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INTRODUCTION

Despite the dramatic increase in research studies of written composition during the past dozen years, we are still unaware of all that takes place when a person engages in the processes of writing and of learning to write. What happens to a child as he is learning to write is especially unclear and relatively unexplored.

Children learn to speak without consciously learning rules for speaking, but they are not expected to learn writing without specific instruction. Lev S. Vygotsky focused on this seeming contradiction: "Such training in writing requires an enormous amount of attention and effort on the part of teacher and pupil and thus becomes something self-contained, relegating living written language to the background. Instead of being founded on the needs of children as they naturally develop and on their own activity, writing is given to them from without, from the teacher's hands."[1]

As the first chapter explains, much of the current research on composition has established that not merely the audience but also the purpose for a piece of writing and the student's feelings about his abilities to produce that writing will affect the student's writing itself. James Moffett in Student-Centered Language Arts and Reading,
k-13 provides a dramatic example of how a student's relatively sophisticated descriptive essay which she wrote for herself was reduced in syntactic complexity and in degree of detail when she re-wrote it for her teacher's evaluation.2

In the pilot study for this dissertation (presented at the Mid-America Linguistics Conference, October 20, 1978), I found that some of my students, though somewhat older than Moffett's, also pare down their writing when it is for a graded essay. Others pack their sentences with empty verbiage and embeddings that ultimately confuse rather than clarify meaning when they write something for my evaluation. Most important for this investigation, however, is that the students change their writing for graded essays in some ways that do not necessarily produce better prose than that which they would write for their own non-academic purposes, such as letters home, diaries, and journals.

The spectrum of modes of composition, the style or manner of writing, can be divided in different ways. The divisions made in various studies will be examined in some depth in chapter one. The two most important divisions for this study were made by Janet Emig and James Britton. Janet Emig in The Composing Process of Twelfth Graders, N.C.T.E., 1971 defines the two modes as "reflexive," in which "the chief audience is the writer himself," and the "extensive," in which the writer conveys "a message or a communication to another." In The Development of Writing Abilities, 11-18 (1975), British composition theorists James Britton and his colleagues ascertain that "writing for the teacher" fits into neither mode, but, to use their
term, is "poetic": the essay which is done merely to complete the writing task, is addressed to an artificial audience who evaluates the piece of writing as an object.

As the literature review will clarify, even individualized error analysis may not help a student if he is insecure about his language abilities: according to Britton:

The checking of grammar, syntax, the tone and appropriateness of the language, is fraught with hazards for the learner, especially if he has any reason for being uneasy about what is being judged or tested. Tests of linguistic acceptability are apt to be so closely associated with subjective judgements about social acceptability that the young writer may learn to mistrust his own language and, by trying to be correct, stifle half of what he wanted to say. . . .

In putting the finishing touches to any piece of writing, one becomes aware, once again, of the two-fold nature of the whole process -- the need to meet demands and satisfy the reader, and the need of the writer to satisfy himself, to do what he wanted to do. 3

In this dissertation, I describe an empirical linguistic difference between "reflexive" writing, which occurs in a fairly secure situation when the writer's main goal is to satisfy himself, and "poetic" writing, which occurs in a relatively insecure situation when the writer's main goal is to satisfy the reader. The results of my pilot study suggested that this difference would appear in the linguistic complexity of the students' writing and in the writers' corresponding degree of linguistic insecurity.

By describing a substantive relation between students' linguistic performance and linguistic insecurity, I give composition teachers an additional tool for understanding students' writing problems. The study provides a means of determining whether a student's writing problems stem more from a need for instruction or from an insecurity
about his writing abilities.

My hypothesis is that the greater a student's linguistic insecurity, the greater the formal syntactic differences between his writing in graded essays and in unevaluated work. Testing this hypothesis was a two-part process. First, I compared the syntactic analysis of students' "reflexive" and "poetic" writing modes, represented by their free-writing journals and graded essays. The students' performances on a linguistic insecurity test were then correlated with the results of the comparison of the modes. Chapters two and three detail my methodology for testing the hypothesis.
BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter 1

Many disciplines have contributed to research of current interest in composition. Linguistics, particularly transformational grammar, has given researchers like Walter Loban a new, powerful tool to analyze the products of student composition, and other researchers like Mina P. Shaughnessy insights for the diagnosis of student errors. Psychologists and psycholinguists have greatly contributed to the understanding of the acquisition of language skills and the processes of writing. All of these disciplines have altered and added to composition researchers' conception of the classical rhetorical modes.

The present study draws upon these several disciplines in order to grasp their interrelation for the student writer. In this chapter, the two main lines of study on which my work is based, writing modes and linguistic insecurity, will first be discussed. Then, there will be an examination of the research methods used in studies similar to mine.

1. Writing Modes

Whenever writing takes place, it is in a particular mode -- a particular manner, fashion or style. How the mode is labeled is
determined by what the labeler sees as causing the difference between modes. Therefore, it is necessary to examine first what researchers have seen as the causes, then what classifications they have made.

Examining discourse from a developmental perspective, one might divide social speech from speech for oneself. As a child is socialized, the need arises for something besides "oral speech" that he has used to explain his world to himself. As two forms of speech emerge and develop, their use becomes more specialized, oral speech becoming more communicative, inner speech becoming more suited for the individual's solitary purposes.

One might also make a division between speech and writing. The difference between the two is a long-standing pedagogical paradox since children are usually much more proficient in oral than written discourse. Various authors suggest that this difference occurs because muscles needed for writing are undeveloped when children begin to learn this skill, so writing lags behind. Others suggest that the new skill must follow the developmental stages of speaking, making writing fall behind four to five years. Lev S. Vygotsky, however, found these explanations "patently insufficient": "A two-year-old uses few words and a simple syntax because his vocabulary is small and his knowledge of more complex sentence structures nonexistent; but the school child possesses the vocabulary and the grammatical forms for writing, since they are the same as for oral speech. Nor can the difficulties of mastering the mechanics of writing account for the tremendous lag between the schoolchild's oral and written language."
Rather, Vygotsky pointed out that while speech symbolizes an idea, writing symbolizes speech. It is this higher degree of abstraction required for second order symbolizing that makes writing harder.\(^6\)

Writing modes can also be divided developmentally by degrees of symbolization. According to Vygotsky, a child first transcribes his writing from oral speech; the second order symbolizing referred to above occurs at this point. However, as a writer progresses, there is less reliance upon speech as an intermediary and writing increasingly becomes a first order symbolism.\(^7\)

Not only developmental stages but also the sex of the writer has been claimed as a cause for differences in writing mode. Few reliable studies have been made in this area, however. One recent, largely empirical study was made by Mary P. Hiatt. Perhaps her strongest statement on the matter is: "The genre-gender question is less prominent in non-fiction, a reason for believing that non-fiction is more truly representative of the differences, if any, between men's and women's styles. It is true that few women write of politics, war and science, but both men and women write biographies and autobiographies, both write critical works, and both write about sex. One could, of course, posit a 'biographical' or 'autobiographical' style. Nonetheless, it is entirely possible that the way a woman writes a biography is different from the way a man writes one."\(^8\)

However, Hiatt never claims that there is a direct sex-link to the differences, but rather a sociologically determined one. Therefore, the relation of sex to one's writing mode will be more fully
discussed in the sociological portion of the linguistic insecurity section of the literature review.

Many theorists, such as Janet Emig, James Britton and James Moffett, have found it more useful to consider writing modes multi-dimensionally, (i.e.) that many factors interact to affect how and what a writer will produce. Janet Emig identifies eight of these factors: "(1) registers -- the field of discourse, the written mode, and the tenor; (2) the linguistic formulation of the assignment; (3) the length; (4) the purpose; (5) the audience; (6) the deadline; (7) the amenities, such as punctuation and spelling; and (8) the treatment of the written outcome -- that is, if the teacher plans to evaluate the product, how -- by grade? comment? conference? peer response? or by some combination of these?" She bases her own division of modes on who initiates the writing process, the writer himself or some other person (in her study and mine, a teacher.)

Though Britton and his co-writers also view writing modes as multi-dimensional, they use audience as the foundation for their division of discourse. A writer's internalization of an audience is developmental: first he learns to internalize particular, individual audiences, then "a 'generalized other' who speaks for society at large;" this internalization is necessary before the writer can self-edit, reorganize or otherwise manipulate his writing to address his reader. They point out that this manipulation might not reflect the conscious intention of the writer or the formal situation of the writing:

The relation is construed by the writer -- though in many cases he will not be aware that he is doing so -- and the sense of audience which he in fact operates may only imperfectly correlate with the role normally taken up by the teacher in the classroom,
or with the role as reader that the teacher would like to take up. We may expect, then, that where the writer, in operating his sense of teacher audience, loses touch with the positive sense of dialogue he is likely to express a relationship which is merely one of examinee to examiner; and it is clear that a range of factors may underlie this. Many of the scripts allocated to the 'pupil to examiner' category appear to conform to this less definite specification -- a point confirmed by reference to the observable gap in such cases between the instructions given by the teacher and the way in which the task was interpreted. Writing of this kind is witness less to the intention of much educational practice than to its drift.12

James Moffett's division of modes combines purpose and function to produce elements of Emig's and Britton's divisions. He explains his distinction thus: "Abstracting from experience makes information, to accomodate oneself to external realities. Abstracting for other people makes communication, to benefit from community." He finds no difficulty with the overlap between these modes, but in fact sees their interaction as very important "because the same abstracting apparatus is serving both. The habit of communicating one's information influences how a person informs himself."13

From these causes for differences in modes, researchers have chosen various divisions to categorize discourse. From the developmental perspective, it is useful for this study to consider Vygotsky's categories of inner and written speech. Emig's categories, reflexive and extensive, represent her modes of the writer initiating his own work and his work being set out for him, respectively. Britton and his colleagues make three major divisions, transactional, expressive and poetic, to categorize how a writer's audience and purpose for writing interact.
As mentioned above, written speech presupposes and depends upon development of inner speech. It requires conscious effort to translate from the personal shorthand of inner speech to written speech which must communicate with someone who does not have all of the writer's information, or at least does not organize that information in the same way for himself as the writer does. Vygotsky's equation for this is typically straightforward: "The change from maximally compact inner speech to maximally detailed written speech requires what might be called deliberate semantics -- deliberate structuring of the web of meaning."\(^4\) A child has difficulty with writing because the psychological ability to translate immediate, personal thought and speech into the "abstract, deliberate activity" of writing is only beginning to develop. Thus, written speech will fall behind oral speech until the writer can acquire a "first order symbolism" proficiency in writing.\(^5\)

It is this "first order symbolism" that educators like Peter Elbow are trying to have their students reach by free-writing. Free-writing discourages the writer from paying much attention to the self-monitoring cues involves in the "second order symbolism" (to be discussed in the linguistic insecurity section of this chapter.) Thus, Elbow may have said more about writing than he expected when he stated that "a person grows more often by means of letting something go than by taking something in. Growth usually looks as though it is a matter of taking something in. . . But in most cases, the new element was already there waiting."\(^6\)
Though the extensive and the reflexive modes indicate the initiator of the work, Emig emphasizes that neither mode is ultimately passive or participatory. The reflexive is a contemplative mode, exploring the meaning of experience. The extensive is more active; the writer explores the question, "How, because of this experience, do I interact with my environment." As will be seen by an examination of Britton's writing modes, reflexive and extensive roughly parallel his expressive and transactional. I have chosen the term "reflexive" for my study, however, because of its emphasis on the writer as the initiator of his own work.

Unlike Emig's division of writing modes, Britton's divisions do differentiate between passive and active, poetic representing the spectator role of writing and transactional representing the participant role. Transactional writing is usually part of ongoing activity, whether it is "informative" in which case "facts, opinions and ideas are invited and given" or "connotative" which is "the language of commands, persuasion, entreaty" and other such interactive behavior. When a writer is operating in the transactional mode, he chooses and organizes his information "according to the demands made by something outside ourselves, something that exists in the situation," and how well the writing carries out its informative or connotative function in the particular situation is the only accurate judgement about the quality of the writing.

Like Emig's reflexive mode, the extensive is used to label writing in which the writer focuses on himself. The writing seems to follow the writer's emerging train of thought which expresses
"the concerns and interests of the writer, free of external demands, in the same informal and implicit way that is characteristic of supportive talk."  

(Here, I understand "free of external demands" as free of demands on how the writer expresses himself, since external stimuli often feed or shape what the writer is thinking about.)

There are various products of this mode: "thinking aloud on paper" for one's own use, "attempts to record and explore" feelings, moods, opinions and preoccupations as they occur to the writer, and letters to friends and relatives primarily for the "purpose of maintaining contact" are typical results of this writing mode. The clue that the letters are not transactional is that "references to shared experiences" are expressed "in highly implicit terms."  

Britton's most concise definition of this mode is: "writing close to the self, carrying forward the informal presuppositions of informal talk and revealing as much about the writer as about his matter."  

There are two directions in which expressive writing can move to become more responsive to an audience. To be transactional, the features of the information which are of interest to the audience must be made more explicit. On the other hand, to fit into Britton's third mode, the "poetic," the implicit must be intensified: "By the deliberate organization of sounds, words, images, ideas, events, feelings -- by formal arrangement in other words -- poetic writing is able to give resonance to items which in a less carefully organized utterance would be so inexplicit -- so minimally supported or explained in the text -- as to be merely puzzling to a reader who was not intimate with the writer and the situation."
Britton contrasts transactional writing, which aims at interaction in the world shared by the writer, and the reader, with poetic writing, whose primary aim is to create a world. A writer working in the poetic mode chooses words, sounds, feelings, events and ideas and arranges them into a formal pattern, to create "a verbal construct, an 'object' made out of language":

The phonetic, syntactic, lexical and semantic aspects of the utterance itself are the objects of attention, by the writer and the reader, in a way that does not hold of non-poetic writing: we might roughly compare the two response processes with those of 'taking in' a painting and studying a map. The function of a piece of poetic writing is to be an object that pleases or satisfies the writer; and the reader's response is to share that satisfaction. In this sense, poetic writing constitutes language that exists for its own sake and not as a means of achieving something else.26

The reader is not necessarily invited, to respond in kind, or react in any way except to respond to the writing as an object.27 Britton considers the graded pieces of writing students do to be in the poetic mode (as I do), because they are a demonstration of skills learned—"a culminating point rather than a stage in the process of interaction."28 He gives examples of student work that show that the prose itself in this mode is not necessarily bad, but dependant on some outside model to attest to its quality. Britton makes the comparison that "like the clothes in the fashion window -- any virtue there may be to display will depend upon how such clothes are worn in the street."29 Thus, a poetic piece of writing might be modeled on one that is reflexive or transactional, without the writer having the need for the functions of either of these other two modes. In school the teacher is usually the one who transmits the model for the student's poetic mode:
In school, however, it is almost always the teacher who initiates the writing and who does so by defining a writing task with more or less explicitness. Not only does he define the task but also nominates himself as audience. He is not, however, simply a one-man audience but also sole arbiter, appraiser, grader and judge of the performance. He becomes an audience on whom pupils must focus a special kind of scrutiny in order to detect what they must do to satisfy him. The peculiar feature of this relationship is that the pupil will see his teacher's response as a means by which his progress is being chartered. It is a part of a larger and more elaborate system of making judgements and not simply a question of the reader's pleasure or understanding or insight. Indeed, the writer is frequently placed in the position of telling the reader what the latter already knows more fully and more deeply.

This sort of spectator writing has been dominant in schools because it was equated with abstract and generalized writing, which itself was valued because of "an implicit belief that progress in writing is associated with movement away from personal language toward more abstract and impersonal formulations," despite the fact that "abstract writing is rooted in a knowledge of particulars and an ability to relate them, so /age is/ a factor in progress here." If a student has not reached the necessary developmental stage, he has no choice but to aim at the externally created model.

2. Linguistic Insecurity

As can be inferred from the above discussion, a student writer can develop linguistic insecurity because of the kind of writing situations that he encounters in school. However, linguistic insecurity also has historical, and educational foundations.

