1. Introduction

Adult-like negative wh-questions are a late development in typically-developing children. Children are able to communicate the content of a negative wh-question, but the question itself is frequently non-adult in form until children are about 5 years of age. A study by Guasti, Thornton & Wexler (1995), for example, found that children used a variety of non-target negative wh-question forms. In a situation where an adult would ask a question like (1), children (aged 3;8 years to 4;7 years) frequently used the range of question forms in (1a-c):

(1) What don’t you like?
   a. What do you don’t like?  (Aux-Doubling)
   b. What you don’t like?  (No Aux-raising to C)
   c. What do you not like?  (Aux + Not)

The non-adult question forms in (1a-c) all have in common that negation, whether it is a negative auxiliary or the form not remains in the IP. Given that negative wh-questions take some time to become adult-like, even in typically-developing children it can be expected that they present a challenge to children with Specific Language Impairment (henceforth, SLI). Before we turn to the data, we briefly review relevant findings from the SLI literature on the components that contribute to the form of children’s productions of negative wh-questions; tense and its manifestation in wh-questions, the structure and movement properties of wh-questions and the status of negation in children’s grammars.
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1.1. Tense and its manifestation in wh-questions

There is now considerable evidence that tense, or finiteness marking, is a linguistic property that provides a particular challenge to English-speaking children (and adults) with SLI (Rice & Wexler, 1996; Rice, Wexler & Hershberger, 1998). These individuals have difficulty with the obligatoriness of tense marking in the sentence. That is, children and adults with SLI frequently omit present and past tense markers, auxiliaries be and do and so on. This has led to the proposal that tense is a clinical marker of SLI in English (Rice & Wexler, 1996).

While finiteness marking is obligatory in all sentences, in wh-questions, tense plays a special role. The tense-marked element moves from I to C, a movement often known as subject-aux inversion. This change in word order, signals the force of the question. In this regard, it is worth noting a study by Rice, Hoffman & Wexler (2009) which had children with SLI judge the grammaticality of wh-questions and yes/no questions with and without do or be present in the C position. The children were tested 9 times over 7 years. Sample wh-questions, with and without the auxiliary verb, are given in (2).

(2) a. What is she doing?/What _ he drinking?
   b. Where does the bug like to sleep?/When _ you like to sleep?

At the first time of measurement, the SLI children had a mean age of 7;8 years. Their composite score on judging the grammaticality of the presence or absence of the auxiliary verb in all questions was 77% accurate, as compared with 90% accurate for the language-equivalent group. The accuracy level for the children with SLI did not improve over time, but remained relatively flat. Rice et al. (2009) note “the affected children do not “catch up” to their peers on judgments of finiteness marking in simple questions” (p.1429). The difficulty judging the grammaticality of questions extends beyond the period when children are doing quite well using tense in simple sentences.

1.2. Structure and movement in wh-questions

According to researchers such as Friedmann & Novogrodsky (2011), van der Lely et al. (2011) and van der Lely & Pinker (2014), children and adolescents with SLI have difficulty representing hierarchical structures, as well as with wh-dependencies (i.e. the relationship between the wh-word and the ‘gap’). The difficulty with wh-dependencies is motivated by evidence that the SLI group’s productions of wh-questions frequently have a filled gap (e.g., van der Lely & Battell (2003). It should be kept in mind, however, that some of these data come from individuals who are labelled as having Grammatical-SLI (G-SLI) (cf. van der Lely et al. 2011 and Friedmann & Novogrodsky 2011). It is not clear that this group of individuals is directly comparable with other children who fit the usual criteria for SLI so we will not pursue a comparison of our findings with this group in detail here.
Evidence that children with SLI do not have difficulty in representing a question structure with a hierarchical syntactic representation come from a study by Rombough & Thornton (2017). This study tested 18 children with SLI, with a mean age of 5;3 years as well as age-equivalent and language-equivalent control groups. In this study, the researchers exploited the fact that answers to wh-questions are constrained by the form of the wh-question that was originally posed. Consider (3).

