Nicknames in Australian Secondary Schools: Insights into Nicknames and Adolescent Views of Self

Donna Starks
La Trobe University, Australia

Kerry-Taylor Leech
Griffith University, Australia

Louisa Willoughby
Monash University, Australia

Although it is widely known that language practices can significantly affect adolescent self-image, research studies on adolescent naming practices are surprisingly scarce. The only study to date on nicknames in Australia was undertaken by Chevalier (2006). Her study provides a comprehensive analysis of morphological and semantic features of names but makes no reference to adolescent language practices and their role in society. Our exploration of initial responses to questionnaire data administered to secondary students in Victoria and Queensland schools considers: (i) common adolescent nicknaming practices and (ii) attitudes of adolescents to nicknames used for others and towards nicknames. We end with suggestions for raising awareness of naming practices to promote cultural and linguistic sensitivity amongst high school students.

KEYWORDS nicknames, adolescents, Australian English, naming practices, language attitudes

Introduction

Personal naming is one of many different types of naming practices. Given names are formally assigned to the holder, who generally has little or no choice in their designation and use. However, whereas given names can sometimes be officially or ceremonially changed, nicknames are acquired informally and often against the holder's wishes. Indeed, the effects and associations of a nickname may last for a

person's lifetime. The social power of nicknames is often remarked on but has seldom been systematically studied. In an early study of nicknaming practices among school-children, Morgan et al. (1979: 15–16) suggest that the study of nicknames is one way of observing the development of social competence; in other words, the way that young people construct social order for themselves. Nicknaming systems, they argue, are the instruments of the social control of personal appearance and personality projection. Nicknames encapsulate the way the bearers are perceived by others in their social milieu and also serve as publicly accepted ideas about the way a person is supposed to be.

The bestowal of nicknames, as we have noted, is not so much within the power of the personal holder as within the social practices of the peer group. Nicknames may change and may do so often as an individual moves through life. Most nicknames relate to the personal attributes of the user, and, as such, create expectations about the user. Nicknames can contribute to both positive and negative views of self and others and may be inaccurate (de Klerk and Bosch, 1996: 526). Although cultural differences exist (cf. Liao, 2006 for Taiwanese; Wardat, 1997 for Jordanian Arabic), typologies of nicknames indicate that they tend to fall into specific categories (Crozier, 2002; Crozier and Dimmock, 1999; de Klerk and Bosch, 1996). Nicknames tend to relate to the user's physical characteristics, such as his/her weight, height or hair color, personal habits or traits, and aptitude or lack thereof. Some nicknames relate to personal histories including cultural or ethnic background, while others include play on rhymes or hypocoristic renditions of personal or family names (e.g., *Smithy*). Renditions of names include commonly accepted forms (e.g., *Beth*) and those which are more unique to the user (e.g., *Be*). Wierzbicka (1992) argues that important pragmatic differences exist between standardized and less-standardized forms of personal names and the two should be considered separately. Our study includes all forms of nicknames, as we believe that they all fulfill the function of identifying the user. In domains such as the Internet, where adolescents are often engaged, forms of personal names can be the most frequent type of nickname (cf. Bechar-Israeli, 1995 for Internet use).

Social psychologists agree that the process of identity formation is a central task in adolescence (Erikson, 1968). Marcia (1980: 267) defines identity formation as a self-constructed, dynamic organization of drives, abilities, beliefs, and individual history. According to Erikson (1968), achieved identity is the product of a period of exploration and experimentation especially during adolescence. Through this process, young people come to a deeper understanding and appreciation of various aspects of their identity. Various authors propose models to describe how identity is achieved through a process of decision-making and self-evaluation (see, e.g., Caltabiano, 1984; Hogg et al., 1987). Many of these studies focus on ethnic identity formation in and across cultural groups (see, e.g., Atkinson et al. Sue, 1983; Kim, 1981; Lee, 2009; Marcia, 1966; 1980; Phinney, 1989; 1990; Roberts et al., 1999), and focus on change over time. Although it widely known that language practices, particularly on the part of parents and peers, can significantly affect adolescent self-image, research studies on young people's naming practices are surprisingly scarce, in linguistically and culturally diverse settings such as contemporary Australia.

