## 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 $\qquad$ "?
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.
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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 | Z | Pr $>\|\mathrm{Z}\|$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 | Z | $\operatorname{Pr}>\|\mathrm{Z}\|$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 | Type |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1-2$ for candy | 1 | 0.2383 | 0.6255 | LR |
| 1 -2 for goodies | 1 | 0.6872 | 0.4071 | LR |

Alternatives for lollies by Sub-Region
Analysis of Initial Parameter Estimates

| 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 Island
Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates - Empirical Standard Error Estimates
Empirical 95\% Confidence Limits

| parameter |  | Estimate | Std Err | Lower | Upper | Z | Pr $>\|\mathrm{Z}\|$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 | Z | Pr $>\|\mathrm{Z}\|$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 | Z | $\operatorname{Pr}>\|\mathrm{Z}\|$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 1 9}$ |
| 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 | . | . | . | . | . |  |

