

The Language Attitude Survey of Jamaica

DATA ANALYSIS

**THE JAMAICAN LANGUAGE UNIT
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE, LINGUISTICS & PHILOSOPHY
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES & EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST INDIES, MONA**

November 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THE JAMAICAN LANGUAGE UNIT WISHES TO THANK THE STUDENTS OF THE L331 CLASS WHO TOOK PART IN THE DATA COLLECTION PROCESS, THE GRADUATE STUDENTS WHO SUPERVISED THE FIELD WORK AND THE OFFICE STAFF AND THE DATA ENTRY PERSONNEL FOR THEIR COOPERATION IN MAKING THIS RESEARCH PROJECT A SUCCESSFUL ONE.

WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO ESPECIALLY THANK MR. SEBASTIAN THOMAS WHO PREPARED THIS STATISTICAL REPORT OF THE DATA ANALYSIS.

THE JAMAICAN LANGUAGE UNIT

NOVEMBER, 2005

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| List of Tables | 3 |
| Executive Summary | 5 |
| Data Presentation and Report for Language Attitude Survey of Jamaica | 6 |
| • <i>A. Profile of the Sample</i> | 6 |
| • <i>B. Language Awareness</i> | 8 |
| • <i>C. Government/Public Use</i> | 14 |
| • <i>D. Language Use and Social Stereotypes</i> | 15 |
| • <i>E. Education</i> | 30 |
| • <i>F. Writing in a Standard Form</i> | 33 |
| • <i>G. Occupation</i> | 37 |
| Appendix | 50 |
| • <i>Questionnaires</i> | 50 |
| • <i>SPSS Output</i> | 52 |

List of Tables

- Table 1:** Demographic Variables for Survey
- Table 2:** Sample Structure
- Table 3:** Sample Distribution of Languages Spoken
- Table 4:** Languages Spoken by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 5:** To whom do you speak by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 6:** To whom do you speak Patwa by to whom do you speak English
- Table 7:** If Minister made speech in Patwa would you think he is:
- Table 8:** If Minister made speech in Patwa by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 9:** Sample Distribution of Stereotypes
- Table 10:** Who is more intelligent by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 11:** Who is more honest by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 12:** Who is more educated by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 13:** Who is more friendly by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 14:** Has more Money by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 15:** Who is more helpful by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 16:** Which school is better for the Jamaican Child
- Table 17:** Which school is better by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 18:** Sample Distribution of Writing Variables
- Table 19:** Is Patwa a Language by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 20:** Should Patwa be an Official Language by Gender, Age, Parish & Region
- Table 21:** Occupation

- Table 22:** Languages Spoken by Occupation
- Table 23:** To whom do you speak by Occupation
- Table 24:** Government/Public Use by Occupation
- Table 25:** Who is more Intelligent by Occupation
- Table 26:** Who is more Honest by Occupation
- Table 27:** Who is more Educated by Occupation
- Table 28:** Who is more Friendly by Occupation
- Table 29:** Who is has more Money by Occupation
- Table 30:** Who is more Helpful by Occupation
- Table 31:** Which school would be better by Occupation
- Table 32:** Is Patwa a Language by Occupation
- Table 33:** Should Patwa be an Official Language by Occupation

Executive Summary

The Language Attitude Survey of Jamaica (LAS) was an island wide study conducted by the Jamaican Language Unit (JLU) to assess the views of Jamaicans towards Patwa (Jamaican Creole) as a language. The sample consisted of 1,000 Jamaicans, stratified along the variables of region (western, central and eastern), area (urban and rural), age (18-30yrs, 31-50yrs and 51yrs and older) and gender.

The sample, in general, had a fairly positive view of Patwa. The majority felt that Patwa was a language and that parliament should make it an official language alongside English. Most indicated that they spoke Patwa with family and friends but not with strangers and co-workers. A significant majority of the sample also felt that a school that taught in English and Patwa would be better than an English only school for Jamaican children.

Despite this, several stereotypical views of Patwa were held by a number of respondents in the sample. For instance, most people felt that an English speaker was more intelligent and educated. Additionally, less than 10% of the sample thought, that a Patwa speaker would have more money than an English speaker.

Several significant relationships were found between the demographic and language variables. The oldest age group (51 years and older) tended to have more negative or conservative views of Patwa when compared with the younger age groups.

Occupation also seemed to have a significant impact on language variables. Though still relatively positive, unskilled/housewives and unemployed individuals tended to be more likely to have negative attitudes towards Patwa.

Data Presentation and Report for Language Attitude Survey of Jamaica

A. Profile of the Sample

The Language Attitude Questionnaire, which is a part of a study conducted by the Jamaican Language Unit (JLU), was randomly administered to a total of 1,000 Jamaican respondents. The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the demographic characteristics of these participants, as well as how these characteristics were used to design the sample structure for the survey.

| | | Frequency (%) |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Region | <i>Western</i> | <i>200 (20%)</i> |
| | <i>Central</i> | <i>200 (20%)</i> |
| | <i>Eastern</i> | <i>600 (60%)</i> |
| Area | <i>Urban</i> | <i>519 (51.9%)</i> |
| | <i>Rural</i> | <i>481 (48.1%)</i> |
| Gender | <i>Male</i> | <i>501 (50.1%)</i> |
| | <i>Female</i> | <i>499 (49.9%)</i> |
| Age Groups | <i>18-30yrs</i> | <i>334 (33.4%)</i> |
| | <i>31-50yrs</i> | <i>334 (33.4%)</i> |
| | <i>51-80+yrs</i> | <i>332 (33.2%)</i> |

As can be seen in table 1, the majority of respondents were from eastern parishes (60%), while western and central parishes equally comprised the remaining 40% of the sample. In terms of urban and rural parishes, respondents constituted 51.9% and 41.8% of these areas respectively.

There was little difference in the number of male and female respondents with the male proportion being slightly larger at 51.1%. This equality between groups was also true of the three age groups in the sample, with 18-30 year olds, 31-50 year olds and those 51 years or older, representing roughly a third of the sample each.

| Table 2: Sample Structure (N=1,000) | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | Age Groups | | | |
| | | | 18-30yrs | 31-50yrs | 51-80+yrs |
| Western | Urban | Males | 17 (50%) | 17 (50%) | 17 (51.5%) |
| | | Females | 17 (50%) | 17 (50%) | 16 (48.5%) |
| | | All Sexes | 34 | 34 | 33 |
| | Rural | Males | 17 (51.5%) | 17 (51.5%) | 16 (48.5%) |
| | | Females | 16 (48.5%) | 16 (48.5%) | 17 (51.5%) |
| | | All Sexes | 33 | 33 | 33 |
| All Areas | | 67 | 67 | 66 | |
| Central | Urban | Males | 17 (50%) | 17 (51.5%) | 16 (37.2%) |
| | | Females | 17 (50%) | 16 (48.5%) | 27 (62.8%) |
| | | All Sexes | 34 | 33 | 43 |
| | Rural | Males | 17 (51.5%) | 16 (47.1%) | 17 (73.9%) |
| | | Females | 16 (48.5%) | 18 (52.9%) | 6 (26.1%) |
| | | All Sexes | 33 | 34 | 23 |
| All Areas | | 67 | 67 | 66 | |
| Eastern | Urban | Males | 50 (50%) | 50 (50%) | 58 (53.7%) |
| | | Females | 50 (50%) | 50 (50%) | 50 (46.3%) |
| | | All Sexes | 100 | 100 | 108 |
| | Rural | Males | 50 (50%) | 50 (50%) | 42 (45.7%) |
| | | Females | 50 (50%) | 50 (50%) | 50 (54.3%) |
| | | All Sexes | 100 | 100 | 92 |
| All Areas | | 200 | 200 | 200 | |
| Total | | | 334 | 334 | 332 |

Region (western, central and eastern), area (urban and rural), age (18-30yrs, 31-50yrs and 51yrs and older) and gender were the variables used to design the stratified sample for the LAS. In the final analysis 36 individual strata broken down by the four key variables were formed.

As has been previously indicated the majority of the sample came from the eastern region, this meant that the twelve strata found in this region were significantly larger than the twenty four found in the other regions. The strata in the western and central regions were more less equal to each other, with the exception of the central region's, rural, 51 years and older female group (which was relatively smaller) and the central region's, urban, 51 years and older female group (which was relatively larger).

B. Language Awareness

Having gathered demographic information, the second major subsection of the Language Attitude questionnaire was Language Awareness. This section had questions on what languages respondents declared themselves speakers of, and to whom respondents spoke English and Patwa. It should be noted that the languages of focus for this project were English and Patwa, this meant that any other languages that participants declared they spoke outside of these languages were ignored.

| Table 3: Sample Distribution of Languages Spoken (N=1,000) | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| What Languages do you Speak? | | Frequency | (%) |
| <i>English</i> | | <i>109</i> | <i>(89.3%)</i> |
| <i>Patwa</i> | | <i>105</i> | <i>(88.9%)</i> |
| <i>Both</i> | | <i>784</i> | <i>(78.4%)</i> |
| To whom do you speak? | | Frequency | (%) |
| English | <i>Friends/Family only</i> | <i>79</i> | <i>7.9%</i> |
| | <i>Strangers/Co-workers</i> | <i>571</i> | <i>57.1%</i> |
| | <i>Everyone</i> | <i>262</i> | <i>26.2%</i> |
| | <i>No One</i> | <i>88</i> | <i>8.8%</i> |
| Patwa | <i>Friends/Family only</i> | <i>629</i> | <i>62.9%</i> |
| | <i>Strangers /Co-workers</i> | <i>32</i> | <i>3.2%</i> |
| | <i>Everyone</i> | <i>285</i> | <i>28.5%</i> |
| | <i>No One</i> | <i>54</i> | <i>5.4%</i> |

As can be seen from table 3, the majority of the sample stated that they spoke both English and Patwa (78.4%). Those who spoke English or Patwa only, were fewer than 11% of the sample each.

Several significant differences were observed with respect to whom respondents were most likely to speak English to as opposed to Patwa. Fifty seven per cent of the sample reported that they were most likely to speak English to strangers and co-workers. This is in sharp contrast to the 3.2% of the sample that said they were most likely to speak Patwa to the same group. The most likely group that respondents said they would speak Patwa

to, were friends and family at 62.9%. Again this is very different to the percentage of the sample that indicated they were most likely to speak English to friends and family (7.9%).

| Table 4: Languages Spoken by Gender, Age, Area & Region | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Gender | Languages Spoken | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Both Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(2) = 11.94; p = 0.003$ | | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 59 (11.8%) | 68 (13.6%) | 372 (74.5%) | <i>n = 499</i> 100% |
| <i>Female</i> | 50 (10%) | 37 (7.4%) | 412 (82.6%) | <i>n = 499</i> 100% |
| Age Groups | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Both Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 19.35; p = 0.001$ | | | | |
| <i>18-30yrs</i> | 26 (7.8%) | 22 (6.6%) | 285 (85.6%) | <i>n = 333</i> 100% |
| <i>31-50yrs</i> | 34 (10.2%) | 39 (11.7%) | 261 (78.1%) | <i>n = 334</i> 100% |
| <i>51-80+yrs</i> | 49 (14.8%) | 44 (13.3%) | 238 (71.9%) | <i>n = 331</i> 100% |
| Area | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Both Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) = 6.52; p = 0.038$ | | | | |
| <i>Urban</i> | 69 (13.3%) | 52 (10.1%) | 396 (76.6%) | <i>n = 517</i> 100% |
| <i>Rural</i> | 40 (8.3%) | 53 (11%) | 388 (80.7%) | <i>n = 481</i> 100% |
| Region | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Both Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 13.92; p = 0.008$ | | | | |
| <i>Western</i> | 13 (6.5%) | 22 (11.1%) | 164 (82.4%) | <i>n = 199</i> 100% |
| <i>Central</i> | 18 (9%) | 31 (15.5%) | 151 (75.5%) | <i>n = 200</i> 100% |
| <i>Eastern</i> | 78 (13%) | 52 (8.7%) | 469 (78.3%) | <i>n = 599</i> 100% |

Table 4 summarizes a chi-square (χ^2) analysis of the languages spoken by the key demographic variables in the study. All four tests found statistically significant relationships between languages spoken and the variables ($p < 0.05$).

With regards to gender, men were more likely than women to speak Patwa only (13.6% versus 7.4%). Women on the other hand, were 8% more likely than men to speak both

English and Patwa. The contingency coefficient showed that this relationship, though significant, was fairly weak ($C = 0.109$).

Younger age groups were more likely to state that they spoke both English and Patwa when compared to older age groups. Eighty six per cent of the 18-30 year age group indicated that they spoke both languages; this was just under 8% more than the 31-50 year (78.1%) age group and 14% more than the 51 year and older group (71.9%). Additionally, the two oldest age groups were more likely than the youngest age group to declare they spoke English only or Patwa only. The contingency coefficient found that the relationship was only slightly stronger than the relationship with gender ($C = 0.139$).

With regards to the relationship between area and languages spoken, individuals from rural areas were more likely to speak both languages (80.7%), than those from urban areas 76.6%. There was only a minimal difference between the two areas in terms of the percentages of those who spoke Patwa only. The contingency coefficient found that this relationship was very weak ($C = 0.081$).

