3-2016

Capitalist Rhetoric and the Redirection of Power Through Metaphor in Reviews of Alejandro Gonzales Iñárritu Films

Isidro Zepeda

CAPITALIST RHETORIC AND THE REDIRECTION OF POWER THROUGH

METAPHOR IN REVIEWS OF ALEJANDRO GONZALES IÑÁRRITU FILMS

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

English Composition:

Applied Linguistics and Teaching

English as a Second Language

and English Composition

_____

by

Isidro Patiño Zepeda

March 2016

CAPITALIST RHETORIC AND THE REDIRECTION OF POWER THROUGH

METAPHOR IN REVIEWS OF ALEJANDRO GONZALES IÑÁRRITU FILMS

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

by

Isidro Patiño Zepeda

March 2016

Approved by:

Dr. Caroline Vickers, Committee Chair, English

Dr. Jacqueline Rhodes, Committee Member

ABSTRACT

Treating the concept of culture as a heuristic allows us to analyze multiple contexts involving culture as continuously changing with or without exterior contact. The productions from such system have the potential to develop identities through ideological materials produced by specialized rhetoric. This paper then focuses on how figurative language and structure affect the ways in which rhetoric, ideology, and identity are formed within the context of film reviews. In particular, I analyze reviews from the films *Birdman* and *The Revenant,* both directed by Alejandro Gonzales Iñárritu, to detail how the use of metaphors influences the production of rhetoric. I use cross-cultural rhetoric and identity frames in each review as a way to identify the implications of the use of metaphors in film reviews and what this choice details about the writers and the agencies for which they work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

CONFERENCE PAPER PROPOSAL

Treating the concept of culture as a *heuristic* allows us to analyze multiple contexts involving culture as continuously changing with or without exterior contact. The productions from such system have the potential to develop identities through ideological *materials* produced by specialized rhetoric. This paper then focuses on how figurative language and structure affect the ways in which rhetoric, ideology, and identity are formed within the context of film reviews. In particular, I analyze reviews from the film *Birdman,* directed by Alejandro Gonzales Iñárritu, to demonstrate how metaphors can influence the experiences writers from multiple *agencies* compose for their audience. In addition, I look at the use of two different languages in two different places: English (England) and Spanish (Mexico). This approach allows for a more thorough account of the rhetorical moves writers make in their reviews, and the ways in which these moves are motivated by culture. Finally, I apply cross-cultural rhetoric and identity frames to each review as a way to identify the implications of the use of metaphors in film reviews and what this choice details about the writers and the *agencies* for which they work.

CHAPTER TWO

CONFERENCE PAPER

Introduction

In order to highlight ideologies influencing each writer's rhetorical approaches, the research for this paper is situated in the context of film reviews. More specifically, I draw on data taken from film reviews written on *Birdman* to trace the development of metaphor and sentence structure and their affect in the types of rhetoric, ideologies, and identities produced in these reviews. I apply cross-cultural rhetoric and identity theory to extract the significance of the use of metaphors in data taken from film reviews written in English (two from England) and Spanish (two from Mexico).

Moreover, this paper discusses why film reviewers organize information deductively or inductively, how ideologies are illuminated through language, and the ways in which the rhetoric, ideologies, and identities promoted by the writers are affected by the *agencies* publishing these reviews. In other words, are the publishers working through the writers to promote their own ways of thinking about the world? Finally, even though some of these rhetorical and ideological patterns are potentially influenced by established traditions, I argue that the redirection of power through metaphor is possible because metaphors can cause a shift in rhetoric, ideology, and identity, which decentralizes power structures.

Methodology

The data for this paper consists of film reviews written on Alejandro Gonzales Iñárritu's *Birdman.* I chose this film because it achieved global recognition and success, resulting in many film reviews written for this film. I use cross-cultural rhetoric and identity theory to look at how metaphors are used to develop unique and creative presentations, where writers build on the film's aesthetics rather than simply presenting information in a narrative-like fashion. In addition, I look at the ways structure influences the articulation of information as means to construct specific cultural variables.

Data and Analysis

<u>English Language Data</u>

As shown in Example 1.A, in a film review written by Joe Planter for *LondonNet*, an inductive structural approach is used. Another important component to this data is the extensive application of metaphors. For instance, in lines 1-2, Planter uses words such as *peppered*, *crammed,* and *bursting*, to describe the motion picture. In addition, in line 1, he states that the film is "peppered with affectionate verbal barbs" to describe the dialogue.

> *Example 1.A*
> →1 Peppered with affectionate verbal barbs aimed at Hollywood's
> →2 current glitterati, Iñárritu's picture is crammed to bursting with
> 3 self-referential treats that demand a second and third viewing.

These metaphors are used to develop a space for a particular audience to occupy, the "glitterati." The use of time and space is also important. The author crafts this space away from a linear description of the film, to address the readers of the review as potential viewers of the film. This motion connects the audience into a thought that carries a deeper aesthetic appreciation for the film, because Planter allows the audience to temporarily occupy the space held by the "glitterati." Therefore, the promotion of the product (film) itself is being replaced by the promotion of an experience. This experience cannot be qualified in terms of a linear narrative. As a result, this moment is developed with a creative pastiche of narrative events eluding sequential motions.

Moving onward, in Example 1.B, Robbie Collin also uses figurative language to create a specific kind of rhetoric in his review. He uses metaphors such as *punctures*, in line 2, as well as similes, such as "like a knitting needle to the gut," in line 3.

Example 1.B

1 There's a scene in which Riggan's fresh-from-rehab daughter

→2 (a superb Emma Stone) punctures her father's pretensions with a

→3 monologue that's delivered like a knitting needle to the gut.

Although Collin's rhetoric is not directed to a specific group, such as the "glitterati" in Planter's review, it continues this notion of blurring realities. It presents an old feeling, one that is most likely understood by the audience, such as the "like a knitting needle to the gut," which allows readers to connect more

4

intimately with the pain of the world created for them to experience. The mixture of *real* and *unreal* materials extends from the film's identity (public) and moves into areas of the writer, review, and audience (private) to establish networks of experience.

In other words, "metaphorical cognition permits [the audience] to see the new in terms of the old…" (Sell, 2008, p.8) and their own thought patterns are triggered by the metaphors to which they are exposed, resulting in a blending of multiple texts, times, and experiences. The audience then has the ability to relate all of their experiences and interpretations to the experience produced by the review. This event causes the audience to develop a pre-experience to the film, a more creative one since their imagination is composing realities through the interpretation of metaphors. The investment here, again, lies not on the product but process.

<u>Spanish Language Data</u>

Juan Luis Caviaro, writer for *blog de cine*, also writes using an inductive approach, as shown in Example 2.A, lines 1-3. I was expecting this data to parallel the English data's structural approach but I found something completely different in this set of data. For instance, Caviaro begins his review by addressing the film's success at the Oscars. The review does not glorify in any way the artistic process, but rather, outlines the film's value by its recognition at the Oscars—i.e. a focus on product rather than process.

Example 2.A

1 El pasado miércoles fui al cine para volver a

2 ver *Birdman* (Alejandro G. Iñárritu, 2014)

→3 tras su triunfo en los Oscar.[1]

The next data, written by a group of writers from *Milenio*, as detailed in Example 2.B, also uses inductive patterns. Another similarity this data shares with data from Example 2.A, line 3, is that it also focuses on the achievements of the film in terms of its success at the Oscars.

Example 2.B

1 El filme *Birdman* del director Alejandro González

2 Iñárritu competirá con nueve catergorías 87 edición

3 del premio Oscar que se realizarán el 22 de febrero próximo.[2]

Even though the frequency of metaphor, measured by metaphor use per sentence, is also low in this data, this data has another feature that does not appear in the English data: longer sentence structure. For example, Caviaro (Example 3.A) uses more complex sentences to critique the inconsistent narrative structure of the film. He then ends the sentence by stating that this particular moment is not an adequate one for this conversation to flourish, so he moves back to describing the narrative.

Example 3.A

1 Aunque a menudo no hay más remedio, creo que es

---

[1] Last Wednesday I went to the cinema to watch *Birdman* (Alejandro G. Iñárritu, 2014) one more time, following its triumph at the Oscars.

[2] Alejandro González Iñárritu's film *Birdman* will compete in nine categories at the 87th edition of the Oscars on February 22, 2016.

2 un error valorar películas como éstas después de un

3 solo visionado; en mi segunda experiencia con *Birdman*

4 volví a disfrutar de su valentía y sus interpretaciones

5 aunque noté una fuerte irregularidad, es un trabajo lleno de

6 altibajos... pero me extenderé en otro texto porque ahora

7 quiero centrarme en un asunto concreto. [3]

The anonymous Mexican writers from *Milenio* also use longer and more complex sentences. The use of ellipses, colons, and commas are rhetorical moves writers take to create more intricate and elaborate compositions. But, as noted in line 2-3 (Example 3.B), they use this space to reference magazines, such as *Variety* and *Daily Telegraph*, as means to connect with other *agencies* that also approve this film. By addressing magazines and red-carpet events that are specifically created to promote products, these writers produce a species of capitalist rhetoric that replaces the film's aesthetic value.

Example 3.B

1 La crítica ya elogió la cinta, así como la actuación de

→2 Michael Keaton: La revista *Variety* etiquetó su actuación

3 como "el regreso del siglo", mientras que el *Daily Telegraph*

4 británico calificó la película como "un cine de categoría,

5 espectacular, protagonizado por estrellas".[4]

---

[3] Although often there is no choice, attributing value to a film in only one viewing is a mistake; in my second viewing of *Birdman* I enjoyed its courage and interpretations once more; however, I noticed a strong irregularity, it is a work filled with ups and downs… but I will expand on this claim in another text because right now I want to focus on a particular matter.

