

3e

1.
 - a. === home alone goes hollywood , a funny premise until the kids start pulling off stunts not even steven spielberg would know how to do . besides , real movie producers aren't this nice .
 - b. Truth: -1, Prediction: 1 [WRONG]
 - c. **Response: The prediction thinks the movie is funny and nice, but there are negatives corresponding to each of these words - “until” for funny and “aren’t” for nice. These negatives are missed by the predictor, leading to the incorrect prediction.**
2.
 - a. === 'it's painful to watch witherspoon's talents wasting away inside unnecessary films like legally blonde and sweet home abomination , i mean , alabama . '
 - b. Truth: -1, Prediction: 1 [WRONG]
 - c. **Response: The predictor doesn't realize that “sweet” and “home” are part of names of things, not words being used in the review.**
3.
 - a. === patchy combination of soap opera , low-tech magic realism and , at times , ploddingly sociological commentary .
 - b. Truth: -1, Prediction: 1 [WRONG]
 - c. **Response: The predictor doesn't realize that “magic realism” is a proper noun, not 2 descriptor words – it should have tied the use of the word “low-tech” to these two words to see that this was not positive.**
4.
 - a. === the best thing i can say about this film is that i can't wait to see what the director does next .
 - b. Truth: 1, Prediction: -1 [WRONG]
 - c. **Response: The predictor doesn't understand that the reviewer is being sarcastic because he doesn't mention anything about the film when he's talking about the best thing about it. The mere presence of “best” and “film” and “does” make the predictor think the review is automatically positive.**
5.
 - a. === . . . standard guns versus martial arts cliché with little new added .
 - b. Truth: -1, Prediction: 1 [WRONG]
 - c. **Response: The predictor misses the fact that “little” modifies “new” to effectively make it mean the opposite of what it thinks it means.**
6.
 - a. === what makes the movie special is its utter sincerity .
 - b. Truth: 1, Prediction: -1 [WRONG]

- c. **Response:** Usually, “utter” comes before something bad, and the predictor doesn’t see it comes before something good this time. Additionally, the predictor thinks the use of the word “movie” is bad because critics often call good movies “films” and bad ones “movies” but this time around it’s different.
- 7.
- a. === provide[s] nail-biting suspense and credible characters without relying on technology-of-the-moment technique or pretentious dialogue .
- b. Truth: 1, Prediction: -1 [WRONG]
- c. **Response:** The predictor doesn’t see that the words after “without relying on” are going to mean the opposite of what they would mean if they were taken at face-value. So the move is not “pretentious”. Additionally, “nail-biting suspense” should have been a key giveaway that it was positive.
- 8.
- a. === gangs of new york is an unapologetic mess , whose only saving grace is that it ends by blowing just about everything up .
- b. Truth: -1, Prediction: 1 [WRONG]
- c. **Response:** The predictor is weighing some heavy words here, but it doesn’t realize that “gangs” “new” and “york” are all part of the movie’s title, so they shouldn’t count towards the score. Also, “only saving grace” should have indicated that “grace” was negative, not positive.
- 9.
- a. === [siegel] and co-writers lisa bazadona and grace woodard have relied too much on convention in creating the characters who surround frankie .
- b. Truth: -1, Prediction: 1 [WRONG]
- c. **Response:** The predictor doesn’t realize that “grace” is the name of a person, not a positive adjective.
- 10.
- a. === an incoherent jumble of a film that's rarely as entertaining as it could have been .
- b. Truth: -1, Prediction: 1 [WRONG]
- c. **Response:** The predictor doesn’t realize that “entertaining” should be negated by “rarely as”.