Individuals from western parishes were the most likely to speak both languages (82.4%). This compares with 75.5% of individuals from central parishes and 78.3% of persons from eastern parishes. This trend changes when comparing the three regions in terms of speaking only English as here, eastern parishes at 13% had the highest proportion of the three regions. The strength of this relationship was weak ($C = 0.117$).

| Table 5: To whom do you speak by Gender, Age, Area & Region | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Gender | ¹ English | | | | ² Patwa | | | |
| | Family Count(%) | Strangers Count(%) | Everyone Count(%) | No One Count(%) | Family Count(%) | Strangers Count(%) | Everyone Count(%) | No One Count (%) |
| $\chi^2(3) = 18.773; p = 0.000$ $\chi^2(3) = 31.68; p = 0.000$ | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 42 (8.4%) | 258 (51.5%) | 141 (28.1%) | 60 (12%) | 274 (54.7%) | 23 (4.6%) | 168 (33.5%) | 36 (7.2%) |
| Female | 37 (7.4%) | 313 (62.7%) | 121 (24.2%) | 28 (5.6%) | 355 (71.1%) | 9 (1.8%) | 117 (23.4%) | 18 (3.6%) |
| Age Groups | Family Count(%) | Strangers Count(%) | Everyone Count(%) | No One Count(%) | Family Count(%) | Strangers Count(%) | Everyone Count(%) | No One Count(%) |
| $\chi^2(6) = 29.39; p = 0.000$ $\chi^2(6) = 36.17; p = 0.000$ | | | | | | | | |
| 18-30yrs | 25 (7.5%) | 222 (66.5%) | 73 (21.9%) | 14 (4.2%) | 245 (73.4%) | 6 (1.8%) | 75 (22.5%) | 8 (2.4%) |
| 31-50yrs | 25 (7.5%) | 190 (56.9%) | 87 (26%) | 32 (9.6%) | 206 (61.7%) | 12 (3.6%) | 101 (30.2%) | 15 (4.5%) |
| 51-80+yrs | 29 (8.7%) | 159 (47.9%) | 102 (30.7%) | 42 (12.7%) | 178 (53.6%) | 14 (4.2%) | 109 (32.8%) | 31 (9.3%) |
| Area | Family Count(%) | Strangers Count(%) | Everyone Count(%) | No One Count(%) | Family Count(%) | Strangers Count(%) | Everyone Count(%) | No One Count(%) |
| $\chi^2(3) = 11.50; p = 0.009$ $\chi^2(3) = 19.75; p = 0.000$ | | | | | | | | |
| Urban | 52 (10%) | 299 (57.6%) | 133 (25.6%) | 35 (6.7%) | 349 (67.2%) | 22 (4.2%) | 118 (22.7%) | 30 (5.8%) |
| Rural | 27 (5.6%) | 272 (56.5%) | 129 (26.8%) | 53 (11%) | 280 (58.2%) | 10 (2.1%) | 167 (34.7%) | 24 (5%) |
| Region | Family Count(%) | Strangers Count(%) | Everyone Count(%) | No One Count(%) | Family Count(%) | Strangers Count(%) | Everyone Count(%) | No One Count(%) |
| $\chi^2(6) = 11.49; p = 0.074$ $\chi^2(6) = 11.51; p = 0.074$ | | | | | | | | |
| Western | 14 (7%) | 125 (62.5%) | 38 (19%) | 23 (11.5%) | 121 (60.5%) | 9 (4.5%) | 65 (32.5%) | 5 (2.5%) |
| Central | 16 (8%) | 110 (55%) | 52 (26%) | 22 (11%) | 127 (63.5%) | 8 (4%) | 58 (29%) | 7 (3.5%) |
| Eastern | 49 (8.2%) | 336 (56%) | 172 (28.7%) | 43 (7.2%) | 381 (63.5%) | 15 (2.5%) | 162 (27.5%) | 42 (7%) |

Table 5 displays crosstabulations done with the key demographic variables and to whom individuals were most likely to speak Patwa and English. Males at 12% were most likely to speak English with no one when compared to females (5.6%).

While the majority of respondents from both genders said they were most likely to use English when addressing strangers/co-workers, females were 10% to do so. As it regards with whom individuals were most likely to speak Patwa, with males were 10% more likely than females to say everyone. Females on the other hand were approximately 16% more likely to indicate that they spoke Patwa to family/friends (71.1% versus 54.7%).

χ^2 tests on both of these relationships were statistically significant at a level of significance of less than 0.01. The contingency coefficient for the relationship between gender and with whom you speak Patwa was 0.178, which was slightly larger than the relationship between gender and with whom you speak English ($C = 0.137$). Both coefficients indicated fairly weak relationships.

The χ^2 test also found significant relationships between age and both language variables. With the exception of those who were 51 years and older, the majority of all age groups said they were most likely to speak English with strangers/co-workers only (18-30 years 66.5%, 31-50 years 56.9%, 51 years and older 47.9%). Older age groups were more likely to speak English to everyone when compared to younger age groups. Whereas 21.9% of 18-30 year olds responded that they spoke English to everyone, 26% of 31-50 year olds said they did so, compared to 30.7% of respondents 51 years or older.

Interestingly, the two older age groups were also more likely to speak Patwa to everyone compared to the youngest age group (30.2% and 32.8%, compared to 22.5%). The youngest age group at 73.4% was more likely than the other age groups to speak Patwa to family/friends only. The percentage of 51 year and older respondents who spoke Patwa to no one (9.3%), was larger than the percentage of 18-30 year olds and 31-50 year who claimed this (2.4% and 4.5% respectively).

The contingency coefficients for both relationships were weak, with the one for age in relation to whom you speak English with ($C = 0.169$) being slightly smaller than the one for the relationship between age and whom you speak Patwa with ($C = 0.190$).

The relationships between area and with whom you speak English and Patwa were both statistically significant. Both were however weak as the contingency coefficient for the relationship between area and with whom you speak English was 0.107, and the one for area and with whom you speak Patwa was 0.141.

A fairly equal majority of both urban and rural respondents stated that they were most likely to speak English to strangers/co-workers only (57.6% and 56.5% respectively). Urban participants were just under 5% more likely to speak English with family/friends only than individuals from rural areas.

At 67.2% urban individuals were also almost 10% more likely than rural participants (58.2%) to speak Patwa with family/friends only. However, rural respondents were 12% more likely to speak Patwa with everyone when compared to urban respondents.

χ^2 tests on both language variables and region found no significant relationships. The majority of respondents in all regions were most likely to speak English to strangers/co-workers only, while the majority in all three regions spoke Patwa to family/friends only.

| Table 6: To whom do you speak Patwa by to whom do you speak English | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| To whom do you speak English | To whom do you speak Patwa | | | | TOTAL |
| | Family Count(%) | Strangers Count(%) | Everyone Count(%) | No One Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(9) = 409.44; p = 0.000$ | | | | | |
| Family | 59 (9.4%) | 6 (18.8%) | 10 (3.5%) | 4 (7.4%) | <i>n = 79</i> 100% |
| Strangers | 482 (76.6%) | 13 (40.6%) | 74 (26%) | 2 (3.7%) | <i>n = 571</i> 100% |
| Everyone | 75 (11.9%) | 12 (37.5%) | 130 (45.6%) | 45 (83.3%) | <i>n = 262</i> 100% |
| No One | 13 (2.1%) | 1 (3.1%) | 71 (24.9%) | 3 (5.6%) | <i>n = 88</i> 100% |

Table 7 shows the relationship between whom individuals spoke Patwa with and those they spoke English with. A chi-square test found this to be statistically significant relationship and the contingency coefficient showed that the relationship was a fairly strong one ($C = 0.539$).

Those who spoke Patwa to family were the most likely group to speak English to strangers (76.6%). Additionally, 40.6% those who spoke Patwa to strangers were also likely to speak English to strangers. Unsurprisingly, the majority of respondents who said that they spoke Patwa to no one (83.3%) said that they spoke English to everyone.

C. Government/Public Use

The third subsection of the questionnaire sought to examine attitudes towards Patwa use by government officials.

| Table 7: If Minister made speech in Patwa would you think he is: (N=1,000) | |
|---|----------------------|
| | Frequency (%) |
| <i>Communicate better with the public</i> | <i>676 (67.8%)</i> |
| <i>Talk down to the masses</i> | <i>205 (20.6%)</i> |
| <i>None</i> | <i>116 (11.6%)</i> |

When asked what they would think if the Prime Minister or Minister of Finance made his speech in Patwa, 67.8% of the sample responded that they would think he was trying to “communicate better with the public”. Only 20.6% of respondents believed that the Ministers would be trying to “talk down to the masses”.

| Table 8: If Minister made speech in Patwa by Gender, Age, Area & Region | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Gender | If Minister made speech in Patwa | | | TOTAL |
| | Communicate better with public Count(%) | Talk down to the masses Count(%) | None Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(2) = 3.43; p = 0.180$ | | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 349 (69.8%) | 91 (18.2%) | 60 (12%) | <i>n = 500 100%</i> |
| <i>Female</i> | 327 (65.8%) | 114 (22.9%) | 56 (11.3%) | <i>n = 497 100%</i> |
| Age Groups | Communicate better with public Count(%) | Talk down to the masses Count(%) | None Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 1.47; p = 0.832$ | | | | |
| <i>18-30yrs</i> | 225 (67.4%) | 71 (21.3%) | 38 (11.4%) | <i>n = 334 100%</i> |
| <i>31-50yrs</i> | 219 (66%) | 71 (21.4%) | 42 (12.7%) | <i>n = 332 100%</i> |
| <i>51-80+yrs</i> | 232 (70.1%) | 63 (19%) | 36 (10.9%) | <i>n = 331 100%</i> |
| Area | Communicate better with public Count(%) | Talk down to the masses Count(%) | None Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) = 3.22; p = 0.200$ | | | | |
| <i>Urban</i> | 338 (65.3%) | 115 (22.2%) | 65 (12.5%) | <i>n = 518 100%</i> |
| <i>Rural</i> | 338 (70.6%) | 90 (18.8%) | 51 (10.6%) | <i>n = 479 100%</i> |
| Region | Communicate better with public Count(%) | Talk down to the masses Count(%) | None Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 12.45; p = 0.014$ | | | | |
| <i>Western</i> | 152 (76.8%) | 28 (14.1%) | 18 (9.1%) | <i>n = 198 100%</i> |
| <i>Central</i> | 133 (66.5%) | 49 (24.5%) | 18 (9%) | <i>n = 200 100%</i> |
| <i>Eastern</i> | 391 (65.3%) | 128 (21.4%) | 80 (13.4%) | <i>n = 599 100%</i> |

Table 7 shows how this government use variable was related to the key demographic variables. No statistical significance was observed for the relationships between government use and gender, age or area.

A χ^2 analysis of government use in relation to region was however significant. Respondents from western parishes at 76.8% were more than 10% more likely than individuals from central (66.5%) and eastern regions (65.3%) to think the ministers would be trying to “communicate better with the public”. By extension, people from central and eastern regions were more likely to view the ministers as “talking down to the masses” than those from western regions. The contingency coefficient showed that this was a weak relationship ($C = 0.111$).

D. Language Use and Social Stereotypes

This represented the fourth section of the survey instrument and it sought to identify stereotype notions individuals hold about speakers of one language versus the other.

| Table 9: Sample Distribution of Stereotypes (N=1,000) | | | |
|--|---------------------|------------------|------------|
| Which Speaker do you think: | | Frequency | (%) |
| Is more Intelligent | <i>Patwa</i> | 73 | 7.7% |
| | <i>English</i> | 550 | 57.8% |
| | <i>Neither/Both</i> | 329 | 34.6% |
| Is more Honest | <i>Patwa</i> | 283 | 31% |
| | <i>English</i> | 278 | 30.4% |
| | <i>Neither/Both</i> | 353 | 38.6% |
| Is more Educated | <i>Patwa</i> | 59 | 6.2% |
| | <i>English</i> | 591 | 61.7% |
| | <i>Neither/Both</i> | 308 | 32.2% |
| Is more Friendly | <i>Patwa</i> | 379 | 39.8% |
| | <i>English</i> | 240 | 25.2% |
| | <i>Neither/Both</i> | 333 | 35% |
| Has more Money | <i>Patwa</i> | 77 | 8.8% |
| | <i>English</i> | 390 | 44.7% |
| | <i>Neither/Both</i> | 406 | 46.5% |
| Is more Helpful | <i>Patwa</i> | 300 | 31.9% |
| | <i>English</i> | 292 | 31.1% |
| | <i>Neither/Both</i> | 348 | 37% |

More Intelligent/More Honest

Only 7.7% of the sample believed that a person speaking Patwa would be more intelligent than a person speaking English. Just over a third of the sample (34.6%) thought neither would be more intelligent. There were no major differences between the number of people who thought that either one of the speakers would be more honest. Thirty one per

cent felt that the Patwa speaker would be more honest, compared to 30.4% who thought the English speaker would be more honest.

More Educated/More Friendly

Unsurprisingly, the pattern for the speaker who respondents thought would be more educated was very similar to the one observed for intelligence. Only 6.6% of the sample believed that the Patwa speaker would be more educated compared with 61.7% who thought the English speaker would be more educated. A larger proportion of the sample (39.8%) thought that the Patwa speaker was friendlier. This is in contrast to the 25.2% who thought that the English speaker was friendlier.

More Money/More Helpful

Only 8.8% of the sample thought that the Patwa speaker would have more money. It should be noted however that 46.5% of the sample felt that neither would have more money. There were no major differences in the number of people who thought the Patwa speaker would be more helpful versus those who thought the English speaker would be more helpful.

| Table 10: Who is more Intelligent by Gender, Age, Area & Region | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Gender | Which speaker is more Intelligent | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(2) = 6.78; p = 0.034$ | | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 260 (53.9%) | 44 (9.1%) | 178 (36.9%) | <i>n = 482</i> 100% |
| <i>Female</i> | 290 (61.7%) | 29 (6.2%) | 151 (32.1%) | <i>n = 470</i> 100% |
| Age Groups | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 5.01; p = 0.286$ | | | | |
| <i>18-30yrs</i> | 182 (56.7%) | 24 (7.5%) | 115 (35.8%) | <i>n = 321</i> 100% |
| <i>31-50yrs</i> | 172 (55.3%) | 21 (6.8%) | 118 (37.9%) | <i>n = 311</i> 100% |
| <i>51-80+yrs</i> | 196 (61.3%) | 28 (8.8%) | 96 (30%) | <i>n = 320</i> 100% |
| Area | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) = 9.85; p = 0.007$ | | | | |
| <i>Urban</i> | 272 (56.2%) | 27 (5.6%) | 185 (38.2%) | <i>n = 484</i> 100% |
| <i>Rural</i> | 278 (59.4%) | 46 (9.8%) | 144 (30.8%) | <i>n = 468</i> 100% |
| Region | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 15.73; p = 0.003$ | | | | |
| <i>Western</i> | 127 (66.1%) | 10 (5.2%) | 55 (28.6%) | <i>n = 192</i> 100% |
| <i>Central</i> | 121 (62.1%) | 20 (10.3%) | 54 (27.7%) | <i>n = 195</i> 100% |
| <i>Eastern</i> | 302 (53.5%) | 43 (7.6%) | 220 (38.9%) | <i>n = 565</i> 100% |

A χ^2 analysis of intelligence with the demographic variables found significant relationships for all of the variables, except age.

More Intelligent by Gender

Approximately 62% of female respondents thought that the English speaker would be more intelligent compared to 54% of males. Males were slightly more likely than females

to think that either the Patwa speaker was more intelligent or that neither speaker was more intelligent. The contingency coefficient showed that this relationship was very weak ($C = 0.084$).

