

**Grammatical Treatment and Specific Language Impairment:
Neighbourhood Density & Third Person Singular –S**

Journal:	<i>Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics</i>
Manuscript ID:	TCLP-2012-0044.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original paper
Keywords:	specific language impairment < language disorders, language intervention, neighborhood density, finiteness markers
Note: The following files were submitted by the author for peer review, but cannot be converted to PDF. You must view these files (e.g. movies) online.	
Table 1 Feb 20 2013.doc	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Running Head: Neighbourhood Density Treatment

Grammatical Treatment and Specific Language Impairment: Neighbourhood Density & Third Person Singular –S

Submitted for blinded review, *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*

Keywords: specific language impairment, language intervention, neighbourhood density, finiteness markers

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to test the effect of manipulating verb neighbourhood density in treatment targeting the third person singular lexical affix. Using a single-subject experimental design, 6 pre-schoolers with Specific Language Impairment (SLI) were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: 1) treatment with sparse verbs or 2) treatment with dense verbs in 12 sessions. The third person singular lexical affix was targeted for 12 sessions of treatment in both conditions. Treatment gain and generalization were measured as the dependent variables. Third person singular % correct change from pre-treatment to post-treatment was measured using sentence production tasks with comparisons across the two treatment conditions. Treatment gain and generalization were greater for children enrolled in the sparse condition. Preliminary clinical recommendations are made and theoretical implications are discussed relative to neighbourhood density effects on lexical activation and storage in children with SLI.

1
2
3 Specific Language Impairment (SLI) is a heritable condition characterized by delays in
4 language that are not caused by hearing impairment, neurological impairment, or intellectual
5 disability (Rice, Smith, & Gayán, 2009). Language is late to emerge for children with SLI and
6 global linguistic deficits are henceforth observed (Zubrick, Taylor, Rice, & Slegers, 2007). Most
7 notable are deficits in vocabulary, morphology and syntax that can persist into the teenage years
8 (Nippold, Mansfield, Billow, & Tomblin, 2009; Rice, Hoffman, & Wexler, 2009). Despite the
9 persistent language delay that characterizes SLI, the details of how treatment effectively
10 jumpstarts the slow moving language system are still emerging (Law, Garrett, & Nye, 2004). In
11 this preliminary treatment study, we tested the feasibility of a novel approach to language
12 treatment for preschool children with SLI. We asked whether the phonological characteristics of
13 words used to teach grammatical morphemes might need to be considered when planning
14 treatment. We first describe grammatical finiteness marking as the specific grammatical skill that
15 poses significant difficulty for SLI. We follow this with a brief review of current treatment
16 approaches that have been evaluated for pre-schoolers with SLI. Next we discuss neighbourhood
17 density as a relevant word characteristic that affects language development. We then motivate its
18 potential facilitative role in grammatical treatment for young children with SLI.

41 Grammar Deficit in SLI

42
43 Many aspects of language are difficult for children with SLI, but for English speaking
44 pre-schoolers, within the domain of grammar, finiteness marking is particularly challenging (for
45 a review see Leonard, 1998). Finiteness marking is an obligatory property of main English
46 clauses that relates to the use of tense and subject-verb agreement markers. In English, finiteness
47 is marked by: 1) lexical affixation for third person singular present tense (e.g. she runs) and
48 regular past tense (e.g. she walked), 2) morpho-phonological verb stem changes for irregular past
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 tense (e.g. she ran), and 3) non-lexical free standing copula verbs (e.g. she is happy, Is she
4
5 happy?) or auxiliary verbs (e.g. she is running; does she run?) in statements and questions. For
6
7 SLI, the emergence and mastery of these finiteness markers is significantly delayed and growth
8
9 rates are slow compared to typical children. Once finiteness markers have emerged, it is common
10
11 for children with SLI to continue to omit them from their speech. In fact, in children's expressive
12
13 language, omission errors can persist until 8-years while receptive errors may be observed into
14
15 the teenage years. (Rice, Wexler, & Cleave, 1995; Rice, Hoffman, & Wexler, 2009). Thus,
16
17 learning that finiteness markers are obligatory in English is challenging for children with SLI
18
19 compared to typically developing peers, thereby presenting a clinically significant problem.
20
21
22
23

24 **SLI Treatment Studies**

25
26
27 The majority of studies addressing grammar treatment for pre-schoolers have focused on
28
29 identifying effective techniques for presenting the grammatical targets. Techniques found
30
31 effective for pre-schoolers with SLI include requesting direct imitations of targeted grammatical
32
33 structures (Connell, 1987; Connell & Stone, 1992) and modelling paired with evoked production
34
35 and performance-based feedback (e.g., Weismer & Murray-Branch, 1989). Conversational
36
37 recasting, or imitating a child's incorrect utterance while correcting errors, has also been shown
38
39 to facilitate generalization of target grammatical structures to spontaneous speech (e.g.,
40
41 Camarata, Nelson, & Camarata, 1994; Fey, Cleave, Long, & Hughes, 1993; Fey, Cleave, &
42
43 Long, 1997; Hassink & Leonard, 2010; Proctor-Williams & Fey, 2007). Moreover, implicit
44
45 instruction appears to be more effective for grammar treatment with pre-schoolers than explicitly
46
47 stating usage rules for grammatical targets (Swisher, Restrepo, Plante, & Lowell, 1995, but see
48
49 Finestack and Fey, 2009 for older children). Following the child's lead and current focus of
50
51 attention has also been identified as effective for preschool children (Yoder, Molfese, & Gardner,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2011). Finally, treatment targeting expressive language using a combination of the
4
5
6 aforementioned techniques facilitates receptive generalization (Camarata, Nelson, Gillum, &
7
8 Camarata, 2009) and is useful for teaching finiteness markers to preschool children with SLI
9
10 (Leonard, Camarata, Brown, & Camarata, 2004; Leonard, Camarata, Pawlowska, Brown, &
11
12 Camarata, 2006)

13
14
15 In the context of treatment research for SLI, one topic that hasn't been considered is
16
17 whether the characteristics of the words used to elicit grammatical targets might also influence
18
19 treatment success. *As a starting point for considering this type of approach, we focused on the*
20
21 *neighbourhood density for verbs paired with a targeted finiteness marker during treatment.*
22
23 Neighbourhood density *is a word form characteristic that* relates to the phonological component
24
25 of a word form as an integrated whole (Storkel, 2009). One common way to measure
26
27 neighbourhood density is to count the number of words, or 'neighbours' created when one sound
28
29 in any word position (i.e. initial, medial, final) is changed via substitution, addition, or deletion
30
31 (Luce & Pisoni, 1998). *A word, like 'bat' that has many neighbours (i.e., 34 total including*
32
33 *neighbours like 'cat', 'boat', 'bag') is by definition 'dense', whereas words, like 'dog' that have*
34
35 *fewer neighbours (i.e., 7 total including neighbours like 'log', 'dig', 'dot') are considered*
36
37 *'sparse'.*
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Neighbourhood Density and Grammar Treatment**

44
45
46 Children do not process dense and sparse words similarly. In typical development, the
47
48 age of acquisition for dense and sparse words differs (Storkel, 2004a; e.g., Storkel, 2009). In
49
50 addition, accuracy of children's responses differ for dense and sparse words on tasks measuring
51
52 word repetition, fast mapping, word recognition, phonological awareness, nonword repetition,
53
54 and sentence imitation (De Cara & Goswami, 2003; Garlock, Walley, & Metsala, 2001; Hogan,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2010; Hoover, Storkel, & Rice, 2012; Hoover, Storkel, & Hogan, 2010; Munson, Swenson, &
4
5 Manthei, 2005; Storkel & Lee, 2011). The direction of neighbourhood density effects (i.e. dense
6
7 vs. sparse advantage) is not consistent across studies because effects appear to be driven by task,
8
9 development, and/or language abilities of the child (Werker & Curtin, 2005). Nevertheless,
10
11 neighbourhood density effects on lexical processing are robust in development (Stoel-Gammon,
12
13 2011). Given this observation, we hypothesized that neighbourhood density effects could be
14
15 relevant for grammatical treatment of lexical affixes like the third person singular because
16
17 expressive use of a lexical affix necessarily involves retrieving and producing a word (e.g.
18
19 retrieve and produce ‘run’ + ‘affix s’ in the third person singular context). Thus, it is possible
20
21 that words with different neighbourhood density characteristics could prompt differential
22
23 learning effects in SLI. While this type of treatment manipulation hasn’t been considered for
24
25 SLI, neighbourhood density effects in treatment are documented for preschool children with
26
27 phonological delays (Gierut & Morrisette, 2012; Morrisette & Gierut, 2002) further motivating
28
29 consideration in treatment of other clinical populations.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 As a preliminary step in this direction, a single-subject experimental treatment design
38
39 was used herein to test the hypothesis that verbs differing in neighbourhood density have
40
41 noticeable and differential effects on grammatical treatment of SLI. Accordingly, we compared
42
43 treatment gain and generalization for two groups of children with SLI who participated in
44
45 grammatical treatment of the third person singular finiteness marker (i.e. ‘The woman kicks the
46
47 ball’). We choose the third person singular finiteness marker as the starting point because growth
48
49 of this structure is slightly slower relative to the other markers in English, thus ensuring that
50
51 most preschool children with SLI would have emerging knowledge, but would not have achieved
52
53 mastery (Ionin & Wexler, 2002; Paradis, Rice, Crago, & Marquis, 2008; Rice, Wexler, &
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Hershberger, 1998). While holding third person singular constant, we manipulated dense verbs
4
5 for one treatment group and sparse verbs for the other treatment group. We predicted that the
6
7 groups would differ in the amount of treatment gain and also, generalization. The results that
8
9 emerged are intended to serve as first documentation to motivate the clinical selection of verbs
10
11 based on neighbourhood density for grammatical treatment of lexical affixes in SLI.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Methodology**

19 **Participants**

20
21 Six children with SLI, two girls and four boys, were recruited from the surrounding areas
22
23 of Lawrence and Kansas City, Kansas to participate. All were monolingual native speakers of
24
25 Standard American English ranging in age from 4;0 to 5;9 ($M = 4;5$). The presence of SLI was
26
27 determined by 1) prior identification of language impairment by a speech-language pathologist
28
29 and 2) expressive grammatical performance below age expectations. [The primary inclusionary](#)
30
31 [criterion for entry into the study was optional use of finiteness markers, including the treated](#)
32
33 [third person singular structure. Optional use for finiteness markers in SLI, in the age ranges](#)
34
35 [herein, is defined elsewhere as accuracy between 20% and 80% on production measures \(e.g.,](#)
36
37 [Hoover, Storkel, & Rice, 2012; Rice, Wexler, & Hershberger, 1998\). Using this as a guideline,](#)
38
39 [we confirmed optional use of third person singular using the Rice/Wexler Test of Early](#)
40
41 [Grammatical Impairment \(TEGI: Rice & Wexler, 2001\) and spontaneous language samples.](#)
42
43 [According to these measures, all children were optional in their use of finiteness markers,](#)
44
45 [including the treated third person singular structures.](#) Additionally, all children had to
46
47 demonstrate correct production of word final /s/ and /z/ in monomorphemic words (e.g. noise,
48
49 horse) because production is crucial for assessing third person singular marking in English. Mean
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Length of Utterance (MLU), receptive vocabulary and articulation were left free to vary across
4
5 the participants. As assessed by parent report, none of the children were concurrently working on
6
7 the third person singular structure, or any other grammar goal, in treatment that was not
8
9 associated with the current study. Table 1 summarizes the participant characteristics.
10
11

12 *Insert table 1 about here*

13 14 **Experimental Treatment Design**

15
16 We used a staggered multiple baseline (MBL) across subjects experimental design (for a
17
18 description of the design see McReynolds & Kearns, 1983). The premise of this design is to
19
20 assess the effect of a treatment manipulation on a given behaviour. One advantage of the MBL
21
22 design, over other single subject designs, is that it allows the examiner to assess treatment gains
23
24 and generalization effects. In the MBL design, experimental control is established when
25
26 behavioural changes within a participant are observed with the instatement of treatment and
27
28 when treatment effects are replicated across participants. Treatment effects are considered
29
30 meaningful when 1) similar patterns are observed across multiple children in the same condition
31
32 and 2) post-treatment patterns differ from baseline patterns (McReynolds & Kearns, 1983). The
33
34 MBL design involves a no-treatment baseline phase followed by treatment. McReynolds &
35
36 Kearns (1983) recommend a minimum of 3 baseline sessions that are incremented as each
37
38 subsequent child is enrolled in the study. For example, in a study where each condition has three
39
40 participants, the first participant in a condition completes 3 baseline sessions, the second
41
42 completes 4 and a third participant would complete 5 sessions. The delay in treatment onset by 1
43
44 additional session for each enrolled participant provides the opportunity to assess baseline
45
46 stability across children. The MBL design, as applied herein, included the following elements: 1)
47
48 random assignment to a treatment condition, 2) an incremented baseline phase with the first
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participant receiving 3 sessions and 3) replication of treatment effects across children within a
4
5 treatment condition. Participant pseudonyms correspond to the child's assigned treatment
6
7 condition and the number of baseline sessions he/she completed. For example, participant Sparse
8
9 3 was assigned to the sparse treatment condition and completed three baseline sessions prior to
10
11 treatment.
12
13

14
15 The independent variable and treatment manipulation in the current study was
16
17 neighbourhood density. The dependent variable was the third person singular % correct change
18
19 from baseline to post-treatment. The effect of neighbourhood density on third person singular
20
21 change was assessed by randomly assigning children to one of the two treatment conditions (i.e.
22
23 sparse or dense), corresponding to the neighbourhood density of the verbs used to elicit the third
24
25 person singular structure. All children were taught the third person singular structure, but three
26
27 children received treatment with sparse verbs while three others received treatment with dense
28
29 verbs.
30
31
32

