Published in final edited form as:

J Speech Lang Hear Res. 2013 February ; 56(1): 222–235. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2012/11-0107).

What do children with Specific Language Impairment do with multiple forms of DO?

Mabel L. Rice and Megan Blossom
University of Kansas

Abstract

Purpose—This study was designed to examine the early usage patterns of multiple grammatical functions of DO in children with and without SLI. Children’s use of this plurifunctional form is informative for evaluation of theoretical accounts of the deficit in SLI.

Methods—Spontaneous uses of multiple functions of DO were analyzed in language samples from 89 children, 37 children with SLI age 5;0–5;6, 37 age-equivalent children, and 15 language-equivalent children, age 2;8–4;10. Proportion correct as well as the types of errors produced were analyzed for each function of DO.

Results—Children with SLI had significantly lower levels of proportion correct Auxiliary DO use compared to both control groups, with omissions of the DO form as the primary error type. Children with SLI had near-ceiling performance on Lexical DO and Elliptical DO, similar to both control groups.

Conclusions—Plurifunctionality is not problematic: children acquire each function of DO separately. Grammatical properties of the function, rather than surface properties of the form, dictate whether SLI children will have difficulty using the word. Overall, these results support the Extended Optional Infinitive account of SLI, and the use of difficulty with Auxiliary DO as part of a clinical marker for SLI.

Much of what is known about young children’s language acquisition is based on studies of particular linguistic forms or functions. For example, auxiliary DO has been the focus of numerous studies (Stromswold, 1990; Santelmann, Berk, Austin, Somashekar, & Lust, 2002; Rowland, Pine, Lieven, & Theakston, 2005; Rowland, 2007; Paradis, Crago, Rice, & Marquis, 2008). A significant outcome of this area of investigation is identification of auxiliary DO as part of a grammatical clinical marker for Specific Language Impairment (SLI) (Rice, Wexler, & Cleave, 1995; Rice & Wexler, 1996; Rice, Wexler, & Hershberger, 1998; Rice & Wexler, 2001; Rice, Hoffman & Wexler, 2009). At the same time, DO carries multiple grammatical functions, most of which have received relatively little investigation in the child language literature. Multiple grammatical functions for a given form could increase the complexity of a child’s task when acquiring auxiliary DO and possibly could contribute to the documented difficulty in acquiring this grammatical form. The general purpose of this investigation was to explicate five different grammatical functions of DO evident in young children’s utterances and to describe use of the different functions by children with SLI and age- and language-equivalent control groups, with the aim of evaluating theoretical accounts of the grammatical deficits of SLI.

Five Functions of DO in the Adult Grammar, from Verb Phrase to Complement Phrase: Lexical Verb, Emphatic Auxiliary, Auxiliary, Tag Question, and Ellipsis

DO is a flexible form in English, assuming multiple, and very different, roles in the morphosyntax (cf. Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985; Lightfoot, 1999). It can serve as a main verb of the clause, as a special form of auxiliary that precedes the main verb, or as a formal grammatical marker whose sole function is to mark finiteness, an obligatory requirement for clauses involving tense and agreement features of the grammar. X' theory provides a precise model of the grammatical functions of DO (cf. Chomsky, 1993, 1995; Haegeman, 1991). Within this model, morphology is closely related to syntax because morphological elements carry word order and phrasal movement requirements, hence the term *morphosyntax* (Pollock, 1989). In this model of the adult grammar, simple matrix clauses consist of a noun phrase (NP) and a verb phrase (VP). Verbs carry tense (TNS) and agreement (AGR) features that are essential for clause structure. An additional projection, the *inflection phrase* (IP), is needed for finiteness marking to meet the requirements of TNS and AGR checking in simple clauses. Figure 1 demonstrates an IP with DO as a lexical main verb. The subject NP is assumed to originate in the “specifier” position to the left of V and move to the “specifier” position to the left of the finite verb in I (head) position. The finite verb originates in the V (“head”) of the VP. (Note that each constituent, VP, IP, CP, has a specifier and a X' position.) In English, lexical verbs originating in V cannot move overtly to I position of the IP. Instead, the V moves covertly to I position of the IP in order to show TNS and AGR (in Figure 1, third person present –s on the base form of DO in the clause “She does her homework.”). As a finite lexical verb, DO shares an important grammatical property with other lexical finite verbs: It cannot raise to the left of the subject. “*Does she her homework?” and “*Completes she her homework?” are both ungrammatical clauses. In another way lexical DO is different from other lexical verbs: The meaning is under specified and must be determined from the interaction of its direct object with context. “She does her homework” may mean “She completes her homework” (with a more semantically specified main lexical verb) or “She is working on her homework,” (with a different main lexical verb and an auxiliary form of BE that appears in I to carry TNS and AGR marking). Here we are interested in the similar grammatical properties of main verb DO and other lexical main verbs, and will refer to this function as *Lexical Verb DO* in our coding system¹. We are also interested in whether children could confuse lexical main verb DO with auxiliary DO which does raise to the left of the subject.

In a different grammatical context, DO can appear as a stressed form before the main verb to mark a finite clause as positive rather than negative. As illustrated in Figure 2, in this usage DO carries TNS and AGR in I, the head of IP projection, in communicative situations in which positive DO denies a stated or implied negative. Here we refer to this usage as *Emphatic DO*. This form of DO also cannot raise to the left of the subject. “*Does she swim?” loses the emphatic positive sense and instead is interpreted as the auxiliary use of DO. It is not clear if emphatic DO raises from V to I, or is inserted directly into I; for our purposes we focus on the fact that it clearly is in I as a verb form carrying finiteness marking.

Auxiliary DO in this study refers to auxiliary DO use in questions, and is illustrated in Figure 3. Pollock (1989) worked out the syntactic properties of auxiliary DO and copula and

¹In this text, capitalized names for the forms of DO denote the names of coding categories as implemented in this study. Uncapitalized names are generic linguistic terms for the structures. In this section, first use of coding category names is italicized, as are the Government and Binding theory terms for morphosyntactic phrasal projections.

auxiliary BE in English. Under this model, questions are derived from the matrix clauses via movement of TNS and AGR features to a projection above (i.e., to the left of) the IP, known as the *complementizer phrase* (CP). This projection also includes two sites: C and the specifier of C' position. As shown in the illustrated clause, "Where does the girl swim?" the Wh- element is moved from the lower VP to the specifier of C' position. Non-emphatic auxiliary DO occupies the C position where TNS and AGR appear via movement from I. The standard account is that auxiliary DO moves from IP in the same way as auxiliary BE (Pollock, 1989) although Chomsky suggests it may be directly inserted in C (1995, p. 164, footnote 20). Figure 3 depicts the standard version. In this position DO does not carry the meanings of either the lexical verb usage or the emphatic DO usage. Because there is no apparent meaning for this use of DO it is sometimes called "Dummy" DO. Lightfoot (1999) argues that the introduction of DO as solely a structural requirement was triggered by historic changes in the verb movement system of the English grammar. Importantly, although lexical verb and emphatic DO carry TNS and AGR they appear in the IP, not CP, projection.

