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ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the speech style shifts occurring in TV cooking shows in Korean and Japanese, where multiple speech styles are available for the speaker on the same propositional meaning. Recent discourse-based studies on style mixtures in various contexts have observed that the speaker naturally shifts marked form to foreground a certain situational meaning over the others (Chang, 2014; Cook, 1998; Geyer, 2008; Okamoto, 1997; M. Y. Park, 2014; Saito, 2010; S. Yoon, 2010). Consequently, matching the linguistic form to social attributes of the speaker on a one-to-one basis cannot fully elucidate the fluidity and dynamism of the style shifts. The analysis of the distributions of each speech style uncovers that –eyo/ayo form (–supnita form is the default in the opening/closing remarks) in Korean data and –desu/masu form in Japanese data are used as the default style throughout the entire TV cooking show discourse. However, the host and the chef do not maintain the default speech style and occasionally shift to other speech styles such as the –ta, –e/a, –supnita forms in Korean and to the naked or non-naked plain forms in Japanese. In Korean data, the style shifts occur in both task-oriented and non-task-oriented talk, whereas in Japanese data, the alternations only occur in task-oriented talk.

Micro-analytic qualitative approach from an indexical perspective of this comparative study reveals that multiple social meanings are created for one speech style and negotiated to be chosen by the speaker to obtain the desired communicative goals. Therefore, simple generalization and categorization of four speech styles in Korean and two speech styles in Japanese in terms of (+/−) distance and (+/−) interaction cannot be made. For example, the most formal –supntia form is employed as a joke to create a playful speech environment, whereas –ta form is employed to
foreground an important content and to give an evaluative remark with an emotional-laden voice.

From an indexical perspective, however, I argue that in TV cooking show discourse, –supnita and –eyo/ayo forms in Korean and –desu/masu forms in Japanese are employed to index the speaker’s presentational stance on public stage. –supnita forms function similarly to the high end of –desu/masu forms in terms of formality. On the other hand, –ta and –e/a forms in Korean are employed to index the speaker’s solidary toward the addressee. –ta form is functionally similar to the naked plain form in Japanese in that both forms are utilized to index content focus of the information conveyed. –ta form is also similar to the non-naked plain form in that both forms index self-addressed spontaneity and solidarity. –e/a forms and the non-naked plain forms are also similar in that both forms index solidarity and intimacy. This study illustrates how conscious choice of the style shifts by the speaker creates multiple situational meanings and further helps the speaker construct his/her identities.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Objectives

It is generally known that language is an important medium to understand society and the world, among scholars of various disciplines. Sociolinguists especially have made an enormous effort to explain the relationship between language and society. Given the fact that the primary interest of sociolinguists is the language use in society, the role of language users or social actors has emerged inevitably as an important factor in constructing social structure through the dynamic use of language. In fact, in his structuration theory, Giddens (1984) maintains that social structure and social agents are interdependent in that the structure is constituted through social agents’ repeated and regularized practices while social agents are constrained in routinized patterns of structural system of a society. In considering the crucial role of social actors in creating social structure, the issue of to what extent the way of social actors’ organizing or formulating social practices through language use varies in different culture has been raised (Mayes, 2003). In other words, investigating linguistic behaviors of different cultures in a similar context will provide a clear picture of in what way social actors using different languages constitute the social structure of a given context.

The current study hopes to examine the speech style shifts occurring in Korean and Japanese TV cooking shows. Speech styles in Korean and Japanese, which generally correspond to speech registers in English, do not change the propositional meaning of an utterance, but carry a social meaning of an utterance in a given context. That is, honorific-rich languages like Korean or Japanese provide the speaker with multiple options when creating an utterance toward the
addressed. Although style alternations by the same speaker toward the same addressee in natural talk have been examined separately in various contexts (Chang, 2014; Cook, 1997, 1998, 2008a, 2008b, 2008c, 2011; Fukuda, 2005; Geyer, 2008; Ikuta, 1983, 2008; N. Iwasaki, 2010; Janes, 2000; E.-H. Kim, 2009; S. K. Maynard, 1991; Okamoto, 1998; M. Y. Park, 2009, 2014; Saito, 2010, 2011; Strauss & Eun, 2005; S. Yoon, 2010), there has been no comparative study between Korean and Japanese regarding speech style shifts. It is an interesting phenomenon where speech level alternations occur in languages that have multiple speech levels like Korean and Japanese. These two non-Western languages are renowned for complex addressee honorifics reflected in verbal endings. Korean has six different speech levels, whereas Japanese has two speech levels (Refer to Section 3.1). By analyzing speech style mixture of different cultures in a similar context, the study will demonstrate how social actors across different cultures can create the structure of TV cooking shows in similar or different ways via their style shifts during the interaction, and will further look into how they strategically obtain the desired discursive goals in a given context to construct and develop the desired identities in each moment.

1.2 Organization of the Research

This dissertation is composed of nine chapters. Chapter 1 includes the research objective and the organization of the research. The research objective is to fill a gap in current studies through a comparative research of speech style shifts occurring in Korean and Japanese TV cooking show discourse. Chapter 2 deals with the theoretical frameworks for the research. The notions of indexicality, frame, and footing are discussed in order to understand the fluid and dynamic features of speech style shifts in naturally occurring data. The deference markers like the honorifics in Korean and Japanese are considered as non-referential, creative, and performative
indexes (Silverstein, 1976), contextualization cues (Gumperz, 1992), in which one can connect what was said to one’s knowledge, interacting with co-participants in a given context.

Chapter 3 provides the language structure of Korean and Japanese honorifics including similar typological features such as SOV order, rich agglutinative morphology, and highly developed honorific systems. As for the same propositional meaning, Korean speaker has six speech styles (–supnita, –eyo/ayo, –so, –ney, –e/a, and –ta), whereas Japanese speaker has only two speech styles (–desu/masu and the plain form). Two Korean speech styles, –so and –ney that are used in limited context, are gradually disappearing in Contemporary Korean (Sohn, 1999) and are not found in TV cooking show discourse. The other four styles in Korean, however, are actively used in various discourse genres. Recent studies using naturally occurring data conducted in the indexical perspective (Chang, 2014; Cook, 1997, 1999, 2008a, 2008b, 2008c; Eun & Strauss, 2004; Geyer, 2008; Ikuta, 1983, 2008; E.-H. Kim, 2009; K.-H. Kim & Suh, 2007; S. K. Maynard, 1991, 2008; Okamoto, 1998, 1999; M. Y. Park, 2009, 2014; Saito, 2010, 2011; Strauss & Eun, 2005) claim that the speaker does not keep one speech style toward the same addressee and switches to other levels to create multiple situational sociolinguistic meanings.

Section 3.3 addresses the following research questions: 1) What is the distribution ratio of each speech style in Korean and Japanese cooking shows? 2) In what situations do the style shifts occur? What are the frequency counts and the ratio of the shifts? 3) What are the communicative functions and the indexical meanings of the shifts? 4) How are these shifts related to the construction of social identity of the host and the chef? 5) How similar and different are the Korean and Japanese data in the questions above?

Chapter 4 discusses the data used for the research and the detailed methodology of the data analysis. Best Cooking Recipes, a Korean TV cooking show and Today’s Menu, a Japanese
TV cooking show are selected for quantitative and qualitative data analysis. The transcribed data is coded by CLAN program to get the frequency counts for each speech style and communicative function. The multiple excerpts drawn from the data illustrate how the interactants switch from the default speech style to the other speech style to strategically obtain discursive goals while constructing the desired identities in a given context.

Chapter 5, 6, 7, 8 provide quantitative and qualitative analyses of the data. Chapter 5 reports the result of the frequency counts for each speech level and communicative function. As expected, –eyo/ayo form in cooking demonstration and –supnita form in the opening/closing remarks are the default in Korean data, whereas –desu/masu form is the default in Japanese data. The style shifts to –ta, –e/a, –supnita forms in Korean data and the shifts to the plain form in Japanese data sporadically occur in both interactants’ utterances during cooking demonstrations and tasting frames. Chapter 6 illustrates a detailed micro-analytic qualitative analysis of the host’s shifts to non-honorific levels: –ta, –e/a forms in Korean data and the plain form in Japanese data. Chapter 7 presents a detailed micro-analytic qualitative analysis of the chef’s shifts to non-honorific levels. Chapter 8 provides a detailed micro-analytic qualitative analysis of both interactants’ shifts to –supnita forms in Korean data and the corresponding use of –desu/masu form in Japanese data. Since the Korean speaker has more speech styles to choose than the Japanese speaker, who only has two speech styles, the style shifts occur more dynamically in Korean data.

Chapter 9 summarizes the findings of quantitative and qualitative analyses and briefly gives the practical implications of the study. Also, limitation of the current study and suggestions for further studies are shortly mentioned.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

2.1 Speech styles and indexicality

In his philosophical writings, Peirce (1955) introduces ‘index’ as one of the three signs denoting objects alongside icons and symbols. Unlike icons and symbols, indexes require an actual context in order to be appropriately interpreted (Cook, 2008c; Hanks, 1992, 1999; Ochs, 1992, 1996; Silverstein, 1976). If we understand all linguistic forms to be indexes (Cook, 2008c; Hanks, 1999), an utterance cannot be interpreted without knowing the relevant context in which the utterance occurs due to ‘the pervasive context-dependency of natural language utterances’ (Hanks, 1999, p. 124). Hanks explains that indexicality involves ‘varied phenomena such as regional accent (indexing speaker’s identity), indicators of verbal etiquette (marking deference and demeanor), the referential use of pronouns (I, you, we, he, etc.), demonstratives (this, that), deictic adverbs (here, there, now, then), and tense’ (Ibid.). Pronouns, deixes, and demonstratives are often referred to as representative linguistic indexical items that can be interpreted differently depending on the context in which they occur. For example, in the utterance, ‘I will see you tomorrow,’ I and you refer to ‘the current speaker’ and ‘the current addressee’ respectively, whoever they are in a given context, and tomorrow will vary based on the time of the utterance. Silverstein (1976, p. 23) categorizes these pronouns, demonstratives, and deictic adverbs as ‘referential indexes’ that contribute to the referential meaning of the utterance. They are also called, ‘shifters,’ in the sense that the reference ‘shifts’ constantly based on the elements of the given context (Ibid., p. 24). Further, it is important to note that linguistic items such as deference markers that are mainly realized as distinguished speech styles in Korean and Japanese are
considered as another type of index that does not contribute to the referential meaning of the utterance. Silverstein categorizes these unique linguistic forms as ‘non-referential indexes,’ including paralinguistic elements such as intonation, rhythm, tone, pitch, and accent. Gumperz (1992, p. 231) refers to these non-referential indexes as ‘contextualization cues’ in which one ‘relates what is said at any one time and in any one place to knowledge acquired through past experience in order to retrieve the presuppositions one must rely on to maintain conversational involvement and access what is intended.’

On a different axis of classification of referential vs. non-referential indexes, Silverstein (1976, p. 34) proposes ‘presuppositional vs. creative indexes’ and points out that deference indexes are ‘the maximally creative or performative devices, which, by their very use, make the social parameters of speaker and hearer explicit.’ In other words, how to address the interactants (e.g., by addressing first name only or last name with the title) and what speech style (e.g., honorific or non-honorific levels) to choose to communicate with the speech partner explicitly establish the social relationship of the interactants, displaying the stances of the speaker toward the addressee and in turn of the addressee toward the speaker through their uptake of what was mentioned. The non-referential creative aspect of deference indexes can give more room for elucidating the dynamic and fluid speech style shifts constantly occurring in natural talk.

Then how are the linguistic forms linked to social context? According to Ochs’ (1992, 1996) two-step model of indexical relations, most linguistic resources are directly indexed to limited acts and stances, through which more complex activities and social identities are constituted in a given context. For example, the use of the –eyo/ayo forms does not directly index the female gender in a way that the conventional view connects the linguistic form directly to the social attribute. Rather, it directly indexes an affective stance of softness and intimacy (first order
of indexicality in Silverstein’s term, 2003), which further indirectly indexes a soft and intimate female gender identity (the second order of indexicality in Silverstein’s term, 2003). That is, the linguistic form of speech levels is not fixed or connected to the social attributes on a one-to-one basis. In order to support the dynamic applications of honorific forms in terms of positioning interactional role categories within a context, Agha (1993) distinguished social status from ‘deference entitlements.’ Social status signifies ‘a position within a system of social stratification,’ whereas deference entitlement denotes ‘relative position within events of discursive interaction.’ In Dunn’s (2005) analysis of wedding speeches in Japan, referent honorifics used toward a young couple by social superiors are well accounted by the ‘deference entitlements’ and the creative aspect of indexicality.

2.2 Framing and footing

Since the introduction of the term ‘frame’ by Bateson (1972), the notion has been adopted in various fields, including anthropology and sociology. In anthropological and sociological points of view, ‘frame’ is an important concept to explicate the relationship between social actions and context in which interactions among actors occur (Goffman, 1974; Hymes, 1974). In other words, a knowledgeable agent (Giddens, 1984) reflexively monitors his/her own actions and those of others in order to interpret them in a given context. Bateson argues that even animals can perceive an action such as biting or chasing differently depending on how the action is framed in a context. That is, the action of biting, on the one hand, can be interpreted as a play if it is framed as a play, but, on the other hand, it can be construed as a fight if it is framed as a fight. In a wider sense of meaning, ‘frame’ is associated with terms such as ‘schema, script, prototype, or stock of knowledge’ to represent the notion of structures of expectation (Bartlett,
The structures of expectation, variously called as ‘schema, frame, script, prototype, or stock of knowledge’, are constituted through repeated actions and past experiences, and are also constantly updated (Schultz, 1962). In a narrower sense of meaning, ‘frame’ is distinguished from ‘schema’ according to Tannen and Wallat (1993). They use the term ‘interactive frames’ to refer to ‘a definition of what is going on in interaction, without which no utterance (or movement or gesture) could be interpreted’ (Ibid., p. 59-60). In contrast, they use the term ‘knowledge schemas’ to refer to ‘participants’ expectations about people, objects, events and settings in the world’ (Ibid., p. 60). Changing their positions on the earlier claim that ‘an interactive notion of frame is dynamic and the knowledge structure notion of schema is static,’ Tannen and Wallat (1993, p. 61) argue that both structures of expectations are dynamic, contributing to the understanding of the utterance in a given context. In other words, both interactive frames and knowledge schemas dynamically function to interpret what is going on in a particular context. This dynamic and fluid notion of frame and schema provides a good analytic tool in understanding speech style shifts occurring in natural talk.

In relation to frame analysis, Goffman (1981, p. 128) further develops detailed analysis on how people interpret objects, events, or experiences to understand the world using the notion of ‘footing.’ He defines it as ‘participants’ alignment, or set, or stance, or posture’ that they take up toward others in discourse. And ‘a change in footing implies a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others,’ which is displayed in a way the utterance is produced or received. The notions of speaker and hearer are additionally divided by Goffman (1981, p. 144) under the category of ‘production format’ and ‘participation framework.’ The speaker roles, broken down by Goffman, include three types: ‘animator’ who automatically produces words like ‘a sounding box,’ ‘author’ who selects words, and ‘principal’ whose position is constituted by the words
spoken. The hearer roles are also subdivided into ‘ratified listeners’ and ‘bystanders’ who are not ratified participants but unintentional overhearers or intentional eavesdroppers.
CHAPTER 3

STRUCTURE OF KOREAN AND JAPANESE HONORIFICS

3.1 Typological features of Korean and Japanese

Korean and Japanese are typologically similar. Both languages are head final languages with the order of SOV, rich agglutinative morphology, and highly developed honorific systems (S. Iwasaki, 2013; Shibatani, 1990; Sohn, 1999; Tsujimura, 2007). In addition, Korean and Japanese are postpositional with nouns followed by particles (e.g., *hakkyo-ey* ‘to school’ in Korean and *gakkoo e* in Japanese), and predicates (e.g., verbs, adjectives, and copula in Korean, verbs, adjectives, adjectival nouns, and copula in Japanese) are morpho-syntactically bound in that they cannot be used without being attached by ending suffixes (clause or sentence enders in Sohn’s term, 1999). Addressee honorifics in both languages are indicated by these sentence enders, constituting six speech levels in Korean and two speech levels in Japanese (S. Iwasaki, 2013; Shibatani, 1990; Sohn, 1999; Tsujimura, 2007).

3.1.1 Structure of Korean honorifics and speech levels

Honourific usage in Korean is systematically developed, forming two major categories: addressee honorifics (AH) and referent honorifics. Referent honorifics are further divided into subject honorifics (SH) and object honorifics (OH). The suffix –*usi*– is attached to predicate stem in order to show the speaker’s deference toward a subject referent (see 1-a, b). The vowel –*u*– is employed if the last syllable of the predicate stem ends with a consonant (see 1-b). SH is realized productively by using the grammatical suffix, but OH is not indicated by a grammatical device. The suffix –*sŏp*– was used to indicate object honorification in Middle Korean. The suffix –*sup*–,
originated from –sŏp–, went through a semantic change in the seventeenth century (Yang, 1999; Y.-S. Yoon, 2005) and it is currently used as a part of deferential sentence ender, –supnita.

Although the examples of using –sap– or –op– as object honorifics are found in letters or prayers

(1)  a. halapeci kkeyse yongton ul cwu-si-ess-eyo.
    grandfather NM(hon.) pocket money AC give SH PST AH
    ‘Grandfather gave (me) pocket money.’

    b. halapeci kkeyse chayk ul ilk-usi-ess-eyo.
    grandfather NM(hon.) book AC read SH PST AH
    ‘Grandfather read a book.’

    c. halapeci kkey yongton ul tuli- ess-eyo.
    grandfather to(hon.) pocket money AC give(hum.) PST AH
    ‘(I) gave grandfather pocket money.’

written in 1930s (Ko & Koo, 2008), there is no grammatically productive device for object

honorification in Korean. Instead, a certain group of special lexical items is employed to indicate

object honorifics (see 2). 2-b shows the case of using Sino-Korean words as object honorification.

(2)  a. malssum (mal) ‘word’, ce (na) ‘I’, cehuy (wuli) ‘us’

    b. colce (拙著) ‘my(poor)work’, soin (小人) ‘I’

    c. tulita (cwuta) ‘to give’, yeccwupta (mwutta) ‘to ask’

    (from Ko & Koo, 2008, p. 465-466)

Unlike the object honorifics phrased within a limited list of lexical items in Contemporary

Korean, addressee honorifics are developed to a greater degree through systematic reflection in

sentence-ending predicates by different speech levels. Regarding the classification of speech

levels (or stylesregisters), many scholars have proposed different views and ideas, and suggested

their own criteria in categorizing speech styles (Eom, 2002; Huh, 1972; J.-T. Kim, 1981; T.-Y. Kim, 2007; J.-S. Park, 2008; Y.-S. Park, 1995; Sohn, 1999; Sung, 1996). While scholars have presented diverse views of classification, ranging from three to six speech levels, all of these
suggestions can be grouped into two different approaches: one-dimensional and two-dimensional classifications.

Some scholars have proposed a linear list of speech levels based on one dimension: honorific levels of pragmatic use (Choe, 2003; Huh, 1972; T.-Y. Kim, 2007; Sohn, 1999). Other scholars have first categorized four styles into formal forms and two styles into informal forms on a formality dimension, and have subcategorized them into honorific and non-honorific forms on the second dimension within the first dimensional classification, arguing that formal and informal styles should be treated differently (Ko & Koo, 2008; Sung, 1996). They point out that the main drawback of the linear one-dimensional perspective is that the intimate style, –e/a form, also often called as panmal (‘half-talk style’), is not included in the classification and is not considered an independent speech level. And it also ignores the frequent use of –e/a forms in everyday conversation (T.-Y. Kim, 2007). Given the fact that in actual language use, style mixture between formal and informal forms often takes place in the same setting regardless of formality, T.-Y. Kim (2007) raises the issue of the lack of strong evidence to support the clear line-drawing between formal and informal styles in the two-dimensional classification.

Sohn’s (1999, p. 234-238, 413) six speech level classification from the one-dimensional perspective is the most cited in the literature on Korean speech styles, and includes –e/a forms and –eyo/ayo forms as independent non-honorific and honorific speech levels respectively. He classifies three honorific levels (deferential, polite, and blunt) and three non-honorific levels (familiar, intimate, and plain) as in Table 3.1. Sohn points out that blunt and familiar levels have gradually been disappearing from daily usage except in limited situations; the less blunt variant –swu is used only in seniors’ speech and the familiar level forms –ney, –na?/–nunka?, –key, and
–sey are classically used by male seniors towards high school or college students or by in-laws towards their sons-in-law. Consequently, the deferential, polite, intimate, and plain levels are the four mainly used levels in Contemporary Korean. Sohn also draws attention to the spread of the –eyo/ayo forms in overall speech contexts, including formal settings such as public lectures and news reports, and notes that the intermixed use of the –supnita forms and the –eyo/ayo forms by the same speaker to the same individual in the same situation.

Two-dimensional classification (see Table 3.2) is not much different from one-dimensional classification, except for the fact that formality is considered as a number-one criterion in categorizing speech levels, and that style mixture of formal and informal forms is ignored in the discussion. Declarative sentence-enders are almost the same in both classifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorifics</th>
<th>Speech level</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Propositive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deferential</td>
<td>–(su)pnita</td>
<td>–(su)pnikka?</td>
<td>–sipsio</td>
<td>–(u)sipsita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>–(e.)yo</td>
<td>–(e.)yo?</td>
<td>–(e.)yo</td>
<td>–(e.)yo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>–(s)o/–(s)wu</td>
<td>–(s)o?/–(s)wu</td>
<td>–(u)o/–wu</td>
<td>–(u)psita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honorifics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>–ne-y</td>
<td>–na?/–nunaka?</td>
<td>–key</td>
<td>–sey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>–e</td>
<td>–e?</td>
<td>–e</td>
<td>–e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>–ta</td>
<td>–ni?/–(nu)nya?</td>
<td>–kela/–ela</td>
<td>–ca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Sohn’s six speech level classification from one-dimensional perspective (Sohn, 1999: 413)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech levels</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Honorifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hapshyo style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hao style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hakey style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hayla style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Honorifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hayyo style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hay style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Sung’s six speech level classification from two-dimensional perspective (Eom, 2002: 83)
3.1.2 Structure of Japanese honorifics and speech levels

Japanese is also well known for its broad range of honorific usage like Korean (S. Iwasaki, 2013; Shibatani, 1990; Tsujimura, 2007). Two major categories of Japanese honorifics are referent honorifics and addressee honorifics (teenee-go ‘polite form’). Referent honorifics are further divided into subject referent honorifics (sonkee-go ‘respectful form’) and object referent honorifics (kenjoo-go ‘humble form’) (Okamoto, 1999, p. 52). One of the characteristics of Japanese honorifics is that both referent honorifics can be realized into morpho-syntactic structure, which makes it productive to apply the rule to most predicates. For example, subject referent honorifics are structured into o-V stem-ni naru (see 3-a) and object referent honorifics are formed into o-V stem-suru (see 3-b). In the meantime, like Korean AH, Japanese addressee honorifics are realized in a sentence ending position by attaching the suffixes –masu for verbs (see 3-a, b; 4-a) and –desu for other word categories (see 4-c) (Tsujimura, 2007, p. 429).

(3) a. Tanaka-sensee ga kore o o-kaki-ni nari-mash-ita.
   Prof. NM this AC write SH AH PST
   ‘Professor Tanaka wrote this.’

   b. Watashi ga sensee no nimotsu o o-mochi-shi-mash-ita.
      I NM Prof. GN luggage AC carry OH AH PST
      ‘I carried the professor’s luggage (for him).’

   c. Tanaka-kun ga kore o ka-ita.
      Mr. (informal) NM this AC write PST
      ‘Tanaka wrote this.’

(4) a. ima go-han o tabe-masu-ka vs. b. ima go-han taberu-ka
      now meal AC eat AH Q now meal eat Q
      ‘(Shall) we eat a meal now?’

   c. o-hana ga kirei-desu. vs. d. o-hana ga kirei.
      flower NM pretty AH flower NM pretty
      ‘The flowers are pretty.’