33 34 **Stimuli**

35
36 **Treatment stimuli.** The treatment stimuli included 12 real English verbs selected on the
37
38 basis of neighbourhood density. Half the verbs had few neighbours and were assigned to the
39
40 sparse treatment condition, while the other half had many neighbours and were assigned to the
41
42 dense treatment condition. Following the procedures of Storkel (2004b), a word-length-sensitive
43
44 calculation for neighbourhood density was obtained from an online calculator drawing from
45
46 child corpora (Storkel & Hoover, 2010). The word length-sensitive calculation is used because
47
48 there is an inherent negative correlation between word length and neighbourhood density such
49
50 that longer words have fewer neighbours. A median split based on the pool of words available
51
52 for a given word length was used to dichotomize each word as 'sparse' or 'dense'. Words within
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a given length with neighbourhood densities above the median were classified as ‘dense’ and
4 words with neighbourhood densities below the median within a given length were classified as
5 ‘sparse’. The number of neighbours for sparse and dense words did not overlap within a given
6 word length. For words that were three phonemes long, the ‘Sparse’ verbs had a mean of 7
7 neighbours (Range = 3 – 11) whereas the ‘Dense’ verbs had a mean of 18 neighbours (Range =
8 17 – 20). For words that were four phonemes long, ‘Sparse’ verbs had a mean of 4 neighbours
9 (Range = 3 – 5) and ‘Dense’ verbs had a mean of 7 neighbours (Range = 6 – 8). Neighbourhood
10 density values were calculated on the bare stem of the verb (e.g. ‘run’ as opposed to ‘runs’).
11 Phonotactic probability, $t(10) = .97$, $p = .456$, and word frequency, $t(10) = -.684$, $p = .522$, values
12 did not differ across sparse and dense conditions. Moreover, syllable structure, verb argument
13 structure, and final allomorph resulting from the third person singular morpheme were balanced
14 across the sparse and dense conditions. The treatment stimuli are shown in Appendix I.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 **Generalization stimuli.** A second set of 30 real verb stimuli (i.e., 15 sparse and 15
33 dense), also selected on the basis of neighbourhood density, was used to assess generalization.
34 These verbs were never presented in the context of the treatment sessions. Like the treatment
35 verbs described above, a word-length-sensitive calculation of neighbourhood density was
36 obtained for the generalization stimuli by following the same procedures of Storkel (2004b) and
37 using the online calculator drawing upon child corpora (Storkel & Hoover, 2010). Likewise, a
38 median split based on the pool of words available for a given word length was used to
39 dichotomize each word as ‘sparse’ or ‘dense’. For words that were three phonemes long, the
40 ‘Sparse’ verbs had a mean of 10 neighbours (Range = 5 - 12) whereas the ‘Dense’ verbs had a
41 mean of 19 neighbours (Range = 14 - 26). For words that were four phonemes long, ‘Sparse’
42 verbs had a mean of 4 neighbours (Range = 1 – 5) and ‘Dense’ verbs had a mean of 10
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 neighbours (Range = 7 – 12). Phonotactic probability and word frequency values did not differ
4
5 across the sparse and dense conditions, t values < 1.0 , p values $> .45$. Syllable structure, verb
6
7 argument structure, and final allomorph resulting from the third person singular morpheme were
8
9 also balanced across the sparse and dense conditions. The generalization stimuli are shown in
10
11 Appendix II.
12
13

14
15 Prior to the first no-treatment baseline session, all children demonstrated receptive
16
17 knowledge of the treatment and generalization verbs by passing a receptive probe with at least
18
19 80% accuracy of picture identification. The probe pictured the target verb alongside a semantic
20
21 and phonological foil; the child was instructed to point to the target verb. Table 2 reports
22
23 receptive knowledge of the treatment and generalization verbs for each child. For the treatment
24
25 verbs, % correct is reported for either sparse or dense verbs, depending on the child's treatment
26
27 condition assignment. For the generalization verbs, % correct is reported separately for sparse
28
29 versus dense verbs.
30
31
32

33
34 *Insert Table 2 about here*
35

36 Pre- and Post-Treatment Measures

37
38 Using the treatment and generalization stimuli, third person singular % correct was
39
40 measured at each baseline session and at a post-treatment session to allow for computation of the
41
42 dependent variable: third person singular % correct change accrued from baseline to post-
43
44 treatment. The amount of change from baseline to post-treatment was of primary interest as a
45
46 reflection of the differential effects of verb treatment varied by neighbourhood density effects.
47
48
49

50 **Treatment gain.** At each baseline session and at the post-treatment session, third person
51
52 singular sentences containing the treated dense or treated sparse verbs were elicited via direct
53
54 imitation and spontaneous elicitation. Sentences containing the treated verb stimuli were
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 presented to assess treatment gain, or the amount of change for third person singular % correct
4
5 on the verb items presented during the treatment sessions, but in sentence contexts that were
6
7 never used during the day-to-day treatment sessions. The same test sentence items were used to
8
9 elicit third person singular via direct imitation and spontaneous elicitation at each baseline
10
11 session and at the post-treatment session. Productions from each baseline session and post-
12
13 treatment were scored for accuracy and % correct values were derived. For each child in each
14
15 condition, change was calculated by subtracting the average third person singular % correct of
16
17 baseline sessions from the % correct at the post-treatment administration of the third person
18
19 singular sentences. The amount of change for all three participants per treatment condition was
20
21 then averaged and compared across conditions using visual analysis.
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Generalization.** Also at each baseline session and at the post-treatment session, third
28
29 person singular sentences containing the generalization verbs were elicited via direct imitation
30
31 and spontaneous elicitation to consider the amount of third person singular change on a set of
32
33 verbs that were never presented during treatment in sentences that were never used during
34
35 treatment. The same test sentence items were used to elicit third person singular via direct
36
37 imitation and spontaneous elicitation at each baseline session and at the post-treatment session.
38
39 In the same manner as the treated verbs, productions from each baseline session and post-
40
41 treatment were scored for accuracy and % correct values were derived. The dependent variable,
42
43 third person singular change, was then calculated by subtracting the average % correct at
44
45 baseline from % correct at the post-treatment administration of the third person singular
46
47 sentences. Likewise, the amount of third person singular change with the generalization verbs for
48
49 all three participants per treatment condition was averaged and compared across conditions using
50
51 visual analysis.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Reliability.** Scoring reliability was calculated for 20% of each child's data used to
4 compute the dependent variables. Two independent judges, blind to the treatment assignment,
5 completed the reliability. Agreement in scoring was 91% ($SD = 2\%$) for the dense condition and
6 91% ($SD = 5\%$) for the sparse condition. *In the case of disagreements, the original scoring was*
7 *retained.*

15 **Treatment Procedures**

16
17 Treatment sessions were conducted on a fixed-time criterion where each child completed
18 two 30-minute sessions a week for 6 weeks, totalling 12 treatment sessions per child. We used a
19 time-based criterion because this afforded all children the same opportunity for learning. As this
20 study was the first to manipulate neighbourhood density in treatment with SLI, a time-based
21 criterion was thought to be a more conservative and controlled approach compared to alternate
22 performance-driven treatment delivery.

23
24 Each treatment session began with the examiner reading a short story with corresponding
25 illustrations that presented either sparse or dense target verbs in a meaningful context based on
26 the child's experimental assignment. Even though the verbs for the sparse and dense stories
27 differed, the same story illustrations were used for both treatment conditions (see Appendix I for
28 a sample). The story presented each verb 4 times with the target structure and twice as a bare
29 verb stem, for a total of 6 verb presentations per story.