(3) Question: What’s the boy doing?
   Answer 1: The boy’s eating an apple.
   Answer 2: Eating an apple
   Answer 3: *Eat an apple
   Answer 4: *An apple

In (3), it is possible to answer with a full sentence answer, as in Answer 1, or with a fragment, as in Answer 2, but not with a VP with the stem form of the verb as in Answer 3 or an NP as in Answer 4 (although these would be perfectly good answers to other questions). According to a linguistic proposal by Merchant (2004), the structure of a respondent’s answer is derived from a representation of the original question. Thus, whether a respondent’s answer falls in the range of grammatical answers, depends on whether they can represent the original question and conduct the appropriate syntactic operations to derive the answer. Thus, if children with SLI are able to do this, we might expect them to give Answers 1 or 2, but if not, they might default to Answer 3, for example, since children with SLI tend to favor the stem form of the verb in their productions. The main finding was that the children’s answers for questions like (3) all fell in the grammatical range; no child ever produced an answer like Answer 3, and answers like Answer 4 comprised 0.6% of the data. The typically-developing age-equivalent children produced fragment answers like Answer 2 81.1% of the time, the language-equivalent children 68.3% of the time and the children with SLI 49.3% of the time. The children with SLI favored full sentence answers like Answer 1, with the other groups using this form less often.

The Rombough & Thornton study suggests that the capacity to generate a CP and represent a wh-question is intact. This is not to say that children with SLI have no difficulty with the production of wh-questions. For example, Stavrakaki (2009), who conducted a study with 8 6- to 10-year-old Greek children with SLI at two time points 5 years apart, shows that the children make a range of errors. In the Stavrakaki study, the children were matched to 3- to 5-year-old typically-developing children, on the basis of language as measured by a verbal IQ test for Greek children. The study elicited subject and object wh-questions, both referential ‘which’ questions as well as non-referential ones with ‘who’. In Greek, both subject and non-subject wh-questions require movement of the wh-phrase as well as inversion, which is V to C movement, rather than I to C as in English.
The children with SLI did not perform as well as the typically-developing children, although their performance improved over time. Both typically-developing children and children with SLI made some non-grammatical errors, such as asking ‘which’ rather than ‘which N’, or turning object questions into subject questions, thereby avoiding movement operations. These errors decreased over time in the SLI children, but the grammatical errors persisted. This group of children produced two kinds of grammatical errors not seen in the typically-developing children. They produced Case errors, in which an NP was marked with accusative case instead of nominative, for example, and they also produced gap-filling errors. For example, when a question such as ‘Which monkey did the man hit?’ was targeted, children would produce (the Greek equivalent of) ‘Which did the man hit the monkey?’, in which ‘monkey’ from ‘which monkey’ is left stranded in its base position. Interestingly, such questions were grammatical in Classical Greek, although they are not permitted in Modern Greek. Although such grammatical errors persisted over time, Stavrakaki notes that they were not consistent in any child. This leads her to conclude that “...the SLI children of this study do not lack basic knowledge of the syntactic operations. They fail to put that knowledge into automatic use in complex syntactic structures.” (p. 394). Hence her conclusion was that these errors represent performance limitations.

Our brief review so far suggests that children with SLI are able to represent question structures with the appropriate structure, but are delayed in using tense morphemes obligatorily, and in carrying out movement operations consistently. Next, we consider the contribution of negation to the form of children’s negative wh-questions.

1.3. Negation in child English

In her seminal dissertation, Bellugi (1967) noted that children acquired negation in stages. At the second stage of negation, children use no or not as their negative marker internal to the sentence, in combination with some kind of predicate. Utterances with don’t and can’t also start to appear in children’s language at this stage, but these are claimed to be unanalysed forms serving as negative markers. This claim is based on the fact that most of the auxiliary system was still absent from children’s productions at stage two. The third stage is characterised by the rapid emergence of the auxiliary system, both positive and negative auxiliary verbs, and was further demonstrated by command of the forms of be, do support in yes/no questions and so on.

Recasting Bellugi’s (1967) observations, Thornton & Tesan (2013) noted that children start with the adverbial form of negation, not, and only later add the head form of negation, the clitic n’t, to their grammar. These observations fit with Zeijlstra’s (2004) proposal that there is a parameter for negation, the Negative Concord Parameter, for which the default setting is adverbial negation.

