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## Introduction

The aim of our project was to determine the preferred language choice of the Polish community in Manchester. The main focus of our research was to establish whether different domains, length of residence and age influenced the language choice. Due to the fact that a large number of Polish citizens recently came to the UK, we wanted to see if there was a pattern in their linguistic behavior as well as in attitudes towards their mother tongue as well as the language of the majority. Moreover, we wanted to compare data collected randomly from a Polish church against the ethnographic and social network sampling.

## Background information

Polish migration to the UK has been taking place for a long time. The first significant movement was after the Second World War when many Polish
citizens left their occupied country in order to find a better future for themselves and their families. Since then a considerable number of Poles have successfully settled down in the UK. The main wave of Polish migration to the UK took place in 2004 when Poland joined the EU. "Between the year ending December 2003 and the year ending June 2010 the Polish-born population of the UK increased from 75,000 to 520,000 " (Office for National Statistics 2011). However, the number of Polish immigrants arriving from Poland has declined in recent years from 96,000 in 2007 to 39,000 in 2009. Our project focuses on the Manchester area where between 20,000 and 30,000 Poles are based.

## Methodology

Together we designed a questionnaire which was helpful in eliciting quantitative as well as qualitative data. The questionnaire was a quick and easy way of collecting information. It also gave us the opportunity to collect data on the attitudes of the Polish community towards both Polish and English languages and in what domains they are both used. The questionnaires were written in both Polish and English, which we assumed by the participant choosing Polish over English would indicate their ability to communicate in English. Our sampling techniques included: random, ethnographic research and social networks (Meyerhoff \& Schleef 2010:5-6).

Some of the random sampling took place in the Polish Church of Divine Mercy in Moss Side. This was the first Polish church to be built abroad after the Second World War with work on the existing building started in 1959. Since then it has become a place of worship for many Poles who came to Manchester. Our data was collected on Sunday after the celebration of the Anniversary of $3^{\text {rd }}$ May Constitution. The interviewees were randomly selected. The participants varied in age and gender. Moreover, some of the information was collected from the business owners such as polish shop in the Manchester Arndale Market.

The ethnographic approach involved one of the group members, who is Polish herself, in gaining data. Questionnaires were sent via Facebook to Polish friends and some of them were also filled in by hand.

Finally, the social networks ('friend of a friend') sampling was used where great amount of data was collected. One of the friends helped in gathering the data from their social network.

## Findings

## General:

The data from the questionnaires was entered on to an excel spreadsheet, following the order that the questions were asked (Appendix 1.1). 21 of the 34 respondents were male and 13 were female. The average age of the informants was 31.1 years old, where closer analysis revealed that 19 were aged 20 to 30 . When allocated to the following age groups the following totals were found:

| $0-20$ | $21-25$ | $26-30$ | $31-35$ | $36-45$ | $46-55$ | Over55 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | 7 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 |

Two of the respondents did not answer the question about occupation, 1 answering that he was retired, 5 were students and the rest were employed in a variety of occupations. Of the two who declined, 1 used English at work and had lived in Manchester for 4 years, whilst the other had lived here less than a year and used Polish at work. Since 1 respondent was retired the responses to language used at school/work totalled 33. Of the 5 students, 3 used English and 2 used both, but they were 25 and 26. Figures for language used at work were 2 Polish, 14 English and 12 used both, when deducting the student replies from the totals.
The average length of time in Manchester and the U.K. was 8.39 and 8.27 years respectfully, most having lived here for 6 years or less, but one respondent aged 55 had lived here since birth. Ages on arrival could be calculated as 9 under 20, 21 aged 20-30, 2 in their 30's and 2 in their 40's, one of whom was 45 and had lived here for less than a year (Appendix 1.1)


Chart 1(source Appendix 1.2)

32 of the 34 respondents spoke both Polish and English, with 2 speaking only Polish. 27 could read and write both languages, 6 only Polish and 1 just English, but she was only 5 years old. 23 had learned English at school, 6 at home and 4 replied "other." 23 had learned Polish at school and the remaining 11 at home. When asked if there was provision to learn both at school, 20 replied "yes" and 14 "no." The availability to learn both was reported to occur in the secondary part of education, with primary education focusing on only one language.