(from Tsujimura 2007: 429)
Although the honorific levels in terms of pragmatic use may be further broken down based on the combination between referent honorifics and addressee honorifics or between suppletive forms (e.g. meshiagaru (SH), itadaku (OH) for taberu ‘eat’) and addressee honorifics, Japanese speech levels basically fall into two categories: –desu/masu forms and the plain form.

3.2 Previous studies on style shifts
3.2.1 Style shifts in Korean

Native speakers of a certain language are not necessarily meta-linguistically or meta-pragmatically aware of the rules of their native language (Silverstein, 2001, p. 382). Korean native speakers are often not aware of how they switch speech levels toward the same interlocutor within the same context. Earlier research on speech levels has focused more on structural forms, classification of speech levels, and meta-pragmatic knowledge on Korean honorific system as a part of comprehensive honorific studies. The supporting data for their speech level classification has been limited to made-up example sentences reflecting ideological and conventional knowledge of the language (J.-T. Kim, 1981; T.-Y. Kim, 1995, 1998). However, some scholars have briefly and descriptively mentioned that style mixture also happens to occur in actual language use, even though they have not provided empirical data to support their observations (Lim, 2005; Sohn, 1999). Other scholars have maintained that the speaker’s intention or strategy plays an essential role in a certain speech level choice (J.-B. Lee, 1994; Y.-S. Park, 1995; Son, Lee, & Jo, 2003; Y.-S. Yoon, 2005).

One of the earlier studies that have paid attention to the style mixture occurrence in an actual data is J.-B. Lee’s (1994) research, which concerns strategic speech style shifts among
chief officers in the army, using data from 30 telephone conversations between high-ranking army officers and their subordinates. He reports that the more severe the status differentials between interlocutors are, the less speech style shifts occur. In other words, speech levels tend to be fixed without shifting to other levels when there exists a distinctive ranking difference in interlocutors’ status in the army. In contrast, style shifts frequently occur in a wider range when interlocutors are in the same or similar rank in the army. The data demonstrates that high-ranking officers tend to switch speech styles back and forth among the four levels: polite (–eyo/ayo), blunt (–so), familiar (–ney), and intimate (–e/a). Lee claims that style mixture among chief officers of a similar rank derives from the speaker’s intention or strategy of resolving disagreement of their social variables such as rank, age, and seniority in the army, and accordingly argues that the wider range of style alternation occurred by high-ranking officers results from their intentional or strategic use of honorific levels in order to give a linguistic favor toward subordinates, that is, to reduce the hierarchical distance and not to sound too formal and authoritative even in the army. Given the fact that the speech in the Korean army is considered the most conservative and fixed by rank, it is meaningful that he draws attention to the speakers’ strategic style mixture on a discourse level using naturally occurring data, even though he only tries to explain the phenomenon by simply relating social status to language use and does not provide a detailed analysis on the presented excerpts.

In the same vein, a survey-based study regarding the strategic use of six speech levels by 30 college professors in Korea has been conducted by Son et al. (2003). Son et al. have stressed the speakers’ strategic use of speech styles based on their specific goals and high consciousness of speech level choices with fellow professors, distinguishing the strategic use from normative use

---

1 The data is based on the phone calls made during a coup d’état on December 12, 1979 in Korea.
of speech styles. Son et al. (2003, p. 178) have proposed several strategic functions of the marked usage of speech levels: 1) displaying respect for addressees’ status, favor compensation, favor guidance, and adjustment of psychological distance, 2) resolving disagreement among age, title, and seniority, 3) displaying authority and management of situation changes. The emphasis on a speaker’s strategic practices in level choices is consistent with Okamoto’s (1998, 1999) attention to the important role of the speaker’s strategy to trigger the use of a certain form in a given context. These non-normative functions proposed in this study are useful in guiding us to understand a speaker’s active involvement in speech level choice. However, directly relating linguistic expressions to social attributes is insufficient to account for the nature of style mixture.

In the doctoral dissertation that covers most of the Korean sentence enders, H. S. Lee (1991, 1993) gives a descriptive illustration that the –eyo/ayo level is mainly used as the default for informal everyday conversations, while the –supnita level is used for a formal business setting, and that the –e/a level is unmarked and representative informal forms conveying ‘assimilated’ information, while the –ta level carries ‘note-worthy’ information over which the speaker holds authority and draws the addressee’s attention. He also distinguishes the informal use of –ta forms in speech from the formal use in written texts such as news articles and novels, naming the written –ta form as a ‘neutral level.’ Along the same line as H. S. Lee’s (1993) study, yet from the interactional perspective of Conversation Analysis, K.-H. Kim (2004) advances Lee’s notion of ‘noteworthiness of the information’ marked by the –ta style and claims that the noteworthy information of the speaker leads the addressee to cooperatively participate or react to the next action of the speaker, which turns out to be a suggestion or an offer. He claims the –ta speaker plays an authoritative role in initiating actions in an interactional process.
An interesting study was conducted by H. R. S. Kim (2010), in which the conveyed meanings of –ta forms are distinguished by types of boundary tone\(^2\) assigned on the last syllable –ta. She argues that it is assumed that the –ta forms carrying ‘newly perceived information’ in H. S. Lee’s (1991, 1993) study are realized with either a low boundary tone, [L%], or a low-high-low boundary tone, [LHL%]. And the –ta form with a high boundary tone, [H%), conveys the meaning of ‘announceability or newsworthiness.’ In other words, the –ta form with [L%] or [LHL%] carries new and noteworthy information but does not emphasize announceability, which is conveyed only by a high boundary tone.

Some studies concerning speech styles have been conducted from a cognitive linguistics perspective (S. Iwasaki, 2006; Noh, 2008). In accounting for how internal states are expressed and described in Japanese and Korean and in showing that expression and description are closely related to ‘reflex, perception, and cognition’ stages, S. Iwasaki (2006) notes that the reflex and perception stages are coded with the –ta forms and the cognition stage is coded with the –e/a forms in Korean, whereas all three stages are coded with plain forms in Japanese. That is, the –ta form in Korean is an expressive mode of either reflex or perception before reaching a full cognition. The reflex stage indicating the most sudden and automatic reaction is similar to Maynard’s (1991) sudden recall or realization marked by the –da ending in Japanese. In a study using a part of the Sejong Corpus\(^3\) and conversations among intimate friends and family members, Noh (2008) suggests that the –ta forms mainly function as the listener’s supporting reactive tokens, attention-getters, or self-repair markers in spontaneous sentences, whereas the plain style functions as speakership claims with rising intonation in non-spontaneous sentences.

---

\(^2\) Boundary tones are realized on the last syllable of an utterance, determining a sentence type carrying speakers’ modality. 9 boundary tones were founded in the Korean language.

\(^3\) a large-scale Korean corpus built with millions of words as a national project.
In line with Iwasaki’s cognitive perspective, Noh also claims that the –ta forms manifest the speaker’s cognitive processing before internalized knowledge, and that the –ta forms are often collocated with the conjecture modal suffix –keyss–, particular lexical items such as mac– (‘to be right’) ani– (‘to be wrong’), revealing local contextual patterning in her spoken discourse data.

Recent research on style shifts often takes indexical perspective in analyzing naturally occurring data in various contexts (Chang, 2014; Eun & Strauss, 2004; E.-H. Kim, 2009; K.-H. Kim & Suh, 2007; M. Y. Park, 2009, 2014; Strauss & Eun, 2005; S. Yoon, 2010). Two studies, Eun and Strauss (2004) and Strauss and Eun (2005), analyze the social meanings of style mixture between the –eyo/ayo forms and the –supnita forms. They pay attention to –supnita’s formulaic usage as opening and closing marker in public spoken discourse. In particular, they argue that old and shared information is carried by the –eyo/ayo forms, whereas new and non-shared information is carried by the –supnita forms (Eun & Strauss, 2004). Considering the fact that the –eyo/ayo forms in their data are often attached to the committal –ci (as a form of –cyo, the contracted spoken form of –ciyo), a marker of seeking agreement, it is not very persuasive to argue that old and shared information is solely carried by the –eyo/ayo forms. Strauss and Eun’s (2005) study proposes that the –eyo/ayo forms index a stance of inclusion, marking semantic encoding of (–) boundary, whereas the –supnita forms index a stance of exclusion, marking semantic encoding of (+) boundary. Accordingly, from the semantic features of (+/–) boundary indexed by two different speech levels, the utterance encoded by the –eyo/ayo level is framed as attached, subjective, and egalitarian, whereas the one marked by the –supnita levels is framed as detached, objective, and authoritative.

Studies analyzing pedagogical discourse (E.-H. Kim, 2009; K.-H. Kim & Suh, 2007; M. Y. Park, 2009, 2014) demonstrate the dynamic context features created by speech style shifts in
classrooms. The –eyo/ayo forms are considered the default form in pedagogical talk in all studies. The –e/a forms, labeled as a ‘intimate’ level signaling ‘intimacy, closeness, and informality’ (Sohn, 1999), seem to function differently depending on classroom contexts. For example, the –e/a forms are claimed to be utilized as a classroom management device (e.g., disciplining, advising, and encouraging an individual students) in an elementary school classroom (K.-H. Kim & Suh, 2007), as a solidarity marker in KFL classrooms (M. Y. Park, 2009, 2014), and as a monologic stance marker or playfulness display in graduate classrooms (E.-H. Kim, 2009). The dynamic interpretation based on the subtle changes of similar context indicates the strong context-dependency of the linguistic forms. Meanwhile, the –supnika forms are used to highlight instructional focus and to mark a boundary in pedagogical activities (M. Y. Park, 2009, 2014), which seems to be the same function of opening/closing remarks in public discourse in Strauss and Eun (2005).

Table 3.3 Situational meanings of four Korean speech styles. (S. Yoon, 2010, p. 160)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>– interactional (impersonal)</th>
<th>+ interactional (personal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ distance</td>
<td>Deferential style:</td>
<td>Polite style:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ritualized self-presentation</td>
<td>Expressing soft affective stance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– distance</td>
<td>Plain style:</td>
<td>Intimate style:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Detached style</td>
<td>Directly expressing affects of the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Spontaneous self-presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the analysis of style alternations shown in TV news, debate, talk shows, and comedy shows, S. Yoon (2010, p. 160) summarizes the situational meanings of four Korean speech styles (see Table 3.3). His claim that the deferential form –supnika and the polite form –eyo/ayo indicate (+) distance, whereas the plain form –ta and the intimate form –e/a display (–) distance contradicts with Strauss and Eun’s (2005) analysis, where –supnika form marks semantic encoding (+) boundary while –eyo/ayo form marks semantic encoding of (–) boundary. Moreover,
it is not very persuasive to classify –supnita and –ta forms into a group category that lacks interactional feature because all four speech styles are actively utilized by interactants in any given contexts. In particular, S. Yoon’s classified analysis in terms of two core features, distance and interactional, mostly conflicts with –ta form and –eyo/ayo form. –Ta form cannot be detached if it lacks distance feature and cannot be spontaneous if it lacks interactional feature. Also, the interactional or personal feature into which –eyo/ayo form is categorized seems to be more comparable with (−) distance feature than (+) distance due to intersubjective nature of the interactions.

In her dissertation, in which she quantitatively and qualitatively analyzing formal TV talkshow interviews, Chang (2014) examines the effect of intra-speaker variables (e.g., age, profession, gender and hometown) on the choice of honorific sentence ending (e.g., –supnita and –eyo/ayo) and the consequences of employing either –supnita or –eyo/ayo forms in a given context. From her quantitative analysis, profession is the most significant variable in the employment of –supnita, whereas gender and hometown variables show marginally significant effect on the choice of honorific endings. It is very intriguing to know that the speakers, who have been categorized into “the intelligentsia group,” which includes professors, politicians, and writers, highly employ –supnita form compared to the guest speakers whose professions are actors, singers, athletes, photographers, and etc. Chang claims that –supnita form is utilized to directly index epistemic stance and to indirectly index an identity of a professional and an expert, whereas –eyo/ayo form is to directly index an affective stance and to indirectly index an individual personhood. In considering the data that she used for the detailed micro-analytic analysis, the use of –supnita forms is expected more in formal TV talkshow interviews,
displaying the highest formality of the conversation. Although Chang (2014) and Strauss and Eun (2005) put speech style alternation between honorific levels in different ways, Chang’s argument is partly consistent with that of Strauss and Eun (2005), in that speech style choice is not created by indicating formality and social status but made by speakers’ intension to index stance and identity.

M. Y. Park (2014) examines the teachers’ use of speech styles in KFL classrooms. She argues that the teachers’ use of –ela forms indexes ‘1) the speaker’s internal thought and 2) the speakers’ expression of solidarity,’ whereas the teachers’ use of honorific levels (e.g., –eyo/ayo and –supnita forms) indexes performing the role of the teachers. In particular, –supnita forms are used when opening and closing the lesson, marking a discourse boundary, announcing classroom activites, and drawing students’ attention.

3.2.2 Style shifts in Japanese

In the recent discourse-based research on Japanese addressee honorifics using naturally occurring data, scholars claim that native speakers of Japanese do not keep only one speech style during their conversations without changing social variables such as age, gender, setting, or power relationship (Cook, 2008c; Ikuta, 2008; S. K. Maynard, 2008; Okamoto, 1999). The idea of direct and static mapping between the –desu/masu form for a high status/older person or in a formal setting and the plain form for a low status/younger person or in an informal setting cannot elucidate exceptional variations frequently occurring in actual discourse events because linguistic forms themselves do not directly correspond to social context features on a one-to-one basis (Agha, 1993; Cook, 1997, 1999, 2008a, 2008b, 2008c; Geyer, 2008; Ikuta, 1983, 2008; S. K.

---

4 Chang labeled them as ‘non-artist’ group to refer to a group of guests who are either the political elites or social
Maynard, 1991, 2008; Okamoto, 1998, 1999; Saito, 2010, 2011). Rather, the speaker’s choice between the –desu/masu and plain forms is more dynamic and flexible in actual discourse. It is suggested that the motivation for style shifts is generated by whether the speaker signals social/psychological/attitudinal distance or not (Ikuta, 1983, 2008), whether the speaker has high consciousness of the addressee or not (S. K. Maynard, 1991, 2008), whether the speaker presents a public-self or not (Cook, 1997, 1998, 2008a, 2008b, 2008c), or by how the speaker adjusts a desired degree of formality in a given situation as a strategy (Okamoto, 1998, 1999).

In her early study, Ikuta (1983) points out that the –desu/masu form signals social, attitudinal, and cohesive distance, whereas the plain form indicates the lack of distance in a given context, claiming that style shifts to the plain form occur to display a speaker’s momentary empathy toward the addressee in an interview talk. In contrast, the –desu/masu form signals attitudinal independence or objectivity. Her recent study (2008), analyzing short interviews with those who work in traditional Japanese occupations, demonstrates the discourse functions of style shifts to the plain form: checking the understanding of what is being said by the interviewees, instigating more information, showing the interviewer’s acknowledgement or involvement, standing in interviewees’ position in a subspace, or supporting the interviewees’ leading role. However, it seems that all of the sub-classified functions in Ikuta (2008) are consequently connected to the main function of the interviewer summarizing what is being said, which is also claimed in Cook (1999). Cook points out that Ikuta’s argument, in which style shifts signal the presence or the lack of distance, cannot explain the case of teacher’s use of the –desu/masu form to students or the case of mother’s use of the –desu/masu form to young children. Interview talk displays clearly distinctive interactional roles of participants as an leaders.
interviewer and an interviewee. The interviewer prompts or initiates questions to acquire relevant information from the interviewee in a floor-yielding manner, whereas the interviewee provides required information in a floor-holding manner.

S. K. Maynard (1991) focuses on interactional feature of style mixture, claiming that the masu form is employed when a speaker has a high awareness of ‘thou’, while the plain form is used when a speaker has a low awareness of ‘thou.’ In her comprehensive analysis of both spoken and written discourse, she illustrates that the –desu/masu form switches to the plain form in ‘low awareness situations (1991, p. 578)’ (see 5). With regard to Maynard’s claim, Cook (1999)

a. when the speaker exclaims or suddenly recalls something,
b. when the speaker vividly expresses events scene-internally,
c. when the speaker expresses internal thoughts self-reflexively, including self-addressed utterances and monologues,
d. when the speaker jointly creates utterances whose ownership is shared,
e. when the speaker presents information semantically subordinate in nature
f. when the speaker is in an intimate relationship with ‘thou’

argues that the employment of the plain form in a neighborhood quarrel between interlocutors shows a contradicting situation to an intimate relationship that Maynard claims as one of the cases where the plain form is used.

Cook argues that the indexical nature of the linguistic forms allows multiple situational meanings from a given context and that the employed form foregrounds a certain indexical value over the other accordingly. Cook claims that the –desu/masu form indexes the mode of public self-presentation and being on stage acting in role. For example, caregivers’ use of the –desu/masu form toward young children in serving food in family dinner conversations does not
signal respect toward the children, but displays their responsibility as a mother in a mode of self-presentation (Cook, 1997). In contrast, she maintains that the plain form indexes the lack of self-presentation, not acting in role, not being conscious of the addressee, and foregrounds other contextual features such as intimacy or referential content itself.

In relation to the research on the functions of the plain form, Maynard (1993) distinguishes two different types of the plain form: one that is followed by a sentence final particle and the other that is not followed by a sentence final particle. She labels the former as ‘non-naked da style’ and the latter as ‘naked da style’. Maynard views the naked form as ‘an indicator of an expression to oneself,’ stressing that the naked form is often employed in a situation where the speaker is not conscious of the addressee. On the other hand, Cook (2008a) points out the fact that the naked form used in formal writings, such as newspaper articles or scientific papers, is not addressed to oneself but mostly directed to a great number of readers. She argues that the naked form is also used when the speaker centers on the referential content as well as when the speaker is not directing his/her speech to the addressee in a given situation. Cook also observes that non-naked plain form followed by a sentence final particle mostly occurs with vowel lengthening, rising intonation, coalescence, and certain voice qualities, which she calls ‘affect keys.’ From this observation, she further develops the idea that the naked forms without affect keys index informal speech style, in which the speaker is relaxed and non-presentational, whereas the non-naked forms with affect keys index detached style, in which the speaker foregrounds the referential content of an utterance.

Further, Okamoto (1998, p. 155) states that ‘the choice of honorifics as indexical signs cannot be correlated with a single social variable. Rather it is best regarded as a strategy based on the speaker’s judgment about the appropriateness of honorific forms vis-à-vis his/her assessment
of multiple social aspects of the context, including the attributes associated with identity and relationship (e.g. gender, age, hierarchy, intimacy).’ She emphasizes the speaker’s strategic involvement in the choice of linguistic forms and multiplicity of context features for determining factors.

In examining the interpersonal functions of style shifts in faculty meetings, Geyer (2008) shows that multiple social meanings are possibly created by the same linguistic form in discourse. She demonstrates in her data that the plain form functions as a solidarity marker as well as a mitigation marker, whereas the –desu/masu form works as a solidarity marker as well as a deference marker. In the faculty meetings where the –desu/masu form is predominantly used, the sporadic switch to the plain form marked solidarity in an elaboration of a joke. Meanwhile, she also claims that the –desu/masu form is used as a solidarity marker in displaying shared knowledge on a certain rule in school in a mode of official tone but accompanied by laughter between two teachers.

Generally, it is expected that subordinates use the –desu/masu form toward their superiors in a company from a conventional and ideological perspective. In Saito’s (2010) study on the analysis of superior-subordinate interactions, however, she argues that subordinates adopt the plain form towards superiors in the situations of ‘self-addressing utterance, providing opinions, and clarifying superiors’ directives. She claims that the employment of the plain form by subordinates indexes 1) the speaker’s inward thoughts and 2) the speaker’s highlighting information.

Korean and Japanese are generally known to share typologically similar features. The summary of the previous studies regarding style shifts examining discourse data suggests that style shift occurs in various contexts in both languages, and that no research on style shifts has
been done in the same context comparatively between Korean and Japanese. Although the data from the similar context has been examined separately in Korean and Japanese such as TV interviews (Chang, 2014; Ikuta, 1983, 2008; S. Yoon, 2010) and classroom conversations (E.-H. Kim, 2009; K.-H. Kim & Suh, 2007; M. Y. Park, 2009, 2014), the analysis from different studies cannot be compared because the data needs to be analyzed in the same conditions.

As a comparative study between two different languages in a similar context, Mayes (2003) has analyzed cooking classes in English and Japanese. She has audio-recorded cooking demonstrations from three Japanese and three American cooking classes, transcribed, and analyzed data in terms of regularities at the level of interaction (the structure of participation), discourse (the content of the talk), and grammar (clause structure and transitivity). Her analysis of the data has been done qualitatively to examine the discourse structure of participation and the content, and quantitatively to look into the types of clauses and transitivity. There are similarities and differences in the structural properties at all levels: interactions, discourse, and grammar. There is ‘default participation structure’ in verbal participation, where the teacher is the primary speaker and the students are the addressees in both languages. In American classes, however, students often take the role of the speaker while such shifts rarely occur in Japanese classes. The basic similarity in the content of the talk at discourse level is that task-oriented discussion is a main topic to be dealt with in both classes. But the Japanese teachers only converse about task-oriented content, whereas the American participants also talk about non-task-oriented content (e.g., jokes, personal stories, and gossip). Further, Japanese teachers emphasize more on ‘instruction’ and the American teachers more on ‘explanation.’ Although Japanese teachers are expected to use more transitive clauses due to frequent use of instruction, transitive clauses are less frequent than intransitives in both languages. The comparative study between two different
languages conducted in similar context gives an insightful idea of how actors behave and interact similarly and differently in a given situation, constructing social structure in a culturally specific way.

Despite the increasing interests in discourse-based research regarding style shifts, no comparative research between Korean and Japanese regarding style shifts taking place in TV cooking shows has been reported. Therefore, this study hopes to investigate the most intriguing linguistic phenomenon, speech style shifts, which can only occur in the languages containing multiple speech styles like Korean and Japanese.

3.3 Research questions

In recent years, studies on style shifts frequently occurring in natural talk have been conducted actively in diverse contexts such as classrooms, interviews, academic consultations, faculty meetings, and TV programs in both Korean and Japanese. These studies shed a light in understanding of how one actively utilizes the language to communicate in a society, to interpret and/or create a context, and to reveal desired identities through alternating speech styles in a given situation. The goal of this study is to explore the indexical meanings of speech style shifts occurring in Korean and Japanese TV cooking shows by examining how the participants actively employ style shifts in order to create a desired context and construct intended social identities, and how the participants of different culture show similar and different linguistic behaviors. The following questions need to be addressed for the study.

1) What is the distribution ratio of each speech style in Korean and Japanese?
2) In what situations do the style shifts occur? What are the frequency counts and the ratio of the shifts?
3) What are the communicative functions and the indexical meanings of the shifts?

4) How are these shifts related to the construction of social identity of the host and the chef?

5) How similar and different are the Korean and Japanese data with regard to the questions above?
CHAPTER 4
DATA AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 The data

The data used for the study are Choykouy yolipikyel (Best Cooking Recipes), a Korean TV cooking show that aired on EBS (Education Broadcasting System, a national-funded TV broadcasting station), and Kyoo no ryoori (Today's Menu), which aired on NHK in Japan. In order to make the data comparable, a similar spoken genre of different cultures has been carefully selected. There are two primary reasons why TV cooking shows have been chosen for data analysis; first, it is a typical dyadic conversation between a show host and an invited chef, in which few overlaps occur compared to multiparty talks as Ikuta (2008) points out in her interview talk study; second, the roles of the host and the chef are fairly distinctive in that the chef is expected to cook food items while providing professional knowledge on food ingredients, procedures, and techniques, whereas the host is responsible for delivering the information to the non-present broadcast audience and managing time for the show.

Table 4.1 Gender and age of participants in Korean cooking shows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ep. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.-H. Park</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>J.-H. Park</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S.-H. Park</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Choe</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S.-H. Park</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S.-H. Park</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S.-H. Park</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>J.-W. Park</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S.-H. Park</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>J.-W. Park</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S.-H. Park</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Jung</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Gender and age of participants in Japanese cooking shows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ep. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kintoo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Ueda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kotoo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Kataoka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kotoo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Hoshi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Murakami</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Sawaguchi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Murakami</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Tanaka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kawasaki</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>Koo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kawasaki</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>Toono</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expected roles of the participants are closely connected to the discourse functions of their utterances in a given context. For the analysis, seven episodes of the Korean cooking show and seven episodes of Japanese show, a total of approximately 350 minutes of recording, have been transcribed for the detailed micro-analytic analysis. Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 present the age and gender of participants in the different episodes of the Korean cooking show and the Japanese cooking show respectively. Each episode in Korean and Japanese data has been randomly selected. It was not intended to have the same host for Korean data, while having different hosts for Japanese data.