30
31 After reading the story, the examiner elicited 36 productions of the target structure in a
32 sentence context per session (i.e. 6 productions per verb). Productions were elicited through a
33 combination of direct imitation and spontaneous elicitation. In instances where a child omitted
34 the target structure from their production the examiner did not require the child to re-attempt the
35 structure, rather the utterance was recasted with the target structure and target verb. In all, each
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 child received 72 exposures to the target structure (i.e. 36 through examiner's auditory exposure
4
5 + 36 through child productions & recasts) per treatment session with 864 cumulative exposures
6
7
8 across the 12 sessions. The only way treatment sessions differed across the conditions was the set
9
10 of six target verbs used in the stories and elicitations for productions. All other materials and
11
12 procedures were identical. Appendix I shows a sample of the treatment protocol.
13
14

15 The day-to-day treatment data obtained from each child was the 36 elicited productions
16
17 of the third person singular treatment target described above with either sparse or dense treated
18
19 words. The productions were used to calculate a third person singular % correct value for each
20
21 treatment session; these % correct values obtained from treatment are plotted in Appendix III for
22
23 the sparse condition and Appendix IV for the dense condition. The % correct values obtained
24
25 from treatment were not factored into the dependent variable because the dependent variable of
26
27 interest was treatment gain and generalization using the treatment and generalization verbs in
28
29 untreated sentence contexts.
30
31
32

33 **Results**

34
35
36 Results associated with treatment gains are summarized first, followed by generalization.
37
38 Results from the sparse treatment condition always precede results from the dense treatment
39
40 condition. In evaluation of the effects of treatment, we compared the effects associated with
41
42 neighbourhood density in three ways: gains in treatment, global generalization and
43
44 neighbourhood density generalization.
45
46
47

48 **Treatment Gain**

49
50 The first comparison made across the treatment conditions was treatment gain, or %
51
52 correct change from baseline to post-treatment for the treated verbs. Here, the sparse treatment
53
54 emerged as optimal in that children enrolled in this condition showed greater change in treated
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sparse verbs. For the sparse treatment condition, the average third person singular % correct for
4 treated sparse verbs was 31% (Range: 19% to 45%) at baseline and 76% (Range: 73% to 83%)
5
6 at post-treatment. This yielded an average change of 46% (Range: 38% to 54%). Positive change
7
8 was replicated across all children in the sparse condition.
9
10

11
12 In comparison, all children enrolled in dense treatment demonstrated less change in the
13 treated dense verbs. Specifically, the average third person singular % correct for treated dense
14 verbs was 35% (Range: 19% to 62%) at baseline and 40% (Range: -19% to 90%) at post-
15
16 treatment, yielding an average change for treated dense verbs of 4% (Range: -19% to 28%). Of
17
18 the two children demonstrating positive change the amount for one child was small (i.e. 4%
19
20 change for [participant](#) Dense 5). Taken together, children enrolled in sparse treatment made
21
22 greater gains in accurately marking third person singular on the treated verbs, with positive
23
24 change replicated across all children.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Generalization**

32
33 A second consideration in evaluation of treatment effects focused on generalization,
34 which was examined in two ways. In a first evaluation, generalization was taken as a whole
35
36 without attention to whether the changes that occurred were differentially distinguished for
37
38 untreated sparse and dense verbs; hereafter this is referred to as global generalization. In a
39
40 second evaluation, attention was given to neighbourhood density in order to examine whether the
41
42 treatment manipulation resulted in differential generalization to sparse versus dense verbs; this is
43
44 termed density generalization.
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Global generalization.** For the sparse treatment condition, the average third person
51
52 singular % correct for untreated verbs was 37% (Range: 32% to 44%) at baseline and 60%
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Range: 51% to 74%) at post-treatment. This yielded a 23% (Range: 10% to 42%) average
4
5
6 change with positive change replicated across all children.
7

8 In comparison, for children enrolled in dense treatment, less global generalization was
9
10 observed. Specifically, the average third person singular % correct for untreated verbs was 35%
11
12 (Range: 14% to 62%) at baseline and 41% (Range: 25% to 64%) at post-treatment yielding an
13
14 average change of 6% (Range: 2% to 11%). While positive change was replicated across all
15
16 children, the average amount observed was less than that of the sparse treatment. Thus, similar to
17
18 the findings for treatment gain, global generalization data indicated that greater generalization
19
20 occurred in response to treatment of sparse verbs than treatment of dense verbs. However, it is
21
22 possible that generalization could have been restricted to one type of verb (i.e., sparse or dense
23
24 verbs rather than broad generalization across both types). To address this issue we considered
25
26 density generalization, or generalization to untreated dense verbs separately from generalization
27
28 to untreated sparse verbs.
29
30
31
32

33
34 **Density generalization.** Density generalization considered change separately for
35
36 untreated sparse versus untreated dense verbs. For the sparse treatment condition, generalization
37
38 to untreated sparse verbs was considered first. Average third person singular % correct was 37%
39
40 (Range: 29% to 42%) at baseline and 57% (Range: 45% to 72%) at post-treatment yielding a
41
42 20% (Range: 3% to 43%) average change. Positive change was replicated across all children,
43
44 with participant Sparse 3 as a possible exception (i.e., 4% change observed). For untreated dense
45
46 verbs, the average third person singular % correct was 33% (Range: 26% to 46%) at baseline and
47
48 62% (Range: 48% to 76%) at post-treatment yielding an average change of 29% (Range: 16% to
49
50 48%) with positive change replicated across all children receiving sparse verb treatment. Taken
51
52
53
54
55 together, 2 of 3 children who received treatment with sparse verbs demonstrated generalization
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of accurate use of third person singular to untreated sparse verbs. On the other hand, all 3
4
5 children generalized accurate use of third person singular to untreated dense verbs, with positive
6
7 change replicated across all children. Thus, treatment of sparse verbs induced generalization to
8
9 sparse and dense verbs for the majority of children.
10
11

12 Minimal density generalization was observed for children enrolled in dense treatment.
13
14 For their untreated sparse verbs, third person singular % correct was 34% (Range: 13% to 57%)
15
16 at baseline and 41% (Range: 26% to 60%) at post-treatment, yielding a 6% (Range: 3% to 13%)
17
18 average change. Positive change was replicated across all children, but the gains were modest
19
20 with the greatest change being 13%, for child Dense 4. For untreated dense verbs, average third
21
22 person singular % correct was 36% (Range: 12% to 67%) at baseline and 42% (Range: 23% to
23
24 68%) at post-treatment yielding a 6% (Range: 1% to 11%) average change. Positive change was
25
26 replicated across all children, but the gains were again modest with the greatest change being
27
28 11% for child Dense 4. Taken together, positive change was replicated across all children in the
29
30 consideration of density generalization, but the amount of change was minimal, with the possible
31
32 exception of child Dense 4. Thus, in general, treatment with dense verbs induced minimal
33
34 density generalization for the majority of children.
35
36
37
38
39

40 In sum, the results highlight third person singular treatment with sparse verbs as
41
42 potentially superior to that with dense verbs with patterns of treatment gain mirroring patterns of
43
44 generalization. While some improvement was noted for children enrolled in dense treatment, the
45
46 gain was noticeably greater for children enrolled in sparse treatment. Likewise, children enrolled
47
48 in dense treatment showed minimal to no generalization to untreated verbs compared with
49
50 children enrolled in sparse treatment.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

