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**Description of the experiments**

In two structural priming experiments, participants read a Dutch prime sentence aloud, followed by a Dutch target fragment that they had to complete using pictures. Experiment 1 had prime conditions such as (1a-d) followed by a target such as (2).

Prime conditions:

1a. Gauw bracht de arts de masseur een handdoek.  (DO, subject noun not repeated)

1b. Gauw bracht de arts een handdoek aan de masseur. (PO subject noun not repeated)

1c. Gauw bracht de boxer de masseur een handdoek. (DO subject noun repeated)

1d. Gauw bracht de boxer een handdoek aan de masseur. (DO subject noun repeated)

Target:

2. Onlangs leende de boxer … (with pictures of a boxer, shirt and footballer)

In Experiment 1, we manipulated whether (1) the prime structure (DO or PO) and (2) whether the prime and target had the same subject noun (e.g., *boxer*). Participants were asked to provide a grammatical and meaningful continuation to the target fragment using the pictures.

 In Experiment 2, we manipulated whether the prime and target had the same verb (e.g., *leende*) or not, in addition to manipulating the prime structure. In both experiments, we scored whether participants completed the target fragments with a prepositional object or double object structure and used this as the dependent measure.

**Files**

Exp1DutchVN.xlsx: MS Excel file with data from Experiment 1.

Exp2DutchVN.xlsx: MS Excel file with data from Experiment 2.

Participant\_info\_sheet.docx: MS Word file, Participant information sheet

Consent\_form.docx: MS Word file, Consent form

**Participants**

Participants were recruited using *Prolific*. They were all native speakers of Dutch, resident in Belgium or The Netherlands, had no language-related disorders and were between 18 and 45 years of age. Forty-eight participants took part in each experiment. The study was approved by the University of Dundee ethics committee and all participants gave informed consent to take part in the study.

**Explanation of variables**

Experiment: Experiment number (1-2)

Participant: participant ID

Sentence: prime or target sentence presented to participants

Transcription: participant’s completion of the sentence fragment

PODO: Scoring of whether the sentence fragment was completed using a prepositional object (p), double object (d), reversed prepositional (r) or other (x) structure.

Error: Whether the prime fragment was misread, the recording was cut off because the participant clicked the button too early or the target structure is corrected to a different structure (x).

Listexp1/2: Experimental list the participant received.

Senpic: Whether the trial was a prime (1) or target (2)

Itemno: Item number

Condition: Condition number (2 = DO verb repeated noun not repeated, 3 = DO verb not repeated noun repeated, 4 = DO verb and noun not repeated, 6 = PO verb repeated noun not repeated, 7 = PO verb not repeated noun repeated, 8 = PO verb and noun not repeated).

**Coding**

A completion was scored as a prepositional object structure (PO) if the verb was followed by a theme noun phrase and a recipient prepositional object (in that order). It was scored as a double object structure (DO) if the verb was followed by a recipient indirect object noun phrase and a theme direct object noun phrase (again in that order). Responses where participants added a particle (e.g., as in *gaf terug,* “gave back”) or used a different preposition indicating transfer (e.g., *naar, voor, bij*) were considered a PO or DO if they had the appropriate structure.