1 The status of not as a head or an adverb is controversial. Here we assume, following Haegeman (1995) and Zeijlstra (2004) among others, that not is an adverb.
Details aside, it could be said that English-speaking children start out with only the adverbial form of negation, *not*, and consider the alternative head form of negation *n’t* only once sufficient data is forthcoming. For some reason that is not yet clear, English-speaking children take some time to figure out that English has a head form of negation in addition to the adverbial form, despite the fact that negative auxiliary verbs in the input should provide these data (Thornton & Tesan 2007, 2013). According to Thornton & Tesan (2013) the form *doesn’t* may be particularly informative to children as it shows the internal make-up of its morphemes more clearly than other forms (i.e., *do + s + n’t*). For this reason, they take productive use of the form *doesn’t* as indication that a child has acquired the head form of negation. The age at which children reach this milestone varies considerably, but the expectation would be that most children would have acquired *doesn’t* by about 3 and a half years of age, and many children much earlier (cf. Thornton & Rombough, 2015).

Returning to children’s negative wh-questions, if children acquiring English know that *n’t* is the head form of negation by 3 and a half years of age, and they also know that auxiliary verbs are heads, then it should follow that children are aware that negative auxiliary verbs are also heads that can potentially raise in the structure. In questions, in addition to the wh-word raising to SpecCP, the negative auxiliary verb in I in the phrase structure must also raise to C. However, we know from Guasti, Thornton & Wexler’s (1995) study that children who are over 3 and a half, and presumably know that *n’t* is a head, frequently do not raise the negative auxiliary verb to C in negative wh-questions. At this point, there is no consensus on the cause of this delay in raising the negative auxiliary verb.

We now turn to our experiment on negative wh-questions in children with SLI. Given what we know from children whose language is developing typically, and from the studies we have reviewed, we can expect that negative wh-questions will be extremely challenging for children with SLI. We can expect that the status of negation in children’s grammars will have an impact on the form of the negative wh-questions they produce.

2. The elicited production study

2.1. Participants

The study was conducted with 18 5-year-old children whose language fit the criteria for SLI; 18 age-matched children, and 18 language-equivalent children whose language was matched by Mean Length of Utterance (MLU), calculated for morphemes. This group of children was in the 3-year-old range. In order to fit the criteria for SLI, children had to test 1 or more standard deviations below the mean on the CELF-P2 language screener assessment (Semel, Wiig, & Secord, 2006) (or the CELF-4 screener if they were over 6 years) and within 1 standard deviation of the mean on a non-verbal IQ test. We used the Kaufman Brief Intelligence Test, Second Edition (KBIT-2 (Kaufman & Kaufman, 2004). The SLI group of children were also required to have an MLU that was 1 standard deviation below the mean for children at their age, as determined by
scores in Rice et al. (2010). Children were also tested on the Test of Early Grammatical Impairment (TEGI) to assess use of tense in obligatory contexts (Rice & Wexler, 2001). The particular subtest that was used was for use of 3rd person singular present tense ‘s’. The descriptive data are summarised in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>MLU</th>
<th>CELF-P2 language screener</th>
<th>KBIT-2 non-verbal IQ test</th>
<th>TEGI 3rd sg. Subtest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLI*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5;5 (range 5;1 to 6;2)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>23.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3;8 (range 3;1 to 4;2)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>120.6</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>70.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5;5 (range 5;0 to 6;1)</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>109.9 (CELF-4; n=3)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SLI is group of children with Specific Language Impairment; LE is language-equivalent group, and AE is the age-equivalent group. The CELF-P2 is the preschool version of the CELF, scores are standard scores; the KBIT-2 scores are standard scores. The TEGI scores are percent correct.

Table 1: Descriptive details for participants

2.2. Method

The children participated in two elicited production tasks (Crain & Thornton, 1998; Thornton, 1996). One task elicited positive and negative questions. The second task elicited sentential negation from children, to assess their knowledge of sentential negation independently from its implementation in question structures.