The goal of this study was to test whether neighbourhood density would be relevant to treatment targeting the third person singular lexical affix. The motivation was based on the premise that treatment of lexical affixes involves the lexical act of retrieving and producing the verb to be inflected. We expected neighbourhood density effects to be the by-product of this lexical component with effects documented as differences in treatment gain and generalization between two treatment conditions. The results supported our hypothesis. [Children in the sparse treatment condition demonstrated greater treatment gain and generalization than children enrolled in the dense treatment condition.](#)

Clinical Implications

The results of this preliminary study might be useful to clinicians targeting the third person singular lexical affix in treatment. Based on the treatment gain and generalization data from this study, one preliminary recommendation might be that clinicians consider selecting sparse verbs for eliciting third person singular productions during treatment. Based on our initial findings, this [tactic](#) might be appropriate only if the treatment goal was to affect (1) gains from baseline to post-treatment on the third person singular structure for the words that were taught, or (2) generalization of the treated third person singular finiteness marker to untreated words. Stated alternatively, it might be recommended that clinicians avoid the selection of dense verbs for eliciting third person singular structure, given that children enrolled in this condition demonstrated noticeably less treatment gain and generalization. Given this, caution might be taken to avoid treatment of dense verbs, if the goals are to achieve gains in treatment and/or generalization.

1
2
3 It is important to point out that **none of the children** in this study achieved mastery of the
4
5 third person singular structure, rather children made modest changes from baseline third person
6
7 singular accuracy with those in the sparse condition showing, on average, more positive change
8
9 than those in the dense condition. It will be important for future studies to replicate the observed
10
11 effects of verb neighbourhood density using a larger sample of children with SLI, with longer
12
13 durations of treatment than 12 sessions, and possibly using treatment protocols that employ
14
15 accuracy rather than time-based criteria. Data from such studies would help to refine and qualify
16
17 the clinical recommendations about the utility of neighbourhood density in treatment of SLI. The
18
19 data might further shed light on the interface between treatment procedures and treatment
20
21 stimuli, and could also inform the range of individual differences in learning.
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Theoretical Implications**

28
29 Beyond the clinical implications, the present results have theoretical implications. While
30
31 neighbourhood density has been shown influential for phonological treatment (Gierut &
32
33 Morrisette, 2012; Morrisette & Gierut, 2002), this study provides a first look at its effects for
34
35 grammar treatment with possible insights of an explanatory nature. We consider two testable
36
37 accounts **and consider the potential theoretical implications these accounts may have for SLI.**
38
39
40

41 **Lexical activation.** Consider that simply thinking about or hearing a word is thought to
42
43 activate other words in a listener's lexicon (Storkel & Morrisette, 2002). In this study, a set of
44
45 target words (albeit dense or sparse) was repeatedly presented across treatment sessions. Words
46
47 were always introduced in the context of a meaningful story, and all third person singular
48
49 production trials were directly tied to events from that story. If models of neighbourhood
50
51 activation (e.g., Luce & Pisoni, 1998) are correct, this repetition of words likely activated other
52
53 related words in the child's lexicon during treatment. Perhaps it is through this process of lexical
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 activation that the opportunity for neighbourhood density to affect lexical affixation was borne
4
5 out.
6
7

8 Consideration of why the sparse treatment condition emerged as optimal may also lend
9
10 insight into neighbourhood density effects on grammar. There are at least two word-learning
11
12 studies that are relevant to this question. In one novel word learning study, Storkel and Lee
13
14 (2011) found that sparse words triggered learning in typically developing pre-schoolers. They
15
16 attributed this result to the idea that hearing a sparse word activates few other words in the
17
18 lexicon. Activation of a few words in sparse neighbourhood presumably speeds the process of
19
20 detecting a mismatch between novel and known words, as opposed to activation of many
21
22 competing within the alternate dense neighbourhood. This apparent difference in activation has
23
24 thus been said to contribute to learning differences between dense and sparse words in
25
26 development.
27
28
29

30
31 A similar argument was outlined in a second developmental word learning study.
32
33 McKean, Letts and Howard (In Press) again found advantages for learning sparse words, but
34
35 their focus was on the phonological distinctiveness of sparse words. They supposed that dense
36
37 words, with many phonologically similar neighbours, limit a child's processing capacity. The
38
39 reason is that dense words are presumably represented with a finer grained level of segmental
40
41 detail. Consequently, detecting a novel from known dense word in word learning likewise
42
43 requires a finer grained level of analysis and differentiation. Similar accounts have been
44
45 advanced by Morrisette and Gierut (2002) in treatment of phonological disorders.
46
47
48
49

50 The relevance to our findings is that the phonological distinctiveness of sparse words
51
52 coupled with activation of rather few words for retrieval might dually converge to thereby reduce
53
54 the processing load needed to produce lexical affixes. Thus children enrolled in the sparse
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 condition of treatment may have been afforded processing advantages to facilitate production
4
5 and generalization of the third person singular lexical affix. By comparison, the dense treatment
6
7 condition may have been more resource demanding, rendering children's use of lexical affixes
8
9 more vulnerable to error. The effects of potentially resource demanding dense words can be
10
11 observed by comparing the trend lines slopes of the two treatment conditions in Appendix III and
12
13 IV. Here it can be seen in the trend line slopes of the treatment data that all three sparse
14
15 participants had positive slopes greater than .20 (see Appendix III), whereas all three dense
16
17 participants had smaller positive slopes less than .11 (See Appendix IV). This difference in
18
19 slopes supports the hypothesis that resource demanding dense words limit correct third person
20
21 singular productions while sparse words facilitate correct productions. It is well established in
22
23 the larger literature that resource-demanding conditions, like dense treatment, can be particularly
24
25 challenging for children with SLI (e.g., Leonard et al., 2007; Miller, Kail, Leonard, & Tomblin,
26
27 2001).

28
29
30
31
32
33
34 **Lexical storage.** It is possible that there is another explanation for the sparse condition as
35
36 optimal. Specifically, sparse words may be more amenable to grammatical changes as a
37
38 consequence of how they are stored in a child's lexicon. Corpus analyses, for example, show that
39
40 dense words are earlier acquired (e.g., Storkel, 2004a). As a consequence of earlier entry into the
41
42 lexicon, the phonological form of dense words is presumed to be more robust, both in storage
43
44 and in segmental specification (e.g., Walley, Metsala, & Garlock, 2003). While robust storage
45
46 and specification may be advantageous under certain circumstances, the emergence of
47
48 grammatical productivity requires children to be flexible in their use of word forms. Such
49
50 flexibility might be realized in use of the root form in certain grammatical contexts as opposed to
51
52 the inflected form in certain other contexts. Thus, even though receptive knowledge of sparse
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and dense generalization lexical items was roughly equivalent across participants (see table 2),
4 flexibility of use in a *grammatical* context might be readily achievable for sparse words because
5 the segmental status of the sparse word form may still be in flux. Flexibility of use for sparse
6 words may also be associated with lexical storage, such that these word forms might not be as
7 robust given the recency of their entry in the lexicon. Thus, despite equivalent performance for
8 dense and sparse items on a receptive probe, it is possible that for children with SLI, dense forms
9 may preclude flexible use in multiple syntactic contexts, as evidenced behaviourally by limited
10 progress in treatment. Again, looking at the trend line slopes of the treatment data (Appendix III
11 for sparse and IV for dense) strengthens the hypothesis that children with SLI do not equally
12 extend their use of dense and sparse words to multiple syntactic contexts. While plausible, a
13 resistance hypothesis of this sort has not been tested for language treatment. This
14 notwithstanding, corpus analyses have shown that robust word forms are highly resistant to
15 analogical changes and also, the regularization of irregular verbs (Bybee, 2007). For the future, it
16 will be necessary to replicate the effects in treatment as a further test of this hypothesis.
17 Examining longitudinal changes in grammar relative to neighbourhood density via spontaneous
18 language samples would inform whether a resistance hypothesis is specific to treatment or a
19 general characteristic of grammatical acquisition.

