

## LANGUAGE ANALYSIS SAC

In response to the announcement of the implementation of parking meters in the small town of Murrumbul from January 2020, both Luca Mahoney and Claudia Crow were inspired to write letters to the editor to express their concerns as members of the community of Murrumbul. Mahoney adamantly rebuts the suggestions made by the Council and ultimately criticises them in an attempt to impel the concerned readers, particularly the residents of Murrumbul to support his position on the issue and see the River Bay Council in a negative light. Moreover, Crow also attempts to refute the intentions of the council and creates a reasoned argument and also by closing her piece with a proposal to further gain the support of the readers for the overall shared contention of both writers and ultimately convince the Council to retract their plan for the instalment.

Mahoney's piece entitled "Paid parking? Not in my backyard!" aims to create a sense of invasion within the readers and imply the fact that the Council's decision to change the parking rules without full consent from residents would seem to be an attack on their property. By referring to it as their "backyard", the writer ignites a sense of fear about their personal space being invaded. Furthermore, whilst directed towards the same readers, the title of Crow's piece "Council failure" creates a sense of concern within the readers and the Council themselves as their failure is expressed by a member of the community they seek to take advantage of. Crow maintains a blunt but reasonable tone throughout her piece and as such, she begins by addressing the problem created by the Council and accuses them of being "illogical". Hence, readers would likely support Crow's stance on the issue and the Council themselves may even begin to reflect upon themselves and question their decision on paid parking meters. Contrarily, Mahoney opens by establishing gratitude as he recognises the "united" effort shown by the residents of Murrumbul, as they are the audience that he primarily seeks to persuade by eliciting a sense of pride within them and establish the fact that their actions in standing against the instalment are in fact courageous. By attempting to demonise the Council themselves, Mahoney seeks to form a divide between him and the readers from the Council. By using inclusive language throughout the letter he creates an alliance with the residents and maintains a division to put pressure on the Council to reconsider their decision. He closes his piece by appealing to readers' sense of logic and pride for their town by implying that the Council of River Bay is threatening to destroy their town similarly to the larger town of River Bay.

Mahoney moves his argument forward by suggesting in a disgusted tone that the actions of the Council in monitoring the town for improvements are in fact very illogical and completely inaccurate and by using logic in his argument, he seeks to persuade readers to understand the desperate nature of the Council to earn money. Seeking to create a divide between the community and the Council, Mahoney repeatedly employs inclusive language "we" and "our", implying a shared connection and responsibility to protect the community and its reputation. Hence, he refers to the Council as a separate entity, terming them as "they" which ultimately allows him to segue into his attack towards the council, describing them as "greedy" and callous. Readers are forced to position themselves on the side of the community and thus, against the Council. Using the metaphor of "crack cocaine" and making it similar to the potential profits the paid parking "scheme" will give the Council, Mahoney seeks to emphasise the fact that the Council are addicted to money like a drug-user is addicted to cocaine, allowing readers to view the Council as callous and a potential "harm" to the community.

Mahoney further suggests the possibility of "madness" happening in Murrumbul using the impacts of paid parking in River Bay to alarm readers about the growing threat of the Council's main interest in gaining revenue.

Keen to create a personal connection with the readers, Mahoney gives an example of a “dear” friend of his in River Bay, who experienced the ramifications of paid parking first-hand, from losing her money to being left in “\$100,000 in debt”. He appeals to pathos by referencing the business owners who will become victims to this decision and rallies readers’ empathy for their plight which is directly related to the Council’s decision. In an effort to refute the opposition he exposes their arguments and then dismisses them in a scathing tone to accuse the Council as acting with self-interest rather than for the good of the community. Hence, Mahoney is keen to tap into the community spirit and she seeks to use this shared outrage to create a momentum against the Council who have commissioned parking meters.

Contrarily, although Mahoney appeals to both logos and pathos in his letter to address how individuals will be affected by the installation of Council Parking Meters, Crow however, focuses just on logos in her blunt criticism of the Council’s decision making, paving a new wave of growing concern within the readers and also the Council themselves. The letters to the editor are accompanied by an image depicting a Close up of the parking meter, making it appear intimidating and a threat to the community. By using red for the “EXPIRY” sign, the picture emphasises the danger of the meter and how it will interrupt the “go slow vibe” the community cherishes and uses as a marketing strategy for tourism. Also, Crow attempts to appeal to readers hip-pocket by emphasising the danger of losing tourists to “other” of the same towns with the same “attractions” could potentially cause a cave within their economy. Ultimately, she causes the Council of destroying the character of the city and subsequently destroying the economy that is reliant on tourism. As a result, readers are likely to believe that indeed the decision of the council to create the instalment has gone “horribly wrong” and as the title of the piece suggests, they have “failed” the community of Murrumbul. Unlike Mahoney, Crow ends her piece with a proposal to the Council and a potential solution in the eyes of the members of the community. Urging the Council to create a “more logical plan” Crow attempts to use pathos specifically towards the Council, hoping that they would overturn their decision and better represent the community’s best wishes.

Whilst Mahoney hopes, along with community of Murrumbul that the Council will understand their point of view of the potential sufferings that may befall upon them using appeals to their sense of emotion and empathy, Crow, in a blunt and yet reasonable tone, argues the enormous effects on the economy of the town as the industry of tourism becomes the main target of the instalment. Whilst both writers concur that the Council should retract their decision and better understand the circumstance of the members of the community, Mahoney seeks to engender a feeling of anger towards the Council, while Crow uses pure logic and a call-to-action to allow the members of the community and also the Council of River Bay to come up with a more logical plan whilst taking the financial situation of the community in question.