Lollies

Laurie and Winifred Bauer

Question 15 asked what word the children used for confectionery:

15 Brackie goes to the shop and buys a mixed bag of things like jaffas, winegums, toffees, Minties, and liquorice all-sorts. How would you finish the sentence "Brackie's got a bag of ______"?

There were 40 different answers to this question, rather more than we anticipated. That total does not include the quite common response of *mixed lollies*, which was counted as an instance of *lollies*, and other simplifications of that sort. Many terms occurred only once, and many others only two or three times.

The most frequent term by far was *lollies*. Of the 150 schools which participated, one lost the relevant sheet of the questionnaire, so we effectively had 149 responses. Of those only two did not report *lollies*.

The other terms with some frequency were *sweets* (64), *candy/candies* (21), *goodies* (20), *junk (food)* (16), *yummies* (and other expressions using *yum*, e.g. *yum-yums*) (8), *treats* (7), *stuff* (6). There were also two reports of *sugar*, both from Auckland. When we mapped these alternatives, there did not appear to be any particularly significant patterns in their distribution.

However, 14 of the 21 occurrences of *candy* were in urban areas, i.e. 66%. 61 of our 150 schools are in urban areas, i.e. 40.6%. There is thus a tendency for *candy/candies* to be an urban form. The plural form of this was used only in Auckland and the area immediately north of Auckland.

13 of the 20 occurrences of *goodies* were reported in the central area of the country, from Hawkes Bay and Taranaki to Christchurch, so this might be a Central Region form.

Of the eight occurrences of *yummy* forms, four were in Auckland and Northland, and the other four were scattered through the South Island. There is thus a large gap in the distribution of this form.

Nevertheless, the overall picture is that *lollies* is still entirely secure in its place in New Zealand English. We believe that the prevalence of *sweets* is due to the fact that in formal situations, such as school rules, *sweets* is likely to be used rather than *lollies*, so that children are perfectly familiar with this, although it is probably not what they would say themselves except when discussing the formal ban on such things from schools. The use of *candy* may be due to the presence of North American immigrants in city schools, or the influence of TV, or both. We do not, of course, know whether this term was supplied by NZ children in these schools, or by outsiders, although in one case, the teacher noted that it had been supplied by a child who had recently arrived from Britain.

Statistical Analysis

Only two terms were deemed worth including in the statistical analysis: *candy* and *goodies*. The statistical analysis produced only one significant correlation: *candy* is urban rather than rural, with a p-value of 0.0119. The regionalisation of *goodies* was not confirmed, probably because the inclusion of Taranaki in the Northern Region rather than the Central Region in the statistical analysis (well justified in terms of overall patterns) evened out the regional distribution.



Map: Two alternatives for *Iollies: candy, goodies*



Key

Note that the insets are not to scale, nor all on the same scale for practical reasons. Each box represents one school in both urban and rural areas.



goodies

See urban map insert

candy

Q15 Statistics: alternatives for *lollies* Alternatives for *lollies* by Decile

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

| parameter | | Estimate | Std Err | Lower | Upper | Ζ | Pr> Z |
|-------------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| intercept | 0.0000 | | • | | | • | |
| item | candy | -1.7691 | 0.5330 | -2.8137 | -0.7245 | -3.319 | 0.0009 |
| item | goodies | -1.7713 | 0.5584 | -2.8658 | -0.6768 | -3.172 | 0.0015 |
| decile*item | candy | -0.0080 | 0.0836 | -0.1718 | 0.1557 | 0963 | 0.9233 |
| decile*item | goodies | -0.0176 | 0.0890 | -0.1920 | 0.1568 | 1976 | 0.8434 |
| scale | 1.0000 | | | | | | |

Alternatives for *lollies* by Main Region

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

| parameter | | Estimate | Std Err | Lower | Upper | Ζ | Pr> Z |
|--------------|------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| intercept | 0.0000 | | • | | | • | |
| item | candy | -1.7918 | 0.7638 | -3.2887 | -0.2948 | -2.346 | 0.0190 |
| item | goodies | -2.5649 | 1.0377 | -4.5989 | -0.5310 | -2.472 | 0.0134 |
| item*region1 | candy, 1 | 0.1178 | 0.8457 | -1.5398 | 1.7754 | 0.1393 | 0.8892 |
| item*region1 | candy, 2 | -0.1252 | 0.8355 | -1.7627 | 1.5124 | 1498 | 0.8809 |
| item*region1 | candy, 3 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| item*region1 | goodies, 1 | 0.4249 | 1.1239 | -1.7780 | 2.6277 | 0.3780 | 0.7054 |
| item*region1 | goodies, 2 | 0.8602 | 1.0842 | -1.2647 | 2.9851 | 0.7934 | 0.4275 |
| item*region1 | goodies, 3 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| scale | 1.0000 | | • | • | • | • | |

