



GENERAL COMMENTS

In 2004, the fourth year of this study, 1413 students presented for the examination. This is an increase of 19% since 2003 and shows that interest in this subject is steadily growing. There is evidence that students are working with increasing confidence with linguistic concepts and the overall standard of the responses in all sections was very pleasing.

This examination paper was designed to challenge students in the areas of metalanguage and text analysis, providing them with an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge of linguistic terms and discourse features. The number of questions, and the marks allocated to each, ensured that inability to answer any one question would not severely disadvantage a student. As in all past papers, at least one question allowed students to make comparisons between the two texts in Section 1 of the examination.

The transcript in Section 2 was of a spontaneous conversation between two young people, in contrast to the more formal transcripts in past papers. It allowed students to demonstrate their familiarity with spoken text analysis.

In Section 3, three essay topics were provided. The essay required students to synthesise their knowledge of linguistics and to use analytical writing to demonstrate their understanding of the range of aspects of and attitudes to language use in Australia.

General Advice

- The use of metalanguage is essential in all parts of the examination including the essay, where students frequently rely on description rather than linguistic analysis.
- Students should practise working with all the subsystems in their analysis of a wide range of texts. Too much focus is given to the lexicon at the expense of syntax, semantics, morphology, phonology and discourse analysis.
- Students require practice in identifying sentence types as compared to sentence structures.
- Students should be guided by the marks allocated to each question, and by the lines provided, in order to avoid excessively long responses to questions worth only a few marks.
- To avoid ambiguity or vagueness, students should be careful to provide line numbers and specific examples in their responses, including underlining a term or example when it is embedded in a longer extract.
- Writing out the essay question in the script book is not an efficient use of time and students should be encouraged to use the time for planning the essay instead.
- Essay responses should aim for depth of analysis rather than mere description and 'social observation' of language use, and should incorporate examples that demonstrate the student's wide reading in the subject area.
- A wide reading list for the study could be made available to students, and relevant activities designed to extend students' understanding and knowledge of language use in the Australian context.

SPECIFIC INFORMATION

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

The following information includes a summary of what was expected in each question and a sample of a student response. All the student sample answers given below received high marks. Students generally contained their responses within the lines provided, although there was space for additional writing if a student used up all the lines. Students were repeatedly asked to provide line numbers in their responses, which most did, but too often students did not specifically identify the example or language feature in the line and thus marks could not be awarded.

Section 1

This section required short answers to two written texts, including two questions (9 and 12) that required a comparison between the two texts. The texts were both Australian and promoted holiday destinations by using similar written discourse features but with different effects. Students demonstrated a pleasing knowledge of the metalanguage and in general were able to identify and analyse the similarities and differences between the two texts. This section tested students' knowledge of Areas of Study 1 and 2, Unit 4.

2004 Assessment Report



Question 1

Marks	0	1	2	Average
%	27	3	70	1.5

This question was answered well by most students, indicating familiarity with the metalanguage and an ability to identify the words as adjectives.

Question 2

Marks	0	1	2	Average
%	6	40	54	1.5

This question required students to explain that the adjectives listed in Question 1 provided descriptive information and provided a positive, appealing image of the Whitsundays to attract potential visitors. Answers needed to address both purposes, as in the example below.

The words identified in question 1 serve to identify some of the features that characterise the Whitsundays as a holiday destination and thus assist the text in providing information to prospective visitors. However, its main function is to promote the Whitsundays as an attractive, desirable holiday destination through the positive connotations attached to the adjectives.

Question 3

Marks	0	1	2	3	Average
%	30	34	16	21	1.3

While many students were able to correctly identify the sentence types as imperatives, a significant number incorrectly named them as declaratives, or described them as a sentence structure (simple, compound, complex or compound-complex). The use of the imperative suggests a directive, urging the reader to participate in the activities, thereby supporting the promotional function of the text. The sequence of imperative clauses fulfils the function of providing information by suggesting that there is a wide range of attractions for all potential tourists.

These sentences are imperative, suggesting that the audience should partake in these activities, making them seem achievable, urging them and intriguing them to visit the Island in order to complete the suggested activities. They also present information regarding the destination in an effective, interesting format.

