#### You're in vs. You're it Laurie and Winifred Bauer

Question 1(b) asked for the term used to tell someone that they are to do the chasing in the basic chasing game. The question was a sub-part of a question about this game:

1 At your school, do children play a game with many players where one player has to run and try to touch another player while all the other players try to run away and not get touched?

- (a)
- (b) At your school, how do you usually tell someone that they are to be the player who tries to touch the others?

Question 1(b) proved to be somewhat unsatisfactory, since quite a number of schools responded with the way they chose the player (e.g. by counting out rhymes), which we specifically asked about in Question 4. Sometimes in the course of these answers, they provided the information we were seeking, but this was not always the case.

There were a relatively small number of different relevant answers given for 1(b), just 17 in all, and the overwhelming majority of the responses were either *it*, or *in* or both. Interestingly, there was not a single response of *he*, although we know that *he* was the usual term in New Zealand at least until the 1950's (see e.g. Sutton-Smith 1981, 51, and the definition of *tiggy* in Orsman's *Oxford Dictionary of New Zealand English*). Many of the other terms were recorded just once, but there were four occurrences of the chant *You're in, you're in, you're in the rubbish bin,* and seven occurrences of *tagger* (including one report in Southland of *tigger*). These forms have been recorded, but are not really significant in the larger picture.

In most parts of NZ, both *it* and *in* were recorded. However, almost all the schools which recorded just *it* are in the northern half of the North Island, extending down as far as the northern edge of the volcanic plateau and Taranaki (but not Hawkes Bay). The majority of schools recording just *in* are south of this line. There are a few exceptions to the basic pattern. Several schools in Auckland and one in the Bay of Plenty recorded only *in*, and there were three scattered schools in the South Island which recorded only *it*.

The table showing the basic figures for the distribution of these terms in the three Main Regions follows:

	Northern		Cer	ntral	Southern	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Schools	57	38	78	52	14	9
it	44	51	34	40	8	9
in	34	30	67	60	11	10

The map for Q1(b) provides a visual representation of this data.







#### Key

Note that the insets are not to scale, nor all on the same scale for practical reasons. Each box represents one school in both urban and rural areas. In some urban areas where the original box was too small to allow splitting, two squares have been linked to show a school reporting both forms.



It

There is just significantly more use of *it* in the Northern Region than the Southern Region, (the p-value is 0.0495), and significantly more *it* in the Northern Region than the Central Region (p-value of 0.0001). There are no significant differences between the Central and Southern Regions on this data. *It* is also significantly more common in the North Island than the South (p-value 0.0035), but this is to be explained by the prevalence of *it* in the Northern Region. *It* is also slightly more common in rural than in urban schools (p-value 0.0355). We investigated the relationship between the Main Region and Urban/Rural factors. The p-value for the Urban/Rural contrast is not significant when Main Region is taken into account (0.0678), but the p-values for both the Northern – Southern contrast (0.0330) and, more importantly, the Northern – Central contrast (0.0001) are still significant. This makes it clear that the regional contrast is more important than the Urban/Rural contrast.

When the relationship between Island and Urban/Rural was investigated, the statistics showed that both of these factors remain significant when the other is taken into account. (The p-value for Island is 0.0024, while that for Urban/Rural is 0.0169 when the other factor is taken into account.) This tells us that when the regionalisation is represented by Island rather than by Main Region, the Urban/Rural factor is still significant.

Thus for *It*, the regionalisation to the Northern Region is the most significant factor. In the absence of the Main Region factor, Island is still a reasonable representation of the regionalisation. The Urban/Rural factor is not significant when Main Region is taken into account (i.e. it is the large number of urban schools in the Northern Region which accounts for this), but when the regionalisation is represented by the (less useful) Island factor, the Urban/Rural difference retains some explanatory power.

In

There is significantly more use of *in* in the Central Region than the Northern Region (p-value of 0.0011). There are no significant differences between the Central and Southern Regions or the Northern and Southern Regions on this data.

No other factors were significant for In.

## Information from school visits

During the school visits, further checks were made on this data. The 'rubbish bin' rhyme was found in a few further schools, perhaps surprisingly even in one or two where the word *it* was otherwise used to the exclusion of *in*. The data obtained during the visits confirmed the general picture presented here, with most schools knowing both, although one was often preferred to the other. In one school, the terms divided by gender, with boys using *in* and girls *it*.

# Conclusion

We can conclude that the *in/it* data supports the divide between the Northern and Central Regions.

## **Historical Snippets**

When some early results from the questionnaire were reported in the *New Zealand Listener*, readers were invited to write to the researchers providing

information on the terms they had used for certain items when they were at school. The responses sometimes contained information about the name of the chaser, although we did not specifically ask for it. *He* was the earliest form reported (in Wellington, about 1917), and was reported from all areas of the country until the 1960s. There were also sporadic reports of *it* throughout this period. However, after the 1960s, there were no further reports of *he*, and the first reports of *in* appear.

Sutton-Smith in *Smitty does a Bunk* (1961) has the children use "He" (p. 59). Maori speakers recall using the form *hii* in Maori, which was clearly borrowed from the English, suggesting that *he* was the norm at the time of the early settlers in at least the Northern areas of the country.

# Q1b Statistics: The chaser is in/it

## In/it by Decile

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical Standard Error Estimates Empirical 95% Confidence Limits

parameter		Estimate	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.0000		•		•	•	
item	in	0.8433	0.3938	0.0716	1.6150	2.1417	0.0322
item	it	0.2744	0.3845	-0.4793	1.0280	0.7136	0.4755
decile*item	in	0.0295	0.0610	-0.0901	0.1490	0.4827	0.6293
decile*item	it	0.0037	0.0603	-0.1145	0.1218	0.0606	0.9517
scale	0.9999		•	•	•	•	

# In/it by Main Region

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical Standard Error Estimates Empirical 95% Confidence Limits

parameter		Est.	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr >  Z
intercept	0.0000					•	
item	in	0.9163	0.5916	-0.2432	2.0758	1.5488	0.1214
item	it	-0.0000	0.5345	-1.0476	1.0476	0000	1.0000
item*region1	in, 1	-0.5254	0.6503	-1.8000	0.7491	8080	0.4191
item*region1	in, 2	0.7885	0.6697	-0.5241	2.1010	1.1773	0.2391
item*region1	in, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*region1	it, 1	1.2192	0.6208	0.0025	2.4359	1.9641	0.0495
item*region1	it, 2	-0.2578	0.5813	-1.3971	0.8814	4436	0.6573
item*region1	it, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000	•		•	•	•	

## **CONTRAST Statement Results**

Contrast	DF	ChiSquare	Pr>Chi	Туре
1 -2 for in	1	10.6588	0.0011	LR
1 -2 for it	1	15.8139	0.0001	LR

noremeter			Estimata	Std Em	ChiSquara	Dr> Chi
	0			SIGEIT	Chisquare	PI>CIII
intercept	0	0.00	0.0000	•	•	
item	in	1	0.9163	0.5916	2.3988	0.1214
item	it	1	-0.0000	0.5345	0.0000	1.0000
item*region2	in, 1	1	24.4490	131502.510	0.0000	0.9999
item*region2	in, 2	1	-1.6094	1.0488	2.3548	0.1249
item*region2	in, 3	1	0.7577	0.8636	0.7697	0.3803
item*region2	in, 4	1	-1.3863	0.7159	3.7499	0.0528
item*region2	in, 5	1	1.4816	1.2004	1.5234	0.2171
item*region2	in, 6	1	0.9295	0.8579	1.1740	0.2786
item*region2	in, 7	1	0.3365	0.9964	0.1140	0.7356
item*region2	in, 8	1	0.6931	1.2450	0.3100	0.5777
item*region2	in, 9	1	1.9169	1.1869	2.6083	0.1063
item*region2	in, 10	1	-0.5108	0.8756	0.3404	0.5596
item*region2	in, 11	0	0.0000	0.0000		
item*region2	it, 1	1	25.3653	131502.509	0.0000	0.9998
item*region2	it, 2	1	25.3653	131502.511	0.0000	0.9998
item*region2	it, 3	1	1.0296	0.7464	1.9028	0.1678
item*region2	it, 4	1	0.8109	0.6828	1.4104	0.2350
item*region2	it, 5	1	-0.0000	0.7868	0.0000	1.0000
item*region2	it, 6	1	0.0000	0.6838	0.0000	1.0000
item*region2	it, 7	1	0.2231	0.8577	0.0677	0.7947
item*region2	it, 8	1	-0.6931	1.0177	0.4639	0.4958
item*region2	it, 9	1	-0.6931	0.7319	0.8968	0.3436
item*region2	it, 10	1	-0.4055	0.8381	0.2341	0.6285
item*region2	it, 11	0	0.0000	0.0000		•
scale	0	1.00	0.0000			