A type of auxiliary DO also appears in reduced clauses that are understood to repeat the content of an earlier clause, sometimes referred to as "stranding." *Elliptical DO* is illustrated in Figure 4. This example is a reply to a question such as "Does she swim in the morning?" In the reply, "She does," the omitted VP is inferred from the previous utterance. Of interest here is the requirement that elliptical DO carries TNS and AGR as the occupant of I. In this example it does not move to C, to the left of the subject.

Figure 5 illustrates the finiteness marking property of DO in tag questions, referred to here as *Tag DO*. The example clause, "She smiles, doesn't she?" is similar to elliptical DO in that the tag construction, "doesn't she?" is related to another matrix clause. As such, the choice of DO for both elliptical DO and in tag constructions is linked to lexical verbs in matrix clauses. If the matrix clause has BE copula or auxiliary, as in "She is happy," DO is not allowed and BE auxiliary must appear in the tag question, "isn't she?" or elliptical sentence, "She is." There are also important differences between elliptical and tag functions of DO. In tag constructions DO moves to the left of the subject for TNS and AGR marking to C of the CP projection, with interrogative force. Also, as shown in the examples, the tag question must contrast positive and negative polarity, such that a positive clause has a negative tag. In the interest of simplicity, this semantic/pragmatic requirement is not included in Figure 5.

In summary, like other lexical main verbs, lexical DO includes the feature "+verb" and cannot move overtly outside the VP and thus cannot raise around the subject. Emphatic DO precedes the lexical verb in what could appear to be the auxiliary position but it cannot raise to the left of the subject, presumably for semantic reasons. Auxiliary DO is generated in I and moves to C in main clause interrogatives and tag-questions. Elliptical DO stays in I with an omitted VP. DO in tag questions moves to C and coordinates the selection of DO if a lexical verb appears in the matrix clause and contrasts the polarity of the tag (negative vs affirmative) with the polarity of the main clause. Children must sort through these various grammatical requirements as they encounter instances of DO use in the speech they hear and as they employ the forms of DO in their utterances. In short, there is much more to DO than auxiliary use in questions, with many possibilities of confusion about when movement is allowed to I or C and when movement is not allowed.

Brief Summary of Children's Acquisition of DO and DO as Part of a Clinical Marker of SLI

An emerging generalization is that auxiliary DO poses a particular challenge to young children learning English as a native language (Stromswold, 1990; Santelmann et al., 2002;

Rowland et al., 2005; Rowland, 2007) and for children learning English as a second language (Paradis et al., 2008). This generalization is also supported by evidence from young typically developing children studied as controls in studies of children with SLI (Rice et al., 1995; Rice & Wexler, 1996; Rice et al., 2009). Early on there were indications that DO was part of a grammatical clinical marker for SLI (Morehead & Ingram, 1973), although the relationship of DO to other morphemes was not recognized in this early work.

In the 1990s Rice and Wexler and colleagues instigated programmatic study of auxiliary DO as part of finiteness marking of TNS and AGR in English as a possible grammatical clinical marker of SLI, based on Wexler's theory of Optional Infinitives (Wexler, 1998). Essentially, the OI account predicts that Auxiliary DO, as part of the TNS/AGR morphosyntax of English, is likely to be omitted in the grammars of young children. Rice and Wexler hypothesized an Extended Optional Infinitive (EOI) period in which children with SLI show a protracted period of omitted DO (Rice et al., 1995; Rice & Wexler, 1996; Rice et al., 2009) although other properties of the syntax, including the basic X' scaffolding of Figures 1–5, is thought to be available to young children (cf. Wexler, 1998; Wexler, in press). The emerging generalization is that children with SLI are more likely than younger language-equivalent children to omit auxiliary DO, and to accept omitted auxiliary DO in questions as grammatical into the adolescent years (Rice et al., 2009).

Direct investigation of the forms of DO beyond auxiliary DO in the utterances of children with SLI is limited. Early on, studies documented that 4-to-5-year-old children with SLI use lexical verb DO as one of their most frequently used verbs (Rice & Bode, 1993; Watkins, Rice, & Moltz, 1993), with a very low rate of overt errors. Stromswold (1990) reported for typically developing children that lexical verb DO appeared in young children's utterances about five months earlier, on average, than auxiliary DO, around 28 months of age. Hadley and Rice (1996) addressed this issue in a study of 11 young children with SLI, compared to seven younger typically developing children. This study included comparisons of lexical verb DO to auxiliary forms of DO (a category comprised of DO in ellipsis, auxiliary DO in questions, and DO in negation). They reported the SLI group used lexical verb DO on average 1 ½ months earlier than auxiliary forms of DO, around 42.6 months. The pattern was also evident in the typically developing children, with lexical DO emerging around 24.3 months, although with a shorter interval to first use of auxiliary DO, around 25.2 months (noting here that the difference did not meet statistical significance in the small sample). When examining the emergence patterns of the different auxiliary uses of DO, they found that in the SLI group auxiliary DO appeared first in ellipsis (for eight of the 11 children) or negation (for the remaining three children). In comparison, the control group showed ellipsis-first acquisition in two of the seven children, with four of the children using auxiliary DO in questions first, and one using negation first. Further, when Mean Length of Utterance (MLU) averaged 3.00 or above, the SLI group's AGR accuracy for auxiliary DO in ellipsis, inversion or negation contexts was 91%. The conclusion was that the morphosyntactic properties of DO in lexical verb and auxiliary DO contexts are available to the children with SLI early on, with few AGR errors. The limitation of the study was that the emergence measure, following Stromswold (1990), was first use of the target form. Investigation of somewhat more advanced children would allow for calculation of the percentage correct in obligatory contexts of use, a more robust metric. A full survey of use of DO in lexical verb DO contexts, compared to auxiliary, emphatic, ellipsis, and tag question uses in spontaneous speech is needed in order to evaluate relative ease and difficulty of the various forms and to evaluate whether plurifunctionality contributes to auxiliary DO omissions.