More Intelligent by Area

Urban respondents were somewhat more likely than rural respondents to think that neither the English nor the Patwa speaker was more intelligent (38.2% versus 30.8%). On the other hand, rural residents were slightly more likely to think that the Patwa speaker was more intelligent. The contingency coefficient found a weak relationship between intelligence and area ($C = 0.101$).

More Intelligent by Region

There was also a significant relationship between region and intelligence. Individuals from eastern regions were up to 13% less likely than individuals from western and central regions to think that the English speaker was more intelligent (53.5% compared to 66.1% and 62.1%). Eastern regions were more likely to think that neither speaker was more intelligent (38.9% compared to 28.6% and 27.7%). The relationship between region and intelligence was found to be a fairly weak one ($C = 0.128$).

| Table 11: Who is more Honest by Gender, Age, Area & Region | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Gender | Which speaker is more Honest | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(2) = 3.14; p = 0.208$ | | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 133 (28.5%) | 156 (33.5%) | 177 (38%) | <i>n = 466</i> 100% |
| <i>Female</i> | 145 (32.4%) | 127 (28.3%) | 176 (39.3%) | <i>n = 488</i> 100% |
| Age Groups | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 9.44; p = 0.051$ | | | | |
| <i>18-30yrs</i> | 79 (25.5%) | 108 (34.8%) | 123 (39.7%) | <i>n = 310</i> 100% |
| <i>31-50yrs</i> | 93 (30.3%) | 87 (28.3%) | 127 (41.4%) | <i>n = 307</i> 100% |
| <i>51-80+yrs</i> | 106 (35.7%) | 88 (29.6%) | 103 (34.7%) | <i>n = 297</i> 100% |
| Area | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) = 11.61; p = 0.003$ | | | | |
| <i>Urban</i> | 124 (27%) | 133 (29%) | 202 (44%) | <i>n = 459</i> 100% |
| <i>Rural</i> | 154 (33.8%) | 150 (33%) | 151 (33.2%) | <i>n = 455</i> 100% |
| Region | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 11.92; p = 0.018$ | | | | |
| <i>Western</i> | 70 (37%) | 55 (29.1%) | 64 (33.9%) | <i>n = 189</i> 100% |
| <i>Central</i> | 67 (36.2%) | 54 (29.2%) | 64 (34.6%) | <i>n = 185</i> 100% |
| <i>Eastern</i> | 141 (26.1%) | 174 (32.2%) | 225 (41.7%) | <i>n = 540</i> 100% |

More Honest by Age

No significant relationship was found between honesty and gender or age. With regard to age however, a sizeable difference was observed between the youngest and oldest age groups as the 51 year and older group was more than 10% more likely to think that the English speaker was more honest (35.7%) than the younger age group (25.5%). The

youngest age group also had the highest percentage of those who thought that the Patwa speaker would be more honest.

More Honest by Area

Urban respondents were significantly more likely to think that neither the Patwa nor the English speaker would be more honest (44%) compared to 33.2% of rural respondents. Rural participants were marginally more likely to think that one or the other of the two speakers would be more intelligent. The strength of the relationship between these two variables was weak ($C = 0.128$).

More Honest by Region

Individuals from western and central regions were more likely than those from eastern regions to think that the English speaker would be more honest (37% and 36.2% versus 26.1%). Eastern respondents were the most likely group to think that neither speaker would be more honest. They were also marginally more likely to think that the Patwa speaker would be more honest (32.2% compared to 29.1% western parishes and 29.2% central parishes). The contingency coefficient for this relationship was equal to 0.113. This indicates that perceptions of honesty are only weakly related to region.

| Table 12: Who is more Educated by Gender, Age, Area & Region | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Gender | Which speaker is more Educated | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(2) = 1.59; p = 0.452$ | | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 291 (60.4%) | 34 (7.1%) | 157 (32.6%) | <i>n = 482</i> 100% |
| <i>Female</i> | 300 (63%) | 25 (5.3%) | 151 (31.7%) | <i>n = 476</i> 100% |
| Age Groups | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 22.07; p = 0.000$ | | | | |
| <i>18-30yrs</i> | 179 (55.6%) | 17 (5.3%) | 126 (39.1%) | <i>n = 322</i> 100% |
| <i>31-50yrs</i> | 188 (58.8%) | 21 (6.6%) | 111 (34.7%) | <i>n = 320</i> 100% |
| <i>51-80+yrs</i> | 224 (70.9%) | 21 (6.6%) | 71 (22.5%) | <i>n = 316</i> 100% |
| Area | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) = 6.36; p = 0.042$ | | | | |
| <i>Urban</i> | 298 (60.9%) | 22 (4.5%) | 169 (34.6%) | <i>n = 489</i> 100% |
| <i>Rural</i> | 293 (62.5%) | 37 (7.9%) | 139 (29.6%) | <i>n = 469</i> 100% |
| Region | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 2.31; p = 0.679$ | | | | |
| <i>Western</i> | 129 (65.5%) | 12 (6.1%) | 56 (28.4%) | <i>n = 197</i> 100% |
| <i>Central</i> | 121 (62.7%) | 10 (5.2%) | 62 (32.1%) | <i>n = 193</i> 100% |
| <i>Eastern</i> | 341 (60%) | 37 (6.5%) | 190 (33.5%) | <i>n = 568</i> 100% |

χ^2 tests found no significant relationship between stereotypes of education and gender or region. Neither of these variables had any noteworthy impact on the general sample's perception that the English speaker would be more educated.

More Educated by Age

With regards to age and the speaker who participants felt was more educated, while the majority of all age groups felt that the English speaker would be more educated, the 51 and older age group was overwhelmingly the most likely group to believe this. Seventy one per cent of the 51 and older age group indicated that the English speaker would be more educated. This compares with 55.6% of the 18-30year age group and 58.8% of the 31 – 50 year age group. It is also interesting to note that the youngest age group at 39.1% were the most likely group to think neither speaker would be more educated when compared to the other two age groups. The contingency coefficient at 0.15 indicated that the relationship between perceptions of education and age was somewhat weak.

More Educated by Area

The χ^2 test of the relationship between area and which speaker is more educated, also proved to be significant. This relationship was only a marginal one however, as the strength of the relationship was found to be very weak ($C = 0.081$).

Respondents from rural areas were slightly more likely to think that the Patwa speaker would be more educated (7.9% versus 4.5%). This trend was also observed in terms of those who thought the English speaker was more educated. Again rural respondents were slightly ahead of urban respondents (62.5% compared to 60.9%).

| Table 13: Who is more Friendly by Gender, Age, Area & Region | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Gender | Which speaker is more Friendly | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(2) = 0.45; p = 0.80$ | | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 126 (26.1%) | 189 (39.2%) | 167 (34.6%) | <i>n = 482</i> <i>100%</i> |
| <i>Female</i> | 114 (24.3%) | 190 (40.4%) | 166 (35.3%) | <i>n = 333</i> <i>100%</i> |
| Age Groups | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 7.95; p = 0.093$ | | | | |
| <i>18-30yrs</i> | 75 (23.3%) | 123 (38.2%) | 124 (38.5%) | <i>n = 322</i> <i>100%</i> |
| <i>31-50yrs</i> | 71 (22.3%) | 134 (42.1%) | 113 (35.5%) | <i>n = 318</i> <i>100%</i> |
| <i>51-80+yrs</i> | 94 (30.1%) | 122 (39.1%) | 96 (30.8%) | <i>n = 312</i> <i>100%</i> |
| Area | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) = 15.87; p = 0.000$ | | | | |
| <i>Urban</i> | 106 (21.9%) | 180 (37.2%) | 198 (40.9%) | <i>n = 484</i> <i>100%</i> |
| <i>Rural</i> | 134 (28.6%) | 199 (42.5%) | 135 (28.8%) | <i>n = 468</i> <i>100%</i> |
| Region | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 7.19; p = 0.126$ | | | | |
| <i>Western</i> | 59 (30.4%) | 66 (34%) | 69 (35.6%) | <i>n = 194</i> <i>100%</i> |
| <i>Central</i> | 54 (28.1%) | 76 (39.6%) | 62 (32.3%) | <i>n = 192</i> <i>100%</i> |
| <i>Eastern</i> | 127 (22.4%) | 237 (41.9%) | 202 (35.7%) | <i>n = 566</i> <i>100%</i> |

Of the four demographic variables, only area was significantly related to respondents' perception of which speaker was friendlier.

More Friendly by Area

Forty one per cent of urban participants stated that they believed neither speaker would be friendlier. This was more than 12% higher than rural residents who were of this opinion. This relationship was found to be weak ($C = 0.128$).

| Table 14: Has more Money by Gender, Age, Area & Region | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Gender | Which speaker has more Money | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(2) = 1.75; p = 0.417$ | | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 201 (43.7%) | 46 (10%) | 213 (46.3%) | <i>n = 460</i> 100% |
| <i>Female</i> | 189 (45.8%) | 31 (7.5%) | 193 (46.7%) | <i>n = 413</i> 100% |
| Age Groups | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 15.88; p = 0.003$ | | | | |
| <i>18-30yrs</i> | 124 (40.4%) | 24 (7.8%) | 159 (51.8%) | <i>n = 307</i> 100% |
| <i>31-50yrs</i> | 116 (40.8%) | 25 (8.8%) | 143 (50.4%) | <i>n = 284</i> 100% |
| <i>51-80+yrs</i> | 150 (53.2%) | 28 (9.9%) | 104 (36.9%) | <i>n = 282</i> 100% |
| Area | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) = 2.17; p = 0.339$ | | | | |
| <i>Urban</i> | 194 (43.5%) | 35 (7.8%) | 217 (48.7%) | <i>n = 446</i> 100% |
| <i>Rural</i> | 196 (45.9%) | 42 (9.8%) | 189 (44.3%) | <i>n = 427</i> 100% |
| Region | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 5.21; p = 0.266$ | | | | |
| <i>Western</i> | 89 (49.2%) | 14 (7.7%) | 78 (43.1%) | <i>n = 181</i> 100% |
| <i>Central</i> | 86 (49.1%) | 16 (9.1%) | 73 (41.7%) | <i>n = 175</i> 100% |
| <i>Eastern</i> | 215 (41.6%) | 47 (9.1%) | 255 (49.3%) | <i>n = 517</i> 100% |

More Money by Age

Only age was significantly related to the speaker respondents thought had more money. The majority of the 51year and older group felt that the speaker of English would have more money (53.2%), this compares with 40.4% of the 18-30year group and 40.8% of the 31-50year group. The majority of the two younger age groups believed that neither speaker would have more money (51.8% and 50.4%). Only 36.9% of respondents from the oldest age group felt that neither the Patwa nor the English speaker was more likely to have more money.

The contingency coefficient of 0.134, showed that this was a fairly weak relationship.

| Table 15: Who is more Helpful by Gender, Age, Area & Region | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Gender | Which speaker is more Helpful | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(2) = 3.44; p = 0.179$ | | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 140 (29.4%) | 165 (34.7%) | 171 (35.9%) | <i>n = 476</i> 100% |
| <i>Female</i> | 152 (32.8%) | 135 (29.1%) | 177 (38.1%) | <i>n = 464</i> 100% |
| Age Groups | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 12.68; p = 0.013$ | | | | |
| <i>18-30yrs</i> | 84 (26.3%) | 96 (30.1%) | 139 (43.6%) | <i>n = 319</i> 100% |
| <i>31-50yrs</i> | 101 (32.5%) | 95 (30.5%) | 115 (37%) | <i>n = 311</i> 100% |
| <i>51-80+yrs</i> | 107 (34.5%) | 109 (35.2%) | 94 (30.3%) | <i>n = 310</i> 100% |
| Area | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) = 8.31; p = 0.016$ | | | | |
| <i>Urban</i> | 132 (27.4%) | 152 (31.6%) | 197 (41%) | <i>n = 481</i> 100% |
| <i>Rural</i> | 160 (34.9%) | 148 (32.2%) | 151 (32.9%) | <i>n = 348</i> 100% |
| Region | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 6.66; p = 0.155$ | | | | |
| <i>Western</i> | 68 (36%) | 57 (30.2%) | 64 (33.9%) | <i>n = 189</i> 100% |
| <i>Central</i> | 67 (35.6%) | 56 (29.8%) | 65 (34.6%) | <i>n = 188</i> 100% |
| <i>Eastern</i> | 157 (27.9%) | 187 (33.2%) | 219 (38.9%) | <i>n = 563</i> 100% |

In terms of helpfulness, gender and region had no significant impact on people's view of Patwa and English speakers. Of note however, is that 36% and 35.6% of respondents from western and central regions respectively, felt that the English speaker would be most helpful, compared to 27.9% of respondents from eastern regions.

More Helpful by Age

The crosstabulation of age and helpfulness showed that the youngest age group was most likely to think that neither of the two speakers would be more helpful. Approximately 44% of the 18-30year age group felt this way compared to 37% of the 31-50year olds and 30.3% of the 51-80year olds. The youngest age group at 26.3% was also the least likely to think that the English speaker would be more helpful when compared to the 31-50year olds (32.5%) and the 51year and older group (34.5%). The relationship between age and perceptions of helpfulness was a weak one ($C = 0.115$).

More Helpful by Area

There was a significant relationship between helpfulness and area. Forty one per cent of urban participants indicated that they believed neither of the two speakers would be more helpful. This was just under 9% higher than the percentage of rural participants that thought this. Rural individuals were somewhat more likely to state that the English speaker would be more helpful than those individuals from urban areas (34.9% versus 27.4%). The contingency coefficient of 0.094 showed this to be a very weak relationship.