Upward social mobility of the English middle class during the seventeenth and eighteenth century is cited as the beginning of linguistic insecurity among speakers of English. According to William Labov, these people's manner of speaking was not appropriate to all of the new
situations with which they were faced, so they sought models to guide them to the so-called "doctrine of correctness." Those things which could serve as models, the school and the dictionary, were elevated as language authorities. Labov finds this same behavior and its results recurring in our own time:

In general, ...those who adopt a standard of correctness which is imposed from without, and from beyond the group which helped form their native speech pattern, are bound to show signs of linguistic insecurity. For most New Yorkers, the reference group for linguistic behavior is not any group of which they are a member. Linguistic insecurity leads directly to hypercorrection, for the insecure speaker has not internalized his newly acquired norms, and has no automatically applied rule to let him know where to stop in his correction. Sometimes the structure of his own native pattern makes it very difficult for him to stop at the mark set by higher ranking social groups.32

This feeling of dependancy on an external model creates a linguistic insecurity which also manifests itself when a student writes. Primarily, it interferes with written language moving from second order to first order symbolism, slowing down or inhibiting all together "the culmination of a long process of complex behavioral functions."33 The fluent writers, according to Britton and his co-writers, "relate orthography directly to meaning," and are thus able "to write large numbers of words, or substantial sections of words, as whole units" without monitoring themselves by some outside norm.34

Sociological factors are also a cause of linguistic insecurity. As can be understood from the quote from Labov, cited earlier, the need for upward social mobility often creates linguistic insecurity, which manifests itself in various ways in writing as the writer tries to listen to some outside model as he composes. A common manifestation
is hypercorrection: "in attempting to correct some non-standard forms, they apply the correction to other forms for which the rules they are using do not apply." For example, since students have often been warned against using "me" as a subject, some use "I" whenever the first person singular is needed, even though it might be the object of the verb, as in the sentence "David allowed my husband and I to use his desk." The same type of pressure for social conformity occurs when people move outside of their native dialect area, and it is strongest "against those who would attempt to use an acquired prestige pattern too early" before they had sufficiently mastered it.

Race, as it is aligned with social distinctions also seems to make a difference in an individual's linguistic insecurity. The difference between older black and white New Yorkers that Labov discusses would not necessarily hold true for other age groups or other locales:

Although Negro speakers share the white attitudes towards correctness, and are even more anxious to change their own speech....For most Negro speakers, any feature of speech associated with Northern regional dialects...,is considered good, cultivated and educated usage, as opposed to Southern dialect features, which are considered uneducated and "rough." But in the same way that many younger New Yorkers prefer the rough outlines of the working class dialect, so many young Negro speakers lean towards Southern characteristics in their casual speech.

Labov also compared the linguistic insecurity and linguistic production of men and women in his study of New Yorkers' speech. He found that women had more frequently tried to change their speech, showed a greater range of stylistic variation, demonstrated a higher degree of correction in formal registers, and scored fifty percent
higher on Labov's index of linguistic insecurity than men did.\textsuperscript{39}

Labov's findings closely match those of Mary Hiatt, whose study was done ten years later. Hiatt's research, described in her book, \textit{The Way Women Write}, focuses specifically on the sociologically-based sex differences in the work of published writers:

It can be claimed, therefore, that fewer of the female non-fiction writers possess a noteworthy style than do their male counterparts. In only three female writers does a particular, individual, and repeated pattern "jump out" at the reader. By the same token, however, it can be claimed that women non-fiction writers are more flexible stylistically because they do employ a wider range and a greater variety of patterns. They are not so fixated on one sentence as are the men.

In general, of course, because the women non-fiction writers write shorter sentences than do the men, their sentences are less complex. But the nature of their stylistic complexity is far less individualized than is that of men. Perhaps it is just that they do not "dare" as does a Mailer, preferring to set down their thoughts in an orderly and relatively unstrained fashion.

Compared to the men writers of non-fiction, they are short-winded. It is the tendency of the men to go on and on.\textsuperscript{40} Hiatt's book will be discussed further in the section on research methodology in this chapter.

Labov also wrote that schools were responsible for much linguistic insecurity because "teachers advocate a language, and an attitude towards language, which is quite remote from everyday life."\textsuperscript{41} There is almost no writing in transactional or expressive modes, no writing arising from a need felt by the student. Vygotsky saw this manner of writing, instruction which is anything but a "complex cultural activity," as an educational contradiction.\textsuperscript{42}

Because it is a creative and dynamic process, writing cannot be so easily measured and tested as material in a math class might be;
according to Moffett, this creative aspect of writing is the very quality that makes it difficult to teach. He suggests that this is why teachers have tried instead to substitute generalizations and formulas about language. Unfortunately, these substitutes are inadequate. They cannot replace practice and the kind of awareness of language that arises from actually using it. Vygotsky's understanding of writing itself reveals why any substitute would fail: "It is a symbol system, not a topic, and when someone learns a symbol system, he learns how to operate it. To learn to operate it well, over the whole range of possibilities, takes a long time, because it involves the intricate relations of thought to speech." And behind the relation of thought and speech lie the "intricate relations" of culture, history and the many other factors that make the student and his writing situation what they are.

The various substitutions teachers make are the causes of much of the linguistic insecurity students feel:

It is possible that much of the advice normally given to children about how to write effectively would, if taken, increase the difficulties. Suppose for instance that a teacher has been to some pains to get the process going by engaging the interest of his pupils in a topic to a point where the ideas are flowing freely. If he then makes precise stylistic demands, grammatical prohibitions and admonitions, and insists, for instance, on the looking up in the dictionary of all the words where the writer is in doubt, he may bring the conscious choosing and the mediated processes of the writer so much into the forefront of his mind that the production of ideas is interrupted to the point where it dries up.

The student is forced to approach writing as second order symbolism as he checks each sentence he composes against grammar rules. Moffett makes an apt comparison of composition "with other kinds of skill,
musical and athletic for example, we know...that thinking about complex internal operations throws them off."

This is not to say that the amenities of writing should not be taught at all. Peter Elbow helps to put their instruction in perspective:

"Editing, in itself, is not the problem. Editing is usually necessary if we want to end up with something satisfactory. The problem is that editing goes on at the same time as producing. The editor is, as it were, constantly looking over the shoulder of the producer and constantly fiddling with what he's doing while he's in the middle of trying to do it. No wonder the producer gets nervous, jumpy, inhibited, and finally can't be coherent. It's an unnecessary burden to try to think of words and also worry at the same time whether they're the right words.

The main thing about freewriting is that it is nonediting. It is an exercise in bringing together the process of producing words and putting them down on the page. Practiced regularly, it undoes the ingrained habit of editing at the same time you are trying to produce.

The habit of compulsive, premature editing doesn't just make writing hard. It also makes writing dead. Your voice is damped out by all the interruptions, changes, and hesitations between the consciousness and the page. In your natural way of producing words there is a sound, a texture, a rhythm -- a voice -- which is the main source of power in your writing."

For the students in college freshman English, the "rules" they learn about writing are less likely to "achieve the automatic regularity" since "the most consistent and regular linguistic system of speech community is that of the basic vernacular learned before puberty. The overt social correction applied in the classroom can never be as regular or farreaching as the unconscious effort of 'change from below' within the system."

The avoidance of error during composition creates linguistic insecurity in other ways, as well:

Next, the teacher evaluates the work according to the criteria that was laid out before the assignment was done. Even
if a system of rewards and punishments is not invoked, the learner feels that errors are enemies, not friends. Avoiding error is an inferior learning strategy to capitalizing on error. It's like the difference between looking over your shoulder and looking where you are going. Nobody who intends to learn to do something wants to make mistakes. In that sense, avoidance of error is assumed in the motivation itself, and error is assumed in the motivation itself, and this is why exercise of will is critical. But if the learner is allowed to make mistakes with no other penalty than the failure to achieve his goal, then he knows why they are to be avoided and wants to find out how to correct them. Errors take on a different meaning. They define what is good.49

Linguistic insecurity is induced by two other sources in school -- teachers who serve as the sole audience for writing and textbooks that do not treat writing as a process. Though the student may be uninterested or even repulsed by a teacher's writing assignment, he still must do it. Britton and his colleagues wrote that this situation leads to the writer merely trying to fulfill minimum requirements: the writing is "shaped solely by the demands of his audience and not by the complementary pressure to formulate ideas in a way which satisfies the writer." Moffett blames this lack of an authentic audience for student writers' problems with language: "An authoritative adult, parental substitute, and dispenser of grades simply cannot suffice alone for audience, because he is a loaded figure about whom youngsters have too many attitudes irrelevant to composition. This perverts the sender-receiver relation into an entirely too particular case of 'trying to get effects on an audience.' Other human resources have to be called on as well, inside and outside the classroom." In such cases the relative status of the teacher and the student in the school's hierarchy is emphasized, according to Britton, since the student is forced into "a writing decorum which expresses the inferior status of the writer:
Whatever happens, the relative status of writer and reader will be set in terms of school relationships. The teacher's superior status is not marked out boldly like the ranks of the army, and we can detect variations as between teachers, and in one and the same teacher on different occasions. Similarly, the role the teacher takes up will vary; he may be an instructor, collaborator, tester, wise adult or punitive arm. The pupil-writer may subtly accommodate to these different roles. Once again his maturity may well be marked by the development of the ability to abandon his inferior status and speak to adult peers.

Though a good teacher can compensate for a poor composition textbook, the typical text is still in the eighteenth century tradition -- a rule giver, full of directives for the rational process of editing, but offering little information about the more subjective processes of composing. Emig discusses how most texts provide an all-purpose model rather than teaching the student how to figure out an organization for his subject that grows out of what he needs to say: "A speaker or writer does not evolve a mode of organization that is indigenous to a specific content: he follows instead the six part outline." This external model for organization, rhetoric and other factors of composition which a text might discuss has the same effect as formal grammar instruction -- the student must revert to second order symbolism to fit what he has to say into a given form as he composes. Emig offers one apology on behalf of the textbooks: "This is not a criticism of the classical texts; it is a historical comment. The rhetorical tradition is simply, in its major works, significantly prior to the development of psychology with its interests in introspection and theories of personality development."
Why should the school, with its teachers and textbooks, have such a strong effect on how students deal with language? Certainly, the majority of students are able to manage with their native vernacular to transact the business of daily living. Why does this constant success with language not counteract any defeat in school? Probably, as Bill Linn points out, it is because it is in school that language is isolated in an unnatural way, leaving the student with more to learn than language: "The existential school of psychoanalysis views insecurity as part of a fundamental refusal to deal with the ambiguities and absurdities of life. Social institutions place individuals in conflicting and absurd positions. Life itself is anxiety producing and often unfair. The individual must come to terms with these hard facts and marshal resources to cope with them."55

3. Research Methodology

The types of research done to investigate writing processes and products have varied widely. Literary analysis has sometimes followed the evolution of an author's work through his various manuscripts. Another way of looking at writing processes has been to ask established writers how they work (as in the Paris Review interviews) or see what they told someone they relied on (as in the letters between Thomas Wolfe and his editor Maxwell Perkins.) Linguistic analysis, a more recent technique, has been used extensively to explore products of composition and in a few studies (for instance, Loban 1976) to examine certain factors of language over a period of time. 56

The present research employs case studies and linguistic analysis. Case studies include indepth examinations of students' essays, journals
and attitudes about writing over a school term of ten weeks. The linguistic analysis includes both measures of linguistic insecurity and measures of linguistic complexity. These research methods have been employed several ways in previous studies.

Janet Emig found evidence of linguistic insecurity by students' "behaviors and attitudes: outward conformity but inward cynicism and hostility." She examined this and other factors of composing through case studies, as will be discussed later in this section.

Britton did not rely on the writers' own explanation of what they do. Rather, he divided the writer-audience range into categories, such as "child to trusted adult" and "student to examiner," and a group of readers sorted pieces of writing by students of various ages and from various schools into the writer-audience category the essays seemed to represent. By this technique, he found that certain tendencies depended on student's age and sex."

William Labov used several techniques to determine the linguistic insecurity of his subjects: he interviewed them directly about their feelings, elicited long passages of speech from them and observed them speak without their knowledge, and gave them a "Self-Evaluation Test" of their linguistic behavior (the basis for my own test). By comparing the results of these various techniques, Labov found that he had measured something other than what he had originally planned:

In the conscious report of their own usage, however, New York respondents are very inaccurate. There is little correlation between their self-evaluation and their indexes of the five variables, in any style. Nevertheless, we can learn a great deal about attitudes towards the variables from their reports. For this reason, the test to be described is not
referred to as a "Self-Recognition Test," but rather a "Self-Evaluation Test." We shall see that when the average New Yorker reports his own usage, he is simply giving us his norm of correctness. No conscious deceit plays a part in this process. It appears that most New Yorkers have acquired a set of governing norms which they use in the audio-monitoring of their own speech. We have reason to believe that the process of stylistic variation which we have described...is governed by the degree of audio-monitoring which is superimposed upon the motor-controlled patterns of native speech. The audio-monitoring which is perceived by the speaker himself as he speaks. He does not hear the actual sound which he produces, but the norm which he imposes.

Techniques of measuring students' linguistic insecurity have not received as much attention among educators as have the measurements of the linguistic complexity of their compositions. The techniques used by Walter Loban and Mary Hiatt represent this analysis of linguistic complexity.

Loban divided his students into three levels of language proficiency: "High," "Low," and "Random." The Random group included students from across the spectrum of abilities, and was presumed therefore to represent the average students. He then did a longitudinal study of his subjects from kindergarten to twelfth grade, taking writing samples each year. He measured their growth in linguistic complexity by two methods: average length, in words, of their "t-units" (non-compound matrix sentences -- main clause plus dependent clauses, if any) and dependent clauses, which he divided into three categories: noun, adjective, and adverb.

The validity of using such measures to say something about the quality of students' writing has often been questioned, since longer sentences or more syntactically complex sentences are not necessarily
better sentences. Loban himself cites Francis Christensen as one who believed that "dependent clauses are often a sign of bad style; he objected to the research of Kellogg Hunt and John Mellon, who showed dependent clauses tallying with more mature writing."  

Moffett defends this type of measurement, though he recognizes its limitations:

What is hard is to use grammar effectively, to take advantage of the resource of English constructions to say what one means and to say it in ways that have the desired effect on the receiver. A sentence having a single word or simple phrase as subject ("Such an idea never occurred to him.") is neither more nor less correct than one having a clause for a subject ("What other people might think of his actions doesn't concern him."). But only more mature users of the language are capable of the latter. Of the three main measures of sentence growth identified by Kellogg Hunt... none involve correctness and all involve greater versatility in phrasing and stating ideas within the limits of English grammatical acceptability. All improve with general growth anyway, so that any treatment can do is accelerate or enhance this growth.  

He sees the syntactic elaboration of t-units as part of a young writer's developmental process, as he discovers syntactic strategies to express his increasingly complex thought, and indeed "that intellectual stimulation is far more likely to accelerate syntactic growth than grammar knowledge."  

Though he did not claim that his techniques could make an all-encompassing statement about his subjects' quality of writing, Loban did use them as gauges of growth. Each year the percentage of the use of each three clause types was calculated for each group of students. His research showed that students in his "High" group used greater percentages of the less-commonly occurring types of noun, adjective and adverb clauses. The differences in the use of adjective clauses between the student
groups were the most striking:

For oral language, our findings on proportions of dependent clauses show the adjectival clause to be an important development for the High group (rising from approximately 22% in the early years to 33% in the later years). In the Low and Random groups, however, the subjects show some yearly fluctuations on this measure, but at the end of high school years they use virtually the identical percentage of adjectival clauses they used in grade one. Thus the evidence seems clear that an exceptional speaker (High) will use a progressively greater percentage of adjectival clauses in oral language, whereas the nonproficient speaker (Low) or average speaker (Random) will show no such percentage increase in the use of adjectival clauses.66

Neither Emig or Hiatt found a great number or variety of clauses particularly interesting as a mark of good writing. In fact, both suggested that relying on a limited "transformational apparatus" (to use Hiatt's somewhat disdainful term) constitutes distinctive styles.