Census findings attest to the linguistic and cultural diversity of Australian society. Despite widespread language shift to English amongst Indigenous and immigrant communities, data from the 2006 census reveal that at least 350 languages continue to be regularly used in Australian homes; of these, some 150–155 are Aboriginal languages (Clyne et al., 2008). Some 17 percent of Australians report that their dominant language is not English, implying that the numbers using a language other than English on a regular basis is higher (Lo Bianco and Slaughter, 2009: 14). Australia is internationally well regarded for its commitment to an inclusive policy of multiculturalism and, despite various policy swings and shifts, this commitment has informed the social and educational policy agenda since the 1970s (see Liddicoat, 1996; 2009; Lo Bianco and Slaughter, 2009; Scarino and Papademetre, 2001 for summaries and critiques of the changing face of Australian multicultural ideology). Education policy documents acknowledge the value of linguistic and cultural diversity, recognizing that cultural and linguistic sensitivity are essential for engagement and participation in the local, regional and international communities of the twenty-first century (see, e.g., MCEETYA, 2005: 2). Intercultural knowledge and skills are also widely recognized in policy documents as having great importance in the enduringly pluralistic Australian society and in a multilingual world (Lo Bianco and Slaughter, 2009: 4). Given this multilingual and multicultural context, a study of young people's nicknaming practices is particularly appropriate. Set against this context, our study hopes to contribute to disseminating intercultural proficiency and building intercultural awareness amongst Australian high school students. We end with suggestions for raising awareness of naming practices to promote cultural and linguistic sensitivity amongst Australian high school students.

Previous studies

There have been few studies on naming practices in the Australian or New Zealand context. In a study of hypocoristic forms in New Zealand and Australia, Bardsley and Simpson (2009) include personal names in their analysis. In an analysis of the pragmatic force associated with personal names, Wierzbecka (1992) draws on data from the Australian context while Poyton's (1990) and Taylor's (1992) studies of naming practices and address terms use Australian English as a database. The latter provide useful information on personal naming classifications as well as insights on naming in Australia. Of particular note is Poyton's distinction between name-based nicknames (based around the addressee's given or surname), addressee-based (based on attributes of the addressee) and event-based nicknames, derived from a "significant incident" in the person's life. Chevalier (2006: 133) draws on this work for her analysis of nickname use, described below.

Chevalier (2004; 2006) completed a study of the naming practices of Sydney residents based on data from 304 interviews. She surveyed the naming practices of adults and their family members, reporting on data from 498 individuals in total. Her study is useful in that it involves a substantial number of nicknames (1207) and includes a detailed analysis of nickname types in this sample. Chevalier's work focuses on morphological and semantic features of both given names and nicknames

and provides a useful point of departure for considering coding in future work. To our knowledge, the studies above are the only studies of naming practices in Australia and they have different foci from the present one. The above studies do little to focus on the naming practices of adolescents, even though it is widely accepted that such language practices can have both positive and negative effects on adolescents' perceptions of themselves and others.

The participating schools

We collected data from five Australian school contexts; four in the State of Queensland and one in the State of Victoria We have 215 questionnaires from Queensland, and 27 from Victoria. Questionnaires were gathered from 55 students in lower years of secondary school, and 187 in upper years of secondary school. Table 1 presents an overview of the participating schools. It contains details about the state in which the school is located, the year group(s) from which the data was collected, and the number of questionnaires elicited at each school.

In what follows we provide a profile of the participating institutions. All names are pseudonyms. The Rural Enrichment Program (REP) targets students from a range of schools in rural and remote Queensland areas. It aims to improve the educational outcomes and opportunities of students who are educationally disadvantaged by geographical isolation. Maryville State High School is a large, suburban co-educational secondary school located in a provincial Queensland city. City College is a state high school located in Brisbane city center. Its student intake comes from both across the city and outlying areas. Walter Taylor Boys Grammar is a large, prestigious independent, non-denominational, day and boarding school for boys, also located in a provincial Queensland city. Its students came from rural and remote areas and from Interstate. Smithton Secondary College is a state school located in suburban Melbourne. The school is over-subscribed due to its strong academic reputation and thus restricts its student intake to the immediately surrounding (middle-class) neighborhoods. The senior student participants from Smithton were all taking a linguistics class,[1] but this has not had a clear influence on the nickname data gathered from this

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES (N = 242 QUESTIONNAIRES)

School	State	Year	Number of questionnaires
REP	QLD	8	30
Maryville	QLD	8	19
City College	QLD	11	78
Walter Taylor	QLD	11	88
Smithton (Group 1)	VIC	7	6
Smithton (Group 2)	VIC	12	21
TOTAL	–	–	242

school. In all schools, there were a range of ethnic and language backgrounds but the predominant group are of Anglo origin.

