

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of the Liberal Arts

**A CROSS-LINGUISTIC AND CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS OF TASTE, FOOD,  
COOKING, AND INTERACTION IN A CORPUS OF TELEVISION COOKING  
SHOWS FROM ROMANIA AND THE U.S.**

A Dissertation in

Applied Linguistics

by

Alina C. Pajtek

© 2011 Alina C. Pajtek

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

December 2011

The dissertation of Alina C. Pajtek was reviewed and approved\* by the following:

Robert Schrauf  
Professor of Applied Linguistics  
Chair of Committee  
Head of the Linguistics Department

Meredith Doran  
Project Associate, Center for Language Acquisition  
Dissertation Adviser

Celeste Kinginger  
Professor of Applied Linguistics

Matthew Jordan  
Assistant Professor of Media Studies

Steve Thorne  
Associate Professor of World Languages and Literature  
Portland State University  
Special member

\*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School.

## ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines how language and culture are performed in a corpus of selected television cooking show discourse from Romania and the US. More specifically, this study offers a micro- and macro-level linguistic analysis of two television cooking shows from the US, *30 Minute Meals* and *The Essence of Emeril*, and two from Romania, *The Recipe from Home* and *I Eat Therefore I Am*; both the US and the Romanian television corpus include one male and one female host. The US shows are among the most popular cooking programs on contemporary television, while the Romanian shows constitute the first food programs ever produced in Romanian.

The present study is the first linguistic anthropological study that investigates how culture and stance-taking, or socio-culturally determined attitudes, are constituted in television cooking show discourse. Drawing on scholarly work from anthropology (e.g., Mannheim and Tedlock, 1995), sociology (Bourdieu, 1997; 1990; 1991), and linguistic anthropology (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989; Besnier, 1990; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Du Bois, 2007), I argue that culture and stance are intrinsically connected, and that a nuanced understanding of US and Romanian cultural frames expressed in cooking show discourse requires an analysis of stance-taking linguistic features. In this dissertation, I focus on two types of discursive stance-taking, *affective stance* (Ochs, 1996) and *interactional stance* (Kärkkäinen, 2006; Du Bois, 2007), and on how they both reflect and construct cultural patterns in television cooking show discourse.

More specifically, using Ochs' (1996) and Silverstein's (2003) indexicality principle, I analyze affective stances towards taste and their indexical meanings in television cooking

show discourse to understand cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences and similarities, as well as gender-specific characteristics of affective stance towards taste in this media genre. I also appeal to Goffman's constructs of the *presentation of self* (Goffman, 1959), *frame analysis* (Goffman, 1974), and *footing* (Goffman, 1981), to examine stance and interaction in television cooking show discourse from the two countries, and how such interactions point to the construction of several host roles. Lastly, I use Silverstein's *indexical order* (2003) concept to understand how particular instantiations of stance, taste, affect, and interaction in the selected corpus have meaning within the broader Romanian and US cultural context.

As the first discourse-analytic study on Romanian media, and the only discourse-analytic study of television cooking show discourse in the US, this analysis contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how everyday discursive patterns (in this case, via the medium of television) relate to cultural patterns in general, and those in Romanian and US cultures in particular. For instance, this study provides evidence not only of differences with regard to affect and interaction between US and Romanian cultures—consistent with traditional “contrastive” or dichotomous views of the differences between Western and Eastern cultures—but also illustrates discursive similarities between the two sets of cultural artifacts, that call for re-examination and questioning of such dichotomous schemata. Furthermore, this dissertation study illustrates the creation of cultural personae of television cooking show hosts through micro- and macro-level linguistic features, and shows how their popularity is at least partly a feature of their stance-taking process towards taste, affect, and interaction.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	x
Chapter 1 .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Focus of study .....	1
1.1.1 Research questions .....	1
1.1.2. Food and cooking discourse .....	2
1.1.3 Television cooking shows as cultural artifacts .....	3
1.1.4 The socio-political background of television cooking shows in Romania and the US .....	4
1.1.4.1 The Romanian television and its historical context.....	5
1.1.4.2 The U.S. television and its historical context .....	7
1.1.5 Cooking show discourse as locus of the emergence of stance-taking .....	11
1.2 Chapter overview .....	12
Chapter 2 .....	15
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	15
Previous studies on taste, interaction, and cooking demonstrations.....	15
2.1. Introduction .....	15
2.2. Taste as reflection of culture and class .....	16
2.3. Studies on interaction between television hosts and viewing audiences .....	20
2.4. Previous studies on cooking demonstrations.....	22
2.4.1. Face-to-face cooking demonstrations.....	22
2.4.2. The analysis of television cooking shows in media and cultural studies.....	23
2.4.2.1. Taste and culture .....	23
2.4.2.2. Gender .....	26
2.4.2.3 Class .....	29
2.4.2.4. Leisure and lifestyle .....	31
2.5 Conclusion.....	34
Chapter 3 .....	36
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	36
Culture and Stance.....	36
3.1 Introduction .....	36

3.2 Defining culture.....	38
3.2.1 Culture as communication .....	44
3.3 Stance-taking in discourse .....	48
3.3.1 Defining <i>stance</i> .....	48
3.3.2 Stance and affect.....	53
3.3.3 Stance and interaction.....	55
3.3.4 Stance-taking in media discourse .....	57
3.4 Analytical tools for the examination of culture and stance .....	59
Chapter 4 .....	61
DATA AND METHODOLOGY .....	61
4.1 Introduction .....	61
4.2 The data .....	62
4.2.1 The television cooking show corpus .....	64
4.2.1.1 30 Minute Meals.....	64
4.2.1.2 The Essence of Emeril.....	65
4.2.1.3 The Recipe from Home .....	67
4.2.1.4 I Eat Therefore I Am .....	68
4.3 Methodology .....	70
4.3.1 Analytic approach.....	70
4.3.2 Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural analysis .....	74
4.4 Conclusion.....	75
Chapter 5 .....	77
DATA ANALYSIS .....	77
Affective stance-taking and taste in U.S. and Romanian TV cooking show discourse.....	77
5.1 Introduction .....	77
5.2 Analytical framework.....	79
5.2.1 Indexicality .....	79
5.2.2 Focus of study.....	81
5.3 Affective stance towards taste in U.S. and Romanian television cooking show discourse .....	83
5.3.1 Affect token frequency .....	84
5.3.2 Evaluating taste—a lexico-pragmatic qualitative analysis of taste and affect.....	85
5.3.2.1 Interjections as markers of vicarious consumption .....	85
5.3.2.2 Multi-sensory evaluations of <i>good</i> food.....	89
5.3.2.3 <i>Deliciousness</i> —originality, cooking technique, and ingredient choice .....	96

5.4 Conclusion.....	101
Chapter 6 .....	103
DATA ANALYSIS .....	103
Interactional stance in TV cooking show discourse from Romania and the U.S. ....	103
6.1 Introduction .....	103
6.2 Analytical framework.....	104
6.2.1 Interactional stance and frame analysis .....	104
6.2.2 Focus of study—interrogative and imperative constructions .....	107
6.2.2.1 Examples of interactional stance markers in television cooking show discourse ....	108
6.3 Interactional stance in television cooking shows from Romania and the US.....	110
6.3.1 Imperative and interrogative constructions as interactional stance markers of <i>focus</i> and <i>inclusion</i> .....	111
6.3.2 The linguistic construction of television cooking show host roles.....	114
6.3.1.1 Shifts in <i>footing</i> —between <i>television cook</i> and <i>friend</i> .....	115
6.3.1.1.1 SM as <i>cook</i> —understanding cooking procedures .....	116
6.3.1.1.3. RR as a <i>friend</i> —sharing life and cooking experiences .....	121
6.3.1.2. Shifts in <i>footing</i> —between television chef and entertainer.....	123
6.3.1.2.1 DC and EL as <i>chefs</i> —importance of cooking technique .....	124
6.3.1.2.2. DC and EL as <i>entertainers</i> —cooking as spectacle .....	126
6.3.1.3 The television host as <i>food connoisseur</i> .....	129
6.3.1.3.1 Evaluation through <i>increased focus</i> in Romanian television cooking shows ....	130
6.3.1.3.2 Evaluation through <i>increased focus</i> and <i>inclusion</i> in U.S. television cooking shows.....	132
6.3.1.4 The television cooking show host as <i>cultural agent</i> .....	134
6.3.1.4.1 Romanian cultural representations of continuity and change .....	135
6.3.1.4.2 U.S. cultural representations of continuity and change.....	139
6.4 Conclusion.....	142
Chapter 7 .....	145
INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS.....	145
Contextualizing stance .....	145
7.1 Introduction .....	145
7.2 Analytical framework.....	146
7.2.1 Indexical order and the discursive construction of social subjects.....	146
7.2.2 Focus of study.....	148
7.3 Constructions of “everyday life” in television cooking show discourse .....	149

7.3.1 Gender and class.....	150
7.3.2 Leisure and lifestyle .....	157
7.4 Conclusion.....	163
Chapter 8 .....	165
CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND FURTHER DIRECTIONS.....	165
8.1. Summary .....	165
8.2 Implications of present study.....	169
8.2.1 Stance-taking, culture, and communication .....	169
8.2.2 Gender and class.....	171
8.2.3 The television cooking show genre within a globalized media world.....	175
8.3 Further directions .....	177
Appendix A: Transcription symbols .....	179
Appendix B: List of abbreviations .....	180
Bibliography .....	182



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: <i>30 Minute Meals</i> episodes ; recipes and program length.....	67
Table 2: <i>The Essence of Emeril</i> episodes ; recipes and program length .....	68
Table 3: <i>The Recipe from Home</i> episodes ; recipes and program length .....	69
Table 4: <i>I Eat Therefore I Am</i> episodes ; recipes and program length .....	71
Table 5: The distribution of affective taste markers in television cooking shows from Romania and the U.S.. .....	83
Table 6: Types of affect taste tokens in <i>30 Minute Meals</i> and <i>The Recipe from Home</i> .....	86
Table 7: Types of affect taste tokens in <i>The Essence of Emeril</i> and <i>I Eat Therefore I Am</i> .....	86
Table 8: The frequency of inclusion and focus markers in the discourse of the four chefs—Simona Mihaescu (SM), Rachael Ray (RR), Dan Chisu (DC), and Emeril Lagasse (EL).....	113
Table 9: Types of affect taste tokens in <i>30 Minute Meals</i> and <i>The Recipe from Home</i> .....	151
Table 10: Types of affect taste tokens in <i>The Essence of Emeril</i> and <i>I Eat Therefore I Am</i> .....	151

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writing of this dissertation has been a long and not always easy process which at times seemed too self-centered to be worth undertaking. At the same time, it has been an invaluable experience which allowed me to not only learn a lot about the two languages and cultures in which I have lived the longest so far—Romanian and U.S. English, but also about my own values regarding self-respect, friendship, happiness, ambition, sacrifice, and family and academic life.

Many people—professors, family, friends, and many more—have influenced me along the way, by making this process either easier or more difficult. To those who have supported me, I thank you, I appreciate very much what you have done for me, and—for what it’s worth—I think of you often. So thank you, Meredith, for your professional guidance you have so kindly given me, for your selfless support, and the tremendous amount of time you have put into giving me thorough feedback on my work. Thanks for your constant enthusiasm for my dissertation topic since the day I came into your office to ask if you would be my adviser. I am certain that I would have never finished my studies if it had not been for your expertise, generous guidance, and friendship. In addition to guiding me in my academic endeavors, you have taught me the importance of constantly “checking in” with what is truly important to me as an individual, and of having the courage to act on it. Thank you so much!

Thank you, Bob, for your support—you are my role model for balancing so graciously your professional and personal life, and integrity and humanism. Thank you for your helpful feedback and wise advice throughout my doctoral studies.

I would like to express my warm gratitude to my committee members, Dr. Celeste Kinginger, Dr. Matt Jordan, and Dr. Steve Thorne for their valuable input, patience, encouragements, and guidance.

On a personal front, I am grateful to many, many good people: to my colleagues in the Applied Linguistics Department at Penn State who have been with me through thick and thin, and who shared my joy of having gone through and completing this process, in particular Gretchen Nauman, Davi Reis, Mary Kathryn Malone, and Priscilla Maunette; to my sister and my friends all over the world who both cheered for me and reminded me about life outside of academia; to my maternal grandmother, with whom I spent a good portion of my very young life which she so beautifully enriched with delicious homemade meals and oral stories—the only ones she knows and can tell; to my parents, who have always believed in me and supported my education in all possible and seemingly impossible ways; to my favorite professor from college, who passed away as I was working on this dissertation, but whose memory is more vivid than ever; and lastly, a loving multumesc to my two favorite people on earth for understanding why I was not always able to spend more time with them during my eternal studies—I’ve already made plans to make it up to you!

# **Chapter 1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Focus of study**

#### **1.1.1 Research questions**

In this dissertation, I attempt to answer the following questions:

Question 1:

How does a micro-linguistic analysis of the selected television cooking show corpus in terms of the expression of taste and affect contribute to understanding the role of indexicality in the construction of attitudes towards food and cooking?

Question 2:

How does a micro-linguistic analysis of the selected television cooking show corpus in terms of the expression of interactional features such as interrogatives and imperatives contribute to understanding the presentation of self by television cooking show hosts, and the construction of desirable lifestyle norms in Romania and the US?

Question 3 (exploratory aim):

What are the implications of this analysis for understanding how the 'everyday' instructional discourse of these television cooking shows reflects, reproduces, challenges, or offers alternatives to, the particular cultural schemata, values, and norms of the countries in which it is produced and viewed?

### 1.1.2. Food and cooking discourse

In this dissertation, I adopt a view of cooking show discourse as a *speech event* (Hymes, 1972; Duranti, 1997), or a culturally, socially, and historically contextualized language use that is collective in nature in that it emerges as a result of the contributions of all of its participants to this communicative act. Speech events, including television cooking shows, are thus intersubjective, context-dependent, and grounded in the cultural norms of their co-participants.

Food, cooking, and eating behaviors are rooted in the cultural frames of a given social group, and for many people, the taste of foods indexes tradition in that it is a trigger for memory and past experience tied to particular cultural contexts. People maintain tradition not only through “culturally-inscribed” taste preferences, but also through cooking processes, which typically take place in a home setting. Traditionally, the process of preparing food is transmitted from generation to generation, and from person to person, via live cooking demonstrations in which experts (members of the community with cooking experience and skill) demonstrate the preparation of traditional recipes, and novices act as apprentices who watch, ask questions about, and learn to reproduce the relevant cooking processes.

Further, in both Romanian and US contexts, professional titles of *cook* and *chef* are gender-specific in that *cook* is typically attributed to females who prepare food in a home setting, while *chef* is generally a title that is more accessible to males who prepare meals as a profession, usually in a restaurant setting. Because of these overall distinctive gender patterns associated with *cook* and *chef*, and because the television cooking show corpus analyzed here includes both male- and female- host programs, this dissertation study includes an analysis of gender-specific cooking show discourse in Romania and the US.

### 1.1.3 Television cooking shows as cultural artifacts

In this dissertation, I focus on a particular, modern instantiation of this transmission of expert cooking knowledge to an apprentice audience: television cooking programs. Taking up a corpus of cooking programs from two different cultural contexts—the US and Romania—the analysis to follow centers on the precise linguistic means by which male and female television cooking hosts both index and construct understandings of food, cooking, instruction, interaction, and culture. The hosts’ discourse is embedded concurrently in the semiotic space of their cooking show set and in the larger general cultural context in which their shows are being produced and viewed. Thus, the aim of this dissertation is to apply discourse analytic and linguistic anthropological conceptual tools to the analysis of contemporary US and Romanian media artifacts—cooking shows-- to examine patterns of language and cultural expression, particularly in relation to stance-taking, that concern taste, affect, and interaction in this media genre.

The television cooking show is a recognized and relatively successful media form in the US (Adema, 2000; Ketchum, 2005), arguably since the days of Julia Child’s *Mastering the Art of French Cooking*, and has experienced great gains in popularity and visibility since the creation of The Food Network, a specialized cooking show television channel, in 1993. In the Romanian context, this television genre is much more recent (early 2000’s), and only two of the cooking shows shown in Romania are actually filmed there (*I Eat Therefore I Am* and *The Recipe from Home*, the two Romanian shows included in the corpus analyzed for this project). These television cooking shows are part of a “new” (post-communist era) media culture in Romania, and are making consistent gains in popularity. The two US cooking shows selected for analysis, *30 Minute Meals* and *The Essence of Emeril*, are two of

the most popular US food preparation programs in the US (Ketchum, 2005), and are thus good representatives of this media genre. In the selection of these particular shows I also controlled for gender by choosing to focus on one female and one male host show from each country.

Since the present study focuses on a relatively limited corpus of television cooking programs--two from Romania, and two from the US--the findings presented in this dissertation are not intended to represent the full spectrum of US and Romanian television cooking programs, nor of definite cultural perspectives from these two national media contexts. Instead, the findings presented here are meant to provide an example of how a detailed cross-linguistic and cross-cultural analysis of discursive production in this television genre provides evidence of both differences and similarities in stance-taking, affective expression, and desired consumer lifestyles, between contemporary US and Romanian media cultures.

#### **1.1.4 The socio-political background of television cooking shows in Romania and the US**

In this section, I situate the television cooking shows analyzed in this dissertation both within the immediate media context—i.e., that of contemporary television—and within the broader historical context of each country, the U.S. and Romania. Such a discussion is relevant to this dissertation study in that it contributes to an understanding of the multitude of socio-political factors which influence the production of television cooking shows, but also the norms and preferences that such shows project. More specifically, this section focuses on the political arena in each country, including issues of commercialism, censorship, and overall access to broadcast media in general; it also points to past and present sociocultural

factors that may implicitly or explicitly prescribe the format and content of television cooking shows in Romania and the U.S.

#### **1.1.4.1 The Romanian television and its historical context**

The first Romanian television channel, *Televiziunea Romina* (TVR 1), was established in 1956; both TVR 1 and TVR 2, established in 1968, were under state control in Communist Romania until December 1989, when the Romanian Revolution took place. In this thirty year period of broadcasting, Romanian television—just like any other form of media, such as newspapers, magazines, and radio—was closely controlled by the Communist Party and other entities such as the police state supported by the Department of State Security, known as *Securitatea*. During this time, Romanian television broadcast for a couple of hours a day mostly political news surrounding the president Nicolae Ceausescu (Georgiadis, 2004).

While the two television channels, TVR 1 and TVR 2 continued to be state-controlled after 1989, other independent, private television channels were established very rapidly. The advent of independent media in Romania after the 1989 revolution, including cable television, not only signaled the beginning of a civil society, but also created the opportunity for new forms of cultural and identity expression through the variety and internationalization of television programs.

While before 1989 there had been two television stations in Romania, both state-owned, by 1998 there were seventy-two commercial television channels, many of which air programs from around the world, in particular from Western Europe and the US (Pichler & Ecker, 1999). Foreign programming includes HBO, Eurosport, Discovery, National Geographic, and Animal Planet, inter alia, and some of the Romanian commercial channels



are ProTV, Antena 1, Prima TV, Atomic TV, B1, Acasa TV and Realitatea TV; the shows analyzed in this dissertation come from the latter two, *Reteta de Acasa* from Acasa TV, and *I Eat Therefore I Am* from Realitatea TV.

According to Coman (2002), revenues from media advertising are the highest for television channels (cf. radio or newspapers) in Romania, which points to the financial power of contemporary state and commercial television. In addition, Georgiadis (2004) argues that given the centrality of television as a medium of communication in Romania, it has appealed to politicians as an arena for launching their political campaigns since the Romanian Revolution of 1989. In fact, some argue that the state owned television channel, TVR 1, played a central role in carrying out the 1989 revolution, as well as in the consolidation of power by the newly formed Romanian government as the revolution developed.

Arguably the second most important political event, chronologically speaking, in the Romanian post-communist era is its integration into the European Union (EU) in 2007. The EU enlargement to include Romania stipulated several economic, political, and social conditions that Romania had to meet before the enlargement, and some conditions that Romania still had to meet after its acceptance into the EU to maintain EU's financial support, crucial to Romania's continuing development (EU commission report, 2007). As during the Romanian revolution, during the EU enlargement process, Romanian television—both state-owned and commercial—played a key role in providing access to information to Romanian citizens on the EU enlargement process and EU's evaluation of the Romanian progress towards accession.

Thirty years of communist regime and censorship, the fall of communism in 1989, and lastly, Romania's inclusion into the EU almost twenty years later, all reflected in some way

in television production and broadcasting, resulted in dramatic changes in the Romanian landscape on all fronts—political, social, economic, and cultural. One of the main aims of this dissertation is to highlight some of the socio-cultural continuities and changes in contemporary Romania in light of the above mentioned historical events as observed in one of its newest media genre—the television cooking show.

In contrast with the novelty of this Romanian-produced media genre, U.S.-produced television cooking shows have started to gain in popularity since the 1960s with cooking show hosts such as Julia Child, James Beard, and Graham Kerr. In the following subsection, I highlight historical events relevant to the development of television broadcasting, including food television programming in the US.

#### **1.1.4.2 The U.S. television and its historical context**

In the U.S., from its very inception in 1936, US television broadcasting was controlled by the federal government, which monitored the compliance of television programming with the “freedom of speech” provision of the First Amendment. In addition, unlike in many other countries, in the US, both radio and television broadcasting had a strong commercial character from the very beginning (Casey et al., 2002; Miller, 2002, Hilmes, 2003). Also, in the first years of television broadcasting, while there were several independent stations, the dominant networks were NBC<sup>1</sup>, CBS<sup>2</sup>, and, by the end of the 1950s, ABC<sup>3</sup>. Following the Second World War, the number of US television stations increased from six to almost 600 within 15 years (Hilmes, 2002).

---

<sup>1</sup> The National Broadcasting Company

<sup>2</sup> The Columbia Broadcasting Company

<sup>3</sup> The American Broadcasting Company

However, the expansion of US television broadcasting was not linear, due, in part, to a combination of economic and regulatory factors (Ouellette, 2002). Before television broadcasting replaced radio as a mass communication medium in 1945, it was supported financially not only by outside sources, but also by radio stations. Due to technical problems, the FCC<sup>4</sup> was forced to declare a television licensing “freeze” in 1948. In this light, in a competition-free environment, the 108 existing licensed broadcasting networks, with the three leading networks, CBS, NBC, and ABC, prospered during the four-year freeze (Hilmes, 2002).

After FCC lifted the licensing freeze, both existing small stations and newly licensed stations typically sought affiliation with the most powerful networks, that is, CBS, NCB, and ABC for economic profits. In this context, the three networks increased their viewership by adding “the option time clause” to their contracts with their affiliate networks (Baughman, 1985; Hilmes, 2002). “The option time clause” involved the use by the big networks of the prime-time slots of the affiliate networks to broadcast programs nationally. According to Hilmes (ibid.), the option time clause, as well as other practices of CBS, NBC, and ABC raised the problem of the “oligopolistic control” of these networks, but no measures were taken in this respect.

In an attempt to recuperate investment costs, in the late 1950s, ABC began to orient its broadcasting more toward high-ranking programming, such as Hollywood films, Disney shows, and programs that appealed to a younger segment of the audience (Anderson, 1994; Hilmes, 2002). Thus, ABC became less focused on “cultural” programming and live studio productions, the latter of which had been considered superior to recorded programs in the past. This change in program content was also adopted by NBC and CBS by the late 1950s.

---

<sup>4</sup> Federal Communications Commission

Initially, public television<sup>5</sup>, which was an alliance of mainly college and television radio, then television stations, had as primary goal to instruct mass audiences by providing “intellectual” and “cultural” programming (Ouellette, 2002; Casey et al., 2002). While the National Association of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB)<sup>6</sup> obtained support from the FCC, the Ford Foundation, and other organizations in the form of allocation of broadcasting space and financial aid, program production costs allowed public television to air only five hours per week. Both the NAEB and the NET programming oftentimes included controversial political and social, as well as educational programs.

PBS was created by CPB<sup>7</sup> in 1967, and while PBS held control of program scheduling in collaboration with several independent stations, PBS was solely responsible for its publicity. Similarly to NET, some of PBS programming was controversial. Additionally, PBS developed programs covering “dramatic mini-series, business news, public affairs, nature documentaries, children’s television and cooking shows” (Marcus, 2002, p.56). However, due to pressure exerted by Nixon’s administration in the late 1960s in the form of accusations of conveying liberal ideologies, PBS began to shift its programming from a political focus to a predominantly cultural emphasis (Ledbetter, 1997).

On the one hand, this new programming format led to the television audience’s perception of PBS as a network of “effete cultural snobbery” (Marcus, 2002, p.56). On the other hand, Ouellette (2002) points out that Newton Minow, the chairman of the FCC in the 1960s viewed PBS as a potential model for the three big commercial networks, which he evaluated as “a vast wasteland” (Ouellette, 2002, p.55). Nevertheless, his attempt to shift the

---

<sup>5</sup> The alliance was called NAEB, the National Association of Educational Broadcasters (Hilmes, 2002, p.55)

<sup>6</sup> Later, NET (National Educational Television) took over NAEB’s programming. NET continued to produce until the 1970s, but was replaced by PBS (Public Broadcasting Service) as the national non-profit network by PBS (Hilmes, *ibid.* p.55)

<sup>7</sup> The Cooperation for Public Broadcasting

focus of commercial programming from sitcoms to “intellectual” programs failed.

Moreover, the type of cultural programming broadcast by PBS resulted in a decrease in its viewership, which in turn led to a decrease in funding. In the 1980s, in addition to the continued political pressure from Washington to promote conservative ideas, PBS also began to face competition from cable channels.

In 1972, cable television was included under FCC regulation, thus it began to be regarded as comparable to the former three big networks. In addition, because smaller, less successful stations also joined cable broadcasting, their status was equalized to that of ABC, CBS, NBC. Many media and cultural studies scholars consider the introduction of cable television revolutionary, in that it transformed television from a local to a national and even a global medium of communication (Casey et al., 2002; Miller, 2002; Murray and Ouellette, 2004, Ashley et al. 2004, *inter alia*).

New cable channels differed from existing networks in that they offered a wide variety of programming, including music, entertainment, news, sports and history. This multitude of offerings was possible because cable television adopted a distinct approach to funding from that of the previous big networks. Since a large portion of the income generated by cable television came from subscriber fees (Hilmes, 2002), cable channels became more independent from advertising companies, and thus were able to experiment with new, “niche” programming (de Solier, 2005), geared toward different segments of the population. Due to the emergence of new technologies, such as cable, satellite, and the internet, in the last twenty years the boundaries between national broadcasting systems have become less rigid. That is, television programming has shifted its initial strong nationalistic character established in the first years of broadcasting toward a more “globalized” approach.

An example of both “niche” programming that transcends national borders is The Food Network, a U.S. commercial cable channel, home to both *30 Minute Meals* and *The Essence of Emeril*. The Food Network airs 115 television cooking shows that are geared towards male, female, or a non-gender specific population, and features a wide range of tastes, recipe types, meal types, and occasions on which meals can be served. Thus, The Food Network presents both U.S. recipes, e.g., in the show *All-American Festivals* and international cuisine, e.g., *Mexican Made Easy*; hunger-appeasing vs. entertaining ideas, e.g., *Hungry Girl* and *Easy Entertaining with Michael Chiarello*; basic vs. sophisticated recipes, e.g., *How to Boil Water*, and *Private Chefs of Beverly Hills*; and lastly, quick recipes and non time-restricted ones, e.g., *30 Minute Meals* and *The Essence of Emeril*, among many other types of television cooking shows.

Contemporary food television, including the cooking shows presented on the commercial channel *The Food Network*, represent a sharp contrast to some of the first U.S. television cooking shows which aired on PBS, e.g., *The French Chef*, and which resonate with and illustrate Marcus’ (2002, p.56) evaluation of PBS as “effete cultural snobbery”, both in format type and intended audience. More specifically, unlike the first cooking shows, contemporary food programs are geared towards a much wider audience than the early PBS food programming, in part through content, i.e., recipe type, but also through an overall more informal and non-technical cooking show discourse that is accessible to a general public.

#### **1.1.5 Cooking show discourse as locus of the emergence of stance-taking**

The present study is thus a micro- and macro-level discourse analysis of *affective and interactional stance-taking* in television cooking show discourse from Romania and the US

that draws from anthropology (e.g., Mannheim and Tedlock, 1995) and sociology (e.g., Bourdieu's (1991) notion of *habitus*) to adopt an understanding of *culture as communication* that views both individual and collective expression as its building blocks. In order to explore how cultural expression is enacted in the interactional discourse of television cooking show hosts, the transcription conventions of Conversation Analysis have been adopted here, as they allow for a detailed rendering of the words spoken, as well as of the speaker's prosodic features, pauses and intonation. Such a level of linguistic and paralinguistic detail is crucial to the analysis of stance-taking in discourse.

In adopting these aims I address a considerable gap in existing research through a) the method of analysis adopted here—a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches to the study of discursive production, and an integrated view of the relationship between macro- and micro-level cultural meanings; b) the analysis of two sets of previously unanalyzed television cooking shows from a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspective; and c) the discourse analytic approach to the study of contemporary Romanian television, which is the first study of this kind.

## **1.2 Chapter overview**

This dissertation is organized as follows: Chapter 2 provides an overview of current work in the broad area of television cooking show discourse by presenting existing empirical research on taste, interaction and cooking demonstrations from a linguistic anthropology and communication perspective, and topics discussed in media and cultural studies from a theoretical perspective such as taste and culture, gender, class, and leisure and lifestyle.

Chapter 3 defines the constructs of *culture as communication* and *stance-taking*--including work on affective and interactional stance-taking--which will lay the groundwork for the analyses in Chapters 5, 6, and 7; in Chapter 3 I also preview the analytical frameworks which will be used in this study, *indexicality* (e.g., Ochs, 1996), *frame analysis*, (Goffman, 1974), *footing* (Goffman, 1981), *the presentation of self* (Goffman, 1959), and *indexical order* (Silverstein, 2003). Chapter 4 offers a detailed account of the present study's methodology, describing the context and nature of each of the shows analyzed in this study, as well as the methods of transcription and data coding used, and the key procedures for data analysis, along with other methodological details of the analysis of stance.

Chapter 5 begins with a discussion of the television cooking show as a *speech event* (Hymes, 1972) and continues with the analysis of affective stance-taking towards taste through the lens of *indexicality* (Ochs, 1996; Peirce, 1955; Silverstein, 2003) in the selected cooking show corpus. In this chapter, I show that in addition to cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences regarding stance, taste, and affect, cooking show discourse from the two countries displays common discursive patterns, some of which are gender-specific, e.g., the choice and frequency distribution of affective features.

In Chapter 6, I appeal to Goffman's constructs of *frame analysis* (1974), *presentation of self* (1959), and *footing* (1981), to present the roles that cooking show hosts set forth in their programs; specifically, I discuss roles such as cook, chef, friend, entertainer, evaluator, and cultural agent. In Chapter 7, I use Silverstein's *indexical order* (2003) to bridge micro- and macro-level perspectives analyzed in Chapters 5 and 6 with elements of the broader context, both of the cooking show, and of Romanian and US cultures. Chapter 8 offers concluding remarks about the significance of the discourse analysis offered, and a discussion



of future directions for the analysis of both face-to-face and television discourse that can shed light on the concept of affective and interactional stance-taking.

## **Chapter 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **Previous studies on taste, interaction, and cooking demonstrations**

##### **2.1. Introduction**

In this chapter, I review the current scholarly work in linguistic anthropology, communication, and media and cultural studies on taste, interaction, and cooking demonstrations. While the television cooking show genre is a prevalent media form in both contemporary US and Romania (Adema, 2000; Miller, 2002; Ketchum, 2005), this genre has exclusively been studied from a media and cultural studies perspective.

There are a few linguistic anthropological (Ochs et al. 1996; Mayes, 2005; Strauss, 2005) and communication studies (Kline, 2005) on taste, interaction, and cooking demonstrations which I highlight in this chapter, and which offer useful insights for the present dissertation, i.e., the adoption of both a qualitative and quantitative, and macro and micro-level approach to discourse analysis; the analysis of taste expression in Japanese, Korean, and US television commercials; the recognition of taste as socializing factor in Italian and US dinner table conversations; the identification of cultural differences in face-to-face instructional cooking discourse in the US compared with Japan; and the focus on features of interactional discourse between television hosts and remote callers in a home shopping program. However, in spite of all these commonalities between these studies and the present dissertation, the aforementioned studies differ greatly from this dissertation in terms of genre and scope of inquiry, in that the present study focuses on the analysis of stance, taste, affect, and interaction in television cooking show discourse from Romania and

the US. Thus, the uniqueness of this dissertation lies not only in the countries included in the analysis—Romania and the US—but also in the combination of the study of taste, affect, interaction, and stance.

The present dissertation seeks to address a considerable gap in the current literature on both television cooking programs, and any media in Romania, by adopting a qualitative and quantitative, micro- and macro-level approach to the linguistic and cultural analysis of taste and interaction in television cooking show discourse from Romania and the US. The main theoretical lens to which I appeal in the study of taste and interaction is *stance-taking* in discourse (e.g., Kärkkäinen, 2006; Du Bois, 2007) coupled with the construct of *culture as communication* (e.g., Bourdieu, 1977, 1990, 1991). These concepts are central to the linguistic and cultural analysis of taste, affect and interaction in media discourse in that on the one hand, a stance-taking framework is conducive to the investigation of micro level features of discourse; on the other hand, within a contemporary view of culture as communication, the television cooking show discourse both reflects and constructs patterns of meaning (e.g., Mannheim and Tedlock, 1995; Bakhtin, 1981) within the contexts of US and Romanian culture.

## **2.2. Taste as reflection of culture and class**

The choice to focus on taste as an analytic category in television cooking programs derives from the work of Bourdieu (1984), who underscores the fundamental relation between taste and culture by drawing a parallel between gastronomic taste and aesthetic taste, and mundane manifestations of culture and broader cultural parameters.

”...one cannot fully understand cultural practices unless *culture*, in the restricted, normative sense of ordinary usage, is brought back into *culture* in the anthropological sense, and the elaborated taste for the most refined objects is reconnected with the elementary taste for the flavors of food.” (Bourdieu, 1984: 1)

Thus, both day-to-day cultural practices and taste and food preferences reveal and define human habits, lifestyles, beliefs, and how we perceive and create reality. Taste encompasses not only aesthetic preferences, but also involves culture-specific understandings of nutrition that affect food selection rules and food consumption etiquette, all of which are class-determined; that is, on the one hand, social class determines the foods to which people have access, and on the other hand, social groupings and their attendant cultural values including food, tend to cluster according to food-related preferences.

According to Bourdieu, taste “ [...] governs all forms of incorporation, choosing and modifying everything that the body ingests and digests and assimilates, physiologically and psychologically” (ibid. p.190). Bourdieu further distinguishes between the *tastes of luxury* and the *tastes of necessity* as indicative of class: taste is driven by the capital (material goods) to which individuals and groups have access, thus shaping preferences and eating habits from as early as childhood:

“The true basis of the differences found in the area of consumption, and far beyond it, is the opposition between the tastes of luxury (or freedom) and the tastes of necessity. The former are the tastes of individuals who are the product of material conditions of existence defined by distance from necessity, by the freedoms or facilities stemming from possession of capital; the latter express, precisely in their adjustment, the necessities of which they are the product” (1994, p.177).

In other words, the tastes of necessity are acquired as a result of food scarcity, which in turn leads to a preference for foods that are plentiful, filling, and strength-giving, while the

tastes of luxury are driven by a relative freedom from the requirements of basic nourishment alone, and tied to the affordability of a wider variety of meal choices, meal display options, and culinary tools, techniques, and conventions.

Since taste—in food, among other tastes- is tied to culture, it is acquired through the same processes of socialization that transmit other forms of cultural knowledge. Children learn the cultural norms that govern the principles of taste through both informal interactions with family members and more formal interactions in the school setting (Bourdieu, 1984, p.67). In an empirical study of dinner table conversations of American and Italian families, Ochs et al. (1996) analyze the ways in which taste is learned through socializing practices. Throughout their observations of socializing practices in the two cultures studied, Ochs et al. (ibid.) note a portrayal of *food as nutrition*, *food as material good*, and *food as reward* in the American interactions (tastes of necessity), in contrast with the construction of *food as pleasure* in the Italian interactions (tastes of luxury).

Ochs et al. (1996) point out two further intercultural differences within the socializing process of taste in the two cultures: one relates taste to *the child as individual* and *the child as social status*, and the second analyzes the relation between taste and *the alignment of adults and children*. Where American adults made generalizations regarding childrens' taste preferences (e.g., concerning what children should or should not like, or what constitutes appropriate “children’s food”), Italian adults encouraged children to have taste preferences of their own, without imposing distinctions between “children’s food” and “adult food.” Also, in the Italian family context, children typically preferred to eat the same meals that the adults ate, which underscores a strong sense of family identity and unity. Conversely, in the

American family context, children and adults often had strong opposing views regarding taste preferences.

Other cross-linguistic and cross-cultural studies have investigated expressions of taste as a representation of culture, as depicted in televised advertising of food and beverage products. Strauss (2005) explores culturally-influenced representations and their linguistic realizations of *taste as sensory perception* and *taste as aesthetic preference* in the genre of the television food commercial in the U.S., Korea, and Japan.

Strauss' (2005) study discusses similarities and differences in patterns of aestheticizing food products in television advertising through a focus on linguistic terms relating to gustatory, visual, tactile, olfactory and auditory sensory perception. From the perspective of taste as aesthetic preference, Strauss (ibid.) notes the predominant occurrence of generic descriptors and a minimal use of hyperbole and animated vocal exclamations in the Japanese commercials. In contrast, the U.S. and Korean commercials exhibited highly specific taste descriptors and a large number of hyperbolic expressions and emphatic reactive tokens.

From a methodological perspective, Strauss (2005) employs a micro-level semiotic analysis of taste descriptor types and frequencies, coupled with the examination of more macro-level elements such as images and communication styles to elucidate the representation of taste preferences in the U.S., Japanese, and Korean cultures. On a micro-level, the study reveals distinct conceptualizations of flavor across the three cultures. That is, in the Japanese commercials, taste preferences were expressed through generic and non-specific descriptors—predominantly *oishii* and *umai* (meaning “good tasting” or “delicious”), signaling only the gustatory domain of sensory perception. In contrast, taste preferences in

the U.S. and Korean commercials were indicated through perceptually complex descriptors which mesh domains of sensory perceptions.

