



2021 VCE English Language external assessment report

General comments

Students should:

- be able to distinguish between social purposes and functions. Students should be encouraged to refer to the social purposes as listed in the study design. They should also take care when referring to subsystem patterns
- frame responses in Section A to address the question accurately, providing enough detail and relevant examples as justification when required
- read questions in Section A carefully to ensure all elements have been addressed
- avoid relying on one example across multiple questions
- avoid providing more examples than required
- focus on salient features when analysing the text provided in Section B
- ensure that features of texts in Section B are identified and explained in relation to the register, context and/or social purposes of the text
- select a range of features across the whole text, focusing on those features that best assist in supporting the text's functions and social purposes
- ensure their Section C essay response addresses the whole topic, focusing on the key words of the question. There were attempts by some students to modify prepared responses to the given topics; these typically did not score well. Careful reading of the stimuli provided can be very helpful in guiding student responses towards relevant ideas
- select relevant examples of English and linguistic theory in Australian contemporary society for their response to Section C, and use appropriate metalanguage to discuss them.

Specific information

Note: Student responses reproduced in this report have not been corrected for grammar, spelling or factual information.

This report provides sample answers or an indication of what answers may have included. Unless otherwise stated, these are not intended to be exemplary or complete responses.

The statistics in this report may be subject to rounding resulting in a total more or less than 100 per cent.

Section A – Short-answer questions

Text 1

In Text 1, students were presented with a 'Frequently Asked Questions' multimodal text for a boutique deodorant company, 'Whiff-a-way'. The text consisted of written questions and answers that readers could expand by 'clicking', with some responses containing short videos that also answered customers' questions. Parts of Text 1 included transcripts of spoken text.

Question 1

Marks	0	1	2	Average
%	17	47	36	1.2

To score two marks, students needed to accurately describe how jargon supported a social purpose of the text. For example, students could discuss how the company used scientific jargon to establish itself as knowledgeable about its products and how they work, promoting itself as a trustworthy authority within the marketplace.

Higher-scoring responses referred to the field or domain the jargon belonged to, or provided specific discussion of the text's context.

Some examples of jargon that students selected included 'pH' (line 9), '(sweat) pores' (lines 15, 20, 30, 35, 44), 'anti-perspirant(s)' (lines 11, 16, 18, 29, 32, 34), 'snake-oil cures' (line 8), 'science' (line 8), 'deodorant(s)' (lines 13, 32, 36), 'the TGA' (line 33) and 'bacteria' (lines 9, 37). A variety of acceptable fields were referred to by students when describing their examples.

The following is an example of a high-scoring response.

The scientific jargon 'pH' (9) helps the Whiff-a-way company in establishing their expertise regarding deodorants, thus making their claims appear more trustworthy and encouraging consumers to purchase their product which is based on scientific evidence.

Question 2

Marks	0	1	2	Average
%	25	18	57	1.3

For two marks, students needed to identify an example of patterning, including a subsystem. Students were not required to analyse the effect of the patterning. It is important that students read questions carefully, as some did not provide all of the required information, or did not provide an example of patterning.

The following is an example of a high-scoring response.

There is use of syntactic patterning, as seen by the antithesis in line 8 'We don't believe in snake-oil cures, we believe in science'.

Question 3

Marks	0	1	2	3	Average
%	12	15	50	22	1.8

High-scoring responses discussed two or more sentence types from the line range required: declaratives, interrogatives and imperatives. These were linked to at least one function and explicitly addressed how the variation of sentence types provided support. Many students did not acknowledge this aspect of the question, providing examples of sentence types only.

Some responses did not include appropriate metalanguage with the quoted examples, and some responses could not be awarded marks as they did not quote from the text when providing a line number that contained more than one sentence of differing sentence types.

Some students incorrectly referred to the interrogative sentences as interrogative tags.

The following is an example of a high-scoring response.

The interrogative ‘Which Whiff-a-way should I try?’ (48) help build rapport with the audience as it is mimicing the questions that they may have and ‘Why not?’ (50) calls on the audience to question their previously held opinions about using their fingers to put deodorant on, which supports the advertising function. Combined with declaratives such as ‘It’s just like a lotion or a cream’ (50) it creates a sense of question and response and supports the informative function.