The questionnaire

The paper draws on written responses to questionnaire data. The questionnaire has three sections and the present paper describes the data from Section 1. The remaining two sections consider general questions on language use and background information. Section 2 of the questionnaire consists of six general questions on language attitudes and practices. Section 3 contains information about place of birth, family language background, ethnic identity, and qualities the students feel are important in friends. It is our hope that the data contained in Section 2 and 3 of the questionnaire will indicate whether and how nicknames relate to other aspects of linguistic behavior and/or language attitudes. However, at the time of writing we have not reached this stage of the analysis.

Section 1 focuses on nicknames of others and self. In the first part of section 1, the student participants are encouraged to think about nicknames that they know and fill in a table which has space for six nicknames. For each nickname they provide, participants are asked to write what the nickname refers to and classify it into one of five semantic categories (N = a variation on a name, P = a physical trait, B = where the name bearer comes from, E = referring to the name bearer's emotions, O = anything else) and evaluate their attitudes towards this nickname by circling one or more smiley, neutral, or sad emoticons. Student participants were not provided with any instructions as to how to assign the nicknames to the semantic categories, nor were they provided with any instructions as to which nicknames to provide.

The second part of Section 1 is a single open-ended question about whether the participants themselves have a nickname, and if so what it refers to and how they feel about it. To maintain anonymity, participants are asked not to write the nickname itself.

Findings

Nicknames for others

The participants engaged enthusiastically with the task, producing 1083 nicknames (or 4.4 nicknames per student). There were slightly fewer nicknames provided by participants in lower (4.2 nicknames per student) as opposed to the upper years of secondary school (4.6 nicknames per student). In what follows, we provide some examples of the elicited nicknames and the categories into which they were inserted. The participants provided varying degrees of information regarding their assignment of nicknames categories, and different students sometimes used different categories for the same name, and, most likely, the same person (e.g., *Maple* categorized as "physical trait" and "other").[2]

Names:	*T-Pham, Digs, Cookie, Sutas, V-dog, AJ, Bunger, Wilson, Marchy, Chau Chau, Belle, Fanch, C-Chan, Moosh, Chicken Wing, Fungus, Xie*
Physical:	*Double-decker Rebecca, Red Pants, Monkey, Susan Boyle, Snowball, Tank*

Place/Heritage: *Surgeon, Sweedy, Sweedy-Z, Elephant, American, Curry, Turk, Japo*
Emotion: *Awks, Moo Moo, Puppy, Jim*
Other: *Bludger, Maple, Cheesy, Juicy, Floppy, Dory, Cookie, Megapig*

Table 2 considers the number and proportion of nicknames in each of the above types in the sample. It excludes 30 nicknames which were either uncoded or listed as a mixture of categories (e.g., *Blackie* categorized as both a physical trait (P) and an ethnic trait (B)). Of the remaining 1053 responses, the majority (619 or 58%) are variants on names. This finding suggests that researchers who ignore variants of names as nickname types may fail to consider the views of large numbers of individuals who see variants of names as nicknames. Of the remaining nickname categories, 165 (15%) refer to physical traits, while only 50 (4%) refer to a feature of the place or ethnicity of the bearer and 34 (3%) refer to emotional states. The category "other" accounts for a further 17% of the data. In an analysis of the "other" category, the following subcategories emerged. Each is accompanied by an example in brackets: (1) nicknames denoting behavior or actions, e.g., *Twirly*, describing a hair twirling habit, *Floss* as in fairy floss, *Couch Potato*, *Price Princess*, *Dopey Dora*, and *Timber*; (2) private or inside jokes, e.g., *Fudge nut*, *Bucket*, *Sham-wow*, *Doodleface*, *Hummus*, and *Fridge*; (3) a variation on an email address, e.g., *Horr*; (4) negative or degrading names, e.g., *Wart*, *Bogan*; (5) television/movie/theatre/video games, e.g., *Luigi*, based on a video game; *Harry*, based on an obsession with Harry Potter, *Jenny New Ninja*, *Barney*, *Goku*, and *Bear*;(6) sport/hobbies, e.g., *Skittles*; (7) memories, dreams, or stories, e.g., *Nimph*, *Chick*, *Dorey Danyon*; (8) objects or possessions, e.g., *Red*, describing a favorite shirt, *Product*, describing a fondness for hair products; (9) mistakes or typing errors in the spelling of real names, e.g., *Sofie*, *Cooleman*, and *Kremmie*; and lastly (10) unclassifiable nicknames, e.g., *Reagan*, *Beady*, and *Puley*. Some of the nicknames in the "other" category are similar in many respects to those reported in Bechar-Israeli's (1995) study of Internet nicknames, which might suggest an influence from cyberspace into daily life and the need for an evaluation of nickname use in our modern technologically savvy society.

