DESCRIPTORS- #LANGUAGE RESEARCH, #NEGRO DIALECTS, NEGROES,
NONSTANDARD DIALECTS, LOWER CLASS, CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED,
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, #PRESCHOOL CHILDREN, LANGUAGE
TESTS, ETHNIC GROUPS, PRESCHOOL TESTS, VERBAL ABILITY, SPEECH
EVALUATION, STANDARD SPOKEN USAGE, TRANSFORMATIONS
(LANGUAGE), KERNEL SENTENCES, SYNTAX, SENTENCE STRUCTURE,
ENGLISH, DEVELOPMENTAL SENTENCE TYPES,

     LANGUAGE SAMPLES OF 20 NEGRO HEAD START CHILDREN IN
WASHINGTON, D.C., WERE ANALYZED USING LEE'S (1966)
DEVELOPMENTAL SENTENCE TYPES MODEL. THE TRANSFORMATIONS AND
RESTRICTED FORMS OF THESE CHILDREN WERE THEN COMPARED WITH
THE RESULTS THAT MENYUK (1964) OBTAINED FOR MIDDLE CLASS
PRESCHOOLERS. RESULTS INDICATE THAT THE ECONOMICALLY DEPRIVED
CHILD IS NOT DELAYED IN LANGUAGE ACQUISITION ALTHOUGH HE USES
A QUALITATIVELY DIFFERENT LANGUAGE SYSTEM THAN THAT OF HIS
MIDDLE CLASS AGE MATE. HIS LANGUAGE CONTAINS MANY FORMS THAT
ARE IDENTICAL TO STANDARD ENGLISH (THIS ACCOUNTS FOR THE
PRESENCE OF ALL THE RESPONSE TYPES OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL
SENTENCE TYPES MODEL), BUT HIS LANGUAGE ALSO CONTAINS MANY
STRUCTURES WHICH ARE CONSIDERED TO BE RESTRICTED FORMS WHEN
COMPARED TO STANDARD ENGLISH. HOWEVER, THESE FORMS ARE NOT
ONLY ACCEPTABLE IN LOWER CLASS NEGRO DIALECT BUT ALSO
INDICATE A LEVEL OF SYNTACTIC DEVELOPMENT WHERE
TRANSFORMATIONS ARE BEING USED APPROPRIATELY. THE LOWER CLASS
NEGRO CHILD IS USING THE SAME FORMS AS THE LOWER CLASS NEGRO
ADULT AND THEREFORE INDICATING THAT HE HAS LEARNED THE FORMS
OF HIS LINGUISTIC ENVIRONMENT. (AUTHOR/DO)

ED020518

GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEGRO PRESCHOOL CHILD

by

Joan C. Baratz
Center for Applied Linguistics

and

Edna Povich
Montgomery County Public Schools

June 1968

Grammatical Constructions in the Language of the Negro Preschool Child

Joan C. Baratz

Center for Applied Linguistics

Edna Povich

Montgomery County Public Schools

Language samples of a group of economically disadvantaged chil-
dren were analyzed using Lee's Developmental Sentence Types model.
The transformations and restricted forms of these children were then
compared with the results that Menyuk obtained for middle class pre-
schoolers.

Results indicate that the economically deprived child is not
delayed in language acquisition. The majority of his utterances are
on the kernel and transformation levels of Lee's developmental model.
The transformations and restricted forms that he uses are different
from those used by middle class children. Although the Negro eco-
nomically impoverished child has many forms in his language that
resemble standard English, results indicate that he has a highly
developed, highly structured linguistic system that is different
from that of his middle class white agemate.

Grammatical Constructions and the Language of the Negro Preschool Child

Joan C. Baratz

Center for Applied Linguistics

Edna Povich

Montgomery County Public Schools

In the literature concerning the language of socio-economically disadvantaged children, their problems have been variously described as: 1) verbal destitution (i.e., they have not learned language), or 2) verbal underdevelopment (i.e., they have learned language incompletely, or 3) linguistically different (i.e., they have acquired a language system that is fully developed but different from standard English).