For example, the U.S. commercials are replete with such synaesthetic expressions as “ooey gooey” (for cinnamon rolls—tactile and gustatory) and “creamy and rich” (for peanut butter—tactile and gustatory). Similarly, Korean commercials are replete with expressions such as *wulhtwung pwulhwtung* “hard and bumpy” (for coffee flavored candy—tactile and gustatory) and *ccalishay* “it’s stinging” (for a carbonated beverage—tactile and gustatory). Cultural preferences here are revealed through the subtlety of language use in that the television advertising in Japan clearly favors generic and neutral expressions of taste coupled with implied messages concerning product quality; the audience is left to infer the goodness of each product through brand names and mere hints at taste and pleasure. In sharp contrast, Korean and U.S. commercials specify taste quality in minute detail, from the multiple points of view of taste as tactile experience and taste as sensual pleasure; what each product has to offer is typically highlighted with great clarity.

### **2.3. Studies on interaction between television hosts and viewing audiences**

The only empirical, micro- and macro-level study of interaction between television hosts and remote audiences in a communication studies vein is a study by Kline (2005) who examines persuasive strategies in U.S. television home shopping programming such as QVC Inc. and Home Shopping Network. Kline (ibid.) aims to understand how commercial influence discourse contributes to the business success of such programming, by building on a previously-discussed concept in scholarly work in the field of communication, *parasocial interaction* (Auter and Moore, 1993), and by proposing that *lamination* (Goffman, 1974), or

the creation of multiple meanings of interpretation through multiple actions, is also at play in television home shopping discourse.

Drawing on the analysis of argument and persuasive discourse (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1983; Clark, 1984), as well as on Brown and Levinson's (1987) analysis of politeness forms, Kline (2005) identifies several persuasive discursive strategies in the data analyzed: the construction of trustworthy relationships between hosts and television viewers by inviting viewers into the studio via phone, or inviting product experts who praise the quality of items for sale, or the hosts and callers' expression of feelings and viewpoints; seeking consensus through inquiry and advocacy, in particular regarding callers' needs for a certain product; creating a believable reality for product worth; staging impressive messages for viewers from other previous shoppers of the same product; and lastly, facilitating teleshopper commitment.

The study by Kline is important to this dissertation in that it acknowledges and investigates the role of interaction between television hosts and viewers and callers, and in that it is the only communications study which bridges micro- and macro-level perspectives of analysis. However, the present dissertation examines host-audience interaction in a different media form—television cooking shows; moreover, the goal of this dissertation is not to analyze persuasive discursive strategies that lead to the success of the cooking shows analyzed in this study, but linguistic and cultural patterns instantiating affect, taste, interaction and stance.



## **2.4. Previous studies on cooking demonstrations**

While there are no scholarly studies on Romanian cooking demonstrations, there is some previous U.S. scholarly work on cooking demonstrations that has centered on face-to-face cooking classes from a linguistic anthropological perspective (e.g., Mayes, 2005) as well as on media-based demonstrations in the field of media and cultural studies (e.g., Ketchum 2005; Adema 2000; Miller, 2002). These studies often relate issues of culture to food preparation, presentation, entertainment, cooking time, and so forth. In what follows, I review Mayes' study (2005) on U.S. and Japanese face-to-face cooking demonstrations (section 2.4.1), and then I discuss relevant media and cultural studies on television cooking shows (section 2.4.2).

### **2.4.1. Face-to-face cooking demonstrations**

Mayes' (2005) study on social interaction focuses on contextual variables and language use in the discourse of face-to-face cooking classes in the U.S. and Japan with a view to understanding not only the construction of the participants' social identities within such an event, but also the structures of the establishments offering these classes and the social structures in general (p. 331). Mayes (*ibid.*) notes that while the two culinary instructional situations were comparable in terms of the genre to which they belonged, they differed mostly in terms of levels of formality.

That is, participants in the Japanese cooking classes exhibited greater degrees of deference in their interactions and a heightened sensitivity to status differences. These differences were observed through a micro level analysis centering on intonation, lexicon,

turn taking, and the use of honorific language in the Japanese cooking classes, and the lexicon and turn taking patterns in the U.S. cooking classes.

#### **2.4.2. The analysis of television cooking shows in media and cultural studies**

Media and cultural studies scholarly work on television cooking shows from the U.S. center on the discursive construction of various social categories such as taste and culture (Adema, 2000; Miller, 2002), gender (e.g., Ketchum, 2005), class (e.g., de Solier, 2005), and leisure and lifestyle (e.g., Adema, 2000; Ketchum, 2005), many of which are also relevant to the television cooking shows from Romania and the U.S. analyzed in this dissertation. In what follows, I provide a more detailed review of those aspects of taste, gender, class, leisure and lifestyle constructs present in work in media and cultural studies that are most germane to this dissertation.

##### **2.4.2.1. Taste and culture**

In his article, “From Brahmin Julia to Working Class Emeril: The Evolution of Television Cooking”, Miller (2002) notes the changes in cooking discourse from the 1960s public television cooking programming of Julia Child, to that of contemporary food channels, e.g., the Food Network (based in the U.S.) and the Carlton Food Network (based in the UK). That is, according to Miller (ibid.), unlike television cooking shows from the 1960’s, contemporary television food programming includes recipes that reflect a wide range of tastes, affordability, and types of cuisines. Drawing on Dimaggio (1991) and Levine (1988),

Collins (2002a) explains that in the 1850's, the so-called Boston Brahmins<sup>8</sup> contributed to the separation of "high culture" and "popular culture" by gaining hegemonic control of non-profit cultural organizations and by acting as "gatekeepers" of the cultural life in Boston (p.4).

That is, while the Brahmins opened access to museums, opera houses and concert halls to the working class, they did so with a view to instruct the masses that "to be cultured was to do as the Brahmins did (and the Brahmins didn't *do* popular culture)" (Collins, 2002a, p.4). Similarly to the Brahmins, and with the authority of a middle class representative, Julia Child teaches her audiences how to cook French cuisine, which she "domesticated" (Krishnendu, 2007) on public television. In other words, Julia Child Americanized French food, brought refined food into the home and "normalized the extraordinary" (Krishnendu, 2007, p. 51).

In contrast to the "high culture" values promoted by cooking programs in the 1960s<sup>9</sup>, contemporary cooking shows on the Food Network promote "a blend of high and low, [...] called midcult" (Miller, 2002, p.84). This "midcult" is constructed on and reflects diverse values, just as diverse as today's television audience is, in terms of class, taste, and race. Miller (2002) illustrates the concept of "midcult" through a discussion of two contemporary television chefs, Jacques Pépin and Emeril Lagasse. In addition to being a television chef on PBS and on the Food Network, as well as a cookbook author, Jacques Pépin is a United Airlines "Celebrity chef," where he designs upscale meals for first- and business-class travelers (Miller, *ibid.*, p.84). Pépin also serves as Dean of Special Programs at the French Culinary Institute in New York City, teaches in the Gastronomy Department at Boston

---

<sup>8</sup> Also known as "The First Families of Boston" (Andrews, 1996).

<sup>9</sup> Here I refer not only to Julia Child, but also to television chefs such as James Beard and Graham Kerr.

University, and contributes to the *Food and Wine* journal. In contrast to Pepin's academic culinary interests and cuisine expertise and audience, Emeril Lagasse is a "self-made celebrity" and Jacques' "working-class equivalent" who has two shows on the Food Network where he demonstrates French-inspired recipes, and is the chef-proprietor of thirteen high-end restaurants<sup>10</sup>.

In section 2.2, I discussed Bourdieu's distinction between the tastes of luxury and the tastes of necessity as indicative of class; however, Miller (2002) argues that the distinction between the tastes of luxury and the tastes of necessity may not be as clear in the U.S. culture dating from the 1990s on as it was in France in the 1960s. This is due in part to the democratization and the commercialization of taste, but also to a blend of high and low culinary and aesthetic taste. According to Miller (2002), "Food television normalizes the exotic for the suburbia and exoticizes the normal for a hip *elite*, middle-class homeworkers, and late-night revelers" (p.84, emphasis original). Miller's (2002) idea is exemplified by the cooking show discourse of television chefs such as Emeril Lagasse, who encourages viewing audiences to try his recipes by claiming that his cooking "ain't rocket science, y'a know?", even when he makes G noise cake or *coq au vin* [chicken with wine], which are French recipes traditionally viewed as difficult to prepare.

Along the same lines, Adema (2000; also Levine, 1988) argues that cooking programs contribute to the democratization and commodification of a taste for haute cuisine; that is, Adema (ibid.) argues that this democratization process is similar to the process of chromolithography as part of which "original paintings were lithographically reproduced in color and thus [made] affordable to the general public" (p.117). However, other scholars

---

<sup>10</sup> Retrieved from <http://www.emerils.com/emerilology/bio> August 16, 2011.

argue on the one hand that both chromolithography and television haute cuisine may contribute to cultural dilution, and, on the other hand, that television food programming may in fact increase the cultural capital of foods from other cultures, in particular French cuisine (Miller 2002, Adema 2000). In this dissertation, I support Adema's argument of the democratization of haute cuisine through television cooking show discourse; I also argue that television cooking programs in fact contribute to maintaining cultural values surrounding cooking and eating while at the same time they promote new eating and cooking patterns that are presented as healthier, more affordable, less time consuming, or overall as a desired change from previous recipes.

#### **2.4.2.2. Gender**

Most gender-related research studies on food programming analyze the negotiation of post-modernist male and female identities as expressed in television cooking shows. The most frequently discussed gender issues in current research on food programming center on a series of contrasting and co-occurring concepts such as domestic and female vs. public and male (Andrews, 2003; Hollows, 2003a; 2003b), and to some extent, the "domestic housewife" vs. "the feminist" (Hollows, 2003a).

However, some studies focus on the popularization of existing gender identities (Smith & Wilson, 2004). For example, in addition to portraying cooking as a simple, affordable process, the cooking show *Cookin' Cheap* introduces "the feminized Southern man" as a domestic cook and at the same time, as a "kind, gentle man of the South," who lacks "machismo" (Smith & Wilson, p.189). The cooking show producers and hosts' desire for the introduction and the popularization of this Southern male identity comes from their

wish to familiarize nationwide audiences with a less known persona of the Southerner, the gentle, feminized man. Even though this identity of the Southerner is represented by many political figures and popular culture characters<sup>11</sup>, it is not typically associated with the South. Thus, *Cookin' Cheap* popularizes this Southern identity in part with a view to counter the more widely known negative identities usually viewed as Southern, that of “the redneck” and “the white trash” (Smith & Wilson, 2004, p. 192).

Through these gender representations, cooking programming hints at non-gender related anxieties of Western television audiences; such anxieties are a result of the fluidity of boundaries (Andrews, 2004) of both “domestic spaces, such as the kitchen, and of gender” (p.195) in postmodernism. That is, the change from cooking as a purely private act to cooking as both private and public, and women’s increased participation in paid labor are two of the main factors that led to the blurring of boundaries between public and private spaces, and male and female roles (Andrews, 2004).

On the one hand, in cooking shows, we note several gender-specific patterns. Female hosts, e.g., Rachael Ray, demonstrate recipes from “homey” looking kitchens, thus legitimizing the domestic cooking setting as “feminine” (Andrews 2004, Hollows 2003a). Additionally, female television hosts point to female relatives such as mothers and aunts as their source of culinary knowledge. In contrast, male hosts, e.g., Emeril Lagasse, typically distance themselves from food preparation as a domestic act by situating their cooking in the public sphere, usually a restaurant, and by framing their culinary skills as gained through professional training (Andrews, *ibid.*, p.196).

On the other hand, contemporary gender identities are not fixed, but rather flexible. This negotiation of identities is discussed in existing literature in the self-representation of

---

<sup>11</sup> Bill Clinton, Jimmy Carter, John Edwards, Forrest Gump (Smith & Wilson, 2004, p.192).

two British hosts<sup>12</sup>, Nigella Lawson and Jamie Oliver, and one American host, Emeril Lagasse. Throughout her shows and cooking materials, Nigella Lawson sets forth a feminine model, the “domestic goddess” (Lawson, 2000) situated at the intersection of “the housewife” and “the feminist” (Hollows, 2003a). One of the central ways in which Nigella constructs this new feminine model is by portraying women’s relationship to cooking as pleasure in itself, and as driven by her own pleasure for eating. However, Hollows (2003a) notes that Nigella presents the position of “domestic goddess” as only available in fantasy<sup>13</sup>, as a matter of choice, and most importantly, as a temporary position.

Along the same lines, the female gender identities of liberation from the kitchen are tightly connected to class (Hollows, 2003a, 2003b), in that having the luxury to choose a certain identity is a symbol of membership in the new middle classes. Drawing on Featherstone (1991a), Hollows (2003a) points out that the new middle classes are characterized by the idea that “there are no rules, only choices” (Hollows, 2003a, p.196). This concept is paralleled in feminist research by “popular individualistic feminism” which frames feminism as a concern of the new middle classes (Skeggs, 1997). The discourse of choice refers not only to sets of opposing identities, such as “feminism and domesticity”, but also to “workplace and family, paid work and domestic labor, and “work-work” and “work-leisure”” (Hollows, 2003a, p.197).

To some extent, Emeril Lagasse situates his cooking show persona at the intersection of private and public spheres (Hollows 2003b, Ketchum 2005). On a macro level, Ketchum (ibid.) analyzes Emeril’s situatedness in both private and public places, by comparing the

---

<sup>12</sup> Their shows also air in the U.S. (Jamie Oliver—Hollows 2003b, Nigella Lawson—retrieved June 15, 2007 from [http://www.foodnetwork.com/food/shows\\_a\\_to\\_z/0,1976,FOOD\\_10001,00.html](http://www.foodnetwork.com/food/shows_a_to_z/0,1976,FOOD_10001,00.html) ) and Australia (de Solier, 2005).

<sup>13</sup> Hollows (2003a) quotes Nigella Lawson (2000, p.vii) who in one of her books explains that the position she sets forth is that of *feeling* like a domestic goddess, not “*being* a domestic goddess exactly” (emphases original).

overall format of Emeril's two shows, *The Essence of Emeril* and *Emeril Live*. While the setting of the first show is Emeril's personal kitchen where Emeril cooks alone, the second show, *Emeril Live*, is imbued with a "party atmosphere" due to the presence of an audience and of different camera shots. *Emeril Live* opens with Emeril running through the audiences and shaking hands with them on his way to his studio kitchen where he cooks (Ketchum, 2005, p.225). In addition to Emeril's dual self-representation as both domestic cook and restaurant chef, his accessible personality and his language use, peppered with "female-directed sexual appeal and male-directed machismo" attract a wide audience of both male and female viewers (Adema, 2000, p.116).

#### **2.4.2.3 Class**

While televised cooking programs reflect both "lowbrow" and "highbrow" cultures (Levine, 1988), "highbrow" elements pervade the cooking show discourse. "Lowbrow" cultures are represented either by cooking programs in which the hosts demonstrate recipes made with inexpensive ingredients (de Solier, 2005; Smith & Wilson, 2001), or by commercials broadcast during or between cooking shows for inexpensive products or restaurants (Ketchum, 2005; de Solier, 2005). "Highbrow" cultures are dually constructed through the representation of the TV hosts' economic status, as observed in the commodities that they have in the kitchen, e.g., cookware and/or appliances, and through the hosts' commodities and social status in real life (Ketchum, *ibid.*), which are publicized through magazines, Internet websites, or other media forms.

While the term "highbrow" is generally used to refer to an upper segment of the society in terms of class, some scholars use a more specific term, "the new middle classes"



(Featherstone, 1991b; Hollows, 2003a; de Solier, 2005), with reference to the highbrow class category situated in post-modernism. Two of the characteristics of the new middle classes discussed in current research are “calculated hedonism” (Featherstone 1991b) and “the aestheticization of everyday life” (Featherstone, 1991a). “Calculated hedonism” refers to the pleasure-giving activity of cooking and eating, coupled with a need for self-control. That is, within the consumption practices of the new middle classes, “discipline and hedonism are no longer seen as incompatible” (Featherstone, 1991b, p. 171). According to Hollows (2003a, 2003b) one of the expressions of hedonism of the new middle classes is their indulgence in foods that in the past were typically associated with the working classes, such as lard and meat pie.

“The aestheticization of everyday life” refers to the framing of everyday experiences as part of a certain lifestyle. According to Bourdieu (1994), the lifestyle of the new middle classes is based on “a morality of pleasure as duty”, within which the idea of “having fun” is central to one’s self-esteem (Bourdieu, 1984, p.367). In this light, cooking is viewed as “aestheticized leisure” and as a pleasure-giving activity (Featherstone 1991a, Hollows 2003a).

Meister (2001) notes that social distinction, leisure, and technology are elements of the “good life rhetoric” of the Food Network (Meister, *ibid.*, p.177). That is, according to Meister (*ibid.*), the Food Network frames “living a good life” as enjoying the food preparation process in an apparent limitless amount of time, and as contingent upon cooking and eating “haute cuisine”, and using the latest and most expensive kitchen appliances. Meister (2001) criticizes the Food Network’s “good life” discourse which, he argues,

underscores differences between “those who have and those who have not” (Meister, *ibid.*, p.177).

The only television cooking show discussed in current research that does not reflect highbrow taste cultures is *Cookin’ Cheap* (Smith & Wilson, 2004). At the same time, it is not necessarily targeted to a lowbrow segment of U.S. society. However, it promotes the display of a lack of economic capital in all aspects of the show: the use of inexpensive ingredients, the simplicity of cooking instructions, the kitchen furnishings, and the flea-market appliances. This inexpensiveness of products is paralleled by an uncouth production of the show, “as an aversion to highly processed media texts” (Smith & Wilson, 2004, p.182).

Through the theme of “Cookin’ Cheap”, the show advances a distancing from highbrow taste cultures and pretentiousness, that is, it purposely does not offer audiences access to the second form of cultural capital, aesthetic culinary knowledge. At the same time, it promotes the cultural values of simplicity of Southern small-town life, and it invokes the nostalgia of a commodity-free culture, both on screen and in real life. In the context of post-modernism, through the cultural values and frugality principles that it sets forth, “Cookin’ Cheap” invites viewers to fantasize about a time when cooking did not have to be sophisticated and did not emphasize the need of access to economic capital.

#### **2.4.2.4. Leisure and lifestyle**

An analysis of U.S. contemporary television programming reveals not only an apparent blending of the spaces reserved for cooking and for eating, but also a clear framing of household chores, e.g., cooking and serving meals, as leisure and fun activities. For

example, at the end of the program, Emeril Lagasse, Giada de Laurentiis, and most other food program hosts on Food Network taste their meals while standing, in the same space where they prepare the meals (Adema, 2000; Hollows, 2003). In the same vein, in contemporary food programming, “cooking as leisure activity” is also expressed in the minimization of cooking technique. For instance, Adema (ibid.) observes that Emeril Lagasse simplifies technique to the extent that a sponge cake is the same as a “Génoise cake”<sup>14</sup>. This lack of focus on technique detail contrasts with an emphasis on technique in the cooking shows of the 1960s (Smith & Wilson, 2004; Krishnendu, 2007).

Food preparation programs are also considered “lifestyle” programming, as in addition to teaching audiences how to cook, they instruct people on how to live a “good” life of consumption (Meister 2001, Ketchum 2005). A comparative analysis of some of the first television cooking shows such as James Beard’s cooking shows<sup>15</sup>, “The Galloping Gourmet”<sup>16</sup>, and “The French Chef”, and contemporary cooking programs, such as *The Essence of Emeril* and *30 Minute Meals* reveals differences in lifestyle patterns, which I discuss in the remainder of this section. Lifestyle patterns reflected in cooking shows inform on the broader cultural contexts of these programs (Miller 2002, Krishnendu 2007), including health-related eating and cooking habits (Ketchum, 2005).

The analysis of the lifestyle of the period between 1940s and 1970s as observed in television cooking programs reveals a strong influence of French cuisine and a preference for

---

<sup>14</sup> According to Adema (2000), who draws on Lang (1984)’ “Larousse Gastronomique”, the preparation of a Génoise requires an “importantly different process” than that of a sponge cake.

<sup>15</sup> James Beard’s cooking shows were the first on television, and first aired in 1946 on NBC. Retrieved July 28, 2007, from <http://www.jamesbeard.org/about/beard.shtml>.

<sup>16</sup> A cooking show whose host was Graham Kerr and which was produced from 1969 until 1971. Retrieved July 28, 2007, from <http://www.grahamkerr.com/gk.php>.

gourmet and decadent meals<sup>17</sup> (Miller, 2002). Contemporary U.S. cooking programming as presented on Food Network is shaped by influences from several international cuisines, including French, which still has a great impact on television food programming (Miller, 2002). According to Miller (ibid.), beginning with the 1980s “importing cuisines” has become much more common than in the 1960s, which he argues, helps build on the concept of “tourism in a bowl”, a slogan which claims to offer the “experience” of other cultures through their foods.

A striking difference between television cooking programs in the 1960s and contemporary cooking programming is the concern for health during the ingredient selection process<sup>18</sup>. That is, the majority of present day television chefs make comments on how healthy their meals are, or conversely, on how decadent they are with a view to advertise an excessive and hedonistic approach to cooking and eating habits (Meister, 2001; Hollows, 2003). For example, Rachael Ray typically presents her meals as not only fast, but also “[a] delicious and healthy [meal]”, and she claims to use few ingredients high in fat. In contrast, Emeril Lagasse adopts “an aggressive approach to cooking” (Adema, 2000, p.116) within which “more is better”. That is, one of Emeril’s key cooking concepts is “BAM! Kick it up a notch” (Adema, ibid., p.116), which means that the more cream, spices, garlic, butter, he adds, the tastier the meal.

In contrast, television food programming of the 1960s as observed in Julia Child’s episode “French Crêpes I” does not typically make reference to how fatty ingredients are, or

---

<sup>17</sup> I base this argument on Julia Child’s series “The French Chef”, on a website that is home to James Beard Foundation and which provides information about his cooking career, and on information provided by PBS about Graham Kerr, the latter of which was retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/juliachild/meet/kerr.html> on July 28, 2007.

<sup>18</sup> Ketchum (2005) notes that Food Network began to air the first two programs focusing on eating healthy meals only in 2004.

how excessively she uses them<sup>19</sup>. That is, Julia Child uses lard in her meals and she constantly cooks with butter, which she keeps melted nearby so that she can use it at almost every step of the cooking process. Graham Kerr is an example of the changing trend in television cooking from rich to healthy meals, in that his early television cooking program, “The Galloping Gourmet”, presented recipes for meals rich in fat and high in calorie content. In contrast, the programs that Kerr produced later in life are similar to contemporary cooking shows in that they focus on healthy meal ideas<sup>20</sup>.

A common trait of contemporary food preparation programming that teaches audiences how to do something at home is that such programming conceals many aspects of the process that television hosts demonstrate by setting forth an unreal presentation of cooking; this element of fantasy is considerably more ubiquitous in contemporary cooking show discourse than in that of the 1960s. For example, Julia Child does not claim to prepare everything in a limited amount of time, makes culinary mistakes on the set, and frames them as a natural part of the cooking process (Miller, 2002). In contrast, Rachael Ray, in spite of her self-deprecating humor, sets forth an image of perfection, in that she presents herself as someone who can cook great tasting, multiple course meals in under thirty minutes on a daily basis, without causing a culinary fiasco.

## **2.5 Conclusion**

In this section, I reviewed scholarly work on television cooking show discourse from fields such as linguistic anthropology, communication, and media and cultural studies to present a comprehensive view of existing research on this television genre. While the studies

---

<sup>19</sup> In an interview with Larry King, Julia Child argues that she does not believe in low fat diets and she believes that people should not be deprived of what tastes good. Retrieved July 30, 2007, from <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0208/15/lk1.00.html>

<sup>20</sup> From <http://www.grahamkerr.com/gk.php>, retrieved July 28, 2007.

highlighted in this section all contribute to some extent to the overall understanding of cultural representations of U.S. television cooking show discourse, the present dissertation focuses on a combination of discursive aspects that have not previously been analyzed, i.e., taste, affect, interaction, and stance in a Romanian and U.S. cross-cultural context. In addition, the present study offers a more nuanced perspective regarding the social categories of gender, class, leisure and lifestyle than those present in media and cultural studies work; this is accomplished through a micro-level linguistic investigation which can reveal contrasting and co-occurring detailed patterns present in the construction of the aforementioned cultural categories that a macro-level analysis alone would not offer.

# Chapter 3

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### Culture and Stance

#### 3.1 Introduction

The aim of this dissertation is to analyze language and culture in television cooking shows from Romania and the U.S.; the corpus on which I base my analysis comprises *The Recipe from Home*, and *I Eat Therefore I Am*, from Romania, and *30 Minute Meals*, and *The Essence of Emeril* from the U.S. In this chapter, I define two constructs which will serve as the key theoretical lenses for the analysis undertaken in the current study: *culture as communication* (Bourdieu, 1977, 1990, 1991) which is characterized by dynamicity and continuity, as well as fluidity and flexibility, and takes into account both individual and collective contributions to the construction of cultural patterns. The second construct I define in this chapter is that of *stance-taking* (Du Bois, 2007; Ochs, 1993; Kärkkäinen, 2006) in discourse, more specifically, affective and interactional stance. This chapter's discussion of the definition of culture will be based primarily on scholarly work from anthropology, sociology, and cultural studies, while that of the concept of stance draws on linguistic anthropological studies.

Most studies of stance acknowledge the significance of this construct not only at the level of the immediate context where stance, given its underlying subjectivity, is seen as “a major organizing principle in language use” (Kärkkäinen, 2006, p.702; also, Du Bois, 2007), but also its function on a broader sociocultural level. For instance, Ochs (1993) argues that stance is an attitude or point of view that is “socially recognized” (p.288), which in turn implies that stance is context-dependent and its expression and function bear the

characteristics of the locus in which it emerges. Along the same lines, Kockelman (2004) views stance markers as “signs that members of a community associate with a speaker’s personal contribution to event construal (where *stances* are possible kinds of personal contributions).” (p. 144). That is, both Ochs (1993) and Kockelman (2004) understand the larger sociocultural context of stance as playing a key role in both the production and interpretation of stance at the level of immediate interactional context.

Similarly to Kockelman (2004) and Ochs (1993), Du Bois (2007) argues for a view of stance as both reflecting and contributing to the construction of the broader sociocultural context; that is, Du Bois (ibid.) sets forth a conceptualization of stance as a “linguistically articulated form of social action whose meaning is to be construed within the broader scope of language, interaction, and sociocultural value” (p.139). Thus, stance is seen as not only encoded in a wide range of linguistic forms (Ochs, 1996), but also as intrinsically connected to discourse and defined through interaction; in section 3.3, I discuss the types of interactions central to the stance-taking process: alignment, evaluation, and positioning (Du Bois, 2007).

Moreover, in part due to the complexity of stance-taking in discourse, stance is an unequivocal reflection of the values and norms of the culture in which it is produced in that, according to Du Bois (2007), stance has the power to invoke “presupposed systems of sociocultural value” (p.139). This function of stance is also emphasized by Ochs (1996) who argues that stances are “central meaning components of social acts and social identities” and have “an especially privileged role in the constitution of social life” (p. 420). Kiesling (2009) also echoes Ochs’ argument for the centrality of stance in discourse by framing stance as one of the basic discursive tools for interaction and meaning-making among the members of a social group in a given community (p.172).



The discussion in this chapter so far has focused on the inherent connection between culture and linguistic stance, as well as the expression of sociocultural norms and values through stancetaking as a dynamic process that emerges in interaction. This view of stance and individual cultural expression implies a contemporary conceptualization of culture as a construct involving continuity as well as both diversity and dynamicity (Strauss & Quinn, 1997; Clifford, 1998) within a delineated geographical context such as that of a country; this contemporary view of culture is preceded in anthropological inquiry by a more traditional conceptualization of culture as an internally cohesive whole that is not subject to change and is not inclusive of individual expression (Boas, 1940; Murdock, 1960). As both culture and stance are central to the theoretical framework to which I appeal in this dissertation study, in the remainder of this chapter I will first present both classic and contemporary conceptualizations of culture (section 3.2), and then define stance-taking and discuss scholarly work on affective and interactional stance (section 3.3).

### **3.2 Defining culture**

In this chapter, I will be taking a contemporary view of *culture as communication*, which productively joins collective and individual discursive production (Bourdieu, 1990) as constituting everyday culture, and thus addresses the blurring of public and private sphere discourse in various cultural media forms, including television programming in Romania and the U.S. Further, in this dissertation, I do not make a distinction between forms of “high” and “popular” culture (Arnold, 1960), in that such distinctions would be based on value judgments and do not constitute an objective classification (Casey et al., 2002). Thus, in this

study, television cooking shows are viewed as both manifestations of contemporary culture, and also as agents of cultural change in the Romanian and U.S. contexts.

Next, I examine both classic and contemporary views of culture and the ways in which these conceptualizations of culture inform the definition adopted in the present dissertation study of media discourse with a focus on television cooking shows from Romania and the U.S. I begin with a discussion of some of the first views of the concept of culture and then I review contemporary definitions of culture; last, I highlight how these concepts of culture inform the analysis in the present dissertation.

The first widely-known definition of culture comes from British anthropologist Tylor (1871) who views culture as a “complex whole” which seems to incorporate both “generalized” and “external” traits, i.e., knowledge, art, law, as well as “individualized” or “internal” characteristics of “man”, i.e., capabilities and habits.

Culture, or Civilization, taken in its widest ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society (p.1).

Tylor also highlights the fact that culture is transmitted or assimilated by individuals through a vaguely defined process of socialization expressed by “being part of society”. In addition, the above definition of culture seems to offer an open perspective regarding which individual traits are included in the construct of culture. Similarly to Tylor, Boas (1930) offers an inclusive perspective of culture, “all the manifestations of social habits of a community” (p.79); however, Boas’ definition seems to place a stronger emphasis on the socially expressed habits of individuals, or the “structure” of these habits, and less on their individual variation.

The next widely discussed and debated definition of culture after Tylor's comes from U.S. anthropologists Kroeber, one of Boas' students, and Kluckhohn who review 164 definitions of culture which have been developed by several anthropologists (e.g., Boas, 1911; Sapir, 1929; Mead, 1937) over more than half a century. In their volume, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions* (1952), Kroeber and Kluckhohn (ibid.) conclude that culture:

... consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiment in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values... (p. 357)

Central to Kroeber and Kluckhohn's (1952) definition of culture are both implicit and explicit patterns that dually construct and reflect the distinct behavior of social groups thus contributing to their group cohesiveness. Further, in the above definition the maintenance and representation of cultural traits specific to each social group is thus expressed not only through individuals' behavior, but is located and transmitted through both symbols and artifacts; this argument points to an abstract conceptualization of culture in that it includes both the immediately palpable "patterns" of behavior and those found in symbols and signs.

Also crucial to Kroeber and Kluckhohn's (1952) conceptualization of culture is continuity as explained through their view regarding the centrality of "traditional ideas" and their values to the construct of culture, where "tradition" is understood as "historically derived and selected ideas". That is, for beliefs and attitudes to be considered part of the culture of a social group, according to Kroeber and Kluckhohn (ibid.), they must undergo the test of time and preference of the members of that particular social group.

Both definitions discussed so far in this section highlight the specificity of habits, customs, and ways of thinking of different social groups and implicitly their uniqueness in terms of cultural and social “patterns”. This observation gave rise to a common belief in the 19<sup>th</sup> century that cultures “evolve”, thus at any given time some are more and less “evolved”—a view parallel to that of Darwin’s biological evolution theory (Tylor, 1871; Morgan, 1877). One of the strongest opponents of this view was Boas (1940), who argued for a relativistic perspective on culture which does not seek to classify cultures into more or less evolved; instead, Boas (ibid.) proposes a view of culture as reflective of the broader historical, political, and social context in which it is formed and transformed, which are inherently unique.

As Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) point out above, and as several other anthropologists from the same time period propose (e.g., Benedict, 1934; Parson, 1949), culture is defined through patterned behavior, i.e., patterns of thoughts, actions, and habits, not only explicit but also implicit (Kroeber and Kluckhohn, 1952, p. 357). Similarly to these directions in the conceptualization of culture, Geertz (1973) much later argues for a semiotic concept of culture as well as an interpretive approach to the analysis of culture:

“The concept of culture I espouse . . . is essentially a semiotic one. Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning (p.5)”.

Through a metaphor of “webs of significance” which individuals themselves have created and in which they are “suspended,” Geertz explains his understanding of the construct of culture. Geertz’ definition highlights the complexity of the construct of

culture—the multi-level semiotics of actions, habits, and thoughts whose analysis must necessarily entail “interpretation” and reflection on the relationships among the elements involved, and the ideologies underlying them; included in this analysis must also be the subjectivity and agency of individuals who both construct and interpret the “webs of significance”.

Individuals’ agency and overall contribution to the construction of culture in their social group is a major shift from previous anthropological perspectives which viewed socialization mostly as a one-way process. Along the same lines as Geertz’ interpretive approach to the analysis of culture is also his view of ethnography, which must inherently be a “thick description” (also Ryle, 1971), or an uncovering of layers upon layers of meaning of contextualized human experience, and its symbolic import in society. In the present dissertation I adopt Geertz’ “thick description” approach to the analysis of culture as this study aims to not only examine and interpret meanings associated with the immediate context of food preparation, but also uncover the multiple “webs of significance” that television cooking show hosts create through their stances towards both food and audiences, and convey through the social act of preparing food.

Geertz’ inclusion of individuals’ contribution to the construct of culture which addresses one of the main critiques of classic definitions of culture, i.e., group unity, is further developed by contemporary scholars such as Hannerz (1992) who appeals to the concept of “cultural flow” to explain his view of the unboundedness or lack of an inflexible autonomy of social groups. Hannerz’s view comes in contrast with earlier conceptualizations of culture as a static and rigid whole or belief system, and entails an understanding of social groups as fluid, diverse, and marked by social and political struggles which are all reflected

in the framing of culture (also Rosaldo, 1993; Clifford and Marcus, 1986); according to Hannerz (1997), central to the discussion surrounding culture are “flux, mobility, recombination and emergence” (p. 2).

Hannerz (ibid.) further illustrates his view of culture by adopting and modifying Geertz’ “webs of significance” (1973, p.5) into “emerging hybridized webs of meaning” (Hannerz, 1992, p. 264), produced and transformed by individuals who are “actors and networks of actors” (1992, p.17). In this view, group-specific cultural entities are both complex and legitimate, and inclusive of a range of social and political experiences and events even though such cultural groups may or may not seem cohesive.

The extent to which individuals’ agency builds on the creation of cultural frames has been widely debated; for instance, on the one hand, ethnographers such as Clifford (1988) argue for the centrality of individual expression in the construct of culture (also Grossberg et al. 1992; Clifford, 1986) by setting forth the idea of culture as “collective fiction” and as the ground for “individual identity and freedom” (p. 106). Thus, in this postmodern view, culture is collective expression and identity, or a sum of individual experiences. On the other hand, scholars from several fields critique this postmodern view on culture, e.g., social psychology and anthropology (Hofstede, 1991), cognitive anthropology (Strauss & Quinn, 1997) or sociology (Vinken et al., 2004). For instance, supporters of the cultural dimension theory (e.g., Hofstede, 1991, 2001) argue for a cultural dimensions model that entails five value perspectives among nations. Unlike postmodernists’ emphasis on individual contribution to the creation of culture, at the core of the cultural dimension theory is group cohesion and distinctiveness.

Drawing on schema theory and a connectionist model approach, Strauss & Quinn (1997) set forth a definition of culture that seeks to incorporate both perspectives discussed above regarding the individual-group dichotomy in the construction of culture by foregrounding both coherence and stability, and dynamicity and flexibility, and acknowledging the role of the individual in the creation of culture, as well as that of the social group (also, Ervin-Tripp, 1969). Thus, according to Strauss & Quinn (1997), “...meanings are based on cultural schemas, schemas that have come to be shared among people who have had similarly socially mediated experiences “ (p. 48). That is, culture is group-specific and stable, and cohesive through schemas, but at the same time flexible due to the role of the individuals who in turn build on these schemas through their own interpretations of experiences and social meanings.

### **3.2.1 Culture as communication**

Most of the aforementioned scholars propose to some extent that culture is transmitted through a process of socialization including Boas who suggested that interaction is at the core of cultural production and transmission (also Tylor, 1871). More specifically, Boas (1940) argues that “the causal conditions of cultural happenings lie always in the interaction between individual and society” (p. 257). Thus, in Boas’ view, the interactions between individuals and their sociocultural context constitute the locus of cultural production. Boas’ students (Sapir, Kroeber, Benedict, and Mead) further tackled issues such as the nature and role of interaction in the construction of culture; for instance, Sapir (1932) defines culture as “a dialogical multisubjective and negotiated reality” (Sidky, 2004, p. 148),

a reality as part of which individuals “abstract ... world of meanings” from their interactions with society (Sapir, 1932, pp. 232-233).

The interconnectedness of interaction and culture, and the role of communication in conveying and transforming culture proposed by Boas and Sapir were later more explicitly foregrounded in anthropological and philosophical inquiry. Through his concept of “dialogism,” Bakhtin (1981) argues that any utterance is socially and culturally situated in that it is inextricably connected to previous discourses; at the same time, given the addressivity of discourse, any utterance also contributes to shaping future interactions. Sociocultural theorists (Vygotsky, 1978; Leontiev, 1978) as well as contemporary cultural anthropologists (e.g., Hall, 1982) also argue that the role of social context is central to the development of the individual which takes place as s/he engages in social activities; such a view reflects the Soviet intellectual tradition which rejects a dualism between self and society (Bakhtin, Vygotsky, Voloshinov, inter alia).

Drawing on Bakhtin’s “dialogism”, Mannheim & Tedlock (1995) argue that culture is continuously produced and reproduced through interactions between individuals and the broader sociocultural context: “every interaction takes place within specific social, institutional, and historical coordinates, all of which color the interaction at the same time as they are reshaped, to greater or lesser extent, by that interaction” (pp. 8-9). That is, language and culture are “dialogical at their core” (p.8), and situated, or emergent in a given context; however, this does not mean that cultural patterns change with every new interaction, but that “language and culture acquire regularities” through interactions (Schieffelin, 1985, p. 722).

Bourdieu (1977, 1990, 1991) also argues that cultural patterns are conveyed through a process of socialization in his theory of social practice which centers on “habitus”, or “a set



of dispositions ... which generate practices and perceptions” (1991, p.13); in other words, “habitus” is a practice-generating principle which provides individuals with socially preferred ways of behaving, acting, and responding. Similarly to the construct of culture, “group habitus” (1977) entails the sharing and internalizing of such patterns of behavior by the members of a community of practice. According to Bourdieu (1990), group habitus is:

“a subjective but non-individual system of internalized structures, common schemes of perception, conception and action” (p. 60)

The socializing character of Bourdieu’s group habitus resonates with other contemporary views of culture as patterns of meaning constructed through dialogical interaction (e.g., Mannheim and Tedlock, 1995; Bakhtin, 1981), in other words, through both verbal and nonverbal communication among social members in a historically situated context. The practices and perceptions generated and transmitted through habitus as part of a socialization process, determine for example, preference or dispreference for taste, one of the foci of the analysis in this dissertation, thus taste—both for foods and as aesthetic selection—

“... classifies, and it classifies the classifier. Social subjects, classified by their classifications, distinguish themselves by the distinctions they make, between the beautiful and the ugly, the distinguished and the vulgar...” (Bourdieu, 1984, p.6).

That is, taste in food and commodities is mediated by the individuals’ habitus, and both distinguishes among individuals and places them in an aesthetically determined category. In other words, taste creates an aesthetic social hierarchy, or “systems of social differences”. The shaping of individuals’ taste by their own habitus is best exemplified in the contrast between the taste of necessity and the taste of luxury as observed through food consumption (Bourdieu, 1984). Bourdieu notes that individuals’ adoption of a certain “food

lifestyle” is determined both by their social class and by how they view their bodies (Bourdieu, *ibid.*, p.190). The taste of necessity results from food deprivation and lack of economic capital, and is typically expressed through preference for foods that are filling and strength giving. Conversely, the taste of luxury or of freedom is acquired through access to economic capital and is expressed through a distancing from necessity and the freedom of choice of a certain food item or commodity.

As seen above in Bourdieu’s definition of group habitus, Bourdieu conceptualizes this construct as entailing both subjective and objective structures; this reflects earlier discussions of cultural continuity but also individuals’ contribution to the reshaping of these structures through everyday social practice. In addition, both group continuity and uniqueness, as well as its openness to change are further highlighted in Bourdieu’s definition by the specification that this system of patterns is bound together by not one, but multiple “schemes of perception, conception, and action” (p.60). This multiplicity of schemes that group habitus entails is a reflection of contemporary views on the construct of culture as an entity that is not static and unitary, but layered, nuanced, and dynamic.

The construct of culture which underlies the study of television cooking shows in this dissertation draws on characteristics of culture developed in contemporary work in anthropology and cultural studies, e.g., dynamicity and continuity; fluidity and flexibility; dialogism; and lastly, dialogism as the locus where culture is constructed, reflected, and redefined. All these characteristics are best encompassed and illustrated in Bourdieu’s concept of group habitus which is thus at the center of the analysis of culture, stance, taste, and interaction in this dissertation.

### 3.3 Stance-taking in discourse

Linguistics, anthropology, and sociology researchers have analyzed *stance-taking* with a view to understand both the discursive construction of this communicative event (Hymes, 1972), and its different functions and meanings it conveys in various contexts, from daily interactions (Du Bois, 2007; Kärkkäinen, 2006; Fitzmaurice, 2004; Clift, 2006; Bucholtz, 2009; Kiesling, 2009; Johnstone, 2009; *inter alia*) to expressive culture, such as music performance (Berger, 2009). This dissertation is a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural study of female and male affective (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989; Besnier, 1990) and interactional (Kärkkäinen, 2006; Du Bois, 2007) stance-taking in television cooking show discourse from Romania and the U.S. More specifically, I analyze affective stance-taking vis-à-vis taste descriptors and their indexical meanings (Ochs, 1996; Lyons, 1977; Peirce, 1955; Silverstein, 2003) in television cooking show discourse from Romania and the U.S.; also, I examine the framing (Goffman, 1974) of cooking shows and the hosts' presentation of self (Goffman, 1959) through interactional stance-taking of focus and alignment.

This chapter is organized as follows: first, I define *stance* and examine previous studies on stance-taking in discourse (section 3.2). Then, I focus on key ideas from *affective stance* (section 3.3) and *interactional stance* (section 3.4) that inform on the present study. Finally, I discuss special considerations for the analysis of stance-taking in media discourse, as well as the importance of this study in section 3.5.

#### 3.3.1 Defining *stance*

Stance is a categorizing and evaluating principle of human experience (Kockelman, 2004), in this case, of the experience of the food preparation process and of the presentation

of self in television cooking show discourse. The conceptualization of stance has its roots in philosophical thought, and to some extent it resonates with Kant's concept of modality, which distinguishes between cognition and things, or thought and content (Kockelman, 2004). That is, according to Kant (1964), "The principals of modality . . . add to the concept of a thing...(p.252)" by distinguishing between an object and its multiple subjective interpretations. Thus, I have selected stance as the main unit of analysis in this dissertation because stance-taking offers insight not only into denotational, but also connotational meanings of an utterance, or the attitudes and judgments that accompany the naming of an object, process, or state. In other words, in the present dissertation the construct of stance is crucial to an understanding of the connotational meanings of cooking show discourse, in particular those pertaining to affect and interaction in that discursive stance-taking provides us with information that goes beyond a factual, objective presentation of the television food preparation process.

Earlier linguistic studies of stance emphasize the lexical and grammatical marking of stance; for example, Biber and Finegan (1988, 1989) analyze adverbials, adjectives, verbs, and modals and the ways in which such linguistic features build on certain speech styles through their frequency and distribution within a text<sup>21</sup>. In contrast to studies such as those by Biber and Finegan (1988, 1989) more recent studies of stance have shifted focus to the *function* of stance in discourse. For instance, subsequent work on stance examines how repeated stance-taking strategies discursively construct the *style* associated with a particular individual (Johnstone, 2008); the establishing of one's *social identity* through social acts

---

<sup>21</sup> The concept of *stance* evolved, in part, from previously discussed concepts such as *posture* (Grabe, 1984), *hedges* (Brown and Levinson, 1978), *footing* (Goffman, 1981), and *evidentials* (Chafe, 1985) which encompass some aspects of the construct of *stance-taking*. However, it was Biber and Finegan who seem to have clearly distinguished *stance* from other such discursive constructs which fulfill similar functions.

which in turn are conveyed through *stance-taking* (Ochs, 1993); the use of *affect* and *truth* markers as *evidentials* in arguments (Haviland, 1989); and lastly, *stance-taking* as an *interactional* evidential (Clift, 2006), and as a marker of *subjectivity* and *intersubjectivity* (Kärkkäinen, 2006; Fitzmaurice, 2004).

The most recent and comprehensive theoretical proposal for a *stance-taking* framework comes from Du Bois (2007) who argues that the main tenets of stance are dialogicality (Bakhtin, 1981), or the argument that linguistic practices are dually shaped both by prior discourse and by the inherent addressivity of the discourse; subjectivity and (other) positioning (Davies and Harre, 1990), and intersubjectivity and alignment (Ochs, 1988; Silverstein, 2003; Vygotsky, 1986). Further, Du Bois goes beyond categorizing stance into different types, i.e., *epistemic* and *affective* (Ochs, 1993; Biber and Finegan, 1989; Clift, 2006; Johnstone, 2008), by questioning the possibility of separating types of stances which he defines as *evaluation* (Conrad & Biber, 2000; Hunston & Thompson, 2000; Lemke, 1998), *assessment* (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992; Pomeranz, 1984), *appraisal* (Chafe, 1994; Kärkkäinen, 2003a, 2003b) which are typically all accompanied by an affective or epistemic positioning.

Instead of such categorizations, Du Bois (ibid.) argues for a multi-faceted view of the stance act, and as he claims, a much more complex than previously suggested in the stance literature (Du Bois, 2007, p.145). That is, Du Bois proposes a foregrounding of *positioning* (Davies and Harre, 1990) and, since according to Du Bois, stances are typically taken vis-à-vis an interlocutor, also of *alignment* (Heritage, 2002; Du Bois, 2002a), which he defines as “calibrating the relationship between two stances, and by implication between two

stancetakers” (p.144). Thus, Du Bois’ proposed view of stance always includes one of the following components: *evaluation*, *positioning*, or *alignment* (p.144).

Moreover, Du Bois (ibid.) draws on these three components, i.e., evaluation, positioning, and alignment to emphasize the importance of contextualizing stance and analyzing all components of the stance-taking process: the stancetaker, the object of stance, and to what previous stances the stancetaker is responding. To further illustrate the importance of taking into account the context in which stance emerges, Du Bois (ibid.) coins the concept *the stance triangle* which includes Subject 1, Subject 2, and the Object towards which a certain stance is taken. That is, Du Bois views evaluation, positioning, and alignment as “three acts in one” (p.162), or the components of a single stance act.

Similarly to other researchers (Clift, 2006; Fitzmaurice, 2004; Kärkkäinen, 2006), Du Bois (2007) also recognizes both the influence of the speaker’s feelings and opinions on the hearer and the social context (Kockelman, 2004) in which the two speakers’ alignment vis-à-vis each other or a certain object occurs. In the present study of *affective* and *interactional stance* I draw on Du Bois’ (2007) framing of stance as a positioning and alignment process carried out between a speaker and a hearer within a social context through *affective* and *interactional* stances. Thus, in this dissertation I adopt a working definition of stance as:

“... a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field” (Du Bois, 2007, p. 25).

That is, in this dissertation, television hosts’ cooking show discourse is imbued with evaluations vis-à-vis the entire food preparation process, in particular the taste of ingredients and meals presented in these shows. In addition, in the context of the television cooking

show, Du Bois' "social actor", or the speaker (S1), is the cooking show host, and the subjects with which the speaker aligns are the television viewers (S2); albeit remotely situated, television viewers are discursively positioned and repositioned by the television hosts whose programs they watch, and are the recipients of inclusion work performed by the speakers (S1). In turn, television viewers (S2) may or may not align with the hosts (S1) regarding the hosts' stances vis-à-vis the meals that they prepare on the shows; this alignment or lack thereof may be achieved through actions, i.e., cooking a certain meal, or other verbal or non-verbal communicative means<sup>22</sup>.

Moreover, U.S. and Romanian hosts continuously perform both positioning and alignment work with their viewing audiences through the use of explicit interactional markers of focus and alignment. In addition to viewing stance as a context-situated act which involves evaluation, positioning and alignment, in the present study, both *affective* and *interactional stance* are seen as recognizable *signs* (Kockelman, 2004), or speech acts (Hymes, 1972) by the members of the Romanian and U.S. socio-cultural context.

Unlike earlier definitions of stance which view stance-taking as a static process undertaken by the speaker alone (Biber and Finegan, 1988), Du Bois' (2007) definition of stance resonates with the view of the television cooking show as a speech event (Hymes, 1972), in that it explicitly takes into account the socio-cultural context in which all stances emerge. This is particularly relevant given on one hand, the subjective nature of stance (Finegan, 1995), and on the other hand, the culture-specific stance-taking patterns as illustrated in the present study of Romanian and U.S. media contexts.

---

<sup>22</sup> The audiences' actions following the viewing of the television cooking shows are beyond the scope of this study.

In what follows, I review concepts from scholarly work on *affective* stance (section 3.3) and *interactional* stance (section 3.4) on which I draw in this study of stance-taking in television cooking shows from Romania and the U.S.<sup>23</sup>.

### 3.3.2 Stance and affect

Affective stance can be constructed through a variety of linguistic features, such as the lexicon, and grammatical and discourse features, e.g., emotion words, descriptors, address terms, including pronouns, exclamatives, tag questions, modals, determiners, tense, aspect, mood, case marking, repetition, etc. (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989; Besnier, 1990; Haviland, 1989)<sup>24</sup>. Chapter 5, which presents the analysis of affect and stance focuses on *descriptors of taste* in female and male television cooking show discourse from Romania and the U.S.; Chapters 4 and 5 offer a detailed discussion on the selection of taste tokens expressing affective stance see.

While most U.S. English *stance-taking* researchers agree that discourse is imbued with *affect* and is thus operationalized through a variety of linguistic forms, they also point out the difficulty of analyzing affective stance in part because of this prevalence of affect in language<sup>25</sup>. In addition, in spite of a widely accepted view that *affective stance* is a worthwhile concept to analyze, most studies of affect are theoretical analyses<sup>26</sup> from a

---

<sup>23</sup> As I pointed out before, to my knowledge, there are no empirical studies on affective stance, thus the concepts reviewed in section 3.3 come from theoretical proposals for the analysis of stance and affect.

<sup>24</sup> Besnier (1990) seems to base his categories on U.S. English alone; Ochs and Schieffelin (1989) on data from English, French, Spanish, Italian, Thai, Japanese, Malagasy, Samoan, Kaluli, Hawaiian, and Dyirbal.

<sup>25</sup> Haviland (1989), for instance, acknowledges the difficulty of attempting to analyze such an ample domain as affective stance and narrows the focus of his analysis to negative affective expression that emerges in grammatical categories of evidence in Tzotzil accusations of truth and deceit.

<sup>26</sup> In recent years several corpus-based studies of *stance* have emerged, but none of these examines affective stance. Also, Bednarek (2008) analyzes emotion across multiple corpora, but her discussion of stance is minimal and only tangential.



linguistic anthropological perspective of the localization, definition, operationalization, and to some extent, function of affective stance (Ochs, 1996; Besnier, 1990; Haviland, 1989).

While such discussions and illustrations of *affect* and *stance* give us valuable insight into this type of expressive discourse, empirical studies can potentially offer a more accurate understanding of these constructs. To further investigate *affective stance*, in Chapter 5 I undertake a systematic, cross-linguistic corpus analysis focusing on both the frequency and function of *affect*, *stance*, and *taste* markers and their indexical meanings (Ochs, 1996; Lyons, 1977; Peirce, 1955; Silverstein, 2003) in television cooking shows from Romania and the U.S. In what follows, I discuss current literature on affective stance in linguistic anthropology and I point out how key concepts from existent work on *affect* and *stance* inform the present study of affective stance in television cooking show discourse.

Affective stances are central to social acts (Ochs, 1996; Besnier, 1990) and from a Hallidayan perspective, *affect*<sup>27</sup> is conveyed through the interpersonal metafunction of language (Halliday, 1970, p.143), thus affective expression is inherently intersubjective. Most linguistic anthropological studies of *affective stance* define *affect* very broadly to include moods, feelings, emotions, degrees of emotional intensity, e.g., involvement vs. detachment, but also little vs. very intense, as well as having binary, either positive or negative valences (Labov, 1984; Ochs, 1996; Besnier 1990; Du Bois, 2007; Kiesling, 2009). In addition, some researchers view the act of conveying emotion as implicitly involving stance expression, as stance “subsumes emotion or affect, by definition” (Schnoebelen, 2010, p.1). With regard to *what* emotion is being conveyed in a given speech act, similarly to Ochs and Schieffelin (1989), the present study is not concerned with speakers’ actual emotional state, the presence or absence of “proof” of speakers’ intentionality of conveying a certain

---

<sup>27</sup> In the present study, I use *affect* and *emotion* interchangeably.

emotional state (Levinson, 1981; Besnier, 1990), or with the sincerity of their statements, but with the linguistic construction and pragmatic function of stance and affect.

As mentioned before, Du Bois (2007) as well as Hunston and Thompson (2000) have used the term “evaluation” as part of both affective and epistemic stances, i.e., of expressing the speakers’ opinions, feelings and attitudes regarding their own statements; moreover, Hunston and Thompson (2000) assign two more functions to *stances*: that of *manipulating the hearers’ positions* vis-à-vis the propositions made by speakers, and that of *arranging and categorizing discourse* through markers of increased focus or boundary marking (also Johnstone, 2008; emphasis added).

In the present study, I argue that *stances of affect* and *taste*, one of the foci of this study (Chapter 5) may indeed influence viewers’ positions through the propositions made by speakers in the context of media discourse, in particular television cooking show discourse. Along these lines, Ochs & Schieffelin (1989) point out that in addition to communicating “referential information” (p.9), e.g., how to follow cooking instructions for a particular meal, speakers convey feelings through their predications, which likely affect interlocutors’ responses depending on the affective stances set forth; while there are no live audiences in the television cooking shows analyzed in this dissertation, the “interlocutors” are viewing audiences and “responses” may be either something they say or do during, or at some point after they watch television cooking shows.

### **3.3.3 Stance and interaction**

In addition to affective stance, in this dissertation I investigate *interactional* stance (Kärkkäinen, 2006; Du Bois, 2007; Bucholtz, 2009; Fitzmaurice, 2004; Clift, 2006), or the

speakers' attitude or direct address towards their interlocutors—in the case of television cooking shows, their viewing audiences. I coin the term *interactional stance* to refer to the explicit interactional features, i.e., imperative and interrogative constructions, used by hosts in television cooking show discourse; I view *interactional stance* as synonymous with concepts such as *interactional evidentials* (Clift, 2006), *interlocutor stance* (Fitzmaurice, 2004), and *intersubjectivity markers* (Kärkkäinen, 2006) discussed in previous stance-taking research.

While the term *interactional stance* in part overlaps semantically and functionally with the aforementioned concepts, the focus of the analysis in this study on a media genre devoid of an audience that is physically present during the show makes the term *interactional stance* more accurate for this type of data and scope of inquiry. More specifically, in this study I emphasize the *function* of *interactive stance* of focus and alignment in cooking show discourse in particular as it builds on the roles set forth by television cooking show hosts in the selected corpus, and implicitly on the framing (Goffman, 1974) of food programming as cooking demonstration and entertainment show. However, it is beyond the goal of this study to demonstrate that television cooking show host discourse is *interactive* as this is a presupposed assumption given previous work on stance (Clift, 2006; Kockelman, 2004), or to analyze the intersubjective nature of such discourse (Kärkkäinen, 2006). Lastly, unlike Fitzmaurice' (2004) analysis of *interlocutor stance*, this study is not concerned with the analysis of turn-taking strategies, which would be salient in a face-to-face interaction, but not in a program devoid of audiences who are physically present.

As I mentioned before in this chapter, previous empirical work on stance and interaction focuses primarily on the intersubjective aspect of stance by arguing that stances

emergence in interaction (Kärkkäinen, 2006; Fitzmaurice, 2004; Clift, 2006). These studies focus on the intersubjective construction of discursive features such as *I think* (Kärkkäinen, 2006); *you know*, *you say*, and *you see* (Fitzmaurice, 2004); and lastly, direct reported speech (Clift, 2006). The analysis of stance as a dynamic, not static concept represents a departure from earlier studies of stance which analyzed stance-taking mostly as a reflection of the opinion, attitude, or feeling of the speaker who performs a stance-taking act (e.g., Finegan, 1995). What these studies have in common is a convincing argument for the intersubjectivity and context-dependency of stance-taking in discourse.

In contrast to the aforementioned studies of stance and interaction, the present dissertation does not aim to demonstrate that imperative and interrogative constructions, the linguistic forms analyzed in this chapter, encode intersubjectivity; instead, the present study of interactional stance focuses on the *function* of explicit interactional features, i.e., imperative and interrogative constructions in television cooking show discourse. I examine the function of such constructions both at the immediate level of cooking show discourse, i.e., that of *focus* and *alignment*, and on a more macro level by analyzing the hosts' presentation of self (Goffman, 1959) and the overall framing (Goffman, 1974) of the cooking show programs in this corpus through markers of focus and alignment.

### **3.3.4 Stance-taking in media discourse**

The study of *stance-taking* in television cooking shows is especially relevant in that television cooking shows constitute a particularly rich artifact from the perspective of *culture*, *stance*, *affect*, and *interaction*. Such discourse displays many central and reoccurring features of U.S. and Romanian contemporary media, such as: the blurring of the boundaries

between *public* and *private spaces* (Fiske, 1987), *the charismatic show host as a cultural icon*<sup>28</sup>; *the lifestyle expert* (Moseley, 2001); the concept of *housework as fun and a leisure activity* (Hollows, 2003); the idea that *one can improve one's self* (Heller, 2006) by simply following a certain procedure; lastly, *the globalization of consumption patterns*, i.e., the preparation and consumption of “world cuisine”.

In this dissertation, the expression of affective constructions towards the taste of the meals presented on the shows and audience involvement markers of focus and alignment is viewed as “dimensions of the sociocultural field” (Du Bois, 2007) that dually index (Ochs, 1996; Lyons, 1977; Peirce, 1955; Silverstein, 2003) eating and food preparation behaviors as well as build on the hosts’ presentation of self (Goffman, 1959) and implicitly a certain framing (Goffman, 1974) of food programming in the two countries. Further, stances of affect and interaction are viewed in this study as not only central to the construal of the television cooking show event, but also as recognizable by members of the Romanian and U.S. cultures.

In the context of the television genre, the study of affect and interaction is particularly revealing in that one could claim that a highly personal attitude, i.e., taste preferences, expressed in a public domain such as the television cooking show may involve a higher level of intentionality (Besnier, 1990) than a face-to-face format. This is due in part to television production techniques which allow for a rehearsed discourse that is also prepared in advance and recorded prior to being broadcast. Along the same lines, the hosts’ seemingly explicit

---

<sup>28</sup>For example, Rachel Ray was named one of 100 most influential people by Time magazine in 2006 (From <http://www.time.com/time/2006/time100/>, retrieved May 1<sup>st</sup> 2007). Currently, Rachel Ray has four shows on the Food Network channel: *30 Minute Meals*, *\$40 a Day*, *Inside Dish*, and *Tasty Travels*, of which *30 Minute Meals* is the oldest. She is also co-hosting CBS’ “The Insider” and in 2006 she became a spokesperson for Nabisco crackers. (Retrieved from [http://www.foodnetwork.com/food/rachael\\_ray/0,1974,FOOD\\_9928,00.html](http://www.foodnetwork.com/food/rachael_ray/0,1974,FOOD_9928,00.html) May 1<sup>st</sup> 2007).

interactions with their remote viewers constitute the locus of a rich linguistic and cultural analysis; that is, given the popularity of their hosts, the television cooking shows analyzed here must reflect and construct beliefs and food-related preferences rooted in the cultural frames and patterns of their Romanian and U.S. viewing audiences.

### **3.4 Analytical tools for the examination of culture and stance**

In this subsection, I preview and offer a rationale for the selection of the analytical lens which I have adopted for the analysis of stance-taking in television cooking show discourse.

In Chapter 5, I appeal to the concept of indexicality (Silverstein, 2003; Ochs, 1996) to analyze linguistic features that encode affective stance-taking towards taste in food programming from the two countries. The concept of indexicality is central to the analysis of stance, affect, and taste because it helps identify contextual meanings that these constructs point to, such as the different aspects of the cooking process, e.g., cooking technique, or procedure, as well as food and lifestyle preferences.

In Chapter 6, I use Goffman's constructs of the presentation of self (Goffman, 1959), frame analysis (Goffman, 1974), and footing (Goffman, 1981), to investigate the interactional stances that television cooking show hosts take up with their remote viewing audiences. While these constructs are interrelated, each of them contributes to the understanding of a different angle of the television cooking show discourse, i.e., the notion of footing builds on the different roles or types of self-presentation that hosts set forth, while frame analysis provides information on a broader level on the television cooking show as a genre. That is, these three constructs point to different aspects of the interactions between

hosts and television viewers, which in turn may vary, and take on novel and nuanced meanings depending on the stage and type of the cooking process.

Lastly, in Chapter 7, I contextualize the findings in Chapters 5 and 6 through the use of Silverstein's indexical order construct (2003), which aims to bridge micro- and macro-level elements of discourse. Thus, through the concept of indexical order I examine how micro-grain linguistic features reflect and construct broader elements of discourse, both at the level of the television cooking show context, and the larger cultural context in Romania and the U.S.

## Chapter 4

### DATA AND METHODOLOGY

#### 4.1 Introduction

The television cooking show is a form of media which displays many central and reoccurring features of U.S. and Romanian contemporary media. At the same time, it constitutes a particularly rich artifact from the perspective of *affect*, *interaction*, and *stance*, and gender representations, which are cultural features encoded in themes present in cooking show discourse such as: the blurring of the boundaries between *public* and *private spaces* (Fiske, 1987), e.g., the transformation of a mundane activity that is usually done in a private sphere, i.e., cooking, into a public performance, i.e., cooking show; the *lifestyle expert* (Moseley, 2001), e.g., in addition to teaching audiences how to cook, hosts teach behaviors surrounding eating and food preparation; lastly, *the globalization of consumption patterns*, i.e., the preparation and consumption of “world cuisine”.

In this dissertation, I attempt to answer the following questions:

Question 1:

How does a micro-linguistic analysis of the selected television cooking show corpus in terms of the expression of taste and affect contribute to understanding the role of indexicality in the construction of attitudes towards food and cooking?

Question 2:

How does a micro-linguistic analysis of the selected television cooking show corpus in terms of the expression of interactional features such as interrogatives and imperatives contribute to



understanding the presentation of self by television cooking show hosts, and the construction of desirable lifestyle norms in Romania and the U.S.?

Question 3 (exploratory aim):

What are the implications of this analysis for understanding how the 'everyday' instructional discourse of these television cooking shows reflects, reproduces, challenges, or offers alternatives to, the particular cultural schemata, values, and norms of the countries in which it is produced and viewed?

To show how the data analyzed in this dissertation informs on the above questions, I begin by describing the television cooking show corpus on which I base this cross-linguistic and cross-cultural study in terms of cooking show settings, television hosts, and recipe description in each of the episodes included in the analysis. In addition, I offer a rationale for the selection of affective taste and interactional stance-taking markers, and a description of the coding process of these features. Lastly, I discuss the transcription style, as well as the methodology adopted, including the cross-linguistic and cross-cultural approach to the analysis of television cooking show discourse.

## **4.2 The data**

The data for this dissertation is a corpus of two Romanian television cooking shows, *Reeta de Acasă* [*The Recipe from Home* henceforth], whose hostess is Simona Mihăescu (henceforth SM), and *Mănînc deci exist* [*I Eat Therefore I Am* henceforth], whose host is Dan Chișu (henceforth DC); and two U.S. television cooking shows, *30 Minute Meals*, whose

hostess is Rachael Ray (henceforth RR) and *The Essence of Emeril*, whose host is Emeril Lagasse (henceforth EL). Both U.S. shows air on *The Food Network*, a U.S. cable channel entirely dedicated to food-related programs, which broadcasts cooking shows, cooking competitions, and other food-related shows. The Romanian television cooking shows air both on cable channels, i.e., *The Recipe from Home* on *Acasă TV* and *I Eat Therefore I Am* on *Realitatea TV*, and on the Internet. The program listings of *Acasă TV* and *Realitatea TV* include news programs, talk shows, weather reports, and political and economics programs.

With regard to the Romanian data, I selected *The Recipe from Home* and *I Eat Therefore I Am* for analysis because they are the only television shows in which the hosts speak Romanian during the show, that is, what the hosts say is not translated from another language<sup>29</sup>. In addition, in both shows the host, and not someone else, cooks the meals that they present to their audiences<sup>30</sup>. The popularity of the cooking show hosts and of their programs, especially those in the U.S., was also one of the data selection criteria<sup>31</sup>. This

---

<sup>29</sup> As of June 2011, there are more than ten cooking shows on Romanian national and cable television which are translated or subtitled from other languages, mostly English.

<sup>30</sup> Simona Mihăescu, the hostess of *The Recipe from Home*, has an additional food preparation show, *Acasă în bucătărie* ("At home in the kitchen"), which airs every Sunday on the same channel. However, in *Acasă în bucătărie* the hostess, Simona Mihăescu, does not cook; instead, the guests who come on her show do the cooking.

<sup>31</sup> Rachel Ray was named one of 100 most influential people by Time magazine in 2006 (From <http://www.time.com/time/2006/time100/>, retrieved May 1<sup>st</sup> 2007). Currently, Rachel Ray has five food-related shows on the Food Network channel: *30 Minute Meals*, *\$40 a Day*, *Inside Dish*, *Tasty Travels*, and *Rachael's Vacation* of which *30 Minute Meals* is the oldest. She also co-hosted CBS' "The Insider", is a spokesperson for Nabisco crackers, and hosts the talk show *Rachael Ray*, the latter of which won her a second Emmy in 2007. (retrieved from <http://www.foodnetwork.com/rachael-ray/bio/index.html>, June 7, 2010). Some of the food-related, "catch" expressions coined and popularized by RR through her television cooking shows are: yumm-o, G.B. [garbage bowl], and E.V.O.O. [extra virgin olive oil], the latter of which was added to the American College Dictionary in 2007. (retrieved from <http://www.rachaelrayshow.com/show/segments/view/adding-a-little-evoo-to-the-dictionary/> June 12, 2010)

According to Emeril's website (<http://www.emerils.com/emerilology/awards> retrieved April 14, 2008) Emeril Lagasse is the host of "the Food Network's highest-rated programs", *The Essence of Emeril* and *Emeril Live*, and is the owner of eleven restaurants and the recipient of numerous awards. Some of Emeril's "catch" phrases are: "bam!" and "kick it up a notch" (retrieved from <http://www.celebchefs.net/chef/the-essence-of-emeril/> June 12<sup>th</sup> 2010).

Simona Mihăescu became popular in Romania in 1998 when she began to host several programs on *Acasă TV* in 1998; she has also been a film and theatre actress since graduating from Theatre. From

criterion is motivated by the fact that the *popularity* of a television program must be due to the fact that it reflects and appeals to, at least to some extent, the cultural norms and values of the audience which it addresses. The rationale for selecting what episodes to analyze was driven by the intention to offer a representative sample of the cooking style, and of the cuisine and recipes typically presented in each of the four shows.

#### 4.2.1 The television cooking show corpus

##### 4.2.1.1 30 Minute Meals

*30 Minute Meals* follows a consistent structure, that is, it begins with a short introduction in which RR talks briefly about the meal recipe she is presenting, followed by slight variations of a formulaic introduction to the show: “Hey^ there, I^’m Ra^chel Ray^ and I make thi^rty minute mea^ls. Now tha^t means that in the time it takes you to wa:^tch this pro^gram, I’ll “ve made a deli:^cious and hea^lthy meal from start to finish.”, and by the presentation of the recipe itself<sup>32</sup>. Each episode is scheduled for a thirty minute period and it contains three commercial breaks; the commercials occupy approximately ten minutes of the thirty minutes. All *30 Minute Meals* episodes are shot in the same kitchen studio, which is equipped with a mix of colorful high end (e.g., Le Creuset and Cuisinart), vintage, and Rachael Ray’s own brand appliances, utensils, and cookware<sup>33</sup>.

---

<http://www.acasatv.ro/emisiuni/la-povestiri-adevarate-simona-mihaescu-este-acasa-de-11-ani.html>, retrieved June 12, 2010.

In addition to hosting *I Eat Therefore I Am*, Dan Chișu owns a restaurant in Bucharest in the culinary style of *fusion* according to an online dining guide ([www.afterhours.ro](http://www.afterhours.ro), retrieved May 1st 2007). Dan Chișu’s popularity is also due to his career as an actor and producer.

<sup>32</sup> This is the typical wording used by RR; the claim of typicality is based on 10 program openings, all of which are nearly verbatim.

<sup>33</sup> From <http://www.foodnetwork.com/shows/30-minute-meals-set-list/index.html> retrieved August 12th, 2011.

RR introduces herself as a cook and usually presents recipes for main meals, which she introduces as variations of classic American or ethnic dishes—especially Italian, which is RR’s ethnicity—but as healthier, simpler, more delicious or less time-consuming to make. Occasionally, she presents desserts or appetizers as well in addition to the main meal ideas, but never appetizers or desserts alone. Table 1 below includes the recipes presented in the *30 Minute Meals* episodes analyzed in this study and their length.

Show no.	Recipes	Length (excluding commercials)
1	barbeque chicken burgers with slaw and macaroni salad with Monterey pepper jack cheese	20 min
2	whole wheat spaghetti with shallots and hot sausage and broccoli rub	20 min
3	poached eggs in a chorizo and tomato stew with garlic croutons, and sparkling sangria	20 min
4	beef meatballs with bucatini and Italian slaw salad	20 min
5	calzone rolls with tomatoes, salami and basil; romaine salad with pane roasted garlic dressing, and hazelnut and almond pound cake	20 min
Total time:		100 min

Table 1: *30 Minute Meals* episodes ; recipes and program length

#### 4.2.1.2 The Essence of Emeril

*The Essence of Emeril* typically begins with a greeting, after which EL announces the recipe that he demonstrates in a given episode<sup>34</sup>. He continues with the demonstration of the actual recipe and ends each episode by thanking his audience for watching his show. Each

<sup>34</sup> The claim of typicality is based on ten episodes.

episode is scheduled for a thirty minute period, and it contains three commercial breaks; the commercials occupy approximately ten minutes of the thirty minutes. All *The Essence of Emeril* episodes are shot in the same kitchen studio, which is equipped with Emerilware cookware and kitchen electrics that one can buy on the Emerilware brand website<sup>35</sup>.

Similarly to RR, EL typically presents main meals that oftentimes include Southern cuisine dishes, or dishes that include a grilling component; unlike RR, EL presents himself as a chef, and the meals that he demonstrates reflect this status mostly through ingredient choice, procedure, and the unlimited amount of time spent preparing the food. The Table 2 below includes the recipes presented in the *The Essence of Emeril* episodes analyzed in this study and their length.

Show no	Recipes	Length (excluding commercials)
1	mesquite smoke Caribbean style black cod filet and lemon crusted halibut; wine tips to go with fish	20 min
2	lamb chops with minty pepper jelly pan sauce, sautéed vegetables, and lambburgers with feta mayo spread	20 min
3	red bean soup, the peacemaker with pan fried oysters and a Creole tartar sauce, and gateau de syrup	20 min
4	Peggy's classic chicken pot pie and clay pot, roasted whole honey chicken	20 min
5	grilled grouper with a mango, habanero pepper barbeque sauce	20 min
Total time:		100 min

Table 2: *The Essence of Emeril* episodes ; recipes and program length

<sup>35</sup> Retrieved from <http://www.emerilware.com/> on August 12, 2011.

#### 4.2.1.3 The Recipe from Home

An episode from *The Recipe from Home* begins with SM announcing the name of the recipe, after which she tells her audience what the necessary ingredients are, gives general guidelines for how these ingredients need to be prepared, and lastly, she teaches the actual recipe<sup>36</sup>. At the end of each episode she expresses her hope that they will watch her show again. Each episode is approximately ten minutes long, and there are no commercial breaks during the cooking show. All *The Recipe from Home* episodes are shot in the same kitchen studio, equipped with modern appliances. Unlike the untypicality of RR's and EL's kitchens in the U.S. culture, SM's studio is considerably more reflective of a contemporary Romanian kitchen in terms of appliances, utensils, cookware, as well as kitchen size and overall set up.

SM introduces herself as a cook and presents meals that are simple and inexpensive to make and that do not require a lot of time to prepare. She presents a single meal in a given episode, i.e., appetizers, main dishes, or desserts, and purposely presents fasting meals during religious fasting periods. Table 3 below includes the recipes presented in the *The Recipe from Home* episodes analyzed in this study and their length.

Show no	Recipes	Length
1	potatoes stuffed with eggplant and squash	11.00 min
2	chicken wings with sour cream sauce	12.00 min
3	eggplant-stuffed peppers	5.45 min
4	meatballs with leeks and olives	7.40 min
5	cauliflower with mayonnaise, eggs, and ham	8.30 min

---

<sup>36</sup> The claim of typicality is based on eleven episodes.

6	yogurt-based cake	9.00 min
7	lentil meal	8.30 min
8	mushrooms with sauce	10.00 min
9	stuffed zucchini	9.20 min
10	pan-cooked vegetables	9.20 min
11	baked crepes	9.30 min
Total time:		99.15 min

Table 3: *The Recipe from Home* episodes ; recipes and program length

#### 4.2.1.4 I Eat Therefore I Am

Unlike the organization of the three cooking shows discussed so far, the organization of *I Eat Therefore I Am* differs with every episode. Some of the most common formats of *I Eat Therefore I Am* include: Dan Chişu cooking for guests at his restaurant; teaching other cooks new recipes at the restaurants where they work; and traveling to Western European countries such as Spain, France, or Italy, and explaining into the camera the meals and food products that he sees there. To provide a ground level comparison with the other three shows, only those episodes in which DC cooks either in the kitchen of his own restaurant or that of other restaurants have been included in the data, and only the actual cooking component has been analyzed. During an episode of *I Eat Therefore I Am* there are not only several commercial breaks, but also news broadcasts. The length of the cooking component of each episode can vary from ten to forty minutes.

DC introduces himself as a chef and oftentimes he presents a series of meals, not just one; this happens in particular when he cooks for guests or when he cooks in somebody

else's restaurant. His meals are made with expensive, hard-to-find ingredients and are not prepared in a limited amount of time. He typically has helpers who carry out the basic preparatory steps of the food preparation process, e.g., peeling vegetables or who cook the actual meal by following DC's instructions. Table 4 below includes the recipes presented in the *I Eat Therefore I Am* episodes analyzed in this study and their length.