Question 4

Marks	0	1	2	3	Average
%	23	27	32	17	1.5

Student responses discussed Whiff-a-way’s bald-on-record approach, with minimal use of euphemisms. Many high-scoring responses noticed the use of terms that are potentially dysphemistic, such as ‘sweat’, ‘pits’ and ‘smelly’. The text acknowledges the potentially disgust-inducing nature of the topic but confronts it head-on. Students also successfully discussed informal language features and their effect on minimising social distance and creating a ‘safe space’ for the discussion of a taboo topic.

For three marks, students were required to discuss how taboo was negotiated, using two examples of language features to support their discussion. It was acceptable for students to refer to examples that negotiated taboo in different ways.

The following is a possible response.

Superlatives are used to create humour and encourage customers to feel at ease with discussing body odour when the product has been ‘tested... on the sweatiest, smelliest...’ (7) Whiff-a-way have also included smiley-face emoticons (5, 21), with the informal language feature further easing any discomfort in discussing the social taboo of perspiration.

Question 5

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	Average
%	9	17	27	27	16	5	2.4

Student responses needed to focus on the language features across the two modes that build rapport with potential (and existing) customers – for example, how particular language features establish a level of intimacy with potential customers and treat them as equals. Rapport is often built using an informal register. Chatting to the audience includes them, as does complimenting them and using Australian colloquial expressions to demonstrate familiarity. The spoken mode is much more conversational, reinforcing the message from the written component in the FAQ and helping to present a more human response.

The slightly more formal written text also helps to develop a rapport as the reader can feel a sense of trust that the company has the required level of expertise.

As part of exploring the creation of rapport, some students acknowledged face needs, which was acceptable. The quality of the student responses depended on how the student analysed the features – it was not enough to simply list them to obtain a high mark.

The following is an example of a high-scoring response.

Informal language features in the written mode such as the shortening ‘pits’ (12) and colloquialisms ‘snake-oil cures’ (8) help decrease the social distance with the audience and thus build rapport. Imitation of vocal effects ‘urgh’ (49) and sentence fragments ‘Why not?’ (50) creates a conversational tone and further helps build rapport with the audience. In the spoken model, compliments towards the customer’s location such as ‘love Darwin’ (24) and to his question ‘Great question’ (26) attends to the customers positive face needs and demonstrates the brands approachable, friendly image which assists with

developing rapport. Furthermore, the personal pronoun 'you' (2,4,18,etc) directly addresses the reader and creates a more intimate text that is targeted towards the reader, thus building rapport.

Section B – Analytical commentary

Text 2

Question 6

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Average
%	1	0.5	0.5	1	2	4	9	14	19	16	14	9	6	3	2	0.5	8.6

The spoken text for this question was a somewhat informal interview of Australian tennis player Ash Barty about her tennis career. Hosted by ABC *One Plus One* TV interviewer Kurt Fearnley, an Australian Paralympian, both speakers demonstrated active participation and camaraderie in the televised exchange.

Many students actively engaged with the text, discussing relevant contextual factors such as the fact that both Barty and Fearnley are famous sport stars, the need for Barty to present a humble persona to avoid the 'tall poppy syndrome' and the preparedness of many of Fearnley's contributions. Relevant functions discussed included entertaining viewers, promoting Barty as an Australian tennis player and celebrating her achievements. Relevant social purposes included the building of rapport, reduction of social distance, encouragement of intimacy and acknowledgement of face needs.