7

Another key feature I found in Spanish film reviews for *Birdman* is their mention of key actors in the film, such as Michael Keaton, Edward Norton, and Emma Stone, as working together to produce the film. This ideological move suggests that the writers view the film as a collaborative piece (Del Rosal Vargas, 2002), where everyone contributes to the "essence" of the film and their value is not defined by the direction they take in specific moments of the plot, but it is planted across the entire body of the film.

I also found that the most noticeable difference between the English and Spanish data is the frequency of metaphors used in the reviews. Metaphors are not linear. Therefore, metaphors value unique experiences (processes) over linear constructions that direct a specific experience, which does not deviate from describing the narrative (product). Without metaphors, the same product is reproduced. A mass reproduction of language valuing rhetoric primarily concerned with describing the product and not the process, or the affect it has on the audience.

Findings

I found the continuous references to other *agencies* in the Spanish data as important moves writers take to develop a particular type of ideology. The choice writers make to refer to these spaces of power creates a trinity effect paralleling

---

[4] Criticism has praised the film, as well as the performance of Michael Keaton: Variety magazine tagged his performance as "the return of the century," while the Daily Telegraph called the film "a five star film,' starring various stars.

Jacques Lacan's (1991) third discourse of capitalism: agent → other →
production. Yes, in all the data we have the film (agent), promoted in a review
(other), for the purpose of generating capital (production) but only in the data
from Mexico do the film reviews, which operate as "other" *materials*, refer the
readers to additional spaces operating as "other." This creates a chain of other →
other that duplicates itself within each connection, since they reproduce by self-
referring to additional units functioning as "other," which are connected to the end
result of production and generate more and more capital each time an "other"
connects to an "other." In this case, this motion occurs each time an *agency*
connects to another *agency*.

For example, by connecting to other *agencies*, such as *Variety* and *Daily
Telegraph*, Mexican writers develop intertextual motions and create the
possibility for their audience to occupy additional spaces. These spaces are also
blanketed with other intertextual relations, which lead them to occupy even more
spaces. As they move between these spaces, the works are self-reproducing,
because they are occupying new minds. In extent, this operation has the
potential to generate more capital because each space requires an economic
exchange to take place. Interestingly, longer sentences are preferred when
writers address these alternate spaces, or *agencies*.

Therefore, Lacan's discursive algorithm serves as a tool to trace the result
of these events in the processes of capitalism. Now, what are the benefits of
tracing such events—written texts on film reviews—their *effect* and *affect* on local

and global contexts, the ideologies being manufactured, reification of identities, and power relations through this algorithm? Well, to begin, these activities are not only specializing a certain kind of rhetoric, they are also reifying a certain kind of identity.

For instance, Mexican writers begin their reviews by identifying the stars of the film. Very little information is given about them and their work. Generally, each review moves quickly into a description of the film's plot. Readers get a scene-by-scene description about what the characters do throughout the film. Everything is situated and described through the main actors. This idea also connects to the kinds of authority figures that are respected and valued in Mexican culture. For example, in these reviews actors are highly regarded and dictate the story being told because of their social status. In short, these reviews produce an anthropocentric view, where reality is created from the lead actor's perspective.

I believe a character driven review helps manufacture a type of capitalist rhetoric in film reviews. It is also brings awareness to the types of identities being produced. These reviews deviate from the narrative only to address other economic spaces (*agencies*), but never to occupy spaces concerned with pleasing the audience through artistic realities, as is the case in the English data. Therefore, the data not only shows the efficiency of writers to convey a message within the context of film reviews, but it also shows the affect larger systems, such as the *agencies*, have on writers in their production of ideology. The writers'

actions are a mirror of the direct, consistent, unchanging task of capitalist reproduction, as described by Lacan's third discourse of capitalism.

At first I thought a deductive frame would produce a more rigid expression. However, both English and Spanish data sets use an inductive approach. Meaning that structure is not the driving force producing the two distinct types of film reviews I analyze. This realization then brought my attention back to metaphors. The presence of metaphor, as noted in the English reviews, decentralizes the point of origin, or narrative development. Following Derridean functionality, metaphors generate, duplicate, and replicate, origins within a single structure until the entire essence becomes the origin. English reviews achieve this activity because they use metaphors. Spanish data attempts to use creative motions through sentence lengthening but it does not achieve the redirection metaphor creates in the English data.

Finally, metaphors allow people to experience the world through various lenses and can potentially influence deviations from "natural" or "normal" societal operations. As Jonathan Sell (2008) states, "metaphor challenges us intellectually to find the ground that makes sense of the relationship of resemblance postulated between topic and vehicle, cross-cultural narrative challenges us to find resemblances or analogies between phenomena, institutions, customs, assumptions, expectations, and so on" (p.8). And in the absence of metaphor, as seen in Spanish reviews, there is a space that lacks

substance. And, in the absence of such a *thing*, it produces a fertile terrain for *capitalist rhetoric* to take root.

Conclusion

What we choose for structure, content, and governing variables within any particular type of communication expresses something about the relationship we have with certain objects and the value they possess within our lives. More importantly, the objects we chose to work with are important, but "…because we chose [them] in the first place, the [objects reveal] more about us than we do about [them]" (Bachelard, 1964, p.1). At first glance, it might appear irrelevant to look at figurative language in film reviews, since it does not posit value in terms of outlining a narrative. However, my data shows that when metaphors are absent in film reviews, this emptiness is filled with rhetoric composed of strong capitalist undertones focusing more on product and less on process.

Each writer's approach either perpetuates creative rhetoric or capitalist rhetoric. The next question to ask then is: can we create change inside a perspective that has cemented itself as a tradition? Again, I believe redirection through the application of metaphors can cause this change in film reviews and create a system where there is no origin or central force of power, but rather, a system where the electrical impulses of power flow throughout the entire *machine*. Finally, research focused on tracing these variables produced through the presence and absence of figurative language, primarily dealing with

metaphors, needs further development. In particular, research showing how metaphors, in film reviews, can be used not simply as a creative tool, but also as a tool for social revolution.

CHAPTER THREE

JOURNAL ARTICLE

Introduction

This paper treats the term culture as a *heuristic*, or tool for thinking,

instead of simply a stationary *thing* to be analyzed (Scollon, Scollon and Jones,

2012). In taking this approach, one has the ability to experience the development

of language due to the notion that direction is not solely based on predestined

features, but also influenced by both internal and external stimuli resulting from

the movement of information being processed and assembled.

In turn, a *natural* product is created. I refer to this product as "*natural*"

because it takes into account the context of each unit of interaction, leaving in its

path specific uses of language within specific contexts. Each interaction either

develops a unique perspective or perpetuates an already established one.

However, the unpredictability of how each interaction takes place grants the

possibility of an unstable *material*, one that allows language and culture to evolve

and develop in very special ways, depending on the variables that are presented

in each context.

Along these lines, my research focuses on tracing how distinct *materials*

develop through unique ways of presenting information within the context of film

reviews. More specifically, I draw on data taken from film reviews written on

Birdman and *The Revenant* by sixteen different *agencies* (sources)—e.g.

newspaper and magazines—to highlight the development of language within the variables of rhetoric, ideology, and identity. The theoretical framework I use to develop my research comes from cross-cultural rhetoric and identity: I look at figurative language and structural patterns produced in data taken from film reviews written in English (four from the United States and Europe) and Spanish (four from Spain and Mexico).

I identify some of the reasons why film reviewers organize and present their information in a particular way, the rhetoric influencing each author's creative/non-creative approach, and the ways in which ideology can potentially affect how each review is written. In addition, my research looks at the influence of culture in the production of film reviews. Finally, even though some of these rhetorical and ideological patterns are derived directly from established traditions, I argue that the possibility of redirection through metaphor exists. If achieved, it can create a shift in language and identity production.

During my research I found scholarship dealing directly with film reviews but not many focused on the use of metaphor in film reviews. I searched the MLA International Bibliography, Linguistics & Language Behavior Abstracts, and Google Scholar database where I found studies on cross-cultural rhetoric between English and Spanish that helped me develop a more thorough understanding of the elements operating in my data. Although the studies consist primarily of academic variables, between novice and expert writers at a professional context, they provide a cross-cultural analysis of elements

composing each language. This information helped unveil larger ideological and cultural artifacts in my data.

I also look at research on intercultural and discursive studies to strengthen the theoretical application of cross-cultural rhetoric studies to my data. In addition, I look at studies on cross-cultural identity as means to trace identity patterns developed by the application of ideology in film reviews. More specifically, I describe why metaphors are used in certain situations, while not used in others and the implications of this choice. Finally, I look at research on deductive vs. inductive patterns and sentence length to highlight potential cultural schemata driving each writer's rhetorical motions.

Literature Review

English-Spanish Cross-Cultural Rhetoric Studies

First, it is important to mention research by Neff et al. (2004), not only because it identifies differences between rhetorical patterns in academic writing made by English and Spanish writers, but also because it focuses on professional writing. Although the context studied was not film reviews, the information on structural features, sentence complexity, and information structures is useful for analyzing the data collected. All of these variables are important because understanding how each variable operates within English and Spanish leads to a more accurate analysis of the data sets.

