

- There wasn't a strike-through option on Google Docs, so I just underlined the words that I wanted to cross out. Sorry for any confusion!
- P.S I only pointed out your piece's pitfalls, but please don't take this as an attack or something said with malice. This is just how my teacher marks so that's how I do it too!

The opinion piece emphatically argues that Banksy's artwork **allows for the expression and manifestation of one's beliefs** Get what you're trying to say but this could be more clearly worded. I'm assuming you're going for something along the lines of "Banksy's artwork is a symbolic protest to ..."? If it isn't, just ignore me. ;p , which may incite change throughout society. The article highlights that only those "living under a rock" are unfamiliar with Banksy and his work, thereby presenting Banksy as an **illustrious and renowned artist** How did you get from "living under a rock" to "illustrious and renowned artist". Spoonfeed me your thinking!. Through this, the writer positions the reader to view **the fact that** (This is a dead-giveaway phrase that you're not being as succinct as you could be. I still fixed your original sentence for grammar issues though). Banksy's artwork was named as Britain's favourite as an expected event rather than as an anomaly. ← Try and make your analysis flow better - it gives the illusion that you have a holistic understanding of the analysis material and that you don't just have a 'search and destroy' approach to the task (which is the worse thing you could do since the whole point of VCAA reworking L.A into A.A was to remove this approach). → By referring the artist as "good old Banksy", the writer employs **colloquial language to portray Banksy as a compassionate and caring figure** This is alright but could go into more depth. Think about the words "good old" - when are people/who is usually labelled as such?. This prompts the readers Nothing wrong with saying "the reader", but why waste your reader's time by using two words when you could use only one? Really nitpicky of me, sorry. ;p to perceive Banksy as a person who is worthy of the honour given to him. Furthermore, the writer's assertion that Banksy undermines the most **"sordid aspects of our society"**, manoeuvres the reader to view Banksy's artwork as a means of **enacting justice** As above, spoonfeed me your thinking! How did you get from A to B?. The writer continues by stressing the notion Word fluff! that "the poshest to the most oppressed" can appreciate Banksy's artworks. In doing this so, the writer suggests that Banksy's artwork appeals to all different types of people in spite of economic status or prosperity. You could also talk about how they're like extremes of the 'social status spectrum'. Therein, Banksy's artworks are depicted to the reader Word fluff. as universally beloved. Additionally, the writer presents Banksy's artwork as "iconic", which has connotations of greatness and excellence, thus further enhancing their portrayal of Banksy's artwork as well as positioning the reader to view it as an artwork worthy of its title. The article concludes with the rhetorical question "who wouldn't love it?", which further alludes to the idea that Banksy's artworks are universally loved. In doing this, the writer endeavours to **dichotomise** Really strong word and sort of incorrect to use to describe what the author is trying to do. The author doesn't want to completely shun Banksy-haters (which is what you're suggesting), he wants them to become Banksy-lovers. those who **critique** Critique doesn't mean criticise. Banksy's artworks and those who appreciate it. In illustrating Banksy's popularity throughout the article, the writer suggests **that the most sensible group of people** You need more evidence and explanation to back up this claim. are those who appreciate Banksy's artwork, hence inclining readers to appreciate and admire Banksy's artwork.

Good job overall. Just remember to SPOONFEED information and don't forget the visual! :)