E. Education

The fifth subsection of the questionnaire had to do with Jamaican's impressions of the use of Patwa in educational institutions.

| Table 16: Which school would be better for the Jamaican Child (N=1,000) | |
|--|----------------------|
| | Frequency (%) |
| <i>The English Only School</i> | <i>288 (28.9%)</i> |
| <i>The English and Patwa School</i> | <i>708 (71.1%)</i> |

A frequency table of the question “Which school do you think would be better for a Jamaican child” showed that the overwhelming majority (71.1%) of the sample thought that a school where children were taught to read and write in English and Patwa would be better than an English only school.

| Table 17: Which school would be better by Gender, Age, Area & Region | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Gender | Type of School | | TOTAL |
| | English Only Count(%) | English & Patwa Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(1) = 2.63; p = 0.106$ | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 133 (26.6%) | 367 (73.4%) | <i>n = 288 100%</i> |
| <i>Female</i> | 155 (31.3%) | 341 (68.8%) | <i>n = 496 100%</i> |
| Age Groups | English Only Count(%) | English & Patwa Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) = 15.76; p = 0.000$ | | | |
| <i>18-30yrs</i> | 83 (24.9%) | 250 (75.1%) | <i>n = 333 100%</i> |
| <i>31-50yrs</i> | 83 (24.9%) | 250 (75.1%) | <i>n = 333 100%</i> |
| <i>51-80+yrs</i> | 122 (37%) | 208 (63%) | <i>n = 330 100%</i> |
| Area | English Only Count(%) | English & Patwa Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(1) = 3.80; p = 0.051$ | | | |
| <i>Urban</i> | 164 (31.6%) | 355 (68.4%) | <i>n = 519 100%</i> |
| <i>Rural</i> | 124 (26%) | 353 (74%) | <i>n = 477 100%</i> |
| Region | English Only Count(%) | English & Patwa Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) = 1.62; p = 0.445$ | | | |
| <i>Western</i> | 63 (31.5%) | 137 (68.5%) | <i>n = 200 100%</i> |
| <i>Central</i> | 51 (25.8%) | 147 (74.2%) | <i>n = 198 100%</i> |
| <i>Eastern</i> | 174 (29.1%) | 424 (70.9%) | <i>n = 598 100%</i> |

Of the demographic variables, only age was significantly related to type of school. While there were no differences between the two younger age groups, the 51 and older group was far less likely than both of the younger groups to have a favourable view of the English and Patwa school. While 63% of this group felt this school would be better, this

was well below the 75.1% of the other two age groups that held this view. This relationship turned out to be weak.

F. Writing in a Standard Form

The final section of the survey had to do with general views of Patwa as a language.

| Is Patwa a Language? | Frequency | (%) |
|--|------------------|--------------|
| <i>Yes</i> | <i>795</i> | <i>79.5%</i> |
| <i>No</i> | <i>205</i> | <i>20.5%</i> |
| Should Parliament make Patwa an Official Language | | |
| <i>Yes</i> | <i>684</i> | <i>68.5%</i> |
| <i>No</i> | <i>264</i> | <i>26.5%</i> |
| <i>Don't Know</i> | <i>50</i> | <i>5%</i> |
| Would you want to see Patwa written on: | Frequency | (%) |
| <i>Road Signs</i> | <i>489</i> | <i>48.9%</i> |
| <i>School Books</i> | <i>573</i> | <i>57.3%</i> |
| <i>Medicine Bottles</i> | <i>451</i> | <i>45.1%</i> |
| <i>Government Forms</i> | <i>438</i> | <i>43.8%</i> |
| <i>Weed Spray</i> | <i>461</i> | <i>46.1%</i> |

Almost 80% of the sample thought Patwa was a language and a further 68.5% felt that parliament should make it an official language. In terms of where respondents would want to see Patwa written, they were most in favour of school books as 57.3% of them said they would want to see it written there. Forty nine per cent of participants said they would like to see Patwa written on road signs.

| Table 19: Is Patwa a Language by Gender, Age, Area & Region | | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Gender | Is Patwa a Language | | TOTAL |
| | Yes Count(%) | No Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(1)=1.10; p=0.294$ | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 405 (80.8%) | 96 (19.2%) | <i>n =501 100%</i> |
| <i>Female</i> | 390 (78.2%) | 109 (21.8%) | <i>n =499 100%</i> |
| Age Groups | Yes Count(%) | No Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) =12.13; p =0.002$ | | | |
| <i>18-30yrs</i> | 276 (82.6%) | 58 (17.4%) | <i>n =334 100%</i> |
| <i>31-50yrs</i> | 276 (82.6%) | 58 (17.4%) | <i>n = 334 100%</i> |
| <i>51-80+yrs</i> | 243 (73.2%) | 89 (26.8%) | <i>n =205 100%</i> |
| Area | Yes Count(%) | No Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(1) =0.01; p =0.951$ | | | |
| <i>Urban</i> | 413 (79.6%) | 106 (20.4%) | <i>n = 519 100%</i> |
| <i>Rural</i> | 382 (79.4%) | 99 (20.6%) | <i>n =481 100%</i> |
| Region | Yes Count(%) | No Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) =2.62; p =0.270$ | | | |
| <i>Western</i> | 153 (76.5%) | 47 (23.5%) | <i>n =200 100%</i> |
| <i>Central</i> | 155 (77.5%) | 45 (22.5%) | <i>n =200 100%</i> |
| <i>Eastern</i> | 487 (81.2%) | 113 (18.8%) | <i>n =600 100%</i> |

Only age was significantly related to people's view of whether or not Patwa is a language. There was no difference between the two youngest age groups, 82.6% of both these groups felt that Patwa is a language. The oldest age group of 51years and older at

only 73.2% was less likely to think Patwa is a language. This relationship was weak ($C = 0.109$).

| Gender | Should Patwa be an Official Language | | | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| | Yes Count(%) | No Count(%) | Don't Know Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(2) = 6.64; p = 0.036$ | | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 358 (71.7%) | 123 (24.6%) | 18 (3.6%) | <i>n = 499</i> 100% |
| <i>Female</i> | 326 (65.3%) | 141 (28.3%) | 32 (6.45) | <i>n = 499</i> 100% |
| Age Groups | Yes Count(%) | No Count(%) | Don't Know Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 4.42; p = 0.352$ | | | | |
| <i>18-30yrs</i> | 240 (72.1%) | 77 (23.1%) | 16 (4.8%) | <i>n = 333</i> 100% |
| <i>31-50yrs</i> | 229 (68.8%) | 89 (26.7%) | 15 (4.5%) | <i>n = 333</i> 100% |
| <i>51-80+yrs</i> | 215 (64.8%) | 98 (29.5%) | 19 (5.7%) | <i>n = 50</i> 100% |
| Area | Yes Count(%) | No Count(%) | Don't Know Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(2) = 6.57; p = 0.037$ | | | | |
| <i>Urban</i> | 336 (65%) | 154 (29.8%) | 27 (5.2%) | <i>n = 517</i> 100% |
| <i>Rural</i> | 348 (72.3%) | 110 (22.9%) | 23 (4.8%) | <i>n = 481</i> 100% |
| Region | Yes Count(%) | No Count(%) | Don't Know Count(%) | TOTAL |
| $\chi^2(4) = 2.67; p = 0.615$ | | | | |
| <i>Western</i> | 127 (64.1) | 60 (30.3%) | 11 (5.6%) | <i>n = 198</i> 100% |
| <i>Central</i> | 143 (71.5%) | 48 (24%) | 9 (4.5%) | <i>n = 200</i> 100% |
| <i>Eastern</i> | 414 (69%) | 156 (26%) | 30 (5%) | <i>n = 600</i> 100% |

Although both relationships were weak both gender and area were significantly related to respondent's opinion on making Patwa an official language. Males were more likely than females to think Patwa should be an official language (71.7% compared to 65.3%).

Individuals from rural areas were more likely than urban individuals to think that Patwa should be made an official language (72.3% versus 65%).

G. Occupation

Though not part of the overall sample structure, respondents were also asked to state their occupation.

| Table 21: Occupation (N=1,000) | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| | Frequency (%) |
| <i>Student</i> | 42 (4.2%) |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 182 (18.2%) |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 254 (25.4%) |
| <i>Self-employed/Professional</i> | 137 (13.7%) |
| <i>Retired</i> | 35 (3.5%) |
| <i>Farmer</i> | 61 (6.1%) |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman</i> | 177 (17.7%) |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 45 (4.5%) |
| <i>Service-professional</i> | 67 (6.7%) |

Clerical/Sales/Service workers at 25.4% represented the most common occupational group in the sample. Additionally, unskilled workers/housewives, skilled workers/craftsmen and self-employed/professionals all accounted for double figure percentages of the sample. Of note is that only 4.5% of the sample was unemployed which is below Jamaica's national average.

The occupation variable was crosstabulated with the various language variables, however the retired and student categories were omitted from these crosstabulations as both groups were relatively small and were found to be highly correlated with the age ranges that were examined earlier. Ninety five per cent of students were 18-30yrs old and 97.1% of retired respondents were in the 51 and older age group. The farmer group was combined with skilled/craftsman and the service professional group was combined with the self-employed group.

Occupation by Language Awareness

| Occupation | Languages Spoken | | | TOTAL |
|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Both Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(8) = 40.82; p = 0.000$ | | | | |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 19 (10.5%) | 35 (19.3%) | 127 (70.2%) | <i>n = 181 100%</i> |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 17 (6.7%) | 19 (7.5%) | 217 (85.8%) | <i>n = 253 100%</i> |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 29 (14.2%) | 8 (3.9%) | 167 (81.9%) | <i>n = 204 100%</i> |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 29 (12.2%) | 36 (15.1%) | 173 (72.7%) | <i>n = 238 100%</i> |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 6 (13.3%) | 2 (4.4%) | 37 (82.2%) | <i>n = 45 100%</i> |

Chi-square analysis found a significant relationship between occupation and the languages spoken by the sample. Respondents in the unskilled/housewife group were the most likely of the occupations to speak Patwa only (19.3% versus 7.5%, 3.9%, 15.1%, 4.4%). Unemployed individuals (13.3%) and Self-Employed/Professionals (14.2%) were the groups most likely to speak English only.

The contingency coefficient found this to be a fairly weak/moderate relationship ($C = 0.206$).

| Table 23: To whom do you speak by Occupation | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Occupation | ¹ English | | | | ² Patwa | | | |
| | Family Count(%) | Strangers Count(%) | Everyone Count(%) | No One Count(%) | Family Count(%) | Strangers Count(%) | Everyone Count(%) | No One Count (%) |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 17 (9.3%) | 91(50%) | 47 (25.8%) | 27 (14.8%) | 104 (57.1) | 7 (3.8%) | 60 (33%) | 11 (6%) |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 16 (6.3%) | 169 (66.5%) | 57 (22.4%) | 12 (4.7%) | 177 (69.7%) | 9 (3.5%) | 64 (25.2%) | 4 (1.6%) |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 13 (6.4%) | 124 (60.8%) | 62 (30.4%) | 5 (2.5%) | 137 (67.2%) | 6 (2.9%) | 48 (23.5%) | 13 (6.4%) |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 22 (9.2%) | 117 (49.2%) | 63 (26.5%) | 36 (15.1%) | 132 (55.5%) | 8 (3.4%) | 82 (34.5%) | 16 (6.7%) |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 4 (8.9%) | 27 (60%) | 13 (28.9%) | 1 (2.2%) | 29 (64.4%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (28.9%) | 3 (6.7%) |

Table 22 shows the relationships between occupation and with whom individuals spoke English and Patwa. While chi-square analysis showed that both relationships were significant, the magnitude of the relationship between occupation and with whom respondents spoke English ($C = 0.224$) was stronger than the relationship between occupation and with whom respondents spoke Patwa ($C = 0.155$).

With the exception of skilled/craftsmen/farmers, the majority of all occupations groups stated that they spoke English with strangers. Skilled/Craftsmen/Farmers and Unskilled/Housewives at 15.1% and 14.8% respectively were the most likely groups to speak English to no one. Conversely, unemployed individuals and self-employed/professionals were the most likely groups to speak English with everyone (28.9% and 30.4% respectively).

With regards to whom respondents spoke Patwa to, the majority of all occupations said they were most likely to speak Patwa with family. Skilled/craftsmen/farmers were the most likely group to speak Patwa with everyone (34.5%) this group was followed closely by the unskilled/housewives group at 33%.

Government/Public Use by Occupation

| Table 24: Government/Public Use by Occupation | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| Occupation | If Minister made speech in Patwa | | | TOTAL |
| | Communicate better with public Count(%) | Talk down to the masses Count(%) | None Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(8) = 14.69; p = 0.066$ | | | | |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 127 (69.8%) | 43 (23.6%) | 12 (6.6%) | <i>n = 182</i> 100% |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 163 (64.2%) | 60 (23.6%) | 31 (12.2%) | <i>n = 254</i> 100% |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 131 (64.5%) | 44 (21.7%) | 28 (13.8%) | <i>n = 203</i> 100% |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 167 (70.8%) | 36 (15.3%) | 33 (14%) | <i>n = 236</i> 100% |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 33 (73.3%) | 10 (22.2%) | 2 (4.4%) | <i>n = 45</i> 100% |

Chi-square analysis found no significant relationship between occupation and attitude towards the use of Patwa by a Minister in a speech in parliament. The majority of all occupation groups felt that a Minister, in doing this, would be “trying to communicate better with the public”.

Language Use and Social Stereotypes by Occupation

| Table 25: Who is more Intelligent by Occupation | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Occupation | Which speaker is more Intelligent | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(8) = 55.86; p = 0.000$ | | | | |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 123 (68%) | 26 (14.4%) | 32 (17.7%) | <i>n = 181 100%</i> |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 139 (57.9%) | 8 (3.3%) | 93 (38.8%) | <i>n = 240 100%</i> |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 91 (49.7%) | 8 (4.4%) | 84 (45.9%) | <i>n = 183 100%</i> |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 125 (53.9%) | 21 (9.1%) | 86 (37.1%) | <i>n = 232 100%</i> |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 30 (75%) | 4 (10%) | 6 (15%) | <i>n = 40 100%</i> |

There was a significant relationship between occupation types and the speaker that respondents felt would be more intelligent. At 75%, unemployed individuals were the most likely group to think that the English speaker would be more intelligent. Fifteen per cent of this group felt that neither speaker would be more intelligent which, along with 17.7% of the unskilled/housewives group, represented significantly lower percentages when compared to the other occupation groups who thought neither speaker was more intelligent (clerical/sales/services 38.8%, self-employed/professionals 45.9% and skilled/craftsmen/farmers 37.1%).

The contingency coefficient of 0.245 found this to be a moderate strength relationship.

| Table 26: Who is more Honest by Occupation | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Occupation | Which speaker is more Honest | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(8) = 25.43; p = 0.001$ | | | | |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 73 (42.9%) | 47 (27.6%) | 50 (29.4%) | <i>n = 170 100%</i> |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 64 (28.1%) | 73 (32%) | 91 (39.9%) | <i>n = 228 100%</i> |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 43 (24.3%) | 57 (32.2%) | 77 (43.5%) | <i>n = 177 100%</i> |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 58 (25.7%) | 71 (31.4%) | 97 (42.9%) | <i>n = 226 100%</i> |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 18 (46.2%) | 12 (30.8%) | 9 (23.1%) | <i>n = 39 100%</i> |

A chi-square test of the relationship between occupation and which speaker respondents thought was more honest, found it to be significant. Unskilled/housewives (42.9%) and unemployed individuals (46.2%) were the most likely groups to think that the English speaker would be more educated. There were only minimal differences in percentages of the various occupations who thought that the Patwa speaker was more honest.

