

expresses

1. In his review article, the writer ~~establishes~~ his opinion about 'The X Factor' in a critical and sarcastic tone underpinned with a lot of humour. He ~~is~~ adopts an informal and conversational register to address his readers who are likely to be viewers ~~of~~ or potential viewers of this entertainment show.

The writer strongly criticises the show using a lot of exaggeration to ~~put~~ portray his dislike for it. He refers to it as an 'entertainment behemoth' that is 'over-produced to within an inch of its life'.

This exaggeration of a show that is already said to be exaggerated is slightly ironic but clearly gets the point across that the show is just like old wine in a new bottle and that this is very obvious on comparing it to other ~~entertainment~~ reality shows such as 'Got Talent'. The use of exaggeration also asserts his points whilst adding humour to it which makes the criticism seem less offensive as when he says that 'the only real difference seems to be a lack of jugglers' ^{and} that there were 'people... terrible.'

The show is continued to be portrayed in a poor light ~~when it is~~ ^{when} it is shown to be the same old thing ^{as} the viewers would be 'forgiven for mistaking... for being the same exact programme.' The entire paragraph devoted to comparing The X Factor with Got Talent highlights and emphasises on this point. The repetition of 'Talent' so many times implies the larger repetition of the entire programme itself.

Furthermore, the writer uses examples and unusual imagery to establish how clichéd and predictable the show is as it seems to simply 'trot out all the old tricks'. The fact that Lady Gaga is 'butchered' gives a very vivid and intense auditory image of horrendous singing while reinstating humour. 'Oh look' and 'surprise surprise' bring the sarcasm back to the forefront and the writer's interpretation of these examples as he comments 'it's as if they're ... organic moments' is quite hilarious.

The possible fear is recalled as the writer satirically reasons why there are no quiet moments on the show by saying 'a real moment... emotions work.'

After the seemingly endless criticism, the writer concludes that there are more things to hate 'than what I've listed above', not only leaving it to the reader's imagination but also implying that it is possible for the show to be worse than what he has already argued.

Once again it is ironic as he describes the show as 'featuring hyperbole' by using hyperbole himself to create a funny image of a 'thousand ... volcano gods'.

Lastly, the writer personifies the show and creates various contrasts between expectations and reality which reminds me, as a reader, of an image of an exaggerated stereotypical image of a teenage

girl who is 'not cool but pretends to be.' ~~for~~ portraying the show as naive and childish. He ends his review by capitalising 'NOT' to emphasize his point one last time that the show is fake and while he does not tell his readers to stop watching it, he implies that they are fools if they are 'tricked into believing it is a phenomenon.' Thereby indirectly dissuading them from watching the show he has so passionately been critical of.

b) Does anybody else feel a sense of déjà vu when they watch Dhoom 3? I wonder why... it couldn't possibly be due to the fact that just like its two predecessors, it has a cop, his ~~sidekick~~ ridiculously dumb sidekick, ~~a gorgeous heroine who causes~~ ~~a~~ a thief who is smarter than the cop until the climax arrives and a gorgeous heroine who causes the thief's downfall! Oh no, it must be due to the fact that they're all named 'Dhoom' and have the same theme song, plus a few instruments each time with every new sequel.

But they say this one is special. After all, it has been ~~so~~ filmed in Germany, in a circus setting with a world famous actor playing his own ^{evil} twin - a round of applause for the writer to come up with these ingenious highlights to cover up his own lack of imagination for a plot.