*Best Cooking Recipes* has been airing on EBS since 2000 and Soo-Hong Park had hosted the show from 2008 to 2013. In the cooking shows, the host invites the same chef for a week to introduce different menus, but under a same theme. Some chefs are invited to the show more than once, so in that case, the host and the chef are already acquainted from previous episodes. Although the Korean cooking show episodes listed in Table 1 have been randomly chosen for data analysis, Episodes 3 and 4 are from the same week with Chef Kim, and Episodes 5 and 6 are from the week with Chef Jong-Woo Park. Considering the fact that Soo-Hong Park shows more
style shifts to non-honorific endings such as –ta and –e/a forms in Episodes 3~6, it can be assumed that intimacy can be created to a different degree between host and chef.

4.2 The format of cooking shows

Each episode is about twenty-five minutes long, composed of cooking demonstrations of two or three dishes and tasting by the host either between or after the cooking demonstrations. In the Korean cooking show, the host begins the show with an opening remark in a formal mode toward the camera, and introduces the chef and exchanges a small greeting and bow with the chef. After the chef introduces the cooking menu of the day, an unseen voice actor introduces the ingredients for the dish. Then, the chef starts the cooking demonstration and the host assists the chef while asking questions regarding the required ingredients, procedure, cooking tricks, and etc. Once the dishes are finished, the host gives a short narrative talk regarding the specific decoration of the table setting where cooked dishes are displayed before tasting. After food tasting, the host makes a closing remark and announces the cooking items for the following episode.

Japanese cooking shows are formatted in a fairly similar order: opening remarks, cooking demonstrations, food tasting, and closing remarks. In Japanese cooking shows, however, no formulaic presentative narration is given for table decoration before tasting by the host. Also, the host’s tasting of the cooked dish seems to be optional, and the timing and the way the host tastes vary depending on the episode. Episode 6 in the Japanese data does not include tasting by the host, whereas in Episodes 1 and 4, the host sits on the table to taste the cooked dishes. Meanwhile, tasting in Korean cooking shows is always scheduled after all the dishes of the day are finished. Also, the voice actor in Korean cooking shows conducts the introduction of the
ingredients of the cooking dishes, whereas the host introduces the ingredients in Japanese cooking shows.

Since TV cooking shows are dyadic conversations without much overlapslap between participants, the data of the shows may look simpler than that of multi-party talk. The host and the chef, however, play multi-layered roles in the context. For example, typical dyadic conversations in TV cooking shows have characteristic participant roles. The host (like the interviewer in Ikuta’s study, 1983, 2008) instigates the interactions and reports necessary information for the not-on-the-scene audience by summarizing, repeating, paraphrasing, clarifying understanding, showing emotional involvement, and expressing acknowledgment, whereas the chef (like the interviewee) provides his or her professional knowledge by showing techniques and explaining food ingredients and procedures.

At other times, the host has further responsibility of managing show time as the show host, whereas the chef displays the social persona as an expert or teacher in the process of contributing professional knowledge. Accordingly, the host enacts multi-layered roles of reporter, show manager, novice/student representing TV audience, or assistant to the chef, whereas the chef takes the corresponding multi-layered roles of knowledge provider, expert/teacher, or leading chef. By performing these multiple roles in this situated context, the host and the chef shift speech styles in cooking discourse in order to accomplish the desired and expected participant roles and identities in each moment.

4.3 The procedure of data analysis

For the micro-analytic qualitative analysis, selected Korean and Japanese TV cooking shows have been transcribed by transcription conventions of Jefferson (1989). Since TV cooking
shows are aimed at broadcasting cooking information to a random audience, the host and the chef are expected to display a presentational mode of public self before the camera and the unseen TV viewers using default honorific levels in both languages (Cook, 1996, 1997, 2008b). The –eyo/ayo form and the –supnita form in the Korean cooking shows and the –desu/masu form in Japanese shows are expected as the default speech style (refer to Chapter 5). It will be discussed in detail in the following chapter by presenting the distribution ratios of each speech style in both languages.

As the first step of analysis, the sporadic shifts to other speech styles (e.g., –ta, –e/a, –supnita in Korean and the plain form in Japanese) have been identified in four different frames:
1) opening/closing remarks, 2) cooking demonstrations, 3) tasting, and 4) non-task-oriented talk. It is also important to recognize whether style shifts take place in ‘task-oriented talk’ or ‘non-task-oriented talk’ in the other dimension (Mayes, 2003). Task-oriented talk refers to any utterances made in interactions relating to cooking dishes. In contrast, non-task-oriented talk refers to the utterances that are not directly related to the cooking activity such as jokes, gossip, personal stories, and story-telling. For example, the host in Korean cooking shows, Soo-Hong Park, often brings up a non-task-oriented talk in the middle of assisting the chef, which is not directly relevant to the cooking demonstrations they are involved. Considering the fact that the main activity of the show is cooking demonstrations, task-oriented talk is usually expected to occur in cooking demonstrations, while non-task-oriented talk may occur either in the demonstrations or elsewhere.

Once the locations of style shifts are identified into four frames in the data, the discourse functions and indexical meanings within the context are analyzed. It is also necessary to analyze how the host and the chef build up social personae and identities through the style shift, which is
a unique linguistic behavior in a given situation, and to look into whether or not the way of the construction process varies across cultures.

Unlike the actual cooking classes analyzed in Mayes (2003), in the dyadic conversations of the TV cooking shows, there is no expectation that the chef takes the default role of the speaker as an expert or teacher, while the host enacts the fixed role of recipient or addressee as a novice or student, even though the chef indeed has an authority over cooking knowledge. Rather, the host often takes the leading role of the speaker as a reporter or time manager of the shows.

The data is also quantitatively analyzed in an effort to examine the distribution ratios of each speech style employed in the data and the ratios of style shifts occurrence from the default speech style to other styles. For the quantitative analysis, the clause/sentence-enders in the transcribed data are coded by CLAN program in order to get the frequency counts for each speech style utilized. Although the –eyo/ayo and –supnita forms in Korean and –desu/masu forms in Japanese belonging to honorific category are expected as the default speech level, the actual distribution for each speech style in cooking shows is unknown without the coding to figure out the distributional frequencies of the clause/sentence-enders. The methodology for coding clause/sentence-enders is dealt with in detail in the following section.

4.3.1 Coding system

Aforementioned CLAN program is used for coding each speech style and sociolinguistic function in the context. Since it is a spoken data, the utterances are not clearly completed with the four sentence-enders in Korean: –supnita, –eyo/ayo, –e/a, and –ta. Plenty of utterances in spoken data, however, are composed of sentence fragments or incomplete sentences ending with clause-
enders such as –ketunyo, –nunteyyo, –koyo, and etc. However, the connective –ketun and –nuntey have been grammaticalized and used as discourse markers in spoken data. The sentence-final –ketun without a main clause has multiple functions of sounding ‘explicative, apologetic, and redressive.’ In the same way, the sentence-final –nuntey without a main clause is used to provide background information while allowing the speaker to avoid being direct in speech acts of requests, disagreements, and denials (A. H.-O. Kim, 2011; Y.-Y. Park, 1999). It is necessary to categorize the clause-enders that has been grammaticalized as the sentence-enders into a different group that distinguishes from the main sentence-enders in order to grasp the whole picture of the speech style distribution in the cooking show discourse. It is necessary to distinguish the combination of clause-enders and the floating particle –yo from the verb or adjective-conjugating –eyo/ayo ending utterances due to the different structure. The sentence-final form without –yo such as –ketun, –nuntey, and –ese/ase are also coded separately from the verb or adjective-conjugating –e/a ending utterances.

On the other hand, two-level distinction of Japanese speech styles seems to be simple. As for the –desu/masu form, however, the decision must be made on which clause-enders that occurred in a sentence-final position without a main clause are coded in spoken data. In the same way as Korean data, the utterances among interlocutors in naturally occurring spoken data are not always composed of completed sentences as in well-written sentences. Rather, the utterances often include various incomplete fragments. Therefore, certain clause-enders such as –kedo is already grammaticalized and employed as a sentence-ender in Contemporary Japanese, even though its original meaning and usage of –kedo grammatically used to be a connective meaning ‘if.’ In many cases, –te form is also used as a sentence-ender during the conversation. The first coding is

5 CLAN stands for Computerized Language ANalysis, which is a program that is designed to analyze transcribed
done in relation to the type of speech styles in order to answer the following research question: 1) what is the distribution ratio of each speech style in Korean and Japanese?

Once the distribution of each speech style is identified, the next question is how each speech style is related to communicative functions in TV cooking show context. That is, the issue of which speech style carries what communicative functions is raised. Consequently, the second coding is done in relation to the type of communicative functions. Mayes (2003) maintains that primary information delivered by the chef in cooking classes are mainly instructions and explanations. She further divides instruction into four communicative functions: instruction, precondition, suggestion, and warning. She also subcategorizes explanation into four communicative functions: explanation, evaluation, justification, and topicalization. In order to set up the second coding category for examining the relations between speech styles and communicative functions, some of her subordinate communicative functions have been borrowed and more functions such as ‘summarization, joke, storytelling, backchanneling response, flow management questions, and etc. have been added.
CHAPTER 5
DISTRIBUTIONS OF SPEECH STYLES

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the distribution of each speech style utilized in Korean and Japanese TV cooking show discourse. Although the host and the chef are expected to employ the honorific endings (–supnita and –eyo/ayo forms in Korean, –desu/masu form in Japanese), it is not quite sure how dominantly honorific endings are utilized in natural talk and in what situations or contexts the sporadic shifts to the plain form occur by the interactants. The purpose of the analysis on distribution of the speech styles is not for indicating statistical significance but for identifying the ratio among different speech styles employed in TV cooking show discourse to grasp the big picture of how the host and chef interact with each other to achieve discursive goals of interactions.

As aforementioned in Chapter 4, all speech styles and its communicative functions are coded by CLAN program to get frequency counts to identify the distribution of each speech style and recognize how the speech style is related to its communicative functions in the given context. To begin with, the default speech styles are located in four frames of TV cooking show discourse: opening/closing remarks, cooking demonstrations, tasting, and non-task-oriented talk. As many scholars have observed, –eyo/ayo form in Korean data and –desu/masu form in Japanese data are classified as the default form throughout the entire TV cooking shows, even though –supnita form is recognized as the default in the opening/closing remarks. Once the default form is identified, the distributions of each speech style in four frames of TV cooking show format is examined to spot the style alternation in two comparative perspectives: one
between the host and the chef and the other between Korean data and Japanese data. In addition, the distributions of speech styles in relations to the communicative functions are analyzed from a comparative perspective as well.

5.2 Default speech style

5.2.1 –eyo/ayo: Default style in Korean cooking shows

Table 5.1 Frequency counts for each speech style in Korean cooking shows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host (1071 tokens)</th>
<th>Chef (1196 tokens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-supnita</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e/ayo</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e/a</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 shows the frequency counts for each speech style in Korean TV cooking show discourse. As expected, –eyo/ayo form is the default throughout entire TV cooking show, occurring 673 tokens (62.8%) in the host’s utterances and 898 tokens (75%) in the chef’s utterances. Intriguingly, it is noticeable that the host employs more –supnita forms than the chef. It is because –supnita is the default form in the host’s opening/closing remarks, which is very ritualistic and formulaic part of TV cooking show discourse. The speech style alternation to –ta form (3.6%) occurs more than –e/a form (1.9%) in the host utterances, whereas the shifts to –e/a
form (2.4%) occurs more than –ta form (1.7%) in the chef’s utterances. –ta form occurs almost twice more in the host’s utterances than the chef’s utterances. The ‘others’ category in Table 5.1 includes grammatically incomplete fracture such as –ketun, –nuntey, –eselase, –theyntey, –kwuna, –ci, –canha, and etc. However, the combined form of the grammaticalized sentence-final and floating ‘–yo’ such as –ketunyo, –nunteyyo, –cyo, and –canhayo are included in –eyo/ayo category. In terms of honorifics, the ‘others’ category belongs to non-honorific speech levels like –e/a and –ta forms. Although it was once considered to omit the grammaticalized sentence-final forms with and without –yo in the distribution analysis of speech style, it is necessary to know the existence of other structures as well as the four main speech styles to understand the big picture of the sentence-ender distribution in the given data.

### 5.2.2 –desu/masu: Default level in Japanese cooking shows

**Table 5.2 Frequency counts for each speech style in Japanese cooking shows**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host (1113 tokens)</th>
<th>Chef (1510 tokens)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-desu/masu plain form others</td>
<td>-desu/masu plain form others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-desu/masu</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-desu/masu</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plain form</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2 presents the frequency counts for each speech style in Japanese TV cooking show discourse. Evidently, –desu/masu is the default form in Japanese data, occurring 1027 tokens (92.3%) in the host’s utterances and 1396 tokens (92.5%) in the chef’s utterances. It should be noted that the style shifts to the plain form occurs in Japanese data as well, even though the number of the alternation to the plain form is small. The host switches to the plain form slightly more than the chef with 31 tokens (2.8%) occurring in the host utterances and 26 tokens (1.7%) in the chef’s utterances. Similarly, the ‘others’ category in Table 5.2 in Japanese data includes grammatically incomplete fracture such as –kedo, –te, –tara, –to, –shi, and etc.

5.3 Distributions of speech styles in four frames

The TV cooking shows is composed of four frames: opening/closing remarks, cooking demonstrations, food tasting, and non-task-oriented talk. It is also important to identify the distributions of speech styles in these four frames to comprehend specifically in which frame the style shifts mainly occur.

5.3.1 Korean TV cooking shows

Table 5.3 displays the frequency counts for speech styles in four frames in the host’s utterances in Korean data. As expected, –supnita form is employed as the default in the opening/closing remarks of the host’s utterances because it takes up 57.5% of his utterances. No speech style shifts to non-honorific levels occur in the opening/closing remarks, where the host frames his utterances as presentational and ritualistic by employing –supnita form, the most formal form available. The form is also highly utilized in tasting frame (37.2%), where the host gives a scripted narrative regarding the table setting and decorations before tasting. Other than
the opening/closing remarks, –*eyo/ayo* form is the default in other frames, where the speech style alternation to non-honorific levels sporadically occur.

Table 5.3 Frequency counts for speech styles in four frames in the host’s utterances in Korean data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host (1071 tokens)</th>
<th>-supnita</th>
<th>-e/ayo</th>
<th>-e/a</th>
<th>-ta</th>
<th>others</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening/closing</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking demo</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasting</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-task oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The style shift to –*ta* form mainly occurs in both cooking demonstrations and non-task-oriented talk, whereas the shift to –*e/a* form usually occurs in non-task-oriented talk of the host’s utterances. It is because the host’s evaluative remarks on food and cooking tricks are often realized with –*ta* form, whereas the host’s jokes and reported speech in story telling in non-task-
oriented talk are mainly realized with –ela form. It should be noted that style shifts to either –ela or –ta forms in the host’s utterances often take place in non-task-oriented talk in Korean data.

Looking into the distribution ratio of the non-honorific speech styles in four different frames, the host utilizes them most in non-task-oriented talk, where the host indexes emotional intimacy toward the chef. The detailed micro-analytic explanation will be given in the following chapter using multiple excerpts drawn from the transcribed data.

Table 5.4 Frequency counts for speech styles in four frames in the chef’s utterances in Korean data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chef (1196 tokens)</th>
<th>-supnita</th>
<th>-e/ayo</th>
<th>-e/a</th>
<th>-ta</th>
<th>others</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening/closing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking demo</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-task oriented</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing frequency counts for speech styles in four frames in the chef’s utterances in Korean data]
In the host’s utterances, the utilization of –supnita form is comparatively higher especially in the opening/closing remarks and the tasting frames. In the chef’s utterances, however, –eyo/ayo form is the default in all frames (see Table 5.4). Note that the chef produces a large number of utterances in cooking demonstration compared to the host, as it is the chef’s primary role to give instructions and explanations in the cooking demonstration process (Mayes, 2003). In the opening/closing frame, however, the chef makes a very few utterances with only 5 tokens in total, which are all greetings exchanged with the host when s/he is introduced, because it is the host’s main responsibility to make the opening/closing remarks. Obviously, no style shift to non-honorific levels in the chef’s utterances is expected to occur in the opening/closing frame.

Still, the chef also utilizes style mixture in other frames. –ta form utilized by the chef only occurs in cooking demonstrations and non-task-oriented talk, whereas the shifts to –e/a form occur in all other frames, except the the opening/closing remarks. Although the number of tokens of the style alternation is larger in cooking demonstrations than in non-task-oriented talk in the chef’s utterances, the actual ratio of the style shifts is higher in non-task-oriented talk than in cooking demonstrations.

5.3.2 Japanese TV cooking shows

In Japanese data, –desu/masu form is markedly the dominant speech style (see Tables 5.5 and 5.6). It is interesting to know that the Japanese host and chef produce a great number of utterances in cooking demonstrations while making a very few utterances in non-task-oriented talk. Less production of non-task-oriented talk between the host and the chef in Japanese TV cooking shows is consistent with Mayes (2003)’s report that Japanese teachers in cooking classes discuss only task-oriented content while American participants also discuss non-task-oriented
content such as jokes, personal stories, and gossip. She explains that this obvious difference between Japanese and American cooking classes is caused partly by the fact that the primary goal of Japanese students is to learn how to cook, whereas that of American students is to meet people through fun cooking events. Mayes suggests that this different set of data indicates how a cooking event is viewed differently across cultures.

As shown in Tables 5.5 and 5.6, the style shifts to the plain form sporadically occur only in cooking demonstrations and tasting frames. The occurrence ratio of style shifts to the plain form by the host (2.9% in cooking demonstrations and 4.55% in tasting) is slightly higher than that of by the chef (1.8% in cooking demonstrations and 1.5% in tasting). Most of all, it needs to be noted that the interactants in Japanese data do not switch to the plain form in non-task-oriented talk, which is strikingly different from Korean data, where the style alternation frequently occurs in non-task-oriented talk.

Table 5.5 Frequency counts for speech styles in four frames in the host’s utterances in Japanese data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-desu/masu</th>
<th>plain form</th>
<th>others</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening/closing</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking demo</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasting</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-task-oriented</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6 Frequency counts for speech styles in four frames in the chef’s utterances in Japanese data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-desu/masu</th>
<th>plain form</th>
<th>others</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening/closing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking demo</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasting</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-task-oriented</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3 Comparison between Korean and Japanese TV cooking shows

From the analysis of distributions of each speech style in interactants’ utterances in Korean and Japanese data, it is shown that –eyo/ayo form (–supnita form in the opening/closing remarks) in Korean and –desu/masu form in Japanese are the default form in TV cooking show discourse. The style alternation sporadically occurs in all frames except in the opening/closing remarks in Korean data, whereas the alternation to the plain form is limited to cooking demonstrations and tasting frames in Japanese data.

Table 5.7 presents the frequency counts for all speech styles produced by the interactants in four frames. It is important to identify how many utterances are actually produced by the host and the chef in four frames to understand how the number of the speech utterances made by each interactant is related to the effort of achieving the specific discursive goals.
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Table 5.7 Frequency counts for all speech styles produced by interactants in four frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O/C</th>
<th>C/D</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>NTO</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korean Host</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.3%</strong></td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Chef</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td><strong>81.2%</strong></td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Host</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5.5%</strong></td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td><strong>7.9%</strong></td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Chef</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td><strong>92.9%</strong></td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The host makes more utterances in the opening/closing remarks and tasting frames, whereas the chef produces more utterances in cooking demonstrations in both Korean and Japanese data. Since the host plays the primary role of opening and closing the show and tasting the dishes as representative of the audience, it is not a big surprise that the host produces more utterances in the opening/closing remarks and tasting frames. Likewise, since the major role of the chef is to give instructions and explanations regarding cooking recipes, ingredients, and procedures, it is natural for the chef to produce more utterances in cooking demonstrations. In particular, the Japanese chef speaks a lot more than the Korean chef in the cooking demonstration frame, taking up 92.9% of the entire utterances.
The most striking difference between Korean and Japanese cooking shows regarding the amount of speech production is that the Korean interactants produce approximately 10 times more utterances in non-task-oriented talk than the Japanese participants. Refer to Table 5.8 for the difference of speech production in four frames among Korean and Japanese interactants.

Table 5.8 Frequency counts for interactants’ total utterances in four frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O/C</th>
<th>C/D</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>NTO</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>2267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2347</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the detailed distribution of each speech style produced in non-task-oriented talk, the default is –eyo/ayo form in both interactants’ utterances and the style shifts occur more commonly in non-task-oriented talk than other frames in Korean data (see Table 5.9). On the contrary, no style shifts to the plain form occur in both interactants in Japanese data (see Table 5.10). The amount of the speech production by both interactants is extremely low, only 1.8% and 1.6% for the host and the chef respectively. Not every Japanese TV cooking show produces less amount of non-task-oriented talk like Today’s Menu, on which the analysis is based in comparison to Korean TV cooking shows. However, the amount of non-task-oriented talk created by the participants is obviously different between the selected Korean and Japanese data for this research.
Table 5.9 Frequency counts for each ending in non-task-oriented talk in Korean data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host (231 tokens)</th>
<th>Chef (142 tokens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-supnita</td>
<td>-e/ayo -e/a -ta</td>
<td>-supnita -e/ayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10 Frequency counts for each ending in non-task-oriented talk in Japanese data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host (62 tokens)</th>
<th>Chef (14 tokens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-desu/masu plain form others</td>
<td>-desu/masu plain form others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Distributions of speech styles in relations with communicative functions

The second coding to each speech style is conducted by the category of the communicative functions to figure out the distribution of speech styles for a certain communicative function and
to eventually answer the research questions 3) in what situations do the styles shifts occur? and 4) what are the communicative functions and the indexical meanings of the shifts?

5.4.1 Functional category

As aforementioned, instructions and explanations are borrowed from Mayes (2003)’s comparative research on Japanese and American cooking classes. As she points out, the primary information delivered by the chef in cooking classes are mainly instructions and explanations. Instructions include suggestions and warnings. For example, the chef suggests other ingredients that can replace the current ingredients for a new taste and gives a negative instruction as a warning. Explanations include justification. In many cases, the chef justifies the way he does in an attempt to explain the procedure and cooking tricks.

Evaluations, report, summarizations, flow management questions, and opening/closing activities are important functional categories drawn from the multiple roles of the host who assists the chef, reports the procedure to the unseen audience, summarizes what the chef has mentioned, manages the show time by opening/closing activities, asks questions to elicit the critical information, and etc. Evaluations, backchanneling responses, greeting, joke, and storytelling are often shown in both the chef and the host’s utterances. Although some functional categories are shown in both interactants’ utterances, however, instructions and explanations mainly occur in the chef’s utterances, whereas evaluations, report, summarizations, and flow management questions frequently occur in the host’s utterances. Other category includes ambiguous utterances that are not clear in communicative functions.

It is true that the speaker may not have the choice between –supnita and –eyolayo forms in the case of categories like questions and instructions because the questions form –supnikka and
the instructive form –usipsio may be too formal to use in cooking shows. Accordingly, the occurrence of –supnikka is only shown 7 times in the host’s utterances. There are different ways of phrasing ‘an instructive message’ without using the most formal –usipsio form. The declarative –supnita form easily replaces –usipsio when giving instructions without sounding too heavy in terms of formality in TV cooking shows.

### 5.4.2 Korean TV cooking shows

Table 5.11 Frequency counts for discourse functional category in the host’s utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Category</th>
<th>-supnita</th>
<th>-eyo/ayo</th>
<th>-e/a</th>
<th>-ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opening/closing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backchannel</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greeting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joke/storytelling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 5.11 and 5.12 provide the distributions of speech styles in relations to communicative functions in the host and the chef’s utterances in Korean data. The large number of tokens for a certain communicative function is closely related to the primary roles of the speaker. For example, the host produces more tokens in relation to the communicative functions such as evaluation, report, and question, whereas the chef makes large numbers of utterances.
when he gives instructions or explanations, suggesting that the roles of the speaker are correlated to the communicative functions.