In Hiatt's first book, Artful Balance: The Parallel Structures of Style, she does examine syntactic structures of prose. She considers frequency and types of parallel structures, what types are found in what genres of prose and are used to express which sort of ideas. She also developed a "Scale of Rhetorical Value" for evaluating the instances of parallelism.67

In The Way Women Write, Hiatt uses the computer analysis of linguistic constructions not only more extensively than in her earlier book, but also to indicate some things that do not seem readily analyzable in this way: sentence length, types and frequency of types of patterns of complexity (determined by having the computer search for punctuation that indicates syntactic unity), tone (also determined by punctuation!), logical processes of argument,
structural balance and rhetorical effectiveness (by parallelism and concomitant rhetorical devices of repetition), imagination (by use and frequency of similes) and adverb types (hyperbolic, -ly, etc.). 68

This extremely empirical and detailed analysis appears to be a reaction against some very impressionistic studies of how women use language:

Robin Lakoff, for example, feels that women use more adjectives of admiration than do men and that they tend to use many more tag questions. Her study is not entirely convincing, however, because of an ill-defined and inadequate sample, based on data "gathered mainly by introspection," consisting of her own speech and that of her acquaintances and using her "own intuitions in analyzing it." Mary Ritchie Key's Male/Female Language furnishes a very general overview of sexist assumptions about women's roles as reflected in many languages, but offers little in the way of new information. 69

As a result of her stringent analysis of works by published male and female writers, Hiatt discovered very specific facts about the differences, such as "women use significantly more short sentences (58 percent of their sample /of non-fiction writers' sentences/ versus 48 percent of the sentences in the men's sample) and thus significantly fewer long sentences" 70 and "only three of the nine female writers of longer-than-average sentences consistently repeat particular patterns." 71 However, she has difficulty in making general statements from the statistics because they are the only information she evaluates about the writers. She does not consider their relative age, socio-economic background, or any other demographics besides sex which would add depth to her study. (To a lesser degree the same criticism could be made of Loban.) The generalizations she does make often give the reader the feeling that ambiguously interpretable facts are being used to support the author's preconceived notions.
about the differences between men and women's prose. For example, Hiatt's claim that women's shorter length of sentences means that they are "short winded" could be drawn into question since she does not make a comparison of the ultimate length of men's and women's books.

Turning from empirical analysis of writing data, other means of analysis used by composition theorists have included longitudinal studies and case studies. Longitudinal studies such as Loban's and case studies such as Emig's have been suggested as one way to overcome "meaningless specificity" and add depth to composition research. The 1963 N.C.T.E. publication, Research in Written Composition, strongly recommended these methods:

The Van-Bruggen study, among others, suggests to the writers of this report that the psychological dimension of writing needs to be investigated by case study procedures. Individual differences may "cancel out" in studies using the mean as the measure of a group. Case studies have done much to help remedial reading specialists understand and assist their "clients," and the similar complexities of writing suggest that much may be gained by developing case study procedures, against a background of experimental group research, to investigate the factors affecting the learning of composition and the procedures which will accelerate and maintain learning. But before the composition teachers can conduct case study investigations, they must learn how to do so.

Another promising type of investigation is the longitudinal study -- the type of study which follows the same individuals through a protracted period of time. The longitudinal study is especially appropriate for written composition.

Bill Linn used case studies to explore how "psychological, sociological, even to a degree historical and religious /factors/ interact to create the student as we encounter him in our writing courses," and "how these factors are instrumental in causing him to write as he does;" and he has chosen four students who typify
groups of students who tend to "behave in somewhat predictable patterns."\textsuperscript{73} The usefulness of this study is hampered, however, since it is as impressionistic as the Hiatt study is empirical.

The Emig study was conducted in a more systematic fashion than Linn's, though in a much more artificial situation:

Each subject met four times with the investigator. At the first session, following an informal conversation of approximately twenty minutes, the subject, in the presence of the investigator, simultaneously composed aloud and wrote down a short piece in whatever mode and of whatever subject matter that he wished. The composing aloud was recorded by a tape recorder. In addition, the subject, in this and subsequent sessions, sat in a position where it was possible for the investigator to observe and make notes on his actions.\textsuperscript{74}

Emig's goals for her research were similar to those of my study -- to look at the differences between her two writing modes, the reflexive and the extensive, for a group of twelfth graders. However, this aspect of her study was unsuccessful, perhaps due to the artificiality of the situation, because she was unable to elicit personal, reflexive writing, but instead received what she considered to be writing in the extensive mode. She regarded this problem as a "kind of comment upon the mode with which the subject was most comfortable and easy and/or the one which he had been asked to produce in school."\textsuperscript{75}

The next chapter will show how I have combined modes analysis of linguistic complexity and tests of linguistic insecurity to determine their correlations with one another. It will also include how I have used the computer to aid in my analysis.
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PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

Chapter II

In determining students' linguistic insecurity and its correlation with various structures in their reflexive and poetic writing, both empirical (quantitative) and interviewing/questionnaire (qualitative) procedures were employed, and finally, in case studies (in-depth, longitudinal studies) qualitative and quantitative results were examined together.

1. Empirical Procedures

The empirical research employed a linguistic insecurity test and a count of t-units and clause types in the students' writing. Samples of their writing were taken from their free-writing journals and graded essays.

The students were in my three sections of remedial composition and two sections of freshman composition at The Ohio State University during the 1978-1979 academic year. The remedial sections included 43 students, 14 fall 1978 in one class and 29 winter 1979 in two classes. The students were placed in the classes if their ACT English scores were 10 or below and their placement essays written during freshman orientation had many errors in sentence structure, paragraphing, unity, and organization, as determined by a group of experienced teachers of remedial and freshman
English. If they agreed that a placement essay showed adequate control of sentence and paragraph skills, the student was placed in the second remedial class (100.02). If he also had adequate proofreading skills (Minimal spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors), he was placed in English 110 (freshman English). These students, as well as those who demonstrate these skills after having 100.01, graduates of 100.02 and students who have between 25 and 26 on their ACT English test went into English 110. My English 110 class included a total of 48 students, 24 winter 1979 and 24 spring 1979.

The students ranged in age from 17 to 25. They were categorized by age into two groups: those 17 to 19, who for the most part, were going straight to college after high school and were taking English their first year of college, were taking English as upperclassmen, or both.

Where students were from varied less: all but a handful were from Ohio. Therefore, I divided the Ohioans into four groups, roughly by four main dialect areas in Ohio: Metropolitan North (including Cleveland and Toledo), North Central (including Akron and Columbus), South Central (including Chillicothe and Dayton), and Southern (including Cincinnati), and also a separate category for those few students outside of Ohio. This division became useful in analyzing the role dialects may have played in the linguistic insecurity test.

The students were also categorized by sex and race. Unlike the pilot study which included a Hispanic student, there were only two racial categories: Caucasian and Black.
The linguistic insecurity test (see appendix ) was modelled after those in William Labov's *The Social Stratification of English in New York City* (1966). Labov matched his informants' reports of their speech with his previously collected data on their actual production, and found that what they reported was their "norm of correctness". Labov concluded that his subjects did not hear the sound which they produced but their norm for that sound. My instrument differs in that, by asking my students to distinguish between what they would say or write in a secure environment ("reflexive") and what they would do in a less secure one ("poetic"), I determine how conscious they are of the difference between their "norm of correctness" and their production in informal speech or writing. Thus, the process elicits their conscious, operative linguistic insecurity. My instrument also differs from Labov's in that, while the oral section (I) contains almost exactly the same items, with a few changes to adapt to the majority of my subjects who were Midland speakers, I also included written samples for their judgements.

The written and oral sections differ slightly in their directions to the student. For the first section of the test, I played a tape by a man with little regional dialect who they have not met. He pronounces a set of words both in Midland dialect and in either 'network', a hypercorrect or a spelling pronunciation; the student checks which he or she would say and which is correct. The items, the students' choices (in International Phonetic Alphabet), and what the difference in the choices represents are:
1. catch: a. *kaht* ̣, b. *kaht* (word specific vowel raising)
5. leash: a. *liʃ*, b. *liʃ* (hypercorrection, laxing a tense, prepalatal vowel -- see 2.)
7. length: a. *lɛŋə*, b. *lɛŋə* (assimilation of a nasal to the following consonant)

The second section pairs standard with hypercorrect, colloquial or nonstandard versions of the sentences: the student checks which he would write to friends and which to the teacher. The differences in the choices represent the following grammatical, stylistic or dialectical items: (each followed by examples)

1. Accusative versus nominative relative pronoun
   a. Whom did you say was here?
   b. Who did you say was here?

2. genitive gerundive phrase versus accusative gerundive phrase
   a. Where you surprised at my being here?
   b. Were you surprised at me being here?

3. non-parallel constructions versus parallel constructions
   a. I like to go swimming as well as going skiing.
   b. I like to go swimming as well as to go skiing.

4. nominative versus accusative pronoun after a preposition
a. Whom did you say was here?
b. Who did you say was here?

2. genitive gerundive phrase versus accusative gerundive phrase
   a. Were you surprised at my being here?
   b. Were you surprised at me being here?

3. non-parallel constructions versus parallel constructions
   a. I like to go swimming as well as going skiing.
   b. I like to go swimming as well as to go skiing.

4. nominative versus accusative pronoun after a preposition
   a. The IRS is looking for you and I.
   b. The IRS is looking for you and me.

5. "got" versus "have" as the main verb with the sense of "must"
   a. I've got to see the doctor.
   b. I have to see the doctor.

6. past participle versus present participle versus infinitive as a verbal complement
   a. John's shirt needs ironed.
   b. John's shirt needs ironing.
   c. John's shirt needs to be ironed.

7. accusative gerundive phrase versus genitive gerundive phrase
   a. I was shocked by him arriving.
   b. I was shocked by his arriving.

8. positive "nowdays" versus positive "anymore"
   a. Politicians are so crooked anymore, I don't know who to trust.
   b. Politicians are so crooked anymore, I don't know how to trust.

9. marked relative clause versus unmarked relative clause
a. The men who we met were very cordial.

b. The men we met were very cordial.

In both sections, the student has the options of checking all versions as what he would write or say, all as correct, or a single version as what he would say and what was correct. Also, students may determine that they say or write neither choice. The test items indicated security if what a student indicated he or she said or wrote was also what he or she considered correct or among the correct possibilities. For example, if the student decided that he said or wrote choice a. but choice b. was correct, that would be an instance of insecurity. However, note that in the cases which the student indicates that he writes or says more than one of the choices, for instance a. and c., the item is marked as secure even if only one of these choices is also considered correct. In these cases the student is probably recognizing that he can operate linguistically at several different levels of formality, at least one of which could be considered "correct."

In fact, several students suggested that this was on their mind by questions that they asked while taking the test. A complete list of the combination of responses which students may give and whether they would indicate security or insecurity is in appendix A.

The linguistic insecurity test was administered before the students' journals or graded essays were returned, during the second week of the quarter, so their answers were unlikely to be affected by my evaluation of their work. They were told before the test that it would not affect their grade or my opinion of their potential to be good writers. They were encouraged to be as frank and perceptive about
what they say or write as possible in order that the tests be useful to them and me. Their earnestness in taking the test was demonstrated by their asking that certain items on tape for the oral part of the test be played back over and over again so they could be sure that they were entering the accurate choice.

The first free-writing journals, as well as the first graded essays, were collected the third week of the quarter in English 110, and the second week in English 110.01. At this point in the term, the students had had no instruction in rhetoric, stylistics, sentence combining, or audience awareness.

The free-writing journal essays were the pieces of writing closest to the "reflexive" mode that I, as a teacher, was able to collect. Students knew from the first day of class that their journals were to be graded, on quantity alone, not on grammar, organization, diction, unity or any other quality of the writing. For English 110 students, fifteen pages of their original prose every three weeks were required to receive an "A". English 100.01 students were asked for five pages every seven to ten days. The students were allowed to write about anything that they wished to in these first entries. The content of their journals, which frequently contained very personal, diary-like material, indicated that the students were usually writing for themselves. Less frequently, they included first drafts of letters to friends and family, or, more seldom, messages to others which were probably never meant to be sent, for example, letters to Dear Abby, mash notes to a biology teacher and complaints to a messy roommate or a rude salesclerk. Also, the students sometimes wrote that they thought
that they would enjoy looking back at what they have written in the future, also indicating that they are writing in the reflexive mode. From the English 110 students first fifteen page assignment, the seventh and eight pages were used for analysis. From the English 110.01 students' first five page assignment, the third and fourth pages were used. These middle pages were chosen to avoid the poetic writing which sometimes occurs when a student is getting used to writing in a journal or the final pages which might be hastily written in order to meet the assignment deadline, and therefore might not be typical of the student's "reflexive" mode.

The set of essays were the first set of graded essays during the course. The English 110 requirements for these essays were that they have a thesis statement and topic sentences for the body paragraphs, support their ideas with examples, and be about three hundred words long. The English 100.01 requirements are for a paragraph length piece of writing which as a topic sentence, explanation, example and conclusion. I consider these pieces of writing to be written in the "poetic" mode, since students are told what I will be looking for in their structure and that the essays will be graded.

As in my pilot study, I calculated the average length and structural complexity of sentences in both the essay and the journal. As a heuristic for establishing both the average length of the sentences and their degree of structural variety, an analysis of noncompound matrix sentences, or, as the literature on composition by Walter Loban and others refers to them, "t-units", was used. The t-unit, most simply stated, is an independent clause plus its subordinate clauses, if any.
For instance, in the sentence, "I went to visit my brother who lives in Patterson Hall, and he was studying," there are two t-units, the second one beginning with "and".

In the pilot study the average t-unit in the essay was 35 per cent longer than that in the journal entries. The differences between the two pieces of writing ranged from 88 per cent for two students to no difference for one exceptional case. I considered this student to be an exception because she was the only case in which my pre-determined portion of the journal, pages 7 and 8, was an entry addressed to me as the teacher of her class: thus, both pieces of writing from this student were meant for the same evaluative audience, causing a similarity in writing mode. Knowing that the essays consistently had longer t-units than the journals lead me to use two-tailed t-tests when examining this part of the data, as will be discussed in the findings chapter.

As an indicator of structural complexity of the t-units in both journals and the essays, I looked for fifteen types of sentence embedding, listed here with an example of each:

Verbal Complement Clauses

1. Indicative (declarative)
   I think that students can write.

2. Subjunctive
   We insist that your paper be legible.

3. Marked infinitive
   Greg encouraged them to write every day.

4. Unmarked infinitive
   We watched Mike run through the library.
5. Genitive gerundive
   We were delighted by Oregon State's giving us a job.

6. Accusative gerundive
   Jeanne watched him putting away his toys.

7. Interrogative
   I wonder how long this dissertation will be.

8. Exclamatory
   Mother was astounded at how long I went to school.

Adjectival Clauses

9. Restrictive relative clause
   The teachers whom we met were very cordial.

10. Nonrestrictive relative clause
    Clarence, who detests opera, didn't go.

Nominal Clauses

11. Free relative clause
    Lynn read what was in the letter.

12. Sentential noun phrase
    That Greg is patient is good to know.

Adverbial Clauses

13. Temporal
    When I woke up this morning, birds were singing.

14. Logical
    If you want to come, call us tonight.

15. Comparative
    Mother works as hard as Dad does.
As an example of how the sentences were analyzed, refer again to the above sentence: "I went to visit my brother, who lives in Patterson Hall, and he was studying." The first t-unit contains two instances of embedding: a marked infinitive ("to visit") and a nonrestrictive clause ("who lives in Patterson Hall").

For interpreting this data, I compared the results of the analysis of each student's journal and essay to determine the difference in number and types of embedding, if any, between the two writing modes. I next compared the degree of difference between the modes with the student's linguistic insecurity test score. Also, I determined what types of clauses were most common in the writing of students who were above the median in linguistic insecurity and compared these with which clauses were most common in the writing of students below the median. From this information I derived part of the description of writing by linguistically insecure composition students. To refine this description, I also counted the number of embeddings which were ill-formed, by standard criteria -- what Loban calls "mazes". An example of such an ill-formed clause would be, "I knew the direction in which he was going in." The writer takes advantage of the left-branch constraint and what John Ross calls "Pied Piping," namely, moving the preposition before the relative pronoun, but he or she is not comfortable or familiar enough with the construction to omit the last preposition. I did not consider errors which did not appear to be the result of constructing the clause. The lack of subject-verb agreement in "Sara read that you was coming," for instance, would be as likely to occur in the main clause of the writer's sentence as in a dependent clause.
2. Qualitative Procedures

The qualitative portion of the research was based on five case studies of my students from winter quarter 1979. Five were randomly selected from the 100.01 section by my closing my eyes and letting my pen point drop on the list of names in my grade book the Friday of the second week of the quarter (January 12, 1979), so I would be choosing from the permanent list of students. The students were not told until the end of the quarter that they had been singled out in this fashion since they were not asked to do anything that the rest of class was not doing.