Some of the stylistic and discourse features discussed by students included:

- Fearnley's opening and how it deviates from his typical use of interrogatives (as it is not part of the interview itself but rather an introduction); that it is more formal or rehearsed in nature than his other contributions to the discourse
- the prosodic features of Barty's speech (e.g. frequent short pauses which result in a slower tempo in parts) as well as non-fluency features (e.g. false starts, filled pauses, etc.). Students interpreted this in a few different but equally plausible ways: that this reflects that she is perhaps nervous about being interviewed; that she is conscious of making a good impression on the media; or that she is wanting to be humble in discussing her achievements
- the vocal effect of laughter from Barty and Fearnley when discussing the chickens and/or the picture of her from childhood. Students successfully interpreted this as an indicator of embarrassment, humility or even acknowledgement of the absurdity of some of what is being discussed. Higher-scoring responses linked this to face needs
- the Question–Answer adjacency pair sequences as typical of the interview format (Fearnley uses mainly interrogatives; Barty mainly declaratives)
- the use of colloquialisms ('it was carnage', line 32; 'chook(s)', lines 20 and 28; 'mate', line 9; 'shocker', lines 39 and 42) as a marker of the informal elements of the register as well as markers of the speakers' Australian identities
- the minimal instances of overlap and how this relates to the text type and relevant expectations for interlocutors' behaviour
- how Fearnley is largely responsible for topic management via the questions he asks, such as lines 18–20 when he steers Barty to the topic he would like to discuss.

Students should take care to select salient features when constructing an analysis. High-scoring responses focused on stylistic and discourse features that helped contribute to the register, social purpose and contextual factors affecting and surrounding the text. They demonstrated an understanding of deliberate spoken language features in comparison to natural ones.

The following is an example of a high-scoring response.

This moderately informal spoken interview between Host Kurt Fearnley (KF) and tennis player Ash Barty (AB) aims to entertain One Plus One viewers and inform them about Barty's childhood as an Australian tennis player.

The conversation carries a degree of formality due to its partially planned nature, meeting expectations for ABC television interviews. The conversation follows typical and expected conventions, with KF fulfilling his role as host by introducing the interviewee with proper noun 'Ash Barty' (6), providing information to viewers who are unfamiliar with tennis stars. He also provides context using declaratives in syntactically patterned listing 'world number one in tennis/ french open champion/', informing watchers of important background information required for coherence of the rest of the text. This section of the text appears rehearsed, using rising intonation to generate an entertaining aura of suspense to engage viewers. Cohesive tie of nouns within the semantic field of 'tennis' (3), including 'arena' (13) and 'balls' (20) keep the text relevant to the interview topic. KF also uses proper noun 'One Plus One' (6) to remind viewers of the program they are watching, performing a greater purpose of promoting the ABC as a high quality network.

KF controls the floor and manages the topic as host for much of the interview. He asks Barty questions using interrogatives, including 'when did you fall in love with tennis?' (39), directing the topic towards things that fans of tennis watching would be interested to know, prompting Barty to take the floor and complete the adjacency pairs by answering. KF also uses discourse particle 'But' (18) to perform a topic loop, signalling that Barty had not sufficiently answered his question.

The direct participants in the conversation have significant social distance, but several features in common, prompting them both to make effort to attend to their positive face needs and build rapport. KF uses positively connotated adjectives 'genuine and humble' (5) to describe barty, attending to her positive face needs in a way that is especially effective given the context of the Australian love of the underdog and dislike of those with 'tall poppy syndrome', presenting her to the audience as likeable. AB respectfully responds with her expected rapport building, giving KF a phatic 'thanks' (7). KF also uses vocal effects of laughter on line 31, overlapping Abs humorous 'there were dogs/' (30) to acknowledge that she made a joke and draw connection through shared humor, building rapport.

Both KF and AB are sports people, giving them significant ability to effectively discuss the semantic field of 'Tennis' for fans of Australian sport watching. Jargonistic nouns 'court' (25) and 'club' (16) require some knowledge from the Audience of tennis for inference, acting as a cohesive tie and enhancing coherence for sports fans. Additionally, deictic reference 'here' (13) to 'Pat Rafter Arena' (13) is a proper noun that only people knowledgeable about Australian sporting locations could understand, effectively creating an 'ingroup' of watching sports fans.