Wh-questions were elicited from the child participants by involving them in a game in which they helped the experimenter find out various details about a snail puppet, who was played by a second experimenter. The snail puppet was shy of grown-ups and retreated into its shell if approached by anyone other than a child. This ploy was used to encourage children to take charge of asking the snail questions, given that the adult was unable to talk to the snail. The questions were elicited during an ongoing discourse with the snail. Because naturalness of the elicitation context was paramount in order to elicit question data from children with SLI, a variety of questions were elicited; these were not balanced for question type. They included questions extracting from object position, and object of PP, as well as adjunct position and a range of auxiliaries including do
and *can*. Both positive and negative questions were elicited in the session. The positive questions were used as a control, to test whether children could produce adult-like wh-questions with I to C movement when negation was not present.

To assess children’s knowledge of negation independently from its role in negative questions, children participated in a second task that elicited simple negative sentences. These were all sentences that adults would negate using the negative auxiliary verb *doesn’t*. In this task, children tested a range of objects for a particular property – to see if they would *spin*, *fit*, *open*, *drive*, *work*, *shake* etc. In this context, an adult would provide a sentence such as *This one doesn’t spin* or *This doesn’t fit* etc. (See Thornton et al. (2016) for more details of the task.) Assuming that use of *doesn’t* signals children have acquired the head form of negation, this control task was used to predict whether, in principle, children have the capacity to raise a negative auxiliary verb to the C position. If children provided other non-target negative sentences that incorporated *not* such as *This not fit*, *This one’s not fit* or *This not fits*, then this could imply that the child still had just an adverbial form of negation and had not yet acquired the head form *n’t*. In this case, the prediction was that raising a negative auxiliary verb to C would not be a possibility in the child’s grammar.

### 2.3. Experimental findings

This section summarises the data from the elicited production study of negative questions as well as the control data for positive questions and for negation.

#### 2.3.1. Wh-question data

The group of children with SLI produced both positive and negative questions. The number of positive questions elicited from the SLI group was comparable to the other groups but overall, the children with SLI produced about half as many negative questions as the two control groups. The data are summarised in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (N = 18 in each group)</th>
<th>Positive wh-questions</th>
<th>Negative wh-questions</th>
<th>Total no. of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLI*</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SLI is group of children with Specific Language Impairment; LE is the language-equivalent group, and AE is the age-equivalent group. Wh-questions included object questions, questions targeting object of PP as well as adjunct questions.*

Table 2: Number of positive and negative questions produced by group
For purposes of presentation, we present children’s positive question data first. The graph in Figure 1 illustrates the range of question forms produced by each group of children. The figure shows that the children in the age-equivalent and language-equivalent control groups were producing adult-like questions with subject-aux inversion at close to ceiling rates, 98.3% for the AE group and 88.1% for the LE group. The children in the SLI group produced questions with inversion at a mean rate of 42.6%. These children produced 43.3% of their questions with no aux, and 13% of their questions with an uninvected aux. A non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that the between group difference was highly significant (Kruskal-Wallis, \( N = 54 \), \( \chi^2 = 30.46 \), \( df = 2 \), \( p < .001 \)). Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences between the groups. The tests indicated a significant difference between the SLI group and both of the control groups.

![Figure 1: Positive question types by group (\( N = 18 \) in each group)](image)

Next we turn to children’s negative wh-questions. Most of the children’s negative questions used those forms previously observed in the grammars of typically-developing children (see (1)). The range of negative wh-question forms produced by the children are shown in Figure 2.