In these case studies I examined the students' linguistic insecurity test, all of their graded essays and expository exercises, three surveys about how they felt about their writing and a minimum of three private interviews.

The journal entries were at least forty-five pages long, the last fifteen including some directed writing. The English 100.01 students were encouraged to free-write on the possible topics for their midterms and final exams, and to rewrite in-class paragraphs to include more detail.

In 100.01 there were three in-class midterms, all of an hour's duration, and an in-class final exam of two hours. The first in-class midterm was during the third week of the quarter and was to be a paragraph of approximately 150 words, on the topic "a most memorable experience", or an approved alternative. The second and third midterms were to be essays of approximately 300 words in length, given the sixth and eighth weeks of the terms, respectively. For the second midterm, the
topic was "a major distraction from studying", and for the third "one way your life will differ from your parents". The final exam was to be a minimum of three hundred words and to respond to one of three topics: "a major cause of apathy," "a prime reason for the popularity of jeans," "why or why not patronize fast-food restaurants."

For the midterms and final exam, students were given fairly specific hints about the possible topics and were allowed to bring in free-writing, notes, outlines, dictionaries and handbooks.

Other written work from the 100.01 classes included two additional in-class paragraphs, an in-class practice midterm, and two essays written outside of class. In these assignments the students were permitted considerable freedom in choosing their own topics.

The criteria for examining these complete sets of written work from students used as case studies were similar to those for the first journal and essay in the empirical portion of the research. I also looked for changes in these factors over the course of the quarter, from assignment to assignment, and between in-class and take-home essays.

Two surveys of how the students felt about their writing were given in class to all students during the quarter. The first was given the same day as the linguistic insecurity test. The survey was in four parts, each to be answered by a sentence or two, though questions two and four were sometimes answered by a simple no:

1. What do you think of your own speech?
2. Have you ever tried to change your speech? What particular things about it?
3. What do you think of your own writing?
4. Have you ever tried to change your writing? What particular things about it?

The second surveys, given the ninth week of the quarter, used two questions:

1. How do you feel about your writing abilities for use in writing letters home or to friends, diaries, journals, etc.?

2. How well do you think your writing meets the expectations of teachers, for the purposes of writing a psychology paper or a history exam, for instance?

Students were asked to answer each question with at least a paragraph. In examining the survey responses, several things were considered: did the response match the linguistic insecurity test in the degree of self-confidence expressed; what things did the students feel were causing them problems in expressing themselves and did these problems actually manifest themselves in the students' work; and was there any change in how they perceived their abilities to use language or in what they considered to be their problems.

All students were asked to come talk to me privately about their writing during the quarter, and when the students in the case studies came in, I asked them certain prompting questions to urge them to talk about their feelings about writing, such as, "Do you like writing in your journal or writing essays better?" "How do you feel when you start to write?" "Is anything that we're doing in class making it easier for you to write?" "When do you feel the least comfortable about writing?" Sometimes, when a student expressed a problem with some aspect of writing, I suggested some possible solutions, but usually,
especially after the first interview, students suggested their own solutions as they discussed their problems. (This proved to be such a profitable way of talking about writing that I began using it with students who were not in the case studies, as well.)

Very seldom did I take notes while the student and I talked. The interviews were rarely more than fifteen minutes, usually occurring after a longer discussion of a paper or exercise, so the students' comments were still fresh in my mind when they left, and I quickly jotted them down.

Since I tried to make the interviews as open-ended as possible, the information gathered from the various students was not completely parallel. However, there was a diversity of ideas about writing touched upon, as will be discussed in the findings chapter.

3. Statistical Tests Run on the Computer

The computer was a very useful tool in the empirical portion of the research. I used it to check the reliability of the linguistic insecurity test and observe the correlations of the data from student essays and journals.

The Kuder-Richardson Reliability Test was used to examine the internal consistency of the linguistic insecurity test. J.P. Guilford and Benjamin Fruchter in *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education* (1978) define reliability "as the proportion of the variance that is true variance."¹ The true variance should be within "the mean we should obtain if we were to apply the measurement a very large number of times."² This particular test "estimates internal consistency by determining how all items on a test relate to all other items and to the total test."³
Because this study's number of subjects (91) were relatively large for an empirical study, determining reliability by internal consistency was appropriate. However, because of the few items, the test was not highly accurate. Also, according to Guilford and Fruchter, "all the Kuder-Richardson formulas, indeed all the internal-consistency formulas that depend upon a single administration of a test, tend to underestimate the reliability of a test." 4

To observe correlations of characteristics of the students and their writing, several statistical procedures were used. The most extensively employed was the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients (r). In *Measuring Growth in English* (National Council of Teachers of English, 1974), Paul B. Diederich explains correlation as a "mathematical procedure that shows to what extent it is true that the higher a student stands on one measure, the higher a student stands on another. The measures need not be of the same characteristic nor on the same scale: one can correlate height in inches with weight in pounds. But one must correlate two sets of measures of the same students; there is no way to correlate two groups on the same measures." 5

For this study's correlations to be run, several items had to be tallied first. Each of the fifteen clause types' occurrences for students' essays and journals were summed for the total population. The number of clause types employed by each student in his essay (TOTCL 1), then his journal (TOTCL 2) were added for the entire population. Next, the total number of words per t-unit for all students were added together, first for their essays (LEN 1), then in their journals (LEN 2). Finally, the number of words used in the
passages from the journals (TOTJ) were summed, and then the words in the essays (TOTS).

Additional items of interest were also computed before the correlations were run. The linguistic insecurity tests were scored by the computer, and a total number of items indicating insecurity was computed for each student. (TOTAL). Next, the computer subtracted LEN2 from LEN1 to give the difference in average t-unit length between the journal and essay for each student (LEN). Finally, the computer subtracted TOTCL 2 from TOTCL 1 which results in the difference in the number of clause types used between the journal and essay.

With these new figures added and subtracted, the computer did a Pearson Correlation of sixty variables. These were TOTAL, LEN 1, LEN 2, LEN, TOTCL 1, TOTCL 2, TOTCL, TOTS, TOTJ, sex (1 equals male, 2 female), age (1 equals 17 to 19, 2 equals 20 and older), region (1 represents northern Ohio, 2 north central Ohio, 3 south central Ohio, 4 southern Ohio, and 5 outside of Ohio), total occurrences of each of fifteen clause types for the essays and of the same fifteen for journals. For each correlation, the computer determined both the coefficient and the significance.

For the same set of variables, the computer also figured frequencies, mean, mode, kurtosis, minimum, maximum, standard error, standard deviation, skewness, median, variance, and range. Of course, these statistics were nonsensical for many of the variables, particularly the nominal data, such as sex and region.

A second test used on the data was the "chi square." The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, the "canned" computer
program I used, also called this test "crosstabulation." Since "crosstabulation" suggests more about the meaning of the test, I will use that term in this study. In Educational Research (Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976), L.R. Gay explains that crosstabulation "compares proportions actually observed in a study with proportions expected to see if they are significantly different." The use of the test is "appropriate when the data are in the form of frequency counts occurring in two or more mutually exclusive categories." Further, crosstabulations may "compare frequencies occurring in different categories that may be groups, so that the /crosstabulation/ is comparing groups with respect to the frequency of occurrence of different events." A researcher must consult a chi square table to determine if a crosstabulation value is significant. However, the crosstabulation value always "increases as the difference between observed and expected frequencies increases."6

The crosstabulations in this study were run on data from the linguistic insecurity test and the sex, age and region of the students. For each half of each question on the linguistic insecurity test (what the student said or wrote and what he considered correct), the possible responses to the item were crosstabulated with students' possible sex, their possible ages (17 to 19 and twenty and over), and finally, their possible region (northern Ohio, north central Ohio, south central Ohio, southern Ohio, and outside of Ohio.)

In the next chapter, the first section will present the empirical data of the research, including the results arrived at by the computer. The section section will present the findings from the case studies, using the empirical results as a backdrop.
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FINDINGS

Chapter III

Though it is first necessary to discuss the findings individually, it is crucial for them to be understood as interactive, as descriptions of several characteristics of students writers which contribute to their writing processes. Since the study has linguistic insecurity as a primary focus, the linguistic insecurity test will be examined first. Next, I will describe the results of the empirical study, namely the significant correlations of linguistic insecurity and aspects of students' writing in the two writing modes. Finally, using the empirical findings as a backdrop, I will present the case studies.

1. Linguistic Insecurity Test.

As explained in the previous chapter, the reliability of the linguistic insecurity test was checked by an internal consistency test called the Kuder-Richardson Formula. It rated the linguistic insecurity test at 0.712, 1.0 being perfect. This is a fairly high rating for the test, given that the Kuder-Richardson Formula underestimates reliability, especially with such a low number of items (18). As an estimate of the test's reliability had there been thirty-six items, I tried the Spearman-Brown Formula, another internal consistency check for reliability, which rated the test at
The mode was five, with a range of fifteen. The mean was 6.189 with a standard deviation of 3.013.

The crosstabulation of the responses on the linguistic insecurity test with the students' sex, age and region showed that students' responses were more often highly correlated with region than with sex or age. (All crosstabulations significant at the .10 level or better are to be found in Appendix B, on computer printout sheets.) One item crosstabulated with sex with a chi square value of 4.81708, with two degrees of freedom, had a significance of 0.0899. This item was what students said was their common pronunciation of "catch," question 1A. Two items crosstabulated with age. Question 2A, what they said was their common pronunciation of "collision," had a chi square value of 12.43960, which, with four degrees of freedom, had a significance of 0.0144. Question 9B, what they thought was the correct pronunciation of "wash," had a chi square value of 9.34948, which, with four degrees of freedom, had a significance of 0.0529. These figures were less significant than may appear since less than ten percent of the subjects were in the "20 or over" category.

Region, however, had eight significant chi square values in crosstabulations with responses to the linguistic insecurity test. Six of the eight were with questions about what they thought they said or wrote, as opposed to three about what they considered correct. Also, five were with questions about what they thought they said or wrote, as opposed to three about what they considered correct. Also, five were with questions about writing, as opposed
to three about speaking. (All but 5A are significant at eight
degrees of freedom.) Question 5A, concerning their common pro-
nunciation of "leash," had a chi square value of 8.33403, with a
significance of 0.081 (four degrees of freedom.) Similarly,
question 5B, the correct pronunciation, had a value of 25.60101,
with a significance of 0.0012. The third significant crosstabulation
of a speech item with region was 9A, how they commonly said "wash."
Its value was 14.34933, with a 0.0731 significance. (The results
from this question were notably unexpected. The intrusive r is
most characteristic of the South Midland dialect, found in southern
and south central Ohio. However, of the twenty-one students who
thought they had the intrusive r pronunciation, only four were
from those two sections of Ohio.)

Of the significant crosstabulations with writing items, the
first was question 11A, which asks whether in an unpressured
situation they would write the correct use of "who" or the hyper-
correct use of "whom." The value was 14.42894, with a significance
of 0.0712. 12A elicits response to a genitive versus accusative
gerundive. Its value was 13.11151, with a significance of 0.1081.
13B was the only significant crosstabulation of region with what
students thought was correct in writing. This judgement on parallel-
ism had a value of 14.87655, with a significance of 0.0616. "Got"
versus "have," question 15A, had a value of 14.40952, with a
significance of 0.0717. A crosstabulation which was expected to
occur with region was "positive anymore," question 18A. The value
was 15.50508, with a significance of 0.0500. Seventy-five percent
of the South Central subjects thought they wrote positive anymore or both positive anymore and its standard English alternative. Fifty-four percent of North Central subjects wrote positive anymore or both. However, only forty percent of the northern speakers wrote positive anymore and none used both.

The frequency of significant crosstabulations with region suggests that the students may be conscious of the differences between their dialects and the "standard" pronunciation. Two different causes may be responsible. First, being away from their homes for the first time, they may be in the least homogeneous speech community they have encountered, which, in turn, would heighten their awareness of their dialect. Secondly, dialects in the southern areas of Ohio are more markedly different from "standard" than the northern, so southern students are more likely to have been made aware of the nonstandard aspects of their dialect prior to the linguistic insecurity test.

2. Empirical Analysis of Writing Mode and Linguistic Insecurity.

Because of this study's relatively high number of subjects, a tendency among even a small number of students gave a significant correlation. Before determining the truly significant correlations among items I examined, the acceptable significance level had to be raised from .01 to .001. Second, in the empirical portion of this study tendencies for large proportions of students were the most interesting. To find these correlations, I used the technique employed by Dr. Robert Bargar in his dissertation, A Study of Music
Reading: *Groundwork for Research in the Development of Training Programs*, 1964. He cited McNear, 1955, as developing the idea that "the square of a coefficient of correlation can be interpreted to indicate the degree (per cent) of the relationship between the specific variables involved." He determined that with sixty-two subjects, a correlation of + .33 was statistically significant at the one per cent level, indicating real relationships. I followed his rating of the squared coefficients:

A correlation of + .33 indicates a relationship on the order of 10%. In the following discussion, any relationships of less than 10% among the variables involved are not significant. Correlations of + .33 to + .50 represent relationships of 10% to 25% and are considered small. Correlations of + .51 to + .70 indicate relationships of 25% to 50% and are considered moderate. Correlations of + .71 to + .80 indicate relationships of 50% to 65% and are considered high. (p. 84)

Using the above definitions of small, medium, and high, the correlations of students' linguistic insecurity and their writing can be presented. (All of the computer printouts are in Appendix C.) There is a small positive correlation between students' linguistic insecurity and the difference in length between their average t-unit in their essay and in their journal. The higher the students' insecurity, the longer the average t-unit in the essays is compared to that in the journals.

There is a negative correlation between insecurity and the number of types of clauses used. The higher the insecurity, the fewer types are used. The correlation is medium for the essays, while only a small for the journals.
There were small positive correlations between exclamatory and restrictive clauses in the essay and insecurity. A small negative correlation (-0.4142) existed between logical clauses and insecurity. In the journal, however, there was only a small negative correlation (-0.3308) between logical clauses and insecurity.

Turning from correlations with linguistic insecurity, the correlations of word counts with clause type counts provided several significant coefficients. The larger the average number of words in a piece of writing, the more types of clauses were used. This was true for the journal and the essay at approximately the same high coefficients (0.7275 and 0.7465, respectively). However, between the average length of t-units and number of clause types, the t-units in the journals had a high positive correlation with the number of clause types (0.8174), whereas those in the essays had only a small one (0.4927).

There were only seven medium level correlations among the clauses. Only one was between the same type of clause (logical) in the journal and the essay.

Not only correlations but also frequencies show a difference between the journal and the essay. An average (mode) of 361 words was in the essay. The average number of clause types was ten. For the journal, the average number of words was 195, and the average number of clause types was seven. The essay would have to have thirteen clause types to equal the ratio in the journal. This supports the correlations by showing that there is a tendency for the journal to have a larger number of clause types per number of words than the essay.
3. Case Studies.

The case studies are intended to show how the characteristics of students and their writing, averaged and generalized about in the previous section of this chapter, actually interact in particular individuals. I will refer to each student by a number which was given to them as an "I.D." for computer analysis of their data. This will preserve their anonymity as well as provide a reference for the reader with which to check back through the computer printouts in the appendix.

In each of the five studies, the geographies and general background of the student will be presented first. Next, I will discuss the student's initial questionnaire and interview, as well as the linguistic insecurity text for that person. Third, the student's essays, then the journals for the quarter will be examined. Finally, I will discuss the last questionnaires and interviews, and try to sum up the student's writing modes and linguistic insecurity. Most of the materials described are found in Appendix C.