TABLE 2

TYPES OF NICKNAMES AT EACH SCHOOL

School	Total nicknames	Variants on names		Physical traits		Place		Emotion		Other	
		n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
REP	125	68	54	19	15	1	0	1	0	36	28
Maryville	68	43	63	18	26	0	0	2	2	5	7
City College	335	216	64	32	9	11	3	16	4	60	17
Walter Taylor	387	210	54	79	20	25	6	11	2	62	16
Smithton	138	82	59	17	12	13	9	4	2	22	15
TOTAL	1053	619		165		50		34		185	

Note: All percentages are rounded down. These responses do not include instances where participants reported nicknames as belonging to more than one type. It also does not report nicknames which did not receive an evaluation. There are 30 such instances in the corpus.

We now consider how nicknames are evaluated. Table 3 provides an overview of the students' attitudes have towards nicknames of others. Of the 1053 nicknames elicited, 675 or 64% were viewed as consistently positive. Only 5% of the nicknames cited in the sample were consistently viewed negatively. A further 23 nicknames (2% of the data) were viewed as sometimes being negative (and sometimes neutral or positive). All other nicknames in the sample were either viewed as positive, neutral, or as varying between neutral and positive, suggesting that nicknames are generally viewed as favorable. The overall responses were relatively consistent across all the schools, with Walter Taylor, a boys-only school, having only a slightly lower proportion of positive responses with Smithton and REP having a slightly higher proportion of negative ones.

Names did not appear to cluster in any obvious way. In our data we have examples of seemingly innocuous and common shortenings of a name (e.g., *Penny*) being viewed negatively and used "to annoy someone," whereas some seemingly unflattering nicknames (e.g., *Couch potato*, *Smelly*, and *Timber*) are viewed neutrally or even positively. The most commonly identified nickname to be evaluated negatively were nicknames to individuals with red hair.

Table 4 presents a more micro-level view of how each of the nickname types in Table 3 is evaluated. Percentages are listed as *n/a* when numbers of occurrences are lower than 5. Nicknames that are based around names are consistently evaluated positively in 71% of all instances; this is followed by nicknames which refer to the "other" category (64% positive evaluation). The responses from the schools show some variation, but the patterns are again relatively consistent across the institutions. Nicknames which refer to physical characteristics, place, or emotion are generally evaluated less positively. However, there is considerable variation between schools on this point, perhaps reflecting different school cultures. Physical traits are not evaluated positively at Smithton (35%) or City College (37%) but are evaluated much more positively at Maryville (61%). Differences in perceptions also exist for nicknames

TABLE 3

GENERAL OVERVIEW OF ATTITUDES TOWARDS NICKNAMES (N = 242 QUESTIONNAIRES)

School	Total nicknames	Nicknames – Positive only		Nicknames – Negative only	
		n	%	*n*	%
REP	125	86	68	10	8
Maryville	68	46	67	2	2
City College	335	217	64	12	3
Walter Taylor	387	233	60	23	5
Smithton	138	93	67	13	9
TOTAL	1053	675	64	60	5

Note: This table excludes nicknames which were evaluated as both positive and neutral (n = 7) and those which were evaluated as negative some or part of the time (n = 23). It also excludes those which were evaluated neutrally (n = 318).

TABLE 4

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TRAITS CONSISTENTLY EVALUATED AS POSITIVE

School	Names		Physical		Place		Emotion		Other		Total	
	Positive/ Total	*%*	*Positive/ Total*	*%*	*Positive/ Total*	*%*	*Positive/ Total*	*%*	*Positive/ Total*	*%*	*Positive/ Total*	*%*
REP (125)	51/68	75	9/19	47	1 /1	-	1/1	-	24/36	66	86/125	68
Maryville (68)	31/43	72	11/18	61	0/0	-	0/2	-	4/5	-	46/68	67
City College (335)	155/216	71	12/32	37	4/11	36	12/16	75	34/60	56	217/335	64
Walter Taylor (387)	138/210	65	35/79	44	15/25	60	4/11	-	41/62	66	233/387	60
Smithton (138)	65/82	79	6/17	35	3/13	-	3/4	-	16/22	72	93/180	51
TOTAL (1053)	440/619	71	73/165	44	23/50	46	20/34	58	119/185	64	675/1053	58

referring to "place" and "emotion" at City College and Walter Taylor. The boys' school appears to be much more favorable to nicknames based on place, whereas the more urban school, City College, shows a greater acceptance of nicknames based around emotion. As numbers are relatively small in each of these categories, the findings need to be interpreted with a high degree of caution.