Question 4

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	Average
%	28	12	19	14	26	2.0

Students gained one mark for each noun phrase identified, and two marks for explaining the effect created by the use of different noun phrases in the text. Students needed to at least include the head noun of the phrase (bolded in the examples below) in order to gain marks.

1. **Heart** of the Great Barrier Reef (lines 3-4)

2. Australian's most desirable holiday **destination** (lines 4 – 5)

The first noun phrase serves to highlight that the Whitsundays is home to one of the most famous tourist attractions; the fact that the Great Barrier Reef is a renowned tourist attraction creates the impression that the Whitsundays is also a renowned tourist attraction. The second noun phrase, as well as identifying its identity as an Australian holiday destination, creates the impression of the Whitsundays as being some exclusive holiday destination distinct from other holiday destinations.

Question 5

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	Average
%	14	15	31	19	20	2.2

It was pleasing to see students able to clearly identify examples of both lexical and grammatical repetition/listing. Students were required to demonstrate their understanding that this stylistic device was used to densely pack information into the text about the range of activities available, to emphasise a word or phrase by repeating it, or as a cohesive tie linking the different parts of the text. In cases where students only identified one form of listing/repetition it was not possible to award full marks.

One example of lexical repetition/listing is 'snorkeling, diving, island hopping.....' (lines 20 – 21). One example of grammatical listing is the repeated use of imperative sentences as in 'sail yourself around the clear water.....or choose a crewed charter.....soak up the beauty and wildlife.' (lines 23-30) The use of both lexical and grammatical repetition has a cumulative effect that creates the impression that the Whitsundays has a versatile and vast range of activities to offer its visitors.



Question 6

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average
%	17	6	18	11	23	7	18	3.1

There were many examples of the various features in the text, providing students with plenty of scope for identifying three features. Many students correctly identified three different features and in general explained the effect of each one appropriately. Some answers either missed or were vague about the intended effect, as in the following answer.

Metaphor: 'heart of the Great Barrier Reef' in lines 3 – 4. The use of metaphor here adds appeal to the holiday destination.

A response that demonstrated a student's clear understanding of the effect of the metaphor is shown in the following example.

An example of metaphor is 'heart of the Great Barrier Reef' (lines 3 – 4), which gives the notion that the Whitsundays is the most important part of the Great Barrier Reef and that it is right in the middle of all the action.

Question 7

Marks	0	1	2	Average
%	3	7	90	1.9

Most students correctly identified two different names, with the most frequent responses being: *The Prom* (lines 3, 7, 13, 22); *the park* (line 12); *a national park* (lines 4-5); *Wilson's Promontory* (line 3); *it* (line 10); *this magnificent national park* (line 14); *the national park* (line 9); *a park for everyone and for all seasons* (line 10); *the southern most tip of the Australian mainland* (lines 3-4); *one of our best loved and most popular national parks* (lines 5-6). Extended explanations about the function of the various names should have been held over until the next question, and students who gave more than was required for this question did not receive any additional marks.

Question 8

Marks	0	1	2	Average
%	14	48	39	1.3

Most students were able to answer this question, with the better answers incorporating metalanguage terms. For full marks, students had to include either a full explanation of the reason for using various names, or a metalanguage term and a brief explanation. Answers could refer to repetition (for increased interest), density of information (to create a sense of there being a range of characteristics at Wilson's Prom) and/or shortening or abbreviation (to create a sense of familiarity, ownership).

The use of synonymy allows the writer to avoid repetition through the repeated use of one noun phrase. This adds variety to the text and makes it more interesting.

Question 9

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	Average
%	26	20	20	15	20	1.9

Some students did not read the question carefully and failed to note that a comparison between Texts 1 and 2 was required, instead attempting to discuss lines 19 – 22 and lines 23-30 in Text 2. Many students struggled to identify the imperative sentence type and thus did not pick up the different force associated with the use of the imperative in each text.

The sentence type used in lines 19-22 is imperative sentences. In Text 1 the writer uses imperatives in lines 23-30 aiming to make readers picture themselves at the holiday destination – an invitation. Text 2 in comparison simply tells readers that they should do the things listed – follow the rules. Text 2's use of imperatives is more like an order.

