese, Hebrew, dialects of Arabic, and Swedish), and these languages are often referred to as grammatical resumption languages (Meltzer-Asscher[6]). In the structure of other languages, however, RPs are not permitted. According to Sells[5], these "intrusive resumption languages" include standard Spanish, French, Italian, Korean, Turkish, and other Germanic languages in addition to English. However, RPs can also be found in normal speech in the latter group of the aforementioned languages. This discrepancy leads to the recognized paradox of resumption in languages such as English: RPs are grammatically incorrect even if they are used spontaneously (Meltzer-Asscher[6]). Research has also shown that grammatical RPs do not belong to the same class, even within a single language. While some RPs are "true" resumptives that are bound in situ by an operator, others are simply spell-outs of movement traces (Aoun & Benmamoun[7], Sichel[8]). Recognizing this classification and the differences in RPs among languages, the following section discusses the RPs in Arabic.

1.2. Resumptive Pronouns in Arabic

In Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), RPs are usually obligatory and refer to either the subject or the object of the sentence, and they can attach to nouns, prepositions, or verbs. When RPs attach to nouns or prepositions to refer to an antecedent, they are obligatory (except when they are moved to the front in interrogatives). However, when they attach to a verb referring to a subject or object of the sentence, they are optional (except when the antecedent is indefinite, in which case an RP must be used, and the RC cannot be headed by *allaði* and *allati* ("who/which/that"). The following examples from Alotaibi and Borsley[9] illustrate this concept:

(3) a. *Ɂayy-i   dӡaamiʕat-in   ðahaba   Aħmad-u   Ɂila _____ ? (gap)
     which-GEN   university-GEN   went.3SM   Ahmad-NOM   to
     "Which university did Ahmad go to?"
     b. Ɂayy-u   dӡaamiʕat-in   ðahaba   Aħmad-u   Ɂilai-**ha**? (RP)
     which-NOM   universit -GEN   went.3SM   Ahmad-NOM   to-**it**

In this example, a contrast is present between the two questions. In (3a), a gap is not allowed in the prepositional object position. In (3b), however, an RP *ha* is used in the same position—which, in this case, is a clitic. We can also rephrase the question (as in example (4)) using a prepositional phrase (PP) filler at the beginning of the question. In this case, a gap is permitted.

Similar to the PP position, a gap is not permitted in the possessor position as in (5a), but an RP must be used in the same position—which is also a clitic in (5b).

The question can also be rephrased using a complex noun phrase (NP) that contains a possessor as a filler, as in example (6).

(4) [PP Ɂila   Ɂayy-i   dӡaamiʕat-in]   ðahaba   Aħmad-u _____? (gap)
     to   which-GEN   university-GEN   went.3SM   Ahmad-NOM
     "To which university did Ahmad go?"

(5) a. *Ɂayy-i   muɁallif-in   garaɁa   Aħmad-u   kitaab-a _____? (gap)
     which-GEN   author-GEN   read.3SM   Ahmad-NOM   book-ACC
     "Which author's book has Ahmad read?"
     b. Ɂayy-u   muɁallif-in   garaɁa   Aħmad-u   kitaab-a-**hu**? (RP)
     which-NOM   author-GEN   read.3SM   Ahmad-NOM   book-ACC-**his**

(6) [NP kitaab-a   Ɂayy-i   muɁallif-in]   garaɁa _____   Ahmad-u? (gap)
     book-ACC   which-GEN   author-GEN   read.3SM   Ahmad-NOM
     "Which author's book has Ahmad read?"

As these examples demonstrate, the RP clitic is possible when the prepositional object position, as in example (4), or possessor position, as in example (6), are in the genitive case. Additionally, the filler is in the accusative case with a gap, but an RP is used when it is in the nominative case. The following examples contain RCs with a definite antecedent where, as in (7a), the filler is in the accusative case, and in (7b), it is in the nominative case (Alqurashi & Borsley[10]).

(7) a. qaabaltu   r-rajul-a   [llaðii   Ɂarifu   _____]
     met.1SM   the-man-ACC   that   knew.1SM
     "I met the man that I knew."
     b. qaabaltu   r-rajul-a   [llaðii   Ɂarifu-**hu**]
     met.1SM   the-man-ACC   that   knew.1SM-**him**
     "I met the man that I knew."