Show no	Recipes	Length
1	chicken with ginger, shrimp, and curry	8.00 min
2	shrimp cream with curry; vegetable pasta; salmon with a sauce made from tomatoes, pomegranate, oyster sauce, wine, and chili; rice boiled in galifen with chicken; rare steak with potatoes; and foie gras with pear confiture	28.00 min
3	pheasant with figs; shrimp cream with green curry; homemade pasta with shrimp; marinated chicken with coconut; salmon with corriander; filet mignon with liver and amaretto; apple tart (served with vanilla icecream).	27.00 min
4	grilled tuna	6.00 min
5	ostrich stew	5.80 min
6	foie gras with figs; shrimp cream with ginger, green curry, trout and coconut; filet mignon with mashed potatoes.	16.00 min
7	chicken with tomato and sourcream ginger sauce	8.00 min
Total time:		98.80 min

Table 4: *I Eat Therefore I Am* episodes ; recipes and program length



## 4.3 Methodology

### 4.3.1 Analytic approach

A corpus of approximately one hundred minutes from each of the two U.S. and Romanian shows have been recorded and analyzed<sup>37</sup>. All shows have been transcribed according to the conventions of Conversation Analysis (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984) which allow for a detailed rendering of both the actual words and their prosodic features as well as pauses and intonation<sup>38</sup>. Instances of nonverbal communication relevant to the target concepts, i.e., *affective* and *interactional stance-taking*, have been marked within double parentheses. Some parts of the Romanian shows were in English, thus have Romanian subtitles; in this case, the English excerpts have been transcribed and Romanian subtitles added in parentheses. This type of detailed transcription, which includes not only what cooking show hosts say, but also how they say it—for instance, word stress, length of pauses, volume—is crucial to an accurate linguistic and cultural study of spoken language in general and *affective* and *interactional stance-taking* in particular.

The analytical frameworks to which I appeal in this dissertation are *indexicality* (Ochs, 1996; Silverstein, 2003) for the study of affective stance-taking; *presentation of self* (Goffman, 1959), *framing* (Goffman, 1974) and *footing* (Goffman, 1981), for the analysis of interactional stance-taking; and lastly, I used *indexical order* (Silverstein, 2003) to frame the contextualization of stance, affect, and interaction in the broader U.S. and Romanian cultural context.

---

<sup>37</sup> The episodes of the Romanian shows are approximately half the length of the U.S. cooking show episodes, thus the number of Romanian episodes that have been included in the analysis are double the number of U.S. episodes.

<sup>38</sup> See Appendix 1 for an explanation of transcription symbols.

In this dissertation, a macro- and micro- level discourse analytical approach has been adopted to the analysis of television cooking shows from Romania and the U.S. (e.g., Ochs et al., 1996). To this end, on a macro level, I examined the instances of organization, content, and surface level elements of the four shows, such as cooking show setting, cooking procedure sequence, host appearance and body language relevant to the analysis of *affective* and *interactional stance-taking*, and analyzed how they pattern across the two cultures. For instance, as the analysis of affective taste and interactional features is central to this dissertation, the inclusion of macro-level aspects such as the cooking process dynamics, i.e., cooking vs. tasting the meals presented on the show, was crucial to this analysis. In addition, for data analysis triangulation purposes, I used sources outside the actual cooking shows, such as interviews with the cooking show hosts, websites, and other material relevant to the concepts of stance, taste, affect, and interaction to offer as nuanced a perspective as possible on these cultural constructs.

On a micro level, I have investigated patterns that build on and reflect elements of the two cultures by highlighting and categorizing the grammatical, semantic, lexical and prosodic tokens which encode *affective stance* vis-à-vis food and *interactional stance*, or the hosts' attitudes towards their viewing audiences. An initial micro-grain investigation of stance and affect led to the creation of the following categories of affective stance-taking directed towards food<sup>39</sup>: lexical features encoding taste, visual appeal, smell, e.g., delicious; verbal expressions indexing food preferences, e.g., to like; and lastly, other affect-encoded food preference features. Of all these affective stance tokens, the first group, i.e., lexical features referencing taste were chosen for analysis. Conversely, while several linguistic features encoded the interaction between television host and viewing audiences in the

---

<sup>39</sup> See appendix C for a table including these tokens and their frequency.

television cooking show discourse from the two countries, only imperative and interrogative constructions were selected for analysis due to their inherent discursive addressivity.

The focus of the data analysis in this dissertation is as follows: in Chapter 5, I analyze affective stance-taking towards taste, in Chapter 6, I examine interactional stance-taking and how it builds on television cooking show persona, and in Chapter 7, I contextualize the results from Chapters 5 and 6 within the broader Romanian and U.S. cultural context.

The rationale for choosing to analyze taste markers in Chapter 5 is two-fold: on the one hand, this sensory experience is one of the most commonly used measure of the quality of a meal by consumers and cooking experts alike; on the other hand, lexical taste tokens were the most frequently occurring affective stance-taking features throughout the four shows in that they total almost a third of all the affect tokens (295 out of 934).

In contrast with affective stance towards taste which expresses the television hosts' attitude towards the ingredients and meals that hosts prepare on their shows, interactional stance-taking, analyzed in Chapter 6, reveals hosts' attitudes and ways of interacting with their viewing audiences, as well as how such attitudes point to the construction of television cooking show social personae. In this dissertation, I define interactional stance markers as markers of increased focus and inclusion. I understand by markers of increased focus the discursive features that hosts use to draw audiences' attention to the different aspects of the food preparation process; conversely, I define inclusion markers as any features of the cooking show discourse which hosts use to engage viewing audiences and seek alignment regarding different aspects of the cooking process, e.g., the taste, visual appeal, or cooking procedure of a meal.

The coding process was carried out in more than one step by coding, and revising and re-coding the data as necessary to ensure a comprehensive and accurate selection of the relevant target micro- and macro- level features. Coding revisions were carried out twice, with the aim to fine-tune the *stance* categories created, as follows: first, after completing the categories that include stance tokens from the four shows, in order to ensure that the tokens selected from Romanian and U.S. English are equivalent semantically; second, after deciding to focus on affective taste, and interactional stance markers of focus and inclusion, to ascertain that the affective and interactional elements included in the analysis belong to their assigned categories<sup>40</sup>. Each interactional and affective taste token was identified and counted as one thought unit (Chafe, 1970), which in the case of television cooking show discourse is typically a phrase, and not a clause, or a sentence, e.g., *yummo*. Conversely, in the case of interjections, the intonation unit was the unit of analysis; for instance, *hmm::^hm-hm::^hm^hm^hm^hmm^!!* was counted as five interjections.

In addition, the researcher alternated the analysis of *30 Minute Meals* with that of *The Essence of Emeril*, respectively of *The Recipe from Home* and *I Eat Therefore I Am* to avoid creating categories based on one show alone and imposing them on the other shows—from the same or different country. The purpose of this back-and-forth coding and the alternating of cooking show analyses is to attempt to maintain an objective perspective and depict the myriad of representations of the concept of affective and interactional stance-taking in food and cooking discourse from the two cultures. When needed, the researcher consulted with

---

<sup>40</sup> Some of the affective stance features were difficult to categorize, e.g., some tokens expressing general excitement towards food could have arguably been included in the taste category but they were left out due to their semantic ambiguity, i.e., it was unclear whether the host extended the meaning of that particular token to reference taste in addition to expressing general excitement vis-à-vis food.

linguists who are in-group informants and native speakers of U.S. English and Romanian respectively<sup>41</sup>.

#### 4.3.2 Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural analysis

In this dissertation, I cross-examined data from all four cooking shows for a detailed, micro-grain and macro-informed analysis of cultural elements present in this television genre from Romania and the U.S. More specifically, the sequencing of this linguistic and cultural investigation is as follows: first, I compared and contrasted the two female host shows, *The Recipe from Home* with *30 Minute Meals*, respectively the two male host shows, *The Essence of Emeril* and *I Eat Therefore I Am*. Then, I examined these gender-specific findings cross-linguistically and cross-culturally, at the same time taking into consideration general stance, affect, and interaction patterns within Romanian and U.S. culture. In other words, while in this dissertation study I controlled for gender variables by primarily analyzing female and male cooking show discourse distinctly, I also made observations based both on data from the same culture, i.e., U.S. or Romanian, and from male and female discourse across all four shows.

I chose to compare *Rețeta de Acasă* with *30 Minute Meals* because both hosts, Simona Mihăescu and Rachael Ray are female, set forth an image of cooks, not chefs, and demonstrate how to cook simple meals from scratch in a short amount of time. Both SM and RR adopt an informal approach to presenting their meal ideas, which includes advice concerning ingredient selection, and food preparation and serving. Conversely, I compared *The Essence of Emeril* and *I Eat Therefore I Am* because both shows present meals that are

---

<sup>41</sup> While ideally data coding is carried out by at least two researchers so that the results can be cross-checked, this was not possible due to the nature of dissertation research.

made in a non-specified amount of time, and that are more sophisticated either in terms of ingredient choice or cooking procedure than meals that one would cook on a regular basis<sup>42</sup>. The hosts of both shows, Emeril Lagasse and Dan Chişu are male and introduce themselves to their audiences, either explicitly or implicitly, as chefs, or cooking experts.

The examination of data from a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspective offers the advantage of highlighting communication patterns which one may not perceive by analyzing discourse from one culture only, as well as to show how semiotic, discursive, and linguistic features within this genre show both similarities and differences across cultures, contexts, and interlocutors (Ochs, 1986). In this way, the contrastive analysis of Romanian and U.S. media contributes to providing a more nuanced and accurate understanding of cultural representations, and emerging media trends, as exemplified in this television genre from Romania and the United States.

#### **4.4 Conclusion**

In this chapter, I discussed the data selected for analysis, including the rationale for the selection of this television genre, and the rationale for focusing on this television cooking show corpus; an in-depth presentation of the organization and content of each of the four shows; and lastly, a detailed description of the actual recipes presented in the episodes included in the analysis. Moreover, I also explained how the data selected, as well as the cross-cultural micro- and macro-level analytic approach adopted in this dissertation

---

<sup>42</sup> Emeril's second show on The Food Network, *Emeril Live*, has not be included in the data for this dissertation because its format is not comparable with that of the other three shows in that a live audience is present on the setting of the show.

contributed to a nuanced understanding of affective and interactional stance-taking in television cooking show discourse from Romania and the U.S.

## Chapter 5

### DATA ANALYSIS

#### Affective stance-taking and taste in U.S. and Romanian TV cooking show discourse

##### 5.1 Introduction

In this study I examine Romanian and U.S. television cooking shows as *speech events* (Hymes, 1972; Duranti, 1997). The concept of *speech event* derives from that of *communicative event*, the latter of which Hymes views as reflecting and being marked by the situatedness of language use within a given community of speakers, where it is both produced and decoded. A *speech event* is defined as a unit of analysis more specific than the communicative event; according to Hymes (1972), a *speech event* is the “activities or aspects of activities, that are directly governed by rule or norms for the use of speech.” (Hymes, 1972, p. 56). Hymes (ibid.) also distinguishes between *speech events* and *speech situations* (p.51); speech situations are activities in which speech is not central, may be present or absent, and where present, it does not follow set rules.

Another characteristic of speech events is that they are co-constructed by their participants (Gumperz, 1996; Duranti, 1997); according to Duranti, a speech event is a “collective *activity* of individual social actors” (Duranti, ibid., p. 239, emphasis added). The *activity of speaking* is thus intersubjective, context-dependent, and grounded in the cultural norms of its co-participants. The framing of television cooking shows as speech events is thus motivated by the fact that such a Hymesian perspective offers both a more comprehensive and accurate view of spoken discourse than a de-contextualized formal analysis of linguistic structure alone would provide. That is, given the collaborative aspect of



the activity of speaking, a view of the cooking show discourse as *speech event* takes into account not only linguistic form, but also other features of the communicative activity such as cultural situatedness, context-dependency and co-constructiveness. In the context of the television cooking show genre even though audiences are not physically present, cooking show hosts employ discursive strategies similar to those typical of face-to-face contexts, such as audience-directed questions meant to draw attention to an aspect of the cooking process, invite for audiences' agreement, or more generally for their opinion regarding the meal that television hosts are preparing.

Television cooking shows are *speech events* in that language is an intrinsic part of television programs in general, and food preparation programming in particular. That is, while viewing audiences can see on the television how meals are prepared, cooking shows involve more than the visual "transmission" of the recipe—they also entail verbal cooking instructions and cultural remarks regarding the meals being presented, *inter alia*. Similarly to other speech events, cooking show discourse is rule-governed and subject to genre conventions, i.e., it follows prescribed conventions typical to both cooking and the television genre, such as openings, recipe presentations, and closings. In addition to these macro-level rules that make the television cooking show a recognizable speech event, other, more implicit discursive rules that are intrinsic to this television genre and that become apparent upon a closer examination, is the enacting of stance-taking towards the meals prepared on the show and television viewing audiences, both of which valence broader constructs such as social personae and cultural values set forth by cooking show hosts.

In this chapter, I undertake a lexico-pragmatic analysis of *affective stance* (Ochs, 1996; Kiesling, 2009) towards *taste*, and I investigate the indexical meanings (Ochs, 1996;

Lyons, 1977; Peirce, 1955; Silverstein, 2003) of affect markers in television cooking show discourse from the two cultures. In Chapter 6, I analyze *interactional stance* (Ochs, 1996; Karkkainen, 2006; DuBois, 2007), more specifically audience involvement of alignment and focus surrounding interrogative and imperative constructions in television cooking shows from the two countries. Lastly, in Chapter 7 I situate the findings on stance, affect, and interaction analyzed in Chapters 5 and 6 in the broader U.S. and Romanian media and cultural contexts; such a macro-level approach is aimed at bringing together linguistic features that express attitudes towards food and viewing audiences, with a culture-specific pragmatic frame of interpretation.

I organize the present chapter as follows: in section 5.2, I discuss the analytical framework to which I appeal in this chapter and the focus of this analysis, then in section 5.3 I examine affective stance surrounding taste tokens from a cross lexico-pragmatic perspective and their indexical meanings; lastly, section 5.4 offers concluding remarks.

## **5.2 Analytical framework**

### **5.2.1 Indexicality**

In this study I appeal to the principles of *indexicality* (Ochs, 1996; Lyons, 1977; Peirce, 1955) to the cross-linguistic and cross-cultural analysis of *affective stance* (Ochs, 1996) in Romanian and U.S. television cooking show discourse. By *culture*, I understand a concept parallel to Bourdieu's (1990) *habitus*; that is, I view *culture* as a set of characteristics which individuals acquire and incorporate into their social practice, as a result of the individuals' "molding" by the structure of both the immediate institutional context and that

of the society of which they are a part (Bourdieu, 1977, p.72). I discuss the definition of culture adopted in this study more thoroughly in Chapter 3.

In this dissertation, I view affective stance as “a mood, attitude, feeling, and disposition, as well as degrees of emotional intensity vis-à-vis some focus of concern (Ochs, 1996, p.410)”. In addition to varying in intensity, affect can also be categorized as carrying a positive and a negative charge (Ochs, 1996; Labov, 1984); it is the former, i.e., the positive affect and its degrees of intensity that the present study investigates due to its prevalence in cooking show discourse in the two countries<sup>43</sup>. In the case of television cooking shows, positive affective stances are conveyed by television cooking show hosts towards ingredients and meals; more specifically, this chapter focuses only on the taste of the food (cf. features of visual appeal or smell) presented on the shows. In this light, I consider all taste tokens analyzed in this chapter to express a positive stance, and concepts such as *affective stance* and *taste features* will be used interchangeably henceforth; *markers*, *tokens*, and *features* will also be used to refer to the same sets of discursive elements.

The theoretical framework which I adopt in this study, indexicality, is the principle according to which linguistic forms point to specific “entities” present in the immediate cultural context, thus gaining indexical meanings with reference to time, space, identity, actions, emotions, inter alia. (Ochs, 1996). According to Ochs (ibid.), affective stance is an illustrative structure for linguistic indexing, in that linguistic forms such as interjections or descriptors typically index affect. In other words, interjections or descriptors such as those that encode some type of preference or evaluation towards food, e.g., *yummy!* or *delicious* are

---

<sup>43</sup> Over 95% of affect tokens are positive in the Romanian and U.S. television cooking shows analyzed in this study.

commonly used in affect-imbued situations, thus they invoke or become associated with such discourse.

### **5.2.2 Focus of study**

In this study, affective markers are discursive verbal or visual features that encode affect and clearly denote a positive evaluation (Ochs, 1996; Hunston and Thompson, 2000; DuBois, 2007) of the taste of ingredients or of the meals prepared on television, not just a general food preference, e.g., “I like/ love macaroni and cheese.” While both verbal and visual tokens have been included in this analysis, the overwhelming majority of elements are either verbal, or visual and verbal; in the latter case, the visual component complements the meaning conveyed by text, oftentimes clarifying and adding nuances to spoken features (Fairclough, 2003; Barthes, 1977).

Kiesling (2009) points out the difficulty of coding stance, especially when undertaking a quantitative analysis, because there is not a one-to-one correspondence between linguistic form and the function of stance-taking, in this case, stance of affect towards taste (p.173). That is, the same linguistic form can function for instance, as affective stance towards taste, but also as affective stance encoding general food preference. The token selection process I undertook while coding affective stance markers in this dissertation considered both the aforementioned coding concerns as well as the subjective nature of analyzing discourse in general. In this light, I conducted a multi-step coding and re-coding process to ensure an accurate selection of affect stance features which also entailed consultations with in-group linguistics specialists who are also native speakers of Romanian

and U.S. English to eliminate possible inter speaker variation. A detailed account of the coding process can be found in section 4.3.1, Chapter 4.

The data coding process reveals two broad categories of affective stance markers (see Table 5): lexical (699 tokens) and verbal (235 tokens); the lexical category includes taste, visual appeal, and smell features of affect, as well as interjections which encode these perceptions of ingredients or food traits. In addition, included in the lexical category are specific elements, e.g., *nice*, which point to a positive stance towards taste, visual appeal, smell, texture, etc., but are not clearly associated with only one of these characteristics. Lastly, television cooking show chefs employ affective language with reference to food texture, color, and other ingredient and meal quality, and such markers have been included as well in the “other” category.

			30 Minute Meals	Essence of Emeril	Recipe from Home	I Eat Therefo re I Am	# of tokens
Lexical affective stance features (699)	1	Taste	120	75	47	53	295
	2	Visual appeal	48	25	31	7	111
	3	Smell	32	15	4	5	56
	4	<i>Nice</i>	111	27	N/A	N/A	138
	5	Other	26	15	45	13	99
Verbal affective stance features (235)	6	<i>Love</i>	40	10	N/A	N/A	50
	7	<i>Like</i>	12	10	16	8	46
	8	Other	41	64	23	11	139
		Total	430	241	166	97	934

Table 5: The distribution of affective taste markers in television cooking shows from Romania and the U.S.

The category of U.S. and Romanian verbal affective markers consists of considerably fewer affective tokens than the lexical category, with a distribution of lexical to verbal markers of 3:1. In addition, the verbal construction category includes preponderantly U.S. English tokens of affect, e.g., *love*, *like*; this comparatively lower number of verbal affect tokens as well as the uneven distribution of Romanian and U.S. English markers (approximately 1:3) were decisive factors in choosing to analyze lexical and not verbal affect discursive features. Further, within the lexical category, given the high frequency of taste features across the two data sets (taste markers consist of nearly half of all affective lexical features, 295 out of 699, see Table 5) and to maintain focus, in this chapter I analyze solely lexico-pragmatic taste constructions in Romanian and U.S. English television cooking show discourse.

In section 5.3, I analyze affective stance in the television cooking show genre from a cross-pragmatic perspective and discuss its indexical meanings in Romanian and U.S. cultural contexts. Section 5.4 will offer concluding remarks.

### **5.3 Affective stance towards taste in U.S. and Romanian television cooking show discourse**

In this chapter, I examine affective stance towards taste from a quantitative and qualitative perspective to uncover further characteristics of food and cooking discourse in U.S. and Romanian media. More specifically, I begin by analyzing the frequency of taste

markers across the four shows as a way of identifying salient discursive taste features and general taste expression trends in the two cultures, and I then I undertake a qualitative, lexico-pragmatic analysis of such features.

### 5.3.1 Affect token frequency

With regard to affect token frequency, both the male and female U.S. hosts use more taste tokens than their Romanian counterparts: there are 120 tokens in *30 Minute Meals* vs. 47 in *The Recipe from Home*, and 75 markers in *The Essence of Emeril* vs. 53 in *I Eat Therefore I Am*, with an overall ratio of U.S. to Romanian taste markers of 2:1 (see Tables 6 and 7).

<i>30 Minute Meals (120 tokens)</i>		<i>The Recipe from Home (47 tokens)</i>	
Interjections	38%	Interjections	18%
Delicious	23%	Gustos [ <i>tasty</i> ]	23%
Good	14%	Bun [ <i>good</i> ]	25%
Other (less than 10% each)	25%	Other (less than 10% each)	34%

Table 6: Types of affect taste tokens in *30 Minute Meals* and *The Recipe from Home*.

<i>The Essence of Emeril (75 tokens)</i>		<i>I Eat Therefore I Am (53 tokens)</i>	
Delicious	60%	Bun [ <i>good</i> ]	55%
Other (10% or less each)	40%	Other (10% or less each)	45%

Table 7: Types of affect taste tokens in *The Essence of Emeril* and *I Eat Therefore I Am*.

This difference in token frequency can be attributed to television production norms specific to Romania and the U.S., but also to distinct culture-specific communication styles and individual host variation. In terms of token distribution, there seem to be comparable patterns in the female and male taste language use across the two cultures. That is, U.S. and

Romanian female taste features are more evenly distributed across several token types that are also semantically comparable, e.g., interjections, *bun* [good]- *good*, *gustos* [tasty]- *delicious* (see Table 6); in contrast, Romanian and U.S. male taste language discourse centers on the use of one single token in more than half of the data thus allowing for less variation in terms of affective taste expression, e.g., *delicious* and *good* [bun] (see Table 7). Such a distribution may point to a more nuanced rendering of taste evaluations in female compared to male cooking show discourse through the frequent use (at least 10% of the time) of three different types of affect taste token in female cf. only one in male cooking show discourse.

In section 5.3.2, I undertake an in-depth analysis of the most frequent taste markers introduced in Tables 2 and 3 in television cooking show discourse from Romania and the U.S.

### **5.3.2 Evaluating taste—a lexico-pragmatic qualitative analysis of taste and affect**

A systematic analysis of the Romanian and U.S. data reveals several discursive patterns regarding the use of taste markers vis-à-vis ingredients, taste, and the cooking process in the two cultures. In what follows, I discuss and illustrate the different functions of the most frequent taste features (see Tables 6 and 7) in the four cooking shows analyzed in this study.

#### **5.3.2.1 Interjections<sup>44</sup> as markers of vicarious consumption**

A common discursive strategy across all four cooking programs is an invitation for television audiences to visualize the taste, texture, smell, and visual appeal of the meals

---

<sup>44</sup> The terms “interjections” and “vocalizations” are used interchangeably in this analysis.



presented on these shows. Moreover, taste evaluations of the television cooking show chefs themselves are based to a great extent on a recalled or projected taste experience in that in addition to evaluating meals at the end of each episode, they also comment throughout each episode on how the quality, quantity and type of the individual ingredients involved will contribute to the overall taste quality of the final product. In fact, the overwhelming majority of food-referenced evaluative language in *30 Minute Meals*, *The Recipe from Home* and *The Essence of Emeril* is used during the cooking process, before the hosts taste an intermediate or final product; the only exception to this “taste-evaluation-in-process” is *I Cook, Therefore I Am*, in which most evaluative taste tokens are used at the end of the show, when the TV chef, Dan Chişu, tastes the meal after he has finished preparing it<sup>45</sup>.

As shown in Table 2, a significant percentage of taste markers in RR’s and SM’s discourse is made up of interjections; that is, in *30 Minute Meals*, 38% of the total number of taste elements are interjections, and in *The Recipe from Home*, 18%; the percentage of such taste tokens is less than 10% of the total taste tokens in *Maninc deci exist* and *The Essence of Emeril*. Thus, of the four cooking show hosts, RR and SM use the most interjections yet most of their taste evaluations occur before the end of each episode when they taste the meals that they present on their shows; I illustrate below the use of interjections in *The Recipe from Home*.

((This excerpt comes towards the end of the episode in which SM has cooked stuffed potatoes; in addition to praising the visual aspect, taste, and ease of the cooking process of

---

<sup>45</sup> *I Eat Therefore I Am* seems to be the least staged and organized TV cooking show analyzed in this dissertation, so perhaps due to this, the chef only praises the meal that he is presenting at the end of the show when he actually also tastes it, even though there are breaks during which he could taste the meals at intermediate stages of preparation.

this meal, she evaluates the taste of an imagined meal combination, stuffed potatoes with roast)).

- (1) *Ma::^mă, da' ara^tă su^per bine. FOA^rte fain ara^tă, îmi pla^ce. Uuuu!! Și- și A^sta poate fi o garnitu^ră, ați văzu^t ? Tre^buie doar să ai^ imagina^ție. =Ui^te, cât de SI^mplu se fa^ce, lînga o fripturi^că. Hmm, FOA^rte bun !*

[Mother, it looks super good. It looks very nicely, I like it. Uuuu ! And this can be a side dish, you see that ? One only has to have imagination. Look, how simple it can be done next to a little roast. Hmm, very good !]

SM's comments regarding the meal that she presents in this particular episode begin with a sequence of visual positive evaluations of different degrees of intensity, e.g., *arată super bine* [it looks super good], *foarte fain arată* [it looks very well], and *îmi place* [I like it] followed by *uuu* !. As SM's evaluative construction *Hmm, FOA^rte bun!* immediately follows her serving suggestion of stuffed potatoes with roast, she praises the taste of this imagined combination, not just of the meal she is presenting in this episode, which only includes stuffed potatoes.

Further, I argue that in *30 Minute Meals* and *The Recipe from Home* cooking show hosts employ interjections to express taste-related enthusiasm in part as a substitute for a real time experience of sampling the meals that they present. In the context of the television cooking show genre, such language structures are imbued with affect to index (Ochs, 1996; Lyons, 1977; Peirce, 1955) the imagined taste experiences for both television chefs and viewers. In what follows, I discuss and illustrate the function of interjections as markers of vicarious taste experience in *30 Minute Meals*.

((This example comes towards the end of an episode in which RR presents the recipe for calzone rolls served with romaine salad with pan roasted garlic dressing; this excerpt refers to the dressing))

- (2) *Okay^, here we go^, ki^ds. O^h, yea::^h, yummm-o::^!! You know^, this dre^ssing is fanta:^stic, on gri^lled fi^sh or chi^cken as we^ll, hmm::^hm^hm::^hm^hm^hm^hm^hm^!! (0.2) NI^ce! O^h! Fanta^stic! Let's see::^, ((tastes the salad)) (0.2) ((makes the "good" sign with the index and thumb of her right hand)) awe::^some! A li^ttle more sa^lt and pe^pper I thi^nk on the sa:^lad, (0.2) ((adding salt and pepper)) a^hh!!*

In excerpt 2 above I note an interplay of strategies that contribute to the affective stance construction of food and taste, and that are equally built on vocalizations and lexical tokens; all of these discursive features work together to create a definite preference for a type of dressing, one of the meal components presented in this episode. However, in contrast with lexical descriptors such as “fantastic,” interjections can be semantically more encompassing and thus potentially more convincing of the high quality of taste of a certain meal; that is, a vocalization such as “*hmm::^hm^hm::^hm^hm^hm^hm^hm^!!*” coupled with prosodic features such as stress, high pitch, and increased volume can offer a less specific but at the same time more complex, intriguing, and emotionally charged rendition of an actual taste experience.

In addition to the more widely used English interjections *O^h*, *yea::^h*, or *a^hh!!*, in *30 Minute Meals*, RR appeals to constructions such as *yummm-o::^!!*, derived from typical adjectives—in this case from the informal “yummy”; both “yum-o”<sup>46</sup> and “delish” as well as other linguistic constructions coined by RR (the latter is not illustrated here but present in the data from *30 Minute Meals*) are trademarks of RR’s discourse which she uses in other media

<sup>46</sup> RR has a nonprofit organization “Yum-o” which “empowers kids and their families to develop healthy relationships with food and cooking.” (retrieved April 7, 2010 from <http://www.yum-o.org/>)

contexts to construct and maintain her TV cooking show persona<sup>47</sup>. Thus, in *30 Minute Meals* as well as in other television programs featuring RR such constructions index a specific taste experience constructed through RR's discourse and vicariously experienced by both RR and her viewing audiences.

RR's idiosyncratic use and type of vocalizations illustrated and discussed above seem to both encode and evoke a higher degree of emotional intensity than the vocalizations used by SM in *The Recipe from Home*, and in this light, RR's cooking show discourse may offer a more powerful or convincing taste experience than SM. While the vocalizations in *30 Minute Meals* indeed carry a stronger affective charge than those in *The Recipe from Home* from an U.S. English standpoint, a cross-pragmatic investigation that considers both cultural contexts reveals that in Romanian, the positive evaluation function of interjections is borrowed from English and is still a relatively marked discourse strategy<sup>48</sup>. Thus, SM's use of interjections and their intensity are relatively close semantically to those from *30 Minute Meals* when taking into account the cultural framework of each of the two television programs.

### 5.3.2.2 Multi-sensory evaluations of *good* food

In this section, I present the use and indexical meanings of the taste evaluator *bun* [good] and *good* in *30 Minute Meals* (14% of taste tokens), *The Recipe from Home* (25% of taste tokens), and *I Eat Therefore I Am* (55% of taste tokens). Because in the fourth show, *The Essence of Emeril*, *good* consists of less than 10% of taste tokens, these instances of

---

<sup>47</sup> RR also has a dog food product, 'Delish' which also serves as evidence of the 'trademark' quality of the expression 'delish' coined by her which builds on her professional persona.

<sup>48</sup> In Romanian, the unmarked meaning of 'hm' is reluctance, uncertainty. From <http://dexonline.ro/definitie/hm> retrieved August 9, 2011.

*good* have been left out of this analysis because of the intended focus in this dissertation study on features of cooking show discourse that are highly representative of the data sets from each country.

Central to the discussion of appraisal taste tokens is the non-verbal behavior of the cooking show hosts preceeding and following these features, as well as on what aspects of the meals cooking show hosts base their taste evaluations of *bun* [good] and *good*. All the hosts of the three cooking show programs discussed here, RR, SM, and DC taste the meals or intermediary products of these meals during their shows, albeit RR and SM do not taste the meals that they make in each episode.

However, as previously mentioned, in *30 Minute Meals* and *The Recipe from Home* the majority of taste evaluators, including *bun* [good] and *good* occur before RR and SM sample their meals; in contrast, in *I Eat Therefore I Am* all taste features evaluating the meals that he cooks on his show, including *bun* [good], immediately follow DC's actual sampling of his meals. Moreover, DC's verbal evaluation of his meals seems to be based solely on his actual taste experience alone, and not on other aspects of his meals, such as visual appeal, smell, or texture. In what follows, I discuss DC's use of *bun* [good].

In *I Eat Therefore I Am*, DC employs instances of *bun* [good] carrying different degrees of intensity, from more neutral to highly positive forms of *bun*, and covering a range of meanings from *edible* to *delicious*. What contributes to the construction of these shades of meaning of the lexical token *bun* [good] in *I Cook, Therefore I Am* is an *expectation* that the host creates discursively and that is based upon the fact that most of his meals are made with ingredients that are very unusual for the Romanian context and thus they may not be good tasting. I illustrate the different meanings of *good* as well as DC's implied *expectation*

regarding the taste of some of the recipes that he presents and that are less common for the Romanian television audience.

((DC presents in this episode *stufat de strut* [loosely, “stuffed ostrich”], a meal which is traditionally made with lamb at Easter time. He says he replaced lamb with ostrich in this recipe version to lighten the meal, because there are many people who require emergency room visits during the holiday season due to overconsumption of fatty foods. However, he has never made *stufat* before, so he solicits the help of his aides, two females, who are skilled in preparing traditional meals, and who actually cook the entire meal. In this excerpt, he tastes the final product of this new version of *stufat* and takes credit for making the meal)).

- (3) 1 *vreau să gu<sup>st</sup>, o furculi<sup>ță</sup>, o linguri<sup>ță</sup>, ((puts some of the meal on a plate)) (0.6)*  
2 *Să vede:::m. ((cools down the meal by blowing air on it)) (0.6) E bu<sup>n</sup>. (0.2)*  
3 *((takes another bite, then looks up as if addressing God)) Ia<sup>rtă</sup>-mă, da e bu<sup>n</sup>.*  
4 *Am combinat strutu cu stu<sup>fa</sup><sup>tu</sup>, da e bun. ((takes another bite)) H<sup>mm</sup>! (0.2)*  
5 *((makes “good” sign with index and thumb)). E bun pă bu<sup>ne</sup>. Poftă bu<sup>nă</sup>.*

[I want to taste, a fork, a teaspoon, ((puts some of the meal on a plate)) (0.6). Let’s see. ((cools down the meal by blowing air on it)) (0.6) It’s good. (0.2) ((takes another bite, then looks up as if addressing God)). Forgive me, but it’s good. I made stuffed ostrich, but it’s good ((takes another bite)) Hmm! (0.2) ((makes “good” sign with index and thumb)). It’s good, seriously. Bon appetit.]

The context of the above stretch of discourse is relevant to understanding the different interpretations of the evaluator *bun*: as mentioned in the introductory explanation to the excerpt, DC is making a traditional Easter meal using ostrich, a rarely used and expensive meat in Romania, as a healthier alternative to lamb, the typical ingredient of *stufat*. Thus, the first instance of *bun* (line 2) constitutes a basic and unexpected announcement to the Romanian TV audience that *stufat* made with ostrich is edible, and even good tasting.

As DC progresses in his evaluation of the meal, *bun* takes on a gradually more and more positive meaning: in line 3, after taking a second bite of *stufat*, DC pretends to be apologizing to God for the “blasphemy” of not using lamb, but ostrich in a traditional Easter meal,<sup>49</sup> then explains that his ingredient choice was dictated by the delicious taste of *stufat* with ostrich-- *Ia^rtă-mă, da e bu^n*. [Forgive me, but it’s good]. In line 4, after DC reiterates what he did, that is, to combine *stufat* with ostrich, he takes another bite of his new variant of *stufat*, and continues with a series of verbal and nonverbal positive evaluators vis-à-vis *stufat*: the interjection *H^mm!*, which is a relatively marked positive evaluator in Romanian<sup>50</sup> is followed by the nonverbal “good” sign, and lastly, by another highly positive *bun* construction: *E bun pă bu^ne*. [It’s good, seriously]. This succession of positive evaluators ends with the set phrase *Poftă bu^nă!* [Bon apetit] which also indirectly suggests that one can enjoy such a meal because it is great tasting.

In contrast to the use of *bun* [good] in *I Eat Therefore I Am*, which, as shown above, equally covers a wide range of nuances encoding a positive evaluation, the majority of *bun* [good] and *good* tokens in *The Recipe from Home* and *30 Minute Meals* encode a strong positive assessment of the taste of food. I illustrate the semantics of *bun* [good] and *good* in the two female host cooking show programs in excerpts 4, 5, and 6 below.

Similarly to DC, SM verbally evaluates the taste of her meals based on own taste experience of the food that she prepares on the show; however, most of the time SM praises her meals before tasting them, and in the majority of these instances she seems to base her taste appraisal of *bun* [good] and other similar positive evaluative features on the visual appeal of her meals; that is, in *The Recipe from Home*, *bun* [good] co-occurs with and is

---

<sup>49</sup> Greek Orthodox religious practices involve the slaughtering and cooking of lambs at Easter.

<sup>50</sup> In Romanian, the unmarked meaning of “hm” is reluctance, uncertainty. From <http://dexonline.ro/definitie/hm> retrieved August 9, 2011.

usually preceded by positive visual appeal features of the meals that she demonstrates. In excerpt (4) below I illustrate SM's appeal to the visual appeal of food as an indicator of its good taste.

((This is the end of an episode in which SM makes mushrooms with sauce, a recipe for both Christmas fasting and to celebrate St. Spiridon, the patron saint of the sick and the poor. In this episode SM does not taste her meal or its components at all)).

- (4) *Deci cam asa^ trebuie să arate la final. Vedeti cum le-am aranja^t.* ((We see on the screen: Ciuperci de post/ 500 g ciuperci, ulei de măsline, 1 ceapă/ 2 căței usturoi, otet, cimbru)) *Si-acuma punem so^sul pe care l-am făcut pe deasu^pra, (0.1) h^mmm!! Ce bu^n, ce bu^n!*

[So this is about how it needs to look at the end. See how I arranged them. ((We see on the screen: Fasting mushroom recipe/ 500 g mushrooms, olive oil, 1 onion/ 2 garlic ears, vinegar, thyme)). And now we are pouring the sauce we made on top (0.1) Hmmm!! How good, how good!]

Here, SM begins the evaluation of her meal with a praise for how the meal should look, and be arranged on the plate and decorated according to the recipe while the television viewers can read the actual recipe on the screen; SM then adds the last meal component, the sauce. It is the visual appeal of the meal with the sauce just poured over the mushrooms on which SM bases her taste appraisal of a vocalization followed by the repeated *bun* [good], i.e., *h^mmm!! Ce bu^n, ce bu^n!* [hmmm!! How good, how good!]; while in this excerpt SM does not explicitly praise the visual appeal of the meal, her positive evaluation of the meal is obvious in that the viewers can see a close up shot of the decorated mushroom meal with the sauce freshly poured over it. Further, in an excerpt following example (4) above, which has not been included here, SM praises more explicitly the taste of her meal through the



interjection *mmm!* and the phrases *it looks super good* and *I like how it looks*, evaluators which are also based on the visual appeal of the meal alone.

Similarly to SM, in *30 Minute Meals*, RR praises the meals that she cooks not only following her sampling of what she has prepared on a given episode, but also, oftentimes, without tasting her cooking, after she evaluates the beauty of the completed meal or intermediary products of this meal<sup>51</sup>. Furthermore, in yet other instances, RR bases her discursive appraisal of the taste of her meals on sensory perceptions such as smell or texture (examples 5 and 6).