The interesting part of the analysis is whether a communicative function is realized with a certain speech style or multiple styles. Note that although the host’s evaluative utterances are phrased by all four speech styles, the shifts to –e/a and –ta forms in the host’s utterances occur more frequently in the communicative function of evaluation and storytelling. The alternation to –ta form takes place twice as more often than the shifts to –e/a form in the host’s evaluative utterances. In the joke or storytelling category, however, the shift to –e/a form (6 tokens) occurs slightly more than –ta form (4 tokens). It is not difficult to understand that –e/a form, having a strong interactional feature, is employed more in storytelling. On the other hand, no shifts to non-honorific styles occur when the host gives a formal report to the audience, opens and closes activities, and makes backchanneling responses, where a certain degree of formality is required.

Table 5.12 Frequency counts for discourse functional category in the chef’s utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>-supnita</th>
<th>-eyo/ayo</th>
<th>-e/a</th>
<th>-ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instruction</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanation</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opening/closing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backchannel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greeting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joke/storytelling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As expected, most of the chef’s utterances are made in order to give instructions and explanations (see Table 5.12). What is prominent in Table 5.12 is that the chef’s style shifts to either –e/a form or –ta form largely occur in instruction, explanation, and evaluation categories, even though all speech styles are utilized to obtain the same communicative functions. In particular, the shifts to –e/a form mainly occur in instruction (10 tokens) and evaluation (12 tokens) categories, whereas the shifts to –ta form occur in explanation (7 tokens) category.

5.4.3 Japanese TV cooking shows

Table 5.13 Frequency counts of Japanese speech styles in terms of discourse functional category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Chef</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-desu/masu plain forms</td>
<td>-desu/masu plain forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summary</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opening/closing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backchannel</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greeting</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joke/story-telling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Japanese data shows a similar tendency, in which most of the host’s utterances are made to obtain communicative functions such as evaluation and report, whereas most of the chef’s utterances are primarily to give instructions and explanations (see 5.13). Although it is a small number, the style alternation to the plain form occurs in the host and chef’s utterances. The host switches to the plain form especially when s/he gives a summary (20 tokens), whereas the chef
shifts to the plain form especially when s/he provides his/her professional knowledge (14 tokens).

It is also intriguing to notice that the chef produces a backchanneling response much more than the host in Japanese data.
CHAPTER 6
HOST’S SHIFT TO NON-HONORIFIC LEVEL:
USE OF -TA, -E/A FORMS IN KOREAN AND PLAIN FORMS IN JAPANESE

6.1 Introduction
In the following chapters, I will present a more detailed micro-analytic qualitative analysis on the style shifts occurring in TV cooking shows by introducing the transcribed excerpts drawn from the cooking show discourse data. First, the host’s shifts to non-honorific styles will be examined in this chapter, while the chef’s shifts to non-honorific styles will be analyzed in Chapter 7. Also, the Korean participants’ shifts to –supnita form will be introduced along with the Japanese participants’ use of –desu/masu form in a comparative perspective in Chapter 8.

According to the result of the frequency counts of each speech style utilized by the participants, –eyo/ayo forms and –desu/masu forms are the default in cooking demonstrations and tasting frames, which is task-oriented talk. In both Korean and Japanese TV cooking show discourse, the host and the chef mainly converse with the default form to play their roles on the public stage. Accordingly, –eyo/ayo forms and –desu/masu forms employed in cooking demonstrations and tasting frames index the participants’ presentational stance, displaying that they are fulfilling their own professional roles in cooking shows. However, the host and the chef sporadically switch from the default form to non-honorific speech styles (e.g., –ta, –e/a form in Korean and the plain form in Japanese) in order to achieve discursive goals in a given situation.

In this chapter, six distinguished communicative functions of style shifts found in the hosts’ utterances will be presented from a comparative perspective between Korean and Japanese hosts who have the same role but have different language culture.
6.2 Default speech style: –eyo/ayo and –desu/masu forms

According to the result of the frequency counts, –eyo/ayo form and –desu/masu form are the default in the hosts’ utterances. Let’s take a look at Tables 6.1 and 6.2 below. Although Korean and Japanese hosts mainly use –eyo/ayo form and –desu/masu form as the default in the cooking demonstration and tasting frames, the style-shifts to non-honorific styles such as –e/a or –ta form in Korean and the plain form in Japanese occur sporadically. The distribution ratio of –desu/masu form is much higher than that of the default –eyo/ayo form because –supnita form, another honorific style in Korean language, take a share of honorific usage.

Generally speaking, –supnita and –eyo/ayo forms share the honorific features with –desu/masu form while –e/a and –ta forms share the non-honorific features with the plain form in Japanese. However, in formal contexts such as job interviews, TV debate, and public speech, where only –supnita and –eyo/ayo forms are available to use, the more casual honorific –eyo/ayo form is employed to index intimacy and solidarity among participants while –supnita form is utilized to index presentational stance toward the addressee (Chang, 2014; Strauss & Eun, 2005; S. Yoon, 2010).

Table 6.1 Frequency counts for each ending in cooking demonstrations in the hosts’ utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Korean Host (603 tokens)</th>
<th>Japanese Host (944 tokens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-supnita -e/a -e -ta others -desu/masu plain form others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-supnita</td>
<td>88 412 6 25 72</td>
<td>867 27 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-eyo/ayo</td>
<td>14.6% 68.3% 1% 4.1% 12%</td>
<td>91.8% 2.9% 5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also noticeable that the Korean host utilizes more –supnita form in tasting frame than in cooking demonstrations. It is because the host gives a few lines of scripted narration, marked
with –supnita form, regarding the table setting and decoration before he tastes the completed dish, which is similar to the formulaic opening remarks.

Table 6.2 Frequency counts for each ending in food tastings in the hosts’ utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Korean Host (164 tokens)</th>
<th>Japanese Host (88 tokens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-supnita</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e/ayo</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e/a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-desu/masu</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plain form</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Hosts’ shift to –ta, –e/a forms in Korean and the plain forms in Japanese

In this section, I will analyze six communicative functions of speech styles shifts to non-honorific levels in Korean and Japanese hosts’ utterances by presenting the excerpts drawn from the TV cooking show discourse. Both Korean and Japanese hosts shift to non-honorific form in order to achieve the first three functions: 1) spontaneous response, 2) evaluation, and 3) checking or confirming the information. The biggest difference between Korean and Japanese hosts in TV cooking show discourse is that the Korean host often employs –ta or –e/a forms to show intimate stance toward the chef through a joke and a reported speech in storytelling, whereas the Japanese host employs the naked plain form when giving a summary of what the chef has previously said, which is a very prominent pattern of using the plain form in the Japanese host’s utterance. –ta form used in writings, such as news articles and scientific research, is also called, ‘the plain form or neutral form’ (H. S. Lee, 1991; Sohn, 1999), but this detached neutral form is not shown in the Korean host’s utterances.
6.3.1 Spontaneous response

The most spontaneous response is realized with –ta form in Korean and the plain form in Japanese in the hosts’ utterances. Since it is a suddenly occurring reflexive action before reaching congnition of the speaker (S. Iwasaki, 2006), the spontaneous response is not directed to the addressee and is marked with non-honorific forms. Excerpts 6.1 and 6.2 show the spontaneous response marked with –ta form by the Korean host and marked with plain form by the Japanese host.

Excerpt 6.1 Vongole Pasta

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: J.-W. Park]

01 C: 자 이제 한 번 열어볼까요? (0.3)
02 ((lifts the lid of the pan))
03 H: 야::::: 열었어요,
04 C: 자. (0.4) 어떠세요=
05 H: =>열었다 입 열었다< [여:::::.]
06 C:
07 (0.4)
08 H: [자 살짝 열었어요,
09 C: [네.]
10여기서:::(0.5) 바로 그날. (0.5)
11 (holds the pan and add cooked clam into another pan ))
12 H: [바로 입 연 애들을 그날 [바로
13 C: [네.]
14 H: [네 바로 넓으시구요= [네=아홉:::

15 C: ca icy han pen yelepo-ikkayo? (0.3)
16 well now one time open-shall we
Well, shall we open the pan now?
17 ((lifts a lid of the pan))
18 H: a::::: yel-ess-eyo,
19 oh open-PST-POL
Oh! The clams opened.
20 C: [ca. (0.4) ette-sey-yo=
21 well how-SH-POL
Well, how is it?
In Excerpt 6.1, the chef is stir-frying minced garlic and chopped chili pepper on the pan while cooking the live clams in another pan. In order to check if the clams are cooked, the chef lifts the lid of the pan using –eyo/ayo form in line 01. The host reports the chef’s action using the same speech level, –eyo/ayo form in line 03. Immediately, however, the host makes a spontaneous response to the chef’s question of how the cooked clams look like in line 04 by employing –ta form in his utterance in line 05. The spontaneous feature of –ta form in the host’s utterance in line 05 is also related to the S. K. Maynard (1991)’s claim that the plain form in Japanese is used when the speaker exclaims or suddenly recalls something. The fact that the host
shifts the speech levels from the default style –eyo/ayo form to the plain level –ta ending, indicates his unplanned exclamation at the moment he notices all the clams opened. The elongated exclamation maker a:::. in the same line that is followed right after the plain form –ta supports his spontaneity. After the brief pause, the host comes back to the default –eyo/ayo form in order to continue his report in line 08. The host uses both –eyo/ayo form in lines 03 and 08 and –ta form in line 05 for the same meaning of the phrase, ‘The clams opened.’ The contextual meaning of the first and the last utterances made by the host with –eyo/ayo form in lines 03 and 08 is close to the report to the TV audience, whereas the utterance made by the host in line 05 displays the speaker’s spontaneous response, which is marked by the style shifts to –ta form.

Excerpt 6.2  Minestrone with Buckwheat Seeds
[male host: Kotoo, male chef: Kataoka]

01 H:  um::: (1.5) ((tastes))
       SF
02 ya:::::::::::::: (0.3)
oh
03 ((puts down the bowl of soup and looks at the chef))
04 moo  nanka::: (0.6)  shigoto o ne?
       DM  DM  work  AC  FP
05 nanka ima  isshun wasurete  [shimaimasita.
       DM  now  one moment  forgot  completely do-MASU
       Well, wow! It is so delicious that I momentarily forgot that I’m at work.
06 C:  [a:::. soo:::. ((laughs loud))
       DM  so
       Oh, really?
07 → H:  tsugi nani yaru n  datta  kena  a soo da. (0.9)
       next  what  do  NOM  CP-PST  so  CP
       What should I do next? Oh, I got it.
08 ((holds the magazine front and gives a light bows to the chef with a smile))
As for what we learned from Chef Kataoka today,

C: (looks at the host and bows back to him while laughing))

H: ((looks at the camera))

The recipes are included in this month’s issue.

Excerpt 6.2 shows style the shifts to the plain form in the Japanese host’s utterances. The host is in the middle of tasting the cooked dish, Minestrone with Buckwheat Seeds. With a long-stretched and loud sound of the exclamation marker ya:::::::::::::::::::: in line 02, the host makes a joke by confessing that the soup is so delicious that he has momentarily forgotten that he is at work in lines 04-05. Laughing at the host’s –desu/masu marked confession, the chef responds in non-honorific level a:::soo::: (‘Oh, really?’) in line 06. Encouraged by the chef’s laughter at his joke, the host, in turn, produces the non-honorific level utterance in a little exaggerated way while continuing his joke by employing the plain form tsugi nani yaru n datta kena, a! soo da (‘What should I do next? Oh, I got it’). a! soo da is a reflex response that is the same type of occurrence as the evaluative remark oishii The acknowledge marker a! is often preceded by the reflex response. Realizing his job to promote the cooking magazine of the month at the end of the show, the host holds the magazine up. In that moment, however, the host turns toward the chef to exchange bows and to laugh with him, displaying that he finally realizes his job, and makes the utterance in line 09. Turing toward the camera, the host eventually wraps up his utterance in line 13 by employing the default –desu/masu form to play a managerial role as the host in a presentational mode.
In this excerpt overall, the playful manner of the host’s interaction with the chef is supported by the exaggerated and elongated exclamation marker while tasting, and loud laughter between the host and the chef constructs a delightful speech environment where the style shifts to non-honorific level result in building up solidarity between the host and the chef who are expected to be presentational on a public stage.

Both Korean and Japanese hosts display the spontaneity by switching to the –ta form and the plain form. The spontaneity is completed with the preceding or following exclamation marker ‘a’, whether it is short or elongated.

6.3.2 Evaluation

The evaluative remarks encoded with non-honorific styles in the hosts’ utterances are often made in tasting cooked dish. Excerpts 6.3 and 6.4 show the typical example patterns of evaluating the food by the Korean host and the Japanese host, respectively.

Excerpt 6.3  
Sesame Leaf Noodle

[male host: S.-H. Park, female chef: Kim]
그래서 인자 이렇게 인자.
이렇게::국물을 딕::: 따놓으면 되지요.
음:

01 C: ((tops red chili on the noodle in a bowl))

02 ike-nun. [hongkochwu. this thing-TC red chili
This is red chili.

03 H: [kuleh-cyo.
yes-POL
That's right.

04 C: [komyeng-ulo. [u:::::
garnish-by
It's for garnishing. Yes.

05 H: [kochwu neh-ko [a:::::
chili add-and oh
Add chili. Oh!

06 C: komyeng-ulo cco:::kum enc-ko
garnish-by a little top-and
Put some on the top to garnish it.

07 → H: hya:;;;;;;:. >ike< .hhh wanpyekha-ta wanpyekha-y.
oh this thing perfect-PLN perfect-INT
Wow! This is really perfect! Perfect!

08 C: [u::
Yeah.

09 H: a::::: "seysang-ey".
oh world-in
Oh my God!

... 35 (2.5) ((add salt into the pan))

36 → H: >masiss-keyss-ta<. [>cincca masiss-keyss-ta<
delicious-will-PLN really delicious-will-PLN
It looks delicious. It looks very delicious.

37 C: [ey.
Yes.

38 H: ettehkey celehkey [kosoha-n hyang-i hwak::: ollaona-yo:::
how like that aromatic-RL fragrance-NM strongly come-up-FP
How is it that it has such a sweet scent?
Excerpt 6.3 demonstrates Korean host’s evaluation on the food marked with –*_ta* form in tasting frame. The excerpt is from the last part of the cooking demonstration in which the chef garnishes the noodles in a bowl with sliced white scallion and red chili. From the elongated exclamation marker *a:::* produced by the host in line 05, the host already expressed admiration for the dish that is almost completed. He is also ready to express his excitement by offering the highest praise *wanpyekha*-ta (‘perfect’) using –*_ta* form for the colorful dish in which the green noodles are decorated with white and red garnish. And much longer exclamation marker *hya:;;;;;;;:* is preceded by the speech level shifts to –*_ta* form in order to support how much the host is impressed with the outlook of the dish. Some irrelevant lines are omitted to effectively show the next style shifts occurring in the same scene.

In the next step, the chef is making the sesame broth to use it as the soup for the noodles. The host makes another evaluative remark at the fragrance of the boiling sesame broth by repeating the phrase *masiss-keyss*-ta (‘delicious’) in –*_ta* form in line 36. The interesting part of the shifts to –*_ta* form in the scene of evaluating the dish is that the host employs only –*_ta* ending in both occurrences in this excerpt. But the host goes back to use the default –*eyo/ayo* form when he asks a question to the chef in line 38.
Rolled Barley Chicken Doria

[female host: Murakami, male chef: Sawaguchi]

01 H: >dewa< watashi:. doria o chotto. =
then I Doria AC a little
Then, I will taste the Doria a little bit.

02 C: =hai [doozo.
Yes, please.

03 H: [itadakoo to omoima][su(.)
eat(hum.) QT think-MASU
I would like to taste.

04 C: [hai.
Yes.

05 (0.9)

06 H: u::ha::::::. (0.5)
Wow!

07 C: atsui kara:::=
hot because
Because it is hot,

08 H: =hai. [ki o tsukete
yes be careful
Yes, I will be careful.

09 C: [yakedo o [shinai yooni ki o tsukete:::=
burning AC do-Neg seem be careful
Be careful not to get burned.

10 H: ((holds a bowl of Doria to taste and lightly bows to the chef))

11 =hai.  'ari'gatoo gozaimasu. (0.2)
Yes. Thank you.

12 ((bows again toward the camera))

13 dewa ta-tta mama de shitsuree itashimasu. (.) hhh (0.4)
Then stand-PST as it is sorry (hum.)
Then, I apologize for eating while standing up.

14 ((in an excited voice))

15 dewa dewa doo deshoo:::(2)
then then How DESU
So, so, how is it?
Excerpt 6.4 demonstrates Japanese host’s evaluation on the food marked with the plain form in tasting frame. Unlike the Korean data, not all Japanese cooking shows include the tasting scene. This is one of the three occurrences of style shift to the plain form in the tasting frame. The host is ready to taste the cooked dish, Rolled Barley Chicken Doria, which the chef has just completed for the show. The host sounds very excited to taste the delicious food since her voice is loud and high-pitched when she officially announces that she is going to taste the food in lines 01 and 03. Realizing the host’s excitement from her loud exclamation marker ʊːhaːːːːːːː in line 06, the chef gives a small warning that she should be careful not to get herself burned when tasting in lines 07 and 09. Still excited, she overlaps the same phrase in line 08 aligning with the
chef’s concern and giving him a big smile with a nod as a sign of acknowledgement of his concern.

Holding a small bowl of Chicken Doria, the host lightly bows to the chef while showing her gratitude in line 11 and bows again toward the camera with a big smile and apologizes for eating while standing up in line 13. In an animated voice, she talks to herself *dewa, dewa, doo deshoo::* (‘So, so, how is it?’) in line 15. She puts a spoonful of food into her mouth, shrugs her shoulder with her eyes closed, and smiles, producing an evaluative utterance encoded with the plain form *oishii* (‘delicious’) in line 17. Smiling, she closes her eyes when she makes the utterance marked with the plain form, which does not seem to be targeted at the ratified addressee, the chef, or the audience. It is a spontaneous projection of her inner thought like ‘a reflex response’ toward the taste of the food, which is always realized with –*ta* form in Korean data.

Right after the evaluative remark realized in the plain form, the host turns toward the chef and initiates the interaction in line 19, seeking for chef’s alignment by saying that it has a great texture. The host employs the default –*desu/masu* form and the sentence final particle *ne* in this utterance. In response to the chef’s agreement utterance *soo desu ne* in line 20, the host makes an evaluative remark again employing –*desu/masu* form in line 22 this time. She looks down to put down the bowl and without looking at the chef, she gives the evaluative remark *oishii desu*. This is surely the response to the chef’s utterance, so the host switches back to the default style while being conscious of the chef.

The following three excerpts are all drawn from the Korean cooking discourse, where the host produces self-addressed evaluative remarks on what he made and how well the noodle was boiled.
Excerpt 6.5 Vongole Pasta

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: J.-W. Park]

01 C: ((puts a summer roll he just made on the cutting board))

02 이렇게. (3.9)

03 ((grabs another rice paper to soak in a hot water.)) (3.9)

04 잘 되세요? (0.3)

05 H: ((holds veggies inside with fingers and covers the filling with a wrapper))

06 "음". (2.8) "일단" 마::는 거:. (0.7)

07 "이런 건<. (2.2) "잘 합니다 제가".

08 저 그 야채를 가운데가 많이 넣.

09 C: 네. [가운데가 줄::>많이 넣으시면< 풍성해 보이죠::.

10 H: [음::

11 그렇죠. (. ) (xxx) (3.8)

12 ((rolls up tightly and put the one he just made on the cutting board))

13 아::이:: 너무 앞게 했다::.

14 C: ((looks at what the host made)) (0.7)

15 음::. 괜찮. 잘 하셨어요. 네.

01 C: ((puts a summer roll he just made on a cutting board))

02 ilehkey. (3.9)

Like this.

03 ((grabs another rice paper to soak in a hot water)) (3.9)

04 cal toy-sey-yo? (0.3)

well become-SH-POL

How is it going?

05 H: ((holds inside veggies with fingers and covers them with a wrapper))

06 "um". (2.8) "iltan" ma::nun ke:. (0.7)

first roll-RL thing

07 "> ile-n ke-n<. (2.2) "cal ha-pnita ce-ka".

this-RL thing-TC well do-DEF I(hum.)-NM

Hm. Rolling, things like this, I am good at.

08 ce ku yachay-lul kawunte-ta mafi neh-

SF DM veggies-AC middle-in many put

Is it better to fill up with the vegetables in the middle?

09 C: ney. [kawunteytakal com::>manhi neh-usi-myen< phungenshay poi-cyo::.

yes middle-in a little many put-SH-if plentiful appear-POL

Yes. It looks more full if you put more the vegetables in the middle.

10 H: [um::

Hm.
In Excerpt 6.5, the chef and the host roll up the fresh vegetables with a rice paper. The chef suggests the host that they make rolls together and shows every step of rolling to the host while explaining. The chef gives a detailed instruction and waits for the host to catch up on the speed of rolling. The chef and the host make one each and put them on the cutting board. After having finished rolling the second one, the chef checks if the host is doing okay on his second try of making a roll in line 04. Focused on holding the vegetables inside with his fingers, the host does not respond immediately to the chef’s question; instead, his speech is followed by some word searching pauses in lines 06-07. In responding to the chef’s remark, the host utters, ‘Hm, rolling, things like this, I am good at it,’ in lines 06 and 07, forming a non-canonical sentence order with a very soft voice. This illustrates that the host is not playing his role of facilitating the show and explaining clearly what is going on as the show host. In addition, he shows off his cooking capability in front of the chef with the deferential ending –*supnita* form in line 07.

Then he reminds himself of the chef’s previous explanation that vegetables should be put in the middle of the rice paper in order to wrap it neatly. The host brings up the chef’s previous
advice, mentioning the necessary amount of vegetable filling in order to mitigate his previous boastful remark that might cause the face-threatening act (FTA). The chef takes up the host’s remark immediately to give his opinion on how the rolls look better with more vegetables inside. In spite of the chef’s advice and his efforts to make a good one, the host realizes that he made it too thin. Putting what he made on the cutting board, the host reveals his unsatisfactory feeling that he made it too thin by employing the plain form –ta, which precedes with the exclamation maker a::i:: in line 13. Upon hearing the host’s utterance, the chef slightly turns his head to look at the one the host just made and cheers him up with a complimentary remark, ‘You did a good job.’

The host’s –ta ending utterance in line 13, which lacks a high consciousness of ‘thou’ (S. K. Maynard, 1991) is not directly targeted at the chef because the host is not looking at the chef when producing the plain form. However, it is certain that the response made by the chef on the following line 15 was initiated by the host’s –ta ending remark. It is not very clear that the host expects the chef to react to his remark. The reaction by the chef to the host’s –ta ending utterance with the exclamation marker sounds normal. There is no FTA involved in the interactions between the host and the chef, even though the host uses the non-honorific plain form on a public stage. Some may argue that there is no soliloquy remark if the addressee, who can hear the speaker, is present, even though the speaker’s utterance is not intended to be heard or to be targeted at the addressee. The important thing, however, is that the host projects his inner thought with –ta form without being highly conscious of the addressee.