In/it by Sub-Region Analysis Of Initial Parameter Estimates

## In/it by Island

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical Standard Error Estimates Empirical 95% Confidence Limits

parameter		Estimate	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.00						
item	in	1.3218	0.3249	0.6850	1.9585	4.0683	0.0000
item	it	-0.3185	0.2683	-0.8443	0.2073	-1.187	0.2352
item*island	in, 1	-0.4796	0.3958	-1.2553	0.2962	-1.212	0.2256
item*island	in, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*island	it, 1	1.0116	0.3469	0.3316	1.6916	2.9159	0.0035
item*island	it, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.00		•		•	•	

	That you contracted Estimates Empirical 95% contracted Emilis									
parameter		Estimate	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z			
intercept	0.000	•				•				
item	in	1.0986	0.5774	-0.0330	2.2302	1.9029	0.0571			
item	it	-0.2513	0.5040	-1.2390	0.7364	4987	0.6180			
item*catholic	in, 1	-0.0896	0.6102	-1.2855	1.1063	1469	0.8832			
item*catholic	in, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000			
item*catholic	it, 1	0.6377	0.5345	-0.4098	1.6853	1.1932	0.2328			
item*catholic	it, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000			
scale	1.000									

## In/it by Catholic

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical 95% Confidence Limits

## In/it by Urban/Rural

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical 95% Confidence Limits

parameter		Estimate	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.000			•	•		
item	in	1.4733	0.3343	0.8181	2.1285	4.4074	0.0000
item	it	-0.1018	0.2607	-0.6128	0.4092	3904	0.6962
item*urb_rur	in, 1	-0.6916	0.4071	-1.4895	0.1063	-1.699	0.0893
item*urb_rur	in, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*urb_rur	it, 1	0.7259	0.3452	0.0494	1.4025	2.1029	0.0355
item*urb_rur	it, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.000		•			•	

## In/it by Main Region and Island, Model 2 (no sig. figs. Model 1)

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical 95% Confidence Limits

parameter		Estimate	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.000		•			•	
item	in	0.9163	0.5916	-0.2432	2.0758	1.5488	0.1214
item	it	-0.0000	0.5345	-1.0476	1.0476	0000	1.0000
item*region1	in, 1	-1.0972	0.9267	-2.9135	0.7190	-1.184	0.2364
item*region1	in, 2	0.5596	0.7096	-0.8312	1.9505	0.7886	0.4303
item*region1	in, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*region1	it, 1	0.8515	0.7727	-0.6629	2.3659	1.1020	0.2704
item*region1	it, 2	-0.4249	0.6189	-1.6378	0.7881	6865	0.4924
item*region1	it, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
island*item	in, 1	-0.5718	0.6602	-1.8657	0.7221	8661	0.3864
island*item	in, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
island*item	it, 1	-0.3677	0.4601	-1.2694	0.5340	7993	0.4241
island*item	it, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.000		•	•	•	•	

#### **CONTRAST Statement Results**

Contrast	DF	ChiSquare	Pr>Chi	Туре
1 -2 for in	1	9.6042	0.0019	LR
1 -2 for it	1	7.8731	0.0050	LR

In/it by Main Region and Urban/Rural, Model 1 Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical Standard Error Estimates Empirical 95% Confidence Limits

parameter		Est.	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr >  Z
intercept	0.0000	•					
item	in	-0.0000	1.0000	-1.9600	1.9600	0000	1.0000
item	it	-0.0000	1.0000	-1.9600	1.9600	0000	1.0000
item*urb_rur	in, 1	1.3863	1.2748	-1.1122	3.8848	1.0875	0.2768
item*urb_rur	in, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*urb_rur	it, 1	0.0000	1.1832	-2.3191	2.3191	0.0000	1.0000
item*urb_rur	it, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*region1	in, 1	1.4469	1.1440	-0.7954	3.6892	1.2647	0.2060
item*region1	in, 2	1.7579	1.1111	-0.4198	3.9355	1.5821	0.1136
item*region1	in, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*region1	it, 1	0.6931	1.1019	-1.4666	2.8529	0.6290	0.5293
item*region1	it, 2	-0.6061	1.0624	-2.6885	1.4762	5705	0.5683
item*region1	it, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*ur*reg1	in 1, 1	-2.8904	1.4312	-5.6954	-0.0854	-2.020	0.0434
item*ur*reg1	in 1, 2	-1.4096	1.4337	-4.2196	1.4005	9831	0.3255
item*ur*reg1	in 1, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*ur*reg1	in 2, 1	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*ur*reg1	in 2, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*ur*reg1	in 2, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*ur*reg1	it 1, 1	1.0986	1.3593	-1.5655	3.7627	0.8082	0.4190
item*ur*reg1	it 1, 2	0.6061	1.2762	-1.8952	3.1075	0.4749	0.6348
item*ur*reg1	it 1, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*ur*reg1	it 2, 1	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*ur*reg1	it 2, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*ur*reg1	it 2, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000						