As Figure 2 shows, the number of adult-like questions decreases dramatically once negation is introduced into the wh-question. Now, even the control groups produce adult-like questions less than half the time, and only 1.9% of the wh- produced by the children with SLI are adult-like, with a raised negative auxiliary verb. Questions such as ‘What do you not like?’ (Inv+Not in Figure 2) with the adverb not are produced frequently by the age-matched
children. This group of children may be aware that such questions are grammatical and it may be that this is a strategy to avoid raising the negative auxiliary verb. All groups produce some questions with doubling of the aux such as ‘What do you don’t like?’, although this form appears to be more frequent in the LE group. The figure shows that for the SLI group, the most frequent question type is ‘Uninverted Aux,’ that is, questions like ‘What you don’t like?’ in which children produced an aux but it was not raised. This question form was seen in the other groups as well, though to a lesser extent. This ‘Uninverted Aux’ group of questions also includes some questions such as ‘Which one that you don’t like?’ in which the complementiser that appears; these were mostly seen in the AE group. Thornton (1995) documented that such questions with that only show up when the wh-phrase is a complex which N phrase, and this was the case for these data as well. For the ‘Uninverted Aux’ questions there was a highly significant between group difference (Kruskal-Wallis, $N = 54$, $\chi^2 = 13.705$, $df = 2$, $p < .001$). Follow-up tests were also conducted to evaluate pairwise differences between the three groups. The tests indicated a significant difference between the SLI group and both of the control groups.

The remaining question types appeared only in the group of children with SLI. This group of children produced 10% ‘Wh+NS+NegAux’ questions in which the subject was missing (and presumably the aux was in its unraised position), that is questions like ‘What don’t like?’. In addition, children with SLI produced 21.4% of ‘Wh+No Aux+Not’ questions in which there was no aux, and the adverb not was used, that is, wh-questions like ‘What you not like?’.

Figure 2: Mean percent of different negative wh-question types by group ($N = 18$ in each group).

In summary, the children with SLI produced fewer negative questions, but those questions they did produce were meaningful and interpretable. However,
almost without exception, the children’s negative wh-questions did not have adult-like syntax.

### 2.3.2. Elicited production of sentential negation

The next step is to review the findings from the control structure eliciting negative sentences to assess whether the source of children’s difficulty with negative wh-questions can be traced to their knowledge of negation. As noted, if children have not yet added the head form of negation, *n’t* to their grammar, they should not be able to raise a negative auxiliary verb to C. Recall that the control for sentential negation tested whether or not children use the form *doesn’t* in their negative sentences when describing properties of objects (*This doesn’t spin, This pen doesn’t work* etc.).

Children produced a variety of different negative sentence forms in contexts when an adult would negate with *doesn’t*. The group means showed a large difference between the children with SLI and the control groups. The age-equivalent children were already adult-like; 99.7% of their sentences were negated with *doesn’t*. The language-equivalent group produced 88.7% of their negative sentences with *doesn’t*, while only 22.8% of the negative sentences produced by the children with SLI were adult-like.

Turning to individual children, of the 18 children with SLI who participated in the experiment, 12 had not yet acquired the form *doesn’t*. There was not a single instance of *doesn’t* in the productions of negative sentences from these 12 children. These children used either *not* or *don’t* as their negative marker, except for one child who always used *didn’t*. Of the 12 children, 7 of the children used *not* consistently, 3 of the children used *don’t* consistently, and 1 child used both negative markers. The negative sentences of these children either used a bare verb with no 3rd person ‘s’ (e.g. *This pen not/don’t work*), positioned the 3rd person agreement marker ‘high’ (e.g. *This pen’s not work*) or ‘low’ (e.g. *This pen not/don’t works*).

The 6 children who had acquired *doesn’t* used this negative auxiliary verb to the exclusion of *not* and *don’t*; all of the children used at least 4 instances of *doesn’t*, and some children used many more. There was just one instance of the negative marker *don’t* in over 75 productions by these 6 children. For this group of children, there were some unanticipated ‘other’ productions. These were instances of inflection doubling such as *This pen doesn’t fits* in which the children used *doesn’t* but also inflected the main verb. We assume that these are performance errors, as children transition to the adult form.

The data from the control testing for knowledge of negation inform us that the acquisition of the head form of negation is indeed late in children with SLI. The control experiment shows that 2/3 of these 5-year-old children have not yet acquired the morpheme *n’t*. These data clearly have an impact on children’s ability to produce adult-like negative wh-questions. We can conclude that these 12 children do not yet have a grammar that allows them to produce adult-like negative wh-questions with a raised negative auxiliary verb. The 6 children who have acquired *doesn’t* have the potential to produce adult-like negative questions.
but in fact, only one child produced one such question with a raised negative auxiliary verb.