The Australian context influences how the interview is conducted. Possessive 'Australia's' (1) is used to evoke a sense of pride in her achievements from the Audience, and attend to AB's positive face needs by presenting her as widely known and iconic. KF, as an Australian, uses colloquial noun 'mate' (9) to refer to AB despite having significant social distance, marking him as Australian to viewers. He also speaks with a general Australian accent, eliding 'yes' to 'ya' (10), utilizing the schwa in a way that is relatable and familiar to watchers of the ABC. Humor is also used, particularly ABs hyperbolic declarative 'I hate it build I love it', (43), which reflects the uniquely Australian self deprecating humor.

The text is spontaneous for much of it, especially as AB does not know the questions. This leads to her use of pauses and pause fillers '(.) um' (36) and non fluency features such as repetition 'its (.) its' (59) as she tries to hold the floor while thinking of her words. In contrast, KF uses syntactic patterning in his planned questions, such as 'the nerves (.) the excitement (.)' (51) listing hyponyms of feelings in a cohesive and clear way that is engaging and entertaining to watchers, utilising pauses for emphasis. Often, AB is uncertain of her statements, hedging them with 'kind of' (26) to be polite and demonstrate that she is unsure.

AB attempts to connect with Australian viewers by demonstrating her ‘typical Australian’ upbringing, marking solidarity between her and watchers of the program by using diminutive ‘chooks’ (28) and ‘farm’ (21) to show that she does not have as much of a great social distance as they may assume, sharing informal experiences. AB also attempts to create humor through hyperbole, describing her childhood playing as dysphemistic noun ‘carnage’ (32) for emphasis, working to entertain both watchers and the Host. She connects with the Audience KF by placing stress on the emotions she describes, such as abstract noun ‘fear’ (63), building rapport as she knows that he shares similar experiences as a young athlete.

Section C – Essay

Students were mostly successful in exploring the key concepts embodied in the questions. The vast majority included contemporary Australian examples using accurate metalanguage and referenced the provided stimulus material. Students are advised to structure their response carefully to ensure that their written features of discourse are as accurate as possible given the timed nature of the essay task.

Question	0	7	8	9
%	1	18	31	50

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Average
%	1	1	1	1	2	5	10	13	15	14	12	9	8	5	3	1	8.7

Question 7

Students were required to consider formal and informal language as well as standard and non-standard language when exploring how true it is in Australian society that people ‘don’t care’ about language usage. The vast majority of responses to this question correctly discussed contexts where formal and/or informal language was successful. Fewer responses addressed when standard and, in particular, non-standard language can successfully be used.

Students responded to this question in varying levels of depth, touching on many of the following ideas:

- the use of informal language to minimise social distance and build rapport. Students referring to the stimulus discussed this in relation to businesses attempting to attract clientele and build a brand (stimulus A). They also discussed that it is best suited for informal and/or casual settings, including day-to-day interactions in the workplace, chatting online, etc., and that formal language use in that context would be inappropriate and potentially face-threatening (stimuli C, D)
- the use of formal language in establishing authority and presenting oneself as e.g. trustworthy, but that an overly high level of formality can make someone seem cold or standoffish and increase social distance (stimulus C)
- the use of standard and non-standard language to achieve different social purposes and how this might correlate with formal and informal language use. People will have different attitudes towards this (stimulus B) and individuals would need to navigate this
- that there is a place for both formal and informal language and standard and non-standard language in Australian society – that we do indeed care in many contexts about the language we use.

The following high-scoring response explored the extent to which it is true that ‘it’s just language’, concluding that it was not always true. It included the student’s own contemporary examples coupled with relevant metalanguage and reference to the stimulus.

'Successful communication requires language users to pay particular attention to the style of language they use', suggests linguists Kate Burridge and Debbie de Laps. This largely holds true with regards to register and the use of certain varieties of English. For instance, public and formal contexts often require the use of Standard Australian English (SAE) while in more social settings, non-standard varieties and informal language is often perceived by certain groups as more appropriate. Though, the pre-concieved notions of strict and rigid contexts in which formal, informal, standard and non-standard language are becoming blurred. Clearly, then, many groups and individuals do take interest in the use of language in varying contexts, but shifting views towards the appropriateness of this language use is creating a lack of care.