Question 10

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	Average
%	11	18	26	22	23	2.3

As can be seen from the mean score for this question, most students were able to identify at least some of the grammatical items required. Once again, students sacrificed marks by not clearly indicating the item. This was particularly true with the conjunctions; it was not sufficient for students to state that a conjunction occurred in line 10, the actual conjunction needed to be listed or underlined when a clause or whole sentence was written out.

Compound: It's.....seasons. (line 10)

2004 Assessment Report



Simple: Use water wisely at the Prom (line 22)
Coordinating conjunctions: and (line 14) but (line 10)

Question 11

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	Average
%	55	17	19	4	4	0.9

This question proved to be difficult for most students, who often confused 'impersonal' with 'informal'. A few students stated that sentences (in lines 3, 15, 16, 23) were informative or imperative rather than correctly naming the (agentless) passive. A number of students wrote about the absence of personal pronouns rather than dealing with impersonal/formal lexical items that were to be found in the text, such as *permitted* (line 23), *management vehicle tracks* (line 23), and *firearms* (line 15). Full marks were awarded to students who identified an example of sentence structure as well as an example of lexical choice, with an explanation for each example.

Environmental jargon is used, as in 'management vehicle tracks' in line 23 or 'erosion' in line 21, which are formal lexical items that create a sense of social distance. Passive voice is used often in the list of rules in order to remove the actor, eg, 'firearms, dogs and other pets are not allowed' (line 15) removes reference to the 'we/the park staff' that would be necessary otherwise, giving a more detached feel.

Question 12

Marks	0	1	2	3	Average
%	25	26	24	25	1.5

There were many examples of lexical and grammatical listing evident in the text, and although most students could identify one example they frequently did not indicate whether it was an example of lexical or grammatical listing. For full marks, a comparison with Text 1 was required.

In lines 8 - 9 a lexical list occurs, naming many of the activities which can be undertaken while visiting Wilsons Prom, eg, walking, camping, swimming.....This is similar to the listing in Text 1, lines 20 - 22, which also names activities which can be enjoyed, as both lists appeal to a range of interests and provide information on what can be done there.

Section 2

The transcript was of a conversation between two teenage girls, and the topic of the conversation was desserts. The text was characterised by a close social relationship as evidenced by the supportive, harmonious tenor of the discussion. A transcription key was provided. This section tested students' knowledge of Areas of Study 1 and 2, Unit 4

Question 13

Marks	0	1	2	3	Average
%	9	15	15	61	2.3

Most students were able to identify the lines at which the topics began and finished, although in a few cases students did not indicate both the start and finish of the topic. Some students wrote about the topics themselves, which was not required and took up students' time unnecessarily. The following answer is succinct and accurate.

Topic 1) *begins at line 1*
 ends at line 23
 Topic 2) *begins at line 24*
 ends at line 43
 Topic 3) *begins at line 44*
 ends at line 61

Question 14

Marks	0	1	2	Average
%	30	50	20	0.9

This question was poorly answered as many students did not discuss the function of the pairs of particles. The question asked for the function of each pair, but many students wrote about the function of each word or of two or three of the words. For full marks, the response had to explain that *well* and *yeah* were transition signals used to frame a topic, while *okay* and *anyway* indicated changes of topic.

Well (1) and yeah (42) open and close a discussion by the first speaker, preparing the way to say something new. Okay (23) and anyway (43) are used to change the topics of discussion.

2004 Assessment Report



Question 15

Marks	0	1	2	3	Average
%	8	14	48	31	2.0

There were many instances of Faye overlapping Erin, and two instances of Erin overlapping Faye. Most students correctly identified an instance of each. A number of students were unclear about the concept of turn taking, and stated that no examples were evident in the transcript. The answers that received full marks identified that the function of the overlapping was to demonstrate harmony and to build a collaborative floor rather than attempting to take over or dominate the conversation.

Erin overlaps Faye on line 6 to make a comment about strawberries. Faye overlaps Erin on line 19, saying 'yes, yes, yes' to express her agreement with Erin on the desire to include 'strawberries in the middle'. The two girls' overlaps, and their turn taking, build on each others' conversation. This would suggest that social distance is small between the speakers.

Question 16

Marks	0	1	2	Average
%	22	43	34	1.1

Faye's responses were identified as minimal responses, backchannel signals or supportive utterances designed to show Erin that Faye was listening and encouraging Erin to continue speaking. Most students correctly explained this function, included the metalanguage term or gave an extended explanation, and were awarded full marks.

Faye uses the backchanneling technique 'yep' in lines 51 – 55 to indicate to Erin that she is paying attention and understands what Erin is saying. Erin is therefore reassured that she has Faye's full attention.

Question 17

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	Average
%	8	13	22	25	17	16	2.8

This question built on the knowledge required for the previous two questions. For full marks, students needed to state that the social relationship between the two participants was a close one, which was illustrated by the overlaps and backchannel signals. Other conversational strategies that could be identified for full marks included: animated prosodics (frequent lengthened syllables, rhythmic representation of the beaters); high level of involvement (numerous questions, short frequent turns); informal lexical choice ('spewing'); laughter with friendly tone; or collaborative style (turns that built on each other, similar to a conversational duet).

Faye and Erin appear to not have a lot of social distance between them, and seem to be 'equal' in social status relative to one another. The freeness with which they overlap and interrupt one another is a sign of intimacy – with a less well-known person this type of interruption might appear rude and impolite. Faye's encouraging 'yep' breaks up Erin's story, but actually provides feedback for Erin to show her the listener is taking an active interest in the conversation. The sometimes informal lexical choice also indicates informality and friendliness, such as 'go down well' (line 2), 'yum' (line 20) and Faye's 'whup, whup, whup' (lines 28, 30, 32).

Question 18

Marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	Average
%	24	25	20	16	9	6	1.8

Students were not expected to discuss each of Grice's maxims in response to this question, but to comment more generally on the cooperative nature of the conversation. Most importantly, the response had to acknowledge that the conversation was cooperative, as the possible overlaps were affirming of each participant and did not represent disorderliness or dominance. Students who failed to identify the cooperative nature of the conversation had misread the transcript and received no marks.

The spoken interaction does uphold the cooperative principle of conversation as its two participants have managed to communicate effectively. There is clear understanding between the two, who complete each other's sentences (lines 6-7) and are still understood by each other even when talking at the same time (lines 25-32). They share social rapport in the form of jokes (line 39) and include each other in the conversation through questioning (lines 24, 44, 47).

Section 3

Question Chosen	0	1	2	3
%	2	58	20	20

As in past years, the final section of the examination required students to write a sustained expository response to one of three possible topics. The essay was designed to assess knowledge of Areas of Study 1 and 2 in Unit 3, and Area of



Study 2 in Unit 4 (Question 20). The majority of students chose Question 19. This section provided students with an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge of sociolinguistics in the Australian context, and it was pleasing indeed to see that the best essays used metalanguage confidently and referred to a range of examples. The better responses included reference to other resources drawn from wide reading on the topics of language use, language change, and attitudes to varieties in Australia. The task required students to write with far more sophistication than simple, instinctive observations of language use. Questions 20 and 21 directed students to discuss a range of subsystems, and although some students did consider more than the lexicon, the other subsystems were too frequently ignored or avoided. A pleasing aspect of this part of the paper was the relative absence of prepared essays, compared to previous years.

Question 19

The best responses to this topic focussed on one or two groups or individuals, both popular (such as hobby groups and television personalities) and professional (IT specialists, doctors and lawyers). In the discussion of how jargon creates cohesiveness, the following points were made:

- jargon marks group boundaries by defining group membership through the use of language unique to the group, such as slang and technical language
- jargon creates a succinct and precise way of communicating amongst group members, for example, through acronyms, abbreviations, shortenings and technical terms
- jargon confers individuals and groups with authority, for example, through the use of technical language.

Responses that were able to make links between these points to demonstrate how cohesiveness is created demonstrated a thorough understanding of the role of jargon. Essays which attempted to discuss aspects of accent, lexicon, morphology and semantics, and which demonstrated sound understanding of how these subsystems marked out individual and group identity, received high marks. Essays that deviated from the topic (for example into a discussion on slang or political correctness), that repeated examples, or that lacked specific examples scored low marks. The following sample is a complete essay, one which demonstrates an excellent understanding of the range of functions of jargon and which uses the metalanguage with assurance, providing relevant and specific examples. Note the length of the essay, about 770 words – four pages hand-written under examination conditions.