With regards how they described their community, 5 replied mainly Polish, 21 said mixed and 4 mainly English. The vast majority, 30, considered their national identity to be Polish, 1 as English (the 5 year old who had lived here for 3 years), 2 British and 1 as "other" (describing himself as "E.U."). Responses for which language they used most revealed 17 (50\%) Polish, 1 replied English (a 40 year old female who had lived here for 15 years) and the remaining 16 used both about the same.


Chart 2 (source Appendix 1.2)

When asked about the importance of each language on a scale of 1-10 (with 10 being very important) the number of responses was fewer than for other questions, particularly from the informants who had chosen to reply to the Polish version of the questionnaire. 22 ranked Polish as 10,3 as 9,1 as 8,1 as 6 and 1 as 5 . The rankings for English numbered only 26 and were as follows: 15 as 10,2 as 9,4 as 8,1 as 7,1 as 6,1 as 5 and 2 as only 4 . The informant who ranked Polish as 5 and also English as 4 was the 31 year old male who considered himself "E.U." who replied that both were important. The other respondent who ranked English as 4 was a 28 year old female who had lived in the U.K. for 4 years, Manchester for 2, a warehouse operative with a degree and had ranked Polish as 8, yet had replied "both" when asked which was more important. A 30 year old male, living in Manchester for 3 years who could speak both languages, but only read and write Polish, not having had school provision to learn both, ranked English as 5, compared with Polish as 10, and replied that Polish was more important and he used it most. 31 responses were obtained for which language was more important, with 8 selecting Polish, 8 likewise for English and 15 considered them both important. Some of the respondents expanded on their replies, with 5 considering both important with Polish as their national identity, but English mattered because they live and work here. Two respondents selected Polish
since they were born there and their national identity was Polish, with one trying to use English more, but using Polish most. Two people, who considered their national identity as Polish, suggested English was more important due to living and working here and used both languages about the same. One of these was a 45 year old mechanic who had lived here for less than a year and chose to fill in the Polish version of the questionnaire.

## Domain Analysis:

Results for which language was used in different situations by the respondents as a whole were calculated as percentages of the number who actually gave responses for the individual categories illustrated in Chart 3.


## Chart 3

Polish seems to be the most popular language at home compared to English or the use of both being predominant at school or work. Socially, the use of both was also fairly common (75\%). Television and News/Magazines categories saw English as being used by roughly half of the respondents, whereas the Internet was used by two thirds in both languages.

The survey by Barr et al (2010:14) suggested further research by age group could be interesting, so closer analysis was carried out to see if there were any marked differences or patterns that could be established. Findings for this were calculated in the same way as for the previous data, making the number of respondents per group more balanced for comparison (Appendix 1.2), and broken down by language and shown in Charts 4,5 and 6.


## Chart 4

Like the survey as a whole, Polish was the most commonly used language at home, but the respondents aged 25 or under used it 100\%. The age group 46-55 used it a third of the time at school/ work, $100 \%$ socially/with friends and noticeably more across the other categories than in Chart 3. Two of the three respondents had not had school provision for both languages, could read/write only Polish and only one could speak both. Those aged 36-45 accessed television in Polish.


## Chart 5

None of the respondents used English at home. In school/work the 75\% aged 20 or under using English were at school, whilst those with 100\% represented 1 aged 46-55 (1 being retired) who was self-employed and 1 of those aged 36-45 had lived here 15 years, used English in all categories except friends/socially, using both like the majority in Chart 3, and could read/write both. Remarkably only the youngest group used English socially/with friends totalling $25 \%$, probably reflecting those in the school environment. The slight increase in television access in the 31-35 age groups from Chart 3 included a 34 year old male who could read/write both languages, despite lack of school provision, and considered English more important. Internet usage was highest amongst the youngest age group and marginally higher than Chart 3 for the 46-55 age groups, 2 of the three having lived here 15 and 55 years respectively, and had an active knowledge of both languages.


## Chart 6

The most noticeable age group to differ from Chart 3 was the $26-30$ group, with $75 \%$ usage at school/work, 91.666 socially/with friends and 83.333 in the news/magazines categories. All had lived here 6 years or less; the majority had an active knowledge of both languages, learned at school, with 50\% claiming to use both languages most, and 75\% considering both as important (Appendix 1.3),whilst all considered their national identity as Polish with most rating it at " 10 ". Interestingly $50 \%$ of the respondents were female and show similar responses throughout the questionnaire (see Appendix 1.3 and for the following data). The 21-25 group had also lived here less than 6 years (as were the majority of respondents); had active knowledge of both languages, but all ranked Polish as "10" (i.e. very important).