### 3. Discussion

We started out with the observation that typically-developing children who have acquired the head form of negation tend not to produce negative questions with a raised negative auxiliary verb, despite having the grammatical knowledge that should allow such structures to be generated. This was true in the present experiment. As shown in Figure 2, only 41% of the age-equivalent children’s negative wh-questions had a raised negative auxiliary verb, and only 32.8% of the language-equivalent children’s questions had a raised negative auxiliary verb in the C position. We also noted that there is no consensus as to why the raised auxiliary verb is so late in typically-developing children.

Although we cannot provide an answer to this puzzle we can nevertheless examine the negative wh-questions of children with SLI and see how they differ, and investigate what factors contribute to their characteristics. We noted that there are a variety of properties that contribute to an adult-like derivation of a negative wh-question: (1) obligatoriness of tense, (2) ability to produce the hierarchical structure of a wh-question, and ability to carry out the relevant movements, and (3) the status of negation in the child’s grammar. In this section, we discuss which of these properties played a prominent role in the form of the questions produced by children with SLI.

We know that children with SLI tend not to use tense morphemes obligatorily; *be* and *do* are frequently omitted from these children’s speech (cf. Rice & Wexler (1996) among others). As seen in Table 1, the group of children with SLI studied in this investigation were no exception, as measured by their production of the 3rd person’s. They produced this tense morpheme in only 23.8% of obligatory contexts in the TEGI standardised test. This challenge with morphemes carrying tense has an impact on the form of the negative wh-questions produced by the children with SLI. Unlike the other groups of children, the children with SLI produced questions in which the auxiliary verb was missing. That is, their difficulty with the obligatoriness of tense can be said to contribute the 21.4% of their negative wh-questions with the form ‘What you not like?’ (‘Wh+No Aux+Not’).

On the basis of experimental findings from Rombough & Thornton (2017), we suggested that children with SLI are able to generate the appropriate hierarchical CP structure for questions. However, they do not consistently move the auxiliary verb in I to C. In positive questions, where this can be measured independently of negation, the children with SLI raised the auxiliary verb/modal about half the time, 42.6% of the time. This shows that the operation is available, but not implemented consistently, unlike the control groups, where it was raised 99.8% of the time for the age-equivalent group and 88.1% for the language-equivalent group. This inconsistency with movement is consistent with previous studies investigating children with SLI (Stavrakaki, 2009, van der Lely & Battell, 2003). Another 11.3% of the SLI children’s positive questions had an auxiliary
present but it was not raised so these questions unequivocally indicate difficulty with movement. As many as 43.3% of the SLI children’s positive questions that do not have a raised auxiliary, do not have an auxiliary at all, so these questions related to failure to use tense morphemes obligatorily. Since there is no overt auxiliary verb in these questions, we cannot tell if there is also any associated difficulty with movement.

The negation control clearly showed that children with SLI are delayed in acquiring the linguistic knowledge that English has a negative head, n’t in addition to the adverb not. Without this grammatical knowledge, children have no choice but to retain their negative marker in the IP, and are forced to come up with alternative structures in order to ask questions. The data show that about half (50.5%) of the children’s negative questions are ones with an uninverted aux, such as ‘What you don’t like?’. In questions of this kind, it is likely that the negative auxiliary verb don’t is frequently being used as a negative marker that is not morphologically decomposable. This is likely because we know that only one third of the children have acquired n’t as a negative head. If children knew that don’t was decomposable, we would not expect to see the children with SLI using this structure so much more often than the children in the control groups. This structure is used by the other groups, at 23.7% for the language-equivalent group and 11.8% for the age-equivalent group, but this is far less often than the children with SLI.

4. Conclusion

Our experimental findings show that of the three potential factors discussed, the obligatoriness of tense and the status of negation in children’s grammars are the two factors that contribute most to the nonadult form of the negative wh-questions produced by the children with SLI. We have also argued that although children can generate hierarchical syntactic CP representations appropriate for wh-questions, they do have some difficulty moving the tensed aux from I to C consistently, so this must also be considered as a factor. Viewing the findings from a broader perspective, this paper has shown that in addition to tense, sentential negation is another linguistic property that is compromised in English-speaking children with SLI.
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