Language can be employed in a myriad of ways, and the use of jargon in different contexts is one of these. The functions of jargon range from its use as a specialist language or code to its ability to create an in-group and exclude others. Also, some jargon, with the rise and influence of technology and other domains has entered the mainstream and become standardised. It is in these different ways that jargon can create cohesiveness within a speech community.

The role of jargon as a specialist language creates cohesiveness by increasing the efficiency of communication. Professions and interest groups will converse in jargon because they know that those who share the knowledge of this code will understand immediately and no unnecessary explanations will have to take place. It is much simpler and efficient for lawyers to speak in 'legalese' with lexical items such as 'subpoena' and 'chattel'. The meaning is understood straightaway by those who share the jargon and it has saved time because it is easier than saying 'making someone testify' (subpoena) and 'belongings' (chattel). It also sounds slightly more impressive! The communication is made quicker and simpler through jargon and hence ensures cohesiveness because unnecessary explanations are omitted from exchanges and interactions.

The jargon that we use can also promote in-group solidarity, which ensures cohesiveness because the members of the group are made aware by language where they belong. When a group is freely conversing about 'volleys' and 'backhands' they are aware that they belong to the same interest group of tennis. This knowledge can increase the closeness and familiarity within a group because the use of jargon helps the members of the group relate to each other. If a new member joins a group, they will try to immediately pick up on the jargon, so that they feel part of the group. This happens often with teenagers who want nothing more than to be included, and their lexicon will alter to 'teen jargon' or 'teenspeak' to add lexical terms such as 'mad' (good) or 'wak' (bizarre but good). Jargon creates cohesiveness because the members of an in-group will know through the use of language who belongs together and by sharing the use of jargon a stronger social rapport is built.

As well as including members of a group, jargon can be used to deliberately exclude others, which creates cohesion by emphasising who belongs and who doesn't. Often people feel excluded and misled when they are unaware of jargon. The language of the military is an example of this because its jargon deliberately confounds and excludes. For example, terms such as 'collateral damage' (civilian deaths) and 'friendly fire' (being killed by your own troops) confounds because they don't actually have any meaning unless one is familiar with the jargon. Similar situations occur when doctors talk about 'negative patient care outcomes'. Someone who isn't aware that this actually refers to death is hence misled and feels excluded because they don't understand. Jargon can be efficient in easing communication, but often it is manipulated to make others feel as outsiders. Through the manipulation of jargon, cohesiveness is created because it puts members of a speech community in their place by deliberately excluding and obfuscating.

As well as the role that jargon can play in manipulation, it can also reflect the influences in a speech community by becoming standardised. This can create cohesion because it shows the similar interests and values that a society shares. With the rise of



technology, jargon that used to be indecipherable to the average person has entered the everyday vernacular. Neologisms such as 'gigabyte' and 'hard drive' have become familiar. Semantic shifts with lexical terms such as 'mouse' and 'surfing' are no longer confusing. Similar situations have occurred when cooking shows dominated our airwaves. Everyone began talking about 'tempura' they cooked with their 'Le Creuset' and how useful a 'pestle and mortar' really is. The standardisation, and sometimes codification, of this new jargon has reflected the interests and influences of our society. A sense of cohesion is achieved by this addition of jargon, due to the way it reflects our speech community's values so that no one could be confused about what our society finds important.

Jargon and its different uses is helpful in creating cohesiveness within a speech community. The ways that jargon can make interactions more efficient, increase in-group solidarity while excluding or misleading others and become standardised through popularity, all create this cohesion. Through the use of jargon interests, relationships and values can be reflected which increase cohesiveness. Jargon is an effective language tool which fulfils the many requirements that members of a speech community have.

Question 20

Responses to this topic, although significantly fewer in number than for Question 19, were generally of a good standard. There was scope within the topic for discussion of:

- the principle of appropriateness
- the social relationships between participants
- the functions/purposes of the interaction
- the mode of communication
- the means of communication (spoken, written)
- the setting or physical location of the participants.