However, if the RC has an indefinite antecedent, an RP must be used, as in (8b).

(8) a. *gaabaltu   rajul-an   [Ɂaʕrifu ____]
     met.1SM   man-ACC   knew.1SM
     "I met a man that I knew."
     b. gaabaltu   rajul-an   [Ɂaʕrifu-**hu**]
     met.1SM   man-ACC   knew.1SM-**him**

These examples highlight the different ways RPs function in Arabic compared with English. Resumptives in Arabic also behave differently within the different varieties of a language—Classical, MSA, and dialect varieties—so what may be acceptable in Classical Arabic, for instance, may not sound acceptable in MSA or among the many dialects of the Arab world.

Moreover, unlike English, the words *allaði* and *allati* ("who/which/that") are only used to start definite RCs and are never used as a *wh*-word to start a question, as in English (except for "that"). With this in mind, definiteness and indefiniteness in statements and questions as well as the different behavior of complementizers between Arabic and English would probably affect one's acquisition and use of RCs in English.

1.3. Previous Studies on Resumptive Pronouns

Several studies have examined the acquisition of English resumptives in the ESL context. Yuan and Zhao[11] studied RPs in English–Chinese and Arabic–Chinese interlanguages. The participants were intermediate English-speaking learners of Chinese and advanced Palestinian-speaking learners of Chinese. The researchers hypothesized that Palestinian speakers would judge Chinese sentences containing RPs more accurately than English speakers because Palestinian speakers were more proficient in Chinese than English speakers and because RPs can be used in Palestinian Arabic but not in English. However, their hypothesis was not confirmed in the study.

In another study, Youhanaee, Mirzaiyan, and Amiryousefi[12] investigated the role of explicit instruction of RCs in the acquisition of English RPs. The participants were Iranian intermediate English learners, and the purpose was to examine the use of RPs in two structurally dissimilar languages: Persian and English. The data was collected through a grammaticality judgment task and a sentence combination task. The findings suggested that exposure to input through teaching materials can enhance learners' performance in particular RC types. The study also revealed that explicit language instruction may result in more stable acquisition by encouraging future noticing in input.

Zenker and Schwartz[13] studied RPs' facilitation of the processing of long-distance subject RC dependencies on L2 comprehension even if they were not used in the L1 and L2.

The researchers used an online self-paced reading task and an offline acceptability judgment task (AJT) with a test group of 29 L1-Korean L2-English language learners and a control group of 25 native English speakers. The purpose of the tests was to determine whether RPs reflect interlanguage grammar representations and/or a strategy to reduce processing overload. They found that RPs helped L2 learners resolve dependencies in long-distance RCs, but not for native speakers. A proficiency effect was observed for the AJT data, indicating that certain L2 learners with lower proficiency levels favored RPs over gaps in long-distance RCs.

Simoiu[14] investigated whether RPs were attested in the English language of Romanian learners and whether their use could be explained by transfer hypotheses or direct access to universal grammar. Their findings showed that, for object *wh*-interrogatives and RCs, the use of RPs was transferred from L1 Romanian to L2 English. In L2 situations that were discourse-linked and resembled Romanian structures, resumptives were acceptable. Resumptives, were, however, also acceptable in non-discourse-linked situations as long as they followed the target language.

In the context of Arab ESL learners, a number of cross-linguistic studies have addressed the use of RCs with a broader scope, not targeting RPs in particular. Albikri and Jarrah[15] studied the acquisition of Arabic and English RCs by L2 English and Arabic learners. Twenty English-speaking students studying Arabic and 20 Arabic-speaking students studying English participated in the study. The study utilized an SCT, a GJT, a multiple-choice test, and a picture description task. The researchers found that Arab learners of English could properly understand and use relative pronouns; however, the Arabic system of relative pronouns affected their performance. By contrast, the English-speaking learners of Arabic were able to easily create and understand the Arabic relative pronouns despite their L1 language interference.

Another study by Alotaibi[16] investigated the extent to which Kuwaiti EFL learners were aware of the structure of English RCs by measuring their ability to produce them. An SCT suggested that Kuwaiti EFL learners may not be fully aware of the rules for forming English RCs and that proficiency level affected the participants' answers. Hassan[17] investigated the learnability of English-restrictive RCs by Egyptian EFL learners. That study employed the sentence combination production test and the GJT. The findings re-

vealed that Egyptian EFL learners might not be entirely aware of the English RC formulation rules. The results also indicated that RC types with subject-subject and object-subject were easier for Egyptian learners to master than those with subject-object and object-object types.

