

# Language Analysis | Sample answer

In response to the article published here:

<https://www.theage.com.au/national/we-owe-it-to-everyone-to-get-vaccinated-20150413-1mk4pd.html>

## Vaccinations

Reacting to the low immunisation rates in Australia, The Age editorial argues that everyone needs to be vaccinated. The title 'We owe it to everyone to get vaccinated' targets the entire country, deeming the lack of vaccinations a concern relevant to all. The word 'owe' establishes a sense of responsibility for the welfare of others and the audience is likely to consider immunisations beneficial to those around them. Eruditely, including the statistics for the improvement of vaccination rates for both one and two year olds, from 75 percent to 90.6 percent and 64 percent to 87.3 percent respectively, the newspaper supports its argument and increases the likelihood of those who are not vaccinated changing their minds. By placing the country's significant achievement 'in less than a generation' at the beginning of the editorial, readers may recognise their own ability to further ameliorate the country's health and safety and therefore the paper intends to influence parents to agree with the author's position that every child should be vaccinated.

The Age acknowledges and praises the government's achievement at having 'helped to lift the vaccination rate' by pairing the terms 'worth cheering' and 'a welcome development', and Australian citizens can understand that they themselves have the power to initiate positive change in our country. However, the paper endeavours to mark the apparent success of the 'free vaccinations' and 'denial of payments' irrelevant, through its comments 'still far from optimal', 'stubbornly around this level' and 'hasn't made much difference'. By juxtaposing the favourable outcome of higher vaccination rates with the objectors' hindrance to an even better ideal, the writer attempts to rally citizen support for their future objective of further raising immunisation rates.

Those who object to being vaccinated are shamed for their refusal as the paper scathingly emphasises their ‘complacency, ignorance [and] willful avoidance’. Referring to the ‘inordinately hysterical claims about the risks associated with vaccinations’, the editorial strives to elicit anger in parents whose children are properly vaccinated, as their health is compromised. The word ‘inordinately’ insinuates that an excessive number of people are ridiculously paranoid about side effects; Australians responsible about immunisations are likely to perceive such people as foolish. Similarly, the paper lampoons parents who claim to have a ‘conscientious objection’ to vaccinations by using double quotations marks to ridicule their irrationality. The intended effect is to sway the audience to consider this notion of objecting to immunisations preposterous.

Despite a desire to see a one hundred percent vaccination rate in Australia, the paper recognises that there are some children for whom ‘vaccinations pose a genuine medical risk’ and families with a ‘genuine religious objection’. The use of the word ‘genuine’ emboldens the writer’s contemptuous reference to Australian families ‘too lazy, selfish or indifferent to have their children vaccinated’, and readers are coaxed to share this condemnation of those unimmunised. Furthermore, we are urged to discern the refusal to vaccinate as unjust to the rest of the community through the paper’s comment that many children ‘are not getting the protection that they– and the wider community– deserve’. The word ‘protection’ is paralleled by the author’s noting of the need to ‘improve the community’s immunity and reduce the risks of contracting ‘debilitating and potentially fatal diseases’, which also arouses fear regarding the adverse consequences of a low vaccination rate. This concept is repeated towards the end of the argument to leave us all with a clear understanding of the importance of being properly vaccinated.

Ultimately, The Age highlights the necessity for the government to implicate new methods intended to increase immunisation rates as the ‘carrot-and-stick approach’ is labelled ineffective. The paper’s scornful description of ‘bogus adherents to the anti-vaccination mythology’ and ‘myths peddled by anti-vaccination merchants’ presents strong animosity towards those who do not comply with the country’s expectations. Australian citizens are once again inclined to disprove this view and perceive these people as moronic and delusional. The editorial concludes with a call-to-action for the government, specifying the implementation of ‘vigorous education programs’ that will extol the ‘benefits of immunisation’, to leave the audience with a complete

comprehension of the importance of vaccinations. The 'we' in the title is again reflected in the last sentence in the phrase 'whole-of-community commitment', targeting readers' sense of personal responsibility and involvement in community life. With this call to action, it is probable that Australians will come together and push for the improvement of the healthcare system and the overall welfare of the country.