Most students were guided by the question and attempted to cover more than one of the subsystems in their response. Lexicon is the area in which students demonstrated greatest assurance; however, many students also discussed syntax (ellipsis, impersonal constructions such as bureaucratese), semantics (doublespeak, taboo, distinctive Australian items with cultural understandings), phonetics (reduction in casual speech, accent) and discourse (politeness markers, hedging markers, emoticons and abbreviations). Below are extracts from good essays on this topic, with appropriate examples drawn from the Australian context.

Sample 1

Informal language use is acceptable in certain contexts and with certain people. Non-standard and informal language use is generally the most acceptable with peers where the social distance between participants is decreased. Certain lexemes may be used, including slang such as 'mate' or 'frog and toad' for road, and expletives such as 'shit'. This will, however, only be acceptable when all participants understand and approve of the use of these lexemes. There may be lexemes specific to a group that are only suitable for use in that group. An example of this may be nicknames that have particular connotations, such as 'Chip' for someone with a chipped tooth. Alterations may also be made with regard to the morphology or phonetics of a lexeme, such as 'Johnno' for 'John'. One may feature elision in speech, as in 'chillin' or 'goin', where the /ŋ/ sound has become /n/. Ellipsis may also occur with regard to syntax, eg, 'catch ya' rather than 'I will catch you later' (although this itself is relatively informal). A variety of less formal features may be present in an informal context.

When making language choices in relation to formal circumstances, various subsystems will be affected. Lexical choice is likely to be more standard, with the omission of colloquialisms or expletives. One will try to use more sophisticated language when in formal contexts. An example of this may be when writing a letter of complaint to a business and saying something like: 'I sincerely hope that the situation is rectified as soon as possible.' As the social distance is likely to be great between participants, it is likely that polite, formal openings and closings will be expected. Formal circumstances will often also require standard morphology or phonetics, with less elision, for example. It is likely that standard syntax will be used and ellipsis will be minimised, eg, 'Are you ready to proceed with the ballot?' compared to 'Ready?' Someone may use more complex syntax in formal circumstances if attempting to appear more sophisticated in their language use. This occurs in the political domain, with doublespeak (eg, 'non-core promises') and long sentences. These conscious language choices are made because of perceived attitudes about language use. The broader, less standard variety of Australian English is thought, for example, to carry connotations of ugliness and ignorance. Changes to language choices in formal circumstances attempt to uphold the principle of appropriateness.

Language choices are dependent on the context and on social expectations. As native speakers of a language, people have an innate ability to determine what is and is not appropriate language use given certain contexts. People will alter their language to suit their audience, their own intentions and how they wish to be perceived.

Sample 2

Register influences the language a person uses so it is appropriate for the domain in which they create their text. The domain of law, for example, is recognised with 'legalese' – a language type characterised by use of archaic tautologies[sic], eg, 'aforesaid amendment', 'notwithstanding', 'aforementioned', and specific jargon, eg, 'plaintiff', 'approach the bench', 'at the bar'. These lexemes are interpreted by others who are familiar with the legal system. People such as judges, lawyers and barristers use this language and expect it to be used while in the courtroom, as it is appropriate register for the domain. A lawyer would need, however, to adjust to the domain of 'home' after a day's work, as a different register is required in this context.



As well as register, the formality of a situation in which people find themselves affects their language use. Using 'wrong' or socially unacceptable levels of formality can be socially detrimental for the user, as people may judge him/her as perhaps uncouth or uneducated or, at the other end of the spectrum, as 'up themselves'. In Australia it is common practice to morphologically adjust language to reduce the formality of lexemes. By adding 'ie' or 'o' suffixes to abbreviated words, 'pokies', 'uni'[sic], 'smoko' and 'hippie' are acceptable diminutives which would be appropriate in a conversation at a friend's barbeque. However, this informality would be deemed uncultured should it be used at a formal function, such as the swearing in of a Prime Minister. Non-standard grammar, such as 'I done good', 'I seen him coming' and multiple negations, eg, 'I ain't taken none of them', are considered informal styles and often are used by teenagers, particularly amongst themselves. Teenagers would (or should) alter this casual style during a talk with the principal, and convert to a more standard, more contextually appropriate syntax.