## Ethnographic versus Church:

The data collected came from 24 questionnaires distributed ethnographically (friend of a friend via our Polish colleague) and 10 from the Polish Church of Devine Mercy (by another member). Charts 7 and 8 show the results for the same domains.


## Chart 7

This chart reveals a lower percentage of Polish use socially than the general survey ( $12.5 \%$ cf. $21.21 \%$ respectively) although 5 (21.74\%) described their community as Polish. Similarly the usage for media was lower, showing a preference for television in English (72.73\% cf. 51.61\%) and a possible trend towards internet and news/magazines in both (Appendix 2.1), with the percentage of users in the latter category being $0 \%$.


## Chart 8

There was a general increase of Polish usage in all categories apart from home, with a corresponding decrease of using both languages. 90\% considered their national identity as Polish, 30\% could only read/write Polish and $50 \%$ had not had provision for both at school (Appendix 2.2)

## English versus Polish:

23 questionnaires were completed in English and 11 in Polish (Appendix 3) and results shown in Charts 9 and 10.


## Chart 9



Chart 10

Generally the use of Polish was higher for those who chose to complete the questionnaires in Polish meaning the use of both was lower than the survey as a whole. $63.64 \%$ had not had school provision to learn both languages.

## Male versus Female:

The ethnographic responses revealed a sample of 13 male and 11 female informants and the results are shown in Charts 11 and 12.


## Chart 11

Language use by Females


## Chart 12

The females used Polish more at home, but English more at work/school than the males and the general survey. They also accessed the media in Polish, whereas the male response was 0\%, having higher responses for using English (Appendix 2.3).

Many more findings could be made from the data we collected on the spreadsheet (see Appendix 1-3).

## Discussion

From the outset of this study we proposed that we would find that the Polish community of Greater Manchester would consider themselves strongly as Polish nationals and use their native language wherever possible, however we also said that this proposal would be different when considering various domains of language use as well with regards to the ages of the informants and what generation of migrant they are. Generally the upkeep and importance of the Polish language was clear to be seen from the results obtained from the study. Kathy Burrel suggests, "Immigrants often reconstruct Poland abroad... preserving ones language, education and religion." (Burrel, 2009:108) Most informants studied spoke their native tongue at home because where immigrants have a chance to speak their language, they do however outside of the home domain the majority spoke English because they live and work in a majority English community and they have to speak English. There are exceptions though, because some people work in Polish establishments and with Polish colleagues. Anna Szuber's study; Native Polish-Speaking Adolescent Immigrants Exposure to and Use of English, 2007 -where she studied 59 polish immigrants in America and their language domains. Anna found that, 'native speakers predominantly used Polish across a variety of setting" (2007:26). This study highlights this as the informants used their native language across all domains including the television and internet. This shows that there are provisions for the Polish people of Manchester to access the media in their mother tongue. I do not think that this is truly representative of the Polish community and their uses of their language when accessing the television and internet. If we categorise the
results into age groups we would get a more valid and representative result across the board. In the study we investigated to see if we would find a pattern that suggested that the percentage of informants accessing different types of domain would vary according to their age. This highlighted younger participants who accessed the media through English more than Polish and that the older generation of Polish immigrants accessed the media through Polish more than English. (Barr et al, 2010:14)This could be due to the school environment affecting the younger population of the informants. With regards to the provision of bilingual education or access to learning in both languages in Manchester the results suggested there is availability to learn both languages in secondary education but no provision in early education. This is a matter for the national curriculum to affect. The findings showed that the informants considered themselves to be Polish when it comes to their identity, showing us that identity is important however there was one informant who considered himself as an 'EU' national which is interesting because he maybe feels that it is important not only to keep his national identity but accept and integrate into the society in which he lives which makes him 'European'. There was one informant who was Polish but considered themselves English by national definition. She was a 5 year old girl who has been living in Manchester since she was 2 years old. One could interpret form this that the girl has no recollection of Poland and or the Polish language and that the English language and culture was introduced early in her life- with most of her friends being English- she notices no difference between herself and her friends. We also looked at and noticed a difference between male and female participants. We found that females used Polish for a greater percentage of time in the home domain; they spoke English more at work/school than males. Another difference was that the female participants accessed the media in Polish whereas the percentage of males who accessed the media through the medium of the Polish language was $0 \%$. The reasons for this are the type of occupation of both sexes. This is because there are generally a higher proportion of females which work in a professional capacity than men so they have to use English more at work.