This was a weak relationship ($C = 0.171$).

| Table 27: Who is more Educated by Occupation | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Occupation | Which speaker is more Educated | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(8) = 22.34; p = 0.004$ | | | | |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 120 (67.4%) | 19 (10.7%) | 39 (21.9%) | <i>n = 178</i> <i>100%</i> |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 138 (57%) | 13 (5.4%) | 91 (37.6%) | <i>n = 242</i> <i>100%</i> |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 112 (58.6%) | 7 (3.7%) | 72 (37.7%) | <i>n = 191</i> <i>100%</i> |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 143 (61.9%) | 14 (6.1%) | 74 (32%) | <i>n = 231</i> <i>100%</i> |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 30 (69.8%) | 4 (9.3%) | 9 (20.9%) | <i>n = 43</i> <i>100%</i> |

It was found that occupation was significantly related to whom participants thought would be more educated. As was the case with stereotypes about intelligence and honesty, unemployed individuals (69.8%) and unskilled/housewives were the most likely of the occupation groups to think that the English speaker would be more educated. Also in keeping with previously identified trends, these two groups were the least likely to think that neither speaker would be more educated. The relationship between occupation and stereotypes about education was weak ($C = 0.157$).

| Table 28: Who is more Friendly by Occupation | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Occupation | Which speaker is more Friendly | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(8) = 25.59; p = 0.001$ | | | | |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 62 (35.8%) | 62 (35.8%) | 49 (28.3%) | <i>n = 173 100%</i> |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 48 (19.8%) | 104 (43%) | 90 (37.2%) | <i>n = 242 100%</i> |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 43 (22.6%) | 71 (37.4%) | 76 (40%) | <i>n = 190 100%</i> |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 49 (21.2%) | 100 (43.3%) | 82 (35.5%) | <i>n = 231 100%</i> |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 17 (38.6%) | 19 (43.2%) | 8 (18.2%) | <i>n = 44 100%</i> |

There was a significant relationship between occupation and which speaker the sample thought was more friendly. Again those respondents who were unemployed and those who were unskilled/housewives were the most likely to think that the English speaker would be friendlier (38.6% and 35.8% respectively). The unemployed group at 18.2% was also far less likely than the other occupation groups to think that neither speaker would be friendlier.

The contingency coefficient of 0.168 found this to be a weak relationship.

| Table 29: Who is has more Money by Occupation | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Occupation | Which speaker has more Money | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(8) = 12.93; p = 0.114$ | | | | |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 67 (43.8%) | 18 (11.8%) | 68 (44.4%) | <i>n = 153 100%</i> |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 94 (41.6%) | 18 (8%) | 114 (50.4%) | <i>n = 226 100%</i> |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 78 (45.9%) | 11 (6.5%) | 81 (47.6%) | <i>n = 170 100%</i> |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 97 (44.7%) | 19 (8.8%) | 101 (46.5%) | <i>n = 217 100%</i> |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 23 (57.5%) | 7 (17.5%) | 10 (25%) | <i>n = 40 100%</i> |

Chi-square analysis showed that there was no significant relationship between occupation and view of which speaker would have more money.

| Table 30: Who is more Helpful by Occupation | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Occupation | Which speaker has more Helpful | | | TOTAL |
| | English Count(%) | Patwa Count(%) | Neither Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(8) = 28.72; p = 0.000$ | | | | |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 71 (40.6%) | 64 (36.6%) | 40 (22.9%) | <i>n = 175 100%</i> |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 66 (27.6%) | 73 (30.5%) | 100 (41.8%) | <i>n = 239 100%</i> |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 42 (22.8%) | 58 (31.5%) | 84 (45.7%) | <i>n = 184 100%</i> |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 78 (34.1%) | 68 (29.7%) | 83 (36.2%) | <i>n = 229 100%</i> |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 15 (37.5%) | 14 (35%) | 11 (27.5%) | <i>n = 40 100%</i> |

Clerical/sales/service workers, along with self-employed/professionals, were the least likely groups to think that the English speaker would be more helpful (27.6% and 22.8% respectively). These groups were the most likely to state that the neither speaker would be more intelligent (clerical/sales/services 41.8% and self-employed/professionals 45.7%).

The chi-square test found this relationship to be significant and the contingency coefficient found that it was fairly weak ($C = 0.179$).

Education by Occupation

| Table 31: Which school would be better by Occupation | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Occupation | Type of School | | TOTAL |
| | English Only Count(%) | English & Patwa Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(4) = 12.49; p = 0.014$ | | | |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 58 (32.2%) | 122 (67.8%) | <i>n = 180 100%</i> |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 59 (23.2%) | 195 (76.8%) | <i>n = 254 100%</i> |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 72 (35.3%) | 132 (64.7%) | <i>n = 204 100%</i> |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 58 (24.5%) | 179 (75.5%) | <i>n = 237 100%</i> |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 16 (36.4%) | 28 (63.6%) | <i>n = 44 100%</i> |

A crosstabulation was also generated for the relationship between occupation and the type of school that respondents thought would be better for Jamaican children. Clerical/sales/service workers (76.8%) and skilled/craftsmen/farmers (75.5%) were the most likely groups to think that the English and Patwa school would be better for Jamaican children.

This relationship, while statistically significant was found to be weak ($C = 0.166$).

Writing in a Standard Form by Occupation

| Table 32: Is Patwa a Language by Occupation | | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Occupation | Is Patwa a Language | | TOTAL |
| | Yes Count(%) | No Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(4) = 7.381; p = 0.117$ | | | |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 141 (77.5%) | 41 (22.5%) | <i>n = 182 100%</i> |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 202 (79.5%) | 52 (20.5%) | <i>n = 254 100%</i> |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 168 (82.4%) | 36 (17.6%) | <i>n = 204 100%</i> |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 200 (84%) | 38 (16%) | <i>n = 238 100%</i> |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 31 (68.9%) | 14 (31.1%) | <i>n = 45 100%</i> |

There was no significant relationship between occupation and view of Patwa as a language. The majority of the sample, irrespective of occupational category, felt that Patwa was a language. It must be noted that unemployed persons at 31.1% were the most likely group to disagree that Patwa was a language.

| Table 33: Should Patwa be an Official Language by Occupation | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Occupation | Should Patwa be an Official Language | | | TOTAL |
| | Yes Count(%) | No Count(%) | Don't Know Count(%) | |
| $\chi^2(8) = 8.62; p = 0.376$ | | | | |
| <i>Unskilled/Housewife</i> | 127 (69.8%) | 45 (24.7%) | 10 (5.5%) | <i>n = 182 100%</i> |
| <i>Clerical/Sales/Services</i> | 173 (68.4%) | 69 (27.3%) | 11 (4.3%) | <i>n = 253 100%</i> |
| <i>Self-Employed/ Professional</i> | 131 (64.2%) | 59 (28.9%) | 14 (6.9%) | <i>n = 204 100%</i> |
| <i>Skilled/Craftsman/ Farmer</i> | 178 (74.8%) | 54 (22.7%) | 6 (2.5%) | <i>n = 238 100%</i> |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 32 (71.1%) | 11 (24.4%) | 2 (4.4%) | <i>n = 45 100%</i> |

There was no significant relationship between occupation and attitude towards making Patwa an official language. Again the majority of all occupational categories thought that Patwa should be an official language.

LANGUAGE ATTITUDE SURVEY OF JAMAICA

DEMOGRAPHICS

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Parish of Residence: | How Long: | | |
| 2. Parish of Birth: | | | |
| 3. Age Range: | 18 – 30 years [] | 31 – 50 years [] | 51 – 80+ years [] |
| 4. Sex: | Male [] | Female [] | |
| 5. Occupation: | | | |

LANGUAGE AWARENESS

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 6. What languages do you speak? | a) English [] | b) Patwa [] | c) Any Other [] |
|--|----------------|--------------|------------------|

LANGUAGE USE & CONTEXT

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 7. To whom do you speak | |
| a) Patwa | |
| b) English | |

GOVERNMENT /PUBLIC USE

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------|----------|
| 8. If the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance made his speech in Gordon house in Patwa would you think he is trying to: | | |
| a) communicate better with the public? | b) talk down to the masses? | c) Other |

IF 1c) PLEASE EXPLAIN:

LANGUAGE USE AND SOCIAL STEREOTYPES

| | | |
|--|----------------|--|
| 9. When you hear a person speaking Patwa and another speaking English, which person do you think: | | |
| Patwa | English | |
| a) Is more intelligent | | |
| b) Is more honest | | |
| c) Is more educated | | |
| d) Is more friendly | | |
| e) Has more money | | |
| f) Is more helpful | | |

EDUCATION

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| 10. There are two types of schools in Jamaica. In one they teach the children to read and write only in English. In the other type of school they teach the children to read and write in English and Patwa. Which school do you think would be better for a Jamaican child? | |
| a) The English Only School [] | b) The English & Patwa School [] |

WRITING IN A STANDARD FORM

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| 11. If there was one proper way to write Patwa would you want to see it written on (You may choose as many as you like) : | | | | |
| a) road signs | b) school books | c) medicine bottles | d) government forms | e) weed spray |

| | | |
|--|--------|---------------------------|
| 12. A language is a form of speech, which can be used to communicate anything people want it to. Do you think that Patwa is a language? | | |
| Yes [] | No [] | Other: [] Please Explain |

| | | |
|--|--------|----------------|
| 13. Should Parliament make Patwa an official language of Jamaica alongside English? | | |
| YES [] | NO [] | DON'T KNOW [] |

14. FOR OFFICE USE ONLY : Region – Western [] Central [] Eastern []

WE JAMIEKAN TINK BOUT LANGGWIJ**WE PIIPL LIV**

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 1. We yu liv: | Ou lang: | | |
| 2. We yu baan: | | | |
| 3. Ou uol yu bi: | 18 – 30 ierz [] | 31 – 50 ierz [] | 51 – 80+ ierz [] |
| 4. Man/Uman: | Man [] | Uman [] | |
| 5. Wa kain a work yu du: | | | |

WE PIIPL NUO BOUT LANGGWIJ

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| 6. We kain a langgwij yu taak? | a) Ingglish [] | b) Patwa [] | c) Soplms [] |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|

OU AN WEN PIIPL YUUZ LANGGWIJ

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 7. Uu yu taak tu ina | |
| a) Patwa | |
| b) Ingglish | |

GOVAMENT / POBLIK TAAK

8. Ef di Prime Minister ar di Minister of Finance mek im spiich op a Gordon House ina Patwa wa mek im du dat :

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| a) fi mek di public andastan im beta? | b) fi taak dong tu di piipl dem? | c) soplms / wat els |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|

IF 8c) Tel wi bout dat:

OU YU LUK PAN PIIPL FI OU DEM TAAK

9. Wen yu ier smadi a taak Patwa an smadi els a taak Ingglish, wich wan yu tink:

| | Patwa | Ingglish |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| a) av muor brienz | | |
| b) muor anis | | |
| c) muor edikietid | | |
| d) yu kyan taak tu muo | | |
| e) av muor moni | | |
| f) muor elp yu if yu ina chrobl | | |

EDIKIESHAN

10. Dem av tuu kain a skuul ina Jamieka. Ina wan kain a skuul, di pikni dem lorn fi riid an rait onggil ina Ingglish. Ina di neks kain a skuul, di pikni dem lorn fi riid an rait ina Ingglish an ina Patwa. Wich kain a skuul yu tink wuda beta fi wan Jamiekan pikni?

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| a) Di skuul wid onggil Ingglish [] | b) Di skuul wid Ingglish an Patwa [] |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

OU FI RAIT PATWA / JAMIEKAN

11. Ef dem did av wan gud wie fi rait Patwa. Yu wuda laik si Patwa rait pan wa? (Chuuz eni amount a dem) :

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|---------------|
| a) ruod sain | b) skuul buk | c) pil bakl | d) govament faam | e) faam sprie |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|---------------|

12. Wan langgwij a soplms we yu kyan yuuz fi se eni ting yu waan se tu piipl. Yu tink se Patwa a wan langgwij?

| | | |
|---------|---------|-----------------|
| Yes [] | Nuo [] | Tel wi bout dat |
|---------|---------|-----------------|

13. Yu tink se Govament shud a mek Patwa wan ofishal langgwij jos laik Ingglish?

| | | |
|---------|---------|---------------|
| YES [] | NUO [] | MI NO NUO [] |
|---------|---------|---------------|

14. FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Region – Western [] Central [] Eastern []

Appendix

Frequency Tables of Demographic variables in Jamaica Language Attitude Survey

urbanru parish

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 urban | 519 | 51.9 | 51.9 | 51.9 |
| | 2 rural | 481 | 48.1 | 48.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

region Region

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Western | 200 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| | 2 Central | 200 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 |
| | 3 Eastern | 600 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

age Age Range

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 18-30 | 334 | 33.4 | 33.4 | 33.4 |
| | 2 31-50 | 334 | 33.4 | 33.4 | 66.8 |
| | 3 51-80+ years | 332 | 33.2 | 33.2 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

sex Gender

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Male | 501 | 50.1 | 50.1 | 50.1 |
| | 2 Female | 499 | 49.9 | 49.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

q5 Occupation

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 1 Student | 42 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| 2 Unskilled/Housewife | 182 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 22.4 |
| 3 Clerical/Sales/Services | 254 | 25.4 | 25.4 | 47.8 |
| 4 Self-employed/Professional | 137 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 61.5 |
| 5 Retired | 35 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 65.0 |
| 6 Farmer | 61 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 71.1 |
| 7 Skilled/Craftsman | 177 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 88.8 |
| 8 Unemployed | 45 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 93.3 |
| 9 service-professional | 67 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Frequency Tables of Language Variables

q6a What languages do you speak? (English)

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 1 Yes | 893 | 89.3 | 89.3 | 89.3 |
| 2 No | 107 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

q6b What languages do you speak? (Patwa)

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 1 Yes | 889 | 88.9 | 88.9 | 88.9 |
| 2 No | 111 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

language What languages do you speak

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 1.00 English only | 109 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 10.9 |
| 2.00 Patwa only | 105 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 21.4 |
| 3.00 Both | 784 | 78.4 | 78.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 998 | 99.8 | 100.0 | |
| Missing .00 | 2 | .2 | | |
| Total | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

q7a To whom do you speak? (Patwa)

