|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EXEMPLAR** | **STRUCTURAL AND CONTENT NOTES** |
| The key binary opposition that underpins this text is between an unspecified future time, and a ‘present’ that resembles our own time.  | TOPIC SENTENCE identifies an aspect of the text and the specific theoretical lens through which it will be explained. |
| The future is represented as a highly industrialised and technologically advanced place, in contrast to the more naturalistic present. | EXPLANATORY SENTENCE provides support to the TS, identifying *how* the lens applies and for what purpose. |
| This distinction is shown in the first paragraph, in which Junior notices the air carried “humidity and the smell of organic matter” so different ‘from the industrial atmosphere of his own time.’ Junior’s cyborg body, and the fact that he has travelled through a wormhole, further reinforce this opposition. The reference to the organisation that Junior works for, the Department of History, as well as Junior’s constant bringing to mind of protocols – a word that the typical reader associates with bureaucratic systems of authority – gives the impression that the future is one in which instrumental reason is highly valued, perhaps over ‘soft’ human emotions. Even Junior’s name is important in this respect: it is infantilising and demeaning, and it reflects that those who have placed the protagonist in his cyborg body and sent him into the past see him more as an object to be manipulated and used than as a human being. | APPLICATION OF THEORY has a balance of *direct* and *indirect* evidence that supports the TS.There should be *cohesive devices* as well as clear *links to the argument itself.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EXEMPLAR** | **STRUCTURAL AND CONTENT NOTES** |
| The distinction between the two times is most emphasised when it comes to describing Junior’s reactions to the car accident that he encounters in the story. Even though the story is written using third-person, non-diegetic narrator, the narration is focalised through Junior’s perspective.  | COHESIVE LINK + TOPIC SENTENCE identifies an aspect of the text and the specific theoretical lens through which it will be explained. This time, as it is the second paragraph, it is more specific. |
| This narrative technique has allowed the author to emphasise the lack of humanity and compassion in Junior’s response to the children who are trapped in the car.  | EXPLANATORY SENTENCE provides support to the TS, identifying *how* the lens applies and for what purpose. (*note cohesive links…)* |
| After he hears a girl’s voice and the male infant screaming, Junior’s reaction is described as being ‘fascinated’ rather than horrified or upset. The cold and understated style of narration used to describe the plight of the two children who are trapped likewise shows that Junior lacks any emotional response when witnessing the distress of the trapped children:*The police report indicated a single survivor, the girl sitting behind the driver. Her younger brother was supposed to have died. Walking around the car so he could see through the windows, Junior saw the boy, with his curly black hair, struggling against the child restraint. His side of the car was closest to the ground.*Additionally, when the girl in the car notices Junior’s lack of willingness to help, and calls out for assistance, her voice is described as ‘poisoned’ by anger – implying that Junior sees emotion as something pathological and toxic, rather than natural or desirable. This lack of empathy for the children in distress is contrasted by the concern shown by the girl when Junior rescues her: ‘Her initial smile at her rescuer became a scream, as he carried her across the road to safety. What about my brother, she cried?’  | APPLICATION OF THEORY has a balance of *direct* and *indirect* evidence that supports the TS.There should be *cohesive devices* as well as clear *links to the argument itself.*There could be *more than one key point of evidence.*  |
| The narration of the story implies that whatever has happened to Junior in the future world has resulted in his dehumanisation, or at least has made him less susceptible to emotional and sympathetic reactions to other humans. | LINK between the theoretical focus and the overall interpretation. |