Nicknames for self

We now examine how participants categorized and evaluated their own nicknames if they have one. The responses were based on qualitative feedback from the participants to the question: "If you have a nickname, tell us what your nickname refers to and how you feel about it. (Please don't tell us your nickname. We don't want to be able to identify you from your questionnaire responses)." One hundred and sixty participants indicated that they have a nickname (66%). As with nicknames for others, the majority of these nicknames for self (115, 71%) are based on personal names (either surnames or first names) and particularly shortenings thereof.

Table 5 shows that students at City College and Smithton were most likely to report that they have a nickname, while one regional school (Maryville) reported a very low number of nicknames; we have no obvious explanation for this finding. The final two columns in Table 5 list the number and the proportion of nicknames that were evaluated as positive rather than neutral or negative or a combination thereof. They relate to comments from students who state that they love their nickname (e.g., "It refers to a mistake that was made in our school newsletter and I love the name"), or they give a *smiley face* in response to the question. The proportion of positive nicknames varies considerably across the schools. It is possible that these proportions reflect differences in school cultures but it is also possible that is may be due more to school discourses than to actual perceptions. Australians are known for their understatements and some students may have given a rather neutral-sounding response as a matter of course.

Most qualitative responses were coded as neutral in their tone but some might be reflect more positive evaluations than reflected in our coding in Table 5.

Some examples of neutral comments follow:

TABLE 5

STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS OF THEIR OWN NICKNAMES

School	Number of student participants	Students with nicknames		Nicknames which are consistently viewed as positive	
		n	*%*	*n*	*%*
REP	30	19	63	7	36
Maryville	19	5	26	1	20
City College	78	61	78	34	55
Walter Taylor	88	55	62	27	49
Smithton	27	20	74	7	35
TOTAL	242	160	66	76	47

Note: Twenty-nine students who had nicknames did not evaluate them (perhaps because it was the third part of the question), two viewed them as consistently negative. The others noted that they were evaluated differently in different contexts, or that they were evaluated neutrally.

> It rhymes with my first name and it doesn't worry me
> It refers to my name it doesn't matter
> My nickname is a derivative of my first name, I feel pretty neutral towards it
> It refers to what my hair was like at an early age and it is funny
> My nickname refers to the disproportionate size of my feet and is also a play on my last name. I don't mind it at all
> About my surname, I do not care about it
> It is a variation of my last name which I don't mind

There were only two students who stated that they did not like their nickname:

> It is a play on my name and I get rather annoyed when people use it

My odd idiolect

One lone student made reference to name-calling, distinguishing this from a nickname, and stating his/her dislike for this.

> I don't have a nickname but I get called names due physical characteristics. They are bad this but I don't care

Other comments indicate the complexities and nuances in nicknames and the difficulties with evaluating them. Students' evaluation of nicknames as positive, negative, or neutral are clearly highly contextually bound and show the importance of teachers (and others) being aware of the naming preferences of their students. As Adams (2009) discusses at length, highly complex attitudes and social relations are encoded in the use of nicknames and a nickname that is viewed positively as a marker of friendship and gentle teasing when used by person X may be viewed as mocking or otherwise offensive when used by person Y.

> All my nicknames are variations of my name. There are some I don't like, but most are fine

My nicknames refer to 10 variations in my name, and inside jokes within friends, I like nicknames among only my friends

Findings such as this show how open responses provide more sophisticated responses but also show the limitations of these responses and the need for follow-up focus group discussions to tease out the intricacies of nicknaming practices.

Discussion/conclusion

Data presented in this study provide valuable insight into contemporary nicknaming practices in Australian high schools. They suggest that nicknames based on names are the most frequent types of nickname amongst Australian youth. Other nickname types commonly noted in the broader literature elicited from the data, such as those based around physical or personal traits, including emotions. A range of other nickname types emerged, including those which refer to activities and events in the media and cyberspace, important aspects in the life of today's Australian adolescents.

