Supplemental Material S1. Exploring potential confounds within the analyses of grammatical judgments.

The DLD and TD groups differed on age, maternal education, and density of dialect specific forms as measured by the DELV-ST dialect subtest and listener judgments. Given this, it was important to consider whether these variables served as confounds to any group results observed for the children's grammaticality judgments. Only one measure each of age and maternal education were available for this analysis; however, two measures of dialect variation were available for consideration. Although the DELV-ST dialect subtest is often used as a measure of dialect variation, five (33%) of the 15 items on the DELV-ST target verbal *–s*, which is also targeted on the TEGI. Moreover, although the two dialect density indices are correlated ($r = .366$, $p < .001$), the DELV-NR, which was used to classify the children by language ability, was more strongly correlated with the DELV-ST dialect subtest ($r = –.268$, $p = .010$), than with the listener judgement task ($r = –.171$, $p = .104$). These findings indicate that the listener judgment task as a metric of dialectal differences was less related to the children's language abilities than the DELV-ST. Given that language ability is what differs between the DLD vs. TD groups and ability is the focus of the study, the listener judgment data was selected as the independent index of the children's dialect differences for the supplemental analyses reported here.

As shown in Table S1, the children's dialect specific form densities, but not their ages and maternal education levels, were correlated with their grammaticality judgements. Using the dialect specific form density measure as a covariate, and clinical group as the independent measure, all significant effects of group as reported in the study remain significant, and dialect specific form density is never significant on the dependent measures tested. Recall that the groups did not differ on the percentages of acceptability for the zero forms; these null group effects also held within the analyses of covariance. Below are the results (Gp = group; Dialect Gp = Dialect as a covariate within the group analysis).

Table S1. Correlations between grammaticality judgments and other measures showing group differences.

	Age[a]	MED[b]	Dialect Density[c]
A′ Score: T/A Zero Forms	.01	.09	–.25*
A′ Score: Zero Present Progressive Forms	–.07	.05	–.18
A′ Score: Overt T/A Misapplications	–.12	.11	–.27**
Percent Acceptability: T/A Overt Forms	.12	.17	–.23*
Percent Acceptability: T/A Zero Forms	.06	.10	.05
Percent Acceptability: Zero Present Progressive	.10	.05	.002
Percent Acceptability: Overt T/A Misapplications	.19	.14	.11

Note. [a]Age reported in months. [b]Maternal education level. [c]Average of three trained listeners independently rating the children's density of dialect specific forms using a 7-point rating scale.

A′ Scores

T/A Zero Forms: Gp $F(1, 88) = 18.05$, $p < .001$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 2.00$, $p = .16$
Adjusted A′ Scores: DLD = .48 vs. TD = .66

Zero Progressive Forms: Gp $F(1, 88) = 17.84$, $p < .001$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 0.49$, $p = .49$
Adjusted A′ Scores: DLD = .58 vs. TD = .83

Overt T/A Misapplications: Gp $F(1, 88) = 24.83$, $p < .001$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 2.59$, $p = .11$
Adjusted A′ Scores: DLD = .52 vs. TD = .74

Percentages of Acceptability: Sentence Types

Overt T/A Forms: Gp $F(1, 88) = 18.88$, $p < .001$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 1.40$, $p = .24$
Adjusted Percentages: DLD = 62 vs. TD = 84

Zero T/A Forms: Gp $F(1, 88) = .94$, $p = .33$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 0.04$, $p = .83$
Adjusted Percentages: DLD = 61 vs. TD = 55

Zero Progressive Forms: Gp $F(1, 88) = 6.98$, $p = .01$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 0.44$, $p = .51$
Adjusted Percentages: DLD = 43 vs. TD = 29

Overt T/A Misapplications: Gp $F(1, 88) = 4.76$, $p = .032$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 0.18$, $p = .68$
Adjusted Percentages: DLD = 56 vs. TD = 41

Percentages of Acceptability: Structure Specific Form Types

Overt *Is*: Gp $F(1, 88) = 17.18$, $p < .001$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 2.74$, $p = .101$
Adjusted Percentages: DLD = 60 vs. TD = 84

Overt Verbal *–s*: Gp $F(1, 88) = 10.40$, $p = .002$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 1.09$, $p = .30$
Adjusted Percentages: DLD = 67 vs TD = 86

Overt Past Tense: Gp $F(1, 88) = 6.18$, $p = .015$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 0.18$, $p = .68$
Adjusted Percentages: DLD = 60 vs. TD = 80

Zero Is: Gp $F(1, 88) = 1.81$, $p = .18$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 0.22$, $p = .64$
Adjusted Percentages: DLD = 49 vs. vs. TD = 38

Zero Verbal *–s*: $F(1, 88) = 0.08$, $p = .78$; Dialect Gp $F(1, 88) = 0.02$, $p = .88$
Adjusted Percentages: DLD = 74 vs. TD = 72