**Supplemental Digital Content 2  
Procedure for elicitation and analysis of a spoken language sample**

An experienced clinical linguist (i.e., one of the authors, E.H.) interviewed all participants in a quiet setting, following a standard procedure:

A. What is your favourite game or sport?

B. Why is [e.g., soccer] your favourite sport?

C. I want you to imagine that I do not know anything about [e.g., soccer]. Please tell me everything a layman should know to be able to play the game: what is the purpose of the game? How many people play it? What are the rules to play it? Please go ahead.

D. Now I would like you to tell me what a player should do in order to win the game. What are the most important strategies every good player should know?

The interviewer displayed interest in the participant’s response by means of nonverbal communication. The speaker was allowed as much time as needed to complete the response. The next question was posed once the participant finished talking and appeared to be ready. In the participant’s response to question C, the interviewer checked if all parts of the question were addressed. If not, the interviewer repeated the question that was not addressed. When the duration of the recording of the conversation did not exceed 6 minutes and the interviewer had the impression that less than 50 utterances were elicited, the same procedure was repeated for an extra game or sport. This way, an attempt was made to elicit more than 50 utterances from each participant[[1]](#footnote-2)‡‡. The digitally recorded language samples were transcribed by another researcher, using the transcription conventions of the STAP method, a method for the analysis of spontaneous language in Dutch children (van den Dungen & Verbeek 1999). After this, two linguists checked the transcriptions and dissimilarities were discussed to attain agreement. Samples were segmented into T-units (Hunt 1970): each T-unit contains 1 independent clause and all attached subordinate clauses. Within utterances, instances of maze behaviour (i.e., false starts, revisions, and self repetitions) and fillers (like *nou* ‘well’ and *zeg maar* ‘let’s say’) were excluded from analysis of the utterance (as described by van den Dungen and Verbeek 1999). Incomplete utterances and elliptical utterances that immediately followed a question of the interviewer and did not have an autonomous syntactic structure were excluded from analysis as well. Dialectal and colloquial expressions were not considered as errors and therefore not analysed as such. Judgement was based on literature (Goeman et al. 2008) and users of specific dialects were consulted to assist in the interpretation.

1. ‡‡ Note: AHI19 did not want to talk extensively about sports / a game and therefore additionally discussed rehearsal of his drumband and participation in a competition; questions were asked that were in line with the context of a game (‘can you tell me what made your drumband successful in a competition?’) to elicit an expository discourse sample comparable to the outcome of the FGST task. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)