## In/it by Main Region and Urban/Rural, Model 2

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical Standard Error Estimates **Empirical 95% Confidence Limits** 

parameter		Estimate	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.0000						
item	in	1.3700	0.7524	-0.1046	2.8446	1.8209	0.0686
item	it	-0.4736	0.6176	-1.6840	0.7368	7668	0.4432
item*urb_rur	in, 1	-0.6048	0.4375	-1.4623	0.2528	-1.382	0.1669
item*urb_rur	in, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*urb_rur	it, 1	0.6732	0.3686	-0.0492	1.3956	1.8266	0.0678
item*urb_rur	it, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*region1	in, 1	-0.5522	0.6895	-1.9036	0.7991	8009	0.4232
item*region1	in, 2	0.7352	0.7131	-0.6624	2.1328	1.0310	0.3025
item*region1	in, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*region1	it, 1	1.3708	0.6429	0.1107	2.6310	2.1321	0.0330
item*region1	it, 2	-0.1672	0.6061	-1.3550	1.0207	2759	0.7827
item*region1	it, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0039						

### **CONTRAST Statement Results**

Contrast	DF	ChiSquare	Pr>Chi	Туре
1-2 for in	1	9.4257	0.0021	LR
1-2 for it	1	16.1888	0.0001	LR

**In/it by Urban/Rural in Northern Region only** Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical Standard Error Estimates **Empirical 95% Confidence Limits** 

parameter		Est.	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.0000		•			•	
item	in	1.4469	0.5557	0.3577	2.5361	2.6037	0.0092
item	it	0.6931	0.4629	-0.2141	1.6004	1.4974	0.1343
item*urb_rur	in, 1	-1.5041	0.6505	-2.7791	-0.2290	-2.312	0.0208
item*urb_rur	in, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*urb_rur	it, 1	1.0986	0.6690	-0.2127	2.4099	1.6421	0.1006
item*urb_rur	it, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000	•	•	•	•	•	

# In/it by Urban/Rural in Central Region only

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical Standard Error Estimates Empirical 95% Confidence Limits

parameter		Est.	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.0000						
item	in	1.7579	0.4842	0.8088	2.7069	3.6302	0.0003
item	it	-0.6061	0.3589	-1.3095	0.0972	-1.689	0.0912
item*urb_rur	in, 1	-0.0233	0.6562	-1.3093	1.2628	0354	0.9717
item*urb_rur	in, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*urb_rur	it, 1	0.6061	0.4783	-0.3313	1.5436	1.2672	0.2051
item*urb_rur	it, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000	•	•	•	•	•	

## In/it by Urban/Rural in Southern Region only

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical Standard Error Estimates Empirical 95% Confidence Limits

r							
parameter		Est.	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.0000	•	•	•	•	•	
item	in	0.0000	1.0000	-1.9600	1.9600	0.0000	1.0000
item	it	-0.0000	1.0000	-1.9600	1.9600	0000	1.0000
item*urb_rur	in, 1	1.3863	1.2748	-1.1122	3.8848	1.0875	0.2768
item*urb_rur	in, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*urb_rur	it, 1	-0.0000	1.1832	-2.3191	2.3191	0000	1.0000
item*urb_rur	it, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000					•	

## In/it by Island and Urban/Rural, Model 2 (no sig. figs. Model 1)

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates – Empirical Standard Error Estimates Empirical 95% Confidence Limits

parameter		Est.	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.0000		•		•	•	
item	in	1.8904	0.5006	0.9093	2.8716	3.7764	0.0002
item	it	-0.8815	0.3907	-1.6473	-0.1158	-2.256	0.0241
item*island	in, 1	-0.5797	0.4263	-1.4152	0.2558	-1.360	0.1739
item*island	in, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*island	it, 1	1.1284	0.3722	0.3990	1.8579	3.0321	0.0024
item*island	it, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*urb_rur	in, 1	-0.7517	0.4215	-1.5778	0.0745	-1.783	0.0745
item*urb_rur	in, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*urb_rur	it, 1	0.8774	0.3673	0.1575	1.5973	2.3888	0.0169
item*urb_rur	it, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.00000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0027			•		•	