Politicians take particular interest in the language they implement, given the public and formal contexts they preside in. SAE is the standard variety of English that is used by most Australians, and Daniel Andrews employs this variety when speaking on COVID-19 related statistics, stating '7 people are in hospital, 2 of those are in ICU and are both on ventilators.' The codified medical jargon initialism 'ICU' (Intensive Care Unit) and noun 'ventilator' (assistive breathing apparatus) creates a formal register that is appropriate for the serious, sombre nature of the information, which is achieved through Andrews' consideration of this context, which required standard formal language use as opposed to an inappropriate implementation of non-standard, informal language. Also, jargon, described by Quentin Crisp as the 'obscure use of specialized language, is generally standard and formal language that politicians implement for intentional confusion and concealment of a message. Treasurer Josh Frydenberg carefully decides to implement jargon nouns 'consumer sentiment' and 'Business conditions' when stating, 'consumer sentiment is at its highest in 11 years. Business conditions have reached record highs', when justifying a grim 52.7 billion dollar deficit. These jargon buzz-words have a conscious obfuscating and concealing function, and Frydenberg employs this formal, standard lexical choice to partially obscure the unsavoury information. This aptly shows how politicians especially take care when deciding on formality and standardness.

Speakers that intentionally employ non-standard and informal language allows for greater success in social contexts, demonstrating the need to take care in language choice. For instance, the variety of English often used by the youth, Teenspeak, is largely informal and is non-standard, allowing it to prevail in social situations. Adjectives employing morphologically ellision such as 'bussin' (meaning good or tasty when generally referring to food), and exclamative 'sheeesh' (used to indicate suprise or delight), are used by teens to more effectively create a sense of in-group membership and generate rapport with other users of the non-standard variety, given its covert prestige allowing the variety to exclude others, particularly adults. Moreover, Gretchen McCulloch mentions in stimulus d how 'norms that we worked out for books and newspapers don't work so well for texts and chats and posts'. This further reflects the extensive consideration of standards that is required to successfully communicate in contexts that call for a more conversational tone. Evidently, great care should be taken into adopting a particular register or variety for successful communication to take place.

Though, shifting Australian views and values regarding appropriate contexts in which language is implement may support that language is indeed 'just language'. The 50th Anniversary McDonalds-in-Australia advertisement gives evidence of this idea, with the company stating 'you rocked up in boardies and thongs', and how 'we came here as McDonalds, but you made us Maccas'. This highly successful business flaunts pre-conceived notions of standard and formal language in the public setting, and recognizes the comedic value of the use of typical Australian apparel nouns 'boardies' and 'thongs', and implementation of the morphological feature of Australian diminutive 'Maccas' to create a strong appeal to national identity, and allowing minimization of social-distance with an Australian audience. This blatantly disregards employment of standard and formal English used by other advertisers, thus demonstrating a lack of care towards these norms to create a greater connection to the audience. This idea is upheld by SBS suggesting how use of more polite requests such as 'Perhaps we should try...' in a managerial position as opposed to a more recognizable imperative that is expected given the hierarchal distance between a manager and an employee avoids an authoritative and formal tone that allows for negative face

needs to be upheld and building of rapport. It is clear that disregarding rigid norms regarding formality and standardness, to adopt a 'who-cares' attitude can be beneficial in some contexts.

It is evident that taking consideration of, and scrutinizing over the register and standardness in public and social contexts alike can help in achieving their respective functions, however shifting ideas surrounding the former standards with respect to the formality and standardness of varieties, suggests that these concepts simply do not matter as much as previously thought, and that truly, 'It's just language'.

Question 8

Students needed to explore public language as described in the study design, and address the norms that go alongside language used in these contexts. This question ultimately leads to discussions about face needs and overt norms.