Although the educational literature surrounding bullying categorizes nicknaming and name-calling as a single category (cf. Hendershot et al., 2006), the findings suggest that the two should be treated as separate. Contrary to previous assumptions, we found many students view both their own nicknames and those of their friends/acquaintances positively, particularly when those nicknames are derived from a variant of their name, an emotional state or labeled as "other." Nicknames based on physical appearance or backgrounds were viewed more ambivalently, but again not negatively, suggesting students have some awareness that these may be problematic. This awareness seems to limit the use of these nicknames but not eliminate it entirely. Somewhat surprisingly for us, the most frequently cited negatively viewed nicknames were those for people with red hair (e.g., *ranga*). This point requires further exploration, but may indicate that students feel the taboo against using negative terms based on hair color is much weaker than the taboo against highlighting ethnicity/background or disability (cf. Allan and Burridge, 2006). We might conclude that students are already showing a reasonable level of cultural and linguistic sensitivity in their naming practices. However, the data for this paper was based on responses to written questionnaires and collected in school contexts. Findings must be interpreted with a degree of caution as they might have differed if the data had been collected via oral interviews or in home contexts. Further, although the school contexts contained a mix of students from English and non-English speaking backgrounds, the school contexts were predominantly Anglo in nature. Findings might have differed if data were collected in more ethnically diverse school contexts.

Teachers and students need to be aware that nicknames are a manifestation of complex social relations (cf. Adams, 2009). Teachers and students thus need to be aware that nicknames can be used as a subtle kind of bullying (particularly if used by students with whom the addressee is not good friends) but that equally some names that seem to be derogatory may be regarded as amusing or otherwise acceptable by the addressee. While our results suggest nicknaming is generally making a positive contribution to identity construction in Australian high schools, we encourage teachers to talk with their students and students to talk to each other about their naming preferences and to help ensure that those preferences are respected.

APPENDIX A: Nicknames, Identity, and Language Questionnaire

(Reprinted with permission from Starks and Taylor-Leech, 2011)

SECTION 1: NICKNAMES

We would like to know about nicknames. Many students have nicknames. A nickname usually refers to some aspect of a person's traits.

Think about nicknames for people you know. **In the table below**:

(**1**)   write their nicknames and state what their nickname refers to

(**2**)   categorize the nickname as **P B E N** or **O**

> **P**   "refers to a physical trait such as hair color"
> **B**   "refers to where the person is from"
> **E**   "refers to the person's emotions"
> **N**   "refers to variation on the person's given or surname"
> **O**   "something else"

Remember to circle whether the nickname is a **positive**, **neutral**, or **negative** term for you.

You may give more than one response (*neutral in some contexts, negative in others*).

Some examples

Nickname	Refers to?	Trait Type	Evaluation
Pom	from England	Background (B)	☺
Bubbles	easily excited	Emotional (E)	☺ and ☹
Jonsy	Surname Jones	Name (N)	☺

1. *Please fill in as many names as you can.*

Nickname	Refers to?	Trait Type (B, P, E, N, O)	Evaluation (Circle one or more)		
			☺	☺	☹
			☺	☺	☹
			☺	☺	☹
			☺	☺	☹
			☺	☺	☹
			☺	☺	☹

2. If you have a nickname, tell us what your nickname **refers to** and **how you feel** about it. (Please, ***don't*** *tell us your nickname. We don't want to be able to identify you from your questionnaire responses*)

SECTION 2: THE WAY WE SPEAK

1.   Have your friends ever talked about the way YOU speak English?
     YES   OR   **NO**
     If **yes**, tell me what they have commented on.

2.   If you moved to another country, how important would it be for you to keep your Australian accent? Circle one.

   A.   **Extremely** important. It reflects who I am.
   B.   **Important.** Australians need to speak like Australians. It is where we are from.
   C.   **Not Important.** It doesn't matter. English is English!

   If you feel you have more to say about this issue, feel free to write more in the box. **O**therwise **move on to the next question.**

3.   Do you think all Australians [*no matter where they were born*] should try to speak English with an Australian accent?
   YES   OR   NO

If you feel you have more to say about this issue, feel free to write more in the box. **Otherwise move on to the next question.**

4.   Do you think it is important for Australian migrants to learn Aussie terms such as "**sunnies**," "**thongs**," "**G'day mate**" and "**arvo**"?
   YES   OR   NO

If you feel you have something more to say about this issue, feel free to write more in the box. **Otherwise move on to the next question**.

