

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. SPECIFIC LANGUAGE IMPAIRMENT	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Specific language impairment	5
2.2.1 Definition	5
2.2.2 Symptoms of SLI	6
2.3 Approaches to SLI	6
2.3.1 Terminology	7
2.3.2 The search for causes: the medical model	7
2.3.3 The search for causes: new developments	8
2.3.4 Underlying processes explaining SLI	11
2.3.5 Intermezzo: what kind of explanation is given?	12
2.3.6 Linguistic problems, whatever the causes	13
2.3.7 Linguistic problems - linguistic causes	14
2.4 Classification	15
2.5 Grammatical SLI: a linguistic profile	17
2.5.1 Inflectional morphology	17
2.5.2 Word order	19
2.5.3 Argument structure	19
2.6 Grammatical SLI: linguistic theories	20
2.6.1 Functional categories in linguistic theory	22
2.6.2 Surface Hypothesis	23
2.6.3 Sparse Morphology hypothesis	25
2.6.4 Missing Feature hypothesis / Implicit Rule Deficit hypothesis	25
2.6.5 Missing Agreement hypothesis	27
2.6.6 Differential Agreement Checking hypothesis	29
2.6.7 Representational Deficit for Dependency Relations	29
2.6.8 Delayed acquisition of functional categories	29
2.6.9 Extended Optional Infinitive Stage	31
2.7 Linguistic explanations of specific language impairment - general remarks	32
2.8 Conclusion	34
3. RESEARCH METHOD	37
3.1 Introduction	37
3.2 Research questions	37
3.3 Subjects	39
3.3.1 Selection of the language-impaired children	39
3.3.2 Selection of the normally developing children	41
3.3.2.1 Measures for matching	41

3.4 Method	43
3.4.1 Research question 1: Tense and agreement	43
3.4.1.1 Matching	43
3.4.1.2 Task description	44
3.4.2 Research question 2: Verb argument structure	45
3.4.2.1 Spontaneous data	45
3.4.2.1.1 Matching	45
3.4.2.1.2 Data description	46
3.4.2.2 The experimental video task	46
3.4.2.2.1 Matching	46
3.4.2.2.2 Considerations on the selection of experimental tasks and items	47
3.4.2.2.3 Task description	48
3.4.2.2.3.1 Alternation: The causative alternation	49
3.4.2.2.3.2 Alternation: The locative alternation	49
3.4.2.2.3.3 Alternation: The dative alternation	49
3.4.2.2.3.4 Clausal complementation	50
3.4.2.2.3.5 Resultative secondary predication	50
3.4.3 Research question 3: Correlation of symptom areas	50
3.4.3.1 Subjects	50
3.4.3.2 Data description	51
3.4.4 Research question 4: Verb specificity	51
3.4.4.1 Matching	51
3.4.4.2 Task description	51
3.4.5 Statistical testing	51
4. TENSE AND AGREEMENT IN DUTCH	53
4.1 Introduction	53
4.1.1 Criteria for use of grammatical morphemes	54
4.1.2 Previous research on Dutch SLI: Bol and Kuiken (1988)	55
4.1.3 Typology of Dutch	56
4.2 Past tense marking	58
4.2.1 Past tense in SLI	59
4.2.2 Past tense: Analytical categories	61
4.2.3 Past tense: Results	62
4.2.3.1 Use of past tense morphemes in obligatory context	63
4.2.3.2 Relative share of past tense categories	64
4.2.3.3 Subtypes of past tense omission categories	65
4.2.3.4 Conclusion	66
4.2.4 Subgroup selection	67
4.3 Subject-verb agreement	67
4.3.1 Three types of agreement errors	68
4.3.2 Agreement: Analytical categories	71
4.3.3 Agreement: Results	72
4.3.3.1 Use of agreement morphemes in obligatory context	74
4.3.3.2 Subtypes of agreement errors	75
4.3.3.3 Conclusion	76
4.3.4 Subgroup selection	77
4.4. Variability	77