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Family & Friends | 629 | 62.9 | 62.9 | 62.9 |
| | 2 Strangers & Work | 32 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 66.1 |
| | 3 everyone | 285 | 28.5 | 28.5 | 94.6 |
| | 4 no one | 54 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

q7b To whom do you speak? (English)

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Family & Friends | 79 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| | 2 Strangers & Work | 571 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 65.0 |
| | 3 everyone | 262 | 26.2 | 26.2 | 91.2 |
| | 4 no one | 88 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is:

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Communicate better with the public | 676 | 67.6 | 67.8 | 67.8 |
| | 2 Talk down to the masses | 205 | 20.5 | 20.6 | 88.4 |
| | 9 none | 116 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 997 | 99.7 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | 3 | 2 | .2 | | |
| | 4 | 1 | .1 | | |
| | Total | 3 | .3 | | |
| Total | | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

rq9a Is more intelligent

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1.00 Patwa | 73 | 7.3 | 7.7 | 7.7 |
| | 2.00 English | 550 | 55.0 | 57.8 | 65.4 |
| | 3.00 Both | 329 | 32.9 | 34.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 952 | 95.2 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | System | 48 | 4.8 | | |
| Total | | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

rq9b Is more honest

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1.00 Patwa | 283 | 28.3 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| | 2.00 English | 278 | 27.8 | 30.4 | 61.4 |
| | 3.00 Both | 353 | 35.3 | 38.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 914 | 91.4 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | System | 86 | 8.6 | | |
| Total | | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

rq9c Is more educated

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1.00 Patwa | 59 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| | 2.00 English | 591 | 59.1 | 61.7 | 67.8 |
| | 3.00 Both | 308 | 30.8 | 32.2 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 958 | 95.8 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | System | 42 | 4.2 | | |
| Total | | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

rq9d Is more friendly

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1.00 Patwa | 379 | 37.9 | 39.8 | 39.8 |
| | 2.00 English | 240 | 24.0 | 25.2 | 65.0 |
| | 3.00 Both | 333 | 33.3 | 35.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 952 | 95.2 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | System | 48 | 4.8 | | |
| Total | | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

rq9e Has more money

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1.00 Patwa | 77 | 7.7 | 8.8 | 8.8 |
| | 2.00 English | 390 | 39.0 | 44.7 | 53.5 |
| | 3.00 Both | 406 | 40.6 | 46.5 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 873 | 87.3 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | System | 127 | 12.7 | | |
| Total | | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

rq9f Is more helpful

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1.00 Patwa | 300 | 30.0 | 31.9 | 31.9 |
| | 2.00 English | 292 | 29.2 | 31.1 | 63.0 |
| | 3.00 Both | 348 | 34.8 | 37.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 940 | 94.0 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | System | 60 | 6.0 | | |
| Total | | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

q10 Which school is better?

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 English school only | 288 | 28.8 | 28.9 | 28.9 |
| | 2 English & Patwa School | 708 | 70.8 | 71.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 996 | 99.6 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | 5 | 1 | .1 | | |
| | 9 | 1 | .1 | | |
| | System | 2 | .2 | | |
| | Total | 4 | .4 | | |
| Total | | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

q11a Road Signs

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Yes | 489 | 48.9 | 48.9 | 48.9 |
| | 2 No | 511 | 51.1 | 51.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

q11b School Books

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Yes | 573 | 57.3 | 57.3 | 57.3 |
| | 2 No | 427 | 42.7 | 42.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

q11c Medicine Bottles

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Yes | 451 | 45.1 | 45.1 | 45.1 |
| | 2 No | 549 | 54.9 | 54.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

q11d Government forms

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Yes | 438 | 43.8 | 43.8 | 43.8 |
| | 2 No | 561 | 56.1 | 56.2 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 999 | 99.9 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | System | 1 | .1 | | |
| Total | | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

q11e Weed Spray

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Yes | 461 | 46.1 | 46.2 | 46.2 |
| | 2 No | 536 | 53.6 | 53.8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 997 | 99.7 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | System | 3 | .3 | | |
| Total | | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

q12 Is Patwa a Language

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Yes | 795 | 79.5 | 79.5 | 79.5 |
| | 2 No | 205 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 1000 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

q13 Should Patwa be an official language?

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1 Yes | 684 | 68.4 | 68.5 | 68.5 |
| | 2 No | 264 | 26.4 | 26.5 | 95.0 |
| | 3 Don't Know | 50 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 998 | 99.8 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | System | 2 | .2 | | |
| Total | | 1000 | 100.0 | | |

Sample Structure

sex Gender * age Age Range * urbanru parish * region Region Crosstabulation

| region Region urbanru parish | | | | | | age Age Range | | | Total |
|------------------------------|---------|------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|---------|----------------|-------|
| | | | | | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | |
| 1 Western | 1 urban | sex Gender | 1 Male | Count | 17 | 17 | 17 | 51 | |
| | | | | % within age Age Range | 50.0% | 50.0% | 51.5% | 50.5% | |
| | | 2 Female | Count | 17 | 17 | 16 | 50 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 50.0% | 50.0% | 48.5% | 49.5% | | |
| | | Total | Count | 34 | 34 | 33 | 101 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | |
| | 2 rural | sex Gender | 1 Male | Count | 17 | 17 | 16 | 50 | |
| | | | | % within age Age Range | 51.5% | 51.5% | 48.5% | 50.5% | |
| | | 2 Female | Count | 16 | 16 | 17 | 49 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 48.5% | 48.5% | 51.5% | 49.5% | | |
| | | Total | Count | 33 | 33 | 33 | 99 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | |
| 2 Central | 1 urban | sex Gender | 1 Male | Count | 17 | 17 | 16 | 50 | |
| | | | | % within age Age Range | 50.0% | 51.5% | 37.2% | 45.5% | |
| | | 2 Female | Count | 17 | 16 | 27 | 60 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 50.0% | 48.5% | 62.8% | 54.5% | | |
| | | Total | Count | 34 | 33 | 43 | 110 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | |
| | 2 rural | sex Gender | 1 Male | Count | 17 | 16 | 17 | 50 | |
| | | | | % within age Age Range | 51.5% | 47.1% | 73.9% | 55.6% | |
| | | 2 Female | Count | 16 | 18 | 6 | 40 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 48.5% | 52.9% | 26.1% | 44.4% | | |
| | | Total | Count | 33 | 34 | 23 | 90 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | |
| 3 Eastern | 1 urban | sex Gender | 1 Male | Count | 50 | 50 | 58 | 158 | |
| | | | | % within age Age Range | 50.0% | 50.0% | 53.7% | 51.3% | |
| | | 2 Female | Count | 50 | 50 | 50 | 150 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 50.0% | 50.0% | 46.3% | 48.7% | | |
| | | Total | Count | 100 | 100 | 108 | 308 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | |
| | 2 rural | sex Gender | 1 Male | Count | 50 | 50 | 42 | 142 | |
| | | | | % within age Age Range | 50.0% | 50.0% | 45.7% | 48.6% | |
| | | 2 Female | Count | 50 | 50 | 50 | 150 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 50.0% | 50.0% | 54.3% | 51.4% | | |
| | | Total | Count | 100 | 100 | 92 | 292 | | |
| | | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | |

Demographic Variables with Languages spoken

What languages do you speak * Gender

Crosstab

| | | | | sex Gender | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--------|------------|----------|-------|
| | | | | 1 Male | 2 Female | |
| language What languages do you speak | 1.00 English only | Count | 59 | 50 | 109 | |
| | | % within language What languages do you speak | 54.1% | 45.9% | 100.0% | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 11.8% | 10.0% | 10.9% | |
| | 2.00 Patwa only | Count | 68 | 37 | 105 | |
| | | % within language What languages do you speak | 64.8% | 35.2% | 100.0% | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 13.6% | 7.4% | 10.5% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 372 | 412 | 784 | |
| | | % within language What languages do you speak | 47.4% | 52.6% | 100.0% | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 74.5% | 82.6% | 78.6% | |
| Total | Count | 499 | 499 | 998 | | |
| | % within language What languages do you speak | 50.0% | 50.0% | 100.0% | | |
| | % within sex Gender | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 11.936 ^a | 2 | .003 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 12.076 | 2 | .002 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 5.496 | 1 | .019 |
| N of Valid Cases | 998 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 52.50.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .109 | .003 |
| | Cramer's V | .109 | .003 |
| | Contingency Coefficient | .109 | .003 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 998 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

What languages do you speak * Age Range

Crosstab

| | | age Age Range | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|--------|--------|
| | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | | |
| language What languages do you speak | 1.00 English only | Count | 26 | 34 | 49 | 109 |
| | | % within language | 23.9% | 31.2% | 45.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within age | 7.8% | 10.2% | 14.8% | 10.9% |
| | 2.00 Patwa only | Count | 22 | 39 | 44 | 105 |
| | | % within language | 21.0% | 37.1% | 41.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within age | 6.6% | 11.7% | 13.3% | 10.5% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 285 | 261 | 238 | 784 |
| | | % within language | 36.4% | 33.3% | 30.4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within age | 85.6% | 78.1% | 71.9% | 78.6% |
| Total | Count | 333 | 334 | 331 | 998 | |
| | % within language | 33.4% | 33.5% | 33.2% | 100.0% | |
| | % within age | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 19.350 ^a | 4 | .001 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 19.761 | 4 | .001 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 16.212 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 998 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.82.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .139 | .001 |
| | Cramer's V | .098 | .001 |
| | Contingency Coefficient | .138 | .001 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 998 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

What languages do you speak * parish

Crosstab

| | | | | urbanru parish | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--------|----------------|---------|-------|
| | | | | 1 urban | 2 rural | |
| language What languages do you speak | 1.00 English only | Count | 69 | 40 | 109 | |
| | | % within language What languages do you speak | 63.3% | 36.7% | 100.0% | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 13.3% | 8.3% | 10.9% | |
| | 2.00 Patwa only | Count | 52 | 53 | 105 | |
| | | % within language What languages do you speak | 49.5% | 50.5% | 100.0% | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 10.1% | 11.0% | 10.5% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 396 | 388 | 784 | |
| | | % within language What languages do you speak | 50.5% | 49.5% | 100.0% | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 76.6% | 80.7% | 78.6% | |
| Total | Count | 517 | 481 | 998 | | |
| | % within language What languages do you speak | 51.8% | 48.2% | 100.0% | | |
| | % within urbanru parish | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.517 ^a | 2 | .038 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 6.602 | 2 | .037 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 4.713 | 1 | .030 |
| N of Valid Cases | 998 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 50.61.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .081 | .038 |
| | Cramer's V | .081 | .038 |
| | Contingency Coefficient | .081 | .038 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 998 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

What languages do you speak * Region

Crosstab

| | | region Region | | | Total | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|
| | | 1 Western | 2 Central | 3 Eastern | | |
| language What languages do you speak | 1.00 English only | Count | 13 | 18 | 78 | 109 |
| | | % within language | 11.9% | 16.5% | 71.6% | 100.0% |
| | | % within region | 6.5% | 9.0% | 13.0% | 10.9% |
| | 2.00 Patwa only | Count | 22 | 31 | 52 | 105 |
| | | % within language | 21.0% | 29.5% | 49.5% | 100.0% |
| | | % within region | 11.1% | 15.5% | 8.7% | 10.5% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 164 | 151 | 469 | 784 |
| | | % within language | 20.9% | 19.3% | 59.8% | 100.0% |
| | | % within region | 82.4% | 75.5% | 78.3% | 78.6% |
| Total | Count | 199 | 200 | 599 | 998 | |
| | % within language | 19.9% | 20.0% | 60.0% | 100.0% | |
| | % within region | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|----|--------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 13.918 ^a | 4 | .008 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 13.930 | 4 | .008 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 3.341 | 1 | .068 |
| N of Valid Cases | 998 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.94.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .118 | .008 |
| | Cramer's V | .084 | .008 |
| | Contingency Coefficient | .117 | .008 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 998 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Government Use By Demographic Variables

If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: *
Gender

Crosstab

| | | | sex Gender | | Total |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------|----------|--------|
| | | | 1 Male | 2 Female | |
| q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 1 Communicate better with the public | Count | 349 | 327 | 676 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 51.6% | 48.4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within sex Gender | 69.8% | 65.8% | 67.8% |
| | 2 Talk down to the masses | Count | 91 | 114 | 205 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 44.4% | 55.6% | 100.0% |
| | | % within sex Gender | 18.2% | 22.9% | 20.6% |
| | 9 none | Count | 60 | 56 | 116 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 51.7% | 48.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within sex Gender | 12.0% | 11.3% | 11.6% |
| Total | | Count | 500 | 497 | 997 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 50.2% | 49.8% | 100.0% |
| | | % within sex Gender | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 3.425 ^a | 2 | .180 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 3.431 | 2 | .180 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .005 | 1 | .944 |
| N of Valid Cases | 997 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 57.83.

If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: * Age Range

Crosstab

| | | | age Age Range | | | Total |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|---------------|---------|----------------|--------|
| | | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | |
| q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 1 Communicate better with the public | Count | 225 | 219 | 232 | 676 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 33.3% | 32.4% | 34.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % within age Age Rang | 67.4% | 66.0% | 70.1% | 67.8% |
| | 2 Talk down to the masses | Count | 71 | 71 | 63 | 205 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 34.6% | 34.6% | 30.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % within age Age Rang | 21.3% | 21.4% | 19.0% | 20.6% |
| | 9 none | Count | 38 | 42 | 36 | 116 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 32.8% | 36.2% | 31.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within age Age Rang | 11.4% | 12.7% | 10.9% | 11.6% |
| Total | | Count | 334 | 332 | 331 | 997 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 33.5% | 33.3% | 33.2% | 100.0% |
| | | % within age Age Rang | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1.472 ^a | 4 | .832 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1.474 | 4 | .831 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .100 | 1 | .752 |
| N of Valid Cases | 997 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 38.51.

If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: * parish

Crosstab

| | | | urbanru parish | | Total |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|----------------|---------|--------|
| | | | 1 urban | 2 rural | |
| q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 1 Communicate better with the public | Count | 338 | 338 | 676 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 50.0% | 50.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 65.3% | 70.6% | 67.8% |
| | 2 Talk down to the masses | Count | 115 | 90 | 205 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 56.1% | 43.9% | 100.0% |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 22.2% | 18.8% | 20.6% |
| | 9 none | Count | 65 | 51 | 116 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 56.0% | 44.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 12.5% | 10.6% | 11.6% |
| Total | | Count | 518 | 479 | 997 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 52.0% | 48.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 3.218 ^a | 2 | .200 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 3.224 | 2 | .199 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.355 | 1 | .244 |
| N of Valid Cases | 997 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 55.73.

If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: *
Region

Crosstab

| | | | region Region | | | Total |
|--|---|---|---------------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| | | | 1 Western | 2 Central | 3 Eastern | |
| q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 1 Communicate better with the public | Count | 152 | 133 | 391 | 676 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 22.5% | 19.7% | 57.8% | 100.0% |
| | | % within region Region | 76.8% | 66.5% | 65.3% | 67.8% |
| | 2 Talk down to the masses | Count | 28 | 49 | 128 | 205 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 13.7% | 23.9% | 62.4% | 100.0% |
| | | % within region Region | 14.1% | 24.5% | 21.4% | 20.6% |
| | 9 none | Count | 18 | 18 | 80 | 116 |
| | | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 15.5% | 15.5% | 69.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % within region Region | 9.1% | 9.0% | 13.4% | 11.6% |
| Total | Count | 198 | 200 | 599 | 997 | |
| | % within q8 If Minister made a speech in Patwa would you think he is: | 19.9% | 20.1% | 60.1% | 100.0% | |
| | % within region Region | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |
| | | | | | | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 12.448 ^a | 4 | .014 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 12.883 | 4 | .012 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 4.863 | 1 | .027 |
| N of Valid Cases | 997 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 23.04.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Contingency Coefficient | .111 | .014 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 997 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Stereotypes by Demographic Variables

Is more intelligent * Gender

Crosstab

| | | | | sex Gender | | Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------|------------|----------|-------|
| | | | | 1 Male | 2 Female | |
| rq9a Is more intelligent | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 44 | 29 | 73 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 9.1% | 6.2% | 7.7% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 260 | 290 | 550 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 53.9% | 61.7% | 57.8% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 178 | 151 | 329 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 36.9% | 32.1% | 34.6% | |
| Total | | Count | 482 | 470 | 952 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.784 ^a | 2 | .034 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 6.808 | 2 | .033 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .231 | 1 | .631 |
| N of Valid Cases | 952 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 36.04.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Contingency Coefficient | .084 | .034 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 952 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more intelligent * Age Range

Crosstab

| | | | | age Age Range | | | Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|---------|----------------|-------|
| | | | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | |
| rq9a Is more intelligent | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 24 | 21 | 28 | 73 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 7.5% | 6.8% | 8.8% | 7.7% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 182 | 172 | 196 | 550 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 56.7% | 55.3% | 61.3% | 57.8% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 115 | 118 | 96 | 329 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 35.8% | 37.9% | 30.0% | 34.6% | |
| Total | | Count | 321 | 311 | 320 | 952 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 5.009 ^a | 4 | .286 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 5.051 | 4 | .282 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 2.301 | 1 | .129 |
| N of Valid Cases | 952 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 23.85.

Is more intelligent * parish

Crosstab

| | | | urbanru parish | | Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------|--------|
| | | | 1 urban | 2 rural | |
| rq9a Is more intelligent | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 27 | 46 | 73 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 5.6% | 9.8% | 7.7% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 272 | 278 | 550 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 56.2% | 59.4% | 57.8% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 185 | 144 | 329 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 38.2% | 30.8% | 34.6% |
| Total | | Count | 484 | 468 | 952 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 9.854 ^a | 2 | .007 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 9.922 | 2 | .007 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 9.304 | 1 | .002 |
| N of Valid Cases | 952 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 35.89.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient | .101 | .007 |
| N of Valid Cases | 952 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more intelligent * Region

Crosstab

| | | | | region Region | | | Total |
|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| | | | | 1 Western | 2 Central | 3 Eastern | |
| rq9a Is more intelligent | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 10 | 20 | 43 | 73 | |
| | | % within region Region | 5.2% | 10.3% | 7.6% | 7.7% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 127 | 121 | 302 | 550 | |
| | | % within region Region | 66.1% | 62.1% | 53.5% | 57.8% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 55 | 54 | 220 | 329 | |
| | | % within region Region | 28.6% | 27.7% | 38.9% | 34.6% | |
| Total | Count | 192 | 195 | 565 | 952 | | |
| | % within region Region | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 15.733 ^a | 4 | .003 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 15.884 | 4 | .003 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 4.695 | 1 | .030 |
| N of Valid Cases | 952 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.72.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient | .128 | .003 |
| N of Valid Cases | 952 | |

- a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
- b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more honest * Gender

Crosstab

| | | | sex Gender | | Total |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------|----------|--------|
| | | | 1 Male | 2 Female | |
| rq9b Is more honest | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 156 | 127 | 283 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 33.5% | 28.3% | 31.0% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 133 | 145 | 278 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 28.5% | 32.4% | 30.4% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 177 | 176 | 353 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 38.0% | 39.3% | 38.6% |
| Total | | Count | 466 | 448 | 914 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 3.139 ^a | 2 | .208 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 3.143 | 2 | .208 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.368 | 1 | .242 |
| N of Valid Cases | 914 | | |

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 136.26.

Is more honest * Age Range

Crosstab

| | | | age Age Range | | | Total |
|---------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|---------|----------------|--------|
| | | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | |
| rq9b Is more honest | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 108 | 87 | 88 | 283 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 34.8% | 28.3% | 29.6% | 31.0% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 79 | 93 | 106 | 278 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 25.5% | 30.3% | 35.7% | 30.4% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 123 | 127 | 103 | 353 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 39.7% | 41.4% | 34.7% | 38.6% |
| Total | | Count | 310 | 307 | 297 | 914 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 9.438 ^a | 4 | .051 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 9.431 | 4 | .051 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .002 | 1 | .961 |
| N of Valid Cases | 914 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 90.33.

Is more honest * parish

Crosstab

| | | | urbanru parish | | Total |
|---------------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------|--------|
| | | | 1 urban | 2 rural | |
| rq9b Is more honest | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 133 | 150 | 283 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 29.0% | 33.0% | 31.0% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 124 | 154 | 278 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 27.0% | 33.8% | 30.4% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 202 | 151 | 353 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 44.0% | 33.2% | 38.6% |
| Total | | Count | 459 | 455 | 914 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 11.610 ^a | 2 | .003 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 11.642 | 2 | .003 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 7.259 | 1 | .007 |
| N of Valid Cases | 914 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 138.39.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient | .112 | .003 |
| N of Valid Cases | 914 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more honest * Region

Crosstab

| | | | region Region | | | Total |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| | | | 1 Western | 2 Central | 3 Eastern | |
| rq9b Is more honest | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 55 | 54 | 174 | 283 |
| | | % within region Region | 29.1% | 29.2% | 32.2% | 31.0% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 70 | 67 | 141 | 278 |
| | | % within region Region | 37.0% | 36.2% | 26.1% | 30.4% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 64 | 64 | 225 | 353 |
| | | % within region Region | 33.9% | 34.6% | 41.7% | 38.6% |
| Total | Count | 189 | 185 | 540 | 914 | |
| | % within region Region | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 11.918 ^a | 4 | .018 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 11.837 | 4 | .019 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .557 | 1 | .456 |
| N of Valid Cases | 914 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 56.27.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient | .113 | .018 |
| N of Valid Cases | 914 | |

- a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
- b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more educated * Gender

Crosstab

| | | | | sex Gender | | Total |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------|------------|----------|-------|
| | | | | 1 Male | 2 Female | |
| rq9c Is more educated | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 34 | 25 | 59 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 7.1% | 5.3% | 6.2% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 291 | 300 | 591 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 60.4% | 63.0% | 61.7% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 157 | 151 | 308 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 32.6% | 31.7% | 32.2% | |
| Total | | Count | 482 | 476 | 958 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1.589 ^a | 2 | .452 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1.595 | 2 | .451 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .069 | 1 | .793 |
| N of Valid Cases | 958 | | |

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.32.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient | .041 | .452 |
| N of Valid Cases | 958 | |

- a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
- b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more educated * Age Range

Crosstab

| | | | | age Age Range | | | Total |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|---------|----------------|-------|
| | | | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | |
| rq9c Is more educated | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 17 | 21 | 21 | 59 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 5.3% | 6.6% | 6.6% | 6.2% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 179 | 188 | 224 | 591 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 55.6% | 58.8% | 70.9% | 61.7% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 126 | 111 | 71 | 308 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 39.1% | 34.7% | 22.5% | 32.2% | |
| Total | | Count | 322 | 320 | 316 | 958 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 22.067 ^a | 4 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 22.717 | 4 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 16.374 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 958 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.46.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Contingency Coefficient | .150 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 958 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more educated * parish

Crosstab

| | | | | urbanru parish | | Total |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------|----------------|---------|-------|
| | | | | 1 urban | 2 rural | |
| rq9c Is more educated | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 22 | 37 | 59 | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 4.5% | 7.9% | 6.2% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 298 | 293 | 591 | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 60.9% | 62.5% | 61.7% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 169 | 139 | 308 | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 34.6% | 29.6% | 32.2% | |
| Total | | Count | 489 | 469 | 958 | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.363 ^a | 2 | .042 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 6.407 | 2 | .041 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 5.238 | 1 | .022 |
| N of Valid Cases | 958 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28.88.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Contingency Coefficient | .081 | .042 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 958 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more educated * Region

Crosstab

| | | | | region Region | | | Total |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| | | | | 1 Western | 2 Central | 3 Eastern | |
| rq9c Is more educated | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 12 | 10 | 37 | 59 | |
| | | % within region Region | 6.1% | 5.2% | 6.5% | 6.2% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 129 | 121 | 341 | 591 | |
| | | % within region Region | 65.5% | 62.7% | 60.0% | 61.7% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 56 | 62 | 190 | 308 | |
| | | % within region Region | 28.4% | 32.1% | 33.5% | 32.2% | |
| Total | | Count | 197 | 193 | 568 | 958 | |
| | | % within region Region | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 2.309 ^a | 4 | .679 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 2.348 | 4 | .672 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .805 | 1 | .370 |
| N of Valid Cases | 958 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.89.

Is more friendly * Gender

Crosstab

| | | | sex Gender | | Total |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------|----------|--------|
| | | | 1 Male | 2 Female | |
| rq9d Is more friendly | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 189 | 190 | 379 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 39.2% | 40.4% | 39.8% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 126 | 114 | 240 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 26.1% | 24.3% | 25.2% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 167 | 166 | 333 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 34.6% | 35.3% | 35.0% |
| Total | | Count | 482 | 470 | 952 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|-------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | .454 ^a | 2 | .797 |
| Likelihood Ratio | .455 | 2 | .797 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .009 | 1 | .923 |
| N of Valid Cases | 952 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 118.49.

Is more friendly * Age Range

Crosstab

| | | | age Age Range | | | Total |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|---------|----------------|--------|
| | | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | |
| rq9d Is more friendly | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 123 | 134 | 122 | 379 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 38.2% | 42.1% | 39.1% | 39.8% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 75 | 71 | 94 | 240 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 23.3% | 22.3% | 30.1% | 25.2% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 124 | 113 | 96 | 333 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 38.5% | 35.5% | 30.8% | 35.0% |
| Total | | Count | 322 | 318 | 312 | 952 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 7.950 ^a | 4 | .093 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 7.853 | 4 | .097 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.597 | 1 | .206 |
| N of Valid Cases | 952 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 78.66.

Is more friendly * parish

Crosstab

| | | | urbanru parish | | Total |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------|--------|
| | | | 1 urban | 2 rural | |
| rq9d Is more friendly | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 180 | 199 | 379 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 37.2% | 42.5% | 39.8% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 106 | 134 | 240 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 21.9% | 28.6% | 25.2% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 198 | 135 | 333 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 40.9% | 28.8% | 35.0% |
| Total | | Count | 484 | 468 | 952 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 15.874 ^a | 2 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 15.949 | 2 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 9.645 | 1 | .002 |
| N of Valid Cases | 952 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 117.98.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient | .128 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 952 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more friendly * Region

Crosstab

| | | | region Region | | | Total |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| | | | 1 Western | 2 Central | 3 Eastern | |
| rq9d Is more friendly | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 66 | 76 | 237 | 379 |
| | | % within region Region | 34.0% | 39.6% | 41.9% | 39.8% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 59 | 54 | 127 | 240 |
| | | % within region Region | 30.4% | 28.1% | 22.4% | 25.2% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 69 | 62 | 202 | 333 |
| | | % within region Region | 35.6% | 32.3% | 35.7% | 35.0% |
| Total | Count | 194 | 192 | 566 | 952 | |
| | % within region Region | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 7.193 ^a | 4 | .126 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 7.191 | 4 | .126 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .874 | 1 | .350 |
| N of Valid Cases | 952 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 48.40.

Has more money * Gender

Crosstab

| | | | sex Gender | | Total |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------|----------|--------|
| | | | 1 Male | 2 Female | |
| rq9e Has more money | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 46 | 31 | 77 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 10.0% | 7.5% | 8.8% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 201 | 189 | 390 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 43.7% | 45.8% | 44.7% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 213 | 193 | 406 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 46.3% | 46.7% | 46.5% |
| Total | | Count | 460 | 413 | 873 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1.751 ^a | 2 | .417 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1.764 | 2 | .414 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .451 | 1 | .502 |
| N of Valid Cases | 873 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 36.43.