20
21
22 **Implications for SLI.** The hypothesized effects of lexical storage and activation on the
23 treatment gain/generalization observed here could have broader implications for understanding
24 the language profile of SLI. One characteristic of SLI is late onset of first words with subsequent
25 deficits in word learning and reduced lexical diversity (Gray, 2003; Rescorla & Achenbach,
26 2002; Rice, Buhr, & Nemeth, 1990; Rice, Oetting, Marquis, Bode, & Pae, 1994; Watkins, Kelly,
27 Harbers, & Hollis, 1995). We hypothesized treatment of third person singular to involve the
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 lexical act of retrieving and producing a verb to be inflected. Given observed deficits in areas of
4
5 lexical acquisition, impairments in lexical activation and storage might also be expected for SLI.
6
7
8 The sparse advantage observed here, however, is consistent with predictions for typical
9
10 development based on models of lexical activation and storage. In other words, if lexical
11
12 activation and storage were problematic for SLI, we might have expected either equivalent
13
14 findings across treatment conditions, or a dense advantage, but not a sparse advantage. In fact,
15
16 studies of neighbourhood density effects in lexical tasks yield converging findings across typical
17
18 development and SLI with both groups showing a recognition advantage for sparse words
19
20 (Mainela-Arnold, Evans, & Coady, 2008; Mainela-Arnold, Evans, & Coady, 2010). Taken
21
22 together, the results of our preliminary treatment study point toward in fact lexical activation and
23
24 storage for SLI that can be harnessed in the treatment of grammatical finiteness markers.
25
26
27
28

29 **Limitations and future directions**

30
31 While this study suggests a first step in the clinical and theoretical utility of word
32
33 properties like neighbourhood density for grammar treatment, there are several limitations that
34
35 will need to be addressed to advance the line of inquiry. As a group, children with SLI are
36
37 heterogeneous in their language skills and the participants of the present study were no
38
39 exception. Variability was observed in children's phonological skills and pre-treatment accuracy
40
41 on the experimental sentence production measure. This can be seen in table 1, where all three
42
43 children in the dense treatment condition had greater phonological errors on a standardized
44
45 articulation test than those in the sparse condition. It is important to note, however, that all
46
47 children had /s/ and /z/ in their segmental inventory, so it is unlikely that the density effects in
48
49 affix production would be traceable to differences in the inventory. Nonetheless, while inventory
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 composition did not differ across children of this study, the number of errors did, suggesting
4
5 some level of phonological heterogeneity.
6
7

8 Another point of difference in the population of study was the pre-treatment third person
9
10 singular accuracy on the sentence production tasks, which was more variable for children in the
11
12 dense condition. There was no a priori reason to suppose that pre-treatment accuracy on the
13
14 experimental tasks would yield differential treatment gain or generalization; the dependent
15
16 variable took pre-treatment accuracy into account in the computation of gain and generalization.
17
18 Moreover, all participants had comparable elicited grammar composite scores on the pre-
19
20 treatment Test of Early Grammatical Impairment (Rice & Wexler, 2001) with this norm-
21
22 referenced measure as perhaps a more valid measure of baseline grammatical skills. Thus, future
23
24 studies might aim for a more homogenous sampling of the population, by restricting the
25
26 inclusionary criteria to include only those who are homogenous in their overall linguistic profile,
27
28 including both the phonological system and the grammatical system. This will be relevant to
29
30 ensuring the validity of any clinical recommendations to emerge from manipulation of word
31
32 properties in grammatical treatment.
33
34
35
36
37

38 Related to the experimental design, one limitation is the single post-treatment follow-up
39
40 session. It will be important for future studies testing the clinical use of verb neighbourhood
41
42 density to collect multiple post-treatment measures to ensure the reliability of effects and
43
44 determine whether greater gains made by the sparse treatment condition can be maintained over
45
46 time. Other types of single subject designs, like the alternating treatment design, where
47
48 participants are exposed to both neighbourhood density conditions may also be necessary to
49
50 understand the precise day-to-day treatment effects of presenting dense vs. sparse verbs. In fact,
51
52 the alternating treatment design would allow us to see whether the slow growth rate in treatment
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of dense words would accelerate with the introduction of sparse verbs. Likewise, if dense words
4
5 hinder treatment acceleration, a deceleration in learning rate should be observed with the
6
7 removal of sparse words and the introduction of dense items.
8
9

10 Despite limitations, this work has the potential to motivate broader lines of research that
11 explore other grammatical finiteness markers clustering with the third person singular structure
12 in development and known to be challenging for children with SLI. For example, it might be
13 feasible to extend neighbourhood density manipulations to the regular past tense finiteness
14 marker. Similarly, treatment of finiteness marking through morpho-phonological stem changes
15 (i.e. irregular past tense) or non-lexical copula and auxiliary verbs might also be tested with
16 respect to neighbourhood density. Research along these lines will help to establish the robustness
17 and clinical utility of the neighbourhood density effects as they apply to the more general
18 grammatical construct of finiteness, while addressing some of the inherent limitations of the
19 present study.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Likewise, future studies might test the effects of other phonological properties and
34 contexts on treatment beyond manipulations of neighbourhood density. Other word form
35 characteristics like age of word acquisition or word frequency might further clarify other ways in
36 which words forms presented as the input during treatment might be involved in jumpstarting
37 change in finiteness markers. In all, research along the lines suggested would help to fully
38 discern the ways in which phonological and lexical characteristics converge with neighbourhood
39 density to optimally support grammatical growth for children with SLI enrolled in clinical
40 treatment.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Acknowledgements.** Removed for blinded review.
4

5 **Declaration of Interest Statement.** Removed for blinded review.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Bybee, J. (2007). *Frequency of use and the organization of language*. New York, NY: Oxford University
8 Press, USA.
9
10
11
12 Camarata, S. M., Nelson, K. E., & Camarata, M. N. (1994). Comparison of conversational-recasting and
13 imitative procedures for training grammatical structures in children with specific language
14 impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 37, 1414-1423.
15
16
17
18
19
20 Camarata, S. M., Nelson, K. E., Gillum, H., & Camarata, M. (2009). Incidental receptive language growth
21 associated with expressive grammar intervention in SLI. *First Language*, 29, 51-63.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Connell, P. J. (1987). An effect of modeling and imitation teaching procedures on children with and
without specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 30, 105-
113.
- Connell, P. J., & Stone, C. (1992). Morpheme learning of children with specific language impairment
under controlled instructional conditions. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 35,
844-852.
- De Cara, B., & Goswami, U. (2003). Phonological neighbourhood density effects in a rhyme awareness
task in five-year-old children. *Journal of Child Language*, 30, 695-710.
- Fey, M. E., Cleave, P. L., & Long, S. H. (1997). Two models of grammar facilitation in children with
language impairments: Phase 2. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 40, 5-19.
- Fey, M. E., Cleave, P. L., Long, S. H., & Hughes, D. L. (1993). Two approaches to the facilitation of
grammar in children with language impairment: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Speech,
Language and Hearing Research*, 36, 141-157.