((RR is mixing ground meat for her barbeque chicken burgers with slaw; in this episode, she also makes macaroni with Monterey pepper Jack cheese))

- (5) *We're just gonna mi^x it A^ll up and play with our foo:^d (a). (.) I^ lo:^ve this part! (b) It's another fu^n thing (c) about ma^king burgers. = They're ME^ssy! It's just goo:^d fun! (d)(.) Get on i^n there and get the CO^ncentrated sauce A::^ll the way through the mea^t, e^venly distri^buted. Ohh^, they smell TE^RRific! MA::^n, this is gonna be a goo:^d meal!*

While typically one gauges the taste of a meal based on its aroma during or after the cooking process, in excerpt (5) above RR comments on the smell of raw ground meat, as she is mixing it with sauce, and dividing the composition into equally sized patties. In other words, RR's smell appraisal of the burger mix appears as a result of her excitement regarding the preparatory stage of the burger preparation process. Moreover, RR's dual reference to the smell, i.e., *Ohh^, they smell TE^RRific!* and taste, i.e., *MA::^n, this is gonna be a goo:^d meal!* of the meal she is preparing at the end of a string of four constructions expressing

---

<sup>51</sup> For example, in this excerpt she praises the calzone rolls she has made at the end of the episode, before tasting them; RR's taste appraisal is based here on the temptation of the cheese oozing out of the calzone, e.g., *You just brea^k them apa^rt and the chee:^se comes oo^zing out. Ma::^n, are the^y goo^d? With that si^mple sa^lad, hmm^!* *Ma::^n, that is my^ ki^nda su^pper. We got a li^ttle bit of rico^tta snuck away there. Okay^.*

excitement vis-à-vis the meat mixing process (see excerpt (5), phrases *a* through *d*) points to the fact that RR's taste prediction of this meal may be based not only on the smell of the mix, but also on her tactile experience of mixing raw ground meat.

Lastly, RR appeals to food texture imagery, i.e., *chewy and gooey*, to claim that the meal that she is preparing, calzone rolls, is *good*. Emphasis here surrounding *good* is constructed through an informal audience-addressed rhetorical question built on *kids*, which similarly to the construction *MA::^n, this is gonna be a goo:^d meal!* in (5) above, is relatively marked in the context of television cooking shows which target an adult audience.

((RR is making calzone rolls and here she describes how to fill them; in this episode she also makes a romaine salad with pan roasted garlic dressing, and hazelnut and almond pound cake)).

- (6) *The^n, we're gonna pu^t the lid ba^ck on, just like tha:^t, po^p them in the o^ven, =let them toa^st and the i^nsides get all che^wy and goo^ey, how^ goo^d is tha:^t gonna be, ki::^ds? (0.1)*

While *good* and its Romanian equivalent *bun* are relatively common taste evaluators in Romanian and U.S. English, in this section I discussed and illustrated some of the complexities of such discursive features as well as their indexical meanings in the context of the television cooking show genre. In particular, I focused on the semantic range of *bun* [good] in *I Eat, Therefore I Am*, and on the cross-cultural patterns of establishing and expressing in a multimodal fashion, i.e., through both image and linguistic constructions, what aspects of a meal are considered indicative of its *good* taste in the female host cooking shows from Romania and the U.S. More specifically, the analysis in this subsection points to the fact that unlike DC, the female hosts, RR and SM, base their taste appraisal tokens *bun*

[good] and *good* not only on their actual taste experience, but also on additional sensory perceptions such as visual appeal in *The Recipe from Home*, and visual appeal, smell, and texture in *30 Minute Meals*.

### 5.3.2.3 *Deliciousness*—originality, cooking technique, and ingredient choice

As shown in the previous section, *good* and *bun* encode an evaluative stance towards the taste of the ingredients, intermediary products, and completed meals presented on the cooking shows analyzed in this study, in particular in *30 Minute Meals* and the two Romanian shows. In addition to evaluating taste, *gustos* [tasty] in *The Recipe from Home* and *delicious* in the two U.S. cooking shows point to what cooking show chefs seem to associate with the reason of the great taste of their meals—cooking creativity, food preparation technique, and ingredient choice.

In *The Recipe from Home*, SM uses *bun* with equal reference to ingredients and final meals; in contrast, she uses *gustos* overwhelmingly with reference to prepared meals or intermediary products of these recipes, thus *gustos* is mostly associated with the taste of prepared meals, not that of individual ingredients used in the recipe. Moreover, in *The Recipe from Home* the great taste of meals seems to be presented as being due to the host's ideas for combining ingredients, and less so to the choice or uniqueness of these ingredients, or to particular cooking techniques<sup>52</sup>. I exemplify this idea below.

---

<sup>52</sup> Reoccurring in *The Recipe from home* is the idea that if one has imagination, a lot of wonderful meals can be prepared using basic ingredients; SM expresses this idea in statements such as: *Cîte minu<sup>^</sup>ni se pot fa<sup>^</sup>ce, (.) da<sup>^</sup>că ai imagina<sup>^</sup>ție* [How many wonderful things can be done if one has imagination !]

((SM is making an appetizer of ham slices filled with a mixture of cauliflower, mayonnaise, eggs, and pickles; none of these ingredients is unusual in the Romanian cultural context. The excerpt below comes halfway through the episode when SM has prepared the filling and is starting to fill the ham slices to make ham rolls)).

- (7) *am saliva^t hahaha, ((laughter)) eu cred ca e foa^rte gustos acest amestec, va spun imedia^t. Dac-am saliva^t, tre sa gu^st. ((tastes the mixture)) (0.1) Hmm^!! Minuna^t ! (0.1) Hai sa mai punem puti::^n, un aperitiv e^xtraordinar ! Foa^rte, foarte gustos. (0.1) Asa::^ . (0.2) In felul ace^sta avem si^ legume proaspete, dar si^ leguma mura^ta, (0.1) deci o combina^tie dulce-acrisoa^ra.*

[my mouth is watering, hahaha ((laughter)), I think this mixture is very tasty, I'll tell you right away. If my mouth is watering, I have to try it ((tastes the mixture)). (0.1) Hmm! Wonderful! Let's add a little more, an extraordinary appetizer! Very, very tasty (0.1). There we go. (0.2) This way we have not only fresh, but also pickled vegetables, (0.1) so a sweet-sour combination].

Even though the cooking procedures that SM uses in this recipe are very basic—combining cooked cauliflower with eggs, pickles, and mayonnaise, and using this mixture to fill ham slices into rolls, in (7) above she praises this combination and points out that the originality of choosing to mix these ingredients is the reason for the good taste of the meal. That is, there is no mention of how the quality of these particular ingredients contribute to the good taste of this appetizer idea, neither does the recipe seem to require specific directions for combining these ingredients; emphasis is placed, however, on the idea of combining sweet and sour ingredients, e.g., fresh and pickled vegetables, which is discursively framed as a cooking procedure central to the success of the meal.

On a micro-level, SM's taste evaluation of the mixture that she is preparing in (7), i.e., *gustos* [tasty, used two times] is reinforced through the repeated intensifier *foarte* [very], as well as other contextual features such as interjections, e.g., *Hmm!*, evaluators that are not taste-specific, but that include a reference to taste in the above context, e.g., *Minunat!*

[wonderful], and SM's remark that the visual appeal of the mixture makes her mouth water and thus forces her to sample it.

Conversely, when parts of a *30 Minute Meals* dish are described as *delicious*, the context surrounding this evaluative marker points to the fact that RR's cooking technique is the reason for the great taste of the food being prepared. In contrast with the focus on the meal idea in *The Recipe from Home*, in *30 Minute Meals* emphasis seems to be placed on another aspect of the food preparation process, food preparation technique; that is, throughout RR's cooking discourse there is frequent mention of the fact that meals *become delicious* as a result of RR's cooking procedures.

((RR is cooking shallots approximately halfway through this episode for her "shallata flavor spaghetti," one of the two meals that she presents as one of her favorites.))

- (8) *I pu<sup>l</sup>led the garlic o<sup>ff</sup> the heat "cause I di<sup>dn</sup>'t want it to get too<sup>^</sup> bro<sup>wn</sup>, now I'm gonna bring the hea<sup>t</sup> up under my combina<sup>ti</sup>on of E.<sup>^</sup>V.<sup>^</sup>O.<sup>^</sup>O.<sup>^</sup> and a li<sup>tt</sup>le bit of bu<sup>t</sup>ter, I've go<sup>t</sup> it over me<sup>d</sup>ium hea<sup>t</sup> though, "cause I don't want the sha<sup>ll</sup>ots to bu<sup>rn</sup>, I wa<sup>nt</sup> them to just cook ve<sup>ry</sup> slowly and get sU<sup>per</sup> swee<sup>t</sup> and deli<sup>c</sup>ious.*

Excerpt (8) begins with a series of cooking techniques accompanied by cause-and-effect explanations for a certain course of action introduced in this excerpt by *because*, e.g., why the butter is cooking over medium heat—so that the shallots do not burn. The second part of the explanation for why the shallots are on medium heat is that they *will change into* a sweet and delicious product if cooked very slowly and according to RR's instructions.

Such explanations are typical of RR's *30 Minute Meals* discourse and their function may be to suggest that the taste of the meals presented on this show are high quality by drawing a parallel between RR's recipes and homemade, time consuming, slow cooked food.

On a show like *30 Minute Meals* that has as core concept cooking meals in a short amount of time, claims regarding the high quality of the taste of the meals presented may be necessary to dispel possible negative expectations held by television viewers vis-à-vis quick and easy meals.

*Delicious* is the only taste evaluator that both *30 Minute Meals* and *The Essence of Emeril* have in common,<sup>53</sup> but while in *30 Minute Meals* *delicious* tokens make up 23% of the total number of taste tokens, in *The Essence of Emeril*, *delicious* represents a much greater percentage of the tokens--more than half (60%) of all taste features. In addition to these differences in frequency, *delicious* encodes different indexical meanings in the two U.S. shows.

That is, unlike RR who uses *delicious* to highlight that the quality of the meals that she presents is a result of the *cooking process* that she demonstrates on the show, EL uses *delicious* to imply that the great taste of his meals is based on the choice, type, and quality of ingredients used, and not necessarily on his cooking technique. In light of EL's self positioning as a chef and RR's as a cook,<sup>54</sup> this focus on ingredient choice in *The Essence of Emeril* and on cooking technique in *30 Minute Meals* is somewhat unexpected in that in addition to ingredient choice, cooking procedure is typically a central part of a chef's culinary signature. I exemplify this focus in *The Essence of Emeril* in (9).

---

<sup>53</sup> I focus here only on taste tokens occurring more than 10% in each of the three shows; in addition to space considerations, the reason for this focus is to analyze a number of taste tokens that is sufficiently large to lend themselves to generalizations in this selected corpus.

<sup>54</sup> In an interview with Larry King, Rachael Ray points out that she is a cook, not a chef: "RAY: Are you kidding me? I'm not a chef. I'm a cook and I eat everything and anything." Retrieved June 13, 2007, from <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0609/18/lkl.01.html> .

((This is a stretch of discourse that contains both general preference and taste tokens, including the evaluative *delicious*, from an episode in which EL cooks herb crusted halibut, one of the two fish dishes presented in this episode; each string of discourse is numbered in order to situate it vis-à-vis the other ones. This excerpt is from the middle of the episode, when EL begins to cook the halibut dish.))

- (9) *1 And it's ca<sup>l</sup>led HA<sup>l</sup>ibut (0.1) and it is one of my FA<sup>v</sup>orite fi<sup>h</sup>sh. It's thi<sup>ck</sup>,  
2 it's fla<sup>h</sup>shy, it's fla<sup>h</sup>ky, but it's fi<sup>h</sup>:<sup>rm</sup>, it's A<sup>b</sup>solutely deli<sup>ci</sup>ous.*  
...  
*9 =But le<sup>t</sup> me te<sup>ll</sup> you wha<sup>t</sup> we're gonna do:<sup>h</sup>. We're gonna ta<sup>ke</sup> some  
10 pa<sup>r</sup>sley. A<sup>nd</sup> we're gonna ta<sup>ke</sup> some che<sup>rv</sup>il. Now che<sup>rv</sup>il is not one of  
11 tho<sup>se</sup> O<sup>r</sup>dinary sort of he<sup>r</sup>bs that you c<sup>n</sup> just go<sup>h</sup> down to the lo<sup>cal</sup>  
12 co<sup>r</sup>ner store and fi<sup>nd</sup>. You go<sup>tta</sup> go to a pro<sup>duce</sup> shop, ahm, you go<sup>tta</sup> go  
13 to a:: fa<sup>r</sup>mer's market, and I'm*  
...  
*25 okay<sup>h</sup>? And no::<sup>w</sup>, wa<sup>tch</sup> this to<sup>h</sup> that I'm go<sup>nna</sup> ta<sup>ke</sup> the ze<sup>st</sup> ri<sup>ght</sup> on  
26 the he<sup>r</sup>bs right he<sup>re</sup> of some le<sup>mon</sup>. So we're gonna ha<sup>ve</sup> some le<sup>mon</sup>  
27 pee::<sup>l</sup> i<sup>n</sup>side tha<sup>t</sup> as we<sup>ll</sup>. =Pre<sup>tt</sup>y ni<sup>fty</sup>, hu::<sup>h</sup>? A<sup>r</sup>i<sup>ght</sup>? So we-we  
28 ha<sup>ve</sup> tha::<sup>h</sup>,*  
...  
*30 And the<sup>n</sup> I'm go<sup>nna</sup> ta<sup>ke</sup>-wa<sup>tch</sup> thi:<sup>h</sup>s, I'm gonna ta<sup>ke</sup> some bla<sup>ck</sup>  
31 pe<sup>pper</sup>. Loo:<sup>h</sup>k at thi<sup>h</sup>s! Wa<sup>tch</sup> thi<sup>h</sup>s! Ta<sup>ken</sup> s'm, uuuh<sup>h</sup>^!! ta<sup>ken</sup> some  
32 uuuuhhhh^!! Ta<sup>ken</sup> s'me bla<sup>ck</sup> pe<sup>pper</sup> like tha<sup>t</sup>*  
*((he takes the black pepper with the blade of his knife and spreads it on the herbs)).*  
...  
*38 No::<sup>w</sup>, he<sup>re</sup>'s wha<sup>t</sup> we're go<sup>nna</sup> do<sup>h</sup>. A little salt MMHHMM<sup>h</sup> ((very high  
39 pitch sound)) a:::nd some fre<sup>sh</sup> gro<sup>und</sup> pe<sup>pper</sup>, now*  
...  
*48 he<sup>r</sup>bs in it, okay:<sup>h</sup>? Dry<sup>h</sup> ski<sup>llet</sup>. Well, you<sup>h</sup> kno<sup>w</sup> what I'm do<sup>ing</sup>, you  
49 see:<sup>h</sup> it. Ru<sup>b</sup> in the he<sup>r</sup>bs, and then in the dry<sup>h</sup> ski<sup>llet</sup>. When we co<sup>me</sup>  
50 back, I'm gonna sho<sup>w</sup> you how to fi<sup>nish</sup> this deLI<sup>ci</sup>ous he<sup>rb</sup> cru<sup>sted</sup>  
51 HA<sup>l</sup>ibut.*

In (9), most of the ingredients mentioned by EL for his herb-crusted halibut recipe are surrounded by either taste evaluators (e.g., line 2), a reference to the scarcity or uniqueness of ingredients (e.g., lines 10-13, or 27), and general excitement about a particular meal

component (e.g., lines 30-32 and 38-39). While some of the ingredients mentioned i.e., *halibut*, *chervil*, and *lemon peel*, are somewhat out of the ordinary in U.S. everyday cuisine, and could render someone excited about using them, the last two, *salt* and *pepper* are affordable, simple, and very common ingredients. However, EL's use of *salt* and *pepper* in this recipe seems to result in a rather strong display of emotion on his part: *black pepper* is surrounded by imperatives and interjections (lines 30-32), and *salt* by a high-pitched interjection (lines 38-39). This emphasis on ingredient choice is also discursively reinforced through several strategies, e.g., direct audience address, *watch out!*, which seem to build up expectation and increase focus on the following step of the cooking process, in particular on what ingredient will be added to the dish next<sup>55</sup>. Lastly, the taste evaluator *delicious* is repeated at the end of this stretch of discourse, this time with reference to the entire meal as if to conclude that the *deliciousness* of this dish is given to the fact that every single ingredient used, even salt or pepper, is central to the successful completion of the meal.

In this subsection, I analyzed the use of *gustos* [tasty] in *The Recipe from Home*, and *delicious* in *30 Minute Meals* and *The Essence of Emeril*, and their indexical meanings to highlight what each of the three television cooking show hosts presents as a crucial component for the great taste of their meals and the overall success of their recipes—originality, cooking technique, and ingredient choice.

## 5.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined *affective stance* (Ochs, 1996; Kiesling, 2009) and taste from a cross-pragmatic perspective through the lens of television cooking show discourse as

---

<sup>55</sup> I discuss some of these discursive strategies in Chapter 6.



a *speech event* (Hymes, 1972; Duranti, 1997). A central component of this analysis of affect, stance, and taste was an investigation of the *indexical* meanings (Ochs, 1996; Lyons, 1977; Peirce, 1955) of the most frequent taste tokens in the television cooking shows selected for this study, two from Romania, *The Recipe from Home* and *I Eat Therefore I Am*, and two from the U.S., *30 Minute Meals* and *The Essence of Emeril*.

In this dissertation study I used a mixed methods approach to the study of stance; in this chapter, the quantitative analysis part showed general tendencies in the use and frequency of taste tokens cross-culturally and across genders, and contributed to a focused investigation of the most relevant features pertaining to taste, affect, and stance in television cooking show discourse. Conversely, the qualitative analysis component added to the findings of the quantitative analysis a more in-depth and richer understanding of the contexts and indexical meanings of taste features in cooking show discourse from Romania and the U.S.

A micro- and macro-level discourse analysis revealed several patterns surrounding affective stance and taste in the food preparation programs analyzed in this study: the use of interjections in female cooking show discourse as a substitute for a real time taste experience and as markers of vicarious consumption; the distinct nuances of *bun* [good] in the Romanian cooking shows, and the range of sensory perceptions surrounding *good* and *bun* [good] to which female cooking show hosts appeal, especially RR, to evaluate the taste of the meals that they prepare on their shows en lieu of an actual taste experience; lastly, the indexical meanings of *delicious* in the two U.S. shows and *gustos* [tasty] in *The Recipe from Home*—more specifically, the discursive construction of what aspect of the cooking process RR, EL, and SM associate with the great taste of their meals.

## Chapter 6

### DATA ANALYSIS

#### Interactional stance in TV cooking show discourse from Romania and the U.S.

##### 6.1 Introduction

As discussed in the previous chapter, in this dissertation I analyze television cooking shows from Romania and the U.S. through the lens of the *speech event* analytic frame (Hymes, 1972); such a perspective both offers an contextualized understanding of how linguistic form constructs and reflects cultural norms and patterns, and provides information about the context and co-constructive character of communication.

In Chapter 5, I undertook a quantitative and qualitative lexico-pragmatic analysis of affective stance and taste as evidenced in the corpus of Romanian and U.S. cooking shows. In this chapter, I analyze the way in which television cooking show hosts *frame* (Goffman, 1974) their cooking show discourse as both *cooking demonstration* and as *television show*, and interact with their imagined television audiences during the food preparation process. More specifically, I focus on the function of imperative and interrogative constructions as markers of *interactional stance* (Ochs, 1996; DuBois, 2007, Karkkainen, 2006), which in turn contribute to the television cooking hosts' *presentation of self* (Goffman, 1959). Within the hosts' presentation of self, I note several shifts in *footing* (Goffman, 1981) or roles taken up by television hosts, such as *cook*, *chef*, *friend*, *entertainer*, *evaluator*, and *cultural agent*. All of these constructs contribute to an alternating discursive *framing* (Goffman, 1974) of *cooking demonstration* and *television show* of the four television cooking shows analyzed in this study, *The Recipe from Home*, *I Eat Therefore I Am*, *30 Minute Meals*, and *The Essence of Emeril*.

The sections below consist of a discussion of the analytical frameworks to which I appeal, including *frame analysis* (Goffman, 1974), *presentation of self* (Goffman, 1959), *footing* (Goffman, 1981) and *interactional stance* (Ochs, 1996; DuBois, 2007, Karkkainen, 2006), in Section 6.2; the presentation and description of the findings of this analysis of interactional stance in Romanian and U.S. cooking show discourse in section 6.3; and lastly, concluding remarks on the function of interactional stance in this television genre from Romania and the U.S., in Section 6.4.

## **6.2 Analytical framework**

In this section, I discuss the major theoretical orientations of the analysis that I present in this chapter, which include *interactional stance*, combined with lenses for examining stance and interaction via Goffman's *frame analysis*, *presentation of self* and *footing*. Next, I offer the rationale for focusing on imperative and interrogative constructions as the target linguistic features for the study of stance and interaction in television cooking show discourse before I present the findings of this analysis in 6.3.

### **6.2.1 Interactional stance and frame analysis**

As mentioned in Chapters 3 and 5, in this study *culture* is understood as a set of dispositions (Bourdieu, 1977, 1990) which develop as a result of the interactions between the subjective individual and the objective social structure of the environment in which the individual lives, and which generate behaviors, preferences, and social practices. In this chapter, I examine interactional stance-taking as instantiated in interrogative and imperative

constructions in U.S. and Romanian cooking show discourse, and as reflective of U.S. and Romanian cultural frames and patterns. In addition, I examine stance-taking in cooking show discourse through the lens of culture as a “thick description” (Geertz, 1973; Ryle, 1971), whose analysis involves an uncovering of layers upon layers of meaning, or “webs of significance” (Geertz, 1973, p. 5).

In Chapter 5, I discussed affective stance (Ochs, 1996) in relation to the taste of the ingredients and meals presented in the U.S. and Romanian television cooking show corpus—more specifically, the frequency and use of affect and taste tokens, in particular their cross-pragmatic function in this television genre. In the present chapter, I shift the focus of my analysis from the linguistic construction of attitudes based on taste and *affective stance* surrounding taste (presented in Chapter 5), to the ways in which hosts interact with their imagined television audiences through the use of interrogative and imperative constructions, i.e., *interactional stance* (Ochs, 1996; DuBois, 2007, Karkkainen, 2006). In other words, while in Chapter 5 I examined affective stance and taste expression as an object of focus in television cooking show discourse, in the present chapter I discuss the ways in which television hosts relate to their audiences through explicit interactional stance-taking linguistic features.

Stance-taking (Ochs, 1996) is inherently intersubjective (Karkkainen, 2006) in that it is a “dialogical public act” (DuBois, 2007, p. 163) which typically involves the existence of both a speaker and a hearer. Further, drawing on DuBois (2000, 2002, 2004, 2007) and Hunston and Thompson (2000), Karkkainen (2006) supports an emergent view of stance (p. 704) within which intersubjectivity is central in that all attitudes or stances that we express are interlocutor- and context-dependent. Within this dialogic relationship among participants

to the stance-taking process, continuous positioning and repositioning (Davies and Harre, 1990) take place, in part through *focus* and *inclusion* work (DuBois, 2007; Johnstone, 2008).

In this study, I interpret *focus* as the emphasis that cooking show hosts place on different aspects of the cooking process, and define *inclusion* as the discursive engagement that these hosts take up with their audiences; at times linguistic features indicate either *focus* or *inclusion*, but other times the two can overlap. Both *focus* and *inclusion* are expressed through a variety of linguistic features, for instance, *focus* through imperative constructions inviting audiences to pay close attention to the cooking process, e.g., *Twenty two mi^nutes or so the cake is do^ne*, (0.2) *we bring it ou^t*, (0.1) *look at tha^t !* (0.1) *Nice and light*, (0.1) *you should sme^ll it, it smells fanta^stic*<sup>56</sup>; conversely, *inclusion* can be expressed through interrogative constructions which seem to ask for the television audience's agreement on the easiness or understanding of a cooking procedure, visual appeal, or other aspect of the food preparation process or meal evaluation, e.g., *A li^ttle bit o' that le^ttuce that we just (.) chi^ffon all up, gonna put a little bit o' tha^t, okay^?*<sup>57</sup>.

In this study of stance and interaction, I also appeal to Goffman's (1974) concept of *framing* or "the organization of experience" (p. 13) and the social aspect of individuals' experience. More specifically, in the case of the television cooking shows analyzed in this chapter, *framing* refers to the organization and presentation of the experience of food, cooking, and the lifestyle that these eating and food preparation behaviors index. Further, I claim that in the context of this media genre, interactional stance contributes to a dual *framing* (Goffman, 1974) of the television cooking show discourse as *a cooking*

---

<sup>56</sup> From *The Essence of Emeril*, episode 3.

<sup>57</sup> From *The Essence of Emeril*, episode 3.

*demonstration* (primary framing) and *an entertainment show* (secondary framework) in both Romania and the US. As I discuss in section 6.3, while these two main formats are present in cooking programs from both countries, I note a more emphatic and consistent framing of the U.S. programs as *entertainment show* and of Romanian programs as *cooking demonstration*, as evidenced by the heightened use of particular discursive features in each of the two cultural contexts.

This dual framing of the eating and food preparation experience is achieved discursively through television chefs' *presentation of self* (1959) including *shifts in footing*, or roles and the various forms of alignment (Goffman, 1981, p.128) that hosts carry out in these roles vis-à-vis their imagined television audiences. In particular, I discuss the television chefs' use of interrogative and imperative constructions as a locus of emergence of the different roles that they construct.

### 6.2.2 Focus of study—interrogative and imperative constructions

As mentioned before, in this chapter I analyze audience involvement in male and female television cooking show discourse from Romania and the US. I define *audience involvement* as linguistic elements present in television chefs' cooking show discourse that invite television viewers either directly or indirectly to participate in the cooking process of their recipes. For instance, television chefs' use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*, or the related possessive adjectives *my* and *our* interchangeably during the meal preparation process, e.g., *I'm making another one of my better burgers today and we'll be eating in under thirty minutes.*<sup>58</sup> and *We're making kind of a quick, pan barbeque sauce here*

---

<sup>58</sup> From *30 Minute Meals*, episode 1 in which RR makes chicken burgers.

to mix in with our chicken burgers.<sup>59</sup> functions as an audience-involving discursive strategy in that such language use suggests that television viewers do not only watch meals being prepared, but also share agency in creating the meal.

In addition to such indirect audience-involving strategies, cooking show discourse is imbued with imperative and interrogative constructions which, given their inherently stance-taking nature as categories of grammatical mood (Karkkainen, 2006), address and engage audiences directly and explicitly in the cooking process. Even though there are no live audiences in any of the four cooking shows analyzed in this study, the use and contexts of interrogative and imperative features arguably contribute to cooking show hosts' *presentation of self* (Goffman, 1959) through the different types of roles and shifts in footing present in the food programs analyzed in this study. In what follows, I analyze imperative and interrogative constructions as *interactional stance* markers, and how such features shape cooking show discourse and hosts' presentation of self in Romanian and U.S. media.

#### **6.2.2.1 Examples of interactional stance markers in television cooking show discourse**

In this section, I exemplify the types of interactional markers present in Romanian and U.S. data, and their position in the discourse of each of the four television cooking show hosts. I begin with the illustration of focus and inclusion markers in the Romanian shows, *The Recipe from Home*, and *I Eat Therefore I Am*, and then I exemplify such markers in the U.S. shows, *30 Minute Meals* and *The Essence of Emeril*. All the examples below are highly representative of the interactional markers analyzed in the four shows.

---

<sup>59</sup> From *30 Minute Meals*, episode 1 in which RR makes chicken burgers.

### A. *The Recipe from Home*

Focus—the act of fasting (tag question, final position)

*in mod norma<sup>l</sup> de miine ar trebui să tinem po<sup>st</sup>, să mincăm numai mincăruri de po:<sup>:</sup>st, da?*

[normally, starting with tomorrow we should fast, we should eat only fasting meals, yes?]

Inclusion—host checks audience understanding of cooking process (tag, final position)

*Îl dăm prin făi<sup>nă</sup> ca să nu iasă compozi<sup>tia</sup>, ați înțele<sup>s</sup>, nu? care e idee<sup>a</sup>*

[We roll it in flour so that the mix does not come out, do you understand, no? what the idea is.]

### B. *I Eat Therefore I Am*

Focus—the visual appeal of an ingredient (imperative, final position)

*De<sup>ci</sup>, o bucată de to<sup>n</sup>, uita<sup>ti</sup> ce frumos ara<sup>tă</sup>!*

[So, a piece of tuna steak, look how beautiful it looks!]

Inclusion—host checks audience understanding of cooking procedure (interrogative, initial position)

*Deci vede<sup>ți</sup> cât e de importa<sup>nt</sup> să fie foa<sup>te</sup> făcut pentru că va dura<sup>te</sup> foa<sup>te</sup> puțin?*

[So you see how important it is to be done because it (the cooking) will not last long?]

### C. *30 Minute Meals*

Focus on the smell and visual appeal of the meal (initial and final position)



((smells the fire-roasted tomatoes)) A<sup>^</sup>hh, they smell ama<sup>^</sup>zing!! (0.1) The<sup>^</sup>re we go! To<sup>^</sup>ns  
of flavor the<sup>^</sup>re, hu::<sup>^</sup>h? Loo<sup>^</sup>k at that! It's go<sup>^</sup>rgeous!

Inclusion—host seeks audience agreement regarding the visual appeal of the meal  
(interrogative, initial position)

*Bucati<sup>^</sup>ni, fa<sup>^</sup>t spaghetti. Ho<sup>^</sup>w goo::<sup>^</sup>d does tha<sup>^</sup>t look, kids, hu::<sup>^</sup>h? Oh, yea<sup>^</sup>h!!*

#### D. *The Essence of Emeril*

Focus—the visual appeal and consistency of a dressing (imperative, initial position)

look at tha::<sup>^</sup>t ! (0.1) *Not too<sup>^</sup> thick, not too<sup>^</sup> thin, (.) o:h, ni<sup>^</sup>ce, rea<sup>^</sup>lly nice !*

Inclusion—host checks understanding of the cooking procedure (tag, final position)

*Then whatchyou do<sup>^</sup> is you're gonna slowly take a couple of these marinated oy<sup>^</sup>sters like  
this, right? ((we see a closeup of the bowl of oysters)) Boo<sup>^</sup>m! Right i<sup>^</sup>nside they go,  
boo<sup>^</sup>m! Ri<sup>^</sup>ght?*

### 6.3 Interactional stance in television cooking shows from Romania and the US

Within each of the four shows, *The Recipe from Home* and *I Eat Therefore I Am*, and two from the US, *30 Minute Meals* and *The Essence of Emeril*, I note a back and forth transition between two types of social frames—from an *primary* frame, that of a food preparation process, to a *secondary* frame, that of cooking as entertainment. These frameworks are established at the level of discourse in part through the hosts' *presentation of self*, in particular their constant *shifts in footing* between being a *cook*, *chef*, *friend*,

*entertainer, evaluator, and cultural agent*. In the context of television food programming, the roles of *cook* and *chef* are the closest to a *primary* frame of a cooking demonstration act; all other roles, *friend, entertainer, evaluator, and cultural agent*, build to a greater or lesser extent on an *secondary* frame, that of television programming as entertainment.

This section is organized into two parts: first, in 6.3.1, I focus on the quantitative findings of imperative and interrogative constructions encoding *focus* and *inclusion*, and on the interpretation of these findings; I also discuss the inclusion and exclusion of linguistic tokens in the categories of *focus* and *inclusion*. In section 6.3.2, I provide a qualitative analysis of the situated functions of specific imperative and interrogative constructions, and how these contribute to constructing various social roles among the four U.S. and Romanian television hosts in their respective cultural contexts.

### **6.3.1 Imperative and interrogative constructions as interactional stance markers of *focus* and *inclusion***

In section 6.2, I discussed the rationale for centering my analysis on interrogative and imperative constructions as explicit markers of interactional stance-taking (Ochs, 1996; DuBois, 2007, Karkkainen, 2006), more specifically of *inclusion* and *focus* in television cooking show discourse<sup>60</sup>. In this section, I present and interpret the frequency of markers of focus and inclusion in the four cooking shows (Table 8); this quantitative component of the

---

<sup>60</sup> In the data analyzed in this study both interrogative and imperative constructions function as markers of focus, alignment, or both; the inclusion of a linguistic feature in one of the categories or both was dependent on the context of the utterance, including step of the cooking process, chefs' non verbal communication, as well as prosodic features such as stress, pitch, and intonation.

analysis provides an understanding of the prevalence and overall pattern of audience involvement as measured through the use of imperative and interrogative constructions<sup>61</sup>.

The choice of emphasis on features of *focus* (a total of 611 tokens) and *involvement* (a total of 203 tokens) is based on the number of such features identified in the 400 minutes of U.S. and Romanian data (100 minutes from each show). The categories created to present the frequency of focus and inclusion tokens in food preparation programs from the two countries—low, medium, and high—have emerged following the coding and counting of the linguistic features that encode either inclusion or focus. As previously mentioned, by *focus* I understand the hosts' emphasis on different aspects of the cooking process, such as ingredients, cooking procedure, or final meal, e.g., *Che^ck it out!*<sup>62</sup>; by *inclusion*, I understand the forms of direct address surrounding different aspects of the food preparation process which are geared towards television audiences with whom hosts appear to seek alignment vis-à-vis their statements, e.g., *isn't ...?*<sup>63</sup>. Further, in this chapter imperative and interrogative constructions are the only linguistic features of focus and inclusion that were considered for analysis.

In the *low* category are the shows that include fewer than 50 tokens, in the *medium* category shows that include between 51 and 100 tokens, and in the *high* category shows that include over 100 tokens.

---

<sup>61</sup> Imperative and interrogative constructions are not the only linguistic features that encode audience involvement; however, they are the most explicit audience involving features in the television cooking show corpus analyzed in this study.

<sup>62</sup> *We're gonna try^ one and we're gonna make su^re that we're gonna fry^ these pe^rfectly right. Che^ck it out! ((we see an upclose shot of the frying pan with oil in it. We hear the sizzling of the oil as Emeril drops the first oyster)) O:h Yea::^h!*, from *The essence of Emeril*, episode 3.

<sup>63</sup> *Now I'm gonna a^dd about o^ne cup of beef bro^th, that's my tri^ck to making this sauce ta^ste like it's been si^mmering a::ll day^. Isn't tha^t the pi^cture you get?* From *30 Minute Meals*, episode 4.

	<b>LOW (1-50)</b>	<b>MEDIUM (51-100)</b>	<b>HIGH (above 100)</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>FOCUS</b>		DC (69) SM (60)	EL (252) RR (230)	611
<b>INCLUSION</b>	EL (35) DC (10)	SM (98) RR (60)		203

Table 8: The frequency of inclusion and focus markers in the discourse of the four chefs—Simona Mihaescu (SM), Rachael Ray (RR), Dan Chisu (DC), and Emeril Lagasse (EL).

In Table 8, I note an overall higher distribution of *focus* tokens—medium and high occurrence (611 tokens), compared to *inclusion* tokens—a low and medium frequency (203 tokens) in both U.S. and Romanian data<sup>64</sup>. Further, Table 8 shows a gender-specific distribution of markers of inclusion with a low frequency in male cooking show discourse (EL-35, DC-10), and a medium frequency in female cooking show discourse (SM-98, RR-60). This finding is consistent with research on inclusion work and gender (Lakoff, 1975) which points out that female speakers use more inclusion markers, e.g., tag questions, than male speakers. Conversely, the distribution of focus markers is culture-specific in that Romanian television cooking show discourse displays a medium frequency of such tokens (DC-69, SM-60, total of 129 tokens) while U.S. food preparation discourse a high frequency (EL-252, RR-230, total of 482 tokens), a ratio of 1:4. This cross-cultural difference in focus markers is parallel to the findings of the taste and affect analysis in Chapter 5, which indicate both a more frequent and more emphatic use of affect markers surrounding taste in the U.S. cooking shows.

<sup>64</sup> The low number of alignment tokens as compared to focus tokens can be explained in part, by the fact that there are no live audiences in any of the shows included in the corpus.

### 6.3.2 The linguistic construction of television cooking show host roles

In this section, I examine how the use of inclusion and focus in context, coupled with their *low*, *medium*, and *high* (Table 8) frequency contribute to the discursive construction of different types of *footing* (Goffman, 1981) set forth by the four television cooking show hosts. As mentioned previously, stance researchers have pointed out the emergent nature of stance in context (e.g., Karkkainen, 2006); in this study, I examine the emergence of stance as instantiated through focus and inclusion markers in the context of television cooking shows. In this media genre, even though audiences are not physically present, the language used by hosts to address their remote audiences is a product of not only the speakers' beliefs and attitudes, and overall cultural background, but also of their imagined audiences' expectations, habits, and preferences vis-à-vis food, cooking, and lifestyle.

Thus, the premise on which I base the analysis in this chapter is that television hosts present themselves through the roles or types of *footing* that they take up, which include those of *cook*, *chef*, *evaluator*, *entertainer*, *friend*, and *cultural agent*, and that these roles are in part co-constructed by hosts and audiences alike. That is, while such roles express a choice in the ways in which hosts present themselves, they also encompass audiences' viewpoint of the world around them, or cultural schemata (Garro, 2000)<sup>65</sup>. In what follows, I discuss and illustrate how features of *focus* and *inclusion* and their immediate contexts construct and index the aforementioned roles, as well as how these roles pattern cross-culturally and across genders.

The distinction between *cook* and *chef* is crucial for the understanding of the concept of the *presentation of self* (1959) in the four shows from Romania and the US. That is, in

---

<sup>65</sup> The popularity of the television cooking shows as well as the four hosts' social status constitute the basis of this argument. See Chapter 4 for an in-depth discussion of this argument.

both Romanian and English, the term *cook* generally designates a relatively low-status role as someone who serves others; *chef*, on the other hand, points not only to a “supervisor” status, but also a high-prestige individual who has special cooking expertise, and may “direct” sous-chefs rather than be in a subordinate position. However, as I discuss in Chapter 7, both female hosts who are also cooks set forth high, preferred social statuses, or a middle class membership through a display of access to economic (RR) and cultural (SM) capital (Bourdieu, 1986). Thus, the personae that RR and SM construct are more complex than a first “reading” of their shows would reveal—one might argue that they embody the “second wave feminist” ideology (Wasko 2005, Fiske 1987, Dow 2005) in that they both perform domestic duties, i.e., cooking for others, and at the same time distance themselves from a solely domestic identity, i.e., that of a cook through social status.