In a similar vein as Neff et al., Simpson (2000) studied published academic journals written by expert native Spanish speakers from Latin America. This text is useful because it continues the conversation about rhetorical maneuvers professional Spanish writers make in their writing. Simpson found that Spanish rhetorical style favors more elaborate sentences with many clauses. In addition, her analysis found that Spanish speakers in Latin American have a tendency to link ideas across paragraphs by means of extended sequential patterns. Both of these studies, Neff et al. (2004) and Simpson (2000) specifically explain the intention of multilingual writers' choice of textual features and patterns, and how these choices *affect* communication practices.

Other research has been carried out in English-Spanish cross-cultural rhetoric (Heath 1983; Phillips 1983) but very few scholars have studied the Mexican-Spanish context. And, since part of my analysis is on Spanish from Mexico, I found the article by Kalman useful for writing this paper. Kalman (1999), an anthropologist, conducted an ethnographic study in a small plaza in Mexico City where he found that the people there were not illiterate but lacked confidence in their skills. This research ties into my work because it developed a foundation that allowed more research to be conducted under related conditions, treating similar cultural variables.

For example, Del Rosal Vargas (2002) found that students writing at the university level produced texts with no argumentation. Del Rosal Vargas called this writing *encyclopedia writing* because it regurgitates information without any

form of analysis. This study, more importantly, found that there was an emphasis in collective equality, advocating for group participation rather than individual work. This part of Del Rosal Vargas' study relates to my analysis, since collective equality is an ideological pattern I found in the data.

Continuing the conversation on English-Spanish cross-rhetoric studies, Camps (2000) looks at the writing practices of six Mexican students studying for their masters or doctoral degrees at U.K universities. Camps' work primarily talks about how students adapt to their new environment and what rhetorical applications transferred over from their EFL writing course at Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterey, a campus in Mexico City. This study is key for my work since I also look at data from Mexican writers.

Intercultural Rhetoric

Building on Gee's (1999) work, Scollon and Scollon (2001) present the idea to treat culture as a small discursive construction, which could help deconstruct cultural and social identities. These small constructions create larger discourse systems that develop various cultural variables, such as identity patterns and ideologies. These units in turn have the ability to influence productions of rhetoric and language. By tracing these motions scholars have identified the materials produced by cultural forces in many types of data.

For example, Fethi Helal (2013) studied how these variables operate within texts written in the United States (U.S.) and France. Helal found that French "authors followed a simple, relaxed, and unelaborate pattern, their U.S.

counterparts opted for a recycled and elaborate pattern of presentation by consistently reviewing previous literature and deducing research conclusions from it" (154). In addition, her research shows that U.S. papers she samples are much longer than French papers. Helal also found that U.S. writers opted for using a deductive pattern in their writing, while French authors use an inductive form.

Moreover, each culture is not only constructed by their respective rhetoric and ideologies but also by the participation of the members of the culture. They are expected to reproduce these social constructions in order to be considered a core member of the group. For instance, Elizabeth Tebeaux (1999) analyzed Mexican-American business letters. In her research she found that Mexican business memos appeal to identity and to family. Writers accomplished this task by mentioning their relationship with people who are close to their readers. In this genre, *each writer is expected to address these topics in order to be considered worthy of their readers*. This research brings to light the possibility that professional writers in film review are subjected to similar expectations.

Metaphors

Jonathan Sell (2008) states, "metaphor is the discursive homologue of psychosomatic wonder, cross-cultural narrative will also stimulate an initial sense of bafflement, bewilderment, wonderment" (p.8). In addition, his analysis finds that "metaphorical cognition permits us to see the new in terms of the old, the strange in terms of the familiar; it also allows us to see the old and the familiar in

terms of the new and the strange" (p.8). These points are important to note in regard to the affects of metaphor in film reviews.

Following the framework presented by Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999), Gibbs (1994), and Kövecses (2002), *which treats metaphors as a mapping between two domains, a source domain and a target domain, a way of conceiving one thing in terms of another*, Anne Golden & Elizabeth Lanza (2013) use metaphors "as a tool in the study of identity" (p.5). They found that "through metaphors, speakers evaluate actions and behaviors and thus negotiate their own positions and portray themselves in different manners" (p.5). Although the data focuses on verbal language, the theoretical framework used for this project is useful to identify the types of identities and how they are produced in the data sets.

On a similar thread, Erico Monti (2009), argues that *we speak metaphorically simply because we think metaphorically*. He argues that metaphors permeate cultures at the conceptual level, which makes it difficult to translate for someone who is not from the particular culture where the metaphor originates. This argument, in effect, outlines the cultural significance metaphors possess and their intrinsic characteristic with rhetorical and ideological forces present within the society they are manufactured.

<u>Deductive and Inductive Structure</u>

Although Hinds' (1990) work primarily focuses on Asian cultures and Expository forms of writing, his work is important for my analysis. Hinds

described *inductive* as a language pattern that presents the thesis statement in the end, while *deductive* offers the thesis statement at the beginning. In his study, Hinds found that Asian communication practices offer many details first, sometimes unrelated to the topic and wait until the end to explain the purpose of their project. I tie this idea to my English-Spanish cross-cultural rhetoric analysis to demonstrate how two distinct cultures, using a variation of the same language, construct information in a specific fashion as a way to communicate a unique message. His work has then been applied to various contexts, and I extend this conversation by applying it to film reviews.

Methodology

The data for this paper consists of film reviews written on Alejandro Gonzales Iñárritu's *Birdman* and *The Revenant.* I collected four film reviews in English (two from England and the United States) and four film reviews in Spanish (two from Spain and Mexico) for each film. I selected reviews for these films because they each achieved global recognition from both critics and moviegoers. As a result, many film reviews were written on both films, which also provides me with a larger set of data. I use cross-cultural rhetoric and identity as theoretical devices to analyze the frequency of metaphors, sentence length, and organization patterns (deductive vs. inductive), between data sets. The purpose of this application is to identify the ideological mechanisms at work in the production of film reviews. More importantly, I look at the rhetorical moves these

writers make at both ideological and structural terrains to outline any potential cultural differences and how these differences are enacted through written language.

The data is broken down by film. Each film is then divided into two sections, "English" and "Spanish," with two subcategories in each section detailing the focal point of each set of data. For example, the two subcategories for English are "England" and "the United States," while the two subcategories for Spanish are "Spain" and "Mexico." For each subcategory I provide data samples from two different writers. In total, I provide eight different film reviews for each film.

In addition, I describe the rhetorical moves each writer makes and the implications behind each move. I build on my claims in the "Findings" part of this paper. I use the first sentences of each piece of data to better trace each writer's rhetorical choices in terms of what each writer values as an important opening idea. In doing so, I hope to trace the power relations responsible for creating a space for such compositions to operate.

<p align="center">Data and Analysis: Birdman Film Reviews</p>

<u>English Language Data</u>

    <u>England: English Rhetorical Patterns.</u> Initially I thought writing produced in England would have a deductive approach, following a similar organization pattern found in studies, such as Yang and Cahill ((2008), conducted using data

samples from the United States. However, my data shows that British writing

deviates from this rhetorical approach in film reviews written on *Birdman.* For

instance, Jo Planter, a film critic from London, in a piece he wrote for *LondonNet*,

as demonstrated in Example 1.A, uses an inductive approach to construct his

review.

> *Example 1.A*
>
> →1 Art and real life playfully blur in Alejandro Gonzalez Inarritu's
>
> 2 technically dazzling comedy, which was shot on location in New
>
> 3 York.

In line 1 (Example 1.A) we see Planter's description of Iñárritu's film as a

"playful blur" between "art and real life," which addresses subtexts of the film,

rather than the actual progression of plot, climax, and denouement. The review

eludes this progression by offering an interpretation of the events within the

timeline of the film for the audience to be drawn to and possibly even become

secluded in this fictitious space. The review achieves this task by escaping the

imaginative space which is the film and entering the audience's environment: it

talks about what the film could do for viewers, such as being dazzled by its

comedic atmosphere, as noted in line 2. The motion of blurring "art and real life"

produced in the film is carried over into Planter's review of the film.

By moving between public (film) and private (emotional response of

viewers) spaces, Planter blurs the lines between art and real life of his readers.

The review develops its own species of art, achieved only through its observation

of art—a sort of mimicry developing a separate and unique experience. In essence the review prepares the reader for the experience of the film, in order to be receptive to its absolute potential.

Then Planter moves on to talk about the location where the film was shot. In this case Iñárritu orchestrated this masterpiece in New York City. This choice is important because now the film is given a real-life body. It adds another layer of closeness for readers because it was filmed in a place that some readers might have visited, or are at least familiar with this place. Planter does not directly go into the film's narrative. Instead he uses an inductive approach to playfully offer readers a taste of the film's beauty with his review. This data offers a good example describing how structural choice influences the rhetoric of the language produced in film reviews.

The next set of data was taken from a review written by Robbie Collin for the *Telegraph*. Based on my previous data, I was expecting a similar structural approach for this data. As it is detailed in Example 1.B, my assumptions are correct.

> *Example 1.B*
>
> →1 The vast majority of Iñárritu's hilarious, beautiful, film-defying
>
> 2 film plays out in an apparently continuous, cut-free sequence
>
> 3 that prowls through the St James Theatre in New York City,
>
> 4 where Riggan hopes to resuscitate his flagging career.