## Problems encountered/reflection on the outcome

We faced several unexpected problems during our research. We had initially planned to pilot test our questionnaires on some students from the University of Manchester. However, this plan did not go through as the Ethics Committee Approval made contacting the student population somewhat complicated for our timescale.

Providing participants with questionnaires proved to be easier than expected and the reception we got from the Polish church turned out to be highly responsive. It was an excellent place to conduct part of the survey as there it was possible to find a rich mix of all ages and most people were happy to be interrupted for a few minutes. Ideally we would have liked to have completed more questionnaires but the data we managed to collect was more than sufficient for the size of report in question. Also second and third generation responses would have been interesting to include, but which we had difficulty finding.

An essential issue addressed by the group was the importance of direct communication when conducting ethnographic research i.e. getting the questionnaires completed on site. This ensures that the questionnaires will get completed. We got all of the 34 questionnaires successfully completed with relatively little resistance. A possible factor here could be that the questionnaire was available in both Polish and English. The questionnaires helped us to identify areas where there was a lack of Polish usage i.e. media. The evidence could be useful for creating more publicity to make people more aware of the services available.

## Further research

The research could be expanded from domain analysis to an in-depth comparison of the language use of Poles who arrived in the UK before their joining the European Union and of those after the expansion of the membership states. How does the maintenance of language differ from those living in the UK since the Second World War to those post-EU? This could be a particularly relevant and current area to investigate as Polish migration to the UK has a long history and comparing it to a new wave of migration could provide us with interesting information. This could be expanded onto a research on language identity. How different is the national identity of the Polish who arrived here after the Second World War to those after the expansion of the EU? The question of national identity is interesting as well as highly important as it is essential to the maintenance of language.
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Appendix 1.1
Data from all the questionnaires


[^0]
## Appendix 1.2

Use by age, Length of Time in Manchester and Language Capability


278




Time in M/cr


Language Capability

|  | $0-$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 20 | $21-25$ | $26-30$ |  | $31-35$ | $36-45$ | $46-55$ | Over 55 |
| Speak Both | 100 | 100 | 100 | 75 | 100 | 66.66 | 100 |  |
| Read/Write Both | 75 | 100 | 75 | 100 | 50 | 66.66 | 50 |  |
| Most Both | 75 | 42.86 | 41.66 | 50 | 50 | 33.33 | 50 |  |
| Important Both | 25 | 14.29 | 58.33 | 75 | 0 | 33.33 | 0 |  |

## Appendix 1.3

## Data for specific age groups



## Appendix 1.4

## Samples of completed questionnaires:

## Survey Introduction

We are a group of students from the University of Manchester carrying out a survey on the choice of language use in the Polish speaking communities of Manchester. We were wondering if you would be willing to take part. Any information that you volunteer will remain anonymous and you are free to withdraw your participation at any time.

We would like to thank you for your contribution and if you would like any further information about the project you can contact us via the email addresses below:

## Questionnaire

Gender Male...X. Female $\qquad$ Age 20..

Occupation $\qquad$ .kitchen chef
Approximately how long have you lived in
(a) Manchester?

Since birth....
...1....Years Less than 1 Year....
(b) the UK?

Since birth..
...1....Years
Less than 1 Year...
Which languages can you speak? Polish.... English.... Both...X......
Which languages can you read and write? Polish.... English.... Both...X....
Where did you learn English? School...X.... Home.... Other.
Where did you learn Polish? School....... Home...X. Other. $\qquad$
How would you describe your local community? (e.g. mainly Polish, mixed etc.) Polish.

Which languages do you use in the following situations?

|  | Polish | English | Both |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| At Home | X |  |  |
| At School/ Work |  |  | X |
| Socially/ With Friends | X |  |  |
| Television |  | X |  |
| Accessing the Internet |  | X |  |
| Newspapers/ Magazines |  | X |  |

Which language do you use most? Polish X....... English.... Both(about the same)
On a scale of 1-10 (With 10 being very important) How important to you is:
Polish?.
10
English?... 10

How would you describe your National Identity?
Polish....X.... British..... English..... Other (please
specify)
Did your school provide the facility to learn both languages?
Yes. $\qquad$

Which do you think is the most important? (Polish or English?)

