Calls for attention

Laurie and Winifred Bauer

Question 23 was designed to elicit calls for attention:

23 You have found a strange insect. Your friends are standing some distance away, but you want them to come and look at it. What would you say to get their attention?

It was only partially successful in doing so, as can be seen from the fact that 42 schools (approaching one third) failed to record a codable response to this question. There were a number of reasons for this failure. The first was that the question elicited a large number of address terms without any associated call for attention, e.g. *You guys, come and look at this.* These responses were not wasted, because the address terms provided were included in the information analysed in 18aii. There were also large numbers of responses without either an address term or a call for attention, e.g. *Come here.* A few of these seemed to be of potential interest, and were coded as 23b. Only calls for attention were included in the data for 23a.

A number of calls for attention were recorded only once or twice, and were ignored. There were seven which were worth further investigation: *hey* (60); *oi* (49); *yoh* (12); *wow* (8); *ho* (4); *hoy* (4); *eh* (3). *Wow* is dubiously a call for attention, but rather an attention-getting exclamation. However, the distinction is somewhat blurred, and nothing hangs on this classification.

Hey was reported from Northland to Southland. It appears to be the dominant form in the South Island, where its only significant competitor was *oi*. However, the numbers of occurrences show that it is not more common there than in the North Island. There is perhaps a slight tendency for *hey* to be used in higher rather than lower decile schools, but it is not strong:



Oi is also found from Northland to Southland. As the following table shows, there is a slight tendency for this to be more frequent in the Northern Region, but it is by no means exclusive to that region.

	Northern Region		Central Region		Southern Region	
	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	No.	% of total
Schools	57	38	78	52	14	9
Oi	22	45	23	47	4	8

There is a more pronounced tendency for it to be a North Island rather than a South Island form:

	North	Island	South Island		
	No.	%	No.	%	
Schools	93	62	57	38	
Oi	35	71	14	29	

There is also a tendency for this to be an urban rather than a rural form:

	Urban No. %		Rural		
	No.	%	No.	%	
Schools	61	40	89	60	
Oi	26	53	23	47	

However, this may be influenced by the tendency for it to be a North Island form, since there is a slightly higher proportion of urban schools in the North Island than in the South Island.

Oi seems to be fairly evenly distributed across deciles, although it was not reported by any decile 1 schools:



Yoh is very patchy in its distribution. It was reported three times in Northland and twice in Auckland, giving 42% of its occurrences in schools in the north of the Northern Region. There was one report from Taranaki and one from Hawkes Bay, then three in Wellington, one in Christchurch and one in central Otago. This does not appear to provide any clear pattern. It is also fairly evenly spread across deciles.

Wow was reported 5 times from the Northern Region, and three times from the Central Region, with only one occurrence in the South Island. It thus shows a tendency to be both North Island and Northern Region, but with so few

occurrences, no great weight can be placed on this. It showed no tendency to be associated with particular deciles.

Ho was reported twice in Northland, once in Auckland, and once in the Bay of Plenty. All four occurrences were thus in the Northern Region. It was reported from decile 1, 3, 6 and 8 schools. It thus shows no evidence of being socially marked, although it may be found only in schools with a significant Maori population.

Hoy was reported twice in Northland, once in the Waikato, and once in Hawkes Bay. All occurrences are thus in the North Island, and predominantly in the Northern Region. More significant, however, is the decile profile of *hoy*: it is reported only from low decile schools:



Eh was a rare form, reported twice from Northland, and once from the timber belt. It is also a low decile form: the schools reporting it were all from deciles 1 – 3.

Thus attention calls show little signs of regionalisation, but some signs of being socially marked in at least some instances.

Since quite a lot of data was provided about alternatives to "Come and look at this", analysis of this data was also undertaken. However, it was not easy to code, and what was coded was not easy to group. One of the major dichotomies which emerged was the difference between *come and look* and *come look* and other similar pairs (*come and have a look/gawk..., come have a...,* etc.). However, when this data was extracted, it showed no patterning on either a regional or a social dimension.

When this dimension was removed from the data, there were only four items worth considering: *check this out* (36), *look what I found* (23), *come/get over here* (13) and *get your butt(s) over here* (10).