Excerpt 6.6 shows the host’s evaluative remarks encoded with –e/a form.
Excerpt 6.6 Mediterranean Seafood Pasta

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: J.-W. Park]

01 C: 그리고 우리가 보통 보면,
02 이렇게 덤질 때 맥: 붙는 순간 잊었어요?
03 H: 붙는 애들:=
04 C: =고게 이제 지금 알단테 [순간이에요. (0.2)
05 H: [네]
06 ((receives a strand of boiled pasta from the chef))
07 이거 제가“한 번” [먹어 보면 알아요.
08 C: [네]
09 (1.5)
10 H: ((tries to chew the pasta strand))
11 음. (0.3) 음. (0.4) 심이 있어요=.
12 C: =네네.
13 → H: 음. (0.5) 맥 이정도야 [맞어. 음:
14 C: [네.
15 (0.4)
16 그려면::] [이제::]
17 → H: [이거 좀 있으면 풀깃썰 víctima.
18 C: [네.
19 (1.4)
20 C: 자:::
21 H: 네:::
22 C: 어느 정도 복으시면:::
23 H: 네:::

01 C: *kuliko wuli-ka pothong po-myen,
and we-NM usually see-if
02 ilehkey tenci-l ttay ttak: pwuth-nun swunkan iss-canh-ayo?
like this throw-RL time tightly cling-RL moment be-not-POL
You know the moment when we throw the noodles on the wall and they stick?
03 H: pwuth-nun ay-tul:=
cling-RL kid-PL
The ones that stick.
04 C: =kokey icy cikum altaney [swunkan-i-eyyo. (0.2)
that thing now now Al Dente moment-CP-POL
That means it is in the Al Dente phase.
05 H: [ney
Yes.
06 ((receives a strand of boiled pasta from the Chef))
07 *ike cey-ka ˚ han pen” [mek-e po-myen al-ayo.
this thing |(hum.)-NM one time eat try-if know-POL
I will know the phase after I taste it.
In Excerpt 6.6, the chef explains that while boiling spaghetti, the *Al Dente* phase occurs when the noodles stick on the wall in line 04. Right after the chef gives a brief explanation on the
phase, the host receives a strand of boiled spaghetti from the chef and takes a little bite of the strand. Looking at the camera and then the chef, the host reports that it is slightly uncooked in the middle, using the default –eyo/ayo form in line 11. Then he keeps saying that it has the right degree of firmness while looking at the cut noodle, employing –e/a form. The –e/a marking by the host does not seem to be targeted at the chef or the TV audience, but the speaking volume is kept at the same loudness when he reports to the chef in the –e/a ending in the previous line. Naturally, without responding to the host’s soliloquy marked by –e/a ending, the chef tries to proceed to the next step by producing a contextualization cue kule-myen (‘then’) in line 16, but the host’s evaluative remark on the noodles in –e/a form in line 17 interrupts the chef. Despite the host’s soliloquy in –e/a marking in lines 13 and 17, the chef automatically gives a backchannel response, which overlaps with the host’s –e/a marking utterances. The chef may not pay much attention to the host’s employment of the intimate level in his utterances or the chef may not care for the host’s style mixture during the interaction. Although the host does not lower his voice to sound more like a soliloquy, his gaze of looking down and the lack of response from the chef other than automatic backchanneling support that it is a soliloquy.

The next excerpt shows another evaluative remark produced by the Korean host on the chef’s life experiences in a non-task-oriented talk. Note the host’s strategy to mitigate a FTA of evaluating a person’s life experience by employing –ta form.

Excerpt 6.7 Vongole Pasta

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: J.-W. Park]

36 C: 이재" 뒤늦게::. (0.7)그리고 나서::.  
37 H: 네.  
38 C: 아: 개그도 도전했는데 개그. 개그도 실패했죠:  
네:: 네::.

개그도 도전하셨어요? (0.3)

네. 시험 같은 거 보셨었어요? [>'그러면'<

아. 시험은 안 봤는데요.

아우. 시험같은 거 보셨었어요? [>그럼< 열기 학원을 다녔죠.

아. 요리사로 교수님이 되시고 이렇게 (0.3)

이. 훌륭하신 분이 됐는데.

아우::.

아우 참. 진짜로::... 와::::::::. >선생님< 파란만장하시다::::::. 진짜::::::.

아. 요리사로 교수님이 되시고. 이렇게 (0.3)

이. 훌륭하신 분이 됐는데.

[아우::.

예. 요.리.::률. 이제 성공했죠. (0.2)

아::::::::::. (.) [그러시구나.

(points the plates near the host))

[밑의 접시를 좀 주실래요?= 네네. 오::::::::. (0.4)

[bursting into a laugh])

C:  며키 투나키.:: (0.7) 칼리코 냐세::.

now late and then

And then later on,

H:  네.

Yes.

C:  e: kayak-to tocenhay-ss-nunytay kayku. kayku-to silphayhay-ss-cyo:= SF joke-also challenge-PST-but joke joke-also fail-PST-POL

Hm, I tried to become a comedian but failed.

H:  cincca [kay:ku-to. kaykumayn-to ha-si-lye|ko.

really joke-also comedian-also do-SH-try to

Really? You tried to be a comedian?

C:  [ney::. [ney::.

Yes. Yes.

H:  kayak-to. tocenha-sy-ess-eye? (0.3)

joke-also challenge-SH-PST-POL

You challenged to become a comedian?

C:  kulay`se` silphayhay-ss-canh-ayo. (0.3)

so fail-PST-not be-POL

So you know I failed.
H: *a. sihem kath-un ke po-sy-ess-eyo?* (/‘kulemyen‘<
oh test seem-RL thing see-SH-PST-POL then
Oh did you try out for auditions?

C: *[a. sihem-un an pwa-ss-nuntey-yoć*
oh test-TC not see-PST-and-FP
No, I didn’t addition for it, but.

H: *a:::
Oh..

C: *hakwen-man:: (.) yelsimhi tany-ess-ess-cyo.*
institute-only diligently attend-PST-PST-POL
I just attended classes.

H: *kayku hakwen-ul tany-ess-ess-eyo? (0.2)*
joke institute-AC attend-PST-PST-POL
You took comedy classes?

C: *>’kunyang‘< yenki hakwen-ul tany-ess-ess-cyo.*
just acting institute-AC attend-PST-PST-POL
I just went to an acting school.

H: *yenki hakwen=
acting institute
Acting school.*

C: *=ney ney.*
Yes. Yes.

H: *au cham: cinccalo:::. wa::::::. >sensayng-nim< phalanmancangha-si-ta::::::. cinca::::::.*
oh really really wow Chef-HT turbulent-SH-PLN really
Wow! Really wow! You have a life full of ups and downs. Really.

C: *kulay’se* sengkonga-n ke-y hana-to epscanh-ayo. (0.3)
so succeed-RL thing-NM one-also not-have-POL
Yeah, but I didn’t achieve anything.

H: *a_ yolisa-lo kyoswu-nim-i toy-si-ko. ilehkey (0.3)*
oh chef-as professor-HT-NM become-SH-and like this
i. hwullyungha-si-n pwun-i tay-ss-nuntey.
SF excellent-SH-RL person(hon.)-NM become-PST-and

C: *[yey. yo::li:::-lu, icey sengkonghay-ss-cyo. (0.2)*
yes cooking-with now succeed-PST-POL
Yes. I guess I am successful in the cooking industry now.

H: *a::::::: (.) [kule-si-kwuna.*
oh be so-IE
Oh, that’s right.
Excerpt 6.7 is the second part of the scene where the chef tells his life story in response to the question of why he became a chef. The chef confesses that he tried to be a comedian in line 38. Surprised by the chef’s unexpected confession, the host, who is a former comedian, confirms the chef’s previous remark and solicits more detailed information from the chef. When the chef says that he even took classes to become a comedian, the host looks toward the chef in surprise and asks if the chef had actually taken comedy classes in a loud voice, confirming the chef’s remark in line 47. Knowing the fact that the chef was not only a former boxer but also tried so hard to become a comedian that he even took special classes, the host finally gives the first evaluative remark *phalanmancangha-si-ta* (‘to have a life full of ups and downs’), shifting to –*ta* form in line 51 where the exclamation marker *wa:******* is naturally preceded. The host’s drastic exclamation is well supported by the degree adverbs such as *au cham: cinecalo:::* that are followed by the exclamation marker in the same line. Responding to the host’s evaluative remark on his life, the chef humbly admits that he didn’t achieve anything in his life. In lines 53-55, disagreeing with the chef’s self-humiliating utterance, the host raises his voice and looks up at
the staff in order to seek an agreement. Smiling, the chef finally admits that he is actually successful in the cooking industry.

While in a non-task-oriented talk, the chef and the host are in the middle of making fresh rolls. As he completes his life story, the chef asks the host to pass him the plate near the host in line 59. While passing the plate to the chef, the host gives another evaluative and complimentary remark *taytana*-n *pwun*-i-si-ta:*:*:*:*:* (*‘How incredible you are!’*) in line 61. And he makes a joke to the chef in the following line again by saying, ‘You should have become a comedian,’ which eventually makes the chef burst into laughter.

The interesting part of this excerpt is that *phalanmancangha*-si-ta and *taytana*-n *pwun*-i-si-ta marked with –ta ending in the host’s evaluative utterances include the subject honorific marker –usi. It is included because evaluating a person or his/her behavior is considered a FTA. –usita, a combination of the subject honorific marker –usi and the plain form –ta, is often produced by both interactants in TV cooking shows. In order to obtain the mitigation effect of evaluating a person or his/her behavior, the host not only combines –usi with –ta form in his utterances, but also utilizes the honorific title –nim to address the chef in the first shift and the honorific word for a person –pwun to refer the chef in the second shift.

All these elements using both the honorific title nim or pwun and the subject honorific marker –usi mitigates the employment of the plain form –ta ending in evaluating the chef’s life story that may have caused a FTA. On the other hand, the chef shows no sign of discomfort when the host uses –ta form, but rather the chef keeps smiling at the host’s evaluative remark in the plain form –ta ending. Because of the host’s exaggerative gestures, animated voice, and his use of many exclamation markers with the –ta ending in a given situation, the chef is able to interpret that the situational context is framed as an entertainment, not an insult. One of the chefs in
Korean TV cooking shows also uses the same strategy combining the subject honorific marker –usi with the plain form –ta in evaluating the host’s knowledge on the food ingredients. The animated voice and the smile of the chef in the given context also give the same idea of being playful and narrow the social distance between the chef and the host.

The Korean host provides a wider variety of evaluative context than the Japanese host who only evaluates on the taste of food. The Korean host evaluates not only on food ingredients and taste, but also on the chef’s cooking tricks and life experiences.

6.3.3 Checking or confirming the information

One of the major roles of the host is to deliver important information to the audience. In an effort to elicit a response from the chef, the host tries to clarify and confirm his understanding of the information by employing –ta form or the plain form.

Excerpt 6.8  Host’s clarification of meaning (Mediterranean Seafood Pasta)

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: J.-W. Park]

01 C: ((toward the host))
02 비린 맛을 중화시키는 방법.
03 H: 네.
04 C: 와인을 좀 넣는 거예요. [화이트 와인을.
05 H: [아:;;;;;;;;: 화이트 와인.
06 C: 네:;;;;.
07 H: [아:;;;;: 그렇죠 해산물에는 화이트 [와인이죠.
08 C: 네:;;;;
09 H: ((hands over a small bowl of white wine)) (0.8)
10 C: 화이트 와인을::
11 H: 네::
12 C: ((add one spoonful of wine and adds a little more)) (2.2)
13 [한 술같 정도 조금::
14 H: [오::.
15 C: 네::
16 H: 조금::
17 C: 네::: [이렇게 넣으시고<
18 H: [이정도:: 오줌=
19 C: =네.
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H: 이 비린 맛을. 해산물의 비린 맛을 씹.........
C: 중화시키 주는 거죠. [그래서
H: [예:: 알코올이 화.........악::
C: 네.
H: 날라가면서.
C: 전문 용어로 우리가... 이거를 풀란베라고 해요.
H: 풀란배? ((looks at the chef))
C: 풀란배. ((also looks at the host))
H: (0.9) ((put his widely open fingers on his stomach while looking at the chef))
 ذو난 배?:
C: ((corrects his understanding while smiling))
 ذو난배 아니요:: ذو란배=[
H: = ذو란배. [아::::
C: [ ذو란배. 네.
H: (turns his face toward the pan))
C: 풀란배.
H: 풀란배.
C: 풀란배.
H: [이것을 중화시키나?
C: 네. (0.4) 그래서, (0.6) 비린 맛도:: ذو (0.2) 중화시키고.
C: 네.
C: 와인을 들어가" 면" 와인의 어떤 성분.
H: 알코올 성분이잖아요?
C: [그렇죠.
C: 근데 (xxx) 우리가 알코올로 먹으면은 (0.2) 흡연하지만.
C: 네.
C: 와인을 줘면 단맛이"나거든요".
H: 아::::::
C: 그래면서. (0.2) 해산물의:: ذو (0.2) 그런 비린맛
육류의 비린맛. 생선의 비린 맛을 날려주거든요.
H: 아:: 그례:: [서:::: ذو
C: [네.

C: (toward the host))

pil-n mas-ul cwunghwasikhi-nun pangpep.
fishy-RL taste-AC neutralize-RL method

H: ney:: yes

C: wain-ul com "neh-nun" ke-yey-yo. [hwaithu wain-ul.
wine-AC a little add-RL thing-CP-POL white wine-AC
In order to get rid of the odor, add a little bit of wine - white wine.

H: [a: ::::::::: hwaithu wain.
oh white wine
Oh! White wine.

C: [ney: :::::::: Yes.
Oh, that's right. White wine goes best with seafood.

Yes.

White wine.

Yes.

About a spoonful; just a little.

Yes, add a spoonful of white wine.

The fishy taste is completely eliminated.

Yes. Alcohol does works.
23  C:  *ney.*  
Yes.

24  H:  *nallaka-myense.*  
fly off  
The alcohol dissolves the smell.

25  C:  *cenmwun yonge-lo wuli-ka:: ike-lul phollanpey-lako ha-yyo.*  
technical term-in we-NM this-AC Flambe-QT do-POL  
We call this 'Flambe' in technical terms.

26  *cham. phwule-lo*  
by the way French-in  
Actually in French.

27  H:  *phwullampey?*  
(looks at the chef)  
Flambe

28  C:  =*phwullampey.*  
(also looks at the hose)  
Flambe

29  H:  *(put his widely open fingers on his stomach while looking at the chef)*  
(0.9)

30  *ppwulna-n phay::*?  
angry-RL ship  
Angry ship?

31  C:  *(corrects his understanding while smiling)*

32  *ppwulna-n pay:: ani-ya:: phwullampey=*  
angry-RL ship no-POL Flambe  
Angry ship? No, Flambe.

33  H:  *=phwullampey. [a:::.]
  Flambe.*

34  C:  *(phwullambey. ney.*  
Flambe, yes.

35  *(turns his face toward the pan)*

36  H:  *phwullampey.*  
Flambe.

37  C:  *phwullam [pey.*  
Flambe.

38  →  H:  *[ikes-ul cwunghwasikhi-ta?]*  
this thing-AC neutralize-PLN  
Neutralize this?

39  C:  *ney. (0.4) kulayse, (0.6) pili-n mas-to:: (0.2) cwunghwasikhi-ko.*  
yes so fishy-RL taste-also neutralize-and

Yes. So it neutralizes fishy taste.
In Excerpt 6.8, the chef explains the trick to remove the odor of seafood and meat by adding white wine. The interaction between the host and the chef is normal with the chef giving informative explanations to the host and with the host uptaking and aligning with the chef while delivering the information that the odor can be easily removed by adding small amount of wine in lines 01-24.
However, when the chef introduces the terminology *flambé*, a cooking trick in which alcohol is added to the dish, in line 25, the host changes his footing from a responsible show host and amenable assistant to a playful comedian repeating the terminology with a rising tone in line 27. Then the chef confirms the word repeating in a falling tone in line 28, which still seems to be a normal process in checking and confirming the new terminology between an expert and a novice. While staring at the chef and pausing for 0.9 seconds, the host put his both hands on his stomach with his fingers wide apart in an exaggerated manner and then starts a word play in line 30 by saying the phrase *ppwulna-n phay* in a loud voice, which has a similar pronunciation to the new terminology, but actually means ‘angry ship.’ From the chef’s smile at the host’s word play, it is assumed that the chef aligns with the host’s playful behavior and reconfirms the word *flambé* in line 32. Satisfied with the chef’s smile and the immediate alignment with his joke, the host repeats the word with the exclamation marker *a:....* in line 33. So, the playful interaction between the host and the chef is completed in line 37.

The host goes back his role as a show host to reconfirm the meaning of the new terminology *flambé* using –*ta* form with a rising intonation that often indicates uncertainty of the speaker. The chef comes back to his work to stir-fry the seafood on the pan with some white wine in line 35. And the chef not only reconfirms the host’s understanding of the word but also gives more detailed explanation of how *flambé* can remove the odor of seafood in the following lines.

It is important to notice that the verb marked with –*ta* ending, *cwunghwasiki-ta* (‘to neutralize’) in the excerpt, is not a plain form, which is *cwunghwasiki-n-ta*, but a dictionary form that is not allowed to be used in conversations or in writings. It is assumed that the reason why the dictionary form –*ta* ending is employed in this context is because the host foregrounds the
meaning of the word rather than highlighting the interactional context between the speaker and the addressee.

**Excerpt 6.9**

Green Tea Pound Cake

[male host: Kintoo, female chef: Ueda]

01   →   H:  .hhh sa. de kono ato:::(.) ma::: asui mama desu kedo samasu:::?
well so this after SF hot as it is DESU but cool down
Well, after this, the cake is still hot, so do you cool it down?

02   C:  kono mama >oite okimasu to ano< na[ka ni joo::ki ga komotte::(.)
this as it is put-MASU if SF inside moisture NM get soggy
If you leave it like this, because of the moisture inside.

03   H:  /hai.  
Yes.

04   C:  betabetani nat*te* shimaimasu n de.
sticky become completely do-MASU NOM because
It will get very soggy and sticky.

05   ((grabs the upper part of the paper))

06   C:  chotto kono::: ka::mi o desu ne.
a little this paper AC DESU FP
This paper.

07   ((tries to pull the paper attached the cake out of the pan))

08   H:  hai.  
Yes.

09   C:  hippatte itada [kimashite.
pull out-hum.-MASU
Pull it and remove it from the hot pan.

10   ((looks for something to use to hold the hot pan))

11   H:  [kore::: ja::: chotto::: soo desu ne. (0.2)
this DM a little so DESU FP
Well, um, that's right.

12   C:  [Sumimasen.
sorry-MASU
I am sorry.

13   H:  ((receives a dish towel from the staff and holds the hot pan))
Oh, here is a dish towel. Let me hold the pan.

Yes.

Yes. Like this. Cool it down like this.

Cool it down like this. It will get soggy if you leave the cake in the pan.

So you are saying that we should remove the cake and cool it down because moisture makes the cake soggy.

Yes.
which often implies the speaker’s uncertainty of the utterance (Gussenhoven, 2004).

Immediately, the chef gives a clear reason why she does not cool it down in the pan in lines 02 and 04, and she tries to remove the cake from the pan in lines 06-07 and 09. However, as she fails to pull out the cake in line 09 because the cake is tightly attached to the hot pan, the chef looks for something to hold it. Without being able to assist the chef, the host also murmurs, stretches syllables, and pauses in between utterances in line 11 because he also does not know what to do in this unexpected situation and tries to find whatever it is available to hold the hot pan. For a short moment in lines 06-14, both interactants seem to be embarrassed looking around and trying to get something from the staff outside of the camera angle.

Finally, the host receives the towel from the staff, noticeably showing a relaxed smile, and says, ‘Here is a dish towel’ in line 14. Then, the chef finally removes the cake from the pan and puts it on the rack. Here again, the chef stresses the previous instruction of cooling down the cake outside the pan, employing –te itadakimasu, the combination of humble expression –te itadaku and masu form in line 17, which gives high formality in her utterance. The host then recycles the chef’s utterance by employing the plain form samasu in line 18, where he foregrounds the importance of the information conveyed.

The plain form samasu occurs twice in the excerpt: (1) to check the understanding in line 01 and (2) to summarize what the chef has said in line 18. Summarization is one of the frequently occurring patterns of style shifts to the plain form in the Japanese hosts’ utterances. This function will be dealt with in detail in Section 6.3.6.

These two excerpts from different cultures present the similar communicative functions. The Korean host switches to –ta form to clarify the meaning of the newly introduced terminology and the Japanese host also shifts to the plain form to confirm his understanding. Additionally,
both –ta marked word and the plain form are produced with a rising intonation, which indicates the uncertainty of the speaker. The fact that the Korean host employs the dictionary form is good evidence that the host uses the form to foreground the content.

6.3.4 Joke

The following two excerpts display the playful behavior of the host, a former comedian, who tries to build up a comedian identity and creates a funny situation through style shift to –ta or –e/a forms.

Excerpt 6.10 Pepper and Eggplant

[male host: S.-H. Park, female chef: Kim]

01 C: 세 개면 맛있겠네 “위”.
02 H: 야:::: 세 개면:: ؤ
03 C: 네.
04 H: ((points each eggplant with his index finger))
05 가지 가지 가지한[다.
06 C: [예::예::
07 (2.5)
08 H: ((slightly raises his head to look around invisible staff in a studio with a smile))
09 웃어주시는 분이 계시는데요? (1.3)
10 ((stretches his back and turns toward the staff))
11 웃을 때 소리 죽여서 웃지 마세요 좀.
12 C: ((chuckles))
13 H: 우리 스탭분들.
14 (turns his body back toward the chef))
15 어떻게 웃나요? [내가 무슨 우스개 소리를 하면.
16 C: [네
17 H: ((mimics the staff’s way of giggling))
18 (1.3)
19 C: ((looks over at Host and bursts into a laughter))

01 C: sey kay-myen ttak:: toy-keyss-ney ’mwe”.
three item-if perfectly become-will-IE DM
Three eggplants will be just enough.

02 H: ya:::: sey kay-myen:: ؤ
oh three item-if
Oh, if there are three,
In this excerpt, the chef and the host are stuffing the inside of cut eggplants with filling made of ground meat and chopped mushrooms. They are holding one eggplant each and the third
cut eggplant is placed on a plate. The chef mentions that three eggplants will be just enough for the cooking show. In responding to the chef’s word choice of ‘three eggplants’ in line 01, the host points each eggplant with his index finger including the one he is holding and says *kaci kaci kaci ha-n-ta* in line 05. The literal meaning of the idiomatic phrase *kaci kaci hata* is ‘Someone does various things,’ which does not sound so bad in its literal meaning. However, it is always used with a negative connotation in which someone meddles in other people’s business too much. Noticing the fact that the name of eggplant and the repeated part of idiomatic phrase are homonym, the host, therefore, intentionally uses the specific idiomatic expression in order to make a joke.

Ironically, the chef, the only ratified addressee in the cooking show, unconsciously agrees with his utterances without paying much attention to the host’s joke. The chef does not even look at the host and keeps filling up the cut eggplant during 2.5 seconds of pause. In the meanwhile, the host waits for her response and pretends he did not to make a joke. Having failed to make the chef laugh at his joke even after a somewhat long pause in line 07, the host is impatient to check the staff’s reaction to his joke, so he slightly raises his head to look to his right side toward the invisible staff in the studio. Smiling, the host notices that some had already laughed. Then the host explicitly asks the staff, who are not ratified addressees of the show, not to try to hide their laughter in line 11. Finally, looking up, the chef also sees the staff’s laughing at the host’s joke and chuckles. Encouraged by the chef’s chuckles, the host turns his body back toward the chef to get her attention and mimics the staff’s way of giggling in an exaggerated manner. With his hard effort, the chef bursts into laughter in the end.

This excerpt is a typical scene that shows the host’s playful behavior, foregrounding his comedian identity, even though his primary role of the show is the host and the chef’s assistant.
Whenever he has a chance to make jokes during the show, he never hesitates to reveal his fun personality as a comedian, which is very different from Japanese show hosts.

Given the fact that –e/a form is labeled as intimate speech style (Sohn, 1999), it is hard to imagine that the intimate style is used between the host and the chef in cooking shows where both participants are expected to show their professionalism on a public stage. However, the style shifts to –e/a form occur often in non-task-oriented talk.

**Excerpt 6.11**  Vongole Pasta

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: J.-W. Park]

01 C: 저는::: (1.2) 복싱 선수였었어요. (0.5)
02 H: ((looks at the chef in surprise))
03 예:::
04 C: hhh ((laughs)) (1.1)
05 H: 복싱을 하셨다구요?=
06 C: ((nods)) =네. 네.
07 H: (4.1) ((bouce-steps like a boxer toward the chef.))
08 C: ((looks back at the host and bounce in toward him))
09 H: [아::: 오::: 진짜::: 어:::저: 자세가:.
10 (stop moving and lean forward toward camera) 누가:누가::: ((laughs))
11 C: 아하하 ((laugh loudly and pats the back of the host))
12 → H: 누가 겁주래 .hhh 누가 겁주래::::: ((laughs loudly and holds his arms)).
13 (1.1) ((both laugh so loudly))
14 그남 장난친 건데::::: hhh ((bends forward while laughing))
15 → 자세를 잡으면 어פק대::::: ((straightens his back and looks upward))
16 이:::이::: 손도 >안 쉬어지네<::: 이:::으: (0.3)
17 등골이 그남. 짜미껏 힘::::: 납네.
18 (0.5) ((begins to assist cooking))
19 아:::::그러셨어요:::네::: hhh 감짝 눌랐네.
20 (0.6) ((look sideways and look at the camera))
21 아:::이::::
22 C: =지금은 아니구[요.