## English

H

## Ankieta

Plec Mezczyzna.... Kobicta.... Wiek 45


Od ilu lat Pan/Pani mieszka w
(a) Manchester?

Od urodzenia.... .......Lat Mniej niz rok..
(b) Wielkiej Brytanii

Dd urodzenia... ....... Lat Mniej niz rok....
lakie jezyki Pan/Pani zna? Polski.... Angielski... Obydwa.... Inne (prosze okreslic).....
W jakich jezykach Pan/Pani potrafi czytac i pisac? Polski.... Angielski.... Obydwa.... Inne(prosze akreslic)....

Sdzie Pan/Pani naucryl/a sie jezyka Angielskiego? W szkole.... W domu.... Inne (prosze

Sdzie Pan/Pani nauczyl/a sie jezyka Polskiego? W szkole... W domu.... Inne (prosze jkreslic)

N jaki sposob Pan/Pani opisalabym swoje lokalne "spoleczenstwo" (np. Glownie Polskie, oznokulturowe itd.)?
lakich jezykow Pan/Pani uzywa w poszczegolnych sytuacjach?

|  | Polski | Angielski | Obydwa |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| W domu | V |  |  |
| W szkole/ w pracy |  | $V$ |  |
| Z przyjaciolmi | $V$ |  |  |
| Ogladajac telewizje | $V$ |  | + |


| Uzywajac internet |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cyytajac gazety/magazyny |  |  |  |

Ktorego jezyka Pani/Pani uzywa najczesciej? Polski... Angielski.... Obydwa(W takim samym stopniu)......

W skali od 1 do 10 (10-najwazniejszy) ktory jest jezyk jest wazniejszy

```
Polski?
```

Angielski?....

Jakby Pan/Pani opisala swoj narodowosc?

Polak/Polka.... Brytyjezyk/Brytyjka..... Anglik/Angielka..... Inne (prosze okreslic)
Cry Twoja szkola dawala Ci mozliwose nauki obydwu jezkow (polski i angielski)?


Jak sadzisz, ktory jezyk jest wazniejszy?
 jest haquísig.