Check this out appears to be largely a Northern form, although there are a number of reports from the Central Region. There are none from the Southern Region. Tables showing the figures for the three-region and the Island divisions follow:

	Northern Region		Centr	al Region	Southern Region	
	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	No.	% of total
Schools	57	38	78	52	14	9
Check this out	22	61	13	36	0	0

	North Island		South Island	
	No.	%	No.	%
Schools	93	62	57	38
Check this out	28	78	8	22

Clearly both tendencies are there, and some further statistical analysis will be required to determine how strong these correlations are.

Look what I found was reported from Northland to Southland, with no evidence of patterning, except that the lack of competition from other forms made this the norm in the Southern region.

Get your butt over here was dotted throughout the country.

Come/get over here was essentially found from Northland to Southland, but there was an unexpected gap in the lower portion of the North Island, with only one report south of Hamilton.

None of these forms showed signs of social differentiation.

Thus this set of data as a whole does not appear to show a great deal of regional patterning.

Statistical Analysis

The forms from 23a which underwent statistical analysis were *oi* and *yoh*. The only correlation which approached statistical significance was the tendency of *oi* to be urban rather than rural (p-value 0.0510).

From 23b, only the form *check this out* was analysed. Because there were no reports of this from the Southern Region, the program returned the result that it is significantly more common in the Northern Region than the Southern Region (p-value 0.0001), but did not return the – equally expected – result that it is more common in the Central Region than the Southern Region. It could not produce a contrast statement, so the Southern Region was eliminated to obtain the comparison between the Northern and Central Regions. This showed that *check this out* is significantly more common in the Northern Region than the Central Region (p-value 0.0050).

It was also shown to be more frequent in the North Island than the South (p-value 0.0286).

When the relationship between the Main Region factor and the Island factor was investigated, the results showed that the Main Region effect is much stronger. When Island is taken into account, the p-value comparing the Northern and Southern Regions was 0.0001; the p-value comparing the Northern and Central Regions was 0.0100. The p-value for Island variation when Main Region is taken into account was not significant. Thus the fact that this correlated with the North Island is largely explained by its distribution in the Northern Region and its absence from the South.

Summary

This was not a particularly successful question. However, even in such a poor data set, there is evidence for difference between the Northern and Central Regions in particular. This can probably be seen as evidence for the pervasiveness of this regional divide.

The accompanying map shows the distribution of *oi* and *Check this out*.





Christchurch Timaru

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.



Oi

See urban map insert

©Laurie and Winifred Bauer 2002

Check this out

Q23a Statistics: Attention calls Attention calls 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	oi	-1.3766	0.4037	-2.1679	-0.5853	-3.410	0.0007
item	yoh	-2.7830	0.7654	-4.2831	-1.2828	-3.636	0.0003
decile*item	oi	0.1105	0.0608	-0.0087	0.2297	1.8173	0.0692
decile*item	yoh	0.0574	0.1146	-0.1672	0.2820	0.5008	0.6165
scale	0.9990		•				

Attention calls 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	oi	-0.9163	0.5916	-2.0758	0.2432	-1.549	0.1214
item	yoh	-2.5649	1.0377	-4.5989	-0.5310	-2.472	0.0134
item*region1	oi, 1	0.4520	0.6512	-0.8243	1.7283	0.6941	0.4876
item*region1	oi, 2	0.0445	0.6416	-1.2131	1.3020	0.0693	0.9448
item*region1	oi, 3	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*region1	yoh, 1	0.4249	1.1239	-1.7780	2.6277	0.3780	0.7054
item*region1	yoh, 2	-0.1161	1.1361	-2.3427	2.1106	1022	0.9186
item*region1	yoh, 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 oi	1	1.2240	0.2686	LR
1 -2 for yoh	1	0.7350	0.3913	LR

Attention	calls	by	Sub	Region
-----------	-------	----	-----	--------

Analysis (Of Initial	Parameter	Estimates
------------	------------	-----------	-----------