A bright, personable, good-natured young woman, she never complained about being placed in the remedial section of English. Like the majority of the students in the class, she was black, 18, and a second quarter freshman. A native of Columbus, she lived at home with her mother. She was always neatly dressed in business-like dresses or pantsuits. (The only time I ever saw her in jeans was when we ran into each other at a shopping center on Saturday after-
noon.) Her business-like apparel reflected her determination to be a business major. This same goal also seemed to motivate her desire to be "correct," at least mechanically, in her essays. I had first met her the previous quarter, when she was taking a French course. A requirement was that she participate in an individualized grammar laboratory for which I was the tutor. She was always diligent in her work and anxious to understand precisely everything that was presented, just as she had been in English 100.01.

Her linguistic insecurity score was fairly high (6), above the mode for all students. She selected several hypercorrect choices for what she considered correct (/nyu/, /ɔftən/, "Whom did you say was here?"), giving the standard choice as what she normally used. She decided that she commonly said "tomato" with a flap but that "t" was correct; that although she would normally use "me," "Where you surprised at my being here" was correct; and though she did not use it in her everyday writing, she thought that positive anymore was correct in "Politicians are so crooked anymore, I don't know who to trust."

Her surveys and interviews early in the quarter had the same insecurity. Though in the first survey she seems most concerned with her pronunciation, she is also interested in improving unity and organization. I was worried by her response to "Have you ever tried to improve your writing?" namely, "Yes, Writing in the same direction" --worried that she was referring to her handwriting. However, when I asked her about it, she assured me that she was referring to the flow of ideas.
In her interviews she said that she needed to write well in a management position so people would know what she wanted around the business, and there wouldn't be mistakes when she ordered merchandise. To write well, she felt it was necessary to learn all the rules of organization, vocabulary, and grammar.

When asked about her processes or strategies for writing in the first interview, she said she usually asked a teacher about the assignment if she didn't understand it in class. Then she wrote it. She didn't make notes, outline, freewrite, or even work through a set of drafts. She usually had trouble starting "because everything sounded stupid." She crossed out lines and threw away pages until she liked something or tired of trying. From that point she checked each sentence as she wrote it.

Her first in-class essay was 149 words long, with ten t-units averaging fifteen words each. The range of sentence lengths was 3 to 31 words. Eight clause types and fifteen clauses were used.

The subject was her first state fair queen contest. I was lucky to not only have her final draft but also the freewriting that I asked her to try first. The way she edited the freewriting shows the end product to be in the poetic mode. Often her changes made the writing more explicit: "the reason for this" became "the reason why it was exciting," "school" became "my high school," to the initials "O.E.A." was added the parenthesis "(Office Education Class)," "off stage in front" became "off stage to sit down in front," and "had lunch" became "ate lunch." Less often, the change was to correct grammar or make something more formal.
Changes favoring the poetic mode, especially those tending to make detail more explicit, have all been discussed and illustrated by composition theoritst. Britton and Moffett also illustrate how children reduce their detail in some cases rather than make their writing more explicit. However, the degree of editing in this essay perhaps suggests more than linguistic insecurity. Note that in the first draft she gives her feelings about being the only black girl in the queen contest. However, in the version she turned in, she only mentions the fact that she was the only black girl.

Her next piece of writing, a take-home essay, was on three reasons why the 1978 blizzard was terrible. It was 343 words long, with twenty-eight t-units averaging twelve words. Again, she used eight clause types, but there were twenty-seven clauses, with a particularly large increase in restrictive and logical clauses. Also, the clauses were often "marked"; of the ten instances were "that" would be optional, she used it in nine. Consider, for example, the following sentence in which both "that's" could be omitted: "It was so bad that people were saying that it wasn't fit for man or beast outside." The frequent marking of optionally marked clauses seems to indicate a close attention to the language and careful monitoring, neither conducive to fluent writing, as discussed in the literature review. Another indication that the essay was written in the poetic mode is that it is very carefully written, with no crossouts. More telling is that there are no detailed examples and little first-hand experience or reflection.
The next essay, written over a week later out of class, shows many of the same tendencies. It is 359 words long, with twenty-nine t-units averaging twelve words each. Nine clause types, with a total of thirty clauses, are used. Restrictive relative clauses go up from seven in the previous essay to eleven. Also, of fifteen optionally marked clauses, thirteen are marked.

The topic, how she is distracted by good-looking guys, demands personal examples, but they are as general and undetailed as her explanations. Consider how little her example adds in this section of her essay: "I'm usually interested in the outside appearance first, and since the body is a physical appearance, I can't help but to notice it. Without a nice build a guy wouldn't look right in his clothes. This guy that I see everyday at school has a real nice body and looks nice in his clothes. He is a good example of what I like."

Before she wrote (the second in-class midterm, her next essay), we had another interview. She told me she had "practiced" in her essay and decided that writing went faster if she freewrote first to see what she had to write about, roughly outlined her ideas, then freewrote the beginning. I asked if she could add more detail to her examples. She replied that she had not been sure personal detail was appropriate, that her high school teachers hadn't liked it. I assured her that personal, detailed examples were fine.

The subject of her second midterm was why parents should teach their children to behave in public. Her examples are personal observations of children misbehaving, and they are detailed.
The essay was 451 words long, with 29 t-units averaging 16 words each. There is a better balance of clauses: eleven types are used, with a total of sixty-one clauses. There are more instances of more types—restrictive and logical clauses are no longer dominant. Also there are more unmarked clauses. Of the twenty-nine optionally marked clauses, twelve are unmarked. The diction seems somewhat more casual, although she still carefully edits. She is not, however, just editing grammar and diction. Note the change of focus due to a major rewording of the second paragraph. She is still stretching for some structures which aren't yet familiar. For instance, she invents a folk etymology in the sentence, "I think this rule should be stressed to the upmost."

Her next two essays, both written in class, reflect the same tendencies. The first of the two has 354 words with twenty-four t-units averaging fifteen words each. Her diction tends to be a little wordy but is fluent. The examples are detailed and, while not personal, are from her personal observation.

The next essay is on a topic she had spoken vehemently about in class—why Ohio State University should not hire foreign teachers. She writes very fluently in this essay: the diction is less contrived and there are more words than in any other of her one-hour essays or even her two-hour final exam, 574 words. There are forty t-units with an average of fourteen words each. Fifty-five clauses represent ten clause types. One example is personal; the others although hypothetical are nonetheless specific and real.
Her final exam is not notably different from her midterms in length of the essay (521 words), number of t-units (34), or words per t-unit (15). There are forty-nine clauses, representing ten clause types. The notable differences are that her essays have gone from predominantly marked clauses, to a fairly even mix of marked and unmarked. Now, in the final, nine out of ten are unmarked. Though the topic would be expected to be less engaging (why jeans are so popular among teenagers), there are more personal examples and more casual, natural diction.

Through her essays, I found it strange that she had so few problems with word endings or verb tense since she had many such errors in her casual speech. In the last journal entries, her speech characteristics were present. Therefore, I believe there was careful monitoring, a second order symbolism, even in her more fluent essays.

The first journal entry, like her essays, showed no word ending problems except one common to many dialects, the past marker of "ask," in the sentence "He were ask a couple of questions." There are 361 words; with thirty-four t-units averaging eleven words each. There are seven clause types and twenty-eight clauses. Twenty of the clauses are divided between the infinitive, temporal, and logical types. Of the four optionally marked clauses, all are unmarked. Also, there are seven cross-out marks, only one of which is for a change of information. The topic of the journal is again the narration of her participation in the queen contest. It is not quite explicit in its detail as the essay on the topic but a little more
personal reflection remains.

The second entry chosen for analysis is 524 words long, with 51 t-units averaging 10 words each. This is about the same average of words per t-unit which occurred in her essays written at the same time in the quarter. The six optionally marked clauses are divided evenly between the two types. There are eleven types of clauses and thirty-five clauses. That is also more clause types than in an essay written at the same time. This journal passage is both a narration and a description of the events and sights at a convention in Detroit which she attended. They are presented in detail with reflections interspersed.

There are ten cross-outs which are predominantly for changing how she originally intended to phrase something, for example, "... but I know it wasn't very long..." More interesting is what she does not cross out or correct, notably her many dropped word endings marking plural nouns and third person singular present tense verbs and past tense verbs. For instance, observe the word endings in these three sentences from this entry:

1. I'm always nervous before test. (drops s-plural)
2. One day we all we to the Renaissance Hotel for lunch. (drops past marker nt of "went"
3. A couple of my friends had rooms that we terrible. (drops r of "were")

In the latest journal entries, the tendencies of the previous entry are continued. The average number of words per t-unit is up to 13. There are 410 words in the entry and 33 t-units. Of eight
optionally marked clauses, six are unmarked. The thirty-six clauses fall into ten types. The diction continues to be casual with much personal detail, and she continues to drop word endings. Especially interesting was that she dropped final consonants from words like "that" even when they were in a stressed position in the sentence, as in "But to keep on staring, tha is rude and disturbing."

According to what she said in her last interview, she was pleased with the progress she had made in her writing. But as she also said in the interview and wrote in her last survey, she was glad that she had been able to please me, her teacher. For her, that was the prime achievement—she felt that her writing was now more likely to please her teachers than it had been before.

There are several notable differences between her poetic and reflexive modes. First, her optionally marked clauses are more often unmarked in her reflexive journal writing. The marked clauses are dominant in her essay until she starts gaining fluency. Secondly, though explanations are more explicit in her essay, the examples are not as detailed as those in the journal, again until the last two essays. Note also the difference linguistic insecurity plays between modes. Before she became convinced that I really would only grade her journal on the number of pages she wrote, and nothing else, the first entries are nearly as carefully edited and lack nearly as much detail and fluency as her early essays. Later in the quarter, however, as she gains confidence, her essays gain the detail and fluency that was only in the early journal writing.
This was the only student in the study who was over 20, female, and white. Somewhat quiet and shy in class, she was very anxious to do well, particularly since she thought she was far behind the other students because she had not been in school for over four years, and she feared she had forgotten all she had learned in high school.

Her linguistic insecurity test score was one of the highest at 111. In the pronunciation section she did not choose any of the hypercorrect possibilities, but the items on her test that were marked for insecurity clearly reflected her awareness of the characteristics of her south central Ohio speech. In items, 1, 3, 6, and 9, she recognized the "standard" pronunciations as correct, and the dialectal variant as what she said.

Further signs of the linguistic insecurity appear in the second section. She marked one hypercorrect choice (item 1. a.) as "correct." Both of the genitive versus accusative gerundive items (2 and 7) were marked as the genitive being what she wrote but the accusative being what was correct. The parallelism item (3) baffled her, and she finally decided that neither choice was correct or what she said. Also, like 125, she decided that, though she didn't write it, "positive anymore" was correct. The other items, 5, 6, and 9, were answered more predictably.

In her first interview she said that her biggest problems were grammar and punctuation. She usually didn't have any trouble getting started because she made an outline first, when she had time.
I had noticed that when she did freewriting, she wrote as slowly and painstakingly as she did when she did focus writing (a revision of a freewriting.) She replied that she "just couldn't write that fast because it comes out wrong." Though I tried for the rest of the term to convince her that it did not matter how it came out, she never write with the same inhibition as the other students. Perhaps the most telling thing she ever said about her feelings toward freewriting came toward the middle of the quarter. I was teasing her about her excessive carefulness, telling her, "Live dangerously--be messy!" She suddenly became very serious and said she felt like her essays were her children, and that she had to "raise" them very carefully so that they would be presentable to the rest of the world. This concern that the essays always be "correct" in a mechanical sense, including handwriting, spelling, and punctuation, can be seen in all her work for the course.

Her first essay written in class was the last of several drafts. Unfortunately for this case study of her writing, she carefully shredded and disposed of each consecutive draft after she recopied it. Because of this carefulness, there were not even any cross-outs on the final draft.

The essay itself was 259 words long, with twenty-seven t-units averaging ten words each. Of three optionally marked clauses, two were marked. The essay contained eight clause types, an average number; however, only thirteen actual clauses appear, a relatively low figure.
The topic was her first job interview, and she provided several detailed instances from the experience. Though some of her errors were due to her dialect ("He dressed in a pen-striped suit, and his pants were out of style with the narrow cuffs."), most of her problems were wordiness ("This was the first in a always continuing series that will go throughout my life.") or what Mina Shaughnessy in Errors and Expectations (1977) called "blurred patterns" ("The way I felt like was in front of the principal at school.")

Her next essay (340 words, twenty-six t-units, and an average of thirteen words per t-unit) remained low on clauses (again, thirteen clauses and eight types). The topic, types of skating, did not lend itself to personal examples, but she did provide detailed description. Her major problem was still blurred patterns: "The difference in the figure skates are the blade is widest and has gradual curve. Also at the front of the blade has a set of teeth are used in spinning and jumping."

The practice midterm that she wrote in class had 505 words, and thirty-three t-units averaging fifteen words each. There is a dramatic increase in the quality of writing since the beginning of the quarter. Besides a longer piece of writing and longer average t-units, indicating greater fluency, there were also forty-seven clauses. When I asked her later about her feelings and strategies for this essay, she said she liked writing for children. (The essay assignment was to discuss a rule you would give a child, and she chose to address her rule to a child.) She said she tried to write using her common, everyday language that a child would
understand. We discussed what we appreciated in the writing we liked, and she concluded that she needed to try to be clear in all of her writing, no matter who the audience was. I pointed out that in this essay she had none of the blurred pattern errors she had in the earlier writing. The avoidance of error seemed to be the more persuasive argument.

Although the examples were imaginary, they were detailed. As in the previous essays, the handwriting was very careful. There was one cross-out, which was too thoroughly marked out to read. Beneath the cross-out she printed "sorry!"—evidence that she still regarded the essay, to a large extent, as an object which could somehow be flawed by such a mark.

The third midterm seemed to be more like her first essay than the second. "Why I would leave my hometown" elicited some personally engaged writing, but much of the detail was description of the town and how her relatives felt about the town.

The essay (386 words, thirty-one t-units, twelve words per t-unit) was particularly low on clauses (23 clauses representing seven types). Blurred patterns also reappear in this essay; for instance, "An example of the nosy person is that one of my aunts belongs to a women's card club."

At this time she was saying that she felt more confident about writing, that the prospect of writing a paper seemed much less formidable. Doing well on several short essays for sociology also supported her growing confidence in her writing skills.
Her final exam reflected her growth in writing in several ways. First, although the essay is somewhat shorter (406 words) than some of her one-hour essays, there are more types of clauses (12) and relatively more clauses (35). Sometimes the clauses have the wrong subordinating conjunction ("This case occurred in New York City which the slayer of Kitty was accidentally scared away three times by her neighbors.") or there is a proximity error ("But each time, he came back to continue to kill her with the neighbors watching out of their windows."), but there are no blurred patterns. Of twelve optionally marked clauses, eight were marked.

Her topic, why people don't get involved, did not elicit any personal examples from her experience, but she did provide detail from the Kitty Genovese case. Also, though there were no cross-outs, there were two inserts.

Her journals were probably the least reflexive of any I received. After I read her first journal submission, I asked her about how she felt about writing it and how she wrote it. She first wrote her entries on scrap paper and corrected the grammar and organization. Unfortunately for this study, she threw away the first drafts after she copied them into her journal.

The first three topics in the first selection I took were short self-contained paragraphs, each separated by a blank line and dated. The longest and last topic was about her hectic trip home one weekend. It was seldom reflective, but simply moved from major event to major event: "I went home to see my parents. The plan was for me to catch the bus which runs downtown. Then go to the
Sheridan Hotel and meet my Uncle Don who I was going home with. I was afraid I would miss the stop that I wanted. But I didn't.
When I got to hotel and immediately found my uncle. We had breakfast together. I met some of his friends he made at this convention. We finally left and started home."

As the above passage demonstrates there is relatively little embedding (22 clauses) for a piece of writing 357 words long, with thirty-three t-units averaging eleven words each. One reason may be that none of the topics were developed or investigated in any depth: a superficial treatment of a subject would not be as likely to demand as much attention to pointing out subtle relationships and logical connections, a process which would need more subordination.

Her second journal was more reflective, since she not only states her roommate's problem with school, but she also expresses her opinions on the roommate's plight. She discussed how upset the roommate was and how little sympathy the girl received from her parents. Then the subject commented, "I tried to calm her down but a friend wasn't enough she needed her family's support. But they wasn't ready to give it."