#### **6.3.1.1 Shifts in *footing*—between *television cook* and *friend***

Both female hosts, Simona Mihaescu (SM) and Rachael Ray (RR), present themselves to their viewing audiences as *cooks* within a *cooking demonstration frame* which resembles the more private act of preparing meals in a home setting. This framing is carried out through the types of recipes that they demonstrate, i.e., made with typical ingredients of Romanian and U.S. cuisine; the limited amount of time needed to prepare these recipes; the hosts’ simple cooking instructions; the home-like setting of both female host cooking shows; and lastly, the family and friend-related references that the two female hosts make during the cooking process. Further, as I illustrate below, in *30 Minute Meals* the public and private spheres (Fiske, 1987; Lefebvre, 1991) seem to blend as RR alternatively frames herself as

both a *cook* and a *friend*, or as “the girl next door”<sup>66</sup> who gives cooking advice to her television viewers.

#### 6.3.1.1.1 SM as *cook*—understanding cooking procedures

Even though SM explains each recipe that she presents clearly and very thoroughly, including all intermediary steps of the cooking process such as peeling the carrots, and emphasizes some of the cooking steps by repeating them—she also constantly uses linguistic markers that seem to function as “comprehension checks” to the audience. These features are typically carried out through the Romanian mood adverbs “da?” [yes?] and “nu?” [no?] functioning as question tags in this context, and are highly frequent in *The Recipe from Home* (total of “da?” markers-108, total of “nu?” markers-8 in 100 minutes of cooking show discourse).

The purpose of these tag constructions seems to be that of increasing *focus* on certain steps of the food preparation process as well as seeking an imaginary *inclusion* of television audiences. From the point of view of the television viewer, both *focus* and *inclusion* fulfill the function of facilitating understanding of the food preparation process, as well as encouraging audience involvement, as illustrated below.

((This excerpt comes from the last fourth of episode 3, in which SM makes stuffed pepper with eggplant. All the audience-involving constructions and their contexts are underlined below))

---

<sup>66</sup> This is a typical nickname that different media outlets have given RR, for instance, cooking channel TV: <http://www.cookingchanneltv.com/chefography/chefography-rachael-ray/index.html> (retrieved June 13, 2011)

- (1) *Amestecă<sup>m</sup> (0.2), toată compozi<sup>ția</sup> (0.2), pîna cînd se omogenizea<sup>ză</sup> (.) și umplem arde<sup>ii</sup>. (0.1) Si::<sup>m</sup>plu de to<sup>t</sup>. (0.2) Foa:<sup>^</sup>rte bine arată. Și acuma cu o li<sup>ngură</sup> umplem arde<sup>ii</sup> da::<sup>^</sup>? Ardeii i-am curățat de coto<sup>r</sup> i-am scos toate nervu<sup>^</sup>rile și îi umple<sup>m</sup> cu această compozi<sup>ție</sup> pe care am făcu<sup>t</sup>-o. Îl dăm prin făi<sup>nă</sup> ca să nu iasă compozi<sup>tia</sup>, ați înțele<sup>s</sup>, nu? care e idee<sup>a</sup>. Așa<sup>^</sup> trebe să arate, da<sup>^</sup>? și îl punem la prăji<sup>t</sup> (0.1) și la fel facem si cu (0.1) următo<sup>rul</sup>. °A::<sup>sa</sup>^.*

[We mix the composition until it homogenizes well, and we stuff the peppers. Very simple. It looks very well. And now, with a spoon, we stuff the peppers, yes? We pulled out the stem and scooped out the membrane, and we stuff them with this mix that we've made. We roll it in flour so that the mix does not come out, do you understand, no? what the idea is. This is what it's supposed to look like, yes? and we fry it, and do the same with the next one. This way.]

In what follows, I discuss several macro- and micro-level constructions from the excerpt (1) which position SM as a *cook*. First, the meal that SM presents, stuffed peppers, is an everyday, typical Romanian meal that is relatively easy to prepare and which does not require special skills or culinary expertise. In sharp contrast with the typicality of this meal come the clarity and specificity of cooking directions; the average Romanian would consider such clear instructions redundant as they or someone they know are very likely able to cook this meal.

For instance, SM points out three times in this short stretch of discourse that the peppers need to be stuffed with the mixture that she prepared before, a relatively straightforward cooking step for a stuffed pepper meal. Similarly to most cooking instructions given by SM, the instructions above are accompanied and thus further clarified by up-close video images of the actual process, and in the second part of the example above, by the explicit “do you understand ?” which follows the introduction of new information, part of the stuffed peppers cooking process—the rolling of the pepper in flour, a critical point in this recipe.



Moreover, in excerpt (1), I note the use of “yes” and “no” as question tags ; this use is highly typical of SM’s discourse and their frequency in this paragraph reflects their prevalence in all *The Recipe from Home* episodes analyzed in this study<sup>67</sup>. As in example (1), throughout SM’s discourse, she uses “yes” or “no” as markers of audience involvement—of both *focus* on certain steps of the cooking process, such as the rolling of the pepper in flour in (1) above, as well as *inclusion* regarding audience understanding of the recipe that SM is presenting.

As discussed in this section and as illustrated above, a high percentage of the *focus* and *inclusion* work is geared towards clarity of cooking procedure and audience understanding of these explanations (70%), and only a small percentage towards SM’s explicitly praising her own meal ideas (8%)<sup>68</sup>. While praising one’s own meals is a relatively disfavored, highly marked speech act in the Romanian cultural context<sup>69</sup>, such self-praise is a marketing strategy that is both common and highly frequent in U.S. television cooking show discourse (see section 6.3.1.3). Given SM’s strong emphasis on clarity of procedure and understanding of the cooking process through a relatively considerable number of focus and inclusion markers (70% of all audience-involving features), I argue that SM, the hostess of *The Recipe from Home* builds on a *cook* persona throughout her cooking show discourse. Moreover, in the Romanian context, a chef always prepares sophisticated meals with the helps of aides (e.g., DC), and in a public, not private space such as that portrayed in the setting of *The Recipe from Home*.

---

<sup>67</sup> The tag “yes” is far more frequent than “no” (“yes?”-108 markers, “no?”-8 markers), but they are used interchangeably in *The Recipe from Home*.

<sup>68</sup> The remainder of 22% of focus and alignment markers surround the presentation of cultural tidbits in *The Recipe from Home*.

<sup>69</sup> I base this claim on personal communication with ten informants who are native speakers of Romanian and have lived in Romania all of their lives (ages 30 to 71).

#### 6.3.1.1.2 RR as a *cook*—reinforcing easiness of cooking procedure

While easiness of cooking procedure is a staple of both *The Recipe from Home* and *30 Minute Meals* and is introduced to viewing audiences interactively thorough both *focus* and *inclusion* work in interrogative and imperative constructions, this aspect of television cooking is strongly emphasized in the latter show. That is, in *30 Minute Meals*, the ease of the cooking process is framed as one of the main reasons for the expeditiousness of the meals presented on the show.

RR presents as her own all the meal ideas demonstrated in *30 Minute Meals*, including variations of traditional U.S. meals<sup>70</sup> and meals that she cooks with store-bought ingredients<sup>71</sup>. She also credits herself for all intermediary cooking steps and time saving tips that facilitate the cooking process and that may or may not be RR's original ideas. This claim for the originality of the recipes that RR presents points to an expression of agency (Davies and Harré, 1990) which is typical in *30 Minute Meals*, and is the most emphatic across all four shows. In example (2), I illustrate both interactional stance of focus and inclusion which build on the concept of easiness of procedure in *30 Minute Meals*, and RR's presentation of a cooking step which may or may not belong to her, but presented as her food preparation idea.

((Example 2 is from episode 1 in which RR makes barbeque chicken burgers with slaw and macaroni and pepper jack cheese; this excerpt is taken from the third part of the episode in the burger preparation stage; focus and inclusion features are underlined below))

---

<sup>70</sup> In episode 1 analyzed in this study, RR makes a variation of chicken burgers with slaw.

<sup>71</sup> In episode 5 analyzed in this study, RR makes calzones with store-bought bread rolls instead of pizza dough.

- (2) *And once you get a<sup>ll</sup> the meat mi<sup>xed</sup>, then put it into an even ba<sup>ll</sup>, and sco<sup>re</sup> it with the si<sup>de</sup> of your ha<sup>nd</sup>. ((She's forming a ball and divides it into four parts.)) THA<sup>t</sup>ll let you know<sup>^</sup> that you've got e<sup>qual</sup> po<sup>rtions</sup> when you're forming the pa<sup>t</sup>ties. =Do<sup>n</sup>'t you HA<sup>te</sup> it when you make up a<sup>ll</sup> the pa<sup>t</sup>ties and you get to the la<sup>st</sup> one and i<sup>t</sup>'s like THI<sup>s</sup> big, and you go<sup>tta</sup> go ba<sup>ck</sup> and take a little bit away<sup>^</sup> from ea<sup>ch</sup> one? Ha<sup>hh</sup>! THI<sup>s</sup>'ll sa<sup>ve</sup> you a<sup>ll</sup> that trou<sup>ble</sup>. (0.2) The<sup>re</sup> we go<sup>^</sup>!*

After RR introduces her suggestion for this food preparation procedure—dividing the meat before forming burger patties—she dually motivates the need for such a cooking step and seeks her virtual audiences' agreement regarding this motivation through the use of the negative question form *don't you hate it...?* This highly frequent inclusion construction in RR's discourse also functions in this context as a marker of increased focus in that it draws viewers' attention to the need for such a food preparation technique. This increased focus on the necessity of this procedure is maintained in the remainder of the excerpt (2) through two more imperatives, including another typical linguistic feature in *30 Minute Meals*, interjections, e.g., *Ha<sup>hh</sup>!*, which in this context seems to mirror the frustration expressed by *hate* which references the problem of having uneven patties.

In addition to framing RR as a *cook* whose food preparation tips help viewers find cooking less time consuming and less complicated, the interactional stance markers in excerpt (2) also construct the hostess of *30 Minute Meals* as an individual to whom viewing audiences can easily relate. Unlike the technical food preparation directions a chef may give from a professional kitchen setting, RR's cooking instructions as well as the positive and negative food and cooking-related stories told by RR are framed in everyday terms, that could easily be relevant to every home, on a daily basis. In the next section (6.3.1.1.3), I argue that RR's seemingly everyday cook persona coupled with an approachable attitude

towards her viewing audiences set forth a presentation of herself (Goffman, 1959) as “the girl next door”<sup>72</sup>, in other words, everyone’s friend, who is both approachable and willing to help.

#### **6.3.1.1.3. RR as a *friend*—sharing life and cooking experiences**

By presenting herself to her viewing audiences as a *friend*, not only as a *cook*, RR adds to the primary framing of *30 Minute Meals* as a food preparation show by introducing a *secondary entertainment* frame which has at the center a marked interpersonal discourse. That is, in *30 Minute Meals* I observe a dual function of the television cooking show discourse: on the one hand, this program is instructional in that it aims at teaching audiences how to prepare versions of typical U.S. meals in under thirty minutes; on the other hand, it is entertaining in that audiences are taught how to cook not by a chef, but by what appears to be an approachable friend to whom everyone can relate, and who seems to be genuinely concerned about her audience’s eating habits.

A great majority of inclusion tokens in *30 Minute Meals* (79%) surround some type of evaluation of the taste, visual appeal, smell, or overall quality of an ingredient or a meal that she prepares on the show (see section 6.3.1.3 for a detailed discussion), or the difficulty of procedure of a typical U.S. meal (see section 6.3.1.4.2). However, features of increased focus (a total of 230, see Table 8) are much more equally distributed in terms of the functions that they fulfill, including that of creating a *friend* persona of RR, the hostess of *30 Minute Meals* (38% of focus markers fulfill this function).

In the remainder of this section, I discuss RR’s presentation of self (Goffman, 1959) as a *friend* as constructed through the use of markers of focus and inclusion, and achieved

---

<sup>72</sup> Retrieved from <http://www.rachaelraystore.com> August 10, 2011.

linguistically through imperative and interrogative constructions. I base this interpretation of RR's host persona on the one hand, on RR's use of negative questions as shown in example (2) above which depending on the context, may index a relationship of friendship among participants (Heritage, 2002); on the other hand, on RR's informality which includes frequent references to her family and a self-deprecating stance, as I illustrate below (example 3).

RR's self-directed irony points to the cooking show discursive *friend* function by building on a non-hierarchical relationship between herself and her viewers. I illustrate this function in (3).

((This excerpt comes halfway through the first episode analyzed in this study, just before RR prepares the chicken burger mixture; underlined below are the features encoding focus and inclusion and that point to a framing of a *friend*))

- (3) 1 *I wanna get the chi:~cken in, and then we'll sea:~son it up, (.) and mix it up. (.) I 2*  
*go^tta remember to take my ri^ngs off too:~^, my husband'd ki^ll me if I got a*  
*3 bunch of chi^cken in my we^dding ring. ((laughter)) Which I do:~^, and I've*  
*4 do^ne. I've even throw^~n them in the ga^rbage! You know^, wiped my ha:~nds 5*  
*when I was do^ne with so^mething. Threw^ them RI^ght in the ga^rbage.*  
*6 Ni^ce. Ri^ght? Mmmm^. Wo^nderful! I'm the quee^~n of burgers, NO^t the*  
*7 quee^~n of CO^mmon sense, THA^t's for sure! ((laughter))*

Example (3) above is a typical example of RR's egalitarian "girl-next-door" self presentation. That is, she begins with a narrative that blends cooking instructions with a seemingly self-directed discourse as part of which RR reminds herself to take the rings off before mixing the raw ground chicken as meat might get in her wedding ring, which would upset her spouse. This apparent self-directed discourse becomes more elaborated as RR recounts a time when she did in fact get meat in her rings, and even threw them in the garbage. The excerpt ends with a self-deprecating comment based on the aforementioned

actions, when RR claims that she lacks common sense for not taking her jewelry off before cooking.

As seen above, a high degree of informality permeates the entire cooking show discourse in *30 Minute Meals*, from the topic of RR's self-directed monologue which references her husband's reaction to getting chicken in her wedding ring, RR's self-deprecation, as well as prosody—non-verbal communication, i.e., laughter, and increased stress, pitch, and volume especially in the last stretch of excerpt (3) that begins with line 5. Several markers of *focus*, e.g., *Mmmm^*. *Wo^nderful!* seem to emphasize the claimed silliness of the situation previously described; also, the sarcastic tone of the only marker with a dual function of focus and inclusion, *Ni^ce*. *Ri^ght?* which seeks to engage audiences regarding the ridiculousness of the situation, highlights even further the events previously mentioned.

The personal and informal nature of this story told by RR—preparing a typical U.S. meal, burgers, the mention of her husband, the kitchen mishaps, i.e., getting meat in the jewelry she is wearing or throwing the rings in the garbage, as well as the self-deprecating comment that ends her story—all told in tongue-in-cheek, set forth a self-presentation of a *friend* who not only shares tips that make cooking easier and less time consuming (section 6.3.1.1.2) but also encourages audiences that if someone clumsy like her can cook, almost anyone else can.

#### **6.3.1.2. Shifts in footing—between television chef and entertainer**

In what follows, I discuss EL and DC's discursive construction of *chef* (section 6.3.1.2.1) and contribution of this role to a *primary* (cooking instruction) framework

(Goffman, 1974) of *The Essence of Emeril* through an emphasis on food preparation and cooking technique, and in *I Eat Therefore I Am* through an emphasis on cooking procedure. I also examine EL's and DC's portrayals of television *entertainers* (section 6.3.1.2.2), and the ways in which EL and DC's *shifts in footing* (Goffman, 1981) from *chef* to *entertainer* build on a *secondary entertainment* framework in the two television cooking shows.

#### 6.3.1.2.1 DC and EL as *chefs*—importance of cooking technique

Emeril Lagasse (EL) clearly portrays a dual *chef* and *entertainer*<sup>73</sup> persona through the use of audience involving strategies of both focus and inclusion which emphasize more elaborate, complex, and more unusual cooking techniques (*chef*) and the strong excitement experienced and expressed while preparing and presenting cuisine (*entertainer*). In contrast with EL, DC engages his television viewers minimally—indeed, in *I Eat Therefore I Am*, DC uses three times fewer *focus* and *inclusion* features than EL in *The Essence of Emeril* (see Table 8: inclusion 10 (DC): 35 (EL); focus 69 (DC): 252 (EL)). The few audience-involvement strategies which DC uses in his cooking show discourse emphasize the cooking procedures of ingredients unique to the Romanian cuisine, e.g., ostrich; however, these instructions are typically incomplete and thus viewing audiences would not be able to prepare themselves the actual meals that DC presents on his show following DC's instructions.

Thus, from an instructional perspective, *I Eat Therefore I Am* lacks to fulfill its function, that of teaching viewers how to prepare meals. In this light, I argue that DC's

---

<sup>73</sup> A famous “catch phrase” that points to a strong entertaining character of *The Essence of Emeril* and now also appears in commercials in which EL features is *Bam!*. Retrieved on June 14, 2011 from [http://www.naplesnews.com/news/2006/jan/28/emiril\\_lagasse\\_lets\\_good\\_times\\_roll/](http://www.naplesnews.com/news/2006/jan/28/emiril_lagasse_lets_good_times_roll/)

minimal audience awareness in *I Eat Therefore I Am* does in fact, point to the status of a *chef* who purposefully disregards television audiences on the premises that DC is too involved in the food preparation process; in other words, the function of the show does not seem to be to instruct audiences how to prepare meals, but to offer a glimpse into a chef's kitchen and exquisite cooking. This implied *chef* status is further reinforced by the nonverbal cues in *I Eat Therefore I Am*, i.e., the presence of aides who perform most cooking procedures in DC's kitchen following his orders, and the studio in which he prepares meals, which resembles a chef's kitchen through its public space (cf. home-like) set up.

Whether EL cooks with common ingredients, e.g., chicken, or ones that are atypical to the U.S. cuisine, e.g., black cod, he never introduces his meals as quick and easy to prepare, unlike RR and SM, whose cooking concept is based on these premises. What is central to EL's cooking is the importance of cooking techniques for a great meal outcome, including taste, smell, visual appeal, and texture. In *The Essence of Emeril*, this emphasis on cooking technique is constructed mainly through features of increased *focus*<sup>74</sup>; of all four shows, *The Essence of Emeril* has the highest number of such tokens (252 tokens, see Table 8). In example (4), I illustrate this type of features of audience involvement.

((EL prepares two fish dishes in this episode; the excerpt below is part of the cooking instructions for Mesquite smoke Caribbean style black cod filet; underlined below are markers of increased focus))

- (4) *Ta<sup>^</sup>ke a loo<sup>^</sup>k at this [black cod], ma<sup>^</sup>rinated for about fou<sup>^</sup>r hours! Okay<sup>^</sup>? Che<sup>^</sup>ck it out! A<sup>^</sup>ll that CO<sup>^</sup>conut and gi<sup>^</sup>nger, I tu<sup>^</sup>rned the smo<sup>^</sup>ker down a li<sup>^</sup>ttle bit right no<sup>^</sup>w, ju<sup>^</sup>st because, you know<sup>^</sup>, I got both bu<sup>^</sup>rn<sup>^</sup>ers going, so wha<sup>^</sup>t we're gonna do<sup>^</sup>*

<sup>74</sup> As I discuss in section 6.3.1.3, in *The Essence of Emeril*, *focus* and *inclusion* markers also encode food evaluations which are used to highlight the quality of the meals that EL presents.



*now is we're gonna sort of mo^ve it ahea^d and we'll ta^ke o^ff the to^p of the smo^ker here. See^ how this is smo^king? The o^nions and the pe^ppers? Beau:^tiful! (episode 1)*

In example (4), phrases encoding increased *focus* both precede (3 tokens) and follow (3 tokens) highly specific instructions first for how black cod was marinated and then for how it is being smoked, a central step in the preparation of this recipe. The excerpt starts with two imperatives<sup>75</sup> and one interrogative phrase, all of which are meant to draw audiences' attention to the minute details of the cod marinate; conversely, example (4) ends with two interrogative and one imperative constructions, which all place emphasis on the cod smoking process. In addition, the last marker of increased focus, i.e., *Beau:^tiful!* also functions as an evaluation token through which EL praises the black cod and vegetable smoking process. I discuss the evaluative aspect of markers of audience involvement, present in particular in U.S. television cooking shows in section 6.3.1.3.

#### **6.3.1.2.2. DC and EL as *entertainers*—cooking as spectacle**

In contrast with EL, who engages audiences extensively through *focus* markers in the food preparation process, in particular the cooking techniques which he describes very thoroughly, in *I Eat Therefore I Am*, DC alternates between giving incomplete to truncated information not only about the specific cooking techniques used, but also about more basic information such as how to combine ingredients and in what amounts. The excerpt below from *I Eat Therefore I Am* comes in sharp contrast with the *Essence of Emeril* example above

---

<sup>75</sup> *Take a look at...!* and *Check this out!* are the most frequent markers of increased focus in *The Essence of Emeril*.

(4), mainly because of the difference in the level of detail between the two shows. Such scarcity of detail is typical of *I Eat Therefore I Am*.

((DC prepares tuna steak with pesto; the excerpt below is the only cooking instruction given by DC in the entire episode regarding the cooking process of the tuna steak. Immediately before this excerpt DC pointed out that he had prepared pesto in a previous episode, which he suggests serving with the tuna he is presenting in this episode; while he briefly mentions what ingredients he used when he made pesto from scratch, he does not give the full cooking instructions for the pesto recipe)).

- (5) *Hai să vezi neapăra^t! cum ă:: cum se- si tonul nu se face foarte mu^lt. E foa^rte important să-l iei imedia^t. Deci l-am pus ai^cea, l-am intos si este aproape ga^ta, deci sub un minu^t. Sub un minu^t! Su^b un minut! Ate^ntie! cind spun sub un minu^t, tonul trebe să fie aproa^pe crud înău^ntu. (0.3) (episode 4)*

[You must come and see! how to-one doesn't need to cook tuna for a long time. It's very important to take it off the heat right away. So I put it here, I turned it, and it's almost done, so under one minute. Under one minute! Under one minute! Attention! When I say under one minute, the tuna has to be almost raw inside.]

In (5), DC points out the importance of the shortness of cooking time of the tuna steak he is preparing in this episode to ensure the tastiness of his meal. However, he does not give any additional instructions regarding the preparation of the steak or that of pesto, which he is serving with the tuna steak. Thus, arguably the only function of this television program is for Romanian audiences to vicariously experience fusion cuisine, i.e., cooking with both Romanian and foreign, expensive, and hard-to-find ingredients<sup>76</sup> for the Romanian context—

---

<sup>76</sup> As mentioned before, DC cooks with ingredients such as ostrich, shrimp, ginger and tuna steak, all of which are unusual in the Romanian cuisine, hard to find and unaffordable for the majority of DC's television audiences.

but not to actually teach them how to use these ingredients in the meal ideas demonstrated by DC.

In contrast to DC—who plays an *entertainer* role by providing audiences with a solely vicarious cooking and tasting experience in that it cannot be duplicated by television viewers—EL frames cooking as *exhilarating* by showing excitement at every detailed step of the cooking process. In addition, because EL explains the food preparation process in very minute details, his cooking renders itself to being duplicated by television viewers; thus, EL fulfills the “instructional” function of his show, in addition to that of an “entertainer”.

Example (6) illustrates EL’s enthusiasm vis-à-vis a seemingly ordinary cooking step, i.e., adding salt and pepper to a meal.

((This example is from the first episode as excerpt (5); here, EL demonstrates how to make herb-crusted halibut. Underlined below are audience-involving markers of increased focus))

- (6) *And the^n I’m go^nna ta^ke-wa^tch thi:^s! I’m gonna ta^ke some bla^ck pe^pper. Loo:^k at thi^s! Wa^tch thi^s! Ta^ken s’m, uuuhh^!! ta^ken some uuuhhhh^!! Ta^ken s’m bla^ck pe^pper like tha^t ((he takes the black pepper with the blade of his knife and spreads it on the herbs)). And mi^xing all u^p and then on to^p of that we’re go^nna ta^ke a li^ttle bit of sa:~^lt, how’s tha^t? (episode 1)*

In (6), EL’s excitement for cooking is expressed through a repeated invitation rendered through high pitched, semantically comparable phrases (*wa^tch thi:^s!* (2 tokens) and *Loo:^k at thi^s* (1 token)) extended to television audiences to direct their attention to the process of mixing salt and pepper with the herbs with which he is going to cover the halibut. EL’s emphatic invitation to this cooking action in progress is highly involving in that audiences seem to take part in both the *expectation* of the excitement of spreading salt and pepper over herbs, the lived experience of seeing the herbs immediately *after* they have been

mixed with pepper, as well as the adding of the salt at the end. The excitement of this live experience is highlighted throughout example (6) through prosodic features, e.g., high pitch in *uuuuuhhhh^!!*, and non-verbal actions such as using the blade of a knife to spread black pepper. Lastly, the interrogative *how's tha^t?*, which appears to ask for audiences' opinion, but in fact functions as a marker of increased focus both on the action of adding salt and pepper and EL's excitement surrounding this action.

So far I have discussed audience involvement strategies of inclusion and increased focus and their function of introducing cooking show hosts as *cook* and *friend*, both expressed by female hosts who frequently use audience-involvement strategies and cook in a home-like setting (section 6.3.1.1); and *chef* and *entertainer*, both expressed by male hosts who use few markers of audience inclusion, and present recipes which require complicated instructions (section 6.3.1.2). In the following sections, I analyze and illustrate further ways in which television cooking show hosts from Romania and the U.S. present themselves (Goffman, 1959): in section 6.3.1.3, the television host as *food connoisseur*, and in section 6.3.1.4, that of *cultural agent*.

### **6.3.1.3 The television host as *food connoisseur***

While all of these types of footings taken up by the four cooking show hosts, especially those of *cook* and *chef*, entail an premise of the hosts' food and cooking expertise, in this section I offer a detailed account of how this cooking show host expertise is constructed and reflected in imperative and interrogative constructions surrounding taste, visual appeal, texture, and smell<sup>77</sup>. In particular, I show that the self presentation (Goffman,

---

<sup>77</sup> For a detailed discussion of taste and affect in the selected cooking show corpus, see Chapter 5.

1974) of *food connoisseur* is emphasized in the U.S. shows through an appeal to both *focus* and *inclusion* markers, while in the Romanian shows analyzed here hosts use only markers of *increased focus* to draw audiences' attention to the taste, visual appeal, smell, or texture of an ingredient or meal.

#### **6.3.1.3.1 Evaluation through *increased focus* in Romanian television cooking shows**

Both Romanian hosts, SM and DC, evaluate the meals that they present on their shows through *markers of increased focus*; as mentioned before, *focus* is defined in this study as cooking show hosts' expression of increased attention to some aspect of the cooking process, and is measured through interrogative and imperative linguistic features that encode this emphasis. In contrast to U.S. cooking show hosts who use *inclusion* strategies as part of the food evaluation process (see section 6.3.1.3.2), Romanian hosts do not appeal to such audience-involving features.

Seeking alignment with someone else vis-à-vis one's cooking—either in a face-to-face or media format—is a highly marked discursive act in the Romanian cultural context which would normally be perceived as boasting; moreover, such action would even be subjected to ridicule when those positively evaluating a meal reference meals that they themselves have prepared<sup>78</sup>. In excerpt (7) below I illustrate features of increased focus surrounding food evaluation in *The Recipe from Home*.

((This is from episode 8 in which SM prepares mushrooms with sauce; this comes at the end of the episode, when the meal is done. Underlined below are markers of increased focus))

---

<sup>78</sup> I base this claim on personal communication with ten informants who are native speakers of Romanian and have lived in Romania all of their lives (ages 30 to 71).

- (7) 1 *nici că se poa^te ceva mai simplu de-ati^t! asa că doa^mnelor, mai ales cele*  
 2 *ti^nere, puteti să:: v-apucati să fa^ceti această retetă, (0.1) pentru că veti merge 3*  
 la SI^gur cu ea. (0.2) *M^mmm! Su^per bine, imi pla^ce cum arată! Si-acuma 4*  
*bine-ntele^s că, imi laud, stiti cum e, orice cioa^ră isi laudă:::, imi laud si eu*  
 5 *si^ngură, da chiar imi pla^ce cum arată!*

[nothing can be easier than this! so ladies, especially young ones, you can start to make this meal because you'll definitely succeed. Mmm! Super good, I like how it looks! And now, of course, I praise my own, you know how it is, any crow praises her... I praise my own... , but I do like how it looks.]

The excerpt from *The Recipe from Home* begins with an evaluation for the easiness of procedure (see line 1), and with the argument that given that this recipe is so easy to follow, the meal idea presented in this episode should be attractive especially to young ladies, who may not know how to cook<sup>79</sup>. Repeated appraisals of the visual appeal of the meal (see lines 3 and 5) follow this evaluation of the cooking procedure, e.g. *imi pla^ce cum arată!* [I like how it looks]; all visual appeal evaluators in excerpt (7) (four tokens, lines 3 and 5) are constructed through imperative constructions whose dual function seems to be that of increasing focus on the quality of the meal and evoking audience engagement<sup>80</sup>.

However, on line 4, which comes in between SM's two stretches of positive evaluations, I note a self-directed sarcastic comment regarding the fact that she praises a meal that she herself has made<sup>81</sup>. As indicated by the saying quoted by SM, praising one's own work borders on ridicule, and at the same time, such praise carries less value than that of

<sup>79</sup> Gender is a recurring issue in *The Recipe from Home* in that SM's recipes seem to be especially geared towards a female audience; for instance, in episode 8, SM encourages female audiences to access the website of her television cooking show as they will find information on favorite actors, movies, health, fashion, and "all these little futile things that interest us, women".

<sup>80</sup> The number of visual appeal markers in *The Recipe from Home* is almost equal to that of taste markers. This contrasts the frequency of visual appeal markers in the other three shows analyzed here. That is, the number of visual appeal markers is three times lower than that of taste markers in the US shows, and eight times lower in *I Eat Therefore I Am*. This finding may suggest that in *The Recipe from Home*, the visual appeal of a meal is presented as equally relevant to its taste quality, or as pointing to the taste quality of the meal.

<sup>81</sup> SM mentions a Romanian saying, *Every crow praises her babies* meaning "Everyone thinks that what they do/ make is good".

someone other than the cook. Thus, SM's concluding statement, *da chiar imi pla^ce cum arată!* [but I do like how it looks], seems to reinforce the genuineness of SM's praise comment on line 3, in spite of SM's acknowledgment that she is positively evaluating a meal that she, not someone else, had prepared. This statement also points to a certain level of conflict resulting from a recognition of Romanian social norms which do not allow self-praise, and the necessity for SM to positively evaluate the meal that she has prepared given the commercial nature of such television programming.

#### **6.3.1.3.2 Evaluation through *increased focus* and *inclusion* in U.S. television cooking shows**

In contrast to the Romanian television cooking show hosts who evaluate the meals that they present on their shows only through markers of *increased focus*, U.S. food program hosts engage their viewing audiences through the use of both *focus* and *inclusion* features. That is, in addition to emphasizing positive aspects of the meals demonstrated on their shows, both RR and EL seemingly seek their audiences' agreement through their positive evaluative comments. The use of *inclusion* and *focus* markers in conjunction with evaluative statements is typical in both *30 Minute Meals* (79% of inclusion markers and 88% of focus markers display an evaluative feature) and *The Essence of Emeril* (72% of inclusion markers and 65% of focus markers encode evaluation). I illustrate both types of interactional stance in (8).

((This excerpt is from the end of episode 3, in which RR has prepared brunch—poached eggs in a chorizo and tomato stew with garlic croutons, as well as sparkling sangria; underlined below are the markers of increased focus and inclusion)).

- (8) 1 So he^re it goes, che^ck it out! o^range zest, le^mon zest and pa^rsley, su^per  
 2 simple, and the SE^cond it hits the hea^t and the e^gg, ((smells the meal and  
 3 moves her hands as to smell the aroma better)) the pe^rfume just comes right  
 4 u^p, now this is rea^lly hea^lthy, it's a beau^tiful plate presenta^tion, right?=It 5  
looks su^per fancy! it's a grea^t little fakeout meal, it's super affo^rdable, and  
 6 le^ftovers the next ni^ght, o^hhh!! Are they^ goo.^d!!

Example (8) from *30 Minute Meals* is a succession of evaluations vis-à-vis different aspects of the brunch idea presented by RR, set off by the *focus* feature *che^ck it out!* (line 1) which places emphasis on everything that follows (lines 1-4)—first, the simplicity of cooking procedure is highlighted after RR mentions three ingredients that she used (line 2), followed by a smell and healthfulness appraisal (lines 3-4). While the aforementioned evaluations are all in narrative form, what follows on line 4 is an *agreement-seeking* feature, i.e., the tag *right?*, regarding the visual appeal of the meal. Engaging viewing audiences vis-à-vis the visual appeal of the meal (cf. its taste) makes such interactional stances seem more genuine as the visual appeal of food is the only aspect of the final meal that viewers can partake. Further, following the use of *right?*, RR praises her meal again as if to answer the question herself—*It looks su^per fancy!* Lastly, RR points out the low cost of the meal (line 5), after which she ends this stretch of discourse with a phrase that encodes increased *focus* on the tastefulness of the leftovers of this meal the following day (line 6).

As mentioned before, such inclusion work vis-à-vis food evaluations is typical in U.S. television cooking show discourse. This high frequency comes in sharp contrast with the lack of such discourse features as well as their markedness in the Romanian cooking show discourse. Instead of seeking agreement with their interlocutors regarding an aspect of the meal that they present, in the Romanian cultural context, cooks may simply positively evaluate a meal that they have prepared, or even downplay its quality. Thus in (7) above,



SM's sarcastic comments immediately following praise directed at her own meal fit into Romanian cultural patterns and discursive "rules" regarding self-praise in that her positive evaluation is followed by self-directed irony as an explanation for her positive comments.

#### **6.3.1.4 The television cooking show host as *cultural agent***

In this section I discuss the construction of the television cooking show host as *cultural agent* through *interactional stance-taking*, in particular through imperative and interrogative constructions functioning as *focus* and *inclusion* markers. I show that each of the four hosts contribute to a framing (Goffman, 1974) of their programs as the locus for either *reinforcing* or *altering* food-related stories, and both religion-specific and regional cuisine.

That is, in their respective shows, SM and EL not only demonstrate recipes, but also introduce to their audiences cultural notes about the meals that they present. For instance, SM incorporates in her show information regarding fasting periods in the Greek Orthodox Church in the episodes in which she cooks fasting recipes, and EL information about Southern cuisine when he prepares recipes with Southern ingredients or cooking techniques<sup>82</sup>. Both SM's and EL's cultural references are devoid of a strongly subjective stance in that through their stories—food-related or otherwise—they do not attempt to alter what is commonly known about Romanian religious holidays or, in the case of EL, Southern cuisine. Unlike SM and EL, RR and DC present recipes that challenge the typical U.S. and Romanian cuisine patterns in some way, or what television audiences' expectations are regarding ingredients, cooking procedures, or entire meals.

---

<sup>82</sup> EL owns several restaurants, one of which serves Southern cuisine (retrieved June 13, 2011, from <http://www.emerils.com/restaurants/>).

Similarly to the role of *connoisseur* (section 6.3.1.3), that of *cultural agent* contributes both to a *primary* and *secondary* framing (Goffman, 1974) of television cooking shows from the two countries. That is, all four shows build on the *primary* framing of the cooking experience by introducing food-related habits and cultural notes to their audiences; however, I argue that RR's and DC's roles of *agent of cultural change* promote a stronger *entertainment* function of their corresponding shows than SM and EL, through their emphasis on food, culture, and change.

In the remainder of this section I illustrate the dual role of the cooking show host as *cultural agent*—that is, *both* as a promoter of food-related customs and regional cuisine and as an agent of change of traditional and widely known recipes, and eating and cooking behaviors in Romanian (6.3.1.4.1) and U.S. cooking show discourse (6.3.1.4.2).

#### **6.3.1.4.1 Romanian cultural representations of continuity and change**

*The Recipe from Home* is imbued with cultural notes, such as information directly related to the recipes that SM prepares, e.g., religious holidays or cultural clichés surrounding wine and certain foods. SM also presents tidbits of information related to her personal cultural life, such as movies that she likes to watch in her spare time, or her college years as a Theatre major. However, the manner in which SM presents this information differs in that she appeals to audience-involving strategies of *focus* and *inclusion* for the food-related cultural notes, and uses a narrative style for the references to all the cultural notes unrelated to food and cooking. I illustrate below the function of *focus* and *inclusion* in references to meals and religion.

((This excerpt comes halfway through episode 9, in which SM makes stuffed squash. This is a filling, non-fasting meal intended for the day before the Christmas fasting period starts. In the part leading up to this excerpt, SM points out that there are two religious holidays on this day: one is the day before the Christmas fasting, and the second one is “the Fall Philips”; she then describes some traditions and superstitions related to the latter holiday. Underlined below are markers of increased focus and inclusion)).

(9) *Chiar da^cã nu le [traditions] mai respectã^m, (0.2) din cind in cind, sã ne-aminti^m de ele măcar in această zi de sărbătoa^re, da^? A:::cuma^ . Revenind la reteta noa^stră:::, (0.1) pentru că tot este o zi de sărbătoa^re in care se mănincă bi:ne:::, hai să vede^m ce putem fa^ce. Punem cărni^ta la prăji:::t, (0.2) a:sa:::, (0.2) asa, stai să-mi iau^ si ceva untu^ră, (0.1) a::sa:: in mod norma^l de miine ar trebui să tinem po^st, să mincăm numai mincăruri de po::^st, da?*

[Even if we don't follow them [traditions] from time to time, let's remember them at least on religious holidays, yes? Now. Going back to our recipe, because it is a religious holiday when we are supposed to eat well, let's see what we can make. We are frying the meat, this way, this way, wait, let me get some lard, all right, normally starting with tomorrow we should fast, we should eat only fasting meals, yes?]