01 C: ce-nun::: (1.2) poksing senswu-y-ess-eyo. (0.5)
   I am a former boxer.
02 H: ((looks at the chef in surprise))
03 vev:::
   Huh?
04 C: hhh ((laughs)) (1.1)
You did boxing?

Yes. Yes.

(bounce-steps like a boxer toward the chef.)

((looks back at the host and bounce in toward him))

Oh my god! Really? Oh that stance!

((stop moving and lean forward toward camera))

Who said you scared me? Who said you scared me?

I am just making jokes.

Why would you do a boxing stance?

My back is drenched in sweat.

So, you did do boxing. Yes. I was very surprised.

((look sideways and look at the camera))

a:: i::=
In Excerpt 6.1, while assisting the chef to make fresh rolls, the host asks the chef when he decided to become a professional cook and the chef responds that he originally played sports. Surprised by the chef’s unique life experiences, the host asks a follow-up question of what kind of sports he played and the chef hesitantly admits that he did boxing. Amazed by the fact that the chef was a former boxer, the host displays an intense reaction and falls back in order to look at the chef in the face in lines 02-03. The chef smiles back at the host while making a roll. The abrupt movement of the host and his loud reaction demonstrate how surprised he is at the chef’s confession.

Right after 1.1 seconds of a short pause, the host repeats the question poksing-ul ha-sy-ess-ta-kwu-yo? (‘you did boxing?’) in line 05. Then, the host bounce-steps like a boxer backward without a word. When the chef looks back at the host who recreates a playful mode in the studio, the chef smiles and aligns with the host by also bouncing toward him. Alarmed by the chef’s bounce-steps, the host stops moving and exaggerates his fear, but he soon bursts into laughter. The chef also bursts into laughter and slightly pats the host on the back to calm him down.

While laughing loudly in a playful mode, the host uses the style shift to –e/a form at the chef and repeats the phrase nwu-ka kepcwu-lay (‘who said you scared me?’) in line 12. Also, in line 15, the host employs –e/a form when he says ‘why would you do a boxing stance?’ Both style shifts to the intimate level –e/a form produced by the host are exactly targeted at the chef.

This excerpt shows the host’s dramatic change of footing. He first maintains his role as the show host until the line 05. He then changes his footing to reveal his comedian identity as he creates a playful context in line 07-17. Finally, he comes back to his primary role of the show
host in line 19. The context is framed as a play when all three times of the shifts to –e/a form occur. The host invites the chef to cooperate in his playful mode by not only employing –e/a form, but also by bounce-stepping like a boxer and laughing loudly. In lines 07-17, the host manifests his mischievous comedian identity and only uses the non-honorific speech such as –unt ey and –ney without –yo. However, the host shifts back to his primary role of the show host in line 19 using the default form –eyo/ayo and wraps up his acting. Even then, he still uses the non-honorific speech level in the same line and looks slightly sideways to check the staff’s reaction to his playful acting. In the subsequent interaction, the host tries another round of playful impersonation and makes the chef laugh loudly.

In this excerpt, the employment of either the honorifics or the non-honorifics speech levels by the host clearly accounts for the footing change in the given context. The host strategically and consciously uses the style shift to –e/a form in order to create a playful mode and eventually to convey his comedian identity rather than the show host identity. It is intriguing to see his footing change through his strategic employment of the style mixture.

6.3.5 Reported speech

Storytelling in the middle of the cooking demonstration often occurs in Korean TV cooking show, which never happens in the Japanese cooking show discourse. The speaker may not have the choice of speech styles in a reported speech. However, it is important to recognize that reported speech is often marked with –ta or –e/a form in storytelling. Three excerpts will be introduced to present the reported speech marked with –ta or –e/a forms in the host’s utterances.
Excerpt 6.12 Pepper and Eggplant

[male host: S.-H. Park, female chef: Kim]

01 H: 어머니. 그네 가요판 주에 방송했는데,
02 [그 요리가 너무 좋더라고 그러면,]
03 C: [으...]
04 H: 우리어머니 가 별써 봤어요.
05 C: 어. (0.2)
06 → H: 봤 가지고 [나도 봤다] 애...
07 C: [그렇지요] 아드님들은:: 봤:: 아드님이 하나가.
08 얼마나 관심 있겠어요: [그지요::?
09 H: [음:: (0.7)
10 C: [부모는::
11 H: [관심은 없으신 것 같애요.
12 C: 부모님이?
13 H: 네::::. (0.8)

01 H: emeni. ku:: nay-ka'yopen cwu-ey pangsonghay-ss-nuntey,
Mom SF I-NM this week broadcast-PST-and
02 [ku yoli-ka nemwu coh-te-lako kule-myen<,
that cooking-NM really good-RT-QT say-if
Whenever I tell my mother that the cooking recipes in the show that I hosted last
week were very good,
03 C: [u::
Yeah.
04 H: wuli emeni-'ka* pelsse pwa-ss-eyo.
we Mom-NM already watch-PST-POL
She has already seen it.
05 C: e::: (0.2)
Yeah.
06 → H: pwa kaci-ko [na-to pwa-ss-ta] yay:::
watch-and I also watch-PST-PLN
She tells me that she already watched it.
07 C: [kuleh-ciyo] atu-nim-tul-un:: mwe:: atu-nim-i ha-nikka.
yes-POL son-HT-PL-TC DM son- -NM do-because
08 elmana kwansim iss-keyss-eyo: [ku-ciyo::?
how much interest be-will-POL yes-POL
Of course. Your mom must be very interested in the show since it is her son doing it,
right?
09 H: [um: (0.7)
Hmm.
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This excerpt is part of the scene where the host brings up a story of how he became a show host from being a comedian while helping the chef with stuffing of the cut eggplant. The chef previously expresses her opinion that being a show host is a much better job. Agreeing with her opinion, he tells the chef that since he started hosting the cooking show, he has gotten interested in healthy cooking. The reported speech in the host’s utterance begins when he uses the address term emeni in line 01. He quotes what he told his mother in indirect speech in lines 01-02. In line 05, however, the host quotes what his mother said in direct speech shifting to –ta form. The host slightly changes his tone of voice to act like his mother and adds the address term yay (‘my boy’) after –ta form, which is often employed by female speakers in addressing a young man.

Excerpt 6.13  Sesame Leaf Dumpling
[male host: S.-H. Park, female chef: Choe]
Once young people try tteokpokki, they love it.

The owner of ttekpokki stand in Youngdeungpo was very rich.

Speaking of tteokpokki, there is a story I want to tell you.

The tteokpokki was so delicious. It was super delicious.

And

Is it okay to say this?
This excerpt is a part of the non-task-oriented talk in the cooking show. The host presents five most popular street foods in Korea because the recipe they are introducing is sesame leaf dumpling, which is also one of the popular street foods. When tteokpokki is announced as the most popular street food, the chef tells a story of a food stand owner who becomes rich because of the secret tteokpokki sauce she makes only using healthy ingredients. Excited upon hearing the success story of the owner, the host claims that the owner must be rich and begins another story of a successful food stand owner, whose menu was also tteokpokki. The host emphasizes how delicious it was and repeats the phrase masiss-e (‘delicious’) marked with –e/a form in a loud and animated voice toward the camera in line 08, as if he were telling a story to a friend. In addition, he turns his head to the right toward the staff, asking if it is okay for him to say the story by employing the non-honorific level ending without –yo, which is inappropriate for a public show. After 0.6 seconds of a short pause, he turns toward the chef and continues the story that the food stand owners used to be gangsters but the food they make is very delicious. While looking
at the chef, he again uses –e/a form in explaining how delicious it was.

The host’s evaluative utterances marked with –e/a form in this excerpt is interpreted in various ways. The host is the narrator of his storytelling and delivers the story while mixing direct and indirect reported speech. It is interesting to notice that his storytelling is usually delivered in indirect reported speech using the sentence ender –tayyo marking with –eyo/ayo form in lines 12, 17, and 19. Meanwhile, the –e/a marking utterances in a loud and vivid voice in lines 08 and 16, which emphasizes the deliciousness of ttekpokki is delivered in direct reported speech. Delivering the story in direct reported speech marked with the intimate speech level –e/a, the host stresses the vividness and interactional feature of storytelling. Furthermore, the host stretches the degree adverb ne: ::::mwu (‘really’) to emphasize –e/a marking phrases, while sticking his index finger toward the camera. Consequently, the shifts to –e/a form employ a form of direct reported speech by the host during the storytelling, creating a vivid and dynamic interaction in the given context.

Excerpt 6.14 Host’s joke in reported speech (Seasoned Dried Pollack)
[male host: S.-H. Park, female chef: Kim]

22  H: 근데 [그게. 참: 눈치없는 행동(이에요.
23  C: [으. [으:::흐흐흐 ((laughs loudly))

24  H: 에::: 맛없[어도.
25  C: ((looks at the host))
26  [그러면 밥 못 익어 먹어=.
27  H: =못 익어먹어요:::::: (0.3)
28  C: [으흐흐(laughs))
29  H: >그리고< 맛있었다 맛있었다 그래야지,
30  더 [>맛있게 만들려< [노력하지.
31  C: [으::::[으:::
32  H: ((looks at the camera))
33  .hhh [너는 맛이 [없네,
34  C: [맛야.
35  H: 우리 >어머니는 잘 만들었었는데 [그러면<
C: (맞아:)

H: ((looks at the other side and makes a face))
네어머니하고 그렇게 왜나한테 왔어 그러구.

C: [예:::

H: ((sticks his index finger while putting on the other hand on the waist))
그게:::?하:::참:::?그렇게 [그걸 못해:.]

C: [예:::

H: ((sticks out his finger again, put both hands on the waist, and looks at the chef))
나는 탁:::::가면 진짜 잘할 수 있는데:::=

C: [에:::

H: 아:::::이::::: 너무 맛있어 보이네요..hhhh

H: kuntey [kukey. cham: nwunchi eps-nun hayngtong]-iyey-ya.
but that thing really sense not-be-RL behavior-CP-POL
Yes, but it is a very senseless behavior.

C: [u. [u:::huhuhu ((laughs loudly))]

Yeah.

H: ey::: maseps-[eto.
SF not tasty-though
Yeah, even though it is not delicious,

C: (looks at the host)

[kulemyen pap mos ete mek-e=.
then meal not receive eat-INT
Then, he will not get food.

H: =mos ete mek-eyo::::<. (0.3)
not receive eat-POL
He will not get food.

C: [uhuhu ((laughs))

and delicious-PLN delicious-PLN be so-must-NOM

H: te >masisskey mantullye< nolyekha-ci.
more deliciously make try-NOM
If he says that the food is delicious, then the wife will try to make even more delicious dishes.

C: [u:::]

Yeah.

H: ((looks at the camera))
If he says that his wife's cooking is not delicious,

C: [mac-a. right-INT] Exactly.

And if he says that his mom's cooking is better,

C: [mac-a. right-INT] Exactly.

Then the wife would say, “you should have married your mom then. Why did you marry me?”

C: [yey:::] Yes

Yeah but a man does not learn how to treat his wife.

C: [ey:::] Yes.

Anyway, men who have wives do not know how to treat them right. I think I will treat my wife very well once I do get married.

C: =ey::: Yes.

Wow! This looks so delicious.
In Excerpt 6.14 the host and the chef agree that married men are often insensitive to their wives, criticizing their wives’ cooking by comparing it to that of their mothers that they are accustomed to. Smiling, the chef looks up at the host when she makes a joke that grumpy men will not get food if they continue to complain in line 26, which is marked with –e/a form. The shifts to –e/a form by the chef will be analyzed further in Section 7.3.3. The host strongly agrees with the chef by repeating the phrase mos ete mek-eyo (‘will not get food’) in line 27. Encouraged by the chef’s big laughter, he explains how men should behave in front of their wives if they want their wives to cook better in lines 29-30. Looking at the camera, the host starts acting as an insensitive husband in lines 33 and 35. And then in lines 37-38, while looking at the other side of the studio, he abruptly switches from his role as the husband to the role of his wife, who is angry with her husband. When the host acts as the angry wife, his utterances in reported speech in line 38 are marked with –e/a form.

Even though the chef automatically gives a backchannel response to the host in line 39, the host continues to show his playful behavior as a comedian. After 0.7 seconds of a short pause, during which he waits for more reaction from the chef, he criticizes the men who do not know how to treat their wives in an exaggerated manner and wags his index finger at the camera, pretending as if there were those men right right in front of him in lines 41-42. He continues to criticize them, while arguing that he will treat his wife very well once he gets married in lines 45-46. His bragging comment that he will be a good husband seems to be targeted at the chef because he asks a couple of times if she has a daughter during the show. Even though the host tries hard to get the chef’s attention, she keeps filling the jar with seasoned dried Pollack without much response other than the automatic backchanneling. Having failed to have the chef
participate in the interaction with him, the host comes back to his primary role as the show host and evaluates the seasoned dried Pollack in a jar, employing the default form in line 48.

In this excerpt, the host shifts to –e/a form three times in lines 38, 42, and 45. The first occurrence of the style shift to –e/a form takes place in a reported speech when the host acts out as the wife who gets mad at husband’s tactless act. This occurrence is similar to the cases in Excerpt 6.13 in that the host strategically uses the style shifts to –e/a form in order to give vividness and interactional feature of his acting. The other two times that the shifts occur are when he brags about the fact that he will be a good husband. The –e/a marking in lines 42 and 45 was not directly targeted at the chef who is the only ratified addressee of the cooking show. However, the host seems to make the utterances in order to show his charming points as a desirable husband, while being conscious of the chef or TV audience as the addressee. And his playful manner of –e/a marking utterance signals that he is still in acting mode and the context is easily interpreted as a play or a joke.

6.3.6 Summarization

Summarizing what the chef has mentioned in cooking demonstration is the most primary communicative functions of style shifts to the plain forms in the host’s utterances in Japanese TV cooking shows. Summarization rarely occurs in the Korean host’s utterances and it is realized with –eyo/ayo forms when it does occur in the Korean data.

Excerpt 6.15 Green Tea Pound Cake

[male host: Kintoo, female chef: Ueda]

01 ((both look at the soaked gelatin sheets in a sieve))
H: kore:(.) kichinto:(0.2) mizu o::: (0.2) kitte iota hoo [ga.
this surely water AC drain way NM

C: /hai.
Yes.

H: ii wake [desu ne?
good reason DESU FP
You need to drain the gelatin sheets well, right?

C: [ano:::
well surely sieve with strain

H: ((puts the gelatin sheets into a warm liquid))

C: [ha::i:] ja:: kono mizu o ki-tta (0.2) itazerachin o?(0.2)
yes well this water AC drain-PST gelatin sheet AC

((looks down at the stove to check if the heat is turned off))

H: e:::
Yeah, pour the gelatin into the pan, like this.

C: kanarazu(.) hi wa tomete [okimasu ne?:
certainly heat TC turn off put-MASU FP
It is important that the heat is turned off.

→ H: [kanarazu(.) hi wa tomeru(.) hai.
certainly heat TC turn off-PLN yes
Yes, indeed.

C: ((stirs the gelatin in the pan))

soshite(.) zerachin ga::: (0.5) tokeru no 'o'
and gelatin NM dissolve NOM AC
And let the gelatin dissolve by stirring.

Oh, that's right. Gelatin dissolves in a warm liquid.

Yes, that's right.

Yes.

When the gelatin is completely dissolved, cool the liquid in a bowl of ice water.

Yes.

In the process of making green tea jello, the host confirms with the chef about a cooking point that water needs to be completely removed from the soaked gelatin in the sieve in lines 02 and 04. While repeating the point, the chef gives further instruction to put them in a warm liquid in lines 05-07. Then the host who is holding the sieve adds the gelatin sheets into the warm green tea. The chef’s instruction toward the host in lines 06-07 is made indirectly with the sentence final particle ね that is often used to seek agreement or alignment of the addressee.

Meanwhile, as he pours the gelatin sheets into the pan, the host brings up another cooking point that the heat needs to be turned off in line 11, which has not been mentioned in the chef’s
previous instruction. Immediately, the chef gives confirmational backchanneling in line 12 overlapping with the host’s line 11, in which the critical information confirmed by the chef is shared with the audience. Acknowledging the importance of the information brought up by the host initially, the chef reconfirms the significance of the information in line 14 by emphasizing it with the adverb kanarazu (‘certainly’). Accordingly, the host repeats the essential point of the chef’s utterance, employing the plain form kanarazu hi wa tomeru (‘Yes, the heat needs to be turned off.’) in line 15 where the shifts to the plain form occur.

While continuing to give instruction of how to speed up dissolving process in lines 18-19, the chef continues to stir the gelatin in the pan. Immediately in lines 20-21, the host displays his understanding of why the chef is stirring the warm green tea. During 1.6 seconds of a pause, the camera zooms in on the pan in which the chef continues to stir the green tea to make the gelatin to dissolve quickly. The first word hai in the host’s summarizing turn in line 24, which is said after the pause, is not a reply to a question, but a signal that the host is ready to play a managerial role as the show host. The host employs the plain form tokeru (‘dissolve’) and mazeru (‘stir’) when he summarizes the essential points of the procedure the chef has demonstrated so far. Without any reactive utterance to the host’s summary, the chef gives the next instruction of cooling the liquid.

In the excerpt, the host switches to the plain form three times in lines 15, 24, and 25. The first occurrence of the shift to the plain form tomeru in line 15 is more noticeable because the style shift to the plain form occurs when the host repeats the same phrase in which the chef employs –desu/masu form. In the same line where the first style shift to plain form occurs, the host’s utterance ends up with hai, indicating that the activity is finished. In lines 24-25, the second and third style shifts to the plain form occur when the host summarizes the key points of
the chef’s cooking demonstration, also displaying that the activity is finished. It is intriguing to know that the plain forms are employed in the final turn of an activity and convey significant information. The host does not expect reactive utterance from the chef because he foregrounds the informative content by using the plain form instead of being conscious of the ratified addressee (Cook, 1998; Okamoto, 1997; Saito, 2010). The host obtains the strategic result of conveying critical information in an objective and neutral manner to the unseen audience by shifting to the plain form without using honorific markers that tend to highlight the relationship between interlocutors, and in turn that may dilute the importance of the conveyed information.

6.4 Chapter summary

Through a more detailed micro-analytic qualitative analysis, I have presented that the host shifts to –ta, –e/a, or the plain form in order to achieve communicative functions. In this chapter, six distinguished communicative functions of style shifts found in the host’ utterances are presented: 1) spontaneous response, 2) evaluation, 3) checking or confirming the information, 4) joke, 5) reported speech, and 6) summarizing. The first three functions of the style shifts in the host utterances appear in both cultures, whereas the last three functions occur only one of each culture. The Korean host utilizes the style shift to –ta or –e/a forms in making a joke or storytelling in a reported speech, whereas the Japanese host employs the naked plain form in summarizing what the chef has previously mentioned.

The Japanese host’s shift to the naked plain form in his summarization is similar to the chef’s shift to the naked plain form in the demonstration of his expertise, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 7. The employment of the naked plain form is to foreground the content
conveyed by the lack of interactional feature of the non-naked plain form utilized in other functions of speech style shifts. On the other hand, the Korean chef’s employment of –ta or –e/a forms in making a joke and storytelling in a reported speech creates a quite different interactional environment, where the host displays an indexical meaning of a solidarity and intimacy toward the chef through the style shifts.
CHAPTER 7

CHEF’S STYLE SHIFT TO NON-HONORIFIC LEVEL:
USE OF -TA, -E/A FORMS IN KOREAN AND PLAIN FORMS IN JAPANESE

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will analyze the chef’s speech style shifts to non-honorific levels, –ta, –e/a forms in Korean and the plain forms in Japanese. Like the preceding analysis of the host’s utterances in Chapter 6, –eyo/ayo forms and –desu/masu forms are the default in chef’s utterances in TV cooking show discourse. Also, the chef sporadically switches the default form to non-honorific speech styles (e.g. –ta, –e/a form in Korean and the plain form in Japanese) in order to achieve discursive goals in a given situation.

Six distinguished communicative functions of style shifts to non-honorific levels found in the chefs’ utterances will be presented with the excerpts from a comparative perspective between Korean and Japanese chefs who have the same role but have different language cultures.

7.2 Default speech style: –eyo/ayo and –desu/masu forms

According to the result of the frequency counts, –eyo/ayo form and –desu/masu form are the default in the chef’s utterances (see Tables 7.1 and 7.2). Similar to the frequency counts of the host’s utterances, the distribution ratio of –desu/masu form in the chef’s utterances is much higher than that of the default –eyo/ayo form because –supnita form takes a share of the honorific usage.

Note that Korean the chef also utilizes more –supnita form in tasting frame than in cooking demonstrations like the Korean host. The chef does not have to play the role of a leading speaker
in tasting frame, so s/he produces less utterances than the host who gives more –sunita marking formulaic explanations regarding the table setting of the day and the formal report on food taste to TV audience. In response to the host’s presentational stance of playing his role as the show host by encoding his utterances with –supnita forms, the chef also creates the presentational mode using more –sunita forms in tasting frames.

Table 7.1 Frequency counts for each ending in cooking demonstrations in the chefs’ utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Korean Chef (971 tokens)</th>
<th>Japanese Chef (1403 tokens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-supnita</td>
<td>-e/ayo -e/a -ta others</td>
<td>-desu/masu plain form others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>752 18 11 118</td>
<td>1298 25 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>77.5% 1.9% 1.1% 11.1%</td>
<td>92.5% 1.8% 5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 Frequency counts for each ending in food tastings in the chefs’ utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Korean Chef (78 tokens)</th>
<th>Japanese Chef (69 tokens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-supnita</td>
<td>-e/ayo -e/a -ta others</td>
<td>-desu/masu plain form others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>54 2 0 9</td>
<td>61 1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>69.2% 2.6% 0% 11.5%</td>
<td>88.4% 1.5% 10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Chef’ shift to –ta, –e/a forms in Korean and the plain forms in Japanese

In the chef’s utterances, six main communicative functions of the style shifts to non-honorific levels are revealed: 1) professional knowledge demonstration, 2) opinion, 3) warning, 4) reported speech, 5) evaluation, and 6) soliloquy. In particular, the most typical pattern shown in both Korean and Japanese chefs’ utterances is the shift to non-honorific forms occurring when the chef demonstrates professional knowledge by giving informative explanation on ingredients or cooking tricks. The professional knowledge demonstration by the Japanese chef is encoded
with the naked plain form without affect keys such as sentence final particles or vowel lengthening (Cook, 2008a; S. Maynard, 1993). The similar demonstration by the Korean chef is also marked with –*ta* forms, carrying out exactly same communicative function as that of the Japanese chef. It should be noted that the Korean chef’s demonstration as of his knowledge is always marked by –*ta* forms, known as the detached ‘neutral style’ (H. S. Lee, 1991; Sohn, 1999), which is also used in writing. On the other hand, –*e/a* form is only used in the chef’s opinion-expressing utterances. Because of the importance of the new information made by the chef, a short or long-stretched acknowledgement marker *a::::::* is often followed by the host. The Korean chef employs both –*ta* forms and –*e/a* forms in expressing an opinion while actively joining the host’s storytelling and adding up more stories to index solidarity with the host through the shifts to non-honorific speech styles. The Japanese chef also employs the plain form in evaluating what the host has made in cooking demonstration in order to index solidarity with the host. The Korean chef uses the –*ta* form to show intimate stance toward the host through a reported speech in storytelling, but the Japanese chef never produces a non-task-oriented talk like storytelling.

### 7.3.1 Expert knowledge demonstration

The chef’s professional knowledge is delivered by the utterances marked with –*ta* forms in the Korean data and the naked plain form in the Japanese data. The following four excerpts show similar functions occurring in two different cultures.