The purpose of the present study was to determine the languag development of a group of Head Start children, using Lee's (1966) Developmental Sentence Types and Menyuk's (1963) research on normal language acquisition as tools for language analyses. It was hoped that these tools would determine whether these children were deficient(i.e., verbally destitute or underdeveloped), or if their language was proficient (i.e., if they had acquired a well-formed language system).

Lee (1966) proposed a method of analyzing language samples that was based upon the work of Braine, Brown and Bellugi, McNeill and Chomsky. The Developmental Sentence Types model was an attempt to illustrate the progression that the child might go through from his early two-word combinations, to the use of the noun phrase, verb

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

phrase and other grammatical forms as independent elements or ker-

nel sentences from which transformations will be derived.

Insert Table 1 about here

Menyuk (1963, 1964) used Chomsky's transformation analysis to

describe language acquisition of normal and language delayed chil-

dren. Her data revealed that children not only used transformations

regularly by four and a half and five, but that they also used

"restricted phrases" in a predictive lawful manner. This study

attempted to compare the types and frequency of the transformations

and restricted forms found in the speech of five year old Head Start

children with those constructions that Menyuk found present in the

speech of five year old white middle class children.

Procedure

Subjects. The subjects were twenty Negro children, ten boys

and ten girls, who attended the Southwest Head Start Program in

Washington, D.C. during the summer of 1966. The requirements for

admission to this program were: 1) that the children's parents had

an income of not more than $3,500 per year, 2) that the children

lived in the southwest area of Washington, D.C., and 3) that the

children would be five years old by November 1, 1966. All subjects

had normal hearing, and were judged to be of at least normal intel-

ligence by their classroom teacher. All had regularly attended the

spring program and were between the ages of 5.0 and 5.6 with a mean

age of 5.3 years.

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Materials. The materials for this experiment consisted of two

sets of pictures. Task I involved the ten pictures in the Children's

Apperception Test --(CAT) (Bellak and Bellak, 1964). This test was

originally designed to be used in psychological testing, however,

the pictures have also been used as a means of eliciting language sam-

ples (Winitz, 1959, Minifie, et.al., 1963, Menyuk, 1964a). Task II

involved a new test which was more specifically related to the expe-

riences of the subjects. It was composed of a series of 8 x 10 black

and white photographs of the subjects, the school and the project

environment. Snapshots of the children at play, in their classrooms,

and on the playground were taken by the experimenters. Activities

within the school environment were also photographed, and at least

one photograph included the picture of each subject.

Test administration. Before any testing was done or any pho-

tographs taken the examiner spent five days in the classrooms. It

was hoped that by participating in all of the children's activities

that the examiner would become more familiar to the children.

All testing was done in a separate room on the same hall as the

classrooms. This was a quiet, bright room approximately 12' by 12'.

It was furnished with a table and chairs. The tape recorder, a

Wollensak 300, was on a chair in front of the table, with the micro-

phone resting on the table.

The tasks were administered individually to all subjects. No

subject received both tasks on the same day. Each subject was

brought into the testing room by the examiner, who showed him the tape

recorder, explained what it was, and asked if the subject would like
to hear himself on it. The tape recorder was then turned on and
the following questions asked: 1) What is your name? 2) Where do
you live? 3) How do you get to school every day? and 4) Do you
have lots of brothers and sisters? This discussion was played back
for the subject to hear. The purpose of this initial period was to
establish rapport and to establish hearing oneself on the tape
recorder as a reward for completing the experimental task. After
this initial period, the examiner said: "Wasn't that fun? Would you
like to hear yourself some more on this machine? I'm going to show
you some pictures and I want you to tell me all about them. Then,
when we're all finished, we can listen to you on the machine. O.K.?
Good. Here's the first picture. What's happening in this picture?"
The tape recorder was then turned on the timing begun. The experi-
mental time was limited to five minutes per task. When the child
stopped responding to the stimulus, the next picture was presented.
Thus any one subject could have been asked to talk about from three
to ten pictures depending upon how long he continued to respond to
each picture.

Results

Responses. A total of 1403 responses were elicited from the
twenty subjects under the two conditions. 750 of these were re-
sponses to the CAT cards and 653 were in response to the photographs.
The mean number of responses per child was 70.2; the median was 75.