Students responded to this question in varying levels of depth, touching on many of the following ideas:

- the face needs of interlocutors. This includes negative face needs of speakers (e.g. being able to say what they like, free from imposition) and positive face needs of hearers (e.g. needing to feel respected and free from harm within society). Students included their own contemporary examples or referred to the stimulus, such as verbal abuse (stimulus A), racial slurs and other offensive language (stimulus B)
- appropriate language in relation to the context or setting of an interaction, touching on formality/informality or the need for plain language (stimulus D). They also discussed this in relation to greater coherence (stimulus D) or greater appeal of texts to wider audiences, including signalling in-group membership to minority groups (stimulus C)
- appropriate/inappropriate language use within public contexts, including the use of otherwise taboo or dysphemistic language and its role in building rapport and (often deliberately) minimising social distance amongst in-groups
- that there are some public contexts and situations where the need to be mindful of our language is losing relevance such as in politics and the media. However, this is often not the case when it comes to using language that is considered politically correct
- that language has the power to include and exclude, promote and suppress, unite and divide. It is for these reasons that we must be mindful of language choices, especially in public language contexts
- that in some public language contexts, overly formal, jargonistic or bureaucratic language can create barriers for some Australian citizens, such as those from multicultural backgrounds, thus the need for simpler language (stimulus D).

The following high-scoring response explored the idea that not all public language contexts are the same, and that while it is important to be careful in most contexts, not all contexts require the same level of care. Excerpts from two body paragraphs are included here.

Carefully selected language choices can help to appeal to the face needs of minority groups, and so becomes key in the public domain to avoid offence. In March 2021, the Victorian government released an 'Inclusive Language Guide' which detailed how language can be changed in the public domain to include minority groups. It comprised of suggestions to use 'spouse' and 'partner' rather than 'husband' or 'wife', as well as promoting the gender neutral compound, 'chestfeeding lactating parent'. This demonstrates the government publicly affording a degree of respect to non-binary citizens, while destigmatizing taboo around gender fluidity and expression. This implies that Victorians need to be careful with language use around gender. In other events, attempts to be careful with language use by the federal government has been highly controversial in the 'Milkshake Ad', released in May 2021. The advertisement was made to educate secondary school students about the importance of consent, following allegations of sexual abuse in parliament. Euphemisms used included 'action-zone' for 'sex', 'moving the line' for 'consent' and 'end-zone' for 'assault'. The euphemistic terms disempowered survivors of sexual abuse, and seemed to trivialize the gravity of the issue, while increasing the topic's taboo quality. The euphemisms diverted from the severity of the issue, especially at a time where talking about sexual assault was becoming

acceptable. This clearly demonstrates that individuals must not always be careful with language use, as sometimes it can obfuscate from serious issues.

Society must not always be careful with language use in the domain, as expression of it can also oppress cultural attitudes. At the beginning of 2021, the AFL released their 'Do Gooder' campaign to mark the beginning of the football season. The campaign consisted of the adjective 'gooder', the second person plural noun 'youre' and the vocative 'Macca'. The sociolect holds covert prestige amongst AFL fans, and although it adopted the waning Broad Australian accent, which is not representative of the general parlance of Australian communities, it was widely uncontroversial. It was a representation of Australian culture, and the love for linguistic innovation, promoted by major broadcasters and the AFL, with dominant groups. This proves that the carelessness around language choice is not imperative, as to no offence rose from it. Contrastly, the increase integration of English variations has proven to be controversial amongst prescriptive media outlets. This African-American vernacular English (AAVE) has spread via the internet to the youth of Australians, where employment of shortening such as 'hella' are used as a means of 'distancing themselves from Anglo-Australian ideals' (Moore), and shifting to a 'ghetto' identity. The careless use of AAVE by the Sydney Morning Herald in an article around Scott Morrison's disregard for environmentalists, has inaccurately conveyed the vernacular being the shortening 'dis' for 'disrespect', they showed prejudice towards the cultural groups who employ it, suggesting Scott Morrison was 'low' to their standards. As a result, it is imperative in public contexts to be careful with language use, in avoidance of revealing prejudice to groups.

Question 9

Students needed to explore the extent to which it is true that Australians make deliberate language choices to project elements of our social and individual identities. This required students to consider both conscious and subconscious choices of language use.