Interpretive Frameworks and Predictions

The plurifunctional properties of homophonous DO summarized above could contribute to the protracted period of acquisition for auxiliary DO for typically developing children and children with SLI. The same phonological form has different underlying representations in the grammar, with different projections and different semantic, syntactic, and morphosyntactic rules and constraints. Further, the phonological form is a single syllable that often appears in clause-internal sites that could further add to processing demands. A child could be confused by multiple hypotheses for how to use DO across the different usages encountered in conversational speech. This could happen if the child had a breakdown in domain-general implicit learning (Tomblin, Mainela-Arnold, & Zhang, 2007) or possibly if children made the wrong inferences from their statistical learning from input (Evans, Saffron & Robe-Torres, 2009), or perhaps the many grammatical functions of DO require verbal memory capacity that exceeds the verbal memory of children with SLI (Gathercole, 2006). If the child was confused about grammatical constraints, errors of usage, such as “*Does she her homework?” would be expected.

The Surface Account of SLI predicts omission of auxiliary DO as a consequence of a processing weakness such that grammatical forms with low perceptual salience are particularly affected when producing them requires the alignment of multiple types of information (Leonard, 1998). This accounts for why a homophonous phoneme can be produced accurately in word-final position but omitted as a morphological affix, for example *–/z/* in “rose” is accurate but omitted in the verb “flies” to mark third person singular present tense. The account also predicts omission of single morpheme function words, such as BE, and, presumably, DO, as a consequence of incomplete processing (Leonard, Eyer, Bedore, & Grela, 1997; Leonard, 1998). The account focuses on “closed class” forms and does not address the learning challenges that could operate in the case of DO where children have to sort out when it is operating as an auxiliary with shared grammatical properties of other auxiliaries versus when it is operating as a main verb with shared constraints of the main verb site in the syntax versus when it carries emphatic force but cannot move to the left of the main verb. In all these contexts DO carries TNS and AGR markings but the word order rules vary.

As noted above, the EOI account posits that children with SLI have access to the underlying syntactic framework, the scaffolding depicted in Figures 1–5. Under this account, the weakness for finiteness marking appears in the children’s grammar as an under-specification of TNS and AGR in I and C. The account accurately predicts omission of finiteness markings in finite sites in the clause and avoidance of overt tense TNS/AGR morphemes in non-finite sites. When children use forms of auxiliary DO these forms are likely to be restricted to finite sites in the C projection, and to show AGR when they are used. That is, overt errors of word order or agreement are unlikely to appear. These predictions follow from the assumption that children, even children with SLI, optionally omit TNS/AGR at the same time that they have the capacity to correctly represent TNS/AGR. If the representation is activated then overt errors of word order or agreement are unlikely (cf. Rice & Wexler, 1996, p. 1242; also, Wexler, Schütze & Rice, 1998). Another implication is that if SLI children represent the syntactic category of V in the verb projection, then they would know that Lexical DO could not precede the subject.

Following a generative representational model, Snyder (2007; 2010) offers a broad view of young typically developing children’s spontaneous utterances, across many languages, under a Grammatical Conservatism (GC) model, such that “children do not make productive, spontaneous use of a new syntactic structure until they have both determined that the structure is permitted in the adult language, and identified the adults’ grammatical basis for

it” (Snyder, 2010). He notes that the majority of children’s spontaneous errors involve omission, not overt errors of commission, and such errors of commission are limited to a tiny subset of the logical possibilities. He posits a model in which parameters of syntax guide children’s acquisition such that children use only certain parameters that are definitely permitted in the target language. Further, he notes that the omissions of optional infinitives are exceptional properties of children’s language use, probably under maturational control (as posited by Wexler, 2003). Snyder argues that finiteness omissions are also compatible with his claim of grammatical conservatism, given the fact that typically developing children show much knowledge of the adult grammar at the time that they omit finiteness forms (Snyder, 2007, pp. 170–171). In other words, the GC model presents a framework unifying the observation that young children avoid many possible grammatical errors in their speech while at the same time, in the languages that show optional infinitive use, they are likely to omit finiteness forms.

We suggest here an extension of the GC model to children with SLI, with the prediction that children with SLI also follow a GC path into their grammar, showing knowledge of grammatical representations of the sort demonstrated in Figures 1–5 in their spontaneous speech as they use multiple grammatical functions of DO, with varying constraints, and yet at the same time they persist in their use of a grammar that allows for omission of Auxiliary DO, but no omissions or errors of Lexical Verb DO or auxiliary DO in Elliptical DO contexts. As in the EOI account, children with SLI are expected to be similar to their younger language equivalent peers in their use of DO forms with the exception of auxiliary DO, which is more likely to be omitted by children with SLI. Further, the GC account could explain if some forms of DO are used rarely in the children’s spontaneous utterances, as this account predicts that young children will avoid producing structures they have not identified in the adult target grammar for entry into their grammar.

This descriptive study across a wide range of DO forms addressed the following questions:

1. What are the early usage patterns of DO in children with and without SLI?
2. Are all categories of DO use evident?
3. Is the same profile of DO use observed in children with SLI compared to age-equivalent and language-equivalent control children?
4. Do errors of DO use differentiate children with SLI compared to age-equivalent and language-equivalent control children?
5. Does the evidence support the EOI and GC models?

Methods

Participants

Thirty-seven children with SLI ages 5;0–5;6 participated, with two control groups: 37 age-equivalent (AE) children and 15 language-equivalent (LE) children ages 2;6–4;10. The racial composition of the full sample was: 80 white, six more than one race, one American Indian/Alaskan Native, two not reported. Ethnicity was 83 Not Hispanic, four Hispanic, two not reported. The participants were drawn from an archival database collected as part of an on-going longitudinal study, approved by the University of Kansas Human Subjects Committee, of children with SLI, their siblings, and parents, as well as control children and their siblings. (Rice et al., 2010; Rice, Smith, & Gayán, 2009). Children with SLI and control children were recruited from schools and attendance centers in Kansas and Missouri. Their siblings and parents were recruited into the study following the enrollment of the target children. All children in this study had normal or above intellectual functioning

defined as a standard score of 85 or above on the Columbia Mental Maturity Scale (CMMS; Burgemeister, Blum, & Lorge, 1972); a passing score on the phonological probe of the Test of Early Grammatical Impairment (TEGI; Rice & Wexler, 2001), which assesses final -t, -d, -s, and -z; no diagnosis of autism, intellectual, behavioral, or social impairments; passed a hearing screening at 25 dB (30 dB in noisy environments) at 1000, 2000, and 4000 Hz; and performance on the Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation (GFTA; Goldman & Fristoe, 2000) above the 15th percentile, in order to ensure sufficient intelligibility for coding morphemes in spontaneous speech samples (distortions of consonant blends in initial position were exceptions to the 15th percentile rule if they were the only source of low scoring).