5. TENSE AND AGREEMENT IN DUTCH: THE DATA COMPARED WITH THEORIES ON GRAMMATICAL SLI	81
5.1 Introduction	81
5.2 Comparison to linguistic theories	82
5.2.1 Surface Hypothesis	82
5.2.2 Sparse Morphology hypothesis	82
5.2.3 Missing Feature hypothesis / Implicit Rule Deficit hypothesis	83
5.2.4 Missing Agreement hypothesis	84
5.2.5 Delayed acquisition of functional categories	86
5.2.6 Extended Optional Infinitive Stage	87
5.2.7 Missing Modal	90
5.2.8 Summary	93
5.3 Tense and agreement: general conclusions	95
5.3.1 A typological inventory of grammatical features	95
5.3.2 The appearance of grammatical SLI in Dutch	96
5.3.3 Individual differences	98
5.3.4 Adaptation versus disorder	98
5.3.5 Differential performance on separate tasks	99
5.3.6 Conclusion: Do current theories explain symptoms of grammatical SLI in Dutch children?	99
6. ARGUMENT STRUCTURE - LINGUISTIC BACKGROUND	103
6.1 Introduction	103
6.2 Linguistic background; acquisition	103
6.2.1 Thematic structure and subcategorisation: syntactic structure - c-selection	103
6.2.2 Alternation	104
6.2.3 Semantic and syntactic bootstrapping	104
6.2.3.1 Canonical mapping and non-canonical mapping	105
6.2.3.2 Acquisition of argument structure	106
6.2.3.3 Crosslinguistic differences: devices for alternation	107
6.2.3.4 An illustration of cross-linguistic differences in alternation: causativisation	108
6.2.3.5 The role of language-specific devices for alternation	110
6.3 Verbs and verb argument structure in SLI: empirical evidence	111
6.3.1 Verb learning in SLI	111
6.3.2 Verb diversity in SLI; General All-Purpose verbs	112
6.3.3 Verb argument structure in SLI	116
6.3.3.1 Introduction	116
6.3.3.2 Realisation of verb complements	117
6.3.3.3 Errors in argument structure	118
6.3.3.4 Argument structure alternation	119
6.3.3.5 Semantic and syntactic bootstrapping	120
6.4 Conclusion	121

7. ARGUMENT STRUCTURE: SPONTANEOUS LANGUAGE ANALYSIS	123
7.1 Introduction	123
7.2 An analysis of the Bol & Kuiken (1988) data	123
7.2.1 Argument realisation: Analytical categories	126
7.2.2 Argument realisation: Results	127
7.2.3 Errors	128
7.2.4 Verb diversity	131
7.3 Conclusion	133
8. ARGUMENT STRUCTURE: EXPERIMENTAL TASKS	133
8.1 Introduction	133
8.1.1 Analytical categories	134
8.2 Verb argument structure alternation	134
8.3 Verb complementation in the alternation tasks	136
8.3.1 The causative-inchoative alternation	136
8.3.1.1 Alternation	139
8.3.1.2 An example: <i>Bewegen</i> ('move')	140
8.3.1.3 Errors	142
8.3.2 Locative alternation	142
8.3.2.1 Alternation	144
8.3.2.2 Verb complementation	146
8.3.2.3 A few words on particles	147
8.3.2.4 Theta role versus argument	148
8.3.2.5 An example: <i>Laden</i> ('load')	150
8.3.3 Dative alternation	151
8.3.4 Conclusion	152
8.4 Resultative secondary predication	152
8.4.1 Introduction	154
8.4.2 A look at the non-canonical items	154
8.4.2.1 <i>Knippen</i> ('cut with scissors')	156
8.4.2.2 <i>Stoten</i> ('knock')	157
8.4.2.3 <i>Schudden</i> ('shake')	157
8.4.2.4 Group comparison across items	159
8.5 Clausal complementation	160
8.6 Conclusion	162
8.7 Is there a correlation between agreement errors and low complementation?	162

9. VERB SPECIFICITY	165
9.1 Introduction	165
9.1.1 Verbs in the lexicon	166
9.2 The experiment	167
9.2.1 Analytical categories	168
9.2.2 Results	168
9.2.2.1 Manners of going	170
9.2.2.2 Manners of putting	172
9.2.2.3 Manners of cutting	174
9.2.2.4 Manners of cleaning	175
9.2.3 Conclusion	176
9.3 Verb specificity and argument structure	176
10. CONCLUSIONS	179
10.1 Tense and agreement in Dutch SLI	179
10.2 Verb argument structure as a symptom area in SLI	180
10.3 Correlation of symptom areas	181
10.4 Verb specificity in SLI	182
10.5 Conclusion	182
REFERENCES	183
NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING	199