As demonstrated by previous research, commonalities exist among ESL learners from different languages in terms of learnability, construction, and use of RPs. Because most of the studies in the literature (including the studies mentioned here) focused on the use of RCs in general, research concentrating on RPs is lacking. Moreover, relatively few studies have been conducted on Arab ESL learners involving the acquisition of RPs. Nonetheless, other studies discussed RPs as part of RCs' general structure and how ESL learners adhered to the target language.

The current study aims to address the use of RPs by an Arab ESL learner. The investigation focused on this particular aspect due to its direct relevance to the syntactic acquisition of English. Adhering to syntactic rules is one of the more challenging aspects for language learners. Additionally, in these cases of language acquisition, ESL learners may find themselves resorting to their L1 in search of a prior set of rules resembling the equivalent structure in the target language—a strategy that results in erroneous use. For these two purposes, the study pursued the following goals:

1. Pinpoint the utterances containing interlanguage features of using RPs in English.
2. Account for the contributing factors for such utterances in light of established theories in the field.
3. Provide implications and suggestions for ESL instructors in light of the study's findings.

2. Methods

The informant in this study was an adult female Arab student attending an intensive English program at a university in the United States. At the time of data collection, the duration of her language studies was about one year. Her exposure to, and use of, English took place both in an academic classroom setting and outside of the classroom. The experiment employed a grammaticality/preference task that was presented to the informant in 12 groups of sentences. With a time limit of approximately 15 minutes, the informant was asked to circle the correct sentence, and she was also asked for her grammaticality preferences in other groups of sentences. Some groups included three sentences, while others included two sentences. Each group contained at least one ungrammatical use of an RP in English, and the other sentences in the group contained a correct use of a relative pronoun. The experiment also included two sets of sentences with prepositions. These prepositions were placed in different positions in a sentence along with the RP. In addition, in some of the groups that included three sentences, there were two correct choices to identify the informant's preferences.

The researcher chose to include a sentence containing an erroneous use of an RP to test the informant's judgment against the other correct sentences in the same group—especially because these incorrect sentences have a structure similar to Arabic. Including this sentence would help identify the informant's tendency to choose such structures and to see whether L1 interference could be attributable. The type of RC used in all of the experiment's sentences was a restrictive (defining) RC. Considering the differences between Arabic and English in the use of resumptives, the sentences varied and included questions and statements, both affirmative and negative. Some of the sentences in each group had different relative pronouns, ungrammatical RPs, different tenses, definiteness and indefiniteness, and different positions of the RC within the sentence. The purpose was to assess the informant's judgment as opposed to her use of resumptives in Arabic. **Table 1** provides details of the example sentences presented to the informant:

Table 1. Sentence details used in the study.

Group No.	Type of Statement	Relative Pronoun Used	Ungrammatical RP Included	Position in the Sentence
1	Declarative/affirmative	Which/that/null	it	Object
2	Declarative/affirmative	Whom/who	him	Object
3	Declarative/affirmative	Which/null	it	PP
4	Declarative/affirmative	That/who/whom	him	PP
5	Declarative/affirmative	Who/null	him	Object
6	Declarative/affirmative	That	it	Object

Table 1. *Cont.*

Group No.	Type of Statement	Relative Pronoun Used	Ungrammatical RP Included	Position in the Sentence
7	Declarative/affirmative	Which/null	it	Object
8	Interrogative	Which	it	Subject/PP
9	Interrogative	Who	him	Object
10	Interrogative	That/null	it	Object
11	Declarative/negative	Which	it	PP
12	Declarative/affirmative	Who	him	Subject

3. Results and Discussion

The overall aim of the study was to explore the use and judgment of English RPs by an Arab ESL learner. The sentences used in the study included RPs that referred to an object antecedent yet are considered ungrammatical in English. The informant accurately answered most of the sentences presented to her. Of the 12 groups of sentences, she made two incorrect choices. However, this does not mean that the correct choices are analytically meaningless; a pattern might be inferred from both correct and incorrect choices that could indicate attributions to L1. In some groups, one sentence may have included a relative pronoun, while the other did not, yet both are correct choices. The following example illustrates this possibility:

1. He likes the red car which he drove.
2. He likes the red car that he drove it.
3. He likes the red car he drove.

The informant selected sentence (1), which contained the relative pronoun "which." The sentence was structured in almost the same order as an Arabic counterpart sentence. Arabic relative pronouns *allaði* or *allati*, and their dual and plural derivations, are used exclusively in definite RCs. Their obligatory use in this type of sentence was probably transferred to produce an English RC using an equivalent relative pronoun despite its optional use in English. This was also apparent in another choice made by the informant:

4. She saw the man the police wanted.
5. She saw the man who wanted him the police.
6. She saw the man who the police wanted.

