Uncovering the nature of ambiguity resolution during comprehension has been a central project of the field of psycholinguistics. This aim has persisted because the nature of ambiguity resolution in comprehension has critical implications for models of sentence processing in general. In this talk, I will bring together two recent lines of research on processing regions of ambiguous material during reading experiments. The first line of research provides a direct comparison of the processing of structural and referential ambiguities. These two ambiguity types have been extensively studied in separate literatures, with the two fields of research arriving at opposite conclusions. Evidence from the processing of structural ambiguities, such as ambiguous modifier attachment, favors models in which a single analysis of ambiguous material is adopted without a cost to processing (e.g., Traxler et al., 1998; van Gompel et al, 2001). This evidence stands in contrast to models in which multiple analyses are simultaneously adopted and compete for selection (e.g., MacDonald et al., 1994). Contrary to the literature on attachment ambiguities, competition has been observed between available referents in pronoun resolution (e.g., Badecker & Straub, 2002). I will present a series of studies using a variety of methods, including eye movements during reading, self-paced reading and an ambiguity judgment task, to show that the separation in the literature between these two ambiguity types is perhaps misleading. The second line of research examines the processing of attachment ambiguity in light of the current demands on processing resources. Previous studies have found differences in reading time patterns on attachment ambiguities depending on task demands (Swets et al., 2008) or individual differences in working memory (von der Malsburg & Vasishth, 2013) in between-participants designs. These differences have led to the hypothesis that readers may engage in Good-Enough Processing (see e.g., Ferreira and Patson, 2007), leaving attachment decisions underspecified either due to an experimental task that does not encourage full interpretation, or due to a lack of available processing resources. In a study of eye movements during reading, we explore the relationship of working memory and processing attachment ambiguities in a within-participant design, taxing working memory resources by couching critical modifiers within the span of a wh-dependency. Our results are consistent with a view that under conditions that tax processing resources, readers may not commit to a single interpretation of ambiguous input.