Has more money * Age Range

Crosstab

| | | | age Age Range | | | Total |
|---------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|---------|----------------|--------|
| | | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | |
| rq9e Has more money | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 24 | 25 | 28 | 77 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 7.8% | 8.8% | 9.9% | 8.8% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 124 | 116 | 150 | 390 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 40.4% | 40.8% | 53.2% | 44.7% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 159 | 143 | 104 | 406 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 51.8% | 50.4% | 36.9% | 46.5% |
| Total | | Count | 307 | 284 | 282 | 873 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 15.882 ^a | 4 | .003 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 16.028 | 4 | .003 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 10.149 | 1 | .001 |
| N of Valid Cases | 873 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.87.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient | .134 | .003 |
| N of Valid Cases | 873 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Has more money * parish

Crosstab

| | | | urbanru parish | | Total |
|---------------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------|--------|
| | | | 1 urban | 2 rural | |
| rq9e Has more money | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 35 | 42 | 77 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 7.8% | 9.8% | 8.8% |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 194 | 196 | 390 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 43.5% | 45.9% | 44.7% |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 217 | 189 | 406 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 48.7% | 44.3% | 46.5% |
| Total | | Count | 446 | 427 | 873 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 2.165 ^a | 2 | .339 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 2.167 | 2 | .338 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 2.157 | 1 | .142 |
| N of Valid Cases | 873 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 37.66.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient | .050 | .339 |
| N of Valid Cases | 873 | |

- a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
- b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Has more money * Region

Crosstab

| | | | | region Region | | | Total |
|---------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| | | | | 1 Western | 2 Central | 3 Eastern | |
| rq9e Has more money | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 14 | 16 | 47 | 77 | |
| | | % within region Region | 7.7% | 9.1% | 9.1% | 8.8% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 89 | 86 | 215 | 390 | |
| | | % within region Region | 49.2% | 49.1% | 41.6% | 44.7% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 78 | 73 | 255 | 406 | |
| | | % within region Region | 43.1% | 41.7% | 49.3% | 46.5% | |
| Total | | Count | 181 | 175 | 517 | 873 | |
| | | % within region Region | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 5.210 ^a | 4 | .266 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 5.221 | 4 | .265 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.289 | 1 | .256 |
| N of Valid Cases | 873 | | |

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.44.

Is more helpful * Gender

Crosstab

| | | | | sex Gender | | Total |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------|------------|----------|-------|
| | | | | 1 Male | 2 Female | |
| rq9f Is more helpful | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 165 | 135 | 300 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 34.7% | 29.1% | 31.9% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 140 | 152 | 292 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 29.4% | 32.8% | 31.1% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 171 | 177 | 348 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 35.9% | 38.1% | 37.0% | |
| Total | | Count | 476 | 464 | 940 | |
| | | % within sex Gender | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 3.444 ^a | 2 | .179 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 3.449 | 2 | .178 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 2.075 | 1 | .150 |
| N of Valid Cases | 940 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 144.14.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Contingency Coefficient | .060 | .179 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 940 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more helpful * Age Range

Crosstab

| | | | | age Age Range | | | Total |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|---------|----------------|-------|
| | | | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | |
| rq9f Is more helpful | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 96 | 95 | 109 | 300 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 30.1% | 30.5% | 35.2% | 31.9% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 84 | 101 | 107 | 292 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 26.3% | 32.5% | 34.5% | 31.1% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 139 | 115 | 94 | 348 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 43.6% | 37.0% | 30.3% | 37.0% | |
| Total | | Count | 319 | 311 | 310 | 940 | |
| | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 12.683 ^a | 4 | .013 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 12.789 | 4 | .012 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 7.658 | 1 | .006 |
| N of Valid Cases | 940 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 96.30.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Contingency Coefficient | .115 | .013 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 940 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more helpful * parish

Crosstab

| | | | | urbanru parish | | Total |
|----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------|----------------|---------|-------|
| | | | | 1 urban | 2 rural | |
| rq9f Is more helpful | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 152 | 148 | 300 | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 31.6% | 32.2% | 31.9% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 132 | 160 | 292 | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 27.4% | 34.9% | 31.1% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 197 | 151 | 348 | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 41.0% | 32.9% | 37.0% | |
| Total | | Count | 481 | 459 | 940 | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 8.308 ^a | 2 | .016 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 8.326 | 2 | .016 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 2.587 | 1 | .108 |
| N of Valid Cases | 940 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 142.58.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Contingency Coefficient | .094 | .016 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 940 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is more helpful * Region

Crosstab

| | | | | region Region | | | Total |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| | | | | 1 Western | 2 Central | 3 Eastern | |
| rq9f Is more helpful | 1.00 Patwa | Count | 57 | 56 | 187 | 300 | |
| | | % within region Region | 30.2% | 29.8% | 33.2% | 31.9% | |
| | 2.00 English | Count | 68 | 67 | 157 | 292 | |
| | | % within region Region | 36.0% | 35.6% | 27.9% | 31.1% | |
| | 3.00 Both | Count | 64 | 65 | 219 | 348 | |
| | | % within region Region | 33.9% | 34.6% | 38.9% | 37.0% | |
| Total | | Count | 189 | 188 | 563 | 940 | |
| | | % within region Region | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|----|--------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.663 ^a | 4 | .155 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 6.618 | 4 | .158 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .084 | 1 | .772 |
| N of Valid Cases | 940 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 58.40.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient | .084 | .155 |
| N of Valid Cases | 940 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Education by Demographic Variables

Which school is better? * Gender

Crosstab

| | | | sex Gender | | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------|----------|--------|
| | | | 1 Male | 2 Female | |
| q10 Which school is better? | 1 English school only | Count | 133 | 155 | 288 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 26.6% | 31.3% | 28.9% |
| | 2 English & Patwa School | Count | 367 | 341 | 708 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 73.4% | 68.8% | 71.1% |
| Total | | Count | 500 | 496 | 996 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 2.619 ^b | 1 | .106 | | |
| Continuity Correction ^a | 2.398 | 1 | .121 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 2.621 | 1 | .105 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .108 | .061 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 2.617 | 1 | .106 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 996 | | | | |

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 143.42.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Contingency Coefficient | .051 | .106 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 996 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Which school is better? * Age Range

Crosstab

| | | age Age Range | | | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | |
| q10 Which school is better? | 1 English school on | Count 83 | Count 83 | Count 122 | Count 288 |
| | | % within age 24.9% | % within age 24.9% | % within age 37.0% | % within age 28.9% |
| | 2 English & Patwa School | Count 250 | Count 250 | Count 208 | Count 708 |
| | | % within age 75.1% | % within age 75.1% | % within age 63.0% | % within age 71.1% |
| Total | | Count 333 | Count 333 | Count 330 | Count 996 |
| | | % within age 100.0% | % within age 100.0% | % within age 100.0% | % within age 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 15.575 ^a | 2 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 15.244 | 2 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 11.652 | 1 | .001 |
| N of Valid Cases | 996 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 95.42.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Contingency Coefficient | .124 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 996 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

q10 Which school is better? * urbanru parish

Crosstab

| | | urbanru parish | | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | 1 urban | 2 rural | |
| q10 Which school is better? | 1 English school only | Count 164 | Count 124 | Count 288 |
| | | % within urbanru parish 31.6% | % within urbanru parish 26.0% | % within urbanru parish 28.9% |
| | 2 English & Patwa School | Count 355 | Count 353 | Count 708 |
| | | % within urbanru parish 68.4% | % within urbanru parish 74.0% | % within urbanru parish 71.1% |
| Total | | Count 519 | Count 477 | Count 996 |
| | | % within urbanru parish 100.0% | % within urbanru parish 100.0% | % within urbanru parish 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 3.797 ^b | 1 | .051 | | |
| Continuity Correction ^a | 3.529 | 1 | .060 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 3.808 | 1 | .051 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .059 | .030 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 3.793 | 1 | .051 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 996 | | | | |

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 137.93.

q10 Which school is better? * region Region

Crosstab

| | | region Region | | | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | 1 Western | 2 Central | 3 Eastern | |
| q10 Which school is better? | 1 English school only | Count 63 | Count 51 | Count 174 | Count 288 |
| | | % within region 31.5% | % within region 25.8% | % within region 29.1% | % within region 28.9% |
| | 2 English & Patwa School | Count 137 | Count 147 | Count 424 | Count 708 |
| | | % within region 68.5% | % within region 74.2% | % within region 70.9% | % within region 71.1% |
| Total | | Count 200 | Count 198 | Count 598 | Count 996 |
| | | % within region 100.0% | % within region 100.0% | % within region 100.0% | % within region 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1.620 ^a | 2 | .445 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1.632 | 2 | .442 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .127 | 1 | .722 |
| N of Valid Cases | 996 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 57.25.

Is Patwa a Language by Demographic Variables

Is Patwa a Language * Gender

Crosstab

| | | | sex Gender | | Total |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------------|------------|----------|--------|
| | | | 1 Male | 2 Female | |
| q12 Is Patwa a Language | 1 Yes | Count | 405 | 390 | 795 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 80.8% | 78.2% | 79.5% |
| | 2 No | Count | 96 | 109 | 205 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 19.2% | 21.8% | 20.5% |
| Total | | Count | 501 | 499 | 1000 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1.103 ^b | 1 | .294 | | |
| Continuity Correction ^a | .945 | 1 | .331 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1.104 | 1 | .293 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | .309 | .166 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.102 | 1 | .294 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 1000 | | | | |

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 102.30.

Is Patwa a Language * Age Range

Crosstab

| | | | age Age Range | | | Total |
|-------------------------|-------|------------------------|---------------|---------|----------------|--------|
| | | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | |
| q12 Is Patwa a Language | 1 Yes | Count | 276 | 276 | 243 | 795 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 82.6% | 82.6% | 73.2% | 79.5% |
| | 2 No | Count | 58 | 58 | 89 | 205 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 17.4% | 17.4% | 26.8% | 20.5% |
| Total | | Count | 334 | 334 | 332 | 1000 |
| | | % within age Age Range | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 12.132 ^a | 2 | .002 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 11.769 | 2 | .003 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 9.080 | 1 | .003 |
| N of Valid Cases | 1000 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 68.06.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient | .109 | .002 |
| N of Valid Cases | 1000 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Is Patwa a Language * parish

Crosstab

| | | | | urbanru parish | | Total |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------|----------------|---------|-------|
| | | | | 1 urban | 2 rural | |
| q12 Is Patwa a Language | 1 Yes | Count | 413 | 382 | 795 | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 79.6% | 79.4% | 79.5% | |
| | 2 No | Count | 106 | 99 | 205 | |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 20.4% | 20.6% | 20.5% | |
| Total | Count | | 519 | 481 | 1000 | |
| | % within urbanru parish | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|----|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | .004 ^b | 1 | .951 | | |
| Continuity Correction ^a | .000 | 1 | 1.000 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | .004 | 1 | .951 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | 1.000 | .506 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .004 | 1 | .951 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 1000 | | | | |

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 98.61.

Is Patwa a Language * Region

Crosstab

| | | | | region Region | | | Total |
|----------------------------|-------|------------------------|--------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| | | | | 1 Western | 2 Central | 3 Eastern | |
| q12 Is Patwa a Language | 1 Yes | Count | 153 | 155 | 487 | 795 | |
| | | % within region Region | 76.5% | 77.5% | 81.2% | 79.5% | |
| | 2 No | Count | 47 | 45 | 113 | 205 | |
| | | % within region Region | 23.5% | 22.5% | 18.8% | 20.5% | |
| Total | | Count | 200 | 200 | 600 | 1000 | |
| | | % within region Region | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|----|--------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 2.618 ^a | 2 | .270 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 2.591 | 2 | .274 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 2.452 | 1 | .117 |
| N of Valid Cases | 1000 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 41.00.

Official Language by Demographic Variables

Should Patwa be an official language? * Gender

Crosstab

| | | | sex Gender | | Total |
|---|--------------|---------------------|------------|----------|--------|
| | | | 1 Male | 2 Female | |
| q13 Should Patwa be an official language? | 1 Yes | Count | 358 | 326 | 684 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 71.7% | 65.3% | 68.5% |
| | 2 No | Count | 123 | 141 | 264 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 24.6% | 28.3% | 26.5% |
| | 3 Don't Know | Count | 18 | 32 | 50 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 3.6% | 6.4% | 5.0% |
| Total | | Count | 499 | 499 | 998 |
| | | % within sex Gender | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.644 ^a | 2 | .036 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 6.699 | 2 | .035 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 6.382 | 1 | .012 |
| N of Valid Cases | 998 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.00.

Symmetric Measures

| | | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal | Contingency Coefficient | .081 | .036 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 998 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Should Patwa be an official language? * Age Range

Crosstab

| | | | age Age Range | | | Total |
|---|--------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------|----------------|--------|
| | | | 1 18-30 | 2 31-50 | 3 51-80+ years | |
| q13 Should Patwa be an official language? | 1 Yes | Count | 240 | 229 | 215 | 684 |
| | | % within age Age Rang | 72.1% | 68.8% | 64.8% | 68.5% |
| | 2 No | Count | 77 | 89 | 98 | 264 |
| | | % within age Age Rang | 23.1% | 26.7% | 29.5% | 26.5% |
| | 3 Don't Know | Count | 16 | 15 | 19 | 50 |
| | | % within age Age Rang | 4.8% | 4.5% | 5.7% | 5.0% |
| Total | | Count | 333 | 333 | 332 | 998 |
| | | % within age Age Rang | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 4.420 ^a | 4 | .352 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 4.434 | 4 | .350 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 3.389 | 1 | .066 |
| N of Valid Cases | 998 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.63.

Should Patwa be an official language? * parish

Crosstab

| | | | urbanru parish | | Total |
|---|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------|--------|
| | | | 1 urban | 2 rural | |
| q13 Should Patwa be an official language? | 1 Yes | Count | 336 | 348 | 684 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 65.0% | 72.3% | 68.5% |
| | 2 No | Count | 154 | 110 | 264 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 29.8% | 22.9% | 26.5% |
| | 3 Don't Know | Count | 27 | 23 | 50 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 5.2% | 4.8% | 5.0% |
| Total | | Count | 517 | 481 | 998 |
| | | % within urbanru parish | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.574 ^a | 2 | .037 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 6.600 | 2 | .037 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 4.563 | 1 | .033 |
| N of Valid Cases | 998 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.10.

Symmetric Measures

| | Value | Approx. Sig. |
|--|-------|--------------|
| Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient | .081 | .037 |
| N of Valid Cases | 998 | |

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Should Patwa be an official language? * Region

Crosstab

| | | | region Region | | | Total |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| | | | 1 Western | 2 Central | 3 Eastern | |
| q13 Should Patwa be an official language? | 1 Yes | Count | 127 | 143 | 414 | 684 |
| | | % within region Region | 64.1% | 71.5% | 69.0% | 68.5% |
| | 2 No | Count | 60 | 48 | 156 | 264 |
| | | % within region Region | 30.3% | 24.0% | 26.0% | 26.5% |
| | 3 Don't Know | Count | 11 | 9 | 30 | 50 |
| | | % within region Region | 5.6% | 4.5% | 5.0% | 5.0% |
| Total | Count | 198 | 200 | 600 | 998 | |
| | % within region Region | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 2.666 ^a | 4 | .615 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 2.639 | 4 | .620 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .754 | 1 | .385 |
| N of Valid Cases | 998 | | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.92.