Lee's Developmental Sentence Types Model. In order to perform
a qualitative analysis of the data, each subject's responses were
analyzed according to Lee's Developmental Sentence Types (Lee, 1966).
Lee's rules for using this construct were followed. Because this
data differed somewhat from Lee's it was necessary to set up an
additional analytical step. Many responses in this sample contained
transformational forms that were not grammatically acceptable sen-
tences in standard English. In her analysis, Lee placed all
responses that were not grammatically acceptable on Level IV. Her
sample, however, did not include a large percentage of "ungrammatical"
responses with transformational modifications, as did the data in
the present study. In the present study, responses that showed
transformational modifications but which were not grammatically cor-
rect in terms of standard English, were not listed as complete
sentences on the Emerging Transformational Level (Level V) but as
Transformational Fragments which were incorporated into transfor-
mations.

Table 2 presents examples of each response type in the Devel-
opmental Sentence Types model as well as the percentage of occurence
of each type for all subjects. Level V, Emerging Transformations,
represents the bulk of the data, with a preponderance of the utterances
on this level being classified as transformational Fragments incorporated
into transformations.

_____

Insert Table 2 about here

_____

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Table 3 represents the percentage of subjects that used each
response type. On Level I Two-Word Noun Phrases were used by 80%
of the subjects: Two-Word Verbals by 65% and Fragments by 50% of the
subjects. On Level II, no response type was used by 50% or more of
the population studied. Level III Predicative Constructions and
Verb Phrase Constructions were used by 75% of the subjects and
Fragments by 70% of the subjects. Fifty-five percent of the subjects
used Stereotyped Phrases on this level. The Actor-Action Sentence
Transformations were used by 95% of the sample and Transformational
Fragments by 100%. One word responses were made by 100% of the
subjects.

Insert Table 3 about here

Transformations and Restricted Forms. All of the responses on
the Emerging Transformational level of the Developmental Sentence
Type were analyzed according to Menyuk's (1964a) list of transfor-
mation types and restricted forms.

Examples of all of the structures described by Menyuk that were
found in the responses of the subjects studied in this experiment
are presented in Table 4. All of the examples were taken from the
responses of the subjects in this study. Menyuk does not always
elaborate on the precise definition of some of the restricted and
transformational categories that are found in her study: classi-
fication of the responses in this study were made on the basis of the
experimenters' interpretation of her categories.

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Insert Table 4 about here

Table 5 presents the transformations found in this study as compared with Menyuk's (1964a) study. There were several transformation types that were used solely by the white upper middle class kindergarten children tested with CAT cards by Menyuk. These were Passive, Separation, Auxiliary-Have, If, Participial Complement, Nominalization and Nominal Compound. Nominal Compound, Passive and Separation were used by almost all of the kindergarten children. However, Auxiliary-Have was used by only 19%, If by 21%, Participial Complement by 40% and Nominalization by only 28% of the kindergartners. Only two transformation types were identified that were used solely by the Head Start children. These were Auxiliary-Do and Adverb. Nineteen transformation types were used by at least 85% of the kindergartners, and only 8 transformations were not used by at least 50% of the children tested by Menyuk. In contrast, only 5 transformation types (Adverb, Auxiliary-Be, Contraction, Negation and Infinitival Complement) were used by more than 50% of the Head Start children.

Thus while the Head Start children used most of the transformation rules used by the kindergarten children, the percentage of Head Starters who used them is quite small as compared with the percentage of middle class white children who used these forms.

Insert Table 5 about here

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Table 6 presents the percentage of occurrence of each restricted form. The restricted forms used by the kindergarten children and not by the Head Start children were: Article Redundancy and Substitution, Particle Omission, Inversion Restriction-Subject-Object, There Substitution, No Separation, Verb Form Redundancy and Noun Form Redundancy. However, the percentage of kindergartners who use these restricted forms was small. Restricted forms used by the Head Start sample were: Possessive, Pronoun First Person, Adverb Restriction, Auxiliary Restriction, Because and So Substitution and If Omission. All of these were used by a small percentage of the subjects except for Auxiliary Omission which was used by 95% of the Head Start children, and was the most frequently occurring restricted form for this group.