The informant's selection of sentence (6) may support this idea. This result is in line with the noun phrase accessibility hierarchy (Keenan & Comrie[18]), which states that there is a hierarchical order of relativization in all languages. This accessibility hierarchy is illustrated in the following (Albikri & Jarrah[15]):

Subject (SU) > Direct Object (DO) > Indirect Object (IO) > Oblique (OBL) > Genitive (GEN) > Object of Comparative (OCOMP).

Thus, when applied to the informant's choices in this study, the choice of the relative pronouns "which" in sentence (1) and "who" in sentence (6) indicated the informant's awareness of the relativization of the object she chose for sentences with relative pronouns. This is especially true because these two choices have Arabic-like structures and objects in an RC are less marked in Arabic. Therefore, it was easier for the informant to process these options compared with the other options in the same group.

Regarding indefiniteness, the informant's preference in another set of sentences was consistent with a familiar Arabic structure:

7. John chose a restaurant which he likes a lot.
8. John chose a restaurant he likes a lot.
9. John chose a restaurant he likes it a lot.

Sentence (8) contains the indefinite noun "restaurant" without any relative pronoun following it. As noted, Arabic does not allow relative pronouns as the head of an RC if the antecedent is an indefinite noun. This could explain why the informant chose sentence (8). This result can also be explained by Eckman's[19] markedness differential hypothesis (MDH), which states that L2 learners find it difficult to acquire the areas of the target language that are more markedly different from their native language. Eckman[19] purported that L2 learners would not have any difficulty acquiring those areas of L2 that differ from their L1 but that are not more marked than the L1. The MDH also asserts that the degree of typological markedness between learners' L1 and L2 can predict the degree of difficulty in L2 acquisition (Jin[20]). When applied to the informant's choice in sentence (8), it is apparent that the informant chose this sentence because it is grammatically correct in English, and it is not markedly or structurally different from its Arabic counterpart; thus, it

was easier to process.

As previously mentioned in the methodology section, the data also included two sets of sentences with prepositions. These prepositions were placed in different positions in a sentence along with the RP. Between two correct choices, the informant chose the ones that were likely easier for her to process as being similarly structured to her L1. Her choices of sentences (12) and (15) are reflected here:

10. Which book has John talked about it?
11. Which book has John talked about?
12. About which book has John talked?
13. I'm not sure which street they are heading to it.
14. I'm not sure which street they are heading.
15. I'm not sure to which street they are heading.

The informant's preferences from among these sentences reflect a possible pattern. The way in which the informant processed sentences prior to making a selection could explain her preference for one sentence over another. This tendency on the part of the participant can also be accounted for through the lens of MDH, which emphasizes that unmarked structures are preferred over marked structures. In this case, word order plays an important role. Sentence (11) shows the unmarked English word order for *wh*-questions with subject-verb inversion. The informant's choice of this sentence may indicate her familiarity with the unmarked grammatical structures. Sentence (12) has a marked structure, as the PP is placed at the beginning. It does, however, follow the typical word order for Arabic *wh*-questions, which starts the *wh*-phrase. In choosing this sentence, the informant might have been transferring her knowledge of word order from Arabic to English. In the second set of sentences, the use of the RP "it" in sentence (13) renders the sentence ungrammatical and was not chosen by the informant, reflecting her knowledge of L2 rules. Similar to sentence (11), sentence (14) has an unmarked structure. Although choosing this sentence would be consistent with the MDH philosophy by having an unmarked structure in English, the informant chose sentence (15). In sentence (15), the preposition "to" comes before the *wh*-phrase. This structure is marked in English, and it is comparable to prepositional phrases used before *wh*-questions in Arabic. This choice by the informant suggests L1 interference, in which the informant used a structure similar to Arabic when there was an unmarked L2 alternative.