In *The Recipe from Home*, more than half of the episodes (6 out of 11) mention that Greek Orthodox religious holidays have dictated the choice of the recipe presented in a particular episode<sup>83</sup>. Excerpt (9) is an example of a religion-dictated recipe choice, in which SM proposes a filling meal on the day immediately preceding the Christmas fasting period, and in preparation for this fasting. The example above begins and ends with the tag *da?* which seems to encode both increased focus and to seek alignment on the importance of remembering religious customs and adopting eating habits that follow religious holiday restrictions, such as not eating meat products on a fasting day. As I discuss in the beginning of section 6.3.1.4, SM sets forth an image of a Romanian culture promoter by proposing

<sup>83</sup> In episode 10, SM explicitly points out that she chooses to present fasting recipes so that her female audiences do not complain if she demonstrates meat-based recipes during fasting periods.

meals that are within the acceptable norms of the Romanian viewing audiences, especially those who observe the Greek Orthodox Church canonical regulations.

In contrast with SM, DC presents himself (Goffman, 1974) as a cooking show host who challenges eating and cooking behaviors, especially those which he considers unhealthy, and suggests ingredient and meal combinations which are great tasting but not part of the Romanian cuisine. This framing (Goffman, 1974) of the television cooking show as a site of teaching about new and healthier ingredients is typical in *I Eat Therefore I Am*, and it frequently overlaps with that of the food preparation show as an *entertaining* program discussed in section 6.3.1.2.2. I illustrate the cooking show host as *agent of cultural change* in (10).

(This example comes from the second part of episode 5, in which DC has prepared and has just tasted stuffed ostrich, a meal which is cooked at Easter time and is typically made with lamb; underlined below are markers of increased focus)).

- (10) 1 *E bu^n.* (0.2) ((takes another bite, then looks up as if to address God)) *Ia^rtă-  
2 mă, da e bu^n. Am combinat strutu cu stufa^tu, da e bun! ((takes another bite)) 3  
H^mm! (0.2) ((makes “good” sign with index and thumb)). E bun, pă bu^ne!  
[episode 5, stuffed ostrich]*

[It’s good. ((takes another bite, then looks up as if to address God)) Forgive me, but it’s good. I made stuffed ostrich [vs. stuffed lamb, a traditional Romanian meal] but it’s good! ((takes another bite)) Hmm! ((makes “good” sign with index and thumb)). It’s good, seriously!]

In this episode, DC attempts an unusual, even provocative cooking act within the Romanian religious and cultural context—that of preparing a very traditional meal typically

served during a major Greek Orthodox holiday, Easter, with ostrich, not lamb<sup>84</sup>, as the main ingredient. Excerpt (10) is a series of taste evaluations of the stuffed ostrich, interrupted only by what seems to be a direct address to God asking for forgiveness for having cooked the meal with ostrich instead of lamb.

In this excerpt, as well as in most of the episodes from *I Eat Therefore I Am* analyzed in this study, DC does not appeal to any inclusion markers when discussing the choice of this novel variation of stuffed lamb, or its cooking procedures<sup>85</sup>. In all three instances in which DC uses emphatic statements (see focus markers on lines 2-3), he does so to highlight the taste quality of this novel version of the traditional Easter meal. Through his seemingly verbal and non-verbal double-interaction—one with God, the other one with his viewing audiences—DC acknowledges that such a meal combination is unique and unheard of in the Romanian context but at the same time he presents it as a possible healthier alternative to stuffed lamb.

Further, in (10), DC appeals to his authority of chef when he offers a change from the traditional version, i.e., the use of ostrich instead of lamb, in that he apologizes only to God for his ingredient choice, but not to his viewers; instead, he emphasizes the great taste of the new version of the recipe when he seemingly addresses his television audiences. While Romanian social norms disfavor self-praise, DC's male chef status seems to override these norms in (10) above where he emphasizes the taste quality of his meal. Alternatively, DC's self-praise construction can be interpreted as indexing surprise for the great taste of a modern version of a traditional Romanian meal—made with ostrich instead of lamb.

---

<sup>84</sup> Lamb is served at Easter time as it carries a strong symbolic meaning of “the body of Jesus Christ, the son of God.”

<sup>85</sup> As pointed out in Table 1 above, in 100 minutes of *I Eat Therefore I Am*, DC uses only 10 inclusion markers; all of these markers build on DC's role of *entertainer*.

#### 6.3.1.4.2 U.S. cultural representations of continuity and change

In sharp contrast with the Romanian television cooking shows in which religion plays a central role in the selection of ingredients and choice of recipes, the U.S. cooking show hosts do not select their recipes based on religious considerations; instead, each of the two U.S. hosts demonstrates recipes that are likely to appeal to television audiences solely because of their taste, visual appeal, or cooking procedure, and which are representative of their signature cuisine. As previously mentioned in this chapter, at the centre of *The Essence of Emeril* are detailed cooking techniques (see section 6.3.1.2.1 for a detailed discussion) but also ingredients from a variety of regional and ethnic backgrounds, such as Southern—Creole and Cajun—as well as French, Portuguese, and Asian<sup>86</sup>.

In addition to focusing heavily on cooking technique in his imagined interactions with his television viewers, EL emphasizes the cultural background of these techniques and ingredients that he uses in his meals through markers of increased focus<sup>87</sup>. That is, in *The Essence of Emeril*, EL not only introduces audiences to fine cuisine, but also teaches them about the origin, history, and use of his ingredients and techniques. Thus, while EL's recipe ideas are novel in many ways, his emphasis is not on the ways in which he contributes to this novelty through creativity and technique, but on the ways in which the culture-specific characteristics of his cooking makes his recipes unique. In this light, I argue that in *The Essence of Emeril*, EL sets forth the role of a *culture promoter*, not that of an agent of cultural change through his recipes with French, Portuguese, Southern, and Asian accents. I illustrate this role of culture promoter in example (11).

---

<sup>86</sup> Retrieved from <http://www.foodnetwork.com/emery-lagasse/bio/index.html> on June 10, 2011

<sup>87</sup> While in *The Essence of Emeril*, EL appeals to inclusion features, these features do not reference cultural notes surrounding the ingredients and cooking techniques that he presents.

((EL makes red bean soup, peacemaker, and gateau de syrup, all Southern recipes, in episode 3; the excerpt below is from the first 5 minutes of the episode in which he introduces the meals. Underlined below are markers of *increased focus*))

- (11) 1 You see^? in Loui^siana cooking you have ba^sically two forms, fo^lks. You've 2  
got Creole, which is the ci^ty cooking of New O^rleans, influenced by the  
3 ri^ver, with its grea^t traditions of-of Fre^nce and Spa^nish an' African  
4 Ame^rican. (.) And the^n, you've got Acadia^na, the country of Lousia^na,  
5 sla::ng Ca^jun, okay^? Which is a:: you know^? They settled do^wn from  
6 Nova Sco^tia in the seventeen hu^ndreds and bega^n to set up and live off the  
7 la::^nd. So there's two^ different i^nfences, two different styles, one is not  
8 ho^tter than the o^ther. ((gestures accompany everything he says in this excerpt))

In this episode from *The Essence of Emeril*, EL demonstrates the recipes for three Southern meals—two from Creole cuisine, red bean soup and peacemaker, and one from Cajun cuisine, gateau de syrup. Example (11) is typical of the entire data set from *The Essence of Emeril* analyzed in this study in that instead of focusing on his own contribution to the uniqueness of these recipes, EL highlights the cultural background of Creole and Cajun meals which he presents in this episode. The function of the focus markers in the excerpt above is to emphasize that there are two forms of Louisiana cooking (line 1), and to point out the origin of the second type of Southern cooking style, Acadiana (line 5). In this excerpt, the interpretation of EL's role of *culture promoter* is based on EL's didactic discourse about the history behind the two styles of Southern cooking, which he exemplifies through his recipes.

In contrast with EL, RR introduces the *30 Minute Meals* recipes, most of which are versions of typical, widely known ethnic or mainstream American meals, as novel because of the changes in food preparation procedure that she suggests; these new recipe variations are typically presented as less time consuming and easier to make than the original recipes. To

further highlight the ways in which her meals are better than the original, RR brings up negative cultural clichés surrounding the original meals and claims that her style of cooking that particular recipe avoids the disadvantages that the original recipe presents. Through such claims, RR’s cooking show discourse builds on her role of *agent of cultural change*, in addition to that of a *cook* (see section 6.3.1.1.2) and *friend* (section 6.3.1.1.3); I exemplify the discursive construction of RR as a *agent of cultural change* in (12).

((This is the last third of episode 4, in which RR prepares beef meatloaves with buccatini, and Italian slaw salad; underlined are markers of focus and inclusion))

- (12) 1 *Now I’m gonna a^dd about o^ne cup of beef bro^th, that’s my tri^ck to making*  
 2 *this sauce ta^ste like it’s been si^mmering a::ll day^.* *Isn’t tha^t the pi^cture*  
 3 *you get?* *The mental pi^cture, a::, mental image I^ get when I think of*  
 4 *spaghe^tti meatballs is some pe^rson ((gesticulates someone stirring heavily in 5 a*  
*huge pot)) slaving away^ behind this hu::^ge pot in the ki^tchen, a::^ll day,*  
 6 *you know^?* *A^-a^! Thi^s one’s gonna taste bi^g, “cause it’s a big tha^nk you, 7*  
*but it’s a^lso a li^ttle bit of a fake^out, kindav a bi^g fakeout.*

The excerpt above starts with instructions for a simplified procedure—adding ready-made beef broth to the meatball sauce—a trick meant to make the sauce taste *as if* it had been cooked for a long time. This simplified procedure is then followed by an explanation of what RR and possibly her audience imagine that the preparation of the original recipe entails, i.e., long hours of *slaving away* in the kitchen. RR then praises the taste of her meal idea cooked for someone as a “thank you” gesture, and acknowledges that her meal is a *fakeout*, meaning an imitation of the original meal.

Both audience involvement markers in (12), one a negative interrogative form encoding both inclusion and focus (lines 2-3), the second one an interrogative encoding focus alone (line 6), emphasize the difficulty of the original meal cooking process. While RR



introduces her own version of the meal as a *fakeout*, i.e., not the original meal idea, she suggests that the taste of her meal variant is as delicious as that of the original meal which took considerably more time and effort to make. RR's presentation of her meal variant in a light that is more positive than that of the original meal because of ingredient choice, simplicity of procedure, and shorter cooking time, is a highly typical feature of *30 Minute Meals*.

In fact, RR's statements, similarly to the ones in (12), are offered as the main reasoning behind introducing to her audience the new version of the traditional meal; moreover, they are further reinforced by claims of the greatness of taste of the meal idea presented in this U.S. television cooking show. As shown above, RR not only introduces to her viewing audience newer versions of typical American meals that she claims to be easier to make but are just as tasty, but also proposes to alter the public's perception of what cooking meatballs with bucatini entails—not *slaving away* in the kitchen anymore, but cooking them in less than 30 minutes.

## 6.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined *interactional stance* (Ochs, 1996; DuBois, 2007, Karkkainen, 2006) of *focus* and *inclusion*, as measured through interrogative and imperative discursive features surrounding ingredients, cooking instructions, and meal ideas in the four television cooking shows from Romania and the US. I appealed to Goffman's *frame analysis* (Goffman, 1974), to understand how the food preparation experience is presented by male and female television hosts in the two countries, and what types of *footing* (Goffman, 1981)

these hosts take up to set forth a multi-faceted experience of the food preparation and evaluation process in this media genre.

The analysis of interactive stance in television cooking show discourse reveals a dual framing of this television programming—that of cooking demonstration, or what I consider the *primary* framework, and that of entertainment show, which I view as a *secondary* framework. Both Romanian and U.S. shows are imbued with audience-involving features of *focus* and *inclusion* that build on both types of framing of the television cooking experience; however, while both shows adopt a cooking demonstration framing, I note a more emphatic representation of the latter, i.e., *entertainment show*, in the U.S. food programming.

To illustrate the two types of framing—*primary*, or that of food preparation, and *secondary*, or that of entertainment—I discussed and exemplified the different shifts in *footing* that hosts took up through their cooking discourse: *cook* (RR and SM), *chef* (EL), *friend* (RR), *entertainer* (DC and EL), *evaluator* (all four hosts), and *cultural agent* (all four hosts). Thus, the more emphatic *secondary* framing of U.S. shows (cf Romanian shows) is based in part on the two U.S. hosts shifts in footing—between *cook* and *friend* (RR), and *chef* and *entertainer* (EL), as well as the highly audience-involving food related evaluations of both *focus* and *inclusion* in U.S. television cooking shows.

In addition, in this analysis of stance and interaction, I note gender-specific characteristics constructed through these different types of footing; for example, both Romanian and U.S. female hosts present themselves as *cooks* while their male counterparts as *chefs*, and female hosts appeal overall to a higher number of inclusion tokens than the male hosts. However, with regard to the role of host as *cultural agents*, the food preparation discourse of the Romanian male chef, DC, is more similar to that of the U.S. female host,

RR, i.e., *agents of cultural change*; conversely, EL's and SM's presentation of self builds on a *culture promoter* role, or a position in which the two hosts teach their audiences food-related cultural details but do not attempt to change public perception vis-à-vis the cultural background of their meals.

**Chapter 7**  
**INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS**  
**Contextualizing stance**

**7.1 Introduction**

In this dissertation, I examine language and culture in television cooking show discourse from Romania and the US, with a focus on stance, affect, taste, and interaction. In this chapter, I aim to bridge the micro-level analysis undertaken in chapters 5 and 6 with the macro-level socio-cultural context of contemporary U.S. and Romanian societies. In order to gain a more nuanced understanding of macro-level socio-cultural patterns, or dispositions, one must also consider the indexical meanings of a micro grain, linguistic investigation. Conversely, a focused, narrow micro-level analysis alone would not provide a full picture of the complexity of the broader cultural context of which the television cooking shows analyzed in this dissertation are a part. For instance, the representation and construction of gender roles in Romania, an Eastern European country, equally display differences and similarities with those in the US, even though Romanian democracy and media are much younger and in a process of formation, and the two countries are not within close proximity geographically. Thus, on the one hand, the present study illustrates the complexity of a given cultural context such as that of contemporary U.S. and Romanian media, and on the other hand, provides evidence against the common East/ West cultural dualism oftentimes applied to comparisons between the U.S. and an Eastern European country such as Romania (Gal & Kligman, 2000).

More specifically, in this chapter, I illustrate the construction of social meaning (macro) through affective and interactional stance (micro) and indexical meanings of these

stance types. To this end, I appeal to Silverstein's (2003) indexical order (also Silverstein, 1987; 1993) and Ochs' (1992) indexical construction of social meaning through stance-taking to examine themes that encode different aspects of everyday life such as gender, class, and leisure and lifestyle, and which occur frequently in U.S. and Romanian media, in particular television cooking shows (Ketchum, 2005; Adema, 2000). I begin with a discussion of the analytical framework I adopt in this chapter and of the focus of this study, and then I present the findings of the analysis of indexical constructions of "everyday life" in television cooking show discourse from Romania and the US.

## **7.2 Analytical framework**

### **7.2.1 Indexical order and the discursive construction of social subjects**

In Chapter 5, I used the concept of indexicality (Ochs, 1996; Lyons, 1977; Peirce, 1955) to examine the immediate contextual meanings of affective stance (Ochs, 1996), in particular taste descriptors and interjections in Romanian and U.S. television cooking shows. This cross-pragmatic analysis was followed, in Chapter 6, by an investigation through the lens of the presentation of self (Goffman, 1959), framing (Goffman, 1974), and footing (Goffman, 1981), coupled with that of interactional stance (Ochs, 1996; DuBois, 2007, Karkkainen, 2006), and how this type of stance reflects the type of information television hosts set forth through their linguistic choices and builds on creating television cooking show personae in the two countries.

Both of these levels of analysis focus on the immediate and larger context at the level of discourse. In the present chapter I appeal to Silverstein's (2003) concept of indexical order which aims at connecting the micro-level features analyzed in Chapters 5 and 6 with more macro-level elements of the broader, cultural discourse:

“...the macro-sociological is really a projective order from within a complex, and ever changing, configuration of interdiscursivities in micro-contextual orders, some of which, it turns out, at any given moment of macro-order diachrony asymmetrically determine others (p.202).”

In Silverstein’s (2003) view, within the concept of indexical order, the micro and macro perspectives are constantly interacting and are so inherently intertwined in that the “macro-sociological” order is the result of the projection of multiple micro-level features of discourse. Further, according to Silverstein (ibid.) through their dynamicity, micro-level discursive features may also influence each other and the meanings they encode contingent on the historical and social situatedness of the macro context.

In this chapter, I show that micro-level discursive features of affect, taste, and interaction are directly related to, and contribute to the creation, through television cooking shows, of “structures of categorical differentiation” (Silverstein, 2003, p.202) such as “... gender, social and socioeconomic class, profession, and other aspects of what we term institutional/ positional social identity as these are relevant to interactionally accomplished indexicality (ibid., p.202).” Thus, on the one hand, according to Silverstein (2003), indexical order plays a central role in linking micro and macro features of discourse and thus constructing multilayered social “structures”; on the other hand, micro-level discursive elements expressing affective and interactional stance reveal preferences, habits, and behavior patterns at a given point in time (Ochs, 1993, 1996; Bourdieu, 1990).

In the same vein, in a linguistic anthropological study, Ochs (1993) points out that social identities including those of gender, socioeconomic class, or profession may be best understood by people’s “social acts”, or “socially-recognized, goal-directed behavior” and their verbal expression of “stances”, the latter of which she defines as a “*socially recognized*

point of view or attitude (p.288, emphasis added)”. That is, according to Ochs (ibid.), the attitudes that speakers express about the propositions that they and their interlocutors utter are recognizable in a particular social context (also, Duranti, 1997; Ochs, 1992); in other words, members of a given community of practice are able to identify culture-specific meanings in their interlocutors’ stance-taking expression.

In the context of the television cooking shows from the U.S. and Romania analyzed in this study, the hosts’ “goal-directed behavior” is that of preparing food; the hosts’ attitudes or points of view are expressed through the verbal and non-verbal expressions that this food preparation process entails. In this chapter, I argue that the hosts’ taste preferences and affect towards ingredients and meals, as well as their interactional patterns with their remote viewing audiences, not only contribute to the construction of the broader sociocultural context (Silverstein, 2003), but also are representative of U.S. and Romanian behavior and cultural patterns.

### **7.2.2 Focus of study**

In this chapter, I appeal to Silverstein’s (2003) indexical order and Ochs’ (1993) concept of the construction of social subjects through indexical meanings to connect micro-level linguistic tokens which have been the focus of my analysis in Chapters 5 and 6—stance, taste, affect, and interaction—as well as macro-level features such as the television cooking show setting and host physical appearance and body language, with broader cultural categories such as gender, social status, and leisure and lifestyle.

I have chosen to focus the analysis in this chapter on these broad categories for two reasons: first, they have emerged in the analyses I undertook in chapters 5 and 6 as

reoccurring themes indexed by the linguistic features analyzed, i.e., affect-imbued descriptors and interjections surrounding taste, and interrogative and imperative constructions that encode focus and inclusion. Second, such themes are discussed at length in contemporary media and cultural studies (e.g., Ketchum, 2005; Heller, 2006; Davies, 2003; Miller, 2002; Fiske, 1987; Horkheimer and Adorno, 1972; Althusser 1971; Hall et al., 1980; Collins, 2002a; Adema, 2000; Baudrillard, 1988; Ouellette, 2004), a scholarly area which argues for the prevalence of these cultural categories in media discourse in general, and television cooking shows in particular. The gap that the analysis in this chapter seeks to fill in media and cultural studies is an illustration of how linguistic stance enacts everyday life in television cooking show discourse through a progression from micro- to macro-level features.

### **7.3 Constructions of “everyday life” in television cooking show discourse**

In this section, I show that cultural categories of gender, class, and leisure and lifestyle are discursively constructed or alluded to, as well as instantiated through detailed and patterned linguistic features—a level of analysis rarely present in media and cultural studies scholarly work on television cooking show discourse. As throughout this dissertation, in this chapter I examine and illustrate these broad cultural categories from a cross-cultural perspective, i.e., to include features of affect, taste, stance and interaction (Chapters 5 and 6) focusing on both Romanian and U.S. cultural contexts. Such a perspective offers a more nuanced understanding of communication patterns in the two countries than would an examination of such patterns focusing on one culture only. In what follows, I examine the social constructs of gender and social class (section 7.3.1), and I focus



on leisure and lifestyle representations (section 7.3.2) in the four television cooking shows from Romania and the U.S. analyzed in this study.

### **7.3.1 Gender and class**

In the data analyzed in this dissertation there are discursive patterns that seem to be identifiable with female and male speakers, e.g., female hosts use highly affective markers such as interjections much more frequently than male hosts—thus one may argue that generally speaking women use more emotionally charged taste markers than male speakers. However, in this analysis I adopt Ochs' (1992) view which argues against interpreting and classifying stances and their indexical meanings into contrastive and more importantly, absolute categories, e.g., male vs. female. That is, Ochs (ibid.) as well as other scholars (e.g., Cook, 1987; McConnell Ginet, 1988; Brown, 1993) point out that one cannot say that certain features index a masculine or feminine identity in any given context, irrespective of interlocutors or the speech act that is being performed.

Instead, Ochs (1992) suggests that there is a *non-exclusive* relation between language and gender (p. 340), in that linguistic features that seem to index femininity may also be associated with masculinity in a different context, or when uttered by, or are addressed to another speaker; conversely, features that apparently index only gender in fact also may point to other social categories such as class, or lifestyle. Thus, in this chapter, I discuss gender-specific observations as related solely to the U.S. and Romanian television cooking shows analyzed here. In addition, I also consider other facets of the television cooking show persona, e.g., class and lifestyle that hosts set forth, and seek to understand the interplay among such categories within and across cultures.

In the analysis of stance, taste, and affect in cooking show discourse from Romania and the U.S. presented in Chapter 5, one of the major findings was that taste descriptors and interjections pattern similarly cross culturally and across genders; that is, the two female hosts use semantically comparable tokens that follow a similar distribution in *30 Minute Meals* and *The Recipe from Home*, and both male hosts appeal to two taste descriptors only, each of which consists of approximately 50% of all the taste tokens in *The Essence of Emeril* and *I Eat Therefore I Am*. For ease of reference, I reproduce below the taste token frequency tables from Chapter 5.

<i>30 Minute Meals (120 tokens)</i>		<i>The Recipe from Home (47 tokens)</i>	
Interjections	38%	Interjections	18%
Delicious	23%	Gustos [ <i>tasty</i> ]	23%
Good	14%	Bun [ <i>good</i> ]	25%
Other (less than 10% each)	25%	Other (less than 10% each)	34%

Table 9: Types of affect taste tokens in *30 Minute Meals* and *The Recipe from Home*.

<i>The Essence of Emeril (75 tokens)</i>		<i>I Eat Therefore I Am (53 tokens)</i>	
Delicious	60%	Bun [ <i>good</i> ]	55%
Other (10% or less each)	40%	Other (10% or less each)	45%

Table 10: Types of affect taste tokens in *The Essence of Emeril* and *I Eat Therefore I Am*.

As briefly pointed out in Chapter 5, these affective taste patterns point to a female host tendency to use a wider range and more nuanced semantic features to express taste preferences than their male counterparts, but also to make more affect-imbued choices through the high percentage of interjections which evaluate taste in *30 Minute Meals* and *The Recipe from Home*. Thus, one may argue that interjections, which carry a high emotional charge (Ochs, 1996), is a feature of affect that is more typical of a feminine stance towards

taste, and the overwhelming use of a single taste evaluative token, e.g., *delicious* in *The Essence of Emeril* and *bun [good]* in *I Eat Therefore I Am* is more typical of a male expression of taste preferences in this media genre. These discursive patterns—i.e., high affect more typical of female hosts, and low level of taste evaluation specificity associated with male hosts—not only within a culture, but across cultures reinforces the argument of gender-specific indexicalities in this dissertation study.

Further, both the use of interjections as markers of vicarious consumption in the female host data, and the overwhelming use of the evaluator *good* in *30 Minute Meals* and *bun [good]* in *The Recipe from Home* based on the two female hosts' sensory experiences that exclude taste, smell, visual appeal, and texture—point to a different premise for the evaluation of the taste of meals than that of male hosts. More specifically, RR and SM seem to appeal mainly to gustatory fantasy—both theirs and their audience's—by imagining the taste of the meal they are preparing. From a media studies perspective, Ang (1985) points out that television plays a central role in the postmodernist consumption culture in that it encourages and helps generate fantasy, which “helps eradicate the distance between a (pleasurable) absent and an (unpleasurable) present (p.134, parentheses original).” In other words, fantasy is the connection established between television images and the gratification they promise, and the individuals' actual attempts at fulfilling it through commercialism in real life. In this light, in the case of the two female host cooking shows analyzed in this study, this type of culinary imagery may be more inviting to viewing audiences to experience the food preparation process vicariously, and at the same time more convincing of the taste quality of the meals that the female hosts prepare than that of their male counterparts.

As I have exemplified so far, there are several differences in terms of the stances towards taste and affect taken by male and female television cooking show hosts as expressed in food preparation programs from Romania and the US. Moreover, as illustrated in Chapter 6, both female hosts, RR and SM, present themselves as cooks while both male hosts, EL and DC, as chefs, professional titles which typically entail a distinction of low status (cook) vs high status (chef). However, in the television cooking show discourse analyzed in this study, there are striking similarities in terms of the social statuses that the female and male hosts present. That is, all four hosts display middle class membership, a desired social status in both Romania and the US, even though the two female hosts discursively construct themselves as cooks, and male hosts as chefs in the food programs analyzed in this dissertation. I further discuss and illustrate this argument in the remainder of this section.

As I point out in Chapter 6, within a *primary framing* (Goffman, 1974) of the roles that television hosts set forth in the television cooking programs analyzed in this study, female hosts, RR and SM, set forth a cook persona, and male hosts a chef persona; in the case of the female hosts, this persona is mainly constructed through an emphasis on audience understanding of cooking procedures (SM), and on the easiness of the cooking process (RR), both achieved interactionally through interrogative and imperative constructions of focus and alignment. A view of female cooking show hosts as cooks (cf. chefs) is prevalent in media and cultural studies research on this television genre, with the exception of Julia Child, or The French Chef, who introduced French cuisine to U.S. audiences, a type of cooking viewed as both exquisite and difficult to prepare, and who provided viewing audiences with

instructions for how to use kitchen appliances to facilitate the food preparation process and thus spend less time in the kitchen (de Solier, 2005; Krishnendu, 2007).

Even though RR's and SM's food preparation discourse encodes features that are associated with cooks, and not chefs, their social status seems to be construed distinctly from that of their professional status. In other words, both RR and SM set forth a middle class membership, albeit constructed differently in *30 Minute Meals* and *The Recipe from Home*. That is, by presenting everyday meals that are easy to make and take less than thirty minutes to prepare, one might expect that such recipes are inexpensive for the majority of the show's viewers; however, many of the ingredients in *30 Minute Meals* are unaffordable, especially when used on a daily basis, as recommended by RR's cooking show (Adema, 2000; Ketchum, 2005). In addition, the setting of RR's show, as well as the cooking utensils used by her during the cooking process index a level of access to economic capital (Bourdieu, 1986) that is beyond the means of the overwhelming majority of television viewers. Thus, while RR sets forth a *cook* persona through her interactions with her remote audiences, she also constructs a more subtle but constantly present middle class image through non-verbal and other semiotic cooking show discourse features (Adema, 2000).

In contrast with RR, SM, the Romanian female host, presents recipes that are affordable to the general public, and her cooking studio is more representative of contemporary typical Romanian kitchens than that in *30 Minute Meals*. However, SM sets forth another form of capital, one that carries an arguably comparable value to economic capital—*cultural capital* (Bourdieu, 1986). That is, SM's show is imbued with references to her college years when she was a Theatre major, a level of education and field of study that carry high cultural value in Romania. SM's repeated references to her leisure activities

which always involve some art form—singing, going to antique shops, the opera, or a classical music concert—further support this point. Thus, in SM’s case the status of *cook* is accompanied by that of a highly cultural social subject in the Romanian cultural context.

The chef persona of both male television cooking show hosts, EL and DC, discussed in Chapter 6 within a framing of the television cooking show as cooking demonstration, or the *primary framing* (Goffman, 1974) of this television genre, is more congruent with the social status that the two male hosts set forth in their television cooking shows. That is, EL and DC present themselves as holding middle class status through their chef persona constructed primarily through cooking technique (EL) and minimal audience awareness (DC), as discussed in Chapter 6. In addition, the two male chefs’ middle class status also comes through in other explicit and implicit features of cooking show discourse such as ingredient selection, cooking show setting, as well as the training and professional background of the two male chefs.

For instance, both EL and DC select ingredients that are relatively atypical, expensive, and hard to find in the U.S. and Romanian cuisine, e.g., black cod (EL) and shrimp (DC), thus portraying through these choices a level of access to economic capital (Bourdieu, 1986) higher than that of the average citizen in each of the two countries. This claim is further illustrated through the setting of *The Essence of Emeril* in a luxurious kitchen that is also equipped with appliances and cooking utensils that one may rarely use, e.g., fish smoker. Conversely, while DC’s kitchen is relatively unsophisticated, he is surrounded by male and female helpers who follow his instructions and perform most cooking procedures from preparing the ingredients to the actual cooking process.

In addition to this display of economic capital, both EL and DC carry cultural capital in the U.S. and Romanian cultural contexts through their expertise as chefs gained in the case of EL by attending culinary schools and being a restaurant owner, and in the case of DC by traveling throughout the world, in particular Western Europe, and gaining firsthand knowledge of ingredients, cooking techniques, tastes, and recipes specific to each place he visited. Moreover, similarly to SM, DC studied Theatre and first became famous as an actor and producer in Romania, which is viewed as a cultural expert position from the standpoint of the Romanian television audiences and overall within the Romanian media and cultural context.

In this section, I discussed social categories of gender and class as portrayed in the television cooking shows from Romania and the U.S. analyzed in this dissertation. Thus, the main focus in this section was the contextualization of taste, affect, stance, and of the roles of cook and chef that cooking show hosts set forth in this study, and how such micro- and macro-levels of discourse construct and reflect gender and class-related characteristics. In the next section, I examine social constructs of leisure and lifestyle through the lens of stance, affect, and taste, as well as the host roles set forth within a *secondary frame* of analysis of the television cooking show, i.e., friend, entertainer, connoisseur, and cultural agent; specifically, I argue that these cooking show host roles point to an entertaining function of this television genre, and I examine the nuanced differences and similarities of this function in the Romanian and U.S. media contexts.

### 7.3.2 Leisure and lifestyle

According to Bourdieu (1984), taste in food and commodities is mediated by the individuals' habitus, and both distinguishes among individuals and places them in an aesthetically determined category, in other words, taste creates an aesthetic social hierarchy, or "systems of social differences (p. 6)." Further, Bourdieu notes that individuals' adoption of a certain "food lifestyle" is determined mainly by their social class (Bourdieu, *ibid.*, p.190), an idea best exemplified in the contrast between the *tastes of necessity* and the *tastes of luxury* as observed through food consumption (Bourdieu, 1984). That is, the taste of necessity results from food deprivation and lack of economic capital, and is typically expressed through preference for foods that are filling and strength giving; conversely, the taste of luxury or of freedom is acquired through access to economic capital and is expressed through a distancing from necessity and the freedom of choice of a certain food item or commodity.

As discussed above, the cooking show discourse of all four television hosts points to a high, desired social status. In addition, in light of Bourdieu's argument regarding the connection between class and taste preferences, as well as the general premise of the television food programming analyzed in this dissertation—to introduce viewing audiences to tasty recipes made with seemingly unlimited food resources—also to the construct of the tastes of luxury.

In this section, I discuss the construction of preferred lifestyles in Romanian and U.S. cultures as portrayed in the television cooking show discourse analyzed in this study. I adopt Bourdieu's (1984) definition of lifestyles as "the systematic products of habitus which [...] become sign systems that are socially qualified (as "distinguished", "vulgar", etc.) (Bourdieu,



1984, p.172). Here, Bourdieu (ibid.) highlights both the individuals' systematicity in displaying a certain "lifestyle", and the nature of "lifestyle" as a "system" prone to evaluation by social subjects. It is the television hosts' systematicity in displaying a certain lifestyle, and how these lifestyles are constructed through affect, taste, stance and interaction that is the focus of this section.

The most prevalent aspect of the lifestyle set forth in all four television cooking shows analyzed in this dissertation is an expression of an overall pleasure for the consumption of food, both actual and vicarious, with an emphasis on the enjoyment of the taste, visual appeal, texture, and smell of the ingredients and the meals prepared on the shows. The level of enjoyment expressed for this food consumption experience varies in intensity, with the most tokens of affective stance towards such features in *30 Minute Meals* (430), then in *The Essence of Emeril* (241), *The Recipe from Home* (166), and lastly, *I Eat Therefore I Am* (96) (See Appendix, Table 5). Thus, the ratio of the number of positive affect tokens surrounding food in the U.S. vs Romanian data is almost 3:1; this finding suggests a more emphatic expression of affective stance towards food descriptors in particular taste, in the U.S. television cooking shows analyzed in this study. On the one hand, one may argue that an emphatic affective stance towards taste in U.S. food preparation discourse is due to the fact that such speech styles surrounding food and taste constitute the preferred norm in U.S. English. On the other hand, this emphasis on taste preferences may be interpreted as specific only to cable television cooking show discourse whose primary function is to encourage audiences to not only watch television, but adopt a strong consumption lifestyle.

Moreover, in the U.S. cooking shows analyzed in this dissertation, this enjoyment for food consumption extends to that of preparing meals; for instance, RR, the host of *30 Minute Meals*, frames the food preparation process as fun and as a leisure activity in an interview with Larry King: “I love the gift of going to work every day and having fun at my job. And I do for a living what I would do for leisure at any other job. I cook. I chat.”<sup>88</sup> This explicit framing of cooking and work as fun is also rendered more implicitly in *30 Minute Meals* through the role of cooking show host as *friend* discussed in Chapter 6, which is constructed through a sharing of stories surrounding cooking and life experiences, and conveyed to viewing audiences through highly informal linguistic choices.

Thus, through a blurring of the distinction between public and private space, RR introduces herself not as the cooking show host who is presenting a new recipe to her television audiences, but as “the girl next door”<sup>89</sup> who loves to cook, eat, and chat about it. This stance towards cooking contrasts sharply with that of the Romanian female cook, SM, for whom cooking is a chore that she needs to finish quickly so that she can move on to more intellectually engaging activities such as reading or listening to music; this stance towards cooking is typical throughout her cooking show discourse.

The idea of framing cooking and other household chores as leisurely activities as presented in *30 Minute Meals* resonates with Bourdieu’s (1984) observation of the “morality of pleasure as duty” of the new middle classes, which is based on the concept that “having fun” is central to one’s self-esteem (Bourdieu, 1984, p.367). That is, while in the past duty was distinct from pleasure, the latter of which was associated with bodily experiences and

---

<sup>88</sup> Retrieved from <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0612/25/lkl.09.html> on May 25th 2007.

<sup>89</sup> retrieved from <http://www.rachaelraystore.com> , August 10, 2011.

with feelings of guilt, this new ethic views “having fun” as an obligation, even when working.

Parallel to the idea of cooking as fun is that of cooking demonstrations as a form of entertainment for viewing audiences (e.g., Adema, 2000; Miller, 2002; Ketchum, 2005). This conceptualization of television food programming, now prevalent and well established in several media contexts, e.g., UK, US, Australia (de Solier, 2005; Ketchum, 2005; Hollows, 2003), and emerging in other countries, e.g., Romania, contrasts the previous approach to cooking programming whose primary function was to teach audiences how to cook,<sup>90</sup> a function which was closer to that of face-to-face cooking classes.

The premise of television cooking programming as a form of entertainment and offering lifestyle suggestions is present in both the Romanian and U.S. cooking shows analyzed in this dissertation, especially in the male host cooking show discourse from the two countries. As I discuss in Chapter 6, in addition to presenting themselves as chefs, both EL and DC set forth the roles of entertainers through several audience involvement strategies (EL), or lack thereof (DC). That is, in *The Essence of Emeril*, EL’s cooking instructions are peppered with comments that reflect a high level of excitement even for the most mundane cooking step—that of adding salt and pepper to a meal. In contrast, in *I Eat Therefore I Am*, DC displays minimal audience awareness through a lack of cooking instructions, to the extent that his recipe are not duplicable by the viewing audiences; however, I argue that such framing of the process of preparing exquisite meals builds on the idea of cooking as spectacle

---

<sup>90</sup> The UK cooking show “Delia’s How to Cook” is a clear example of instructional cooking programs (Ashley et al. 2004, Andrews 2003, Strange 1998, Hollows 2003b) in that it provided clear demonstrations for recipes that are easy to follow, portrayed cooking as a “practical and social skill,” and had as a central theme one’s moral improvement through learning how to cook and through hard work (Ashley et al., 2004).

similar to that performed by a chef, which is meant to amaze viewers, not necessarily teach them how to cook.

While the two male hosts construct this entertainment role in very distinct fashions, the function of such roles—to entertain—is the same in both *The Essence of Emeril* and *I Eat Therefore I Am*. This analysis of the entertainment role of the cooking show host and the framing of food preparation programs as lifestyle suggestions in both Romania and the U.S. is an argument against absolute and contrasting categorizations of behaviors and patterns specific to East/ West cultural contexts such as those in Romania vs. the US; at the same time, this also constitutes an example of the effect of globalization and the fading of the expression of a strong national cultural identity.

The concepts discussed so far in this chapter—e.g., a middle class lifestyle as part of which housework chores are fun, and the idea of entertainment through vicarious consumption of television food programming—are set forth in cooking show discourse by individuals who are cultural icons in Romania and the US, in part because they frame themselves as food, culture, and lifestyle experts. As I point out in Chapter 6, all four hosts take a stance of food connoisseurs, or authority figures in taste, food, and culture.

To point out the quality of the meals that they present, SM and DC appeal to markers of increased focus which are meant to draw audiences' attention to the taste, visual appeal, or overall quality of the meals that they present on the shows. Moreover, in addition to using increased focus markers, RR and EL use audience-involving strategies that seem to seek audiences' agreement both regarding the quality of their meals and of the hosts' taste and food expert status. The U.S. hosts' lifestyle expert status is further reinforced discursively by the recommendations that both RR and EL make which go beyond instructions concerning

the actual cooking process of a given recipe; that is, RR and EL offer their television audiences suggestions regarding what products to buy and from what stores, as well as how to entertain with food. While such advice is also present in the Romanian shows analyzed in this study, in the U.S. programs it is more assertive and imperative.