Insert Table 6 about here

The most frequently occurring restricted form for the kindergarten children was Contraction Deletion which was used by 48% of Menyuk's subjects. The next most frequently occurring restricted form was Inversion Restriction Verb Number. These restricted forms were used by a very small percentage of the Head Start children. The remaining restricted forms found for the kindergarten children occurred very infrequently.

In contrast there were 7 restricted forms that were used by 50% or more of the Head Start children. These were Auxiliary Omission (95%), Noun Phrase-Omission (90%), Article Omission (70%),

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Conjunction Restriction (65%), Verb Phrase Substitution (55%), Pre-

position Omission (50%) and Verb Phrase Omission (65%). All of

these restricted forms were used by very few of the kindergarten chil-

dren, while Auxiliary Omission and Conjunction Restriction were not

found at all in the kindergarten transcripts.

Discussion

Developmental Sentence Types. Lee's Sentence Types appears to be

an adequate framework for analyzing language samples of this type,

since it was possible to classify all utterances of the Head Start

children within the Developmental Sentence Types model.

Wile all response types were found, the frequency of the Noun

Phrase Predicative Construction, Designative Construction as well as

the sentences and transformations that develop from them was a small

percentage of the total number of responses. The Verb Phrase Construc-

tion and its successive forms were the most frequent fully "grammatical"

in the sense of standard English forms. This could be due to the

phenomenon that Bernstein (1959) observed in lower class language, i.e.

"the use of grammatically simple, often unfinished sentences stressing

the active voice." However, a more likely explanation may be found

in the nature of the stimuli. The pictures used were all action pic-

tures and the children naturally talked about what was going on in them.

The small percentage of Noun Phrases that occurred was not con-

sidered to be significant because the majority of constructions and

sentences on other levels included the Noun Phrase or a pronoun to stand

for a Noun Phrase. The small number of Noun Phrases, Designative Sen-

tences, Predicative Sentences and their Emerging Transformations seems
to indicate that while these children are using what appear to be
standard English forms, these forms represent only a small percentage
of their language structure; the majority being a different kind of
structure that could only be classified as transformational fragments
when one uses Lee's model which is based on standard English.

If one accepts the assumptions of some of the earlier research
that there is linguistic underdevelopment in lower class Negro speech,
then one would expect to find the majority of responses of the chil-
dren in this study to be on the first three levels. But this was not
the case. Rather, 59.7% of the responses occurred on Levels IV and V,
47.3% of which were on Level V, the Emerging Transformation level. In
addition, 100% of the subjects used responses on Level V. These results
indicate that the lower class child is not functioning at an "under-
developed" or "retarded" level of syntactic development, but that he is
operating on a level appropriate to his age.

Analysis of Emerging Transformations. The largest number of re-
sponses occurred on Level V, the Emerging Transformational level which
would indicate that the children are operating on a high level of
syntactic development. When one examines the responses on Level V,
howev· it appears that the largest percentage of responses on this
level and for the total of all responses) was Transformational Frag-
ments incorporated into transformations. The fact that these Trans-
formational Fragments are not randomly distributed; 95% of the children
use the Auxiliary Omission, 65% of the children use the Conjunction

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Restriction and 40% of the children use Auxiliary Restriction supports

the view of some linguists (Stewart, 1964; Dillard, 1966) that the

language used by these children is well-formed, but is simply differ-

ent from middle class standard English. Thus, many Head Start utterances

will be quantified incorrectly as "Fragments" because they are not "well-

formed" in terms of middle class standard English patterns. However,

if adult Negro dialect were used as the basis for judgment (and the

Negro dialect is the language in the child's environment, and the lan-

guage that he is developing) then many "restricted" forms would have to

be reclassified. For example, Verb Form Omission as in <u>When your sister</u>

<u>come home, don't let her see nothin'</u> would have to be reclassified as

being an adult transformation in Negro Non-Standard speech, since in

that code the rules governing addition or deletion of the third person

verbal ending -<u>s</u> do not match those of the standard English, where the

use of this verbal ending is obligatory. From the point of view of the

Negro dialect, both <u>she come</u> and <u>she comes</u> are equally "normal", gram-

matical forms. In addition, the double negative in the example, <u>don't</u>

<u>let her see nothin'</u>, is a typical Negro Non-Standard usage (as it is

in many languages such as French and Spanish), and as such should also

be classified as an adult transformation rather than as a restricted

form.

Comparison of the transformations used showed that the Head Start

children used most of the types that the kindergarten children did, but

that there were some transformations that the Head Start children did

not use at all. The difference between the Head Starters and the

kindergartners did not appear to be one of developmental level, but

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

rather one involving the nature of the responses to be categorized as

transformations or as restricted forms. The majority of the kinder-

garten responses were examples of transformation types, whereas the

majority of the Head Start responses contained "restricted transfor-

mations" when standard English was the criterion upon which judgments

were based. Only two transformations (Adverb and Auxiliary-Do) were

used solely by the Head Start children.

The fact that the largest number of responses occurred at Level

V would indicate that the children were operating on a high level of

syntactic development. However, when one examines the responses on

Level V, it appears that the largest percentage of responses on this

level were Transformational Fragments incorporated into transformations.

Comparisons of the restricted forms used by the Head Start children

and Menyuk's subjects showed the greatest difference between the two

groups. Those restricted forms used by the kindergartners were rarely

used by Head Starters and the most frequently used forms of the Head

Start children occurred rarely if at all in the kindergarten tran-

scripts. Head Start children used different restricted forms than did

the kindergarten children.

Albright and Albright (1958) suggested the adaptation of the tech-

niques of descriptive linguistics in order to identify the specific

nature and features of children's language. Lee's Developmental Sentence

Types and the transformations and restricted forms listed by Menyuk are

based on information that linguists have provided, but like previous

analyses of language, they are based almost exclusively on the structure

of standard English dialect. Language studies of the economically de-

prived child have used as their criterion of language development mea-

surements based on the standard dialect because of an implicit

assumption that non-standard dialect represents, at most, mere low- level

modifications of standard English. Since it is most likely that the

economically deprived Negro child is learning a different dialect from

that of standard English, we must discern the competence in the lan-

guage that these children are learning -- the language which is in their

social environment -- if we wish to assess their language development.

When we assess their language development by how well they have learned

standard English, we are merely testing their abilities in a dialect

that may be at most peripheral to their experience and linguistic envi-

ronment. Therefore, we must first identify the characteristics of

lower class Negro speech which the disadvantaged Negro child is learning.

Stewart (1965, 1967) and Dillard (1966) described some features

of lower class Negro dialect: 1) It does not necessarily inflect the

verb to show the grammatical difference between the simple present and

the past tense. I see it could mean 'I see it' or I saw it', even

though these tenses do exist as grammatical entities in the dialect;

2) It negates the present and past tenses differently. The negative

for the present would be I don't see it, while the negative for the

past would be I ain't see it; 3) It forms the possessive differently,

so that he brother is the equivalent form for 'his brother', and de

man hat is equivalent to 'the man's hat'; 4) The double negative is

found in many constructions; 5) Structure. like he good and dey over

dere are normal forms in adult Negro dialect.

Stewart (1965) has pointed out that because there are similar-
ities between the white and lower class Negro non-standard dialect,
the two have been assumed to have the same deep structure. The differ-
ences were interpreted as errors, and many researchers have thus assumed
that the lower class child was using a deficient form of standard English,
rather than a different, highly structured language of his own.

If we take the research on Negro Non-standard that linguists have
done, we see that the structures that they have described as typical
structures of Negro adults speech have been classified via Menyuk's
categories as restricted forms. The Double Negative, Possessive Re-
striction, Verb Phrase Omission, Verb Phrase Substitution, Tense
Restriction and Auxiliary Restriction all can be seen as characteristic
forms of adults Negro dialect rather than as restricted forms in stan-
dard English. These forms together represent 76% of all the restricted
forms identified in this study. It is necessary for us to remember
that although the Negro child's usage of the Double Negative (or for
that matter the French child's use of the Double Negative) is to be
regarded as evidence for language acquisition of a form that is present
in the adult speech of his community, the middle class child who uses
the Double Negative must have such a usage classified as a restricted
form since the adults in his environment do not use that particular
form.