However, other factors may have contributed to the informant's choices. One of these factors involves individual preferences, in which L2 learners of English may have unique preferences for particular syntactic structures despite coming from similar linguistic or learning backgrounds. Thus, additional experiments would help target the relationship between Arabic and English regarding the use of resumptives by L2 speakers.

Although this study attributes the informant's preferences for certain syntactic structures to L1 influence, alternative explanations should also be considered. One possibility is the role of individual cognitive processing strategies, where the informant might favor structures that are easier to process or align with her exposure to English in specific contexts. For example, frequent interaction with English speakers who use non-standard or informal structures could influence her preferences. Another explanation could involve the informant's familiarity with specific sentence patterns from her academic materials, which might prioritize certain structures over others. Finally, affective factors such as confidence in grammar usage or anxiety during the experimental task might have shaped her choices. Exploring these factors in future research would provide a more holistic understanding of the interplay between linguistic, cognitive, and emotional variables in second language acquisition.

4. Conclusions

This experiment involved an attempt to analyze linguistic judgments made by an Arab L2 speaker of English. It studied the informant's use of RPs in English and attempted to account for her sentence preferences in light of her L1. The results highlighted the informant's tendency to choose sentences that were structurally similar to Arabic. The results may also indicate a knowledge gap in recognizing other correct forms of English pronouns as being alternatives for resumptives. The informant showed accurate overall English proficiency through grammatically judging RPs. The informant's performance on the tasks can be summarized in three main points that indicate a possibility of L1 influence:

1. Selecting a relative pronoun word order and structure that was similar to Arabic.
2. Adhering to Arabic rules in preferring indefinite noun antecedents that did not use RPs.

3. Choosing sentences that had prepositions in unmarked Arabic positions when there were English alternatives that were more grammatically accurate.

For future studies, a more syntactic approach toward the use of resumptives in English would yield accurate results compared with other languages in general and Arabic in particular. Although the current results have offered informative insights, the results are based on a single informant, so the study's generalizability is limited. To validate and build on the study's findings, future studies might include a wider range of populations. Future studies might also investigate how Arab ESL learners with different proficiency levels acquire RPs. Studies might also utilize different empirical methods, perhaps by measuring spoken, written, and eye-tracking data, to acquire a more thorough understanding of the acquisition of the linguistic structure.

Nonetheless, this study has highlighted various implications for ESL instructors, particularly in the Arab context of learning English as a second or foreign language. In designing course materials, ESL instructors should recognize and prioritize the possible influence of L1 structures on the acquisition of L2 equivalent structures. Integrating awareness of these cross-linguistic variations into language teaching may contribute to fewer interlanguage features and a more accurate approximation to L2 output. In helping learners overcome these hurdles, ESL instructors can also provide more targeted course plans and activities. An accurate syntactic output of RPs in English may result from more explicit instruction and practice on English RCs while emphasizing how they differ from Arabic structures.

The findings of this study underscore the importance of tailoring ESL curriculum design to account for cross-linguistic influences. Specifically, Arab ESL learners demonstrate a tendency to transfer syntactic structures from Arabic to English, particularly in their use of resumptive pronouns. ESL instructors should consider integrating targeted activities that contrast the use of relative clauses and resumptive pronouns in English and Arabic. For example, exercises that explicitly highlight the ungrammaticality of resumptive pronouns in English could help learners internalize the correct structures. Moreover, embedding comparative linguistic tasks within the curriculum can raise learners' awareness of syntactic differences, reducing reliance on L1 transfer and fostering more accurate L2 output. These strategies can also be supplemented with context-specific examples that reflect common learner errors, ensuring a more pragmatic and impactful approach to instruction.

In light of the study's findings, ESL instructors working with Arab learners are encouraged to focus on several key areas to improve syntactic accuracy. First, instructors should provide explicit instruction on the differences between English and Arabic relative clauses, with a particular emphasis on the absence of resumptive pronouns in standard English. Second, classroom activities should include tasks that require learners to identify and correct ungrammatical uses of resumptive pronouns in English sentences. Third, instructors can use contrastive analysis exercises that highlight how marked structures in Arabic differ from their unmarked counterparts in English. Finally, integrating technology-based tools such as interactive grammar checkers or eye-tracking applications may offer learners immediate feedback and enhance their syntactic processing skills. By adopting these strategies, instructors can help learners overcome common challenges associated with cross-linguistic influence and achieve greater proficiency in English.