Students responded in varying levels of depth, touching on many of the following ideas:

- how particular language use can signal cultural identity (stimulus D), social identity (stimulus C), age (stimulus A), gender, nationality etc. It allows individuals to present themselves as part of the relevant in-group, building rapport with other members and minimising social distance
- appropriate language use in particular contexts (e.g. in text messages vs other more formal written forms of communication) and how expectations about language use in these contexts can vary depending on age (stimuli A, D)
- how a mismatch in expectations can lead to a breakdown in relationships and damage rapport (stimulus C). Positive face threats result when interlocutors do not respond in the way their conversation partner would like or when they fail to take concerns about appropriate language and behaviour seriously
- audience and context and the influence this has on our language choices, relative to overt and covert norms and the need to fit in
- the limits to which we can control our language choices; how much we convey subconsciously when we communicate without deliberation
- that language is a reflection of our social groups, interests and occupations, with students exploring when this language is deliberately used and when it is subconsciously used.

The following high-scoring response explored deliberate and non-deliberate language choices in terms of how they reflected social, cultural and national identity. It included appropriate personal anecdotes to supplement contemporary examples and the stimulus material. Included here is the introduction and excerpts from two body paragraphs.

Language choices, both deliberate and non-deliberate, reflect one's identity, and may also reflect attitudes towards different social groups. Language choice of colloquialisms and profanity often reflect an individual's Australian identity, and the responses to these by the public may demonstrate attitudes towards this identity. Non-Australian identities can also be reflected through language choices that make

up ethnolects and idiolects. Age identity, particularly teen identity, is often reflected through the use of slang, which also often reflects attitudes toward other groups.

In contemporary society, Australian identity is often reflected through language choice, particularly through the use of colloquialisms and taboo such as profanity. For example, the NSW premier said 'it's been a hundred days of blood, sweat and no beers' in response to the opening up of NSQ. The phrase 'blood, sweat and no beers' is a twist on the colloquialism, 'blood, sweat and tears'. The lexeme 'tears' is substituted with the rhyming 'no beers'. This is a deliberate language choice that would have required thought to produce this effect. The phrase emphasizes the extent of the suffering NSQ has been through during lockdown, but also demonstrates the premier's Australian identity as he talks about the cultural value placed upon 'beer' and drinking. However, Australian identity can also be conveyed unintentionally. In a post-Olympic interview, swimmer Emma McKeon, used the exclamative '[expletive deleted]!' in excitement. This was followed by her widened eyes and shocked face, demonstrating that was not a deliberate language choice, but instead a phrase led by emotion. This was laughed about by reporters and the general Australian public, and this taboo language use did not negatively affect her image, but instead highlighted her Australian identity. This is because Australians tend to be more accepting of profanity, and often use it as a marker of identity. This demonstrates how both deliberate and non-deliberate language choice can reflect one's Australian identity.

Language choice is also able to reflect the identity of those with different ethnic backgrounds as well as attitudes towards them. For example, in the documentary, 'History Bites Back', the presenter represents her Aboriginal identity in the line 'the situation blackfellas are in' as well as her use of other Aboriginal lexemes, such as 'mob' and 'deadly'. These Aboriginal lexemes demonstrate that she is of Aboriginal ethnicity and build rapport and in-group membership with others in the community, as others would not be able to understand. Similarly, the Samoan slang 'uce' was used in the dialogue of an Australian drama, possibly representing the writers' or characters background (stimulus d). The use of these non-Standard English terms on mainstream Australian television also demonstrate society's attitude towards becoming more inclusive and accepting of non-Standard varieties of English and ethnolects, allowing those speakers to 'feel accepted [and] have a place in Australian society' (stimulus d). These are deliberate choices made to demonstrate one's ethnic identity. However, non-deliberate choices could also demonstrate one's non-Australian background. For example, my mother, who has a Thai background and is not fluent in English, elides the final 's' in 'sometimes', instead saying 'sometime'. She is unaware of the standard way of saying this lexeme, which reflects her non-English speaking background. However, this is not a feature of Tenglish, the blend between Thai and English, as it is not common between other Tenglish speakers. Therefore, this is not a deliberate language choice to build overt prestige with other Tenglish speakers, and is instead representative of her idiolect and individual identity. This demonstrates how ethnic backgrounds and attitudes can be reflected by language choice.