Spontaneous language samples were collected from the children every six months. The samples were collected by trained examiners in naturalistic play settings with toys for the purpose of eliciting valid utterances for the calculation of Mean Length of Utterance (MLU) with sufficient numbers of obligatory finiteness contexts for analysis of finiteness markers. Each sample lasted approximately 25 minutes with a target of 200 complete and intelligible child utterances per sample (see Rice et al., 2010). Inter-transcriber reliabilities exceed 85% on utterance, word, code, and morpheme levels based on regular monitoring.

From the data archive, children in the SLI group were selected who met the following criteria:

1. A minimum of five instances of DO contexts in the spontaneous sample (Ingram, 1989).
2. An MLU from the spontaneous language sample in the affected range, defined as MLU standard score of 85 or less, based on local norms (Rice et al., 2010), where the mean = 100 and standard deviation = 15.
3. Classified as SLI in the longitudinal study based on at least one omnibus language standard score below 85, either the Test of Early Language Development 2 (TELD-2; Hresko, Reid, & Hammill, 1991), the TELD 3 (Hresko, Reid, & Hammill, 1999) or the Test of Language Development Primary 2 (TOLD-P2; Newcomer & Hammill, 1988) depending on age at time of testing. Omnibus test data was collected within six months of the language samples analyzed.
4. A composite standard score on the TEGI (Rice & Wexler, 2001) of one standard deviation or more below the mean, based on the means and standard deviations provided in the manual.

Children in the control groups met the following criteria:

1. A minimum of five instances of DO contexts in the spontaneous language sample.
2. An MLU from the spontaneous language sample in the unaffected range, defined as MLU standard score of 85 or greater, based on local norms (Rice et al., 2010)
3. Performed above 85 standard score on omnibus language measures (TELD-2; Hresko et al., 1991, TELD-3; Hresko et al., 1999, or TOLD-P2; Newcomer & Hammill, 1988, depending on age at time of testing). Omnibus assessment was collected within six months of the analyzed spontaneous sample.
4. A composite standard score on the TEGI of higher than one standard deviation below the mean, calculated with the means and standard deviations provided in the manual (Rice & Wexler, 2001).

The sample of children with SLI focused on the 5;0–5;6 age level as a time of early finiteness marking (Rice & Wexler, 2001). Thirty-seven children, mean age = 5;3 were

selected who met all criteria, with an obtained mean MLU of 3.67, range 3.3–4.11, for the SLI Group. From the available younger children in the database 15 children were selected for MLU equivalence, defined as each child in the group having a MLU that was within 0.1 of at least one member of the SLI group (cf. Rice, Redmond, & Hoffman, 2006). The MLUs for these groups were not significantly different ($t[50] = -1.58, p = .12, d = 0.54$). The N for this group is smaller due to the relatively stringent inclusion criteria and fewer available unaffected younger children. The LE group's mean age was 3;8 with an age range of 2;6–4;10². Finally, 37 children were selected for the AE group, with a mean age of 5;3 and range 5;0–5;6. The children met all the criteria listed above.

Table 1 reports the means for each of the measures used in participant selection and the means of the TEGI *DO* standard score, calculated from means and standard deviations provided by the manual (Rice & Wexler, 2001). The table indicates that the SLI group differed from the control groups on overall language performance at the time of the analyzed language sample.

Data Analysis Procedures

For each transcript, a concordance of all uses of forms of *DO* was generated using Systematic Analysis of Language Transcripts program (SALT, Miller & Chapman, 2002). Each utterance containing a form of *DO* was coded. This included a polarity code, differentiating affirmative versus negative uses of *DO*. Because no previous reports exist of the distribution of affirmative and negative uses of *DO* by children with SLI and control groups, we wished to describe this distribution and to further code the affirmative uses according to the syntactic structures illustrated in Figures 1–5: Lexical Verb *DO*, Emphatic *DO*, Auxiliary *DO*, Elliptical *DO* and Tag *DO*. We focused on affirmative uses because negation differs from the affirmative uses in semantic, morpho-phonological, syntactic, and dialectal ways that complicate direct comparisons across the two types of *DO* auxiliaries and the interpretation of children's errors relative to the adult grammar: Negation involves a semantic component that often appears as *DO* + a contracted form, i.e., “don't” and “doesn't.” Further, the negation component is, under a generative model, hypothesized to reside in another functional projection, NEG, with complex related grammatical properties that may or may not involve another hypothesized functional projection for MOOD (See Guasti, Thornton, & Wexler, 1995; Guasti, 2002; Schütze, 2010). Finally, there are dialectal variants on the requirements of the 3rd person form of *DO*+NEG, such that “he don't” can be acceptable in local dialects, usage that can complicate inferences about AGR + NEG (Oetting & McDonald, 2001). This study generates an overall count of instances of negative uses of *DO*, without further analyses to differentiate the semantic, morpho-phonological, morphosyntactic, or dialectal properties, which warrant detailed analyses beyond the scope of this study. Given possible dialectal use of “don't” with 3rd person singular subjects, the coding of NEG reported below is conservative with regard to possible errors attributable to dialect and does not include non-agreeing “don't” in the Error category.

Children's affirmative responses were coded according to: Accuracy (correct/omission/error), subject person (1st, 2nd, 3rd), subject number (singular/plural), and tense (present/past). Errors were categorized in a separate error table for each transcript. Transcripts were coded by a single coder with a second coder trained to evaluate the reliability of the coding scheme. Inter-coder reliability on 6% of the transcripts was 96.5% Utterances with multiple *DO*s did not enter into analyses because of the complexities of interpreting errors when there

²The age range is somewhat larger than usual. Out of the children in the archival sample who met all the criteria for the LE group, all but two were in the age range from 2;6–4;1; the two exceptions were 4;8 and 4;10. Inspection of their *DO* contexts did not show performance differences from others in the LE group.

is more than one DO in the clause. The counts of DO, whenever possible, are based on obligatory contexts, according to the adult grammar (Brown, 1973).

The accuracy code always referred to the accuracy of the DO form. Sentences that were malformed, but where the DO use was correct were counted as correct DO uses, although they received a code indicating there was another, non-DO error in the sentence. Non-omission DO errors refer to errors of commission, such as using the wrong DO form (e.g. “*Does they like candy?” or a BE substitution for DO, or vice versa (e.g. “*where is this go?”). Omissions referred to utterances where the DO form was obligatory in the adult grammar but had been omitted (e.g. “*what you want?”). Omissions of DO in 2nd person yes/no questions were coded (e.g. “you want a cookie?”), but were not included in counts of DO omissions in any analyses because these types of utterances are allowed in discourse contexts in the adult grammar. In utterances such as “*where he go?” an omitted DO was assumed. Although it is possible that a modal verb, such as “can,” was intended, transcribers had access to contextual information to infer that the semantics of a modal interpretation did not apply.