Funding

Institutional Review Board Statement

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Qassim University (24-98-01/July10-2024).

Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the author upon reasonable request.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study, in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data, in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

References

[1] McCloskey, J., 2006. Resumption. In The Blackwell companion to syntax. Wiley: Hoboken, NJ, USA. pp. 94–117. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996591. ch55

[2] McKee, C., McDaniel, D., 2001. Resumptive pronouns in English relative clauses. Language acquisition. 9(2), 113–156. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327817L A0902_01

[3] Hazem, A.H., 2015. A Syntactic-o-Semantic Study of English Resumptive Pronouns in University Students of English Written Performance. Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities. 22(12), 383–420. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3531599

[4] McCloskey, J., 2017. Resumption. In: Everaert M, van Riemsdijk HC, editors. The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax. 2nd ed. Wiley: Hoboken, NJ, USA. pp. 1–30. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118358733. wbsyncom105

[5] Sells, P., 1984. Syntax and semantics of resumptive pronouns. Linguistic Review. 4(3), 261–267.

[6] Meltzer-Asscher, A., 2021. Resumptive pronouns in language comprehension and production. Annual Review of Linguistics. 7, 177–194. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-031320-012726

[7] Aoun, J., Benmamoun, E., 1998. Minimality, reconstruction, and PF movement. Linguistic Inquiry. 29(4), 569–597. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/002438998553888

[8] Sichel, I., 2014. Resumptive pronouns and competition. Linguistic Inquiry. 45(3), 655–693. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00169

[9] Alotaibi, M., Borsley, R.D., 2013. Gaps and Resumptive Pronouns in Modern Standard Arabic. In: Müller, S., (Ed.). Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Freie Universität Berlin. CSLI Publications: Stanford, CA, USA. pp. 6–26. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21248/hpsg.2013.1

[10] Alqurashi, A., Borsley, R.D., 2012. Arabic relative clauses in HPSG. In Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Chungnam National University Daejeon. CSLI Publications: Stanford, CA, USA. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21248/hpsg.2012.2

[11] Yuan, B., Zhao, Y., 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

[12] Youhanaee, M., Mirzaiyan, A., Amiryousefi, M., 2023. Explicit Teaching of an Unsalient Property: the case of illicit resumptive pronouns in English relative clauses. Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning. 15(31), 255–269. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22034/elt. 2023.56695.2542

[13] Zenker, F., Schwartz, B.D., 2021. Resumptive pronouns facilitate processing of long-distance relative clause dependencies in second language English. Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America. 6(1), 325–339. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v6i1.4972

[14] Simoiu, A., 2016. Resumptive pronouns in wh-interrogatives and object relative clauses in L2 English: UG access or transfer? Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics. 18(1), 123–135.

[15] Albikri, R., Jarrah, M., 2022. The Acquisition of Arabic and English Relative Clauses by L2 English and Arabic Learners. Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences. 49(5), 534–548. DOI: https://doi.org/10.35516/hum.v49i5. 2776

[16] Alotaibi, A.M., 2016. Examining the Learnability of English Relative Clauses: Evidence from Kuwaiti EFL Learners. English Language Teaching. 9(2), 57–65. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n2p57

[17] Hassan, I.H., 2018. Investigating the acquisition order of English restrictive relative clauses: Evidence from Egyptian EFL Learners. Journal of the Faculty of Education at Alexandria University. 28(1), 313–343. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21608/jealex.2018.156732

[18] Keenan, E.L., Comrie, B., 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. Linguistic Inquiry. 8(1), 63–99.

[19] Eckman, F.R., 1977. Markedness and the contrastive analysis hypothesis. Language Learning. 27(2), 315–330. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770. 1977.tb00124.x

[20] Jin, L., 2008. Markedness and second language acquisition of word order in Mandarin Chinese. In Proceedings of the 20th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics; Columbus, OH, USA, 25–27 April 2008. Available from: https://bpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/u.osu.edu/dist/2/123895/files/2024/05/15_jin-l-ac159aa40579d537.pdf#:~: text=The%20study%20explores%20the%20difficultie s%20of%20native%20English,aiming%20to%20relat e%20it%20to%20the%20markedness%20theories