Collin's approach is similar to Planter's approach. In line 1 (Example 1.B), Collin focuses more on what the film d*oes* in terms of its beauty, sense of humor, and how it defies other films, instead of talking about the film's narrative. By addressing the comedic and aesthetic value of the film, the author creates another layer to the film, produced by his personal, interpretative processes. Again, this activity follows the "film-defying film" motion, producing a film-review defying film-review, due to the reviews ability to permeate both public and private spaces. This approach may suggest an important ideological feature of British English, which is the lack of space and/or privacy between text and audience, which generates a level of intimacy that intertwines writer, review, reader, director, film, and viewer into a single experience.

By looking at previous examples, the inductive structural method allows authors of *Birdman* film reviews written in England to play with space, time, and, more importantly, metaphors. If the writer's approach is less direct, then the reader's experience is more unique, since it does not follow the predetermined sequence of events coming directly from the film's narrative. This rhetorical pattern adds a more personalized dimension to each review. For instance, in Example 2.A, lines 1-2, Planter uses metaphors, such as *peppered*, *crammed,* and *bursting*, to describe the motion picture. In addition, in line 1, he states that the film is "peppered with affectionate verbal barbs" to describe the dialogue.

    Example 2.A

      →1 Peppered with affectionate verbal barbs aimed at Hollywood's

→2 current glitterati, Iñárritu's picture is crammed to bursting with

3 self-referential treats that demand a second and third viewing.

These metaphors are used to develop a space for a particular audience to occupy, the "glitterati." In brief, the use of figurative language in line 1 (Example 2.A) demonstrates that the rhetorical approach used by Planter develops an ideological motion geared towards a specific audience, one composed of subjects more in tune with *aesthetics*. The use of time and space is also important here because the author takes time from the description of the film to address potential viewers of the film, who share the position of an elite audience. Therefore, the promotion of the film is replaced by the promotion of an experience, which is not qualified in terms of linear narrative and, as a result, develops through creative assemblages of figurative language.

Moving forward, in Example 2.B, Collin also uses poetry to create a specific kind of rhetoric in his piece. He uses metaphors such as *punctures*, in line 2, as well as similes, such as "like a knitting needle to the gut," in line 3.

Example 2.B

1 There's a scene in which Riggan's fresh-from-rehab daughter

→2 (a superb Emma Stone) punctures her father's pretensions with a

→3 monologue that's delivered like a knitting needle to the gut.

Although Collin's rhetoric is not directed to a specific group, such as the "glitterati" in Planter's piece, it continues this notion of blurring the private with the public by presenting an old, familiar feeling. One that is most likely understood by

the audience, such as the "knitting needle to the gut." This motion is created to help the audience develop a more profound understanding of the new information and sequence of social patterns organized within the film's identity (public). In other words, the "metaphorical cognition permits [the audience] to see the new in terms of the old…" (Sell, 2008, p.8), and by writing to their experiences, the writers are able to seduce the preexisting neuron patterns of the audience because the neurons are stimulated by the figurative language to which they are exposed. The audience has the ability to connect all of their experiences and interpretations into their current response to the review. The investment here, again, lies not on the product, but process.

United States: English Rhetorical Patterns. United States writer Ben Kendrick uses a deductive approach in a review written for *Screen Rant*. A deductive approach follows a more narrative-like scheme where information is organized based on importance and relevance to chronological organization. For instance, Hardison (1966) outlines deductive patterns and functions in the following manner: coherence is increased when the materials in the paragraph are arranged according to a definite method. The methods available are the same as those for the essay as a whole…. They include the inherent orders of time, space, and process; and the logical orders such as general to specific, least to most important, cause and effect and climax (p.46).

The functions of deductive patterns, as described by Hardison (1966) are visible in line 1 (Example 3.A), where Kendrick moves directly into the film by

27

addressing its name and then quickly goes on to state the name of the main

actor, Michael Keaton. What we have here is a sequential order of events that

are classified by their importance based on their nature as objects, and their

value within the system in which they exist. Kendrick moves on to talk about the

character Michael Keaton plays, Riggan Thomson, (line 3, Example 3.A), and his

role in the film.

  Example 3.A

   →1 In *Birdman or (The Unexpected Virtue of Ignorance)*,

    2 Michael Keaton plays former blockbuster movie star

    3 Riggan Thomson – remembered best for

    4 portraying comic book hero *Birdman* on the big screen

    5 (back in the 1990s).

  The description of the film in this review is more direct. It does not play

with time or space through the rearrangement of events both inside and outside

the film. Instead the review focuses on the tittle of the movie, the name of the

leading star, the character he portrays, and what he does in the film. This

organization pattern led me to my next observation. It quickly became apparent

that when comparing the data from British writers to this set of data, Kendrick

uses a more *anthropocentric* approach, which can potentially be influenced by

the deductive method. I use the term *anthropocentric* because his review

revolves around what Riggan Thompson (the main character of Iñárritu's film)

does instead of describing other, more profound, layers of the film. Everything is

interpreted through the eyes of Thompson. Therefore, the audience is limited to the experience of Thompson.

The next set of data comes from American writer Peter Debruge, who just like his American counterpart uses a deductive approach. Debruge's writing also uses a similar rhetorical assemblage found in Kendrick's review. Both writers focus on Riggan Thomson as the one dictating the motion of the film. Everything is described in relation to Thomson and every other character's actions are also described by the main character's actions. I believe this structure allows a critique on the type of individualism promoted by these reviews, which also mirrors capitalist tendencies. For example, the first five lines in Example 3.B are written specifically about Michael Keaton's character, Riggan Thomson, and his journey.

Example 3. B

1 As Riggan Thomson, Keaton isn't playing himself so

2 much as an archetype that few other actors could have fit:

→3 an insecure celebrity whose Faustian decision to embody

4 a superhero called *Birdman* subsequently made it impossible

5 for critics or audiences to take him seriously in anything else.

One difference I noticed among United States writers is in line 3 (Example 3.B) where Debruge relates the film to the narrative of Dr. Faustus. This move creates expertise by forming intertextual connections. I believe this approach speaks about an ideological force characterized with power generated

throughout history, also known as *tradition*, which benefits a select group of people.

The influence *tradition* has on a narrative is so immense that *tradition* could accredit or discredit any work being done within or even around it. As a result, by drawing comparisons to texts that are well known in elite spheres, Debruge is granting *Birdman* a similar aesthetic stature. In addition, this rhetorical choice creates a space where prior knowledge of this tradition is necessary for the audience to achieve full membership to this specific brand of experience. I found this interesting because when Planter addresses the "glitterati" he uses figurative language, but when Debruge connects to Dr. Faustus he does not use any figurative language.

Spanish Language Data

Spain: Spanish Rhetorical Patterns. Alejandro G. Calvo, in a review he wrote for *Sensacine*, uses an inductive approach, as shown in Example 4.A. This example parallels previous studies, such as Simpson (2000), because they have shown that Spanish writers tend to take this approach across various written contexts. Though, surprisingly, Calvo begins by talking about the director and his accomplishments rather than addressing what the film does for the audience, as was the case in British film reviews for *Birdman*. Calvo then speaks about the director for a few more paragraphs before he even begins talking about the film. This approach also contrasts results from the data produced by United States writers in Example 1.A and 1.B, since their approach is more centered on the

30

main actor and his role in the narrative. Calvo focuses more on the director and the orchestration of the film as a whole rather than directing his attention towards an actor force to drive his review.

Another important factor to note is Calvo's use of metaphors as rhetorical strategies to communicate something unique to his readers. For instance in line 4 he writes that the film's plot is *asfixiante*, which translates into English as *suffocating*.

Example 4.A

1 Tras la debacle crítica de *Biutiful* (2010) muy pocos

2 esperábamos que el realizador mexicano Alejandro González

3 Iñárritu fuera capaz de recuperarse. Su cine, siempre

→4 grandilocuente, tan asfixiante en sus formas como plano en sus

→5 preceptos morales, machacando una y otra vez al espectador por la

6 vía de la tortura de sus personajes parecía una versión pánfila, sin

7 mesura posible, de lo logrado en los años noventa por Lars Von

8 Trier o Michael Haneke. [5]

By describing the narrative as "suffocating," Calvo is creating an atmosphere of suspense around the film, adding another layer to an already multilayered production. Furthermore, in line 5 Calvo describes the film as *machacando* (disintegrating) the audience. Again, this review is more concerned

---

[5] After the criticism of *Biutiful* (2010) very few people expected Mexican director Alejandro Gonzales Iñárritu to recover. His film, always bombastic, suffocating in the flat ways of its moral precepts, harping again and again the viewer by means of torturing his characters seemed gullible, without restraint, similar to what was achieved in the nineties by Lars Von Trier or Michael Haneke.

about *how* the audience can potentially experience the film at various human plateaus: psychological, emotional, and, to some degree, even physical. It breaks down the viewer's perceptions of reality—i.e. preconceived notions of film narrative structures. The care, attentiveness, acknowledgement of not only the plot but of other, potentially untouched, areas of the film gives the inductive approach a sense of *foreplay*—some *thing* predating the act of *watching.* In this case its description.

Similarly to Calvo's review, instead of going straight into the core of the film David de la Parra writes around the film's narrative, Parra makes this rhetorical move by mentioning the director first, just as his Spanish counterpart. Then describes Iñárritu's prior accomplishments. As I mentioned before in other parts of my analysis, an inductive structural approach seems to pave way for the use of metaphors. For instance, in line 7, Parra describes the film's story as *sazonándolo*, which translates into English as *seasoning.* The use of "seasoning" in this data is similar to the use of "peppered" in the data collected from British writers.

Example 4.B

1 Con *Birdman* nos encantamos ante una de las películas

2 del año. Tal vez la película del año sin lugar a dudas.

3 El cineasta Alejandro González Iñárritu compone una

4 de las historias más llamativas y rompedoras del momento.

5 Apoyándose en unas grandes interpretaciones.

6 Empezando por la presencia de Michael Keaton.

→7 Siguiendo por un gran Edward Norton y sazonándolo

8 todo con nombres como Emma Stone o Naomi Watts. [6]

A move away from the individual also occurs in this data. The director is defined as part of the orchestra, an instrument, just as every character in the film. The composer is the film itself, which is composed of an assemblage synchronized in creativity. As explained in lines 6-8 every character contributes and is equally important to the story. This finding reaffirms Del Rosal Vargas' (2002) claims about how the Spanish language emphasizes community and equal collaboration, rather than celebrating individuals.

Although Spanish writers share similar rhetorical selections as British writers, I found that sentence length was significantly different in Spanish film reviews. For instance, in Example 5.A, Calvo uses longer sentences, favoring a more elaborate structure composed with many clauses (Simpson, 2000). In the data I gathered, I found that inductive structures create the possibility for writers to engage in more complex topics through the use of more elaborate sentences. This activity does not come solely from the language but also suggests something about the power relations driving the culture producing these communication patterns. I discuss some of these power relations in greater detail in the "Findings" part of this paper.

---

[6] With *Birdman* we are facing one of the films of the year, perhaps the film of the year without a doubt. Filmmaker Alejandro Gonzales Iñárritu composes one of the most striking and groundbreaking stories of our time. Founded on great interpretations. Beginning with the presence of Michael Keaton. Following the great Edward Norton and seasoning all of the film with names such as Emma Stone and Naomi Watts.

Example 5.A

　　1 Retrato de una estrella de Hollywood en horas bajas,

　　2 únicamente recordada por su pasado como

　　3 superhéroe -magnífico el cast: Michael Keaton nunca

　　4 ha estado mejor, consiguiendo transfigurar su propio

　　5 pasado como actor a la ficción con toda la sorna y amargura

　　6 del actor en declive-, *Birdman* se construye como un fascinante

　　7 y estilizado falso plano-secuencia -más cercano al espíritu

　　8 ilusionista de Alfonso Cuarón que a las líneas de juego empírico

　　9 de Brian DePalma- que coquetea tanto con el cine-dentro-del-cine

　　10 (en las bambalinas de un teatro de Broadway) como con la puesta

　　11 en escena del abismo, profesional y vital. [7]

In lines 1-11 (Example 5.A) Calvo writes a paragraph-like sentence uses many colons, dashes, commas, and parenthesis to convey a message with many layers of meaning. This stylistic difference is also an ideological one, which points to the values of his culture.

In the next piece of data Parra also engages in a similar rhetorical action. In brief he uses longer, more complex sentences throughout his review, as shown in the example below.

---

[7] Portrait of a Hollywood star in his lowest hour, only remembered for his past as a superhero—magnificent cast: Michael Keaton has never been better, being able to transfigure his own past as an actor of fiction with all the sarcasm and bitterness of an actor in decline—*Birdman* is constructed as a fascinating and stylized false plane-sequence—closer to the spirit of the illusionist Brian DePalma—that flirts with both film-within-the-film (in the scenes of a Broadway theater) like in the setting of the scene of the abyss, professional and vital.

34

Example 5.B

    1 El colofón a dichas criticas las emite una crítica teatral,

    2 que califica a los actores del nuevo éxito de cine de

    3 acción como "gente sin talento que sólo vale para

    4 recaudar millones de dólares en taquilla y que se reparte

    5 premios en galas estúpidas a base de dibujos animados".[8]

Moving on, as I explained in Example 4.A and Example 4.B, Spanish writers use a lot of figurative language in their reviews, which closely parallels my data on British reviews. For instance, in Example 6.A, line 1, Calvo uses the words *fiereza* (fierce) and then, in line 7, *endiablada* (possessed) to describe the film. These characteristics grant the film a state of personification that transforms all of its elements into functioning identity traits, which the audience gravitates towards in the form of recognition.

Example 6.A

    1 Es imposible no rendirse ante la fiereza cómica de *Birdman*,

    2 una fogata de vanidades, miedos e inseguridades sometidas

    3 al caos sofista más delirante, que busca tanto hacer leña de los

    4 horrores de la industria del espectáculo sin dejar de poner en

    5 escena el absurdo de tanto ego y desesperación volcada en el

    6 medio. Un tiro de película, acelerada y endiablada, a la que es

---

[8] The coda for these criticisms are issued by a theatrical criticism, that qualifies the actors with the new success of action films as "untalented people that are valued only to make millions of dollars at the box office and to distribute awards in stupid events, a base for cartoon pictures."

7 imposible resistirse. [9]

In Example 6.B, Parra also uses the word *sazonada* (seasoned) to describe the film.

Example 6.B

1 *Birdman* es, de principio a fin, una durísima crítica contra el cine

2 de acción y aventuras, especialmente el de superhéroes, que

3 sazona las carteleras.[10]

<u>Mexico: Spanish Rhetorical Patterns.</u> Juan Luis Caviaro, writer for *blog de cine*, also writes using an inductive approach, as shown in Example 7.A. I expected to discover something similar to my findings in my data on United States reviews, since both places have developed their own variation of the original language of their respective colonizing forces. First, as done in Spanish reviews, Caviaro describes the director's accomplishments by detailing his win at the Oscars. What is most interesting about this review is that Caviaro weighs the film's success by its recognition at the Oscars. Although Caviaro uses an inductive approach, his use of figurative language is almost inexistent, since it favors a more direct approach formed by traditional narrative structures.

Example 7.A

1 El pasado miércoles fui al cine para volver a ver *Birdman*

---

[9] It's impossible not to surrender to the comic fierceness of *Birdman*, a bonfire of vanities, fears and insecurities subjected to the craziest Sophist chaos, seeking to make firewood of the horrors of the entertainment industry while putting in every scene the absurdity of both ego and despair, overturned in the film. The film is a bullet, accelerated and possessed, which is impossible to resist.

[10] *Birdman* is, from beginning to end, a harsh criticism against the action-adventure film, especially the superhero film that seasons billboards.

2 (Alejandro G. Iñárritu, 2014) tras su triunfo en los Oscar.[11]

Moving forward to the next piece of data, written by a group of writers from *Milenio*, as detailed in Example 7.B, uses inductive patterns. Another similarity this data shares with data from Example 7.B is that it also focuses on the achievements of the film in terms of its success at the Oscars:

Example 7.B

1 El filme *Birdman* del director Alejandro González

2 Iñárritu competirá con nueve categorías en la 87 edición

3 del premio Oscar que se realizarán el 22 de febrero próximo.[12]

One thing that stands out, however, from this particular set of data is that Mexican writers use the inductive approach but, unlike British and Spanish writers, they do not use extensive figurative language. In this case their approach is similar to United States writers, who tend to be more direct. This suggests that the inductive structure does not always lead to the use of more figurative language. However, it does create a specifically colored rhetoric: capitalist, due to the absence of figurative compositions.

Even though figurative language does not occur at such a high rate, Mexican writers do share the Spanish's preference for a complex sentence structure. For example, Caviaro, in Example 8.A uses longer, more complex sentence structure, over more simple sentences.

---

[11] Last Wednesday I went to the cinema to watch *Birdman* (Alejandro G. Iñárritu, 2014) one more time, following his triumph at the Oscars.

[12] Alejandro González Iñárritu's film *Birdman* will compete in nine categories at the 87th edition of the Oscars on February 22, 2016.

Example 8.A

1 Aunque a menudo no hay más remedio, creo que es

2 un error valorar películas como éstas después de un

3 solo visionado; en mi segunda experiencia con *Birdman*

4 volví a disfrutar de su valentía y sus interpretaciones

5 aunque noté una fuerte irregularidad, es un trabajo lleno de

6 altibajos... pero me extenderé en otro texto porque ahora

7 quiero centrarme en un asunto concreto. [13]

The anonymous Mexican writers also use longer and more complex sentences. The use of colons and commas are rhetorical moves these writers make to create more intricate and elaborate compositions. But as noted in line 2-3 (Example 8.B) they reference magazines, such as *Variety* and *Daily Telegraph*, to express that these agencies also approve the film. By addressing magazines and red-carpet events, the writers are promoting other marketable products that develop rhetoric geared towards profit rather than experience.

Example 8.B

1 La crítica ya elogió la cinta, así como la actuación de

2 Michael Keaton: La revista *Variety* etiquetó su actuación

3 como "el regreso del siglo", mientras que el *Daily Telegraph*

---

[13] Although often there is no choice, attributing value to a film in only one viewing is a mistake; in my second viewing of *Birdman* I enjoyed its courage and interpretations once more; however, I noticed a strong irregularity, it is a work filled with ups and downs… but I will expand on this claim in another text because right now I want to focus on a particular matter.

4 británico calificó la película como "un cine de categoría,

5 espectacular, protagonizado por estrellas."[14]

The film reviews in Spanish also mention other key actors in the film, such as Edward Norton and Emma Stone. The way these reviews structure their contribution is not necessarily to specific moments in the plot but to the entire project as a whole. This rhetorical move suggests that the film is looked at as a collaborative piece (Del Rosal Vargas, 2002) where everyone contributes to the "essence" of the film because their value is not defined with the actions they take in specific moments of the plot. Instead, their actions are molded into the emotion, the mentality, and the body of the film.

Again, another important difference I noticed between Spanish writers and Mexican writers is that Spanish writers use way more figurative language. However, the inductive frame and long sentence structure is a consistent pattern. I also found that metaphors increase the visual and mental capacity to imagine alternate paths somewhere inside the viewer's being, while their absence reaffirms a monotonous breath, which lacks diversity and uniqueness. And this motion promotes only one view primarily composed of a traditional, linear structure. Metaphors are not linear and therefore value unique experiences (process) over a specialized narrative that produces a specific experience, which

---

[14] Criticism has praised the film, as well as the performance of Michael Keaton: Variety magazine tagged his performance as "the return of the century," while the Daily Telegraph called the film "a five star film,' starring various stars.

39

does not deviate from the source's purpose (product). It is the same product produced over and over, a mass production valuing rhetoric of *efficiency*.

Data and Analysis: *The Revenant* Film Reviews

English Language Data

England: English Rhetorical Patterns. As I mentioned in my "Methodology" section, in order to best outline the existing ideologies composing the rhetoric of film reviews for these films, the *agencies* where I took *The Revenant* reviews are different from where I took *Birdman* reviews. With that said, the next set of data is from *Screen Daily*, which is stationed in London. However, a film critic from the United States wrote this review. Although this data is the only one of its kind I offer in this paper, it points to other elements of these reviews that are important: *agencies* that produce the reviews. Writer Tim Grierson uses an inductive form to construct his review.

Example 9.A

→1 Over his career, filmmaker Alejandro G. Iñárritu has

2 obsessively chronicled the beatific suffering and spiritual

3 rebirth of ordinary men, consistently demonstrating an

4 extraordinary showmanship that often risks tipping over

5 into self-aggrandisement.

In line 1, Example 9.A, Grierson's review matches the approach taken in the data from the reviews written for *Birdman,* including talking about everything

around the story's narrative, with the exception of the storyline. For instance, Grierson begins his review outlining the obsession with the "beatific suffering and spiritual rebirth of ordinary men" Iñárritu has had over his career. This approach gives the reader a more refined access to the film because they are given a unique path—i.e. the path the director took into the film is described to situate the audience at a point in time even before the inception of the film. In other words, the audience goes, for a brief moment, through the journey that the director took to awaken the film's potential, which also mirrors the journey taken by Glass in the film.

Again, this approach parallels other reviews from England because elements of the film are incorporated into the reviews as a way to build, to train, to prepare the potential of the audience's receptors. For example, in Planter's review of *Birdman* there is a blurring of "art and real life" that decentralizes public (film) and private spaces (viewer responses), which mimics the film's narrative since it follows Riggan Thomson's struggle with identifying *actuality* within a multilayered *reality*. In Grierson's review, the same process occurs but the product is different. Here the review mimics not only the long journey of Glass, but also of Iñárritu.

Moving forward, the next set of data, written by Hannah Sayer, comes from *UK Film Review*. As expected, the data follows an inductive organizational pattern.

Example 9.B

1 Following the success of *Birdman*, Iñárritu has gone to the next

2 level making *The Revenant*, as it has now become renowned for

3 being one of the most difficult shoots ever complete.

Sayer follows an inductive method, as Grierson does and also continues the approach of developing a rhetoric composed of the process involved in creating the film. It is a rhetoric that speaks also on the journey Iñárritu took to achieve his position "on the next level." He accomplished this task by perfecting the aesthetics granted only through the actualization of "difficult shoots" that uncovered a more pristine picture beneath the standard filters. An appreciation for the film's aesthetics and director's gruesome journey is created in this review.

This approach puts the readers in the shoes of the writer, who walked this journey by planting herself into the journey of the director (film), who rooted himself in Punke's (2002) interpretation of Glass' struggle, as the medium to orchestrate such a beautiful composition. This thread of hardship, desire, passion, betrayal, love, and destiny is knitted with the inspiration brought forth by every step Glass took about 200 years ago without him knowing. His journey continues with the experiences of the audience. Time blurs. Experience blurs. Space blurs. The private is exposed and through its wound the public experiences a unique pleasure invoked through the careful building, attentive crafting of rhetoric triggering a revolt against predetermined motions.

Following a similar thread as *Birdman* film reviews, this data set uses figurative language. Not to the extent as other reviews but they are present, nonetheless.

Example 10.A

1 *The Revenant* provides the grandest canvas yet for Iñárritu's best

2 and worst qualities.

For example in line 1 (Example 10.A), Grierson describes the film as a "canvas" where Iñárritu brings life with the "best and worst" of his qualities not only as a director but an artist, too. Grierson's selection of figurative language connects to a definition of "metaphor" developed by Jonathan Sell (2008). He states the original term "metaphor" comes from the Latin word *translation*, which was, in general terms, the word "translation" in English. In other words, Grierson is using figurative language to describe the process of translating information before it is presented, but his metaphor is also representative of this process since a "canvas" is a space where translation occurs. In extent, translation continues even at the level of the review because Grierson describes Iñárritu's interpretative process through his own interpretative process, which is also constructed through metaphor.

Sayer continues the figurative language pattern in her review. For instance, in line 1 (Example 10.B), describes the winter as "relentless" and then personifies the film by attributing to it the quality of "following" the path of explorer Hugh Glass.

43

Example 10.1B

>→1 The film follows his attempts to survive through the relentless

>2 winter, as he embarks on a quest to find the men who deserted

>3 and betrayed him.

Although Sayer's review continues the pattern of figurative language in reviews from English *agencies*, her review takes a different and more valuable approach. For example, she references a review written by Jeffrey Wells who is known for making "notorious comments," about films. More specifically, she narrows into Wells' description of *The Revenant* as too 'brutal' for "half the population." Sayer describes this claim as "a dated and sexist view to have of cinema in 2015," in line 2 from Example 10.2B.

Example 10.2B

>1 By suggesting that *The Revenant* is too 'brutal' for half of the

>2 population is no doubt a dated and sexist view to have of cinema

>3 in 2015.

By connecting to Wells' piece through a metaphor Sayer is able to identify a major power relation developing patriarchal structures. Here, metaphors work as Jonathan Sell (2008) describes, "a tool in the study of identity" (299). It is also important to trace the particular kinds of identities that are reified through the use of certain metaphors. Up to this point the data that contains figurative language has helped decenter rhetoric perpetuating repeated experiences, but here we see metaphors working to solidify experiences to form ideologies of exclusion.

However, Sayer addresses the metaphor and through it is able to construct a space where an important conversation on female equality and gender stereotypes can operate, redirecting the flow of power.

<u>United States: English Rhetorical Patterns.</u> In a review Mark Kermode wrote for *the guardian*, he uses a deductive structure. He goes into the narrative of the movie in the first two sentences of his review.

Example 11.A

> 1 The legend of American frontiersman and fur trapper Hugh Glass,
>
> 2 who was left for dead after being mauled by a bear in the early
>
> 3 1820s…

This particular approach does not deviate much from simply presenting the narrative of the film. The review quickly describes the film through the motions of the main character, Hugh Glass, played by Leonardo DiCaprio. As shown in Example 12.A, the reviewer details some of the success DiCaprio has achieved through his roles in other movies to bring value to his current role in *The Revenant.* Kermode then continues to describe the film's narrative through DiCaprio's character, paralleling American film reviews for *Birdman.* However, Kermode ends his review by accrediting the director and the cinematographer for the overall production of the film.

The next piece of data was taken from the *Los Angeles Times*, written by Kenneth Turan. In his review, Turan begins with an inductive form but then reverts to a deductive one. However, throughout his review, Turan goes back

45

and forth between inductive and deductive structures, which results in a blending of these forms.

Example 11.B

    1 Previous Alejandro G. Iñárritu films such as *21 Grams*, *Babel*

    2 and the Oscar- winning *Birdman* have not lacked for pretension

    3 and self-importance,

Although the structure in this review somewhat changes, the variable that remains constant in this set of data is the review being written around the main actor, in this case DiCaprio. Even when Turan mentions the "double Oscar-winning cinematographer Lubezki," he does it to describe Lubezki as DiCaprio's "greatest ally," in terms of DiCaprio's Oscar race. Again, we see this actor-centered review being produced.

Although the use of metaphors in Kermode's review is limited, he does sprinkle his review with a couple that are worth mentioning. For instance, in lines 2-3 (Example 12.A), he describes the wilderness as a "virgin" with an "unnerving" beauty. For a brief moment Kermode is held captive by the beauty of the film's aesthetics and from that place is able to communicate to the audience in the only possible way, through metaphor.

Example 12.A

    1 The actor's great ally here is double Oscar-winning

    →2 cinematographer Lubezki, who brilliantly captures the unnerving

    →3 beauty of a virgin wilderness and Glass' agonizing attempt to stay

4 alive in it.

However, this moment comes after Kermode first describes the "Oscar-winning" Lubezki to highlight the significance of these metaphors through the identification of Lubezki as a recognized figure in this elite circle. Therefore, Kermode first validates his metaphors by highlighting Lubezki's position in the Academy and only after establishing this connection he is able to bring value to his creative interpretation.

Turan's review is not as colorful as Kermode's review, but it also creates value for the film in terms of its acceptance into elite circles through the multiple "Oscar-nominated" main actor, DiCaprio, who was also nominated for his current role in *The Revenant.*

Example 12.B

1 Having previously been Oscar-nominated for *What's Eating*

2 *Gilbert Grape*, *The Aviator*, *Blood Diamond* and most recently *The*

3 *Wolf of Wall Street*, it's clearly DiCaprio's turn to triumph with a

4 performance which relies more upon physicality than the spoken

5 word.