Further, as discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, U.S. and Romanian television cooking shows serve as the locus for both lifestyle maintenance and change through the affective stances that hosts take vis-à-vis classic and novel recipes, as well as concerns of nutrition and health, and regional and religious dietary restrictions. That is, all four hosts introduce themselves to their audiences as agents of cultural maintenance or promotion of existing and preferred lifestyles (SM and EL), and of cultural change or attempts to alter current food and behavior- related lifestyles on the main basis of unhealthiness and food preparation time (RR and DC).

The cooking show hosts' success of changing viewers' lifestyle patterns varies and is beyond the scope of this dissertation study. However, by using ingredients that are unfamiliar to the Romanian cuisine, e.g., ostrich instead of lamb in a traditional Romanian meal, or tuna fish as a healthier alternative to pork, DC may contribute to an "internationalization" of Romanian cuisine and at the same time to setting the stage for healthier eating habits, even though these entail cooking with ingredients that are expensive and hard to find in Romania. Conversely, U.S. audiences may be tempted to prepare the recipes presented by RR as less time consuming than their original variants, and in time RR's meal versions may replace what are currently viewed as classic U.S. recipes, e.g., burgers with slaw and macaroni and jack cheese salad.

Lastly, while the influence of such television cooking show hosts and the lifestyles they set forth may not be immediately perceived or acknowledged, it is evident for instance, in the selection of RR as one of the 100 most influential people by TIME Magazine<sup>91</sup> in 2006. Moreover, the language use of hosts such as RR has permeated contemporary U.S. English discourse surrounding food to the extent that expressions coined by RR such as “delish”, i.e., delicious, “yumm-o”, i.e., yummy, or “E.V.O.O.”, i.e., extra virgin olive oil, are recognized and used in everyday talk about food and taste; for instance, E.V.O.O. has been added to the Oxford American College Dictionary in 2007<sup>92</sup>.

#### **7.4 Conclusion**

In this chapter, I situated key micro-level findings of stance, taste, affect, and interaction from Chapters 5 and 6 in the larger context of television cooking show discourse, and interpreted them within a Romanian and U.S. cultural frame of reference. To this end, I appealed to Silverstein’s (2003) concept of indexical order which argues that such micro-grain discursive features contribute to the construction of larger sociocultural categories. More specifically, in this chapter, I focused on how affective and interactional stance-taking in television cooking show discourse builds on and reflects broader sociocultural categories, including social identities of gender, class, leisure and lifestyle (also Ochs, 1993).

In this chapter I focused on the aforementioned categories both because they emerged as frequent themes in the U.S. and Romanian data analyzed in this dissertation, and because they are discussed at length from a theoretical perspective in the field of media and cultural

---

<sup>91</sup> From <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1187293,00.html> retrieved August 7<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

<sup>92</sup> From [http://www.everythingrachaelray.com/2006/12/evoo-is-official\\_11.html](http://www.everythingrachaelray.com/2006/12/evoo-is-official_11.html) retrieved August 7<sup>th</sup>, 2011

studies. Thus, the analysis in this chapter illustrates differences and similarities in the ways in which gender, class, leisure and lifestyle are constructed cross-culturally, and shows how they are instantiated through linguistic features in U.S. and Romanian food preparation media discourse.

## Chapter 8

### CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND FURTHER DIRECTIONS

#### 8.1. Summary

In this dissertation, I have analyzed patterns of communication as expressed in a television cooking show corpus that comprises 400 hundred minutes of two television cooking shows from Romania, *The Recipe from Home*, and *I Eat Therefore I Am*, and two from the US, *30 Minute Meals* and *The Essence of Emeril*. Through the lens of a micro- and macro-level discourse analysis, I have identified and illustrated similar and contrasting patterns that are prevalent in Romanian and U.S. cooking show discourse. These patterns focus dually on the television cooking show hosts' stances towards the meals that they present on their shows, and the viewing audiences who watch these cooking programs on television.

I present below the specific questions that I addressed in this dissertation study, and summarize the question-specific findings.

#### Question 1:

How does a micro-linguistic analysis of the selected television cooking show corpus in terms of the expression of taste and affect contribute to understanding the role of indexicality in the construction of attitudes towards food and cooking?

To address question 1, I focused on the *indexical meanings* (Ochs, 1996; Silverstein, 2003) of affective stance towards taste in the four shows analyzed in this study. From a quantitative perspective, tokens of affective stance towards taste patterned similarly in female



host data from the two countries, as well as in male data from Romania and the U.S. from a frequency and token choice viewpoint. That is, female hosts used a wide range of taste tokens while male hosts used only two types of tokens, all with a relatively evenly distributed frequency in the present television cooking show corpus.

A qualitative analysis revealed that the Romanian and U.S. female hosts' use of interjections as taste evaluators points to the hosts' vicarious enjoyment of the taste of the food that they present before actually tasting these meals. A second linguistic feature expressing the hosts' stance towards taste that was frequent in the data analyzed was *bun* and *good*, which varied widely semantically in *I Eat Therefore I Am*, taking on meanings from "good tasting" to "delicious"; in contrast, in the two female host shows, *good* and *bun* [*good*] were used solely with the meaning of "great tasting".

In addition, unlike in *I Eat Therefore I Am*, where the use of *bun* followed an actual tasting of the meal demonstrated on the show, in the two female host shows, *bun* and *good* typically indexed a multi-sensory experience that involved the taste, smell, or visual appeal of the meal. Lastly, the analysis of stance, taste, and affect in Chapter 5 showed that the hosts' claim of deliciousness is based in the shows analyzed in this study, not on an actual tasting of the meal, but on cooking creativity (SM), food preparation technique (RR), and ingredient choice (EL).

#### Question 2:

How does a micro-linguistic analysis of the selected television cooking show corpus in terms of the expression of interactional features such as interrogatives and imperatives contribute to

understanding the presentation of self by television cooking show hosts, and the construction of desirable lifestyle norms in Romania and the US?

Through Goffman's *frame analysis* (1974), I identified different ways of constructing the overall television cooking show format to reflect either a cooking demonstration or entertainment show format. Within this framing, I discussed the hosts' *presentation of self* (Goffman, 1959) as *cook* (RR, SM), *chef* (EL and DC), *friend* (RR), *entertainer* (EL, DC), *evaluator* (all four hosts), and *cultural agent* (all four hosts) achieved linguistically through imperative and interrogative constructions encoding *focus* and *inclusion*. While within the discursive construction of these roles I have noticed tendencies of a gender-specific distribution (e.g., both SM and RR presented themselves as *cooks*), there were also cross-cultural differences. For example, U.S. hosts used considerably more involvement tokens than their Romanian counterparts when taking up the role of *evaluator*. This emphasis on audience engagement of the U.S. hosts points to a stronger affirmation of the U.S. hosts' food evaluator status. That is, U.S. hosts do not only express their positive evaluation of some aspect of the meals that they demonstrate, e.g., visual appeal, smell, taste, but also seem to seek their audience's agreement regarding this evaluation.

Question 3 (exploratory aim):

What are the implications of this analysis for understanding how the 'everyday' instructional discourse of these television cooking shows reflects, reproduces, challenges, or offers alternatives to, the particular cultural schemata, values, and norms of the countries in which it is produced and viewed?

To address the implications of the aforementioned findings of the affective and interactional stance analyses, I used Silverstein's *indexical order* (2003), which aims to bridge micro and macro elements of discourse, and thus to build on the creation of broader social and cultural categories. More specifically, I discussed how the micro-level features of stance, affect, taste, and interaction construct and reflect social and cultural categories of gender, class, leisure and lifestyle in the two countries. This discussion thus aimed at contextualizing stance by taking into consideration not only the immediate context of television cooking show discourse, i.e., setting, host body language, cooking sequence, but also the broader U.S. and Romanian contemporary cultural contexts.

For instance, the analysis in this chapter points to the existence of a different premise for the evaluation of the taste of meals for male and female cooking show hosts. That is, while the two male hosts typically base the evaluation of the taste of their meals on an actual sampling of the meal, the two female hosts constantly appeal to a gustatory fantasy by verbally evaluating the meals before they actually taste them.

This chapter also discusses the discursive construction of middle class status both implicitly (female host shows) and explicitly (male host shows) in shows from the U.S. and Romania, as well as the presence of the tastes of luxury in all four shows analyzed here. Lastly, I addressed the exploratory aim above by discussing the construct of *work as fun* that permeates television cooking show discourse, in particular in the U.S. context, and the implications of such an argument embedded both in this television genre and broader cultural context.

## **8.2 Implications of present study**

The analysis of the cross-cultural television cooking show corpus in this dissertation brings new insights not only into linguistic anthropological constructs such as stance-taking and culture as communication, but also into the understanding of taste, affect, and interaction in general, and in particular in cross-cultural contexts, i.e., Romania and the U.S. Moreover, the present dissertation provides support for the importance of the study of media discourse as a locus for the emergence of cultural forms and social identities of gender and class, as well as the study of popular television show hosts' language use as a central factor in concurrently maintaining and changing cultural frames and patterns.

### **8.2.1 Stance-taking, culture, and communication**

With regard to the construct of stance-taking, the present dissertation, which focuses on both affective and interactional tokens, provides support for a conceptualization of stance specific to the function that it fulfills, i.e., to express affective attitudes towards food, in particular taste, and interactional attitudes towards viewing audiences, or the remote audiences of television cooking show hosts. In contrast to a broader term that would incorporate two or more types of stance, such specific conceptualizations offer the flexibility to include all nuances of these different types of speaker attitudes into a micro-level discourse analytic process such as the one adopted in this dissertation; this approach to stance conceptualization is also reflected in recent work in stance-taking in discourse (Kiesling, 2009; Kiesling personal communication; Johnstone, 2008; Kärkkäinen, 2006).

Moreover, this dissertation study is one of the first, if not the only study of stance-taking in television cooking show discourse. Such a type of discourse brings new insights

into the analysis of stance-taking as well as television programming in general in that it highlights the addressivity of television discourse especially when a live audience is not present. That is, even though interlocutors are not physically present when hosts demonstrate their recipes, television hosts engage audiences in multiple ways throughout the food preparation process through culture-specific audience involvement strategies.

Lastly, this study illustrates how micro-and macro-level elements of discourse conjointly build on the concept of stance-taking vis-à-vis taste, affect, and interaction through their patterned occurrence in television cooking show discourse. Also, the cross-linguistic, cross-gender, and cross-cultural approach adopted here contributes to a nuanced understanding of the complexity of stance-taking which would not have been visible by simply analyzing discourse from one culture only, or produced by either male or female speakers.

Along the same lines, the present study also reinforces the view of culture as communication (Bourdieu, 1997; 1990; 1991), in this case, through the medium of television. The popularity of television cooking show hosts constitutes compelling evidence for the culturally-imbued messages that they convey to their viewing audiences, both regarding food and cooking, and lifestyle patterns and preferences in general, through verbal and non-verbal cues. In other words, for viewing audiences to enjoy and relate to the cooking show hosts' food preparation instructions and stories—cooking-related and otherwise—cooking show discourse must “speak to” their cultural values, preferences, and habits.

On the one hand, as shown in this dissertation, television cooking shows not only perpetuate existing cultural norms and habits, but also set forth novel attitudes towards eating, cooking, and serving suggestions, as healthier, tastier, and more inexpensive

alternatives to already established recipes or eating patterns. On the other hand, one might also argue that viewing audiences contribute to cooking show programming and implicitly to the eating and behavior patterns or the cultural values that hosts set forth in their shows by posting comments, suggestions, and recipe requests on the cooking show websites.

For example, in *The Essence of Emeril*, Emeril points out that the fact that he presents multiple chicken recipes in a particular episode is the result of viewers' requests for such recipes. Another example of the dialogic nature of television food programming, and the viewing audiences' influence on the cultural norms presented in this media genre is the Romanian hosts' consideration of Orthodox Church dietary restrictions at different times of the year. For instance, SM, the Romanian female host, points out that she is presenting only fasting recipes within a fasting period (e.g., the period leading up to Christmas) because otherwise she would receive complaints from her female viewers.

### **8.2.2 Gender and class**

As shown in this dissertation study, the Romanian and U.S. corpora present similar patterns in that both female hosts display a more nuanced expression of taste preference than their male counterparts, and a stronger emphasis on offering cooking instructions that can be duplicated by the television viewers. The latter observation is consistent with the role of *cook* set forth by the female hosts; in contrast, the two male hosts from Romania and the US discursively construct the role of *chef* through a decreased use of audience involvement strategies. However, even though the four hosts discursively build on a *cook/ chef* image, both female and male hosts seem to address a non-professional cooking audience, i.e.,

everyone who is interested in preparing food, or even simply watching food being prepared on television.

However, on the one hand, one may argue, given the above findings regarding taste, affect, and interaction, that the two female hosts, RR and SM, appeal to a female viewing audience more than their male counterparts, in that female audiences may themselves follow a similar food and cooking rhetorical pattern, as well as recipe choice. Conversely, one may argue that the two male hosts, DC and EL appeal primarily to a male audience which, similarly to DC and EL, may use a limited number of food evaluation tokens and interlocutor involving strategies when talking about food and cooking. To some extent, this female/ male audience focus is implied in all four cooking shows in that for example, in both countries women are more likely to cook for their families, and men to hold chef positions more frequently than women.

On the other hand, in the U.S. context, the emphatic entertaining function of television cooking shows (Adema, 2000; Ketchum, 2005), e.g., *30 Minute Meals* and *The Essence of Emeril* may mitigate the gender-specific addressivity of these shows, in that the shows' instructional function set forth by hosts as chefs and cooks becomes secondary. In contrast, in the Romanian context, gender-specificity is reinforced through explicit references to a male audience (DC), respectively to a female audience (SM). That is, DC points out that if male viewers adopt his healthy meal ideas, they are going to be more physically attractive and they are going to be more successful at getting dates. Also, SM directly addresses young women who, she argues, should be able to follow her recipes even if they do not know how to cook.

Thus, in the Romanian context are emphasized both the instructional function of such shows and the culturally-based assumption that female viewers are more likely to prepare and serve meals to their families in a home setting, and male viewers to work as chefs in a paid position such as a restaurant chef, and only occasionally to prepare meals. In this role, SM also seems to serve as a surrogate female relative in that she offers cooking advice to young female audiences who need to provide their families with cooked meals. However, as most Romanian female viewers hold jobs outside of the home—as unlike in the U.S., in Romania women have always had to work outside the home during the last fifty years or so, both during Communism and after 1989—SM’s recipes are adapted to such constraints in that they are easy to prepare and not time consuming.

In this light, what *The Recipe from Home* brings anew to the Romanian cultural context is the acknowledgment that women should have time to themselves even though they hold jobs and prepare meals for their families. While the recognition of the importance of “having fun” (Bourdieu, 1984) is present in the U.S. television cooking show discourse<sup>93</sup>—and potentially inspired by it—in *30 Minute Meals*, RR views *work as fun* while in *The Recipe from Home*, SM points out that having fun is distinct from cooking, and that it happens *after* the cooking process is complete.

As mentioned before, all four hosts introduce themselves, either implicitly (the female hosts) or explicitly (the male hosts) to their viewing audiences as middle class representatives through a multitude of discursive elements. However, the social personae and cultural norms set forth by the two male chefs are more explicitly linked with class than with gender, in part because of their stated chef status in the two male host shows.

---

<sup>93</sup> Retrieved from <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0612/25/lkl.09.html> on May 25th 2007.



In the Romanian post-Communist social, political, and cultural context, the display of the concept of class is especially compelling, even more so after Romania became part of the European Union in 2007. Similarly to the US context, the middle class representation of television cooking show hosts can arguably reflect both a desired and an existing status in contemporary Romania. The middle class constructions presented in *I Eat Therefore I Am* and *The Recipe from Home* include a display of wealth, power, status, erudition, and an apparent multicultural lifestyle, in particular regarding cooking and eating habits.

Wealth, power, and status are relatively unmarked representations of middle class constructs in Romania, as well as in the U.S.; however, erudition and multicultural lifestyle orientations are relatively marked from the point of view of the U.S. contemporary society. By erudition, I understand an appreciation of higher education, and knowledge of literature, history, culture, and fine arts, or what Bourdieu views as cultural capital (1986). In a country with a relatively low standard of living as Romania<sup>94</sup>, but with free public pre-K through college education, erudition is more typical than wealth, and equally, or even more valuable. Second, an orientation towards an eclectic approach to preparing recipe ideas from different countries as seen in the Romanian cooking shows analyzed in this study, may be the result of a Western influence on Romania after it has become part of the EU; at the same time, it may also be a consequence of the strict restrictions of the Communist era during which Romanians were not allowed any form of contact with any democratic country or with the citizens of those countries.

---

<sup>94</sup> From <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ro.html> retrieved November 11, 2011

### **8.2.3 The television cooking show genre within a globalized media world**

A detailed, cross-linguistic and cross-cultural analysis of media discourse is especially relevant in that it helps uncover both global and individual social and cultural trends and patterns. For instance, this dissertation study uncovers issues of communication, gender, class, religion, and lifestyle that are both similar and distinct in the two countries. While it is difficult to pinpoint whether cultural similarities are the result of a globalization trend, or of internal cultural shifts, such comparable patterns may yield insights into preferred lifestyles, ways of thinking and of communicating, and cultural maintenance and change.

In this dissertation, I have shown that cultural celebrities like Rachael Ray and Emeril Lagasse in the U.S., and Dan Chisu and Simona Mihaescu in Romania, not only maintain broadly accepted cultural values within each context, but also emphasize certain cooking and eating habits that may reinforce national or religious identity to some extent. For instance, as mentioned before, both Romanian hosts follow in their recipe choice the canons of the Greek Orthodox Church, the religious affiliation of the majority of Romanians, but make no reference to the religious affiliations of the many minority groups in Romania.

In addition to promoting existent cultural values, cooking show hosts, e.g., Rachael Ray and Dan Chisu, act as agents of cultural change by introducing to their audiences novel recipes which are presented as healthier, faster to prepare, or overall better alternatives to their original variants, and which aim to contribute to changing lifestyle patterns and habits, e.g., eating healthier meals. Thus, given this dual role of cooking show hosts—of promoting both existent and novel cultural themes, more attention to this type of television discourse may reveal newly adopted cultural values in a given country-specific context.

Further, the personas of RR and EL not only reflect existing U.S. cultural values, but also embody the brands that the two cultural icons have constructed through their signature products and meal ideas, and have initiated and maintained through all the media forms in which they participate, from television shows to commercials. That is, through her cooking show discourse, RR constructs the image of “the girl next door” and that of a friend who is willing and happy to offer cooking advice to those who need it. *30 Minute Meals* is thus framed as a television program which presents recipes for quick, easy, healthy, and inexpensive meals. Somewhat contrastively, EL introduces himself to television viewers as a chef who prepares exquisite meals, but who also instructs and demonstrates to audiences what high cuisine is. As discussed earlier in this dissertation, both RR and EL have coined “catch phrases” such as “yum-o” (RR) and “bam!” (EL) which reflect, construct, and promote the branding of the two hosts.

Unlike in the U.S., in Romania the concept of branding of the television cooking show host is considerably less present due in part to television cooking show design which frame Romanian hosts as being detached from the recipes that they present (cf. their U.S. counterparts). For example, in *Reteta de Acasa*, SM is the presenter, or demonstrator, but not the author of the recipes that she introduces to her audiences; conversely, in *I Eat Therefore I Am*, while DC takes credit for most recipes that he presents, he oftentimes admits that he does not know how to cook the meals, so his aides prepare the dishes instead of him. Such traits present the Romanian television hosts as having much less agency than the U.S. hosts in the food preparation process, and overall less control over the shows that they host.

However, Romania may also begin to adopt an approach to “branding” of the television cooking show hosts as well as of other cultural icons in the future if Romanian

producers may decide to adopt this U.S. (and other countries') presentational style of television cooking show hosts. That is, the fact that *30 Minute Meals*—similarly to all other foreign-produced television cooking shows which dominate Romanian commercial television—airs in Romania may result not only in an increased popularity of RR's products, and preferences regarding cooking, serving, entertaining with food, but also in a novel approach to the presentation of self of such television celebrities.

Closely connected with the idea of branding is the aforementioned entertaining function of U.S. television cooking shows in that for cooking show hosts to promote their own brands and television programs, their performance needs to be at least somewhat entertaining for the television viewers; in addition, for commercial purposes, the cooking shows must be accessible to as wide an audience as possible. Thus, while one of the functions of television food programming in both countries remains that of instructing audiences how to cook and implicitly providing access to a variety of cooking techniques and meal ideas, this function becomes secondary especially in the case of U.S. food programming (Adema, 2000; Ketchum, 2005).

### **8.3 Further directions**

Television cooking shows constitute a rich locus for the analysis of stance, taste, affect, and interaction. To further strengthen the validity of the present cross-gender and cross-cultural findings, future research on stance-taking in other forms of television discourse from the two countries would be necessary. In addition, further studies of affective and interactional stance-taking in media discourse would contribute to a more complex conceptualization of this construct in this communication format. Such an investigation

would both help reinforce some the claims made in this dissertation, and would contribute to the very limited literature on stance-taking within a cross-cultural perspective.

Given the relatively newly democratic Romanian socio-cultural and political context, future studies of the Romanian media could potentially highlight additional aspects of contemporary Romanian society that are central to defining its identity in a time of transition, such as the present period in which Romania still recovers from the Communist rule and is adapting to its new role within the EU. Conversely, similar studies of the U.S. media could offer a more nuanced understanding of communication trends and patterns, as well as preferred lifestyles in U.S. present-day society.

Finally, further cross-cultural micro- and macro-level discourse analyses of television cooking shows would contribute to a more in-depth understanding of media globalization patterns, and their influence on socio-cultural constructs, including gender, class, and religious identities, as well as food and eating behaviors.

## Appendix A: Transcription symbols

^ stress

(.) 1 sec pause

CAPS higher volume

[overlap

=latching

. falling intonation

? rising intonation

, no change in intonation

:: elongation of sounds

•hhh in breath

°whisper°

>fast speech<

(( )) researcher's comments

[ ] translation

## **Appendix B: List of abbreviations**

ADV	adverb
FML	formal
IND	indicative
INF	informal
INT	interrogative
IMP	imperative
PL	plural
PRES S	Present Simple
SG	singular

Appendix C: Affective taste markers

			<b>30 Minute Meals</b>	<b>Essence of Emeril</b>	<b>Recipe from Home</b>	<b>I Eat Therefo re I Am</b>	<b># of tokens</b>
Lexical affective stance features (699)	<b>1</b>	<b>Taste</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>295</b>
	2	Visual appeal	48	25	31	7	111
	3	Smell	32	15	4	5	56
	4	<i>Nice</i>	111	27	N/A	N/A	138
	5	Other	26	15	45	13	99
Verbal affective stance features (235)	6	<i>Love</i>	40	10	N/A	N/A	50
	7	<i>Like</i>	12	10	16	8	46
	8	Other	41	64	23	11	139
		Total	430	241	166	97	934

Table 5: The distribution of affective taste markers in television cooking shows from Romania and the US.



## Bibliography

- Adema, P. (2000). Vicarious consumption: Food, television and the ambiguity of modernity. *Journal of American and Comparative Cultures*, 23(3): 113-124.
- Andrews, Robert (Ed.) (1996). *Famous Lines: A Columbia Dictionary of Familiar Quotations*. Columbia University Press.
- Atkinson, J. M., Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ashley, B., Hollows, J., Jones, S. & Taylor, B. (2004). Television Chefs. In *Food and Cultural Studies*. Routledge.
- Auter, P. J. and Moore, R. L. (1993). Buying from a friend: A content analysis of two tele-shopping programs. *Journalism Quarterly*, 70 (2): 425–436.
- Bakhtin, M.M.(1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M.Bakhtin*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. (Edited by M. Holquist; translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist).
- Baughman, J. (1985). *Television's Guardians: The FCC and the Politics of Programming, 1958– 1967*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.
- Bednarek, M. (2008). *Emotion Talk and Corpora*. Palgrave MacMillan, Houndsmills.
- Benedict, R. (1934). *Patterns of Culture*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Berger, H. (2010). *Stance: Ideas about Emotion, Style, and Meaning for the Study of Expressive Culture*. Wesleyan.
- Besnier, N. (1990). Language and affect. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 19: 419-

451.

Biber, D. and Finegan, E. (1988). Adverbial Stance Types in English.” *Discourse Processes* 11: 1-34.

Biber, D. and Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of Stance in English: Lexical and Grammatical Marking of Evidentiality and Affect. *Text* 9: 93-124.

Boas, F. (1911). *The Mind of Primitive Man*. The Macmillan Company.

Boas, F. (1940). *Race, Language, and Culture*. The University of Chicago Press.

Boas, F. (1930). Anthropology In *Encyclopedia of the social sciences*, Vol. 2. (pp. 73-110). New York: Macmillan.

Bourdieu, P. (1974). The School as a Conservative Force: scholastic and cultural inequalities. In Eggleston, J. (Ed.). *Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education*. London: Methuen.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Trans. Nice, R. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1979). Baudrillard, J (1988). *America*. London: Verso.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Trans. Nice, R. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production*. Columbia University Press.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Bucholtz, M. (2009). From Stance to Style: Gender, Interaction, and Indexicality in Mexican Immigrant Youth Slang. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 146-170). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carr, D. (2006, October 23). Rachel Ray Gives the Gift of Time. *The New York Times*, p.1.

Casey, B., Casey, N., Calvert, B., French, L., and Lewis, J. (2002). *Television Studies. The Key Concepts*. Routledge.

Chafe, W. (1994). *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chafe, W. (1970). *Meaning and the Structure of Language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Clark, R. A. (1984). *Persuasive Messages*. New York: Harper & Row.

Clifford, J. (1988). *The predicament of culture: Twentieth-century ethnography, literature, and art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, J. (1986). Introduction to *Writing Culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Clifford, J. & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.), (pp. 1-26). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clift, R. (2006). Indexing stance: Reported speech as an interactional evidential. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10: 569–595.

Collins, J. (2002a). *High-Pop: An Introduction*. In Collins, J. (Ed.) *Making Culture into Popular Entertainment*. Blackwell Publishing.

- Collins, J. (2002b). *No (Popular) Place Like Home?* In Collins, J. (Ed.) *Making Culture into Popular Entertainment*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Collins, J. (1992). Postmodernism and Television. In Allen, R. (Ed.). *Channels of Discourse, Reassembled*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Coman, M. (2002). *Media in Romania, 1990-2001: A Source Book*. Berlin: Vistas Verlag.
- Conrad, S., & Biber, D. (2000). Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing. *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*, 56–73.
- Davies, C. E. (2003). Language and American “good taste”. In Aitchison, J. (Ed.). *The New Media Language*. Routledge.
- Davies, B. and Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20(1): 44-63.
- De Solier, Isabelle (2005). TV: Culinary Television, Education and Distinction. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*. 19(4): 465-481.
- Dimaggio, P. (1991). Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth Century Boston: The Creation of an Organizational Base for High Culture in America. In Mukerji, C. and Schudson, M. (Eds.). *Rethinking Popular Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dobran, V. (Chief Editor) (2001-2011). *Maninc deci Exist*. Dan Chisu. Romania: Realitatea.net.
- DuBois, J. (2007). In Englebretson, R. (ed.). *Stancetaking in interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1969). On sociolinguistic rules: Alternation and co-occurrence. In *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 4, Sociolinguistics. New York: Academic Press.

European Commission Archives (2007). Retrieved October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011.

Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Media Discourse*, London: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.

Featherstone, M. (1991). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Sage.

Fiske, J. (1987). *Television Culture*. Routledge: London and New York.

Fiske, J. (1989). *Understanding Popular Culture*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Fitzmaurice, S. (2004). Subjectivity, intersubjectivity and the historical construction of interlocutor stance: from stance markers to discourse markers. *Discourse Studies*, 6(4): 427-448.

Gans, H. (1999). *Popular Culture and High Culture. An Analysis and Evaluation of Taste*. Basic Books.

Geertz, C. (1973). *An interpretation of cultures: Selected essays by Clifford Gerdez*. New York: Basic Books Inc.

Georgiadis, B.D. (2004). *The Romanian Media in Transition*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Florida State University. Retrieved October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper and Row.

- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, C. and Goodwin, M. (1992). Assessments and the Construction of Context. In *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, eds. pp. 147-90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W. (1984). Written Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5: 101-123.
- Groszberg, L., Nelson, C. & Treichler, P. (Eds.). (1992). *Cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hall, S. (1982). The rediscovery of “ideology”: Return of the repressed in media studies. In M. Gurevitch, T. Bennett, J. Curran & J. Woollacott (Eds.). *Culture, society and the media*. (pp.56-90). London: Methuen.
- Hannerz, U. (1992). *Cultural complexity: Studies in the social organization of meaning*. New York: Columbia university Press.
- Harker, R., Mahar C., Wilkes C. (Eds.) (1990). *An Introduction to the Work of Pierre Bourdieu. The Practice of Theory*. McMillan Ltd.
- Haviland, J.B., (1989). “Sure, sure.” Evidence and affect. *Text* 9: 27-68.
- Heller, D. (Ed.) (2006). *The Great American Makeover. Television, History, Nation*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hollows, J. (2003). "Feeling Like a Domestic Goddess: Post-feminism and Cooking". *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 6(2): 179-202.

Hudgins, S. (2005). A Conversation with Julia Child, Spring 1984. *Gastronomica*. Summer.

Hunston, S. & Thompson, G. (2000) (Eds.). *Evaluation in text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp.35-71). New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.

Jameson, F. (1984). Postmodernism: or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. *New Left Review*. 146.

Johnstone, B. (2009). Stance, Style, and the Linguistic Individual. *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Stance*. Ed. Alexandra Jaffe. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kant, I. (1964). *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*. Harper Perennial.

Kärkkäinen, E. (2006). Stance-taking in conversation: From subjectivity to intersubjectivity. *Text & Talk*, 26-6: 699-731.

Ketchum, C. (2005). The Essence of Cooking Shows: How the Food Network Constructs Consumer Fantasies. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 29(3): 217-234.

Kiesling, S. F. (2009). Style as Stance: Stance as the Explanation for Patterns of Sociolinguistic Variation. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 171-194). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Kline, S. (2005). Interactive Media Systems: Influence Strategies in Television Home Shopping. *Text*, 25 (2): 201-231.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). The Study of Culture. In Lerner, D. & Lasswell, H.D. (Eds.). *The Policy Sciences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kockelman, P. (2004). Stance and subjectivity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 14:127-150.
- Krishnendu, R. (2007). Domesticating Cuisine: Food and Aesthetics on American Television. *Gastronomica*, 7(1) (Winter 2007): pp. 50-64.
- Kroeber, A.L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions*. Harvard University Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology Papers 47.
- Kroeber, A. L. & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions*. New York: Random House.
- Labov, W. (1984). Field methods of the Project on Linguistic Change and Variation. In J. Baugh & J. Sherzer (eds.), *Language in Use*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Ledbetter, J. (1997). *Made possible by... The Death of Public Broadcasting in the United States*. Verso.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Blackwell.
- Lemke, J. (1998). Metamedia Literacy: Transforming Meanings And Media. In D. Reinking, L. Labbo, M. McKenna, & R. Kiefer (Eds.), *Literacy for the 21st Century: Technological Transformation in a post-typographic world*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. pp.283-301.



Leontiev, A. N. (1978). *Activity, consciousness, personality*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Levine, L. (1988). *Highbrow/ Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Levinson, S. (1981). The Essential Inadequacies of Speech Act Models of Dialogue. In H. Parret, M. Sbis and J. Verschueren, eds. *Possibilities and Limitations of Pragmatics*, pp.473-492. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*, vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mayes, P. (2005). Linking micro and macro social structure through genre analysis. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38: 331-370.

Mannheim, D. and Tedlock, B. (1995) (Eds.). *The Dialogic Emergence of Culture*. University of Illinois Press.

Mead, M. (1937, 2002) (Ed.) *Cooperation and Competition Among Primitive Peoples*. Transaction Publishers/ New York and London: McGraw-Hill.

Meister, M. (2001). Cultural Feeding, Good Life Science, and the TV Food Network. *Mass Communication & Society*, 4(2): 165-182.

Miller, T. (2002). From Brahmin Julia to Working- Class Emeril: The Evolution of Television Cooking. In Collins, J. (Ed.). *High-Pop. Making Culture into Popular Entertainment*. Blackwell Publishing.

Mocanu, C. (General Director) (2007-2011). *Reteta de Acasa*. Simona Mihaescu. Romania: Acasa TV.

Morgan, L. (1877). *Ancient Society*. MacMillan & Company.

Moseley, R. (2001). "Real Lads *Do* Cook... But Some Things Are Still Hard to Talk About: the gendering of 8-9", *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 4(1): 32-39.

Murdock, G. P. (1960). Cognatic forms of social organization. In G. P. Murdock (Ed.), *Social structure in Southeast Asia* (pp. 1–14). Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Ochs, E. (1993) Indexing gender. In *Sex and gender hierarchies*, ed. by B. Miller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Reprint of "Indexing Gender" in *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon*, ed. by A. Duranti & C. Goodwin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.)

Ochs, E. (1986). Introduction. In Ochs, E., Schieffelin, B. (Eds.). *Language Socialization Across Cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1-13.

Ochs, E., Pontecorvo, C., & Fasulo, A. (1996) Socializing Taste. *Ethnos*, 1-2: 7-46.

Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (1989). Language has a heart. *Text*, 9: 7-25.

Ouellette, L. (2002). *Viewers Like You? How Public TV Failed the People*. Columbia University Press.

Pichler & Ecker (1999). Country Analyses: Romania. In Brunnbauer, U., Grandits, H., Gruber, S., Kaser, K., Pichler, R., Promitzer, C. (Eds.). *How to Construct Civil Societies? Education, Human Rights and Media in Southeast Europe: A Critical Guide*. Retrieved October 12<sup>th</sup>, from <http://www-gewi.kfunigraz.ac.at/csbsc/guide/Romania.htm>.

Parson, T. (1949). *Essays in Sociological Theory*. Glencoe, IL.

Patterns of Culture. (2011). In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/446822/Patterns-of-Culture>

Peirce, C. (1955). *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*. Dover Publications, New York.

Pomerantz, A. M. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessment: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structure of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosaldo, R. (1993). *Culture and truth*. Routledge.

Ryle, G. (1971). What is le Penseur doing?. Published lecture.

Sapir, E. (1932). Cultural anthropology and Psychiatry. *Journal of abnormal and Social Psychology*, 27, 229-242.

Sapir, E. (1929). The status of linguistics as a science. *Language* 5

Schieffelin, B. (1985). The importance of cultural perspectives on infant care and feeding. In *Infant Care and Feeding in Oceania*. L. Marshall (Ed.), pp. 1-12. NY: Gordon & Breach.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sidky, H. (2004). *Perspectives on culture: A critical introduction to theory in cultural anthropology*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall. p 148.

Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical Order and the Dialectics of Sociolinguistic Life. *Language and Communication*, 23(3-4): 193-229.

Silverstone, R. (1994). *Television and Everyday Life*. London and New York: Routledge.

Skeggs, B. (1997). Becoming a Modern 'Woman' (review article). *Cultural Studies* 11(3): 489-492.

- Smith, G.M., and Wilson, P. (2004). Country Cookin' and Cross-Dressin'. Television, Southern Masculinities, and Hierarchies of Cultural Taste. *Television and New Media*, 5(3): 175-195.
- Spigel, L. (1992). *Make Room for TV. Television and the Family Ideal in Postwar America*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Stanley, A. (2006, September 19). Beyond the kitchen, breaking bread with America. *The New York Times*, p. E.10.
- Strauss, S. (2005). The linguistic aestheticization of food: A cross cultural look at food commercials in Japan, Korea, and the United States. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37: 1427-1455.
- Strauss, C & Quinn, N. (1997). *A Cognitive Theory of Cultural Meaning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuschman, B. (General Manager). (2001-2011). *30 Minute Meals*. Rachael Ray. United States: The Food Network.
- Tuschman, B. (General Manager). (2000-2007). *The Essence of Emeril*. Emeril Lagasse. United States: The Food Network.
- Tylor, E. B. (1958). *The origins of culture: Part I of "Primitive culture"*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers. Original publication in 1871.
- Van Eemeren, F. and Grootendorst, R. (1983). *Speech Acts and Argumentative Discussions*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2005). *Introducing Social Semiotics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Vinken, H., Soethers, J. & Ester, P. (Eds.). (2004). *Comparing cultures: Dimensions of culture in a comparative perspective*. Lieden, Netherlands: Brill.

Voight, C. (1997). *You are what you eat: Contemplations on civilizing the palate with Gourmet*. Unpublished Master's thesis, McGill University, Canada.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society. The development of higher psychological functions*. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), Trans. M. Cole & M. Lopez-Morallis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Trans. A. Kozulin. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

## **Vitae**

Alina C. Pajtek

### **Education**

- |                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| January 2005- December 2011 | Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics, The Pennsylvania State University, GPA: 4.0/4.0.   |
| 2000- 2002                  | M.A. Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, Michigan State University, GPA: 3.8/ 4.0   |
| 1993-1997                   | B.A. English Language, Literature and Methodology; French Language, Literature and Methodology, West University of Timisoara, Romania, GPA: 9.40/ 10 |

### **Research interests**

Discourse analysis, cross-cultural communication, linguistic anthropology, media and culture

### **Selected conference presentations**

- Pajtek, A.C., “Interactional stance in TV cooking show discourse from Romania and the US”. GURT, Washington DC, March 2011.
- Pajtek, A.C., “Affective Stance in US Television Cooking Show Discourse.” 11th International Pragmatics Conference, Melbourne, Australia, July 2009
- Pajtek, A. C., “The Tastes of Necessity and Luxury: Culture as Reflected in TV Cooking Shows from the US and Romania.” AILA, Essen, Germany, August 2008
- Pajtek, A. C., “*I cook, therefore I am*”: a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural analysis of televised cooking shows in Romania and the U.S. Arizona Anthropology and Linguistics Symposium, Tucson, AZ, May 2008