

The Slap

Task 2: Oral production – Tsiolkas on Trial

Task:

Imagine that Tsiolkas has been put on trial for defaming Australia on the international stage with his critical representation of Australian culture in *The Slap*.

The class will be divided into two groups. Each group will then be divided into two teams: one will prepare the case for the defence and one will prepare the case for the prosecution. The four teams will operate independently of each other, although the rules of discovery will apply. If one person finds a resource to use, it must be shared with their opposing team.

Important cases often involve teams of barristers who each make arguments at different points in the trial. Several students in your group may take on the role of barrister within each team, while others may wish to take on roles such as expert witnesses.

During the presentations, one group will act as the jury for the other, deciding the case based on the merits of each team's argument.

In preparing your cases, your team will need to draw together:

- your critical understanding of *The Slap*, particularly in evaluating its representation of Australian cultural identity,
- the arguments and responses surrounding *The Slap* in the public domain,
- your understanding of the use of polyphony as a strategy to mediate narrative perspective in *The Slap*,
- your understanding of the ways in which language, structural and stylistic choices within *The Slap* communicate values and attitudes, positioning both Australians and the wider world,
- your understanding of Australian cultural identity and how a text such as *The Slap* may operate within that.

In addition, you will need to demonstrate your skills in:

- articulating a critical and informed response to the text, using appropriate metalanguage,
- evaluating their own and others' ideas and points of view using logic and evidence,
- experimenting with content, form, style, language within the medium of verbal argument, such as using rhetorical devices and evidence,
- adapting literary conventions for specific audiences, challenging conventions and reinterpreting ideas and perspectives, by exposing how others may interpret Tsiolkas' writing.

In your role as jury, each team will also evaluate the ways in which your peers used language and content to position an audience.

To do:

- Decide who amongst your group will take on the roles of barristers, expert witness and Tsiolkas himself,
- Working together as a team, prepare and draft your case,
- Each person should write their own argument, developing the agreed upon case, using evidence and a range of rhetorical devices,
- Rehearse, developing your speaking skills to position your audience – the judge and jury.

Due:

Further notes:

See over for assessment rubric.

Assessment rubric:

	A	B	C	D	E
Arguments reflect an understanding of how Tsiolkas represents Australian culture, making reference to specific language usage (ACELR038) (ACELR040)	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of Tsiolkas' cultural representations & language use <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates thoughtful understanding of Tsiolkas' cultural representations & language use <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates satisfactory understanding of Tsiolkas' cultural representations & language use <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates some understanding of Tsiolkas' cultural representations & language use <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates limited understanding of Tsiolkas' cultural representations & language use <input type="checkbox"/>
Arguments reflect an understanding of how Tsiolkas actively positions readers, challenging cultural perceptions of Australia (ACELR037) (ACELR039)	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of Tsiolkas' positioning of readers' perceptions of Australia <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates thoughtful understanding of Tsiolkas' positioning of readers' perceptions of Australia <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates satisfactory understanding of Tsiolkas' positioning of readers' perceptions of Australia <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates some understanding of Tsiolkas' positioning of readers' perceptions of Australia <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates limited understanding of Tsiolkas' positioning of readers' perceptions of Australia <input type="checkbox"/>
Argument explores specifically the impact and effectiveness of polyphony and other literary conventions (ACELT042) (ACELT043)	Demonstrates sophisticated analysis of polyphony and other literary conventions <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates thoughtful analysis of polyphony and other literary conventions <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates satisfactory analysis of polyphony and other literary conventions <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates some analysis of polyphony and other literary conventions <input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates limited analysis of polyphony and other literary conventions <input type="checkbox"/>
Develops an effective line of argument justified with textual and other evidence (ACELR045)	Develops a sophisticated and well-justified line of argument <input type="checkbox"/>	Develops a thoughtful and soundly-justified line of argument <input type="checkbox"/>	Develops several points of argument with relevant evidence <input type="checkbox"/>	Develops a some points of argument and refers to some evidence <input type="checkbox"/>	Limited development of argument and little or no evidence <input type="checkbox"/>
Uses appropriate analytical metalanguage (ACELR046)	Integrates metalanguage seamlessly into analysis <input type="checkbox"/>	Employs a range of metalanguage to enhance analysis <input type="checkbox"/>	Employs some examples of metalanguage correctly within analysis <input type="checkbox"/>	Employs few examples of metalanguage within analysis <input type="checkbox"/>	Employs little or no metalanguage within analysis <input type="checkbox"/>
Uses a range of rhetorical devices in the presentation of argument (ACELR052)	Offers sophisticated evaluation of own work and effects on audience <input type="checkbox"/>	Offers thoughtful evaluation of own work and effects on audience <input type="checkbox"/>	Offers satisfactory evaluation of own work and effects on audience <input type="checkbox"/>	Offers some relevant evaluation of own work <input type="checkbox"/>	Offers limited relevant evaluation of own work <input type="checkbox"/>
Employs a range of effective verbal and non-verbal elements to impact on audiences	Uses a wide range of targeted verbal and non-verbal techniques <input type="checkbox"/>	Uses a range of verbal and non-verbal techniques for effect <input type="checkbox"/>	Uses some verbal and non-verbal techniques for effect <input type="checkbox"/>	Attempts use of some verbal and non-verbal techniques for effect <input type="checkbox"/>	Little attempt to use verbal or non-verbal techniques for effect <input type="checkbox"/>

(ACELR048)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reflects on own and others' arguments employing logic and evidence (ACELR047)	Offers sophisticated evaluation of own and others' work <input type="checkbox"/>	Offers thoughtful evaluation of own and others' work <input type="checkbox"/>	Offers satisfactory evaluation of own and others' work <input type="checkbox"/>	Offers some relevant evaluation of own and/or others' work <input type="checkbox"/>	Offers limited relevant evaluation of own or others' work <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

Result: