

## PEER REVIEW WORKSHOP FOR FILM ANALYSIS ESSAY #2

Please exchange papers with a partner and read his or her paper carefully. Underline the thesis and topic sentences. Honestly answer the following questions as carefully as you can and do so holistically rather than individually.

### **1. Is the title brief, clever, and intriguing? How might it be improved?**

-I think that the title of the essay has both good and improvable points. To talk about good points, I think that the title is brief and straightforward. The essay is basically about the movie *Dark Figure of Crime* and its theme about the human mind. When I first read the title, I directly understood that the essay would address psychological themes in the film. However, there are some improvable points in the title. Although the readers can easily understand the theme through the title, the title lacks intriguing or interesting points. 'Understanding Other minds' is just a normal title, and this would not attract the reader's attention. Moreover, I think the title does not embrace all of the topics in a nutshell. While reading the essay, I realized that the topic was more about the power dynamics in human relationships. Understanding the human mind was a peripheral point within the more important topic. I think the readers can be confused about this point because the title only implies smaller topics in the essay. Therefore, I think that the title should be more creative and comprehensive despite its simplicity and directness. I thought of some alternatives and came up with two possible titles.

- (1) Beyond Human Relations: The Hidden Power Struggle
- (2) The Secret of Human Relations: Survival of the Fittest

I thought that these two feasible titles might modify the improvable points in Chanseo's essay. Both of the titles address the bigger topic in the essay, which is the power dynamics in human relations. Moreover, by using words like hidden and secret, these words can attract more attention from the readers. The readers would be curious about the secret of human relations and try to read Chanseo's essay. I hope Chanseo can refer to my ideas and create an excellent title for her essay.

### **2. What is the organization of the introduction? What elements are included, and what else should be, assuming something is omitted? How effective is the introduction at introducing the thesis of the essay?**

- I think the introduction is quite well organized in that when I read the introduction, I was able to read it without any hesitation. The introduction starts with a question asking readers about the psychological experience in human relations. I think that this kind of hook is quite effective to make the readers drive in Chanseo's essay because the readers might think of their experiences and keep reading the essay. Moreover, the transition from the hook to the introduction of the film was good. The introduction also involves the basic information and a summary of the film. Lastly, the essential thesis is also included in the introduction. Most of the elements are included, besides the process of what questions emerge from the film that leads to the thesis. There are only a few parts that create the connection between the movie and the thesis. I think it would good to include what questions can be made after watching the movie. This can make a smooth transition between the

background information and the thesis. When Chanseo adds this part, I think the introduction would be greater than now.

**3. Discuss the thesis. Is it contestable? Does it develop an interpretive position regarding the film? Does it cover the film's implicit meaning or do you find it dealing more with the explicit meaning of the film?**

-I think that the thesis statement of the essay is quite contestable. Chanseo's thesis is 'The film *Dark Figure of Crime* emphasizes the importance of the power within a relationship and warns people by showing how people in weak positions will react and end in a one-sided situation.' I was quite surprised about the thesis because of its deepness. I think that some people can think of the first part of the thesis. However, the latter part of the thesis statement was Chanseo's interpretation, and it is contestable. Some people can refute the point that the film is warning people, or some can rebut to the point that these weak people ended up being in a one-sided situation. Moreover, the thesis covers the film's implicit meaning because it doesn't illustrate the plot or explicit meaning of the film. The film's plot is mainly about crimes and the battle of nerves between the detective and criminal, and I think when Chanseo wrote this as the thesis, it only covered the explicit meaning of the film. However, Chanseo thought of a deeper meaning beyond this plot: power dynamics in human relations and warning to minorities. The thesis in the essay was excellent, and after reading the thesis, I was more curious about how the film depicts this theme.

The only part that needed to be improved is that there is no mention of the semiotic, cinematic terminology in the thesis or introduction. The second essay is mainly about these terms, but I think the introduction and thesis lacked information or explanation about these terms utilized in the film. It would be better to involve this explanation in the introduction or thesis briefly.

**4. Consider the overall organization of the essay. How is it structured? How might this structure be improved? Consider the location and appropriateness of topic sentences. How might these be improved? How well are the paragraphs developed?**

- The overall essay compounds one introduction paragraph, three body paragraphs, and one conclusion paragraph. I think that the amount of the introduction conclusion paragraph is sufficient. However, I think that the essay should have more body paragraphs because one paragraph explains the film's narrative, which allocates only two paragraphs to explain the semiotic, cinematic, and narrative/literary terminology. Moreover, I think that the second paragraph can be more shortened because it only addresses the summary of the film. Writing a lengthy paragraph only for a plot summary is not a wise decision. It would be better to shorten the plot summary and allocate more space or words for the film analysis. I suggest one introduction paragraph, one short paragraph explaining the plot summary, 2-3 longer paragraphs explaining the semiotic, cinematic tools utilized in the film, and one conclusion paragraph. Another way is to involve the summary of the film in the introduction paragraph. Regarding the topic sentences, the location of topic sentences is great. All of the topic sentences are located at the beginning of paragraphs, which is easy for the readers to follow the flow of the essay. However, I think that the third body paragraph's topic sentence is quite vague and complicated to understand. The part 'the perplexity and stress when he is in the opposite position' were quite hard to comprehend. I think it would be better to simplify the topic sentence in a brief way. I think the topic sentence can be easier to understand when the structure is more simple. Chanseo can change the topic sentence to 'The photochromic glasses symbolize Taeho's fluency of dominating over Hyung Min affectionately and also demonstrate the mental struggles of Taeho after the position is changed.' Besides this topic sentence, all of the topic sentences were good and straightforward. Moving on to the development of paragraphs, I think the paragraphs are well

developed. There were no strange sentences arranged in the paragraph. Moreover, there was no digression in the paragraph. Under the topic sentence, the paragraphs are organized, and they give enough explanation to understand the idea of the paragraphs. Chanseo only needs to add more content about the semiotic, cinematic analysis and change the third body paragraph's topic sentence. The overall organization is good.

**5. Consider the writer's application of semiotic vocabulary to the film. Which terms are applied, and how successful is the application in your view?**

- I think there is only one application of semiotic vocabulary to the film. A symbol is used in the writer's essay. The writer talked about photochromic glass as a type of symbolization. This photochromic glass can be seen as a symbol in that the producer gave a new meaning between the glasses and Taeho's fluency of dominating over Hyung Min affectionately. However, I think that except for this part of mentioning symbolization in the body paragraph, the essay lacks the application of semiotic vocabulary to the film. A symbol is a small part of the semiotic vocabulary, and there are other terms to utilize. I think Chanseo should add more parts of semiotic vocabulary in the essay. Talking about the icon, index, metonymy, and synecdoche would enrich the content of the essay. Moreover, I think that the photochromic glasses are closer to a metonymy than a symbol because the movie describes the psychological disposition through the features of the photochromic glasses. According to Chanseo's essay, the photochromic lens in the glasses allows the user to have a bright view of dark and dark views when they are in bright surroundings. The film associates this feature with the mindset of Taeho. Thus, I think the photochromic lens is closer to a metonymy. Furthermore, a symbol is usually based on cultural interpretation or convention. Although there are no direct connections between the two subjects, symbolization is created through educated knowledge or cultural aspects. However, the photochromic glass and Taeho's mindset have no previous connection with each other, and most people can't understand it without watching the movie. Therefore, it is better to say the photochromic glasses as a metonymy.

**6. What cinematic vocabulary has the writer applied to the film? How effective and accurate is that application?**

- I actually couldn't find any part of the essay stressing the cinematic vocabulary that the writer has applied to the film. Chanseo's body paragraphs only focus on characterization, plot summary, and symbolization. I hope Chanseo adds a whole paragraph talking about the cinematic terms in the movie. There was no explanation of camera movements, tools, lighting, focus, editing, etc. I think it would be good to emphasize the lighting in the movie because I knew that the surroundings were essential in the movie when I read the essay. In the part when Chanseo mentioned the photochromic glasses, she emphasized the contrast of dark and bright moments. Moreover, I think it would be good to involve focus or editing in the movements. This is because since the movie is a mind game movie among two people, I thought there would be many two shots showing these two people. When Chanseo can explain these two shots in the movie, I think it would be easier to explain how the film depicted the psychological struggles between the two main characters. I hope Chanseo can add any of these cinematic terms because the second film essay must involve such terms.

**7. Where do you find the analysis and interpretation unconvincing or superficial?**

(1) Unconvincing parts

- There was one part that was unconvincing.

The part that was unconvincing to me was the symbolic meaning of the glasses. There are two

points that were unconvincing to me in this part. The first point is the glasses are rather a metonymy than a symbolization. I explained this specifically in question 5, so I would briefly summarize my points. I think the glasses are a metonymy because the movie utilizes the feature of these glasses to depict the psychological state of Taeho. The second point is that I don't think that the glasses symbolize Taeho's fluency of dominating over Hyung Min. If the glasses symbolized Taeho's fluency, I think the glasses should keep representing the dominance of Taeho over Hyung Min. But, when I read the essay, Chanseo mentioned that in the latter part of the movie, Taeho complains about the glasses because now his position changed to a minor one. This means the glasses don't mean the fluency of Taeho, and I think it rather represents the changing psychological state of Taeho in the film. Except for these two points, other points in the essay were plausible.

## (2) Superficial parts

-I think the two parts of the essay, characterization, and symbolization, only superficially conveyed the movie's general theme. As I previously mentioned, Chanseo's thesis was quite unique in that Chanseo involved the perspective, which is the power dynamics in relations and warning to the minor ones in an unbalanced relationship. However, there is no explanation for the consequences of a one-sided relationship depicted in the movie. All parts of the essays are just covering part of the power dynamics in the relationship. I think it would be better to add additional analysis of why the movie's ending can be seen as a one-sided result and how we can see the relationship between two characters as dominant and recessive. Except for that part, I think that she well analyzed the meaning of each element in the movie, including sophisticated analysis and specific examples.

## **8. If the writer has employed quotations from the film, have they been introduced and glossed appropriately or were they simply tossed into the essay without a lead-in or explanation about their significance?**

- The writer not employed any quotations from the film. However, I think it would be better to add some quotations from the film because the movie is usually processed by the two characters' dialogues. The movie is mainly about the mind game among two characters, so I think there would be many conversation scenes in the movie. When Chanseo adds one of the quotations from the conversation in the film, the readers would vividly experience the film's plot and mindset of each character. I hope Chanseo can add quotations and gloss them appropriately to make a fascinating essay.

## **9. Discuss the author's conclusion. What strategies were employed to develop the conclusion? How is it developed? Does it merely summarize the body of the essay or does it go further and demonstrate the implications of the analysis?**

- I think that the author's conclusion is kind of weak, to sum up, the whole essay. The author developed the conclusion by firstly introducing the ending of the movie and restating the thesis statement. In the last part of the conclusion, the author mentioned the director's warning that appeared in the final part of the movie. I thought this conclusion was weak because it merely summarized the plot of the film. The conclusion also only summarized the body of the essay by restating the characterization and symbolization. Moreover, no part showed the larger implications of the discussion in the essay. It just restated the thesis statement and ended with telling a simple fact that the director warned the audiences of human relations. I think it would be better to add some creative and memorable remarks in the final part of the essay rather than mentioning the director's warning. Furthermore, I think that the restatement of the thesis is similar to the one in the

introduction. I think Chanseo should rephrase the thesis and make a difference from the thesis in the introduction. When Chanseo adds more creative and remarkable endings in the conclusion, I think the readers who read the essay would have a lingering impression.

#### **10. Has the writer carried out a Works Cited entry for the film? Is the citation accurate?**

- The writer carried out a reference for the film. However, the writer failed to carry out a separate page of a Works Cited entry for the film. Chanseo should add a new page and write references and Works Cited on that page. Moreover, the citation is inaccurate in that the writer should indent the second line in the MLA format citation. The sequence or form of the citation is correct.

#### **11. Discuss the writer's use of transitions. Are they interesting and novel or merely typical and standard?**

- I think the writer's use of transitions is merely typical and standard. There are no creative or fascinating transitions in the essay. The transitions used in the essay are just normal. I think especially the transition in the conclusion paragraph can get improved because it is currently typical. The transition used in the conclusion paragraph is 'To conclude and summarize.' I think that this transition is easily seen in many typical essays, and it is not a good way to end the essay. Instead of using these standard transitions that we use in TOEFL essays, it would be better for Chanseo to think of her unique transition that can improve the conclusion. Although there were no creative transitions, her transitions well connected the flow of the essay, and it was easy for me to follow the transitions and move on to the next idea.

#### **12. Sum up what the author should consider doing to improve this essay**

- I think that a connection between the film and the thesis should be made or written in the introduction.
- 2) I think the author needs to reduce or replace the usage of personal pronouns like 'you', 'we' in the introduction paragraph. (This point also corresponds to other paragraphs.) Using such personal pronouns renders the essay unprofessional.
- 3) The film should be in italics. All of the parts mentioning the film should be changed to italics.
- 4) The second paragraph should be shortened or combined with the first paragraph because it is merely a plot summary.
- 5) The last sentence of the second paragraph contains a spelling mistake. Need to change the Taejo part.
- 6) The topic sentence of the fourth paragraph should be modified to a simpler version because the sentence structure is complicated, and this makes the readers confused about the point.
- 7) The third line of the fourth paragraph involves a grammar mistake. Change 'glasses is' to 'glasses are.'
- 8) The seventeenth line of the fourth paragraph contains a spelling mistake. Need to change 'Taejo' to 'Taeho.;
- 9) Try to find other transitions in the conclusion. It would be better to change the part 'To conclude and summarize.'
- 10) Need to change the title in italics in the 6th line of the conclusion.
- 11) Need a remarkable ending. It is not fascinating to end the conclusion by merely mentioning the director's warning at the end of the film.
- 12) The title of the essay should involve all of the contents in a nutshell. The title is brief but needs

to be more fascinating to attract the reader's attention.

13) Need to involve more semiotic terms in the essay. Only explaining symbolization in the film makes the essay less analytical.

14) Also need to involve more cinematic terms in the essay. There are no points that mention the cinematic terms applied to the film in the essay.

15) The photochromic glasses should be analyzed as a metonymy rather than a symbol.

16) It would be better to change the meaning of the glasses as a representation of Taeho's psychological disposition.

17) Need to describe more about why the relationship between the two characters can be one-sided and why the consequences are also seen as one-sided.

18) It would be better to employ quotations from the film because the film is usually based on the conversation between two characters.

19) Try to rephrase the thesis in the conclusion because the thesis statement and the restatement of the thesis in the conclusion are quite similar.

20) Need to create a new page for citation. Also, the second line of the citation should be indented.

21) I think the paragraph should be more indented because now it only indented three letters.

22) Need to add the initials and page number at the top of each page.

23) In the conclusion, 'In the end' is used twice, and I thought it was quite repetitive. I think it would be better to change one of them.

24) Don't need to make extra space between paragraphs.

25) Also, it would be better to add more parts related to the topic of the second film essay. There are too many narrative parts which was the topic of the first film essay.

My last general suggestion of Chanseo's essay is to include more perspective or analysis of cinematic, semiotic terms in the movie. The essay includes too many parts explaining the narrative features of the film. The topic of the second film essay is applying cinematic, semiotic terms to films and analyzing them. To fulfill the requirements of the second film essay, I think Chanseo should add many parts explaining these terms rather than narrative terms. Nevertheless, it was a great essay, and I really enjoyed reading it. I hope I gave some help to revise Chanseo's essay.