## Appendix 2.1

Enosgraphio Guestentioms

| Genser | Age | Ocrapution Distribution | hamor | 隹 UK | Spotes | Feowne | Englah | Potah | Commanty | Norne | Sca/Vork | Socialy | TV | Internet | Nowv | Most | P1.46 | E1-10 | Nat it | Provalion | Impertant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F | 24 | Afrinistaser | 5.5 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | \% | M | p | 5 | 8 | B | B | $E$ | E | 55 | 15 | F | Y | \% |
| $F$ | 5 | Ebydant <br> Tocting Nanive | 3 |  | 8 | E | 8 | H | 4 | p | E | 5 | $E$ | E | $E$ | $B$ | 5 |  |  | N | $E$ |
| M | 30 | Sceenver Devplarning | 3 |  | 8 | p | 0 | 8 | E | P | 0 | 8 | E | 8 | E | P | 55 | 5 | P | N | $p$ |
| * | 25 | Bucervisor Cusbleridet | 5 |  | \$ 11 | 8 | 11 | 3 | M | P | B | t | ז | 8 | B | B | 10 | 50 \% |  | N | B |
| F | 31 | Advisor Stuctural | 3 |  | P | 8 | 8 | H | M | P | E | 8 | E | E | n | 0 | 10 | 10 |  | $Y$ | 8 |
| H | 28 | Tnaineer Healticare | 5 |  | 5 | 8 | S | \% | M | B | E | 8 | E | B | B | It | 10 | 10 F |  | $Y$ | E |
| F | 21 | Assibtart <br> Scanser | 5 |  | B | 8 | 5 | H | $p$ | P | E | 8 | E | n | E | B | 10 | 10 F |  | N | 8 |
| M | 31 | Oewrator | $\Sigma$ |  | E | 8 | 0 | 8 | M | $p$ | T | E |  | E | E | P | 0 | 4 |  | $\gamma$ | 0 |
| 4 | 27 | Erploped Prastios | 4 |  | B | 8 | 8 | 8 | $E$ | B | n | 8 | $E$ | $E$ | E | 8 | 10 |  |  | $\gamma$ | $p$ |
| M | 34 | Termician | 4 |  | B | 8 | H | 5 | E | $p$ | 0 | B | E | B | E | P | 10 | 10 F |  | N | E |
| M | 23 | Parer | 4 |  | 8 | 8 | 5 | 8 | $E$ | F | 0 | 8 | E | 8 | 0 | P | 10 | 7 |  | $Y$ | $p$ |
| M | 27 | Erphoped | 5 |  | 8 | 8 | \$ | 8 | F | $\stackrel{*}{ }$ | \% | 8 | 8 | 8 | B | $p$ | 10 |  |  | Y | 1 |
| $F$ | 40 | Clitintr Samples Tean | 15 |  | 0 | B | H | 8 | M | B | $E$ | 8 | E | $E$ | E | E | 9 | 10 E |  | N | E |
| $\stackrel{F}{\text { F }}$ | 25 | Lesoer | 1 |  | 5 | 8 | 5 | 5 | P | $P$ | $E$ | 8 | E | 0 | $E$ | 8 | 10 | 9 |  | $Y$ | 8 |
| $\stackrel{F}{*}$ | 24 | Whitwos | 3 |  | B | 8 | 5 | 5 | N | P | E | 8 | $\underline{5}$ | 8 | 0 | p | 16 | 91 |  | $Y$ | 8 |
| M | 20 | Phobert | 5 |  | B | 8 | 5 | H | M | ${ }^{17}$ | E | 8 | B | B | 5 | 8 | 16 | 10 p |  | $Y$ | B |
| M | 25 | Phident | 2 |  | 8 | 8 | \% | H | M | P | - | 8 | E | E | E | P | 10 |  |  | $Y$ | p |
| M | 20 | Karchen Chef Seles Rishitant | 1 |  | B | 8 | 8 | H | P | P | B | $\rho$ | E | L | 5 | $P$ | 15 | 10 F |  | $Y$ | F |
| F | 54 | Plavics | 15 |  | 8 | B | H | 5 | P | $p$ | E | p | - | P | 5 | P |  |  | $p$ | N | P |
| M | 23 | Tectrician Whourse tpent OMA. Degt | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | * | H | - | P | 0 | P | $\varepsilon$ | $E$ | E | P | 45 | 58 |  | $\pi$ | 8 |
| F | 20 | Marual Verker | 2 |  | 8 | $p$ | 5 | 5 | M | P | 8 | 8 |  | 0 | E | P | 8 | 4 |  | $Y$ | 8 |
| F | 20 | Plucties | 4 |  | 䫆 | 0 | 5 | * | 9 | f | E | 0 | 8 | \% | $E$ | B | 9 | * |  | N | \# |
| M | 30 | Tectsician | 3 |  | 8 | P | 0 | 5 | M | $p$ | 8 | 8 | ${ }^{*}$ | 0 |  | $P$ | 10 | 10 P |  | $N$ | B |
| 18 | 28 | Shoploreper | 8 |  | 8 | 8 | H | 5 |  | P | B | 8 | $p$ | - | 8 | $p$ |  |  | $P$ | $Y$ | 8 |
| 13 | 605 |  | 1155 | 151.5 | ) 1 | 3 | 46 | 17 | 5 | 20 | * | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 13 | 2 | 15 |  |
| 11 | 27.35 |  | 4.4125 | 4.845 | 0 | 1 | 5 | $\tau$ | 54 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 16 | 6 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 23 | 20 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 20 | 5 | 17 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 12 |