parameter		DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSquare	Pr>Chi
intercept	0	0.00	0.0000			
item	oi	1	-0.9163	0.5916	2.3988	0.1214
item	yoh	1	-2.5649	1.0377	6.1090	0.0134
item*region2	oi, 1	1	0.2231	1.0488	0.0453	0.8315
item*region2	oi, 2	1	-0.6931	1.2450	0.3100	0.5777
item*region2	oi, 3	1	1.0217	0.7491	1.8602	0.1726
item*region2	oi, 4	1	0.2803	0.7211	0.1511	0.6975
item*region2	oi, 5	1	0.2231	0.8515	0.0687	0.7933
item*region2	oi, 6	1	0.3567	0.7392	0.2328	0.6294
item*region2	oi, 7	1	-1.1632	1.2145	0.9172	0.3382
item*region2	oi, 8	1	-0.6931	1.2450	0.3100	0.5777
item*region2	oi, 9	1	0.4643	0.7640	0.3693	0.5434
item*region2	oi, 10	1	-1.2809	1.2088	1.1230	0.2893
item*region2	oi, 11	0	0.0000	0.0000		
item*region2	yoh, 1	1	1.8718	1.3516	1.9178	0.1661
item*region2	yoh, 2	1	0.9555	1.5089	0.4010	0.5266
item*region2	yoh, 3	1	0.4249	1.2790	0.1104	0.7397
item*region2	yoh, 4	1	-0.6539	1.4550	0.2020	0.6531
item*region2	yoh, 5	1	0.1671	1.4724	0.0129	0.9097
item*region2	yoh, 6	1	0.7191	1.2095	0.3535	0.5521
item*region2	yoh, 7	1	-22.8004	107371.404	0.0000	0.9998
item*region2	yoh, 8	1	-22.8004	131502.576	0.0000	0.9999
item*region2	yoh, 9	1	-0.2683	1.4614	0.0337	0.8544
item*region2	yoh, 10	1	-22.8004	101861.457	0.0000	0.9998
item*region2	yoh, 11	0	0.0000	0.0000	•	
scale	0	1.00	0.0000		•	

Attention calls 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	oi	-1.1221	0.3077	-1.7252	-0.5190	-3.647	0.0003
item	yoh	-3.3142	0.7198	-4.7251	-1.9033	-4.604	0.0000
item*island	oi, 1	0.6170	0.3748	-0.1176	1.3517	1.6462	0.0997
item*island	oi, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*island	yoh, 1	1.1979	0.7939	-0.3580	2.7539	1.5090	0.1313
item*island	yoh, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000	•		•	•	•	

Attention calls 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	oi	0.0000	0.5000	-0.9800	0.9800	0.0000	1.0000
item	yoh	-1.4663	0.6405	-2.7217	-0.2110	-2.289	0.0221
item*catholic	oi, 1	-0.7862	0.5343	-1.8335	0.2610	-1.471	0.1412
item*catholic	oi, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*catholic	yoh, 1	-1.1405	0.7277	-2.5667	0.2858	-1.567	0.1171
item*catholic	yoh, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000			•	•	•	

Attention calls 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	oi	-0.3075	0.2635	-0.8239	0.2089	-1.167	0.2432
item	yoh	-2.0053	0.4026	-2.7944	-1.2162	-4.981	0.0000
item*urb_rur	oi, 1	-0.7002	0.3588	-1.4035	0.0031	-1.951	0.0510
item*urb_rur	oi, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*urb_rur	yoh, 1	-0.7797	0.6119	-1.9790	0.4196	-1.274	0.2026
item*urb_rur	yoh, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000	•				•	

Q23b Statistics: Check this out

Check this out 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	check_o	-1.0276	0.4556	-1.9205	-0.1348	-2.256	0.0241
decile*item	check_o	-0.0218	0.0730	-0.1649	0.1212	2995	0.7646
scale	1.0001	•	•	•	•	•	

Check this out by Main Region

Analysis Of Initial Parameter Estimates

		DE	D	0.15	<u>a</u> 1 ; a	
parameter		DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSquare	Pr>Chi
intercept	0	0.0000	0.0000	•		
item	check_o	1	-25.3653	0.3038	6970.1610	0.0001
item*region1	check_o, 1	1	24.9010	0.4078	3727.8114	0.0001
item*region1	check_o, 2	0	23.7559	0.0000		•
item*region1	check_o, 3	0	0.0000	0.0000		
scale	0	1.0000	0.0000	•		

CONTRAST Statement Results

Contrast	DF	ChiSquare	Pr>Chi	Туре
1 -2 for check_o	1	8.2006	0.0042	LR

Check this out by Sub-Region

Analysis Of Initial Parameter Estimates

parameter		DF	Estimate	StdErr	ChiSquare	Pr>Chi
intercept	0	0.00	0.0000	•		
item	check_o	1	-25.3651	1.0541	579.0486	0.0001
item*region2	check_o, 1	1	26.0582	1.3642	364.8526	0.0001
item*region2	check_o, 2	1	23.7556	1.5202	244.1815	0.0001
item*region2	check_o, 3	1	25.0466	1.1520	472.7385	0.0001
item*region2	check_o, 4	1	24.7291	1.1318	477.3662	0.0001
item*region2	check_o, 5	1	23.7556	1.3081	329.8036	0.0001
item*region2	check_o, 6	1	23.5193	1.2236	369.4905	0.0001
item*region2	check_o, 7	1	25.1419	1.2494	404.9148	0.0001
item*region2	check_o, 8	1	23.7556	1.5202	244.1815	0.0001
item*region2	check_o, 9	1	23.2856	1.2937	323.9827	0.0001
item*region2	check_o, 10	0	23.1679	0.0000		
item*region2	check_o, 11	0	0.0000	0.0000	•	
scale	0	1.00	0.0000			