Results

Each child’s total number of correct, omissions, and errors for each category were calculated. Caveats apply for the identification of omission errors in some categories. Obligatory contexts for Negation, Lexical Verb and Emphatic DO uses can be difficult to detect, rendering Omissions as unlikely, although overt morpho-syntactic or AGR errors are readily detectable. Obligatory contexts for Elliptical DO were observed in utterances such as “so (do) the windows” where the “do” was omitted. Another caveat is that plural present subjects do not require overt AGR morphology, as in “they do the housework”; if plural subjects appear frequently this would limit the opportunities to observe Omissions. Preliminary analyses revealed rare use of tag questions in the samples, with insufficient numbers for analyses. That category was dropped from further analyses.

Questions 1 and 2

What are the early usage patterns of DO in spontaneous utterances of children with and without SLI? Are all categories of DO use evident early on?

These questions were treated as initial descriptive summaries of the data. Given the lack of such descriptive information in the literature we report here all uses, affirmative and negative. The average number of correct uses, DO omissions, and non-omission DO errors were calculated to provide an overview of the general patterns of usage in these three groups. These means are presented in Figures 6–8.

Figures 6–8 demonstrate that general usage patterns of DO were similar across all groups. With the exception of Auxiliary DO use in the SLI group, errors and omissions of DO were rare in all groups and categories. At another level, we examined the proportion of children per DO form in each category for each group. These proportions are presented in Table 2.

Figures 6–8 and Table 2 show that negative uses of DO were frequent and appeared in each child’s sample, primarily in the form of “don’t.” It is clear that all the target categories of DO are not present in the spontaneous samples of all children. There is a wide range in the proportion of children who use DO contexts across categories. For example, Auxiliary DO as well as Lexical Verb DO appears for most children in all groups, but Emphatic DO appears for few children. Analyses of within-subject comparisons of accuracy across all forms of DO were not appropriate given the lack of use of all forms across all children.

Question 3

Is the same profile of DO use observed in children with SLI compared to age-equivalent and language-equivalent control children?

For this question, analyses are restricted to affirmative DO, with a minimum number of three DO coding contexts in a given category in order for that child to enter into comparisons for that category (Ingram, 1989). For Lexical Verb DO, there were 15 children from the SLI group, five children from the LE group, and 20 children from the AE group with at least three DO contexts. For Auxiliary DO, there were 23 children from the SLI group, nine children from the LE group, and 25 children from the AE group with at least three DO contexts. For Elliptical DO, there were nine children from the SLI group, two children from the LE group, and seven children from the AE group with at least three DO contexts. Because there were no children who had more than three contexts for Emphatic DO, this category was not included in this analysis.

The dependent variable was the child's proportion correct out of all DO contexts per category, calculated as Total correct/Total correct + Total omissions + Total non-omission errors.). Coding for grammatical subjects revealed relatively few uses of plural subjects, thereby reducing the possible complications for estimating Omissions. The proportion of plural present tense subjects for Auxiliary DO contexts for the SLI group was 14%, AE group, 18%, and LE group, 11%.

For all comparisons, effect sizes for group ANOVA results are reported as η^2 and effect sizes for t-tests are reported as Cohen's d values (Cohen, 1988). A one-way ANOVA was conducted to identify effects of group on the mean proportion correct for each category (see Figure 9). For Auxiliary DO use, the means and standard deviations per group are as follows: SLI, .37 (.32); LE, .82 (.24); and AE, .92 (.03). There was a significant effect of group ($F[2,54] = 33.76, p < .01, \eta^2 = .56$). Follow-up pairwise comparisons revealed that the proportion correct on Auxiliary DO use was significantly different between the SLI and LE groups ($t[30] = -3.9, p < .001, d = 1.66$) and the SLI and the AE groups, adjusting for unequal variances ($t[29.9] = -7.7, p < .001, d = 2.43$), such that the SLI group had significantly lower levels of accuracy on Auxiliary DO than both the LE and AE groups.

For Lexical Verb and Elliptical DO use, all unaffected control children had perfect accuracy, with no variation in the accuracy levels. Therefore an ANOVA was inappropriate for these categories. The SLI group scored trivially lower than the controls on Lexical Verb use, with mean proportion correct and standard deviation of .97 (.07). For Elliptical DO use, five children in the SLI group had perfect accuracy, one had a proportion correct DO use of .8, two had a proportion correct of .67, and one had a proportion correct of .5.

Although within group comparisons were ruled out for the unaffected control children due to perfect accuracy on Lexical Verb and Elliptical DO, there were ten children in the SLI group who had more than three uses of Lexical Verb DO and more than three uses of Auxiliary DO, allowing for a within group comparison. A paired samples t-test revealed that for this subset of the SLI group, they were significantly more accurate on Lexical DO than Auxiliary DO ($t[9] = 3.86, p < .01, d = 1.43$).

Question 4

Do errors of DO use differentiate children with SLI compared to AE and LE control children?

To address the final research question, an analysis of the error patterns for each group was conducted. Two categories of errors were considered: DO omissions and non-omission DO

errors. In order to evaluate error rates, proportions of each error type were calculated and compared across groups.

In these analyses the denominator for the calculation of proportion of errors reflected only the opportunities for that error type, such that the denominator in the calculation of proportion of errors depended on the type of error being analyzed. DO omissions can occur in any context where the DO form is required structurally. Because Emphatic DO is never structurally required, it did not factor into the calculation of proportion of DO omissions. Therefore the denominator for the proportion of DO omissions was each child's total number of Auxiliary DO contexts, Lexical Verb DO contexts, and Elliptical DO contexts. The non-omission DO errors category refers to errors of commission, where a DO form appeared, but was incorrect either because the child made an error of TNS/AGR marking, confused the DO form with a BE form, or used an over-regularized form. Because non-omission DO errors can occur in any utterance containing a DO form, the denominator for non-omission DO errors was each child's total number of DO uses, including Emphatic DO uses. These proportions were then averaged for each group.

Table 3 contains the group means of these proportions in addition to the total number of each error type and the total number of contexts for each error type. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate group differences in proportion of errors. There was a significant effect for group on the proportion of DO omissions ($F[2,86] = 12.35, p < .001, \eta^2 = .22$), and non-omission DO errors ($F[2,86] = 3.45, p < .05, \eta^2 = .07$). Pairwise comparisons to probe these overall group effects were subsequently conducted.

Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare the error patterns of children with SLI to those of the LE group. Differences between the SLI and the LE control group were significant for the proportion of DO omissions ($t[50] = 2.07, p < .05, d = .64$) such that the SLI group had significantly more DO omissions than the LE group. There were no significant differences between the SLI group and the LE group on non-omission DO errors ($t[50] = 0.27, p = .79, d = 0.09$). The dominant error type for children with SLI in these data is omission of the DO form. The error patterns of the AE group compared to the SLI group were also compared using independent samples t-tests. Because the AE children had reached adult-level mastery, they performed at ceiling with minimal numbers of errors for each error type. Adjusting for inequality of variances, there were significant differences between the two groups on the proportion of DO omissions ($t[42.7] = 5.14, p < .001, d = 1.35$) and the proportion of non-omission DO errors ($t[37] = 2.47, p < .05, d = 0.73$), such that the SLI group had significantly more of each error type than the AE group.

Discussion

This study was designed to examine the early usage patterns of multiple grammatical functions of DO by children with and without SLI, as an investigation of how children manage a plurifunctional form, as well to evaluate theoretical accounts of the deficit in SLI. Multiple grammatical functions, with varying constraints, could pose particular problems for children with SLI as they sort through the differences, which could plausibly contribute to their known protracted acquisition of auxiliary DO (Rice & Wexler, 1996; Rice et al., 1998; Rice et al., 2009). If plurifunctionality adds to the learning problems for children with SLI, and therefore contributes to their difficulty with auxiliary DO, then children with SLI are likely to have difficulty with multiple functions of DO, with errors of commission as well as omissions across grammatical contexts. On the other hand, children with SLI could be similar to younger language-equivalent children in their deduction of fundamental syntactic representations such as the scaffolding depicted in Figures 1–5. They could form representations that would constrain commission errors while leaving auxiliary DO

vulnerable to omission errors attributable to special weaknesses of under-specification of TNS and AGR, as predicted by the GC and EOI models.

The evidence from this investigation supports the prediction that children with SLI do not have general difficulties with DO. Instead, the difficulty appears to be localized to a tendency to omit auxiliary DO in finiteness-required contexts. Children with SLI had significantly lower proportion correct Auxiliary DO use compared to both the LE and the AE groups. In stark contrast, children with SLI performed at near ceiling levels for Lexical Verb DO, similarly to both control groups. Additionally, the within-group comparison demonstrates children with SLI had significantly lower proportion correct on Auxiliary DO compared to their use of Lexical Verb DO. These outcomes, using proportion correct use, are consistent with earlier studies of the emergence of DO forms in young children's language (Stromswold, 1990; Hadley & Rice, 1996). Both groups of control children had 100% accuracy on Lexical Verb DO, with lower levels of accuracy for Auxiliary DO; the SLI group performed near-ceiling for Lexical DO while they continued to omit Auxiliary DO at a very high rate. Lexical verb DO is not only first to emerge in young children; it is also first to become mastered in comparison to auxiliary DO.

Children with SLI also had higher performance on Elliptical DO (mean proportion correct = .85) than on Auxiliary DO in questions (mean proportion correct = .37). Although this is a sizeable difference, interpretation is limited by variable accuracy rates in a small set of children for Elliptical DO. Of the nine SLI children who met the criterion of three elliptical utterances, five had perfect performance and four did not. The overall mean proportion correct of .85 can be taken as preliminary evidence that children with SLI are relatively accurate with Elliptical DO, although replication is needed. The high proportion correct with Elliptical DO is notable, however, considering the multiple dimensions that need to be aligned for proper use of Elliptical DO.

Error Patterns

The error patterns clearly show that the hallmark error for children with SLI was omission of Auxiliary DO in questions, rather than errors of commission. Overt agreement errors (errors of commission) were rare for all children. Group differences between the SLI group and the AE control group were significant for both error types due to the fact that the AE group had near perfect accuracy in their DO use. However, the only significant difference between the SLI group and the LE group was for Auxiliary DO omissions. The two groups were similar in their rate of occasional agreement errors; children with SLI produce equivalent numbers of non-omission errors as their LE peers. Overall, children with SLI perform at significantly lower levels of accuracy than typical LE peers, due to the omission errors for Auxiliary DO consistent with a selective difficulty with the morphosyntactic requirement of TNS/AGR marking (Rice, 2003). Omissions of Lexical Verb DO forms or Elliptical DO forms were exceedingly rare or non-existent.

Note that the children did not make errors indicating confusion of different functions of DO. For example children never made errors where a Lexical Verb DO was raised up to the CP to form a question, as in “*Does she her homework?”. As predicted by the GC and EOI models, the lack of errors with Lexical Verb DO suggests that the SLI children, as well as the controls, know that this form of DO has the feature “+verb” and therefore it cannot undergo movement. The avoidance of these types of errors is consistent with the prediction that children acquire the many forms of DO separately, according to morphosyntactic properties. Taken together, the findings on early use of multiple functions of DO indicate that children, both typically developing and children with SLI, appear to acquire multiple functions of a plurifunctional form with minimal confusion of the distinct grammatical properties.

Theoretical Implications

Overall, the outcomes of the study are consistent with predictions of the GC account and the EOI account. A major advantage of these interpretations is that they can accommodate that the grammars of children with SLI, as well as younger children, apparently include accurate representations of syntactic properties of lexical verb DO and elliptical DO at the same time that auxiliary DO is omitted. Interestingly, children with SLI do not generate all possible forms of errors, nor do they omit all forms of DO.

The strengths of the grammars of children with SLI can be overlooked in models proposed to account for their weaknesses in grammatical acquisition based on general learning mechanisms (cf. Tomblin, et al 2007). Other models, such as the Surface Account (Leonard, 1998; Leonard, et al., 1997), assume children have access to syntactic representations but such models have not addressed how to reconcile the pattern of omissions of DO with avoidance of errors in use of lexical or elliptical DO. A more complete evaluation of the predictions of the Surface Account for uses of DO will require evaluation of the salience of DO in its various clausal contexts.

Consistent with the GC account, we found very few errors of commission (Non-omission DO errors), with many more errors of DO Omission, particularly for the children in the SLI group. At the level of individual transcripts, however, we did observe one type of non-omission error, the addition of finiteness morphology on main verbs in utterances where the DO serves an auxiliary function (e.g. “*where does this goes?”). These types of errors in the SLI group were closely examined to determine if they are representative of the SLI group’s grammar, and also to determine if these should be considered in conflict with the GC predictions about errors of commission. Main verb finiteness errors in clauses with auxiliary DO were not representative of the SLI group as whole. Less than half of the SLI children produced these types of errors at all, and of those that did, three children contributed more than half of the errors.