## Appendix 2.2

| Bluch Ouessornaivs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bender | Age |  | Cocapation | in mor | In UK | spoten | foavite | Enght | Potah | Commurity | Hisese | Per/Work | Sectuly |  | Iv | momet | NewsMay | Most | P 4.90 | E1-50 | Not 19 | Provion | Inpertset |
| 4 |  | 14 | Student | 5 |  | 5 | ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 5 | H | M | P | E | 8 |  |  | * | - | ] | 15 |  |  |  | P |
| 4 |  | 15 | Student | 1 |  | 18 | ${ }^{8}$ | 53 | ${ }^{+}$ | M | P | E | E |  |  | n | - | 0 | 16 |  |  | r | 8 |
| и |  | 22 |  | 4 |  | 48 | B | 8 | H |  | P | E | B | a |  | p | 5 | P |  |  | P | $r$ | P |
|  |  |  | Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a |  | 3 | Mansoer Admin | $a$ |  | 68 | n | 8 | 5 |  | 8 | B | 8 | $B$ | 3 | B | n | 1 | 16 | 10 |  | Y | 8 |
| 1 |  | Ss | Anditaint | 55 |  | 5 | n | 5 | ${ }^{*}$ | M | P | E | $p$ | - | - | L | E | - | 90 | 10 B |  | N | E |
| 4 |  | 3 | Retined SEmployed Whe | 37 |  | 78 | P | H | 3 | M | 8 |  | P | B | 5 |  |  | $p$ | , |  | P | N |  |
| 4 |  | 58 | Merchast Food | 41 |  | 18 | B | 8 | 8 | M | P | E | n | - | , | 11 | B | 8 |  |  | $p$ | N |  |
| 4 |  | 53 | Technican | 4 |  | 4 P | $p$ |  | 5 | M | P | F |  |  |  | p | P | P |  |  | $p$ | N | E |
| n |  | 45 | Mecharie | Less | Less | ${ }^{5}$ | P | $\bigcirc$ | 5 | M | $P$ | E | P | P | - |  | B | 8 |  |  | P | N | E |
| F |  | 23 |  | Less | Less | B | \% | 5 | 5 |  | $p$ | $p$ | P | P |  | $p$ | P | - | 10 |  | P | Y | $p$ |
|  |  | 300 |  | 153 | 153 |  | 3 | 7 | 6 | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{1}{8}$ | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 5 |
|  | 2 | 30 |  | 12.125 | 19.13 | 30 | - 0 | ! | 4 | 7 | $\bigcirc$ | - |  | 0 | 8 |  | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | $\pm$ | 5 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 2 |  |  | $s$ | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | - | 2 | 0 |  | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | ${ }^{8}$ | 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 0 |  |  |  |

Appendix 2.3
Domain usage as percentage

| Erinograchic |  |  | Etesgraphio |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hiome | SichoplWierk | Socialypilesd | Televisisn | litames | NewniMaps |
| Plah | 83.33 | D | 125 | 4.55 | 4.17 | 5 |
| Enght | 0 | 45.83 | 4.17 | 7273 | 25 | 5858 |
| Bent | 16.68 | 54.17 | 83.33 | 22.72 | 70.5 | 43.41 |
| Etrogrshe |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Norne | SchoolWiork | Socialy Filends | Televidon | indornes | Newstiaga |
| Naie | P | B | 0 | E | - | E |
|  | $p$ | 8 | 8 | E | B | 0 |
|  | 8 | E | 8 | $E$ | B | 园 |
|  | P | E | 8 |  | B | E |
|  | 8 | 8 | 8 | E | E | E |
|  | P | 8 | 8 | E | 8 | E |
|  | P | 8 | 8 | $E$ | 8 | 8 |
|  | P | 0 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
|  | E | 0 | 8 | - | 8 | E |
|  | P | B | \% | E | E | 5 |
|  | P | 8 | p | E | E | 5 |
|  | $p$ | 0 | P | $\varepsilon$ | $E$ | 8 |
|  | P | n | 0 | E | 8 |  |
| Female | Home | teheolWhork. | Sooleffetrients | Televinion | Internet | Nrwn/lags |
|  | P |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | P | $E$ | E | E | E | E |
|  | P | $E$ | 8 | $E$ | 8 | 8 |
|  | P | 5 | 8 | $E$ | 8 |  |
|  | 0 | 5 | 8 | E | E | E |
|  | $p$ | E | - | E | 8 |  |
|  | P | $E$ | $\square$ | E | 8 | 8 |
|  | $\rho$ | $E$ | $\nabla$ | B | $p$ | 0 |
|  | $p$ | 8 | 8 |  | 8 |  |
|  | $p$ | 5 | B | ${ }^{8}$ | 8 | E |
|  | P | 0 | 9 | P | B | 8 |


| Charch |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Horme | $5 \mathrm{chow/Whark}$ | Sevialipfriends | Nalenion | Introset | Newnlage |
| Pathr | 60 | 22.22 | 44.44 | S5.58 | 37.5 | 22.22 |
| Enploh | 0 | 6865 | 6 | 6 | 12.5 | 11.11 |
| Bet | 20 | 11.11 | 55.50 | 44.44 | 56 | $66^{6}$ |


| Have | Hense | SchoolWink | Seoialyl riend | Talivilian | Indomet | Newilays |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Poluh | 76.92 | 9 | 15.38 | $a$ | 4 | 6 |
| Englah | 0 | 15,38 | - | 83.333 | 3077 | 54.33 |
| Both | 23.00 | 3462 | 84.62 | 15.605 | 623 | 41.856 |