CONTRAST Statement Results

| Contrast | DF | ChiSquare | Pr>Chi | Туре |
|------------------|----|-----------|--------|------|
| 1 -2 for candy | 1 | 0.2383 | 0.6255 | LR |
| 1 -2 for goodies | 1 | 0.6872 | 0.4071 | LR |

| parameter | | DF | Estimate | Std Err | ChiSquare | Pr>Chi |
|--------------|-------------|------|----------|------------|-----------|--------|
| intercept | 0 | 0.00 | 0.0000 | • | | |
| item | candy | 1 | -1.7918 | 0.7638 | 5.5035 | 0.0190 |
| item | goodies | 1 | -2.5649 | 1.0377 | 6.1090 | 0.0134 |
| item*region2 | candy, 1 | 1 | -24.5736 | 216811.094 | 0.0000 | 0.9999 |
| item*region2 | candy, 2 | 1 | 0.1823 | 1.3354 | 0.0186 | 0.8914 |
| item*region2 | candy, 3 | 1 | 1.2528 | 0.8997 | 1.9387 | 0.1638 |
| item*region2 | candy, 4 | 1 | -1.4271 | 1.2741 | 1.2546 | 0.2627 |
| item*region2 | candy, 5 | 1 | 0.1823 | 1.0878 | 0.0281 | 0.8669 |
| item*region2 | candy, 6 | 1 | 0.5680 | 0.9177 | 0.3831 | 0.5360 |
| item*region2 | candy, 7 | 1 | 0.5390 | 1.1073 | 0.2369 | 0.6264 |
| item*region2 | candy, 8 | 1 | -24.5736 | 216811.094 | 0.0000 | 0.9999 |
| item*region2 | candy, 9 | 1 | -1.0415 | 1.2815 | 0.6605 | 0.4164 |
| item*region2 | candy, 10 | 1 | -24.5736 | 167941.152 | 0.0000 | 0.9999 |
| item*region2 | candy, 11 | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | | |
| item*region2 | goodies, 1 | 1 | 0.9555 | 1.5089 | 0.4010 | 0.5266 |
| item*region2 | goodies, 2 | 1 | -23.8004 | 216811.094 | 0.0000 | 0.9999 |
| item*region2 | goodies, 3 | 1 | 0.8910 | 1.2136 | 0.5390 | 0.4628 |
| item*region2 | goodies, 4 | 1 | 0.0800 | 1.2722 | 0.0040 | 0.9498 |
| item*region2 | goodies, 5 | 1 | 1.4663 | 1.2334 | 1.4133 | 0.2345 |
| item*region2 | goodies, 6 | 1 | 0.7191 | 1.2095 | 0.3535 | 0.5521 |
| item*region2 | goodies, 7 | 1 | 0.4855 | 1.4839 | 0.1071 | 0.7435 |
| item*region2 | goodies, 8 | 1 | 0.9555 | 1.5089 | 0.4010 | 0.5266 |
| item*region2 | goodies, 9 | 1 | 0.9555 | 1.2153 | 0.6182 | 0.4317 |
| item*region2 | goodies, 10 | 1 | 0.3677 | 1.4792 | 0.0618 | 0.8037 |
| item*region2 | goodies, 11 | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | | |
| scale | 0 | 1.00 | 0.0000 | • | | |

Alternatives for *lollies* by Sub-Region

Analysis of Initial Parameter Estimates

Alternatives for *lollies* by Island

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

| parameter | | Estimate | Std Err | Lower | Upper | Ζ | Pr> Z |
|-------------|------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| intercept | 0.0000 | | • | | • | | |
| item | candy | -2.3418 | 0.4682 | -3.2595 | -1.4241 | -5.001 | 0.0000 |
| item | goodies | -1.9661 | 0.4036 | -2.7571 | -1.1752 | -4.872 | 0.0000 |
| item*island | candy, 1 | 0.7706 | 0.5429 | -0.2934 | 1.8346 | 1.4194 | 0.1558 |
| item*island | candy, 2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| item*island | goodies, 1 | 0.1490 | 0.5023 | -0.8354 | 1.1335 | 0.2967 | 0.7667 |
| item*island | goodies, 2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| scale | 1.0000 | | • | • | • | • | |

Alternatives for *lollies* by Catholic

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

| parameter | | Estimate | Std Err | Lower | Upper | Ζ | Pr> Z |
|---------------|------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| intercept | 0.0000 | • | • | • | • | • | |
| item | candy | -1.0986 | 0.5774 | -2.2302 | 0.0330 | -1.903 | 0.0571 |
| item | goodies | -1.9459 | 0.7559 | -3.4275 | -0.4643 | -2.574 | 0.0100 |
| item*catholic | candy, 1 | -0.8044 | 0.6332 | -2.0454 | 0.4367 | -1.270 | 0.2040 |
| item*catholic | candy, 2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| item*catholic | goodies, 1 | 0.1089 | 0.7974 | -1.4540 | 1.6718 | 0.1366 | 0.8914 |
| item*catholic | goodies, 2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| scale | 1.0000 | • | • | • | • | • | |

Alternatives for *lollies* by Urban/Rural

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

| parameter | | Estimate | Std Err | Lower | Upper | Ζ | Pr> Z |
|--------------|------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| intercept | 0.0000 | • | • | • | • | • | |
| item | candy | -1.1676 | 0.3060 | -1.7674 | -0.5678 | -3.815 | 0.0001 |
| item | goodies | -1.7148 | 0.3621 | -2.4245 | -1.0051 | -4.736 | 0.0000 |
| item*urb_rur | candy, 1 | -1.2559 | 0.4992 | -2.2343 | -0.2776 | -2.516 | 0.0119 |
| item*urb_rur | candy, 2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| item*urb_rur | goodies, 1 | -0.2048 | 0.4851 | -1.1556 | 0.7460 | 4221 | 0.6729 |
| item*urb_rur | goodies, 2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| scale | 1.0000 | • | | | | | |