The question for the GC perspective is whether these types of errors represent a possible abstract grammar that the child is considering. Across the three children with the most main verb finiteness errors of this type, only one child demonstrated evidence that this error type was part of his abstract grammar. Examination of language samples collected within six months of the ones analyzed here revealed that one child showed continued main verb finiteness errors in clauses with auxiliary DO, making it possible that this error type was part of this child’s grammar. Of the other two children with many main verb finiteness errors, one child’s count was high because of frequent use of the phrase “*where this goes?” during the setting up period of the play session. Because this error type occurred in only one phrase construction, it could be limited to one context or it could be more productive in clauses not elicited, making it impossible to determine if this error represented a possible grammar the child was entertaining or an unanalyzed form. The third child with many of these errors had resolved this issue within six months. The presence of these types of errors in a few children demonstrates one way that the grammatical system could potentially break down. Therefore it is notable that, in fact, the children in the SLI group overwhelmingly do not produce this type of error. This perspective is consistent with the GC account. Children with SLI generally do not misplace finiteness morphology in question formation.

Overall, we conclude that the grammatical properties of each form are what dictate whether it will be a challenge to children with SLI, in spite of the homophony of the DO form across different grammatical functions. The GC notion adds further specification to the EOI model, by clarifying further the ways in which children with SLI are similar to younger typically developing children, and suggesting possible mechanisms which guide children’s acquisition of grammar that may be shared by children with and without SLI.

Let us acknowledge the empirical strengths and limitations of the study. The partitioning of negative from affirmative clauses is a strong element of the study, avoiding possible complications of interpretation attributable to the semantic dimension of negation, as well as morpho-syntactic or dialectal variants. At the same time, detailed description of negative DO clausal contexts warrants further study. As with other studies of this kind, the group sizes are relatively small and therefore have limited power to detect small effects. This is especially important when low incidence phenomena such as grammatical errors are of theoretical interest. Recall Snyder's (2007) notion that children will avoid producing new syntactic structures requiring grammatical structures they have not identified as grammatical in the adult grammar. This prediction bears on the results of this study, in which there were few tag questions, presumably related to the clausal requirements diagrammed in Figure 5. If children with SLI or young children are likely to avoid structures they do not have entered in their grammar (with the notable exception of auxiliary DO), then targeted elicitation procedures may be needed in order to generate sufficient examples for investigation of possible errors.

The multiple forms of DO and the findings reported here suggest ways to refine the design of clinical interventions to enhance the grammatical abilities of children with SLI. Clinicians could consider introducing Elliptical DO as a context to highlight early use of Auxiliary DO. In elliptical contexts, auxiliary properties of DO could be taught in tandem with auxiliary BE, highlighting the ways in which both forms can appear in the same site in questions or in ellipsis. At the very least, the design of intervention programs must be mindful of the multiple grammatical functions of DO, and the likelihood that if DO is omitted for questions it may not mean that DO will be omitted in all possible contexts of use. Likewise, our interpretive models must be mindful of the ways in which children with SLI apparently have robust access to subtle grammatical constraints at the same time they have persistent immature grammars for other properties of the grammar.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the National Institutes of Health Grants T32DC000052, P30DC005803, R01DC001803, and R01DC005226 to Mabel Rice, as well as by the University of Kansas Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Research Center Grant P30HD002528 to John Colombo. The study is based on a thesis completed by the second author in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master of Arts degree at the University of Kansas. Portions of the study were reported at the Symposium on Research in Child Language Disorders, Madison, Wisconsin, June, 2010 and at the Boston University Conference on Language Development, November, 2010. We would like to thank past and present research assistants and students in Mabel Rice's Language Acquisition Studies lab at the University of Kansas for data collection and data processing. Special thanks go to Denise Perpich for her assistance with data processing and summaries. We appreciate the time and effort of the children and their families who participated. We are grateful for the comments of editors and reviewers that added to the quality of the paper.

References

- Brown, R. A first language: The early stages. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1973.
- Burgemeister, BB.; Blum, LH.; Lorge, I. The Columbia Mental Maturity Scale. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation; 1972.
- Chomsky, N. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In: Hale, K.; Keyser, SJ., editors. The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 1993. p. 1-52.
- Chomsky, N. The minimalist program. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 1995.
- Cohen, J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. 2. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum; 1988.
- Evans JL, Saffran JR, Robe-Torres K. Statistical learning in children with Specific Language Impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2009; 52:321-335.
- Foder JD. Unambiguous triggers. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1998; 29:1-36.

- Gathercole SE. Complexities and constraints in non-word repetition and word learning. *Applied Psycholinguistics*. 2006; 27:599–614.
- Goldman, R.; Fristoe, M. Goldman Fristoe Test of Articulation-2. 2. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service; 2000.
- Guasti, MT.; Thornton, R.; Wexler, K. Negation in children's questions: The case of English. In: MacLaughlin, D.; McEwen, S., editors. *BUCLD 19 Proceedings*. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Press; 1995.
- Guasti, MT. *Language acquisition: The growth of grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 2002.
- Hadley P, Rice M. Emergent uses of BE and DO: Evidence from children with specific language impairment. *Language Acquisition*. 1996; 5:209–243.
- Haegeman, L. *Introduction to government and binding theory*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishing; 1991.
- Hresko, WP.; Reid, DK.; Hammill, DD. *The Test of Early Language Development 2*. 2. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed; 1991.
- Hresko, WP.; Reid, DK.; Hammill, DD. *The Test of Early Language Development 3*. 3. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed; 1999.
- Ingram, D. *First language acquisition: Method, description, and explanation*. New York: Cambridge University Press; 1989.
- Leonard, LB. *Children with specific language impairment*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 1998.
- Leonard LB, Eyer JA, Bedore LM, Grela BG. Three accounts of the grammatical morpheme difficulties of English-speaking children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 1997; 40:741–753.
- Lightfoot, D. *The development of language: Acquisition, change, and evolution*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers; 1999.
- Miller, JF.; Chapman, RS. *Systematic analysis of language transcripts (SALT software)*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Language Analysis Laboratory; 2002.
- Morehead DM, Ingram D. The development of base syntax in normal and linguistically deviant children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*. 1973; 16:330–352. [PubMed: 4744953]
- Newcomer, PL.; Hammill, DD. *Test of Language Development 2-Primary*. 2. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed; 1988.
- Oetting JB, McDonald JL. Nonmainstream dialect use and specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2001; 44:207–283.
- Paradis J, Rice ML, Crago M, Marquis J. The acquisition of tense in English: Distinguishing child second language from first language and specific language impairment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*. 2008; 29:689–722. [PubMed: 18852844]
- Pollock JY. Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1989; 20:365–424.
- Quirk, R.; Greenbaum, S.; Leech, G.; Svartik, J. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman; 1985.
- Rice, ML. A unified model of specific and general language delay: Grammatical tense as a clinical marker of unexpected variation. In: Levy, Y.; Schaeffer, J., editors. *Language competence across populations: Toward a definition of Specific Language Impairment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; 2003. p. 63-95.
- Rice ML, Bode J. GAPS in the verb lexicons of children with specific language impairment. *First Language*. 1993; 13:113–131.
- Rice ML, Hoffman L, Wexler K. Judgments of omitted BE and DO in questions as extended finiteness clinical markers of SLI to fifteen years: A study of growth and asymptote. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2009; 52:1417–1433.
- Rice M, Redmond S, Hoffman L. MLU in children with SLI and younger controls shows concurrent validity, stable and parallel growth trajectories. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2006; 49:793–808.