Fennale
Polst
Enjleh

| Hoesw | SchoolWiork | Sodialy/Fienok | Tekerinion | Istarnet | Nomi/Vogr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90.31 | 0 | 309 | 10 | 5.09 | 0 |
| \% | \%182 | 9.09 | 60 | 18.13 | 54.55 |
| 969 | 18.15 | 1812 | 30 | 7273 | 45.45 |

## Appendix 3.1

## General Data



## Appendix 3.2

## General Data

| Polsh Questornaines |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender Ago M |  | Oceupation | $\mathrm{la} \mathrm{Mor}_{37}$ | InUK Spoken |  | Rowle | Engleh <br> H | Polsh 8 | Commity <br> M | Home <br> $B$ | Sollwhe | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sociall } \\ & \mathrm{P} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TV } \\ & \mathrm{B} \end{aligned}$ | Inkmat | Noresly | Most P 1/10 |  |  | E 1-10 N | Nt D | Provisios impotart |  |  |
|  |  | Pefred SEnployed | 37 | 37 |  | $P$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | P |  | 9 |  |  | N |  |  |
| M |  | Whe Merchent Food Tectrician | 41 | 41 | 8 | B | s | s | M | $\rho$ | $E$ | B | B | B | B | B |  |  | P |  | N |  |  |
| $M$ | 53 |  | 4 |  | $p$ | $p$ |  | 8 | M | $p$ | P |  |  | P | $P$ | P |  |  |  |  | N |  | 8 |
| M |  | Mochanic | Less | Less | B | P | 0 | \$ | M | P | E | P | P |  | B | B |  |  |  |  | N |  | E |
| F | 23 |  | Less | Less | 8 | 8 | 5 | 8 |  | $p$ | P | P | P | P | P | P | 10 | 10 |  |  | Y |  | $p$ |
| F |  | Sies Atsent Plastics | 15 |  | $B$ | 8 | H | 8 | $p$ | P | E | P | B | P | B | P |  |  | P |  | N |  | $p$ |
| u |  | Tectucicion Whouse operat | 3 |  | B | B | \$ | H | M | P | B | P | E | $E$ | B | P | 10 | 0 | 10 P |  | $Y$ |  | B |
| F |  | (40 Ded) | 2 |  | $B$ | P | $s$ | S | M | P | B | B |  | B | 8 | P |  | 8 | 4 P |  | $Y$ |  |  |
| F |  | Manal Woner Plastics | 4 |  | $B$ | 8 | S | S | M | P | E | B | B | 8 | E | B |  | 9 | 10 P |  | N |  | $8$ |
| M |  | Tedricish | 3 |  | 8 | P | 0 | 5 | M | P | 8 | B | E | B |  | P | 10 | 0 | 12 P |  | N |  | B |
| F |  | Shoskeper | 8 |  | 8 | $B$ | H | 5 |  | P | $B$ | B | P | B | B | P |  |  |  |  | Y |  |  |
| $F$ | 451 |  | 117 | 104 | 1 |  | 5 | 10 | 1 | 10 |  | 5 |  | 3 |  |  | 8 | 3 | 1 | 11 |  | 4 | 2 |
| 5 | 40.09 |  | 13 | 11.56 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 1 | - 1 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | \$ | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |


| English |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home | Schoolvios | Soclappriends | Telowivion | Inlerst | Nums/Migs |
| Potst | 78.28 | 0 | 1.1 | 13.64 | 4.35 | 0 |
| Englath | 0 | 56.52 | 4.35 | 63.83 | 2809 | 56.52 |
| Botr | 21.74 | 4348 | 38.95 | 2275 | 69.58 | 43.45 |


| Potsh |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hane | Schooi/Wers | Socaliyifiends | Telovesion | Intientel | News/laig |
| Poish | 90.91 | 20 | 59 | 33,389 | 32535 | 22.22 |
| Engleh | 0 | 40 | 0 | 22.272 | 11.111 | 11.11 |
| Bot | 906 | 40 | 50 | 4.444 | 55.555 | 3680 |


[^0]:    Thealper aje $6254^{21.25} 7^{20136} 12^{31-35} 4^{36-45} 2^{45-95} 3^{\text {Overs5 }}$