If the Level V Fragment responses are to be considered as trans-
formation types in Negro dialect as Stewart's work would suggest, then
the number of transformation type responses is greatly increased for

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

the Head Start children, and the number of restricted forms greatly

decreased. The proportion of transformations and restricted forms

is then very similar to that for the kindergarten population, but the

kind of transformations for each population is different.

Cutts (1963), Smiley (1964) and Green (1965) have pointed out

that the values, attitudes and culture of the lower class are different

from those of the middle class, and that the lower class has developed

a different language. Thus, it is not valid to evaluate the language

of one culture with the norms from the language of a different culture;

only comparisons as to the similarities and differences between them

can be made. For in turning the tables, if we retained the method of

judging one system by another system's rules (a procedure which rep-

resents the "fatal flaw" in a great deal of the research on language

of the economically disadvantaged), we would have to say that middle

class children are "verbally destitute" or "underdeveloped" in language

acquisition because there are nine forms (Auxiliary Omission, Prep-

osition Restriction, etc.) which are used by Head Start children but

that are not within the verbal repertoire of the middle class kinder-

gartner! A linguistic analysis of the lower class language patterns

which simply asks "What forms are being used to generate structures?"

rather than one that asks "What forms look like standard English?"

allows the researcher to view variations between lower class and middle

class language structure as differences rather than as deficiencies.

Summary

Having analyzed the language samples of Negro Head Start children

via Lee's (1966) Developmental Sentence Types and Menyuk's (1964) lin-

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

guistic classifications, this study has indicated that the lower class

child is using a qualitatively different language system than that

of his middle class age mate. His language contains many forms that

are identical to standard English. This accounts for the presence of

all the response types of the Developmental Sentence Types model.

However, his language also contains many structures which are considered

to be restricted forms when compared to standard English. These forms

are not only acceptable in lower class Negro dialect, but also indicate

a level of syntactic development where transformations are being used

appropriately. The lower class Negro child is using the same forms as

the lower class Negro adult, and therefore indicating that he has

learned the forms of his linguistic environment.

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Bibliography

Albright, R., and Albright, J. Application of descriptive linguistics
to child language. J. Sp. & Hrg. Res., 1965, 1, 257-261.

Bellak, L. and Bellak, S., Children's Apperception Test (C.A.T.).
Larchmont, N.Y., C.P.S., Inc., 1964.

Bernstein, B., A public language: some sociological implications of
a linguistic form. Brit. J. Sociology, 1959, 10, 311-336.

Cutts, W. Reading unreadiness in the underprivileged. N.E.A.J.,
1963, 52, 23-24.

Dillard, J.L., The Urban Language Study of the Center for Applied
Linguistics., The Linguistic Reporter, 1966, 8, 1-2.

Green, W., Language and the culturally different. Eng. J., 1965,
54, 724-733.

Lee, L., Developmental sentence types: a method for comparing normal
and deviant syntactic development. J.Sp. & Hrg. Dis., 1966,
31, 311-330.

Menyuk, P., Syntactic structures in the language of children. Child
Develp., 1963, 34, 407-422.

--------- Syntactic rules used by children from preschool through
first grade. Child Develp., 1964a, 35, 533-546.

--------- Comparison of grammar of children with functionally deviant
and normal speech. J. Sp. & Hrg. Res., 1964b, 7, 109-121.

Minifie, F., Darley, R., and Sherman, D., Temporal reliability of seven
language measures. J. Sp. & Hrg. Res., 1963, 6, 139-148.

Smiley, M., Research and its implications. In A. Jewett, J. Mersand
and D. Gunderson, Improving English Skills of Culturally Different
Youth. Wash. D.C., U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1964.

Stewart, W.A., Foreign language teaching methods in quasi-foreign
language situations. Non-standard Speech and the Teaching of
English, 1965, Wash. D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

--------- Urban Negro speech: sociolinguistic factors affecting
English teaching. In R. Shuy (ed.) Social Dialects and Language
Jearning, 1964, National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign,
Il.

--------- Sociolinguistics factors in the history of American
Negro dialects. The Fla. For. Lang. Rep., 1967, 5, 4-5.

Winitz, H., Language skills of male and female kindergarten children,
J. Sp. Hrg. Res., 1959, 2, 377-386.