Though there are slightly fewer words in this entry than in the first (332) and the same average length of t-units (eleven words), there are more clauses (25). There are no cross-outs, and this two-page passage, according to the dates she labelled them with, was written over the period of four days. Both facts led me to believe she was still being very careful in her writing, an indication that her journals were written in the poetic mode. A
characteristic of the writing which further convinced me that
the writing was "poetic" was its explicitness about things that
she or a good friend, the usual audiences for a very reflexive
piece, would assume. For example, "old friends" in this sentence
should not have to be defined in a typical journal entry: "Also I
had fun with my old friends meaning my roommates."

Like the first two, her last journal entry also has many
characteristics of poetic writing. First, though there are 417
words in the selection and ten words per t-unit, there are only
twenty-two clauses, representing eight clause types. The explicitness
noted in the previous journal entry is still present: "My Mom
went crazy. She bought all her three sisters (my aunts) and her
mother robes as Christmas gifts next year." However, there was
less explicitness of that kind and more reflection than in the
second journal entry: "They were twenty dollar robes for six dollars
and nothing were wrong with them. My mom said with her luck the
family will decide /inserts "not"/ to give each other gifts next
year. But I don't think that will happen. I bought a new dress
and jacket. I love to shop, especially if there are sales." Note
that the logical leap between the last two sentences was not made
explicit, suggesting the implicit quality of reflexive writing.
Also interesting is that the longest, most embedded sentence in the
passage was the one in which she expresses anger: "I finally got
my Health book in the sixth week of the quarter. I think it is such
a waste when I know when I sale it back to the book store I will
not get half of what I paid for this new book." Note that the two
indicative clauses are not marked, suggesting her greater fluency.
Though this student wrote very little in the reflexive mode, the difference in her writing between the two modes is clear. In her essays she tended to have serious syntactic problems like blurred patterns. But, in her journal she had much less difficulty, although she used the same clause types. In final survey, she wrote that she felt much more relaxed about writing. Her only comment on the journal revealed her attitude that it was of minor importance: "When I wrote my Journal this helped me to be able to write better letters to my friends."

Like 125, this student was female, black, 18 years old, and a native of Columbus. Her linguistic insecurity test rated a five, which was average. On the pronunciation section she chose the hypercorrect, spelling pronunciation of "often" as being correct, though she herself did not say it. She chose the one syllable pronunciation of "garage" as her own, but the two syllable one as correct. She also chose the intrusive r pronunciation of "wash" as what she said, although she didn't think it was correct. In the second section, she decided the hypercorrect usage of "whom" was correct, but that she didn't commonly write it. For item seven (genitive versus accusative gerundive) she chose the accusative as what she wrote and the genitive as what was correct. For item two, which gives the same choice, she chose the accusative as both what she wrote and what was correct.

Her first survey and interviews indicated a unique attitude among the subjects. She was very confident about her abilities to write in school and other formal situations; she felt that when she wrote for
herself or friends, she became sloppy and left gaps in the information. I tried to explain that "gaps" are typical of reflexive writing and that it might be less "sloppy" in some respects than she thought.

For her first midterm essay, she chose a topic which she had already treated in her journal (the first time she tried out to be a cheerleader), which might account for why it was exceptionally detailed, fluent, and embedded for a first essay—in fact better in these ways than her next two essays. The essay was 325 words long, with twenty-three t-units averaging 14 words each; twenty-four clauses represented eight types. Of eleven optionally marked clauses, eight were unmarked.

Although the second essay she wrote was done out of class, it had the same number of words and average length of t-units as the inclass midterm. However, there were only fourteen clauses and seven clause types. Of six optionally marked clauses, four were marked. Further, though she did not have blurred patterns of the type in the essay of 126, she did have difficulty with ordering the clauses logically, as in the sentence, "Businesses lost so much money during the winter of 1978, that they also had to close, because no one would come into work." Though the topic, hardships of the 1978 blizzard, elicited dramatic detail and personal examples in several other students' essays, it did not in hers.

The next essay, her second midterm, did have more personal examples though they were not exceptionally detailed. The topic, what distracts me from studying, did cause her to be a little more reflective, as in her comment on the distraction by the phone: "It always seems to ring when your doing something and not ring when your not doing anything."
The preceding quote demonstrates a difference in self-monitoring between her essay and her journal. Though she makes various common errors like the "your" for "you're" error above, she never misuses the -s for third person singular present tense verbs in her essay as she does in the journal.

This essay had about fifty more words than the first two essays and fewer words per t-unit (13), but there were substantially more clauses (38) distributed among eight clause types. Despite the increase of clauses, the logical connections between the parts of some sentences broke down, in the following case, even though her cross-outs indicate she was aware of a problem: "These are the things that no matter when I try to study, I just can't seem to get into it."

After she wrote this essay, we had an interview in which she said she was having greater difficulty writing in class, because she would see other people writing and feel she ought to be writing also. However, when she would try to write, she could not think of what to say and would start to panic. We talked about how everyone had his own process of writing and tried to have her recall how she wrote her first essay. She decided that she would do more freewriting before she tried a final draft of her essay.

An in-class practice midterm was the next piece of writing. Though it was about the same length (330 words) as the first two essays, the average t-unit was dramatically longer (21 words) than the earlier work. The number of clauses (35) was closer to that in the third essay, but there were more clause types used (10). Also, of twelve optionally marked clauses, nine were unmarked.
Despite these seeming indicators of fluency, she had several problems with using the subordinations, as in the sentence "What I mean with this statement is that I see so many children with either their clothes are too little or they are too big." Her cross-outs indicated that she frequently changed her mind about the syntactic direction of her sentences; the beginnings of sentences are sometimes changed for this reason: "What I mean" was changed to "I also feel," and "I know" was changed to "I could have."

The number of words in the third midterm (498) would suggest that she was becoming more fluent, as would the increased number of clauses (54, which represent ten clause types) despite the lower average number of words per t-unit (15). The additional fact that there is only one cross-out for a change of word choice, would also indicate less self-monitoring, as would the larger proportion of optionally marked clauses left unmarked (eleven of thirteen).

However, the difficulties that she has with her subordinations belie the other indicators. In this essay there were misuses of relative pronouns which appear to be hyper-corrections ("There are three main reasons in which I would expect my life to be different from my parents."), blurred patterns ("The main thing how I expect my life to be different from that of my parents, is having a college education."), and lapses in short term memory about what was written in earlier parts of sentences ("Not only a college education is important to me, but also getting married at a reasonable age is also important."
Her detail and examples were better in this essay. The topic, how my life will differ from my parents' lives, also allowed her to reflect on the facts she presented, since she was writing well except for the clause errors, I decided to encourage her to allow more time to proofread after she wrote. She said she always looked over her papers after she finished, but she never saw most of the errors until she got the paper back. I suggested that she put the paper away as long as she could before she proofread it. Since the final was two hours long rather than one as were the midterms, she could afford to get a drink of water and wander around the building for at least fifteen minutes before trying to proofread. She thought that she would need longer than fifteen minutes to be objective about her essay but she said she would try.

Her final exam was not flawless, but it showed substantial improvement. There were 447 words, with twenty-six t-units averaging seventeen words apiece. The number of optionally marked clauses was divided almost evenly into five marked and six unmarked. There were fewer clauses (38) than in the last midterm, but several more clause types (13). Although there were still a few sentences in which the beginning seemed to have been forgotten at the end, there were a predominance of good sentences and several that were very sophisticated. For example, note how well she handled the embedding in the following sentence: "Another matter I have to consider now that I have a new and vivid understanding of the definition of poverty, is how inexpensive it is to eat out."
There are six cross-outs in her essay. She not only was correcting errors, but also making her correct constructions more sophisticated. In this sentence, for example, the first changes a plural to a generic noun, and the second creates an ellipsis of a redundant verb: "The locations of the food chain also plays an important part in my fast food chain decision, as well as the time." Since she maintained her usual organization and detailed examples, she probably was able to refrain from doing her editing until after she finished composing.

There was not a dramatic difference between the writing in her essays and her journals. Unlike 126, however, the reason was not that her journal was in the poetic mode, but rather that her essays were often reflexive. Her first journal had misspellings and grammar errors, but only two cross-outs. Most of the passage was a letter to a close friend. There are lots of questions, little detail, and many things about her life at Ohio State University which are not made explicit but would not seem too vague to her friend, which is a characteristic of reflexive writing.

Though the journal passage is fairly short (247 words, with twenty-two t-units averaging eleven words each), there are ten clause types and twenty-nine clauses. Of fourteen optionally marked clauses, twelve are unmarked. Unlike her later essays there are no poorly constructed clauses, even though some sentences are densely embedded, as is the sentence, "Now that I have ran out of something to say I'll think I'll leave to next time I write but I won't write until you write back." (This sentence is very telling of the letter being in the reflexive mode since it reveals that it is not the information transmitted but the maintenance of contact which is most important.)
The second journal was 350 words long, with twenty-seven t-units averaging thirteen words. There are nine clause types and twenty-nine clauses, somewhat higher than the number in the "blizzard of 1978" essay she wrote just three days before this passage. Also, her optionally marked clauses are almost evenly divided: four marked and five un-marked.

The first of the two pages was about her trip home. It was reflective, and there were other indicators that it was reflexive, but she misused the relative "which," compounding it with "in" as "inwhich." The word was used in sentence after sentence: "When I went home, I went to a dance, inwhich I had a very nice time." "I went to a basketball game, inwhich my old high school won." "I love to shop at home, because they're so many stores inwhich you can choose from."

The second page is about abortion, and in many respects is like a first draft of a paper for another class rather than a journal entry. The hypercorrections and formalisms seem particularly poetic in a sentence like, "The topic I am about to discuss is "Abortion and its effects."

Throughout the journal she has word ending errors that were absent in her essays, but her last journal entries had many more of these errors. These included the black dialect use of "it" in existential sentences ("The real problem though, it was so much water outside, that it seemed like a flood or lake"), as well as the missing endings.

The first part of the entry was on the recent bad weather, and the second part, on her first love. Both seemed to be personally engaging for her.
The various "counts" in this journal were typical of her other entries. There were 386 words, with thirty-five t-units averaging eleven words. Thirty-five clauses represented nine clause types; the majority of clauses were either indicative, marked infinitive or temporal.

A reader of this description may consider that the journal is not a good thing since it encourages a student to make errors. However, whether or not the reader believes in a student's right to his own language, he might consider that if a student feels free enough to use more of his own language, to whatever dialect it may belong, the student is also free enough to use all the types of syntactic structures he already controls, and perhaps see them for the first time in writing. In the case of the present student, she decided that she liked "inwhich"—she had heard teachers say it and tried it in her journal. A week later she tried it in her essay and found she was not using it correctly. Though in her conversation with me, she could not remember any other specific examples, she was sure that she had experimented with other phrases in the same way.

This student entered the course fairly secure about her language skills and remained so. However, her opinion of her writing was still to some degree dependent on her teacher's opinion: "Infact I know I write well. All my midterms had A's on them and my teacher said I write well."

The oldest student in the study at 24, he is black and from Toledo. He had had two English classes at Toledo University, one in composition and one in literature, before coming to Ohio State University, where he
placed into the remedial composition class.

On his linguistic insecurity test he rated a seven, which was slightly above the average insecurity score. His section on pronunciation contained several common discrepancies. Though he always chose the standard pronunciation as correct, he decided that he said "tomato" with a flap, "garage" in one syllable, and "wash" with an intrusive r. The discrepancies on the second section, however, were less expected because he twice chose the hypercorrect choice as what he said and the standard as what was correct. He also chose positive anymore as what he said but not what was correct. Also, he was the only student in the study who decided in item 9 that he wrote the marked clause but the unmarked one was correct.

His interviews and surveys revealed that he was more insecure than his linguistic insecurity revealed. Both of his teachers at Toledo had severely criticized his writing, and though he had suspected that his writing was not good enough to test out of the English composition courses at O. S. U., he had not anticipated having to also take the remedial series. He dreaded having to write at all, and now he had to write papers for three quarters.

The only thing he had enjoyed about his previous English classes was keeping a journal. He brought the journal he had kept to our first interview, and it seemed to be totally freewriting, and totally illegible, as were the in-class essays he had written. I asked him about what he liked in a piece of writing. He mentioned clarity, excitement and good grammar, but not legibility, so I decided not to bring it up at this point and re-read what Mina Shaughnessy had to say about handwriting.
His first essay was 209 words long, with twelve t-units averaging seventeen words. There were six clause types and eighteen clauses, and the two optionally marked clauses were both marked.

The topic he chose was his first driving lesson. The support, therefore, was all personal, but it was not very detailed. His conclusion that learning to drive is harder than it looks made the essay of broader significance than simply a personal experience. He told me that he had been taught to do that at Toledo.

His word ending errors were the most striking problem in his writing. Not only did he leave off endings ("Like all teen age boy of 16 I was telling ever body that I know how to driving."), but he frequently added endings that weren't appropriate to the function of the word in the sentence ("So drive teach me not to believe that ever thing is easily because it looks easily."). It was because of the addition of endings that I suspected there was something more than black dialect behind his errors. When I asked him if he had ever been tested for dyslexia or similar disorders, he said that he had been tested in high school and there had been no indication of such problems.

In his second, take-home essay many indicators in his work suggest fluency: 438 words, seventeen t-units, an average of 26 words per t-unit, 48 clauses and ten clause types. Of six optionally marked clauses, four were marked. The topic, why he likes sports, elicited personal though not particularly detailed examples.

However, there were often embedding errors, as well as ending errors: "Because the enjoyment of these two sports for me came from
the fact, I all way like going to practiced and because I knew that all of the hard work the team and I would do, would pay off in the end if we won the game and knew that we have done are best out there on the field." Often in this essay when a sentence did come out clearly, I had the feeling that he had heard it very often in the locker room ("From participate in sport I learned pride in myself and my work and pride in a job well done by other people.").

There errors were probably not out of carelessness. There were several erasures in this essay, though they were too carefully erased to decipher. Also, he was one of the last to finish in-class essays, usually throwing away several wads of paper when he turned in his final drafts.

His next essay, the second in-class midterm, had approximately the same "counts" as the previous essay: 358 words, fifteen t-units averaging twenty-four words each, seven clause types and forty-three clauses. Of two optionally marked clauses, one was marked and one was not.

The topic, how living in an apartment distracts students from studying, elicited several detailed personal examples. The handwriting is a little better and so are the sentences, although there are still ending and subject-verb agreement errors. Note in the two following sentences that despite the other errors, the embedding occurs in a logical progression: "Like sometime when I come home from classes I will find a note from my roommate Randy telling me to wash the dishes and take out the trash can and empty it. Which I do in order before I even start studying my homework for the next day. When I do wash
the dishes its seem to take one hours to do, because there are all way so many in the sink from the day and night before, that we didn't do, and sometime doing them distract me from studying." As the punctuation in this passage demonstrates, he is very aware of the clauses as constituent structures, marking off nonrestrictive clauses as if they were sentences or restrictive ones as if they were non-restrictive.

At this point in the quarter, he was very discouraged because he did not feel he was making progress. Since in the remedial English class I only gave grades for unity, organization, and detail, his essays had received high marks. However, he had not received as high grades for his writing in philosophy and history. His philosophy teacher had told him that his grammar was so bad that she could not understand what he was trying to say.

Like 117, he said that he could not understand why he did not catch errors when he proofread. However, he was not sure how to correct them even though he knew they were wrong. I sent him to the remedial English tutors for word ending and grammar exercises since he though that would help him, but I suspected that there was more to his problem than ignorance of rules.

The third midterm evidenced the same types of ending and clause errors as the first ones. He even repeated errors that I had specifically explained in earlier essays, such as the spelling of "always." There were 495 words, twenty t-units, and twenty-five words in the average t-units. He used nine clause types to produce sixty-six clauses. The topic, one way I will be different from my parents, produced both detailed examples and reflection.
Since there was so little improvement in his writing from the previous essay, I asked him if the tutors had been able to give him any useful exercises. He said that they had kept him well-supplied, and he did them almost every day, but he usually forgot the rules when he started to write. I was glad that he was not monitoring himself as he composed, because he usually presented his ideas in an orderly way and supported them with detailed examples, and editing while composing might interfere. However, he needed more conscious control of his language when he proofread. I asked him to xerox a few pages from his journal and proofread them for practice.