- 1
2
3 Finestack, L. H., & Fey, M. E. (2009). Evaluation of a deductive procedure to teach grammatical
4
5 inflections to children with language impairment. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*,
6
7 *18*, 289-302.
8
9
- 10
11 Garlock, V. M., Walley, A. C., & Metsala, J. L. (2001). Age-of-acquisition, word frequency, and
12
13 neighborhood density effects on spoken word recognition by children and adults. *Journal of Memory*
14
15 *and Language*, *45*, 468-492.
16
17
- 18
19 Gierut, J. A., & Morrisette, M. L. (2012). Density, frequency and the expressive phonology of children
20
21 with phonological delay. *Journal of Child Language*, *39*, 804-834.
22
23
- 24
25 Gray, S. (2003). Word-Learning by Preschoolers With Specific Language Impairment: What Predicts
26
27 Success? *46*, 56-67.
28
29
- 30
31 Hassink, J. M., & Leonard, L. B. (2010). Within-treatment factors as predictors of outcomes following
32
33 conversational recasting. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *19*, 213-224.
34
- 35
36 Hogan, T. P. (2010). A short report: Word-level phonological and lexical characteristics interact to
37
38 influence phoneme awareness. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *43*, 346-356.
39
40
- 41
42 Hoover, J. R., Storkel, H. L., & Rice, M. L. (2012). The interface between neighborhood density and
43
44 optional infinitives: normal development and Specific Language Impairment. *Journal of Child*
45
46 *Language*, *39*, 835-862.
47
- 48
49 Hoover, J. R., Storkel, H. L., & Hogan, T. P. (2010). A cross-sectional comparison of the effects of
50
51 phonotactic probability and neighborhood density on word learning by preschool children. *Journal*
52
53 *of Memory and Language*, *63*, 100-116.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Ionin, T., & Wexler, K. (2002). Why is 'is' easier than '-s'? acquisition of tense/agreement morphology
4
5 by child second language learners of English. *Second Language Research*, 18, 95-136.
6
7

8
9 Law, J., Garrett, Z., & Nye, C. (2004). The efficacy of treatment for children with developmental speech
10
11 and language delay/disorder: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*,
12
13 47, 924-943.
14
15

16 Leonard, L. B. (1998). *Children with specific language impairment*. Cambridge: MA: MIT press.
17
18

19
20 Leonard, L. B., Camarata, S. M., Brown, B., & Camarata, M. N. (2004). Tense and agreement in the
21
22 speech of children with specific language impairment: Patterns of generalization through
23
24 intervention. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 47, 1363-1379.
25
26

27 Leonard, L. B., Camarata, S. M., Pawlowska, M., Brown, B., & Camarata, M. N. (2006). Tense and
28
29 agreement morphemes in the speech of children with specific language impairment during
30
31 intervention: Phase 2. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 49, 749-770.
32
33

34 Leonard, L. B., Ellis Weismer, S., Miller, C. A., Francis, D. J., Tomblin, J. B., & Kail, R. V. (2007).
35
36 Speed of processing, working memory, and language impairment in children. *Journal of Speech,*
37
38 *Language and Hearing Research*, 50, 408-428.
39
40
41

42
43 Luce, P. A., & Pisoni, D. B. (1998). Recognizing spoken words: The neighborhood activation model. *Ear*
44
45 *and Hearing*, 19, 1-36.
46
47

48 Mainela-Arnold, E., Evans, J. L., & Coady, J. A. (2008). Lexical representations in children with SLI:
49
50 Evidence from a frequency-manipulated gating task. *51*, 381-393.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Mainela-Arnold, E., Evans, J. L., & Coady, J. A. (2010). Explaining Lexical-Semantic Deficits in
4
5 Specific Language Impairment: The Role of Phonological Similarity, Phonological Working
6
7 Memory, and Lexical Competition. *53*, 1742.
8
9
10
11 McKean, C., Letts, C., & Howard, D. (In Press). Functional reorganization in the developing lexicon:
12
13 separable and changing influences of lexical and phonological variables on children's fast-mapping.
14
15 *Journal of Child Language*,
16
17
18
19 McReynolds, L. V., & Kearns, K. P. (1983). *Single-subject experimental designs in communicative*
20
21 *disorders*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
22
23
24
25 Miller, C. A., Kail, R., Leonard, L. B., & Tomblin, J. B. (2001). Speed of processing in children with
26
27 specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, *44*, 416-433.
28
29
30
31 Morrisette, M. L., & Gierut, J. A. (2002). Lexical organization and phonological change in treatment.
32
33 *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, *45*, 143-159.
34
35
36
37 Munson, B., Swenson, C. L., & Manthei, S. C. (2005). Lexical and phonological organization in children:
38
39 Evidence from repetition tasks. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, *48*, 108-124.
40
41
42
43 Nippold, M. A., Mansfield, T. C., Billow, J. L., & Tomblin, J. B. (2009). Syntactic development in
44
45 adolescents with a history of language impairments: A follow-up investigation. *American Journal of*
46
47 *Speech-Language Pathology*, *18*, 241-251.
48
49
50
51 Paradis, J., Rice, M. L., Crago, M., & Marquis, J. (2008). The acquisition of tense in English:
52
53 Distinguishing child second language from first language and specific language impairment. *Applied*
54
55 *Psycholinguistics*, *29*, 689-722.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Proctor-Williams, K., & Fey, M. E. (2007). Recast density and acquisition of novel irregular past tense
4 verbs. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 50*, 1029-1047.
5
6
7

8
9 Rescorla, L., & Achenbach, T. M. (2002). Use of the Language Development Survey (LDS) in a national
10 probability sample of children 18 to 35 months old. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing*
11 *Research, 45*, 733.
12
13
14

15
16 Rice, M. L., Hoffman, L., & Wexler, K. (2009). Judgments of omitted BE and DO in questions as
17 extended finiteness clinical markers of specific language impairment (SLI) to 15 years: a study of
18 growth and asymptote. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 52*, 1417-1433.
19
20
21
22

23
24 Rice, M. L., Smith, S. D., & Gayán, J. (2009). Convergent genetic linkage and associations to language,
25 speech and reading measures in families of probands with specific language impairment. *Journal of*
26 *Neurodevelopmental Disorders, 1*, 264-282.
27
28
29
30

31
32 Rice, M. L., Wexler, K., & Cleave, P. L. (1995). Specific language impairment as a period of extended
33 optional infinitive. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 38*, 850-863.
34
35
36

37
38 Rice, M. L., Wexler, K., & Hershberger, S. (1998). Tense over time: The longitudinal course of tense
39 acquisition in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language and*
40 *Hearing Research, 41*, 1412-1431.
41
42
43
44

45
46 Rice, M. L., Buhr, J. C., & Nemeth, M. (1990). Fast mapping word-learning abilities of language-delayed
47 preschoolers. *55*, 33-42.
48
49