**Excerpt 7.1** Radishi Green Kalbi Soup

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: Jung]
C: 그런데 여기서도 또 비법이 있어요.
H: 어떤 비법이 [있습니까].
C: (smiles) 네 최고의 요리 비결이니가.
비법을 [알려드려야 겠네요]
H: 네.
C: 시래기 삶거나 삶기를 세 번에 나누어서 할 때.
H: 네.
C: =첫 번째는 :: 콩을 소금물에 삶는다.
H: (0.2) 네.
C: 네. 두 번째는 :: (0.2) 쌀뜨물에 삶는다.
H: 쌀뜨물에요.
C: 네 :: 그 :: 쌀뜨물에 삶으면.
H: [예::::.
C: 그 :: 항기가 날라가거든요.
H: [아:::::
C: 그리고 마지.마지막에는 그냥 맛은 물로만 삶으면서도 됩니다.
H: 오:::

C: kulentey yekisetot to pipep-i iss-eyo.
but here also special tip-NM be-POL
But there is also a special trick here.

H: ette-n pipep-i iss-supni-ka.
what special tip-NM be-DEF-Q
What kind of special trick?

C: (smiles) ney choyko-uy yoli pikyel-i-nikka.
yes best-GN cooking recipe-CP-because
pipep-ul [allyetu-lyeya-"keyss-ney-yo"
special tip-AC inform-will-IE-FP
Well, since the show is called 'Best Cooking Recipes', I will tell you.

C: silayki salmke salm-ki-lul sey pen-ey nanwu-ese ha-l ttag.
dried radish greens boil boil-NOM-AC three times divide-and do-RL time
When you boil dried radish greens three times,

H: ney=
Yes.

C: =ches penccay-nun:: kkulh-nun sokummmwul-ey salm-nunta.
first time-TC boil-RL salt water-in boil-PLN
First, you should boil it in salt water.

H: (0.2) ney.
Yes.
In this excerpt, the chef shows a special trick on how to boil dried radish greens. It is hard to make it soft because dried radish greens originally contain a lot of fiber and is dried for long-term storage. Making an eye contact with the host, the chef lists three steps to make it soft, while employing –ta form in lines 08 and 10. When he gives a detailed explanation in those three steps, the chef utilizes the plain form –ta ending for the first two steps, sokummwul-ey salm-nta (‘boil it in salt water’) and ssalttumwul-ey salm-nta (‘boil it in water that was used to wash rice’), foregrounding the content and emphasizing the information. The trick of boiling dried radish
greens in salt water and then in the water that was used to wash rice is important information in this context because most people usually boil it in just water when cooking with dried vegetables. The host reveals his strong interest in using the water that was used to wash rice in line 11 and as if he had anticipated the question, the chef further explains why he uses that particular water.

When delivering the last step of boiling process, which is not as important as the first two steps, the chef shifts back to the default form –*eyo/ayo* ending in line 18.

It is important to notice that the chef intentionally employs the plain form –*ta* in order to emphasize the significant information about the boiling process, but utilizes the default form –*eyo/ayo* for less significant information.

Let’s take a look at the shift to the naked plain form by the chef in the Japanese cooking shows.

**Excerpt 7.2** Seafood Pilaf

[female host: Murakami, male chef: Sawaguchi]

01 C:  

02 H: moo arakajime awasete oku n desu ne? (0.4) already in advance mix NOM DESU FP  

*Fresh cream and egg yoke need to be mixed before they are put in the sauce, right?*

03 C: >soo desu. soo desu.< (0.3) kimi dake::: iremasu to. (0.2) so DESU so DESU SF egg yoke only add-MASU if  

*That’s right. It is because egg yoke tends to clot without fresh cream.*

04 H: [a:::::::]

05 H: Oh, I see.

06 → C: ano::: nama kuriimu de::: nobashite ageru. (1.0) soo suru to::?

*SF whipped cream with dilute-PLN so do if*

07 [e::: tama ga deki-nai n desu ne::=

*SF bubble NM make-Neg NOM DESU FP*

*Well, if you dilute the yoke with fresh cream, you won’t get any egg yoke bubbles.*
H: [e:::] =e:::
   Really.
Oh.

C: e:::
Yeah.

[0.8] ((keeps stirring the sauce))

H: a. sarani koo nanka noodo ga tsu-ita yoona::: (0.4)
oh additionally like this DM concentration NM get-PST seem
sonna kanji desu [ne:::]
like that feeling DESU FP
Oh, also it seems as though the sauce is getting thicker as well.

C: [soo desu ne:::]
   so DESU FP
   That’s right.

[5.3] ((keeps stirring the sauce with a spatula))

ato wa::? e::::::: (1.2)
next TC uhm
Next, um.

H: sa:::<kore ga::? (0.8) mo:::rune soosu to iu.>=
Then, this NM Mornay sauce QT say
Then, this is what is called Mornay sauce.

C: =>soo desu. ‘soo desu.’< (0.6)
   so DESU so DESU
 e::::::: edamu chiizu to? (0.5) ran:::oo ga:::. hitte?:
   uhm Edam cheese and egg yoke add
   That’s right. If you add Edam cheese and egg yoke,

H: e.
Yeah.

C: [e::::::: kondo:::. nanae ga morune soosu to [narimasu ne?]
   uhm this time name NM Mornay sauce QT become-MASU FP
   You get this sauce called Mornay.

H: [e:::] [e:::::::]
   [e:::::::]
I see.
Oh!

C: kore wa moo guratan sen:::yoo no soosu to iwate. e. (0.5)
   this TC already gratin exclusive GN sauce QT called yes
   This sauce is especially used for gratin.

H: a.(.)
Oh.

C: totemo koku no aru. (0.5)
   really rich flavor GN have-PLN
   It has a really rich flavor.
In Excerpt 7.2, the chef is in the process of making Mornay sauce particularly used for making gratin. While stirring the yellow sauce in the pan, the chef adds the mixture of whipped cream and egg yoke to the sauce. The host points out that the whipped cream and the egg yoke need to be mixed before they are put in the sauce in line 02. While giving a backchannel response to the host’s question, the chef further explains the reason why he has mixed two ingredients before putting them in the sauce in lines 03-04. Immediately after the host’s long-stretched acknowledgement marker in line 05, the chef continues to demonstrate his professional knowledge for the procedure in lines 06-07. When he expresses his trick of diluting the yoke with fresh cream in line 06, the chef switches to the plain form – te ageru. After one second of a pause, however, the chef gives a justifying explanation by employing the default form in line 07.

The chef continues to stir the sauce during 5.3 seconds of a long pause and tries to give the following instruction while searching for the word by saying, ‘next, um..’ in line 15. However, the host interrupts the chef’s pause and guides him to provide the detailed information about the sauce. When the host asks if it becomes Mornay sauce in line 16, she stretches syllables of her utterance at a slower pace, probably because she not only wants to mitigate the weight of an FTA but also wants to give the chef a chance to explain Mornay sauce. The host’s stretching of the syllables at a slower pace and the high-pitched rising intonation give an impression that she is trying to smoothly induce him to provide information at the right time.
Accordingly, the chef first gives a backchannel response to the host’s question again in line 17 and as an expert, he provides the detailed information that Edam cheese and egg yoke need to be added to in order to call it a Mornay sauce in lines 18 and 20. Encouraged by the host’s acknowledge marker e::: with a rising intonation that displays the host’s interests in his detailed explanation, the chef continues to give further information about the sauce in lines 22 and 24. In line 24, where the chef adds more explanation about the rich flavor of the sauce, the chef switches to plain form. In Japanese cooking show discourse data, the host’s summarizing and the chef’s explaining turns are often marked by the plain form, foregrounding the ‘content’ itself while playing their major roles as the host and the chef. Although they are on a public stage in a presentational mode, they momentarily background the consciousness of ‘thou’ in order to focus on the information they carry.

The following excerpt illustrates another example of a Korean chef demonstrating his expertise by employing –ta forms.

**Excerpt 7.3** Pineapple Tiramisu

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: J.-H. Park]

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>C: 여기 이제 지금:: 음:: 준비되어 있는::: (.) 치즈가 뭐 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>아:: 마:스카르뽀::네 치즈예요. (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>((shows Mascarpone cheese on a sieve))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>H: ((in an exaggerated foreign accent)) 음::: 마::스카르뽀::네:::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>C: 네 마스카르뽀네 치즈라고 이탈리아의.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>크림치::즈로:: 아주 대::표적[인:::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>H: [아::::::::::.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>C: 어 그런:: 치즈죠.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>H: [아::::: 이게요:::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C: 네::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>H: [마스카:::::::] 마스카라? 치즈? (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>C: [(chuckles)] [마:스:카르::뽀::네:::] &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>H: [(also chuckles)] [마스카르::뽀::네:::] &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>C: [포네::::::: 예::::::: (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>&gt; 아 워 이름까지 아실 [필은 없고&lt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The cheese that we have prepared here is Mascarpone.

Yes. It is called Mascarpone, a representative Italian cheese.
In Excerpt 7.3, the chef introduces a special Italian cheese called, *mascarpone*, which is a crucial ingredient for making *tiramisu*. When it is introduced, the host playfully repeats the name with an exaggerated foreign accent in line 05. Without any reaction, the chef continues to explain the cheese, so the host tries again to show his playful side by associating the unfamiliar name of the cheese with the word ‘mascara,’ which is an eye cosmetics item, and pretends that he cannot properly recall the name of the cheese in line 11. Then the chef reacts to his second attempt at making a joke by chuckling and tries to enunciate each syllable of the name without losing her control to give the proper information on the cheese in line 12. Satisfied with the chef’s reaction, the host repeats the name again in a normal way with a controlled demeanor, cooperating with the chef.

In line 16, however, as a continuing, yet different, part of her reaction to the host’s joke, the chef displays her authority as an expert, mentioning to the host that he does not need to know the
exact name and continues to explain the cheese. If you only take the propositional meaning, the chef’s comment can sound rude and inappropriate between those who are in responsible roles on a public stage. However, she strategically uses the subject honorific marker –usi– in order to reduce the weight of the FTA and quickly moves to her explanation on the cheese, which is interrupted due to the unexpected joke of the host. In addition to the subject honorific marker used in line 16, the previous playful banter in lines 11-13 right before the chef’s harsh-sounding comment helps the chef’s FTA in line 16 to sound less rude and inappropriate.

Out of his playful mode, the host co-constructs the utterance in line 19, cooperating with the chef who finally starts again to give detailed information in line 18. When the chef considers what was said by the host to be insufficient in line 19, she adds further information in lines 20-21, where her display of knowledge as an expert on the ingredient is marked with the –ta form in line 21. The acknowledgement marker aa:: by the host in line 22 as a response to the chef’s full definition about the cheese demonstrates the host’s multiple participant roles of a novice/student and a host, reinforcing the chef’s authority over the information conveyed.

The host, who made his debut as a comedian, changes his footing and displays two different identities: one as the show host and the other as the comedian. As the host, he is very cooperative with the chef, acknowledging the chef’s professional knowledge in lines 10 and 22. He also presents his comedian identity by acting in a playful mode in lines 05 and 12, where he utters incomplete sentences that can possibly be considered the same as the plain level without –yo.

On the other hand, when the chef first introduces the cheese in line 03 she employs the default –eyo/ayo form and when she mentions it a second time, she uses –cyo in line 09. The committal –ci of the combined form –cyo emphasizes the information the speaker conveys. The
chef’s authoritative status over the information as an expert is most represented with the –ta marking in line 21 when the chef finally gives the full information on the cheese.

Excerpt 7.4 Seafood Pilaf
[female host: Murakami, male chef: Sawaguchi]

01 H: um::: (1.0) suko::::::shi iro ga arimasu ne::::::?:
SF a little color NM exist-MASU FP
Um, the brown rice has a little bit of color.

02 C: [soo desu ne. (0.8)]
so DESU FP

03 cho::tto:::::: ano:::::::: nioi mo suru n desu kedomo.=
SF smell also do NOM DESU but
That’s right. Brown rice also has a bit of a smell, but,

04 H: =e:::::::
Yeah.

05 → C: ano:: tomato beusu de (0.3) kono nioi ga:::(0.5) hotondo kanjirarenaku naru.
SF tomato base by this smell NM almost taste-cannot become
Well, tomato sauce can remove this smell.

06 H: a:::::::
Oh, I see.

07 C: /hai.
Yes.

Excerpt 7.4 also illustrates the chef’s providing professional knowledge in the plain form. The chef is scooping rice with a rice paddle, which is used for cooking Seafood Pilaf. The host points out the yellowish color of the brown rice in a careful manner with stretched sound on the second mora of sukosi (‘a little’) in order to reduce the confrontational degree of the challenging comment in line 01. The host’s concern is that the yellowish color of the brown rice might be an unfavorable feature for children. The use of the sentence-final particle ne that indicates the speaker’s seeking interactional agreement is also considered as a mitigation purpose by the host. Immediately agreeing with the host’s concern about the negative feature of the brown rice, the
chef even brings up another concerning factor, the smell of the brown rice, and emphasizes how the tomato sauce can efficiently remove the smell in line 05, where he shifts to the plain form kanjirarenaku naru. The acknowledgment marker a::::: with stretched sound is also followed in reaction to the chef’s demonstration of his professional knowledge, indicating the host’s multiple participant roles as a novice/student and the host.

The following four excerpts, all drawn from the Korean cooking shows, illustrate the cases where the Korean chef switches to –ta or –e/a forms to express an opinion to the host’s storytelling, to give an instructive warning, and to deliver a reported speech.

7.3.2 Opinion

Excerpt 7.5 Pepper and Eggplant

[male host: S.-H. Park, female chef: Kim]

01 H: 어머니. 그:: 내”가” 요번 주에 방송했는데,
02     [그 요리가 너무 좋더라고 그러면<,
03 C: [으::
04 H: 우리어머니”가” 벌써 뻗어요.
05 C: [으:: (0.2)
06 H: 왜가지고 [나도 봤다] 예::
07 C: [그렇지요] 아드님들은::: 뭐::: 아드님이 하니까.
08 얼마나 관심 있겠어요: [그지요::?
09 H: [음: (0.7)
10 C: [부모는::.
11 H: [”관심은 없으신 것 같애요”.
12 C: 부모님이?
13 H: 네:::::: (0.8)
14 C: ‘왜::::: 관심 있었지:::”
15 H: [왜냐면 제가 좀 참견했거든요=  
16 C: [음: (0.7)
17 H: 주방에 가서 (0.4) 어머니:::=
18 C: [음: (0.7)
19 H: [이거 이렇게 하하시는 게 아네::::::]
20 C: ((looks at the host)) [이럼 안된다.
21 H: ((looks at a camera to mimic his mom))
22 C: [그러니까 우리 어머니까].
23 C: [안된다]
H: [(looks around staff while mimicking)]

흐:: 너 이::: (0.3) 너 [이녀석 (.)

H: (turns his gaze toward the chef])

니네 아버지도 안 하던:::::: 어::디 주방에서,

참 [건을 하나고 [너 이담에 웬.

C: [조금 안 [다고.

H: [내가 웬.

C: [으:::

H: :니네 아버지도 안 하던::::: 어:

디 주방에서,참

견을 하냐고 [너 이담에

고 what.

C: 조금 안 [이라고.

H: 내가 웬.

C: [으:: (0.2)

H: emeni. ku::: nay-"ka"yopen cvu-ey pangsonghay-ss-nunyey,
Mom SF I-NM this week broadcast-PST-and

\[>ku yoli-ka nemwu coh-te-lako kule-myen<\,
that cooking-NM really good-RT-QT say-if

Whenever I tell my mother that the cooking recipes in the show that I hosted last
week were very good,

C: [u::]
Yeah.

H: wuli emeni-"ka" pelsse pwa-ss-eyo.
we Mom-NM already watch-PST-POL
She has already seen it.

C: e:: (0.2)
Yeah.

H: pwa kaci-ko [na-to pwa-ss-ta] yay:::
watch-and I-also watch-PST-PLN
She tells me that she already watched it.

C: [kuleh-ciya] atu-nim-tul-un:: mwe:: atu-nim-i ha-nikka.
yes-POL son-HT-PL-TC DM son- -NM do-because

elmana kwansim iss-keyss-eyo: [ku-ciya::?
how much interest be-will-POL yes-POL
Of course. Your mom must be very interested in the show since it is her son doing it,
right?

H: [um: (0.7)
Hmm.

C: [pwumo-nun::]
Parents-TC
Parents..
H: ['kwansim-un eps-usi-n kes kath-ayo'.
Interest-TC not-be-SH-RL thing seem-POL
My parents don’t seem to care too much.

C: pwumo-nim-i?
parents-NM
Your parents?

H: ney:::  (0.8)
Yes.

C: 'way::: kwansim iss-keyss-[ci::'`
no interest be-will-NOM
Why? I am sure They care.

H: [waynymyen ce-ka com chamkyenhay-ss-ketun-yo=
because I(hum.)-NM little interfere-PST-IE-POL
It’s because I once interfered her.

C: =ey
Yeah.

H: cwupang-ey ka-se (0.4) emeni:: =
 kitchen-in go-and Mom

C: =u.
Hm.

H: [ike ilehkey ha-si-nun key anyey-]
this thing this way do-SH-RL thing not
When I went to the kitchen and told my mother, “That’s not how you should do
that.”

C: ((looks at the host)) [ilem antoy-nta.
like this must not-PLN
“You must not do it like this.”

H: ((looks at the camera to mimic his mom))

C: [kulenikka wuli emeni-ka ].
then we Mom-NM
Then, my mom said.

C: [antoy-nta]
must not-PLN
You must not.

H: ((looks around staff while mimicking))

C: hu:: ne i:: (0.3) ne [i nyesek,]
SF you this you this kid
Huh? you little brat.
Excerpt 7.5 is a continuing interaction of Excerpt 6.12. When the host tells the chef that, even before he could mention the show to his mother, she has already watched it in line 04, the
chef overlaps the host’s utterances in lines 06 and 07, claiming that his mother is surely interested in the son’s show by utilizing the seeking agreement form –ciyo, which is the combination of a committal –ci and –yo ending. Contrary to her expectation, when the host softly replies that his parents do not seem to care for what he is doing in line 11, the chef stops herself from responding further and checks what he was really trying to say. After 0.8 seconds of a short pause followed by the host’s disagreement to the chef’s claim, she changes her tone of voice into a whispering sound so that the TV audiences do not hear her response. The whispering tone of her voice and the use of –ci ending without –yo indicate her change of footing from a guest chef to a caring mother toward the young male host.

In line 16, the host goes back to the story of what happened with her mother and reveals that he bothered his mother in the kitchen, even though cooking is not his expertise. Though the host’s acting of his mother begins in line 18, the continuing utterance by the host in line 20 overlaps with the chef’s cooperative remark ilem antoy-nta (‘you must not do it like this’) in line 21. Because the chef’s co-participation in acting was not clearly delivered in her first try due to the overlap of utterances, she repeats the phrase antoy-nta again in line 24. Emeni, an address term for ‘mother’, said by the host in a loud and vivid voice in line 18, becomes a contextualization cue to make the chef to look up at the host and to co-participate in acting with him. The host’s mimicking his mother continues in the following lines in an animated and exaggerated manner. Upon the host’s playful facial expressions and vivid voice, the chef ends up giggling, while giving him an agreeable remark at the same time.

The chef’s opinion of the host’s meddling attitude toward his mother in the kitchen is encoded with –ta form in the previous excerpt. The following excerpt presents the chef’s shifts to –e/a form in a reported speech.
Excerpt 7.6  Pepper and Eggplant

[male host: S.-H. Park, female chef: Kim]

12  H:  아. 물론 저도::: 어머니 거 먹을 때.
13  C:  (laughs)  [u:::]
14  H:  어머니 게 힐:::선 제가 >갖있다고 하는데<.
15  C:  [예::::: 그럼요.
16  H:  >제가 여기서 먹어보면<.
17  C:  [그리고]  선생님 게 맞있[어요.
18  H:  [그리서]  [결혼하면은(.)
19  C:  [예::::: 흐흐חק ((laughs loudly))
20  H:  아::: 맞없[어요.
21  C:  (looks at the host)
22  H:  [그러면 밥 못 얻어 먹어=.
23  C:  [으흐흐 (laughs))
24  H:  >그리고< 맞있다 맞았다 그래야지,
25  C:  [으:::::]
26  H:  [이해없(어도).
27  C:  (looks at the host)
28  H:  [그러면 멍 못 얻어 먹어=.
29  C:  =못 얻어먹어요:::::::::: (0.3)
30  H:  >웃 아::: (laughs))
31  C:  [으흐흐 ((laughs loudly))
32  H:  >그리고< 맞있다 맞았다 그래야지.
33  C:  [으:::::]
34  H:  [이해없(어도).
35  C:  (looks at the camera)
36  H:  [맞아.
37  C:  [맞아.

12  H:  a. mwullon ce-{to::: eumeni ke mek-ul ttay.}
     surely  I(hum.)-also Mom thing eat-RL time
13  C:  (laugh))  [u:::]
     Yeah.

14  H:  eumeni key hwel:::ssin cey-ka  >masiss-ko ha-nuntey<.
     Mom thing far  I(hum.)-NM delicious-PLN-and do-but
     Of course. Whenever I taste my mother’s food, I always tell her it tastes much more
delicious.
15  C:  [yey:::::: kulem-yo.
     yes agree-POL
     Yes. Of course.
16  H:  >cey-ka yeke re mekopo-myen<.
     I(hum.)-NM here eat-if
17  H:  [hwaksili] sensayng-nim key masiss-[eyo.
     surely chef-HT thing delicious-POL
     Whenever I taste food here, your cooking is definitely more delicious.
So when a man gets married, he always tells his wife that his mom’s cooking is more delicious. It is because he got accustomed to it.

Yes, but it is a very senseless behavior.

Then, he will not get food.

If he says that his wife’s cooking is not delicious,

If he says that the food is delicious, then the wife will try to make even more delicious dishes.
Excerpt 7.6 overlaps with Excerpt 6.14 and Excerpt 7.8. In this excerpt, the chef’s shift to –e/a form in lines 20, 26, 34 and 36 will be the focus of the analysis. Agreeing with the host’s strategic verbal behavior toward his mother, the chef provides her opinion on why married men often complain that their mothers’ cooking is better than that of their wives. She looks up at the host to make eye contact and explains that men have been accustomed to their mothers’ cooking for a long time in line 20. She raises her voice employing –e/a form and elongating the last syllable lay:... to emphasize. Additionally, encouraged with a strong support from the host, she looks up at the host again and makes a joke that grumpy men will not get food if they continue to complain in line 26, which is also marked with –e/a form. Immediately, the host takes up the chef’s joke as a sign to demonstrate his playful character and acts in an even more exaggerated manner. The chef is filling a jar with seasoned dried Pollack at the moment but she keeps making an agreeable response to the host when the host takes over the floor and starts acting from line 29. The chef’s backchanneling is formulated in –e/a form in lines 34 and 36 though it may have been produced automatically.

The interesting part of the shifts to –e/a form by the chef in this excerpt is that –e/a marked utterance is directly uttered to the host. It is noticeable that the chef consciously looks up at the host, making eye contact with him whenever she produces –e/a form. Otherwise, she looks down to fill a jar with seasoned dried Pollack. With the playful manner of both interactants and the
loud laughter, the chef’s employment of the intimate speech style –e/a form in the given context is not seen as a lack of politeness; instead, it creates an indexical meaning of solidarity and intimacy.

The following excerpt displays another function of style shift to –e/a form in the chef’s utterances in the Korean cooking shows.