Check this out by Island

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

parameter		Est.	StdErr	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.0000					•	
item	check_o	-1.8124	0.3813	-2.5598	-1.0650	-4.753	0.0000
item*island	check_o, 1	0.9702	0.4433	0.1014	1.8390	2.1886	0.0286
item*island	check_o, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000	•	•	•	•	•	

Check this out 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	check_o	-1.4663	0.6405	-2.7217	-0.2110	-2.289	0.0221
item*catholic	check_o, 1	0.3779	0.6714	-0.9380	1.6938	0.5628	0.5736
item*catholic	check_o, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000	•	•	•	•	•	

Check this out 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	check_o	-1.1676	0.3060	-1.7674	-0.5678	-3.815	0.0001
item*urb_rur	check_o, 1	0.0377	0.3958	-0.7380	0.8135	0.0954	0.9240
item*urb_rur	check_o, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000	•	•	•	•	•	

Check this out in Northern and Central Regions only

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	check_o	-1.6094	0.3038	-2.2049	-1.0140	-5.297	0.0000
item*region1	check_o, 1	1.1451	0.4078	0.3458	1.9445	2.8078	0.0050
item*region1	check_o, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000						

Check this out by Main Region and Island, Model 2 (no sig. figs in Model 1)

Analysis Of Initial Parameter Estimates

parameter		DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSquare	Pr>Chi
intercept	0	0.00	0.0000	•		
item	check_o	1	-25.3654	0.3919	4189.5922	0.0001
item*region1	check_o, 1	1	25.2169	0.5544	2068.8900	0.0001
item*region1	check_o, 2	0	23.8895	0.0000		•
item*region1	check_o, 3	0	0.0000	0.0000		•
item*island	check_o, 1	1	-0.3159	0.6220	0.2578	0.6116
item*island	check_o, 2	0	0.0000	0.0000		•
scale	0	1.00	0.0000			

CONTRAST Statement Results

Contrast	DF	ChiSquare	Pr>Chi	Туре
1 -2 for check_o	1	6.6278	0.0100	LR

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

parameter		Est.	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.0000	•	•	•	•	•	
item	check_o	-1.4759	0.3919	-2.2440	-0.7078	-3.766	0.0002
item*region1	check_o, 1	1.3275	0.5544	0.2408	2.4141	2.3944	0.0166
item*region1	check_o, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
item*island	check_o, 1	-0.3159	0.6220	-1.5350	0.9033	5078	0.6116
item*island	check_o, 2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000		•			•	

Check this out by Sub-Region in SRs 1-9 only

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

parameter		Est.	Std Err	Lower	Upper	Ζ	Pr> Z
intercept	0.0000	•	•	•	•	•	
item	check_o	-2.0794	0.7500	-3.5494	-0.6095	-2.773	0.0056
item*region2	check_o, 1	2.7726	1.1456	0.5272	5.0180	2.4201	0.0155
item*region2	check_o, 2	0.4700	1.3276	-2.1320	3.0720	0.3540	0.7233
item*region2	check_o, 3	1.7610	0.8823	0.0318	3.4902	1.9960	0.0459
item*region2	check_o, 4	1.4435	0.8558	-0.2339	3.1208	1.6866	0.0917
item*region2	check_o, 5	0.4700	1.0782	-1.6432	2.5832	0.4359	0.6629
item*region2	check_0, 6	0.2336	0.9739	-1.6752	2.1424	0.2399	0.8104
item*region2	check_o, 7	1.8563	1.0062	-0.1159	3.8285	1.8448	0.0651
item*region2	check_o, 8	0.4700	1.3276	-2.1320	3.0720	0.3540	0.7233
item*region2	check_o, 9	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
scale	1.0000	•	•	•	•	•	

Check this out by Main Region and Island in Northern and Central Regions only