His next essay, an in-class practice midterm, was his longest piece of writing of the quarter (703 words). The twenty-eight t-units averaged twenty-five words. Eleven clause types and ninety-three clauses were in the essay. Of nine optionally marked clauses, five were unmarked.

The essay is not only indicative of greater fluency, but the handwriting is strikingly neater. More importantly there are substantially fewer ending errors. Some of the spelling errors, such as "drak" for "dark," still suggested a perception problem like dyslexia, so I praised his improvement in proofreading and advised that he go to the university specialist.

His approach to the topic, one rule I would give a child, was more creative than most of the other students'. He addressed his essay to his "son" and explained the reasons for his rule, never leave without telling your parents where you are going, in a parental voice. Note particularly his example of going to the rock quarry without telling
his parents, which extends over almost three pages. His personal engagement probably increased his fluency, as various composition theorists, particularly James Britton, have suggested.

The final exam does not seem to have the same degree of fluency, though there are still detailed examples. He said, when the topics were announced, that he had written on something like the final topic, why people do not get involved, in other classes. Though there were other topics that interested him, he thought this one would be the easiest.

The length of the essay was closer to that of his earlier essays than the last one: 439 words, sixteen t-units averaging twenty-seven words each. There were more clause types (twelve) though not substantially more clauses (fifty-three).

The most interesting characteristic of this essay is that there were no ending errors or subject-verb agreement errors. He turned in his essay after about an hour and fifteen minutes. I read it quickly and found one subject-verb agreement error and two word ending errors, then I told him that his organization, unity, and detail were very good, but since he still had time, why didn't he check it again for "mechanical" errors. He found his mistakes and erased and rewrote two places were his handwriting was a little messy.

Since I knew dyslexia could not be cured, at least this quickly, I asked him what the specialist had told him. He said that he had not had time to see her; he thought he could find his errors better because he had "studied" his journal and learned what kinds of mistakes he made.
His journals were very reflective, often turning into written prayer, so they were undoubtly reflexive. This is particularly the case in the first journal entry. He first bemoaned the fact that he is lost in himself, then he turned without transition to why he didn't go to English class, then to not doing his homework, then to how everyone wanted him to do well in school but he was not, and finally he wrote a prayer asking for God's forgiveness. Another indication that this was reflexive writing was that, unlike his essays, nothing was supported by detailed examples. For instance, he wrote, "My life is something bad broken, in the facts I lift it fall out of my hand." However, he never explained how or why it is "bad broken."

The most striking fact about his "counts" was that his average t-unit is much shorter—fifteen words. The journal passage was 223 words long and contained fifteen t-units. There were eleven clause types and twenty-three clauses, a high variety of types per number of clauses. Finally, of nine optionally marked clauses, five were marked.

In his second journal entry, the writing was not so clearly in the reflexive mode. For the first part, he seemed to have set up a topic for himself, which he begins with the sentence, "Do it seem to you as you get older in life, there is less to do now, then when you was a little child?" Such a rhetorical question seems particularly poetic. He did not follow through with the extensive examples that he provided in his essays. However, there were more explicitly detailed examples than in the first journal.
The average t-unit was also quite a bit longer (26 words). There were 268 words and eleven t-units in the entry. Nine clause types also represented a drop from the last journal, although there were thirty-four clauses. Six optionally marked clauses were divided evenly between marked and unmarked, similar to the pattern in the first entry.

For the last entry, my predetermined page choices gave me a passage in which he had tried to set up an essay with a thesis and subtopics to discuss his weekend at home. The writing was fairly explicit in detail, but it was still reflective and showed little evidence of self-monitoring, as the following sentence demonstrates: "Just for the little time I being away from home the question $\text{"quarter"}?$ it seemed to bring hs feeling out in me out this last week in when I went home."

This passage was strikingly low on clauses for this student: twenty-one clauses and nine types. The writing included 234 words, ten t-units and an average of twenty-three words per t-unit. Of seven optionally marked clauses, four were unmarked.

Though this student was not as confident at the end of the quarter as I might have hoped, his attitude had improved ("... I am willing to try ot write now when ask too, while in the past I shi away from writing as much as I could.") but was realistic ("My writing skill is still not up to what a college English teacher would expect, but it is better than when I first start.").
The differences between his journal and essay prose are greatest at the beginning of the quarter, when he is the most linguistically insecure. As he gains security, his essay takes on more detail and some of the reflective quality of his journal, whereas in later journals he uses the organization of his essays to express his inner, reflective thoughts.

A white, eighteen-year-old male from Columbus, this student had a high insecurity about his writing abilities, but he enjoyed writing in much the same way that he liked to gossip. Before, during and after class he talked about his active social life and illegal ventures with me, his fellow students and friends who walked by the classroom door. He had a fairly high rating of 10 on the linguistic insecurity test. Many of the discrepancies on the pronunciation section of his insecurity test were due to his choosing hypercorrect options as correct though he himself did not say them (items 4, 5, 7, and 8). He also decided that he said "garage" in one syllable, though that was incorrect, and that neither pronunciation of "wash" was what he said, although both were correct.

On the written portion he again chose a hypercorrect option as correct on item one ("whom" versus "who"). On items 2 and 7 he decided the genitive gerundive was correct but he did not write it. On item 5, "got" versus "have," he commonly wrote "got" although he didn't think it was correct.
He wrote on his first survey that "My own writing is not very good it has never / inserts "has " again/ been. Too many sentence structure mistake misspelled words ect." During our first interview he said that there were not so many mechanical errors in his writing that people could not understand what he had to say if they needed to, but that it would be easier for them if he took a little more time to proofread.

His first essay was 203 words long with sixteen t-units averaging thirteen words. Ten clause types and seventeen clauses were used. The essay was a detailed personal narration of his first time getting drunk, and he supported his claim that "The first time that anyone gets drunk is always the drunkest they ever get," with vivid detail from the point that described how "My friend and I bought a bottle of 'Southern Comfort' whiskey from a person we both knew," through the various stages of the experience, which ended at the police station. His detail and fluency suggested that he enjoyed writing the essay. When I asked him if he did, he answered, "Sure. Didn't you like reading it."

His second essay also concerned drinking—how people ruin parties by getting too drunk. The narration of his examples is detailed but much less embedded than his explanation and discussion: "I saw my girlfriend, and she told me about a party. It was at a friend's home, so we both decided to go. We got there early and not very many people had arrived yet, but soon the house was full of people. Everybody was having a good time, and they all seemed to be drunk."
As the previous passage indicates, there were relatively few clauses (twenty-two), despite there being more clause types (nine), for the number of words in the passage (200), t-units (eighteen), an average length of t-units (eleven). Of eight optionally marked clauses, five were unmarked.

His first in-class essay was slightly longer than his two out of class essays (261 words, twenty-two t-units, and twelve words per average t-unit), but was less embedded (seven clause types and twenty clauses). Of five optionally marked clauses, three are marked. The writing was just as detailed and interested, however. The topic was a typically atypical one—the first time he was caught stealing. Not only did he provide detail whenever possible ("We had brought a crowbar from home to pry the door open.") but his feelings about the events are expressed dramatically ("When I looked at him all I could see was a shot gun in my face.").

He has little trouble with sentence structure or mechanics. In this essay, there was only one erasure, which he made in order to have all of the last sentence on the last page.

His second in-class midterm essay was much longer and embedded than the first. The 486 word piece had twenty-eight t-units averaging seventeen words each. It was also much more embedded, with ten clause types and fifty-five clauses. Of twelve optionally marked clauses, nine were marked.

The topic, how the lack of self-discipline causes students to fail in college, contained detailed but not personal examples. Nonetheless, he affirms his personal commitment to the belief: "That's why I
I say that regular study habits will keep a student from facing failure in his or her subject.

His sentence structures in this essay were not merely corrected but more sophisticated. He made good use of both implied ellipsis ("That is why going to class is so important, because the student that did go knew about the assignment and passed. The student that didn't go, failed.") and parallelism ("It's not hard to figure out why this is true because drinking and smoking destroys brain cells and draws you away from school and into trouble.").

The next essay, the in-class practice midterm, had slightly fewer words (417), the same average length of t-units (seventeen words), but ten fewer clauses (forty-five) among fewer types (nine). Of twelve optionally marked clauses, eight are marked. As in the previous essay, the examples are detailed but not personal. He mentioned after writing the essay, "why teach a child respect," that he did not like the rule he chose, so he "couldn't get into writing the essay."

Also, if his five cross-outs and additions are an accurate indication, he edited himself much more than in previous essays. He even added "that" in optionally marked clauses: "He would be like that in any social thing /inserts "that"/ he does."

In our interview after this essay, he said that when, as in the previous essay, he is not interested in a topic, the essay is harder to write, specifically, it is more difficult to make the sentences "sound natural." He emphasized that he liked to choose his own topics for this reason.
His third essay was "a solution to the bus problem at Ohio State University." He is very detailed, though there is only one personal example. His hypothetical examples often include as much concrete detail as his personal one: "A student who gets on a bus at west campus at nine-thirty has to be on North Campus at ten. The extra stop at the Agriculture building takes up his needed time so he ends up being late for his class."

The essay was 423 words long, with twenty-seven t-units averaging sixteen words each. There was a total of ten clause types and thirty-three clauses. The fact that of nine optionally marked clauses, six were unmarked probably meant that he was self-monitoring less for sentence structure errors; as the previous essay demonstrated, marking unmarked clauses was a part of his last editing process.

His final exam was 527 words long, with thirty-nine t-units averaging fourteen words. There were ten clause types and fifty clauses. For the second time in his essays, there were more optionally unmarked (5) than marked (3) clauses.

Though the topic, "why are fast food restaurants popular," did not elicit personal examples from most students, he did provide detailed hypothetical ones. Often they were humorous, as in the following: "Let's say that your visiting your sister in Germany. The German food is just killing you. So one day you see a 'MacDonald's', if you ordered a hamburger it would taste about the same as one you would order in your home town. You know that the hamburgers are good so you run inside and get yourself a dozen." He also inserted humor into his explanations, for example, "If you are in a big hurry or
or forgot your pants, you can just stay in your car and get served."

His journals especially drew on his pleasure in telling stories. They contained perhaps the most unlikely stories that a teacher would ever expect to read, even in a journal: descriptions of the various times he was "busted," his love affairs, and his wild parties. He was also reflective about people and society for pages at a time.

His first journal passage was 392 words long, with thirty-one t-units averaging thirteen words. There were eleven clause types and forty-one clauses, a higher ratio of clause type and clause to total words than in the essays written at about the same time.

Note that his sentence structure is as good as in his essays. He also generalizes about the experience he has first presented in detail: "I learned that if lend some money and do things for them you rarely get anything in return." He then frankly evaluates his work: "I didn't really like this essay because I didn't stick to the topic sentence and messed up the story."

His next journal entry showed much less evidence of "practicing" essays, and was probably more in the reflexive mode. He seemed to be aware of the fact that I was going to read the entry but to not care to be more explicit in his detail. For example, he writes about one of his friends, "He has gotten in more trouble than any of my other friends, I can't begin to tell of them all so I won't just think of the worse. I don't really like him very much anymore because he is too much of an asshole to like."
This entry contained 410 words, with thirty-three t-units averaging twelve words each. There were nine clause types and thirty clauses. Of five optionally marked clauses, three were marked.

Before he turned in the last journal, he apologized and said he hoped I would not take it too seriously. He had written it all the night before it was due because he had forgotten about it. There were more fragment sentences and also a blurred pattern ("I hope that some day she will understand that I'm only kidding and not to get so mad at me."). The topic of the first page of the journal was how girls lie, and the second was the strange things that his girlfriend does. The entries are probably reflexive because they are very reflective, are not explicitly detailed, and do not take into account the fact that I, a likely reader, am female.

The journal has fairly typical "counts" for this student: 405 words, thirty-four t-units and twelve words per t-unit. Although his essays at this time were dominantly marked, of sixteen optionally marked clauses in this journal, twelve were marked. There were ten clause types and thirty-nine clauses.

Though this student was linguistically insecure, he was confident that his language skills did not prevent him from expressing his ideas. Of the five students discussed in this chapter, his attitude is probably the healthiest for a composition student, since it does not cause him, like Moffett's student, to "pare down" his ideas while he develops his writing abilities.
In the next chapter, I will summarize the findings and point out the most important correlations. I will also suggest several ways in which this research might be continued.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Chapter IV

As may be expected in any research project, an accurate overview of the study is difficult -- if not impossible -- to do immediately after the study is completed. It is not until findings are replicated and implications are tried that the importance of a study can be gauged. However, with the immediate results at hand, this chapter first summarizes the findings, then explains the limitations, and finally suggests some implications for teaching and for future research, the latter section also including a discussion of the combined use of quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

1. Summary of Findings

I explored the hypothesis that the greater a student's linguistic insecurity, the greater the formal syntactic difference between his writing in graded essays and in unevaluated work. This research has shown that, at least for structures like clauses and t-units, there is a significant negative correlation between the number of clause types and number of words per t-unit and a student's linguistic insecurity. I interpreted this to mean that here tended to be fewer of certain characteristics which are generally considered to be common in sophisti-
icated writing when the writer is insecure. Also, the greater a
student's linguistic insecurity, the greater the difference in the
quantity of these items between his poetic and reflexive writing modes.
In other words, the insecure student often has strikingly less sophisti-
cated writing in essays for the teacher than in writing for himself
or a friendly, uncritical audience. A more secure student is likely
to use a similar percentage in both modes. As demonstrated in the
case studies, linguistic insecurity also increases the difference
between the modes in quality of syntactic structures ("well-formedness"),
detail of examples, and general fluency. These aspects of writing are
usually higher in the journals than in the essays, but the essays fall
increasingly short in these qualities when the student is more insecure.
As the student's confidence builds, these qualities are more evident
in his essays.

Another finding of this study is that linguistic security is
correlated with fluency, or first order symbolism, in writing, for many
students. As demonstrated in the case studies, linguistically insecure
students often self-edit as they compose in the poetic mode. Linguisti-
cally secure students tend to do less editing while they compose,
saving editing for a later stage. I found that, by itself, simply
telling an insecure student, "Don't edit until you are at least
finished with your first draft," was to no avail -- he would continue
to do so until he felt confident enough in himself to delay editing,
accepting whatever was written first as good enough for that stage in
the process.
2. Limitations

There are limitations to this study in each of its three components. I will first examine those in the linguistic insecurity test, then those in the quantitative study, and finally those in the qualitative study.

The major problem with the linguistic insecurity test is its brevity. As the Spearman-Brown test indicated, doubling the number of items on the test may have increased the reliability over a tenth of a point if the additional eighteen items had the same internal consistency as the first eighteen. It would have been especially useful to have more double checks on a type of item. It was particularly interesting, for items 2 and 7 which both asked for judgements on the accusative versus the genitive gerundive, to see if a student was consistent in which he considered correct.

Secondly, the test should either be given to a group which is homogeneous as to native dialect or not include items which would be answered differently by individuals of different dialects, without regard to their linguistic insecurity. As was indicated by the crosstabulation of region with the responses, for nearly half of the items on the test, there was a significant difference in the answers from students from different regions. If the subjects were from essentially the same dialect community, in which all of the choices for the items on the test existed, then the items would be equivalent in eliciting students' norm of correctness. However, if a choice for an item is not in a dialect community, no matter what its members' geographics may be, a student will usually not choose it as what he
he thinks is correct. Therefore, he may rate lower in insecurity than might actually be the case. Thus, a revision of the test should take into account the dialect or dialects of the subjects in a more exacting way than I did.

The quantitative data has the same general limitations as any quantitative data, as I will discuss in the last section of this chapter. It also has limitations peculiar to itself. First, though there are more than sufficient subjects for the Pearson Product-Moment Correlations, the crosstabulations would be more reliable if there were more subjects who were more equally divided among the categories of the age, sex, region, and race variables.

Secondly, and more troubling for this study, is the relatively small proportion of possible types of structures that were examined. There might be other linguistic items with a significant positive or negative correlation with linguistic insecurity which would be easier to identify or faster to tabulate for the average, overworked composition teacher.