Question 21

Essays which clearly identified a specific individual or group and that explained how identity was constructed via at least two of the subsystems, and which provided examples, scored well on this topic. Features of the subsystems that could have been included are similar to those listed above for Question 20. The student sample essay which follows clearly sets up the nature of the discussion in the introduction and then carefully identifies and analyses the features of three individuals' language use, as well as the range of attitudes held by others to those individuals' identities. The conclusion is short; the student appears to have run out of time. The assured use of the metalanguage, with specific examples, is commendable. The whole essay is about 650 words in length (four hand written pages).

Language is a powerful tool used in constructing identity. Depending on the accent one has, the lexicon and morphology they choose to use and their grammatical and syntactic use, individuals can change their own identities and how they wish to be perceived by others. Examples of individuals constructing their own identities through language are Steve Irwin, 'crocodile hunter', Jamie Oliver the British chef, and Queen Elizabeth. Attitudes towards these personalities are varied.

Steve Irwin's language is a combination of every stereotypical Australian English language feature. He uses lengthened vowels and diphthongs to mimic the typical 'Aussie drawl' and his speech is littered with slang and colloquialisms, such as 'crikey' and 'g'day'. Ellipsis is common in Steve Irwin speak, such as in 'you comin'?' and elision is also commonly found – 'take a look at that croc!' Flapping is another feature of Steve Irwin's speech, such as in 'foody' for 'footy', as is palatalisation. Steve Irwin also uses colourful idioms and morphology, such as 'barbie' and 'Aussie' unique to Australian English, as well as (sometimes unusual) grammar and syntax, such as ending a sentence with 'but'. Although these features of Australian English are common amongst many speakers, Steve Irwin exaggerates his accent to reflect his identity – a relaxed, outback larriken. His language choices help his audiences to relate to him as an 'average Aussie' and his accent also makes him seem real and familiar.

Jamie Oliver, the cockney speaking young British chef, also uses idiomatic language. Oliver's cockney accent is perhaps the most distinctive language feature. He uses glottal stops as in /bo'le/ rather than 'bottle' and he uses high rising intonation frequently. Elision is a common feature of his language, such as in 'fish'n'chips' and he often drops the /t/ sound from the ends of certain words – 'I wan' i'. Oliver's lexicon is also creative and witty, such as his use of the word 'pukka', which has since become a buzzword. 'Mate' and the profanities 'bloody' and 'bugger' are also favourites. Jamie Oliver's identity is constructed largely by his language. By adopting a cockney accent, his image becomes more casual and friendly and he is easier to relate to as a normal person. His use of slang and colloquialisms, as well as his witty profanities, are a reflection of his age, which is perhaps why his audience is made up of mostly young people. Oliver uses cooking jargon, such as 'fold in the eggs' and 'simmer paprika and baby spinach', which is a reflection of his interests and area of expertise.

The Queen of England, compared to Steve Irwin and Jamie Oliver, uses a much more formal and standard variety of English, similar to 'Received Pronunciation'. Her lexicon is formal – 'we cordially invite you....' and she rarely uses non-standard English such as slang, colloquialisms or profanities. Queen Elizabeth also properly enunciates each word, so there are few cases of elision, assimilation, flapping, epenthesis or ellipsis in her speech. Queen Elizabeth's speech is a reflection of her identity, and she uses language to construct her identity. Her formal register and standard lexicon are used to indicate her class and role in society.

The attitudes towards these public figures are varied. Some consider Steve Irwin to be satirising and mocking Australian English, and that he is portraying Australians as 'bogans'. Others do not mind so much, and see Irwin as a well-intentioned larriken who represents Australians as friendly and enthusiastic. Jamie Oliver and his cockney accent are very popular, and many Britons have even adopted his style of speech, so it is no longer just working class people who speak with a cockney accent. Many Jamie Oliver terms have become the new buzzwords. Some however, believe that Oliver is promoting poor English, but this is debatable. Queen Elizabeth's royal accent is thought by many to be overly posh and that her language use indicates that she believes herself to be above all other people.

Language is often used by celebrities and other groups and individuals to construct their own identities.