- Rice ML, Smith SD, Gayán J. Convergent genetic linkage and associations to language, speech and reading measures in families of probands with Specific Language Impairment. *Journal of Neurodevelopmental Disorders*. 2009; 1:284–282.
- Rice M, Smolik F, Perpich D, Thompson T, Rytting N, Blossom M. Mean length of utterance levels in 6-month intervals for children 3–9 years with and without language impairments. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2010; 53:333–349.
- Rice M, Wexler K. Toward tense as a clinical marker of specific language impairment in English-speaking children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*. 1996; 39:1239–1257. [PubMed: 8959609]
- Rice, ML.; Wexler, K. Rice/Wexler Test of Early Grammatical Impairment. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation; 2001.
- Rice M, Wexler K, Cleave P. Specific language impairment as a period of extended optional infinitive. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*. 1995; 38:850–863. [PubMed: 7474978]
- Rice M, Wexler K, Hershberger S. Tense over time: The longitudinal course of tense acquisition in children with specific language impairments. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 1998; 41:1412–1431.
- Rowland CF. Explaining errors in children's questions. *Cognition*. 2007; 104:106–134. [PubMed: 16839536]
- Rowland CF, Pine JM, Lieven EVM, Theakston AL. The incidence of error in young children's *wh*-questions. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2005; 48:384–404.
- Santelmann L, Berk S, Austin J, Somashekar S, Lust B. Continuity and development in the acquisition of inversion in yes/no question: dissociating movement and inflection. *Journal of Child Language*. 2002; 29:813–842. [PubMed: 12471974]
- Snyder, W. *Child Language: The parametric approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2007.
- Snyder, W. Children's grammatical conservatism: Implications for syntactic theory. Plenary address presented at the Boston University Conference on Language Development; Boston, MA. 2010 Nov.
- Stromswold, KJ. Learnability and the acquisition of auxiliaries. Doctoral dissertation. 1990. Retrieved from <http://dspace.mit.edu/>
- Tomblin JB, Mainela-Arnold E, Zhang X. Precedural learning in children with and without specific language impairment. *Journal of Child Language Learning and Development*. 2007; 3:2690293.
- Watkins RV, Rice ML, Moltz CC. Verb use by language-impaired and normally developing children. *First Language*. 1993; 13:133–143.
- Wexler K. Very early parameter setting and the unique checking constraint: a new explanation of the optional infinitive stage. *Lingua*. 1998; 106:23–79.
- Wexler, K. Lenneberg's dream: Learning, normal language development, and specific language impairment. In: Levy, Y.; Schaeffer, J., editors. *Language Competence Across Populations: Toward a definition of Specific Language Impairment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2003. p. 11-61.
- Wexler, K. Grammatical computation in the Optional Infinitive Stage. In: deVilliers, J.; Roeper, T., editors. *Handbook of Generative approaches to Language Acquisition: Studies in theoretical psycholinguistics*. New York: Springer Science+Business Media; 2011. p. 53-118.
- Wexler K, Schütze C, Rice ML. Subject case in children with SLI and unaffected controls: Evidence for the Agr/Tns omission model. *Language Acquisition*. 1998; 7:317–344.

Figure 1.
Lexical Verb DO

Figure 2.
Emphatic DO

Figure 3.
Auxiliary DO

Figure 4.
Elliptical DO

J Speech Lang Hear Res. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2014 February 01.

Figure 6.
Mean number of correct DO uses, DO omissions, and DO errors in all categories: SLI Group

Figure 7.
Mean number of correct DO uses, DO omissions, and DO errors in all categories: LE Group

Figure 8.
Mean number of correct DO uses, DO omissions, and DO errors in all categories: AE Group

Figure 9.
Proportion Correct DO use

Table 1
Group Descriptive Information: Means (SD) of Inclusion Criteria, *do* Probe, and Omnibus Language Measures

	N	Age	GFTA percentile rank	MLU in morphemes	MLU Standard Score	Omnibus Language Standard Score	TEGI composite Standard Score	TEGIDDO Probe Standard Score
SLI	37	5;3 range: 5;0–5;6	27.28 (16.05)	3.67 (0.32)	74.52 (6.62)	79.73 (7.04)	39.69 (15.88)	49.01 (27.08)
LE	15	3;8 range: 2;6–4;10	78.47 (22.85)	3.81 (0.20)	94.15 (8.31)	113.47 (15.90)	101.62 (8.22)	98.81 (12.83)
AE	37	5;3 range: 5;0–5;6	70.72 (17.38)	5.12 (0.49)	104.83 (10.2)	105.7 (10.55)	105.30 (8.15)	102.94 (11.13)

Table 2

Proportion of participants per each category of DO use

	SLI n=37	LE n=15	AE n=37
Lexical Verb DO	.76	.60	.92
Emphatic DO	.14	.07	.16
Auxiliary DO	.89	.93	.95
Elliptical DO	.59	.53	.57
Negative Uses	1.00	1.00	1.00

Table 3

Mean (SD) Proportion of Errors and Total Errors and Error Contexts

	SLI n=37	LE n=15	AE n=37
Mean proportion of DO Omissions *	.28 (.28)	.11 (.26)	.04 (.09)
Total DO omissions	111	7	13
Total DO omission contexts	354	125	342
Mean proportion of non-omission DO Errors *	.04 (.09)	.03 (.05)	.002 (.01)
Total non-omission DO errors	13	5	1
Total DO contexts	361	126	348

* indicates significant group effects, where $p < .05$