50
51 Rice, M. L., Oetting, J. B., Marquis, J., Bode, J., & Pae, S. (1994). Frequency of input effects on word
52 comprehension of children with specific language impairment. *37*, 106-122.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Rice, M. L., & Wexler, K. (2001). *Rice/Wexler Test of Early Grammatical Impairment*. San Antonio: TX:
4
5 The Psychological Corporation.
6
7
8
9 Stoel-Gammon, C. (2011). Relationships between lexical and phonological development in young
10
11 children. *Journal of Child Language*, 38, 1-34.
12
13
14 Storkel, H. L. (2004a). Do children acquire dense neighborhoods? An investigation of similarity
15
16 neighborhoods in lexical acquisition. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 25, 201-221.
17
18
19
20 Storkel, H. L. (2004b). Methods for minimizing the confounding effects of word length in the analysis of
21
22 phonotactic probability and neighborhood density. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing*
23
24 *Research*, 47, 1454-1468.
25
26
27
28 Storkel, H. L. (2009). Developmental differences in the effects of phonological, lexical and semantic
29
30 variables on word learning by infants. *Journal of Child Language*, 36, 291-321.
31
32
33 Storkel, H. L., & Hoover, J. R. (2010). An online calculator to compute phonotactic probability and
34
35 neighborhood density on the basis of child corpora of spoken American English. *Behavior Research*
36
37 *Methods*, 42, 497-506.
38
39
40
41 Storkel, H. L., & Lee, S. Y. (2011). The independent effects of phonotactic probability and
42
43 neighbourhood density on lexical acquisition by preschool children. *Language and Cognitive*
44
45 *Processes*, 26, 191-211.
46
47
48
49 Storkel, H. L., & Morrisette, M. L. (2002). The lexicon and phonology: Interactions in language
50
51 acquisition. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 33, 1-24.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Swisher, L., Restrepo, M. A., Plante, E., & Lowell, S. (1995). Effect of implicit and explicit" rule"
4 presentation on bound-morpheme generalization in specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech,*
5
6 *Language and Hearing Research, 38*, 168-173.
7
8
9
10
11 Walley, A. C., Metsala, J. L., & Garlock, V. M. (2003). Spoken vocabulary growth: Its role in the
12 development of phoneme awareness and early reading ability. *Reading and Writing, 16*, 5-20.
13
14
15
16
17 Watkins, R. V., Kelly, D. J., Harbers, H. M., & Hollis, W. (1995). Measuring children's lexical diversity:
18 Differentiating typical and impaired language learners. *38*, 1349-1355.
19
20
21
22 Weismer, S. E., & Murray-Branch, J. (1989). Modeling versus modeling plus evoked production training:
23 A comparison of two language intervention methods. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 54*,
24 269-281.
25
26
27
28
29
30 Werker, J. F., & Curtin, S. (2005). PRIMIR: A developmental framework of infant speech processing.
31 *Language Learning and Development, 1*, 197-234.
32
33
34
35
36 Yoder, P. J., Molfese, D., & Gardner, E. (2011). Initial mean length of utterance predicts the relative
37 efficacy of two grammatical treatments in preschoolers with specific language impairment. *Journal*
38 *of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 54*, 1170-1181.
39
40
41
42
43 Zubrick, S. R., Taylor, C. L., Rice, M. L., & Slegers, D. W. (2007). Late language emergence at 24
44 months: An epidemiological study of prevalence, predictors, and covariates. *Journal of Speech,*
45 *Language and Hearing Research, 50*, 1562-1592.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix I
 Sample Illustration from 'Snow Day' Story Used for Both Conditions

Sparse Treatment

Words

Fix
 Give
 Laugh
 Work
 Drive
 Step



Dense Treatment

Words

Make
 Peek
 Take
 Bump
 Crash
 Spin

Vignette for Target Sparse Verb 'Fix' (5 neighbours) and Target Dense Verb 'Make' (20 neighbours)

Examiner reads: 'It's almost time to go inside, but first Zoe and Max want **to fix/to make** a snowman. Zoe **fixes/makes** the snowman's body. Max **fixes/makes** the snowman's head. Zoe and Max want **to fix/to make** the face for the snowman. Zoe **fixes/makes** the snowman's eyes and nose while Max **fixes/makes** the snowman's mouth. The snowman is going to look so great when Zoe and Max are done!'

Direct Imitation of Target Structure with Target Sparse or Dense Verb

Examiner: Say Zoe **fixes/makes** the snowman's body.

Target child response: Zoe **fixes/makes** the snowman's body

Examiner Feedback for incorrect third person singular use: 'Remember, Zoe **fixes/makes** the snowman's body'

Spontaneously Elicited Production of Target Structure with Target Sparse or Dense Verb

Examiner: Max is going to **fix/make** the snowman's head. Now it's your turn to tell me what Max does.

Target Response: Max **fixes/makes** the snowman's head.

Examiner Feedback for incorrect third person singular use: 'Remember, Max **fixes/makes** the snowman's head'


Appendix II
Verbs & Sentences Used to Assess Generalization

Dense	Sparse
Generalization Verbs & Sentences	Generalization Verbs & Sentences
The woman <u>pokes</u> the bubble	The woman <u>moves</u> the ball
The boy <u>hides</u> behind the tree	The boy <u>walks</u> to the park
The boy <u>bites</u> the cookie	The man <u>wipes</u> the floor
The girl <u>rides</u> the horse	The man <u>dig</u> s a hole
The woman <u>kicks</u> the ball	The woman <u>cooks</u> the food
The teacher <u>reads</u> a story	The teacher <u>knocks</u> on the door
The girl <u>hugs</u> the doll	The girl <u>hops</u> on the couch
The boy <u>shakes</u> the bottle	The boy <u>climbs</u> up the tree
The dog <u>sleeps</u> under the bed	The dog <u>crawls</u> under the bed
The man <u>breaks</u> the dish	The girl <u>drops</u> the doll
The man <u>slides</u> on the floor	The woman <u>swims</u> in the water
The man <u>spills</u> the water	The teacher <u>cleans</u> the dish
The teacher <u>slips</u> in the hole	The boy <u>scoops</u> the snow
The girl <u>stacks</u> the box	The man <u>builds</u> a house
The woman <u>holds</u> the food	The girl <u>tastes</u> the cookie

Appendix III

Third person singular % correct for sparse treatment words at baseline sessions, treatment sessions and post-treatment session with linear trend lines for the sparse treatment condition. Standardized beta coefficients (b) are included to indicate treatment data slopes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Appendix IV

Third person singular % correct on dense treatment words at baseline sessions, treatment sessions and post-treatment session with linear trend lines for the dense treatment condition. Standardized beta coefficients (b) are included to indicate treatment data slopes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3rd Person Singular % Correct




Table 2

Pre-Treatment % Correct Receptive Knowledge of Treatment and Generalization Verbs.

Condition	Participant	Treatment	Generalization	Generalization
		Probe Items %	Probe Dense %	Probe Sparse %
Sparse	Sparse 3	100	87	87
	Sparse 4	80	93	93
	Sparse 5	100	100	93
	<i>Mean</i>	93	93	91
Dense	Dense 3	83	93	93
	Dense 4	100	93	93
	Dense 5	80	80	87
	<i>Mean</i>	88	89	91