5.   Do you think it is important for Australian migrants to be able to speak English before they move to Australia?
   YES   OR   NO

If you feel you have more to say about this issue, feel free to write more in the box. **O**therwise **move on to the next question.**

6.   When you think about "**Australian English**," tell me the first three things that come into your mind.

SECTION 3: BACKGROUND INFORMATION
I'd like to know a little more about yourself and the languages you and your family speak.
   First, tell us about your family

1.   Which country were your caregivers (i.e., your parents or legal guardians) born? (You may circle **more than one**)
   SAME AS ME
   DIFFERENT FROM ME

2.   **If** one or more of your caregivers were born in a **different country than you**, provide details below
   A.   In what language/**s** do your caregivers speak to each other?

   _____

   B.   **If your caregivers speak more than one language,** what is the language they use most of the time?

   _____

Now tell us about yourself
3.   In which country were **you** born? _____
4.   What was the **first** language you learned to speak? _____
5.   What language do you speak **most of the time** now? _____

6. In what languages can you talk about a **lot** of different things (e.g., English)?
   Language 1: _____
   Language 2: _____
   Any other languages? _____

7. Do you think of yourself as:
   A. Australian
   B. Mostly Australian and a bit of another nationality
   C. Mostly another nationality and some Australian

8. If someone asks you "*where are you from*," how do you answer this question, and why?

9. What do you think is important in a friend?
   A. The way they dress   YES   NO
   B. The way they think   YES   NO
   C. The way they talk   YES   NO
   D. The way they act   YES   NO
   E. Who their friends are   YES   NO
   F. Where they are from   YES   NO

If you have anything else to add, please do so.

Thank you **sooooo** much for taking time to answer these questions for us!

Notes

[1] To the best of our knowledge, none of the other students involved had any prior knowledge of linguistics.

[2] The questionnaire data did not provide enough detail about the source of the nicknames for us to be able to comment on the nickname source (e.g., friend, family member, classmate). There was also no information available to make any assumptions about the how student participants chose the nicknames they selected amongst other possible types. The range and types of nicknames suggest that they drew on friends rather than family.

Bibliography

Adams, Michael. 2009. Power, Politeness, and the Pragmatics of Nicknames. *Names* 57(2): 81–91.

Allan, Keith and Kate Burridge. 2006. *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson, D. G. Morten, and D. Sue. 1983. *Counseling American Minorities*. Dubuque, IA: William. C. Brown.

Bardsley, Dianne and Jane Simpson. 2009. Hypocoristics in New Zealand and Australian English. In: *Comparative Studies in Australia and New Zealand: Grammar and Beyond*. Ed. P. Peters, P. Collins, and A. Smith. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 49–70.

Bechar-Israeli, Heya. 1995. From "Bonehead" to "cLoNehEAd": Nicknames, Play and Identity on Internet Relay Chat. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication,* 1.2. Available at: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol1/issue2/bechar.html> (Accessed 20 January, 2012).

Caltabiano, Nerina. 1984. Perceived Differences in Ethnic Behaviour: A Pilot Study of Italo-Australian Canberra Residents. *Psychological Reports* 55: 867–873.

Chevalier, Sarah. 2004. Nicknames in Australia. *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée* 80 (Winter): 125–137.

Chevalier, Sarah. 2006. *Ava to Zac: A Sociolinguistic Study of Given Names and Nicknames in Australia*. Tubingen: Francke Verlag.

Clyne, Michael, John Hajek, and Sandra Kipp. 2008. Tale of Two Multilingual Cities in a Multilingual Continent. *People and Place* 16(3): 1–9.

Crozier, W. Ray. 2002. Donkeys and Dragons: Recollections of Schoolteachers' Nicknames. *Educational Studies* 28(2): 133–142.

Crozier, W. Ray and Patricia Dimmock. 1999. Name-calling and Nicknames in a Sample of Primary School Children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 69(4): 505–516.

de Klerk, Vivian and Barbara Bosch. 1996. Nicknames as Sex-role Stereotypes. *Sex Roles* 35(9–10): 525–541.

de Klerk, Vivian and Barbara Bosch. 1997. The Sound Patterns of English Nicknames. *Language Sciences* 19(4): 289–301.

Erikson, Erik. 1968. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton.

Hendershot, Candace, Joseph A. Dake, James H. Price, and Grace K. Lartey. 2006. Elementary School Nurses' Perceptions of Student Bullying. *The Journal of School Nursing* 22(4): 229–236.