Table 1

LEE'S DEVELOPMENTAL SENTENCE TYPES*

Level I 2-Word Combinations	2-Word Noun Phrase	2-Word Designative	2-Word Predicative	2-Word Verbal	2-Word Fragments / 2-Word Stereotyped Phrases
Level II Noun Phrases	Noun Phrase				
Level III Constructions	(Noun Phrase incorporated into Constructions)	Designative Construction	Predicative Construction	Verb Phrase Construction	(Phrase Structure Fragments incorporated into Construction) / Stereotyped Constructions
Level IV Kernel Sentences		Designative Sentence	Predicative Sentence	Actor-Action Sentence	(Stereotyped Constructions incorporated into Sentences)
Successive Levels Emerging Transformations		Interrogative "Wh" Question	Negative Conjunction	"Do" plus Negative Infinitival Complement	(Transformational Fragments incorporated into Transformations)

Lee, L. Developmental Sentence types: a method for comparing normal and deviant syntactic structure. J.Sp. Hrg. Dis., 1966, 31, 311-330.

EXAMPLES AND PERCENTAGE OF OCCURRENCE OF EACH RESPONSE TYPE

Baratz and Povich — Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

	Noun	Designative	Predicative	Verbal	Fragments	Stereotyped Phrases
Level I	a monkey 3.1	dat lion .3		walks in 2.5	by the wolf 1.7	I 'caro .6
Level II	no more baby .7				chew let tails .2	
Level III		dat about two bears .5	a baby in a crib 2.3	open dat door 7.5	so he get 1.5	an' up an' down 3.0
Level IV		dat is dad ovah class 2.3	his name is Wesley .7	a lady talk to uah man 6.4	see tha's 3 little .4	tha's all I know 2.6
(Level V) Successive Levels		who's this .5	dat's not me aat's Deborah .3	an' Debby cidn' know it was Deborah 9.1	an' tiger goin a house an' tiger got all burned up 36.7	I donno that cre .2
One Word Responses 12.5						

Table 3

PERCENTAGE OF SUBJECTS USING EACH RESPONSE TYPE FOR TASKS I AND II

	Noun	Designative	Predicative	Verbal	Fragments	Stereotyped Phrases
Level I	80	20		65	50	5
Level II	30				15	
Level III		25	75	75	70	55
Level IV		40	30	80	20	25
Successive Levels (Level V)		40	25	95	100	
One Word Responses	100					

Table 4

TRANSFORMATIONS AND RESTRICTED FORMS USED BY HEAD START CHILDREN

Transformations	Example
Negation	she can't go outside
Question	don't you know about it?
Contraction	duh daddy's not gonna see dem
Inversion	when it's hot outside come back in uh house
Relative Question	who is that?
Imperative	an' Miss Rush said: get up on uh table
Pronominalization	there were two little girls in uh room one was washin' clothes an' ironin' an' one was washin' dishes
Got	duh ghost is gonna get duh children
Auxiliary -- Be	I'm gonna knock everything down
Do	yeah but I don' know her name
Do	he wasn't doin' it
Possessive	dat's he muvver's high heels
Reflexive	I read duh book den I play wid duh house den I go by myself
Conjunction	den Janis got in hers an' Darrel got in his an' I was goin' to leave 'em
Conjunction Deletion	I would take duh skates away an' put 'em in duh closet
So	so she said: "good, good"
Because-causal	they couldn't even eat the bottles 'cause the bottles were glass
Pronoun in Conjunction	I tol' duh odder lady an' she should uh told you
Adjective	uh fever got him a new car
Relative Clause	I don' know what's here
Complement-Infinitival	I wanna hold it
Iteration	an' one girl was goin' over dere tuh tell he tuh put the flag down.
Adverb	when it's raining ou side come back in duh house

Table 4 (con't)