Therefore, this actor-driven film is also an Academy-driven one. Because of the success *The Revenant* has had so far within the Academy, this review also narrows into that electrical pulse of social power to bring value to the words that are written.

<u>Spanish Language Data</u>

        <u>Spain: Spanish Rhetorical Patterns.</u> The following data set was taken from *Hobby Consolas*, written by Manuel el Campo. As shown in Example 13.A, Campo uses an inductive approach. He begins his review by describing Iñárritu's previous success in *Birdman* as continuing with *The Revenant.* Then in line 4 Campo describes the film as an instant "classic" (*clásico*) since the movie's "opening day" (*estreno*).

Example 13.A

        1 Iñárritu lo ha vuelto a hacer. Tras dejarnos boquiabiertos con la

        2 pirueta cinematográfica que supuso *Birdman*, con *El Renacido*

        3 (*The Revenant* en original, mucho más apropiado en su

        4 significado de "fantasma") ha firmado una fascinante película que

        5 ya es un clásico desde su estreno.[15]

    Another important element to note in this review is the sentence length. Although there are fewer long-sentences in this data, they are still present. In Example 13.A, for instance, Campo uses commas and parenthesis to develop longer sentences creating a more complex structure. This data parallels Spanish data from *Birdman* because they both have an inductive form paired with longer sentences.

---

[15] Iñárritu has done it again. After leaving us speechless with the pirouette cinematography of *Birdman*, with *El Renacido* (*The Revenant*, in the original, much more appropriate in its significance of "ghost") he has rendered a fascinating film because it has been a classic since its release.

The next data was written by Miguel Ángel Pizarro for *e-cartelera*. The paragraph structure mirrors Campos' inductive approach. Pizarro, in line 1 (Example 13.B), talks about the opening day of the film in the United States and then moves on to write about the critiques that have been written on the film.

Example 13.B

→1 Aunque en Estados Unidos *El Renacido* se estrenará de manera

2 limitada el 25 de diciembre, ya han surgido los primeros

3 comentarios de la nueva película de Alejandro González Iñárritu.[16]

Pizarro's review also contains longer sentences. For example, the second paragraph in his review is composed of only two sentences. In this particular paragraph, he uses three commas, one semicolon, and three conjunctions (and). Again, inductive approaches, so far, demonstrate longer, more complex sentences. They move in a circular motion with different depths, too.

Another pattern that continues with this data is Campo's use of figurative language. For instance, in line 1 (Example 14.A), Campos describes the structure of the film's argument as a "skeleton" (esqueleto). Although this particular metaphor is commonly used in various cultures to describe fundamentals, such as form or structure, it is still an example of a metaphor. Surprisingly, though, Campos uses fewer metaphors in his review when compared to Spanish reviews written for *Birdman*.

---

[16] Although in the United States *The Revenant* premiers in a limited way on December 2, 2016, the first film critiques have emerged from Alejandro Gonzales Iñárritu's film.

Example 14.A

> 1 El esqueleto argumental de *El Renacido* se puede resumir en una
>
> 2 sola frase: [17]

Pizarro takes a similar approach in his review. Although he uses metaphors, the frequency of metaphors is also lower when compared to *Birdman* data.

Example 14.B

> →1 Las críticas declaran que la película es visualmente una auténtica
>
> →2 maravilla, que el realizador mexicano consigue una crueldad y
>
> 3 brutalidad extrema y que sus actores, especialmente Leonardo
>
> 4 DiCaprio…[18]

For example, in line 1 (Example14.B), Pizarro describes the film's visual as an authentic (*auténtica*) marvel (*maravilla*). Then in line 2 he describes Iñárritu as having "found" (*conseguir*) "extreme" (*extrema*) "cruelty and brutality" (*crueldad* y *brutalidad*). The use of metaphor in this particular moment details the lengths Iñárritu needed to travel in order to obtain an aesthetics, which would later grant the film its prestige. In this example, metaphors actually work towards threading Iñárritu's process as a director into the film's process as a narrative.

---

[17] The skeleton of the plot of *The Revenant* can be summarized in one sentence:

[18] The reviews state that the film is visually a real marvel, that the Mexican filmmaker achieves extreme brutality and cruelty, and that its actors, especially Leonardo DiCaprio…

Mexico: Spanish Rhetorical Patterns. The next data is from a piece written

by Adrian Andrade for *el mexicano*. Andrade's review uses a deductive pattern

that is not visible in Mexican reviews on *Birdman* used for this paper. Andrade

begins his review by describing the context of the film. For instance, in line 1

(Example 15.A), Andrade describes the narrative to be in "Montana y Dakota del

Sur" (Montana and South Dakota). Then he goes on to describe the main

character, Hugh Glass, and what he does throughout the narrative.

Example 15.A

→1 Situada en Montana y Dakota del Sur, el cazador Hugh Glass se

2 encuentra liderando una expedición militar a cargo de conseguir

3 pieles de animales.[19]

The identification of context, character, and purpose in Andrade's review

continues Hardison's (1966) definition about the organizing principles: time,

space, and process. Although this text does not situate the reader in a specific

time, it develops the space and then describes the process. This action produces

a mechanical, sequential presentation with little deviation from the narrative,

which differs from other Mexican reviews detailed in this paper.

The next data, written by Luis Gamboa for *Premiere*, somewhat continues

the inductive approach seen in *Birdman* reviews from Mexico. Gamboa begins

---

[19] Located in Montana and South Dakota, the hunter Hugh Glass finds himself leading a military
expedition in charge of getting animal skins.

his review by describing the global recognition of the director and the publicity around his latest film.

Example 15.B

> →1 Iñárritu es un personaje global. Todo el mundo tiene una opinión
>
> 2 sobré él y sobre su cine.[20]

For example, in line 1 (Example 15.B), Gamboa states that Iñárritu is a "global figure" (*personaje global*) and that *the entire world has an opinion over his films*. This approach parallels other Mexican reviews because the writers bring value to the film and even to their review because they create a rhetoric that situates everything related to Iñárritu as a world-renowned discourse of aesthetically elevated cinema. However, even though Gamboa begins with an inductive pattern he moves between inductive and deductive forms throughout his review, which does not follow rhetorical patterns in other Mexican reviews.

As I mentioned in the previous data set, although Andrade does not extensively use figurative language, he deviates from a deductive structure and for a moment follows an inductive pattern that produces something interesting in his review. As shown in line 3 (Example 16.A), Andrade's deviation from a deductive process allows him to use the metaphoric phrase "calmar las aguas turbias en la Academia," which translates to: *calm the turbulent waters of the Academy*.

Example 16.A

---

[20] Iñárritu is a global character. Everyone has an opinion on him and his cinema.

1 Aún sostengo con firmeza que no debió haber ganado con

2 *Birdman*, todavía con este drama del viejo oeste que de igual

→3 manera está siendo sobrevalorada quizás para calmar las aguas

4 turbias en la Academia.[21]

This motion to use metaphors is important because Andrade is talking about the social issues involving the Academy, such as underrepresenting women and certain ethnic groups. However, the only time he uses metaphors is when talking about the Academy, which follows a similar thread of elitism generated from other Mexican writers in the reviews detailed in this paper. Still, it is important to highlight the value metaphors hold in this context as catalysts for conversations operating outside mechanical motions to take place.

Moreover, Gamboa's review also produces a few gems. For instance in line 1 (Example16.B), he describes Iñárritu's films as "solid like a rock" (sólido como una roca). He also describes *The Revenant* as "precious for being unique, and precious for being beautiful."

Example 16.B

→1 El cine de Iñárritu es, lo lleva siendo desde hace 15 años, sólido

2 como una roca.[22]

Since this data is the only one that blends the inductive/deductive structures and uses metaphors from Mexican writers, an important question is

---

[21] Still I firmly hold my opinion that he should have not won with *Birdman*, continuing the drama of the old west that has been overrated perhaps to calm the turbulent waters of the Academy.

[22] Iñárritu's film is, it has been for 15 years, solid as a rock.

raised: does moving between inductive/deductive forms allow Mexican writers to develop a higher metaphor rate in film reviews?

Findings

While analyzing the data from *Birdman* reviews I noticed a unique pattern. Reviews from England and Spain use far more metaphors than reviews written in the United States and Mexico. At first I believed it was because England and Spain are conquering powers, while the United States and Mexico are, to a certain degree, extensions of these powers that there was some sort of metaphor limitation in the space of film reviews. However, this pattern changed in *The Revenant* reviews and there were moments where metaphors were used as a catalyst to redirect the conversation from the film to bring awareness to important social injustices.

Still, one pattern that is consistent throughout the data from U.S. and Mexico is that the language focuses primarily on the plot of the film. Both data sets share a particular type of specialized rhetoric that does not deviate much from the narrative of the film, and when it does, it is only to refer back to privileged spaces, such as the Oscars, popular magazines, and well-established literature. Their description of the film is qualified using these external forces that drive solely on recognition that produces economic power. In other words, the writers bring meaning to their work by inserting their critiques into other *agencies* with national or even global recognition.

Moreover, the choice writers make to refer to these spaces of power creates a trinity effect that parallels Jacques Lacan's (1991) third discourse of capitalism: agent → other → production. Sure, all data shows the film (agent), promoted in a the review (other), for the purpose of recognition to generate profit (production) but only in data from the United States and Mexico do film reviews, which operate as "other" *material*, refer its readers to additional spaces operating as "other" at a higher frequency. This process creates a chain of other → other that duplicates itself within each connection, since they reproduce by self-referring to an additional unit functioning as "other," which is connected to the end result of production, generating more and more profit each time an "other" connects to an "other." This activity creates a network of power amongst elite spheres, including competing *agencies*.