Hogg, M. A., D. Abrams, and Y. Patel. 1987. Ethnic Identity, Self-esteem, and Occupational Aspirations of Indian and Anglo-Saxon British Adolescents. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs* 113: 487–508.

Kim, Jean 1981. The Process of Asian-American Identity Development: A Study of Japanese American Women's Perceptions of their Struggle to Achieve Positive Identities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Lee, Jung-Eun. 2009. She is Hungarious so she's Mexican but she's Most Likely Indian: Negotiating Ethnic Labels in a California Junior High School. *Pragmatics* 19(1): 39–63.

Liao, Chai-chih. 2006. Linguistic Analysis of Nicknames of Junior High School Students. *Journal of Language and Linguistics* 5(1): 68–86.

Liddicoat, Anthony. 1996. The Narrowing Focus: Australian Language-in-Education Policy. *Babel* 31(1): 1–6, 24.

Liddicoat, Anthony 2009. Evolving Ideologies of the Intercultural in Australian Multicultural and Language Education Policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 30(3): 189–203.

Lo Bianco, Jo with Yvette Slaughter. 2009. *Second Languages and Australian Schooling. Australian Council for Educational Research*. Camberwell: Victoria.

Marcia, James. E. 1966. Development and Validation of Ego-identity Status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 3(5): 551–558.

Marcia, James. E 1980. Identity in Adolescence. In: *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. Ed. J. Adelson. New York: Wiley, pp. 159–187.

MCEETYA Ministerial Council on Education, Training and Youth Affairs. 2005. *National Statement for Languages Education in Australian Schools: National Plan for Language Education in Australian Schools 2005–2008*. Hindmarsh: DECS Publishing.

Morgan, Jane, Christopher O'Neill and Rom Harré. 1979. *Nicknames: Their Origins and Social Consequences*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Phinney, Jean. 1989. Stages of Ethnic Identity in Minority Group Adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence* 9: 34–49.

Phinney, Jean. 1990. Ethnic Identity in Adolescents and Adults: Review of Research. *Psychological Bulletin* 108(3): 499–514.

Poyton, Cate. 1990. Address and The Semiotics of Social Relations: A Systemic-Functional Account of Address Forms and Practices in Australian English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Sydney.

Roberts, Robert E., Jean S. Phinney, Louise C. Masse, Y. Richard Chen, Catherine R. Roberts, and Adrea Romero. 1999. The Structure of Ethnic Identity in Young Adolescents from Diverse Ethnocultural Groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence* 19: 301–322.

Scarino, Angela and Leo Papademetre. 2001. Ideologies, Languages, Policies: Australia's Ambivalent Relationship with Learning to Communicate in "Other" Languages. In: *Australian Policy Activism in Language and Literacy*. Ed. J. Lo Bianco and R. Wickert. Melbourne: Language Australia, pp. 307–325.

Starks, Donna and Kerry Taylor-Smith 2011. A Research Report on Nicknames and Adolescent Identity. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics* 17(2): 87–97.

Taylor, Brian. 1992. Otto 988 to Ocker 1988: The Morphological Treatment of Personal Names in Old High German and Colloquial Australian English. In: *Language and Civilisation: A Concerted Profusion of Essays and Studies in Honour of Otto Hietsch*. Ed. C. Blank. Vol. 2. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 503–536.

NICKNAMES IN AUSTRALIAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS
Wardat, Mahmud. 1997. Nicknaming in Jordanian Arabic: A Sociolinguistic Perspective. *Interface* 12(1): 45–58.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1992. *Semantics, Culture and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Notes on contributors

Donna Starks is a Senior Lecturer in the Faculty of Education at La Trobe University. Her research focuses on language and identity. She has a particular interest in ethnic varieties of English, the development of ethnolects, and the use of ethnic labeling. She has worked with numerous migrant communities on issues related to language maintenance and language revival.

Kerry Taylor-Leech lectures in Applied Linguistics. Her research focuses on the interconnections between language use, identity, education and literacy. She is particularly interested in the relationship between language and settlement for immigrant families of non English-speaking background and the interactions between recently arrived immigrants and the host community.

Louisa Willoughby is a Lecturer in Linguistics at Monash University. Her research focuses on language maintenance and language issues in education, health, and disability service provision. She is particularly interested in how speakers use language to signal their membership of social groups and draw boundaries between in-group and out-group members.

Correspondence to: Louisa Willoughby, School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Building 11, Monash University, Victoria, Australia 3800. Email: Louisa.Willoughby@monash.edu.