Restricted form	Example
Verb Phrase – Omission	duh big bear an' duh liddle bear
Redundancy	he was being mad
Substitution	they sittin' down lookin' at T.V.
NounPhrase – Omission	ain' got day no more
Redundancy	an muvver and faver they went to bed
	tiger go in duh house and tiger got all burned up
Preposition– Omission	he playin' duh hat
Redundancy	I climb up on the tree
Substitution	tiger runnin' at duh monkey
Article Omission	dey were playin' game
Double Negative	he don' ha' no coat at school
Contraction Deletion	he play like he a real gorilla
Inversion Restriction	dere's three bears pullin' on uh rope
No Question	who do' people are
Reflexive Third Person	dey gonna fall down hurt dereself
Tense Restriction	Rorel Jones a ' uh bruver an' Dan was in duh drawer rockin' uh chair while Miss mush was fixin' uh box
Pronoun Restriction	don dem gonna fall
Adjective Restriction	one of dem girls is ironing
Relative Clause Restriction	an Debby didn't know it was darktime
Verb Form – Omission	when your sista come in uh house, don' let her see nuttin'
Substitution	I knows who dat is
Noun Form – Omission	dere dis two bunny rabbit duh ghost gonna get duh bunny rabbit an' eat' em all up
Substitution	three playin' balls an' two playin' cowboys an' one playin'wi' duh puzzle
Possessive	uh king sittin' down in uh king chair
Pronoun First Person	where me at?
Adverb Restriction	she doin' nufin'
Auxiliary Restriction	an' we was lookin' at duh movies an' Darrel was lookin' at duh movies an' I was laughin'
Conjunction Restriction	climb up duh tree try uh get dim
Auxiliary Omission	dey pullin' uh rope
	dey gonna fall back
Possessive Restriction	dey got dem things an day got dem budder an' its all gone

Tabe 4 (cont.)

Possessive Restriction: the monkey fall on he head

Because or So Substitution   he gonna get up in uh tree to the
                                                 tiger won' eat him up

                                                 he stay in house an muver was beat
                                                 him for he didn' go outside

If Omission   dey go way up dere dey go fall

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Table 5

PERCENTAGE OF KINDERGARTEN AND HEAD START CHILDREN
USING EACH TRANSFORMATION TYPE

Transformation	Kindergarten n = 48	Head Start n = 20
Passive	66	
Negation	100	55
Question	92	30
Contraction	100	70
Inversion	100	5
Relative Question	87	20
Imperative	89	25
Pronominalization	33	5
Separation	89	
Got	100	45
Auxiliary - Be	100	85
Have	19	
Do		25
Do	100	30
Possessive	100	35
Reflexive	66	10
Conjunction	100	25
Conjunction Deletion	89	40
If	21	
So	37	10

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Table 5 - continued

Transformation	Kindergarten n = 48	Head Start n = 20
Cause	97	15
Pronoun in Conjunction	100	15
Adjective	100	45
Relative Clause	87	15
Complement		
Infinitival	100	50
Participal	40	
Iteration	17	5
Nominalization	28	
Nominal Compount	100	
Adverb		65

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Table 6

PERCENTAGE OF KINDERGARTEN AND HEAD START
CHILDREN USING EACH RESTRICTED FORM

Restricted Form	Kindergarten n = 48	Head Start n = 20
Verb Phrase		
Omission	13	65
Redundancy	15	5
Substitution	35	55
Noun Phrase		
Omission	21	90
Redundancy	17	15
Preposition		
Omission	15	50
Redundancy	17	10
Substitution	23	20
Article		
Omission	8	70
Redundancy	13	
Substitution	2	
Particle Omission	9	
Double Negative	2	35
Contraction Deletion	48	

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Table 6 - continued

Restricted Form	Kindergarten n = 48	Head Start n = 20
Inversion Restriction		
Subject-Object	8	
Verb Number	40	5
No Question	2	15
There Substitution	4	
No Separation	2	
Reflexive Third Person	29	15
Tense Restriction	.9	40
Pronoun Restriction	35	40
Adjective Restriction	13	15
Relative Clause Restriction	21	10
Verb Form		
Omission	29	45
Redundancy	19	
Substitution	13	15
Noun Form		
Omission	25	15
Redundancy	13	
Substitution	4	10

Baratz and Povich   Grammar of Negro Preschool Children

Table 6 - continued

Restricted Form	Kindergarten n = 48	Head Start n = 20
Possessive		5
Pronoun First Person		15
Adverb Restriction		25
Auxiliary Restriction		40
Conjunction Restriction		.65
Auxiliary Omission		95
Possessive Restriction		15
Because of So Substitution		5
If Omission		10