For example, by connecting the film to Dr. Faustus, Debruge develops an intertextual motion that situates his audience in another space for them to experience. That space, in return, is also blanketed with other intertextual threads that lead readers into other spaces. As they move between these spaces, the works are self-reproducing, because they are occupying new minds. This process, in addition, has the potential to generate profit because entrance to each space requires capital. Also, the data in Example 8.B written for *Milenio* provides another instance where other *agencies*, specifically "Variety" and "Daily Telegraph" are mentioned to bring additional value to the film and review.

Therefore, Lacan's discursive algorithm fits well as a tool to trace the result of these events in the processes of capitalism. Now, what are the benefits in tracing such events—written texts on film reviews—their *effect* and *affect* in local and global contexts, the ideologies being manufactured, the reification of identities, and power relations through this algorithm? Well, in order to attempt to answer these questions it is important to first identify one other critical element in the data: the implications of the structural approach writers take in reviews written in the United States and Mexico for *Birdman* and *The Revenant.*

For instance, United States film reviews for *Birdman,* for the most part, begin their review by identifying the star of the film, such as Michael Keaton. Very few information is given about Keaton or his work and writers generally move straight into the film's plot. The reviews are composed of scene-by-scene descriptions about what Keaton does throughout the film. The other actors are introduced only in relation to Keaton's actions. Everything is situated and described through the star actor. This idea also connects to the kinds of authority figures that are respected and valued in United States' culture. In this case actors are highly regarded, just as athletes and pop-stars, and hold the ability to move the narrative around them.

In other words, the central figure is the one holding the power, which is granted through various external socioeconomic and political forces. These power structures influence our perception of the reality created even in films. By looking at this rhetorical approach the data suggests that a certain type of

rhetoric is produced, which not only replicates information for profit, but also reifies identities to take on the role of a consumer. It trains the audience at a psychological, emotional and even physical degree to occupy specific spaces. It trains them to move between and among target spaces to continue exploring preprogrammed experiences because they reaffirm hierarchical dominance while producing economic power for specific *agencies*.

In short, the data not only serves as ground towards a conversation about a rhetoric of *efficiency* held by each writer but more importantly hints to the affect the *agencies* have on writers, which are potentially influenced by greater systems, such as investors and/or political infrastructures. This rhetorical approach mirrors a direct, consistent, unchanging task of replicating an identical product to reproduce profit.

Initially, I thought these differences came from the way certain reviews are structured—i.e. the structure is what carves out the content and a very rigid frame develops mechanical rhetoric, a species of *Capitalist Rhetoric*. But Mexicans, in this context, use inductive structures without always using the creative edge the British and Spanish consistently develop in the data for both films. This action leads me to believe that the key force is metaphor. The presence of metaphor decentralizes the point of narrative origin. Following Derridean functionality (Derrida, 1967), metaphors generate, duplicate, and replicate, origins within a single structure until the entire essence is the origin. There is no predestined path colored with cultural determinism.

For instance, Andrade, in Example 16.A, deviates from the deductive form to create a moment where, through the use of metaphors, he is able to talk about an important social issue: the underrepresentation of women and certain ethnic groups in popular culture. This is another example of how metaphors allow writers to interpret the world through various lenses and can potentially influence deviations from "natural" or "normal" societal operations, as means to talk about important social issues. As Jonathan Sell (2008) states, a "metaphor challenges us intellectually to find the ground that makes sense of the relationship of resemblance postulated between topic and vehicle, cross-cultural narrative challenges us to find resemblances or analogies between phenomena, institutions, customs, assumptions, expectations, and so on" (p.8). And in the absence of the metaphor, we are unarmed as a society to think outside predetermined motions.

Moreover, Example 10.B details another moment where the data shows not only an alternative stimulus though metaphor, as observed in most reviews from England and Spain, but an alternative perspective to unjust views about women. Sayer brings attention to the metaphoric use of the word 'brutal' in one of Well's reviews, as being a tool to perpetuate social stereotypes that are not an honest representation of the population they intend to represent. In this case Wells' comment was directed to women. Sayer dives into this metaphor to initiate and expand a more meaningful message within her review for *The Revenant.* Therefore, metaphors, although primarily used as an artistic mechanism

producing alternate realities triggering pleasure receptors, could also be used as catalyst towards conversations about social issues across multiple power structures, a type of *tool* for social change.

Conclusion

The rhetorical moves writers make on structure and content expresses something about the relationship they have with the objects they describe, and the value those objects possess within their culture. And by culture I refer to the *agencies* for which they work and their target audience. In other words, the objects they choose to work with are important, but "…because [they] choose [them] in the first place, the [objects reveal] more about [them] than [they] do about [the objects]" (Bachelard, 1964, p.1). In short, the rhetoric knitted by *agencies* through their writers is composed of threads that are important to the forces governing these spaces and reveal more about the *agencies* ideologies than it does about the subjects in their reviews. At first glance, I thought it was the language or the country producing these reviews as the agents developing this rhetoric. However, my data shows certain *agencies* publishing reviews are marked deeper than others with this sort of capitalist rhetoric, which means that *agencies* are the ones producing these ideas and not the language or culture.

Moreover, it is critical to note the rhetorical moves, in the space of metaphors, to trace how capitalism has affected and continues to affect *agencies* that communicate information to individuals and larger cultures, in both a local

and global context. I believe *redirection*, through the application of figurative language, can cause a Foucauldian shift, resulting in a variation of rhetoric, ideologies, and identities produced. A state where there is no origin or central force of power, but rather, a balanced electrical impulse of power flowing evenly from the smallest (individuals) to the largest (power structures) units. Finally, research focused on tracing these elements produced through the presence or absence of metaphors in film reviews needs further development.

REFERENCES

CONFERENCE PAPER

Bachelard, G. (1964). *The psychoanalysis of fire*. Boston, Massachusetts:

    Beacon Press.

Barros, E. M. D. D. (2009). Text genres and literacy practices: verb tense and

    time in the movie review genre. *Revista Brasileira de Lingüística Aplicada*,

    9(1), 177-200.

Del Rosal Vargas, G. (2002). El desarrollo de las habilidades discursivas. In

    Cuadernos de Difusión Académica del Área de Redacción Universitaria.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference*. Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in

    Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. *Coherence in writing: Research

    and pedagogical perspectives*, 87-110.

LoCastro, V. (2008). Long sentences and floating commas. *Contrastive rhetoric:

    Reaching to intercultural rhetoric*, *169*, 195.

Nasio, J. D. (1998). Five lessons on the psychoanalytic theory of Jacques Lacan.

    Albany, New York: SUNY Press.

Sell, J.P.A. (2008). Towards a rhetoric of cross-cultural identity. *Revista

    Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, *21*, 129-146.

Simpson, J. M. (2000). Topical structure analysis of academic paragraphs in

    English and Spanish. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*(3), 293-309.

Taboada, M. (2011). Stages in an online review genre. *Text & Talk-An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, *31*(2), 247-269.

REFERENCES

JOURNAL ARTICLE

Bachelard, G. (1964). *The psychoanalysis of fire*. Boston, Massachusetts:

 Beacon Press.

Barros, E. M. D. D. (2009). Text genres and literacy practices: verb tense and

 time in the movie review genre. *Revista Brasileira de Lingüística Aplicada*,

 9(1), 177-200.

Camps, D. (2000). Drawing on, adapting and recreating writing practices for their

 academic purposes: The case of six Mexican postgraduate students at

 four British universities. *Revista de Clase Internacional*, *2*(5), 1-14.

Del Rosal Vargas, G. (2002). El desarrollo de las habilidades discursivas. In

 Cuadernos de Difusión Académica del Área de Redacción Universitaria.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference*. Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Gee, J. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New

 York City, New York: Routledge Press.

Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language and

 understanding.* United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Golden, A., & Lanza, E. (2013). Metaphors of culture: Identity construction in

 migrants' narrative discourse. *Intercultural Pragmatics,* 10(2), 295-314.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and works in communities

 and classrooms.* United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Helal, F. (2013). Discourse and intercultural academic rhetoric. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, *3(*2), 149-156.

Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives*, 87-110.

Kalman, J. (1999). *Writing on the plaza: Mediated literacy practice among scribes and clients in Mexico City*. New York City, New York: Hampton Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. New York City, New York: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh*. Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

LoCastro, V. (2008). Long sentences and floating commas. *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric*, *169*, 195.

Monti, E. (2009). Translating the metaphors we live by. *European Journal of English Studies*, *13*(2), 207-221.

Nasio, J. D. (1998). *Five lessons on the psychoanalytic theory of Jacques Lacan*. Albany, New York: SUNY Press.

Neff, J., Dafouz, E., Diez, M., Prieto, R., & Chaudron, C. (2004). Contrastive discourse analysis: Argumentative text in English and Spanish. *Discourse across language and cultures*, 267-283.

Phillips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation*. London, England: Longman Press.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (2001). Discourse and intercultural communication. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 538-547.

Sell, J.P.A. (2008). Towards a rhetoric of cross-cultural identity. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, *21*, 129-146.

Simpson, J. M. (2000). Topical structure analysis of academic paragraphs in English and Spanish. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*(3), 293-309.

Taboada, M. (2011). Stages in an online review genre. *Text & Talk-An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, *31*(2), 247-269.