The second limitation of the empirical study created a limitation in the case studies. It was very helpful in analyzing the case studies to have some general tendencies suggested first by the empirical analysis of data (as will be discussed further in the last section of this chapter.) Future research might include as its first step an examination of other types of syntactic structures (the case studies suggest that optionally marked clauses might be a reliable correlate of fluency for some students), types of adjectives, adverbs, and subordinating conjunctions, and rhetorical devices for such needs
as cause and effect markers. For this last type of study the researcher may find tools for analysis in the recent work in discourse analysis.

Not only would more students be helpful for more accurate cross-tabulations, but a larger number of students for case studies would also be advisable, since the case studies often reveal kinds of interaction that are averaged out of sight in statistical generalizations. The more case studies attempted, the more types of interactions are likely to be observed.

Also in connection with the case studies, it would be useful to conduct a longer longitudinal study. It would be interesting, for instance, to follow students through their four years of undergraduate schooling to see whether their attitudes about writing change as they have experience with research reports, term papers, and term project—longer pieces of writing which require greater involvement from the writer with the subject. A determination of what kinds of strategies for writing that he retains from a composition class versus those he develops later would also be useful, since students of composition should be introduced to the practically workable, useful strategies in class.

Longer studies would also be a more realistic picture of the student's progress in writing skills. Due to time limitations, I only did case studies of my remedial students since I knew from my past experience with them that fewer had reached any "plateau" in their writing skills. Either a longer study or one that used students other than those in remedial sections would give the more expected picture of
sometimes rapid development and sometimes no progress at all, or even seeming regression, in a student's skills.

3. Implications for Teaching

The findings of this study could easily be overstated. There is no intention to suggest, for example, journals contain better writing than essays, thus journals are all a student should be asked to write. Though the journal creates a secure situation in which a student can feel "safe" to use more of his language with which he is competent, it does not demand that he practice the skills he will need to communicate with other audiences, such as providing explicit detail, organizing his ideas in a manner that will be logical and easy to follow, and editing his writing so that it will not contain errors which would distract his audience from the ideas. However, it might be useful for a teacher to realize that a student who has few or ill-formed types of clauses, for instance, may need more than constant grammar correction and sentence-combining exercises. He may need help in building his linguistic security in order that he be able to draw upon the variety of well-formed clause types that he already commands in his speech and casual writing.

There are many ways that a teacher might approach the problem of a student's linguistic insecurity depending on the student himself. The reactions of several case study students to certain assignments and counseling suggest several possibilities.

One possibility is for the insecure student to do more writing whose main purpose, for the writer, is to put ideas into writing. In the classes that I taught, the students' main opportunity for this kind of writing was their journal. They were told that I would not evaluate
journals as I did essays, and my assumption was that they would write to express themselves for themselves. Their journal writing often had characteristics of what has traditionally been considered bad writing (spelling errors, punctuation error, grammar errors, and slang), but also had very important characteristics of good writing (fluency, embedding, personal engagement) that were sometimes lacking in the essays of the less linguistically secure students. In the journal these students have a chance to have a relatively unintimidating experience with writing, which allows them to use their own language of composing and experiment with written forms -- sentence structures, organizations, ideas -- that they may avoid in evaluated essays in an effort to be "safe." Often the better characteristics of the journal writing are later transmitted to the essays.

This technique will not work for everyone. Students like 126, for example, do not easily shift into the reflexive mode for any piece of writing done for school credit, whether or not it is evaluated. However, such students may be moved toward that mode by topics demanding personal engagement. Finding such a topic for any particular student requires consultation with him about his interest. Some students are also personally engaged by topics that draw on events in their lives to which they had a strong emotional reaction, such as "the most dangerous situation that I have encountered."

Another possibility is to encourage insecure students to do more writing outside of class which might be reflexive. The most obvious source for more outside writing in this mode are letters to family and friends. A teacher might also advise a student to keep a diary or
a calendar such as Moffett describes.¹

The key to finding uninhibiting opportunities for the insecure student to write rests in the teacher's creativity and perceptiveness. A teacher must first discover what inhibits the writer and then invent a situation in which the student can write without that inhibitor being a factor, until the student gains confidence.

4. Implications for Research

There are several directions that a researcher may go from this study, following the areas of interest in composition and linguistics. These have been suggested in the discussion of the study and several more will be mentioned here. Perhaps the most important implication for research, however, is the methodology used: the combination of quantitative research and qualitative studies. Both types of investigation have limitations, but used together they qualify and supplement one another in very useful ways.

There are various restrictions to quantitative research. The first is that this research technique can only consider counts of items. Obviously, not everything can be counted, especially not everything that affects a process like composition. It is very difficult to quantify the quality of even the writing product. One is forced, as I was, to decide upon some index of the quality of writing, and even if one chooses several indices (in this study, length of t-units, number of clauses, and number of clause types), all the factors of writing are not considered. They can't be.
Not only does most empirical research count an index, rather than the actual quality, but the quality of the index is also difficult or complex to count. Walter Loban developed a system of "mazes" for his counts, and a system of "well-formed" versus "ill-formed" clauses could have been profitably used in this study, but a system which would also include whether an idea could have been better expressed as a phrase, and adjective, an adverb, a separate sentence, or even a different type of clause would be very difficult to manage, if indeed there would be any way of determining which would be the best alternative expression.

Two other problems with quantitative research have been treated in the many books on qualitative research methods, so I will only touch upon them here. First, though quantitative research points out tendencies, it must average out important individual differences to do so. Secondly, though it show correlations, frequencies, proportions and other valuable statistics, it does not show causes and effects.

Case studies also have limitations. Their greatest problem is that they are not generalizable to a larger population. They only describe particular individuals, who may have characteristics in common with others. Who the researcher chooses for case study subjects, therefore, determines at least partially how valuable the studies will be.

Further, they are also limited by the time the subjects are observed and the number of things observed about them. The length of time, as mentioned in the earlier section, allows the research to see more or less of a process and to see more or fewer of the causes and effects of the various stages of a process. Too short of an
observation might mislead the research. If the students in my case study were followed through the two other English composition classes they must take, for instance, I doubt if they would all continue to make as rapid and as steady progress in developing their writing skills.

When the quantitative and case study approaches are used together, several of the limitations of each can be offset by the other. For instance, case studies bring out individual differences hidden in the averages and proportions of the empirical research. Likewise, the quantitative research provides a backdrop of general tendencies which put the case studies in context with the general population.

Also, though causes and effects are still not always clear in case studies, the researcher is able to look at more of the factors affecting the subject. The more factors he can consider and the closer he can work with the subject, the better he will be able to make an accurate assessment of causes and effects.

As was mentioned earlier, further research in writing mode and linguistic insecurity could be done by considering other indices besides number of clauses, types of clauses and length of t-units. Another profitable use of longitudinal case studies in conjunction with quantitative research may be to examine two comparable sets of students from a college at which composition classes are not required -- one group who took the class their freshman year and one who never took it, and examine whether their writing and linguistic insecurity are
significantly different at the end of four years, and what factors appeared to be responsible for the differences and similarities.

Though the longitudinal case studies in conjunction with empirical research have many other possibilities for investigating theoretical and pedagogical problems, the combination is only useful to the degree to which it views the composition student in a larger context. The more characteristics of the student, his culture, and his environment that it takes into account, the better, since so many factors to this point uninvestigated interact and have an effect on how and why a person writes.
APPENDIX A

RESPONSES TO THE LINGUISTIC INSECURITY TEST

The first two pages of the appendix are the possible responses to the test and whether they were rated secure or insecure. The second page is the distribution of actual scores.
The following table first lists the scores that the students received on their linguistic insecurity tests (CODE), how many students received that score (ABSOLUTE FREQ), and the percentage of the total population who received that score (RELATIVE FREQ).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>100.0</td>
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Linguistic Insecurity Test

A. Put the letter of the pronunciation of the word you use informally (with family and friends, not in school) under the column labelled 'I say' and the letter of the pronunciation which would be considered standard English (which might be used in formal situations) under the label 'Correct'. If you say both in informal situations, put both letters in that column; if you use neither, leave the column blank. If both would be correct, put both letters in that column; if neither would, leave the column blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I say</th>
<th>Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>catch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>collision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>tomato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>leash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>garage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>wash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Put an X in the column marked 'I write' after the version of the sentence you would normally write to friends or family. Put an X in the column marked 'Correct' after the version which should be written in a formal paper (i.e., for the English teacher). If you would write one sentence in both situations, put an X after it in both columns. If you could write any of the sentences in one situation, put an X after each sentence in the appropriate column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I write</th>
<th>Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a.</td>
<td>Whom did you say was here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who did you say was here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. a.</td>
<td>Were you surprised at my being here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were you surprised at me being here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. a.</td>
<td>I like to go swimming as well as going skiing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to go swimming as well as to go skiing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. a.</td>
<td>The IRS is looking for you and I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The IRS is looking for you and me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I write</td>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. a.</td>
<td>I've got to see the doctor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. I have to see the doctor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. a.</td>
<td>John's shirt needs ironed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. John's shirt needs ironing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. John's shirt needs to be ironed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. a.</td>
<td>I was shocked by him arriving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. I was shocked by his arriving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. a.</td>
<td>Politicians are so crooked nowadays, I don't know who to trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Politicians are so crooked anymore, I don't know who to trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. a.</td>
<td>The men who we met were very cordial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The men we met were very cordial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Answer these questions on the back of this sheet:

1. What do you think of your own speech?

2. Have you ever tried to change your speech? What particular things about it?

3. What do you think of your own writing?

4. Have you ever tried to change your writing? What particular things about it?
APPENDIX C
PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

In the following table nine characteristics of the students' writing are correlated with themselves. Below each correlation is listed first the coefficient, then the number of cases, and last the significance of the correlation.

The abbreviations in the table are:
TOTAL: score on the linguistic insecurity test
LEN: average length of t-units in the essay minus the average length of t-units in the journal
TOTCL: total clauses in the essay minus the total in the journal
TOTCL1: total clauses in the essay
TOTCL2: total clauses in the journal
TOTS: total words in the essay
LEN1: average length of t-units in the essay
TOTJ: total words in the journal
LEN2: average length of t-units in the journal
APPENDIX D
CROSSTABULATIONS OF QUANTITATIVE DATA

The following set of tables are crosstabulations of the responses to several questions according to the region of the student. For each question (Q), the item number is given. 1 through 9 are the items from the pronunciation section, and 11 through 19 are the items from the written section. If the question is labeled "A" (as in Q9A), it was the first half of the item, what the student thought he said or wrote. If it is labeled "B", it was the second half of the item, what the student thought was correct.

Horizontally, each cell is labeled by its dialect region. 1 equals Northern Ohio, 2 equals North Central Ohio, 3 equals South Central Ohio, 4 equals Southern Ohio, and 5 equals outside of Ohio. Vertically, they are labeled by which choice the student made on that item.

In each cell there are four numbers. The first is the actual number of students in that region who gave that response. The second is the percent of students who gave a response in a particular region. The third is the percent of students who gave a particular response. The fourth number is the percent of the total number of students who were in that region and gave that response.

The numbers to the right of the table are first, the actual number of people who gave a response, and second, the percent of the total number who gave that response. The pairs of number at the bottom are first, the actual number of people in that region, and second, the percent of the total number who were in that region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>ROW PCT</th>
<th>INORTHERN</th>
<th>NORTH CE</th>
<th>SOUTH CE</th>
<th>SOUTHERN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>COL PCT</th>
<th>1 OHIO</th>
<th>NTRAL OH</th>
<th>NTRAL OH</th>
<th>OHIO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
<td>1 I</td>
<td>2 I</td>
<td>3 I</td>
<td>4 I</td>
<td>5 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1 OHIO</td>
<td>NTRAL OH</td>
<td>NTRAL OH</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 I</td>
<td>9 I</td>
<td>4 I</td>
<td>2 I</td>
<td>3 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 I</td>
<td>2.1 I</td>
<td>3.1 I</td>
<td>4.1 I</td>
<td>5.1 I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0 I</td>
<td>37.5 I</td>
<td>16.7 I</td>
<td>8.3 I</td>
<td>12.5 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 I</td>
<td>2.1 I</td>
<td>3.1 I</td>
<td>4.1 I</td>
<td>5.1 I</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6 I</td>
<td>31.1 I</td>
<td>30.6 I</td>
<td>50.0 I</td>
<td>60.0 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 I</td>
<td>2.1 I</td>
<td>3.1 I</td>
<td>4.1 I</td>
<td>5.1 I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6 I</td>
<td>9.9 I</td>
<td>4.4 I</td>
<td>2.2 I</td>
<td>3.3 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 I</td>
<td>2.1 I</td>
<td>3.1 I</td>
<td>4.1 I</td>
<td>5.1 I</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 I</td>
<td>5.5 I</td>
<td>3.3 I</td>
<td>4.4 I</td>
<td>5.5 I</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>COUN</td>
<td>NORTHERN</td>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>TNRAL</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>TNRAL</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>PCT I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3 I</td>
<td>1 I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 I</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>1 I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>50.0 I</td>
<td>16.7 I</td>
<td>16.7 I</td>
<td>0.0 I</td>
<td>16.7 I</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32.5 I</td>
<td>44.6 I</td>
<td>14.5 I</td>
<td>3.6 I</td>
<td>4.8 I</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>27 I</td>
<td>37 I</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3 I</td>
<td>4 I</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>1 I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>100.0 I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>2.6 I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>0 I</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Column Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Missing Observations = 1**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>INORTHERN</td>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SOUTHERN</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>NTRAL</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>NTRAL</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5A</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COLUMN | 30 | 39 | 12 | 4 | 5 | 90 |
| TOTAL | 33.3 | 43.3 | 13.3 | 4.4 | 5.6 | 100.0 |

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>NORTH CE</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>SOUTH CE</th>
<th>SOUTHERN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>TOT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>INOR</td>
<td>OHI</td>
<td>NTRAL</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>NTRAL</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OHI</td>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>PCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>ROW PCT</th>
<th>NORTHERN CE</th>
<th>NORTH CE</th>
<th>SOUTH CE</th>
<th>SOUTHERN CE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>ROW PCT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>ROW PCT</th>
<th>INORTHERN</th>
<th>NORTH CE</th>
<th>SOUTH CE</th>
<th>SOUTHERN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>COL PCT</th>
<th>OHIO</th>
<th>NTRAL OH</th>
<th>NTRAL OH</th>
<th>OHIO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>INORTHERN</td>
<td>NORTH CE</td>
<td>SOUTH CE</td>
<td>SOUTHERN OTHER</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>NTRAL OH</td>
<td>NTRAL OH</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>INORTHERN</td>
<td>NORTH CE</td>
<td>SOUTH CE</td>
<td>SOUTHERN</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>1 OHIO</td>
<td>NTRAL OH</td>
<td>NTRAL OH</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>ROW PCT</th>
<th>INORTHERN</th>
<th>NORTH CE</th>
<th>SOUTH CE</th>
<th>SOUTHERN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>ROW TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>I OHIO</td>
<td>NTRAL OH</td>
<td>NTRAL OH</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td></td>
<td>I TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.I</td>
<td>3.I</td>
<td>4.I</td>
<td>5.I</td>
<td>I TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>NORTHERN</td>
<td>NORTH CE</td>
<td>SOUTH CE</td>
<td>SOUTHERN</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>I OHIO</td>
<td>NTRAL OH</td>
<td>NTRAL OH</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>ROW PCT</th>
<th>INORTHERN</th>
<th>NORTHERN</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>SOUTHERN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>COL PCT</th>
<th>OHIO</th>
<th>NTRAL</th>
<th>OHIO</th>
<th>OHIO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13B</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOT PCT</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>NTAL OH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>NTKAL OH</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>INORTHERN</td>
<td>NORTH CE</td>
<td>SOUTH CE</td>
<td>SOUTHERN</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT PCI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 11</td>
<td>1 15</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 18</td>
<td>1 23</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMNT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>INORTHERN</td>
<td>NORTHERN CE</td>
<td>SOUTH CE</td>
<td>SOUTHERN</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>Row PCT</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SOUTHERN</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


