

~~The writer~~ The Western Australian Government's ~~consideration~~ ~~over~~ ~~whether~~ or not ~~they~~ ~~should~~ ^{proposal to} introduce shark culling practices has caused much debate over whether ~~is~~ ~~an~~ ethical and practical ~~thing to do~~ ^{strategy}. The writer of the article "Experts says shark cull would be pointless" published in the Age, contends that this measure would not have an effect in reducing the number of deaths from shark attacks. While his piece conveys a rational and serious tone, the article "Sharks to begin human cull off the Western Australian coast" published by The Shewer, employs ~~an~~ sarcastic tone in ^{an} attempt to position readers to feel that the ~~the~~ culling of sharks in their natural habitats is ludicrous. In a similar vein to the written pieces, ~~an~~ ~~instagram~~ a captioned instagram image uploaded by 'purplenettie' also has an intention of uniting readers to feel against shark culling practices. All three pieces are similar in their position against the culling of sharks, but vary in the strategies used in attempt to persuade readers to share this point of view.

The writer of the piece "Experts says shark cull would be pointless" attempts to coerce readers into taking ~~the~~ ^{the} side against shark culling by referring to the 'expert' opinions of Shaun Collin and Ryan Kempster from the University opinions of WA's Oceans Institute. By referring to these ~~obvious~~ ^{experts} it gives weight to the writers contention that the killing of sharks is 'pointless'. The experts state that there is "no evidence a cull would make the sea any safer" and that the consideration of a shark cull "is a response based on emotion rather than of scientific data". The writer also uses Collin and Kempster's example of a cull in Hawaii which resulted in "no significant decrease in the number of shark bites recorded". Hence, this causes readers to ~~feel~~ ^{be} inclined ^{to feel} that the shark cull is not an effective way ^{to} ~~in~~ ^{to} ~~reducing~~ ^{reducing} ^{the no. of} deaths from shark attacks thereby ~~feeling~~ ^{turning} against the Western Australian Government's proposition. The writer goes on to refer to research made by the university which found that "the number of shark bite incidents occurring each year appears

to be directly related to the length of time people spend in the water." In turn, this offers another explanation to readers as to why there have been a number of shark attacks off the western Australian coast. This further supports the writer's contention that a shark cull is unnecessary as it is somewhat, humans' fault for putting their own lives at risk by swimming in sea. Therefore readers are inclined to feel that there must be a better solution to reducing shark attacks in opposition to the shark cull.

satirical

In contrast, the writer of piece "sharks to begin ^{human} cull off the western Australian coast" takes a cynical approach to position readers to feel that the shark cull laws are laughable. The writer of the article suggests that "sharks are planning to begin culling humans off the western Australian coast" when in reality, it is the opposite. The sharks are apparently doing this to protect "some of their favourite habitats" and claim the cull is in response to "an increase in the number of human attacks in recent days". While the ~~intention~~ ^{cynicism sarcasm} is quite clear to readers, there is an underlying message outlining the injustice of shark culling. The writer reiterates the fact that it is the sharks' natural habitat ^{and} that they deserve to be able to swim in it, particularly targetting readers that care for the wellbeing of ~~animals~~ wildlife. A ~~shark~~ 'Bruce' claims that they "sharks should be able to swim here without fear of being brutally attacked" a similar ^{adopt} argument humans in support of the shark cull ~~would~~ take up. Therefore ~~the~~ the writer intends to outline an opposing point of view to the debate over whether or not there should be a shark cull. Readers are positioned to ~~somewhat~~ ^{somewhat} sympathise ~~feel somewhat~~ feel somewhat sympathetic for sharks and in turn, feel against the shark cull laws. The use of sarcasm in this piece highlights to the readers the flaws in the plans to kill sharks in order to protect the lives of human beings.

how?
example

have you explained what these are?

The ~~is~~ captioned Instagram image also has the purpose of uniting ~~the~~ audience to take a stand against the WA Government's proposition to ~~to~~ introduce shark culling laws. The image is of thousands of people on the beach facing a clear, and nearly empty, ocean. The absence of people in the ocean could be ~~analysed~~^{interpreted} as symbolising how ~~at~~^a person's natural environment is on land.

In turn, it is the ocean that belongs to the vast marine wildlife. The social-media user captioned the photo, stating that "we are swimmers, surfers, kayakers, beach goers and kite surfers", listing all the people who would be directly threatened by shark attacks and goes on to say "and we do not support the catch-and-kill policy of WA". This has the effect of outlining that ~~the~~^{the} people who are most threatened by shark attacks do not even support the government's practices. Therefore ~~rather~~ the audience are positioned to question whether ~~any~~ shark cull law is ~~even~~ necessary if the people the law is trying to protect do not even support the policy. ~~The~~ media-user calls the shark-culling laws "the catch-and-kill policy" in attempt to highlight the ruthlessness of this law, thereby further turning the audience against ~~these~~^{these} shark culling.

~~The~~ ~~image~~ ^{uploaded} by "purplenettles" evokes ~~a more~~ serious and passionate tone while the ~~pi~~ varies to the two previous written pieces in conveying a more emotional and passionate tone.

~~The writers of the Article in the Age and~~

The writers of the written pieces published on The Age and The Skewer Websites as well as the image ~~posted~~ on the website Instagram all adopt different approaches to ultimately achieve the same goal; to turn their audience against the government's shark culling laws. ~~The~~ The Age article refers to expert advice and research in a clear and firm tone to cause readers to question the validity of shark culling laws. The Skewer article, in contrast, adopts a far less serious ^{tone} and ~~sarcastic~~.

~~tone in order to cause readers~~ is quite sarcastic but addresses the faults in some of the arguments made by those in support of shark culling. Lastly, the Instagram photo conveys a more emotional tone and highlights to the audience that even the people the government is trying to protect do not support the shark-killing policies.