7.3.3 Warning

Excerpt 7.7 Sesame Leaf Noodle
[male host: S.-H. Park, female chef: Kim]

01 C: [그래가지고 인자. 저. 위생봉지 주시겠어요?
02 H: [xxx]
03 C: [요거요거.
04 H: {(opens a plastic bag for the chef)}
05 C: [열어놓고 있었어요 "선생님".}
06 C: {(holds the plastic bag with one hand)}
07 →예::<(holds the plastic bag open)
08 H: [요거를]
09 C: 여어 가지고 냉장고에::<(put the dough into the bag)
10 H: "음".
11 C: 다 상해니까::<.
12 H: 오.
13 C: 냉장고에 밀여어놓으면 지질로 어울려요.
14 (1.1)
15 H: 지가::<.
16 C: 음::<. 지가 어울려 안 어울려지고 되나::<.
17 H: 어 배기지 못해죠.
18 C: [이기. 오 이기 지금은 좀 된 거 같에도.
19 왜냐면 칼국수는 반죽이 좀 돼야 되거든요.
20 H: 야::<.
21 →C: 그래야 되기 때문에 처음부터(0.2) 녹으면:: 안 돼::<. (0.3)
22 H: 어::<. 녹는다는 게 너무 질이면 안 된다는.
23 →C: [이?: 젤으면 안 돼::<. ((laughs))

01 C: [kulaykaci-ko inca. ce. wisayngpongci cwu-si-keyss{-eye?
02 H: [(xxx)

Then, now could you pass me that plastic bag?
C: [yey:.]
   Yes.

H: ((opens a plastic bag for the chef))

C: [yele noh-ko iss-ess-eyo >"sensayng-nim".]
   open-and be-PST-POL chef-HT
   I had it open, Chef.

→ C: ((holds the plastic bag with one hand))

H: [yoke-lul
   this thing-AC
   This.

C: yee kaci-ko nayngcango-ey:. ((put the dough into the bag))
   put into-and refrigerator-in
   Put it in the bag and keep it in the refrigerator.

H: ‘um’.
   Hmm.

C: ta sanghay-nikka::.
   all go-bad-because
   Or else it will go bad.

H: a.
   Oh.

C: nayngcango-ey ttak yee noh-umyen cicello ewullecy-eyo.
   refrigerator-in just put into-if naturally agglomerate-POL
   If you put it in the refrigerator, the dough agglomerates naturally.

(1.1)

H: ci-ka::i
   that thing-NM
   The dough.

C: u::::. ci-ka ewulle: an ewulleci-ko toy-na:::
   yes that thing-NM agglomerate not agglomerate-and become-IE
   Yeah, the dough agglomerates.

H: e payki-ci mos [ha-cyo.
   endure-NOM not do-POL
   Yeah, it cannot help but get blended.

C: [iki. u iki cikum-un com toy-n ke kath-ayto
   this thing this thing now-TC a little stiff-RL thing seem-though
   because chopped noodles dough-NM a little stiff must-because
Although the dough seems to be stiff enough it needs to stiff more because it’s better like that for chopped noodles.

20  
H: a::::
Oh, I see.

21  
C: kulayya toy-ki ttaymwuney cheumpwute (0.2) nwuk-umyen:: antoy-ay:: (0.3)
must become-NOM because from the first soft-if must not-INT
That is why the dough must not be too soft in the beginning.

22  
H: e:: nwuk-nunta-nun key nemwu cil-umyen an toy-nta-nun.
SF soft-PLN-RL thing really watery-if not become-PLN-RL
When you say ‘too soft’ do you mean it can’t be ‘too watery’?

23  
C: [e:: cil-umyen an toy-ay:: ((laughs))
yes watery-if not become-INT
Yeah, it must not too watery.

In the process of making dough for chopped noodles, the chef mixes all the ingredients with flour and asks the host to pass a plastic bag so that she can put the dough into the bag.

Holding the plastic bag with one hand, she puts the dough in the bag, while giving instruction marked with –e/a form in line 07. The chef suggests putting the dough in the bag and keeping it refrigerated because the dough naturally agglomerates inside the bag while kept in the refrigerator.

The chef uses the default –eyo/ayo form in line 13 to wrap up her explanation.

In line 15, however, the host refers to the dough as ci in order to give an animated effect, which is a word often used to indicate a ‘living thing’. The chef immediately uptakes the word ci, treating dough as a living creature in line 16, and ends the utterance with the non-honorific form toyna without –yo. And in lines 18-19, she continues to explain that dough needs to be stiffer because it is better for chopped noodles. This following explanation by the chef is also marked with the non-honorific level –ketun in line 19. After the acknowledgement marker a::: by the host, the chef gives an instructional warning that the dough must not be too soft in the beginning, shifting to the intimate speech style –e/a form in line 21. As the host initiates the repair the meaning of the word nwuk-umyen in line 22, the chef confirms the meaning and self-repairs the
word in trouble by repeating the word *cil-umyen* from the host’s previous utterance, again in –e/a form in line 23. The chef laughs with a bit of embarrassment when she self-corrects the word probably because she unconsciously said a word in her dialect on a public show. Both the chef and the host laugh loudly together for a while until the host finally asks the chef about her hometown.

In this excerpt, the chef uses –eyo/ayo form only twice: once when she asks for the plastic bag in line 01 and the other when she tries to complete the explanation in line 13. Other than these two lines, she uses the non-honorific level at the host. In particular, the chef shifts to –e/a form when she gives instruction in line 07 and instructional light warning in lines 21 and 23.

**7.3.4 Reported speech**

–ta marking in reported speech is also shown in the chef’s utterances in the Korean cooking show discourse.

**Excerpt 7.8** Chef’s reported speech (Seasoned Dried Pollack)

[male host: S.-H. Park, female chef: Kim]

12 아. 물론 저 [도::: 어머니 거 먹을 때.
13 C: ((laughs)) [으::.
14 H: 어머니 게 월::: 셰가 [>맞 있다고 하는데<.
15 C: [예::::::: 그럼요.
16 H: >제가 여기서 먹어보면.<
17 C: [확실히] 선생님 게 맞있어요.
18 C: [그래서] [결혼하면은()]
19  맨::날::: ([) 부인한테 그런’단다’ ((looks at the host))
20  ’엄마 게 더 맞있다’ 그기 길들어져서 그래::::::: ([)
21 H: ((leans forward to the chef))
22 근데 [그게. 참: 눈치없는 행동]이에요.
23 C: [으. [으::흐 хр хр ((laughs loud))
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In this excerpt, the chef is putting the seasoned dried Pollack into a jar, while telling the host to take some home with him so that his mother can taste it. She adds that it is proven to be delicious if his mother finds it delicious after tasting. With her humble assessment on her food, the host stresses that the dish the chef cooked in the studio is actually much more delicious than his mother’s cooking, though he always tells his mother that her cooking is the best. Agreeing
with the strategy of the host’s proper verbal behavior, the chef brings up an example of married men’s improper ways of responding to their wives’ cooking in a reported speech, employing –ta form in lines 19-20. The host immediately aligns with the chef’s opinion in line 22, saying that it is a very insensitive behavior for men to criticize their wives’ cooking. When the chef produces a direct reported speech using –ta form in a soft voice, *emma key te masiss-ta* (‘Mom’s cooking is more delicious’), she momentarily looks up at the host. Staring back at the chef, the host also makes a face displaying his dissatisfaction with men who have poor manners to their wives and leans his upper body forward toward the chef, showing his agreement and intimacy toward the chef. Even though the chef is looking down to grab more seasoned dried Pollack in the bowl, in response to the host’s agreement, the chef bursts into laughter in line 23.

The next two excerpts present the Japanese chef’s style shifts to the plain form to evaluate on what the host has made during the cooking demonstration and to make a soliloquy remark.

### 7.3.5 Evaluation

**Excerpt 7.9** Temarizushi

[male host: Kotoo, male chef: Hoshi]

```
01   H:  ((looks at how temarizushi is being made))
02           a:: soshite:: (0.3)
            And
03   C:  ((puts a rice ball to on the lettuce))
04           >kore mo< ippen nosete:::
            this also one side put on
            Put the rice ball on the lettuce.
05   H:  e:::. (0.6)
            Yeah.
06   C:  ne::¿ (0.9)
            Right?
```
H: um:. (0.6)
  Hmm.

C: ((covers the rice ball with plastic wrap))

  every sides from pull
  Pull each edge of the plastic wrap to cover the rice ball.

C: ((passes the wrapped rice ball to the host))

H: [shihoo kara taguriyose]te.
  every sides from pull
  Pull each edge of the plastic wrap to cover the rice ball.

C: ((passes the wrapped rice ball to the host))

H: ((twists the plastic wrap, pressing lightly to make it into a round shape))

C: sooo desu ne.
  temarizushi na n de ne? (0.2)
  That's right. It's because we are making temarizushi.

H: nan ka. temarizushi to iu ka. teruteru boozuzushi mitai na. ((laughs loudly))
  Well, it looks more like a teru teru bozu sushi rather than temarizushi.

C: a. >kono katachi ni< narimashita ga. .hhh (0.2)
  this form become-MASU but
  Please look at the one I made.

H: ((unwraps the rice ball to show it to the chef))

C: kon na nde. ikaga deshoo ka. (0.8) sa::::::::.
  this with how DESU Q DM
  What do you think?
C: (picks up the rice ball with chopsticks from the host)

hai. [yoku dekimashita:::. ()]
yes well make-MASU
You made it well.

H: [hai:::.] hai. arigatoo gozaimasu. .hhh
Yes. yes thank you.
Thank you.

C: ((puts the rice ball on the cutting board))

→ a. hora. kire:::.
DM pretty
Look. It's pretty.

H: a. hon::too::цу un:::. (0.6) e:::.
really
Oh, really? Hmm. Yeah.

C: kore dake ja chotto ne. ()
this only a little FP
I guess it is not finished yet.

H: e. (0.5)
Yeah.

C: omoshiroku nai n de ne:::. (.)
interesting-Neg because FP
It looks a little bland.

H: hai.
Yes.

C: ((makes a cross cut in the lettuce on the top of temarizushi))

→ chotto (0.4) hoocho o irete ne:::. (0.7)
a little knife AC insert FP
Cut a little with the kitchen knife.

H: a. (0.4) hoocho no hoo ni.=
knife GN side in
Oh, with the kitchen knife.

C: =e:::.
Yeah.

H: juumonji ni [narimashita.
crisscross become-MASU
You made a cross cut.
C: [chotto kore o kitte]  
DM this AC cut  
Cut this a little bit.

H: hai. (0.9)  
Yes.

C: ((opens where the cut was made in the lettuce with chopsticks))

H: nani ga hajimaru n deshoo. =  
what NM begin NOM DESU  
What now?

C: =chotto. koo ne:::  
a little SF FP  
A little bit...

H: e:::.  
Yeah.

C: meku. mekuru to ne::: (0.2)  
open open if FP  
If you open it up,

H: [a:.............................]  
Oh, I see.

C: [koo chotto iro ga koo mieru n de ne:]  
DM little color NM DM be seen because FP  
You can see the color of the rice a little bit.

H: e:::e:::.  
Yeah.

C: chotto koo iu no mo chotto:: wan punto de. ii no kana::: to iu fuuni.  
little this say thing also little one point good NOM QT say  
I think it's good to add this kind of decoration.

H: soo::: (0.3) osha:::re:::na kanji ni narimashita ne. [mata.]  
so stylish feeling become-MASU  
Right. Temarizushi looks much more beautiful.

C: (laughs loudly) (0.4) e::: (0.9)  
(ne::: [koo iu kanji desu ne::])

H: [a:.............]  
Oh!
Excerpt 7.9 demonstrates the casual interaction between the host and the chef, which is rarely seen in Japanese cooking shows. The chef is showing how to make temarizushi. Holding the square-shaped plastic wrap on his palm, the chef puts a rice ball on the lettuce and covers the rice ball with plastic wrap. The chef passes the wrapped rice ball to the host and casually tells him to try it in line 12, where the chef utilizes the non-honorific level –te form. Suddenly invited to make the temarizushi, the host checks with the chef if he is doing okay while twisting the plastic wrap to make a round shape of the temarizushi in lines 16-17. In response to the host, the chef clearly stresses that it is temarizushi that he is making in line 18. Excited by the chef’s casual and intimate approach, the host makes a joke while laughing loudly that what they are making looks more like teru teru bozu rather than temarizushi in line 19. Teru teru bozu is a Japanese traditional handmade doll that just looks like a small Halloween ghost doll. The host makes a joke that the way they are making temarizushi with the plastic wrap looks like the teru teru bozu doll dangling on a window of a Japanese house. The non-honorific levels also constitute the utterance made by the host when he makes a joke.

Without any reaction from the chef at his joke, however, the host unwraps temarizushi to show it to the chef and asks for his opinion on what he has made by employing the default form in line 22. The chef also responds to the host’s question in the default –desu/masu form in line 24. In line 27, interestingly, the chef switches to the plain form when giving an evaluative remark on the shape of the temarizushi. Immediately in the following line, the host employs the non-honorific level by responding hontoo (‘Really?’).

In lines 29-49, the chef demonstrates the procedure of how to add cute decoration on the temarizushi by making a cross cut on the lettuce and opening it up to show the reddish rice underneath the lettuce. While giving a step-by-step instruction, the chef employs the non-
honorific level –te ne instead of –te desu ne in lines 31, 34, and 47. In contrast, the host reports the procedure to the audience by employing the default form in lines 37, 42, and 50. The sudden switch to the non-honorific forms by the chef in the second half of the excerpt seems to be initiated in line 27 when he makes an evaluative remark.

However, the first use of the non-honorific form –te by the chef is shown in line 12 when he tells the host to try making temarizush. Considering that the cooking show is a public stage where the interactants are expected to utilize the honorific default form, the utterance made by the chef kore chotto kotoo san chotto yatte mite (‘Mr. Kotoo, try making one.) sounds inappropriate in the given context. Although the chef uses chotto twice to mitigate the imposition on the host, the utilization of the non-honorific –te ending does not reduce the degree of inappropriateness. On the contrary, the host makes a joke on the outlook of the temarizushi while laughing loudly in the following lines. Although the chef does not show any reaction at the host’s joke and shows a curt manner when he interacts with the host, the chef actually displays intimacy toward the host in the interaction by employing the non-honorific level throughout the excerpt. In contrast, the host does not forget his primary role as the show host by employing the default form in reporting to the audience, even though he makes a joke and laughs loudly in interactions with the chef.

The next excerpt presents a soliloquy remark uttered by the Japanese chef.

7.3.6 Soliloquy

Excerpt 7.11 Millet and Bean Risotto

[male host: Kotoo, male chef: Kataoka]

01 ((Camera shows a plate of beans))
C: *sore kara. soramame. (0.3) hai. (0.2)*
Next are broad beans. Yes.

H: *kore mo kawa o muite ari[masu] ne::(.)*
This also skin AC peel-MASU FP
*These beans are also peeled.*

C: *[hai]. <hoo::renn::soo::>. (0.2)*
Yes. *Spinach.*

H: *hai. (0.4)*
*Yes.*

(Camera still shows beans)

C: *mada dete konai. >a. hoorennsoo< desu ne::?=*
Yet come out-Neg spinach DESU FP
*We haven’t shown the spinach yet. Oh! Here comes the spinach.*

H: *=hai.
Yes.

C: *sore kara asu::pa::ra desu ne(.)*
That from asparagus DESU FP
*Next is asparagus.*

H: *e::e.=*
*Yeah.*

C: *=hai.*
*Yes.*

In Excerpt 7.11, the chef is introducing the ingredients for Millet and Bean Risotto. While the camera zooms in on the plate with ingredients, the chef introduces *sora mame* on the plate that is seen in the camera in line 02. The chef continues to introduce the next ingredient, spinach, placed on the other plate, at a noticeably slower pace in line 04. The camera still shows the plate of beans even after the host’s response *hai* in line 05. In that moment, the chef produces a soliloquy remark *mada dete konai* (‘Spinach is not shown yet’) marking in the plain form in line 07. As soon as the camera shows the second plate where the spinach is placed, the chef abruptly reintroduces spinach employing the default –*desu/masu* form in the same line.
The plain form marked by the chef in line 07 is a spontaneous response of the speaker who projects the inner thought outward without being conscious of the addressee. It is assumed that the chef monitors the screen when he introduces the ingredients one by one. In the moment when the camera shows the plate of spinach, the fingertip of the chef is slightly shown in the screen, which means that the chef has been keeping an eye on the screen and has intuitively pointed the spinach with his finger.

As aforementioned, TV cooking shows are made to be broadcasted on television; the interactions between the host and the chef are interpreted to be presentational on stage. Accordingly, the expected speech levels are the –eyo/ayo forms in Korean and the –desu/masu form in Japanese. Although all variables remain the same, no participants involved in the shows utilize only one speech style consistently. That is, the participants’ choice of style in a given context cannot be explained only by a direct mapping of a style to a certain social status or context. Significantly, the style shifts retain more dynamic and manifold indexical values in a situated context.

7.4 Chapter summary

Through a more detailed micro-analytic qualitative analysis, I present that the chef shifts to –ta, –e/a, or the plain form in order to achieve communicative functions. The shifts made by the chef provide six communicative functions: 1) expert knowledge demonstration, 2) opinion, 3) warning, 4) reported speech, 5) evaluation, and 6) soliloquy. Interestingly, the chefs in both cultures achieve the discursive goal of demonstrating professional knowledge by employing –ta form and the naked plain form, which are also used in formal writing. The Korean chef utilizes only –ta form to foreground the content conveyed while showing the authority as an expert. The
Japanese chef also employs the naked plain form to focus on the significant information delivered with a professional authority. Characteristically, the acknowledgement marker by the host is often followed after the chef’s shift to –ta or the naked plain form.

Although both Korean and Japanese chefs similarly employ detached non-honorific forms to project expert knowledge, the Korean chef, who has another non-honorific speech style to choose from, creates more playful interaction with the host by employing both –ta and –e/a forms to express an opinion in the host’s storytelling act and to deliver a reported speech. Meanwhile, the Japanese chef focuses more on task-oriented talk because the chef’s primary role is to present cooking recipes without being involved in any storytelling. However, an abrupt happening like the camera not being able to follow the chef’s introduction of each ingredient allows the chef to make a self-addressed spontaneous remark using the plain form. The Japanese chef also employs the non-naked plain form in evaluating what the host has made in cooking demonstration in order to index solidarity with the host.
CHAPTER 8

STYLE SHIFT TO HONORIFIC LEVEL: USE OF \textit{–SUPNITA} AND \textit{–DESU/MASU}

8.1 Introduction

In previous chapters, the speech style shifts to non-honorific forms have been analyzed. In this chapter, I will present a more detailed micro-analytic qualitative analysis on the speech style shifts to honorific level such as \textit{–supnita} forms and \textit{–desu/masu} forms in TV cooking show discourses. Unlike in Japanese where \textit{–desu/masu} form is the only honorific speech style, the two honorific speech levels \textit{–eyo/ayo} forms and \textit{–supnita} forms in Korean language allow the speaker to make a choice depending on the speakers’ discursive goals in a given context.

It is generally said that \textit{–supnita} forms carry higher formality than \textit{–eyo/ayo} forms and the former indexes a stance of exclusion with the semantic feature of \textit{(+)} boundary, whereas the latter indexes a stance of inclusion with the semantic feature of \textit{(-)} boundary with the addressee (Strauss & Eun, 2005). \textit{–supnita} form is also utilized to directly index epistemic stance and to indirectly index an identity of an expert, whereas \textit{–eyo/ayo} form is to directly index an affective stance and to indirectly index an individual personhood in TV formal interview discourse (Chang, 2014). However, I argue that \textit{–supnita} forms in TV cooking show discourse is employed to index the speaker’s solidarity through a joke, as well as a presentational stance by achieving the communicative goals of marking boundaries between activities, giving a formal report, and getting attention. \textit{–desu/masu} forms in TV cooking shows are also employed to index the speaker’s presentational mode, as already seen in previous research (Cook, 2008b, 2008d; S. K. Maynard, 1991; Okamoto, 1997, 1999).
8.2 –supnita and –desu/masu: Default style in the opening/closing remarks

–supnita and –desu/masu forms are used as the default form in the opening/closing remarks in TV cooking shows. No style shifts to non-honorific levels occur in the participants’ utterances in opening/closing remarks (see Tables 8.1 and 8.2), which implies that the opening/closing remarks are highly formulaic parts of the cooking show discourse.

Table 8.1 Frequency counts for each ending in the opening/closing remarks of Korean shows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host (73 tokens)</th>
<th>Chef (5 tokens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>supnita</td>
<td>-e/ayo -e/a -ta</td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>31 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 4 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>42.5% 0% 0% 0%</td>
<td>20% 80% 0% 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2 Frequency counts for each ending in the opening/closing remarks of Japanese shows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host (62 tokens)</th>
<th>Chef (14 tokens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>desu/masu</td>
<td>plain form others</td>
<td>desu/masu plain form others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 Style shifts to –supnita forms in Korean and use of –desu/masu forms in Japanese

The two major communicative functions of –supnita and –desu/masu forms in the host’s utterances in both cultures are 1) to give a formal report and 2) to mark a boundary between activities. Interestingly, the Korean host employs –supnita form to get attention, whereas the Korean chef utilizes the form to make a joke. Let’s take a look at the detailed analysis in the selected excerpts.
8.3.1 Opening and closing remarks

The first two excerpts illustrate opening remarks and the following two excerpts presents closing remarks in both cultures.

Excerpt 8.1 Mediterranean Seafood Pasta

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: J.-W. Park]

01 H: ((looks at the camera))
02 네 안녕하세요.
03 → 최고의 요리 비결의 박수홍입니다: (0.5) 아.
04 주: 오일: 근무제가 시행되구요() 맞벌이 부부가.
05 → >많아지다 보니까< 외식을 하는 경우가 많지 않습니까?:
06 외식을 하면은: 집에서 는: 먹던 메뉴가 아닌
07 색다른 맛과::그런 멋을 느낄 수가 있는데요(0.4)
08 → 단점도 있습니다 (0.6) 비용이 만만치가 않구요(0.4)
09 또: (.) 좋은 식재료를 써는지. 믿을 만한 식재료를
10 썼는지 걱정이 되기도 하구요(0.5)
11 → 그런데 이런 걱정하실 필요가 없습니다: (.)
12 이번 한 주 동안(0.2) 집에서도:: (0.3)
13 줄길 수 있는 편리한 레스토랑의 메뉴들: (.)
14 → 여러분들께 공개하도록 하겠습니다: (0.3)
15 → 정말 어렵게 모셨습니다: (0.3)
16 여러분께: 패밀리 레스토랑의: (0.3)
17 정말 따뜻한 요리(.) 요리법을 소개해주실지(0.2)
18 → 박종우 선생님: (0.2) 모시겠습니까.
19 ((turns toward the coming chef and claps. ))

01 H: ((looks at the camera))
02 ney annyengha-sey-yo.
03 yes greeting-SH-POL
04 Good morning.
05 → choyko-uy yoli pikyel-uy pakswuhong i-pnita: (0.5) a(.)
06 best-GN cooking secret recipe Park Suhong be-DEF
07 I am Suhong Park, show host of Best Cooking Recipe.
09 week 5days work system-NM enforce-and dual-income couple-NM
10 → manhacita po-nikka < oysik-ul ha-nun kyengwu-ka manh-ci anh-supnika?:
11 increase-because eating-out-AC do-RL case-NM many-NOM not-be-DEF
12 With 5-day workweeks and increasing numbers of working couples, don’t you find
13 yourself eating out more often?
14 oysik-ul ha-myen-un. cip-eyses nul:: mek-ten meynyu-ka ani-n
15 eating-out-AC do-if-TC hosue-in always eat-PST menu-NM not-RL
The opening/closing remarks display a typical institutional narration. There is no room for impromptu speech to occur and the opening is a very formulaic part of the show. It is assumed that the writer of the show scripted the opening remark. Since it is the most formulaic part of TV cooking show discourse, it is not very difficult to expect that the host will employ the
deferential ending –*supnita* as shown in lines 03, 05, 08, 11, 14, 15 and 18 in Excerpt 8.1.

However, the greeting phrase, ‘Good morning’, is marked with –*eyo/ayo* form as in *annyenha-s-eyo*, and not –*supnita* form as in *annyenha-sip-ni-kka*, which is often used in a highly formal context such as TV news, debates, and public speech. –*eyo/ayo* marked greeting may imply that TV cooking shows are not as formal as TV news, debates, or public speech. In addition, there is a certain degree of freedom for the host to manipulate the discourse organization of opening remarks by making a slight pause and attaching –*yo* to clause-enders in order to show his stance toward audience as in lines 04, 07, 08 and 10. Both –*ko* and –*nuntey* are the typical clause connectives that are often followed by the particle –*yo* and a brief pause to allow the speaker to process the long structure of the formulaic opening remarks due to a short retention span. What was actually said by the host in the opening remarks is assumed not to be the exact script given to him since the host has some freedom to pause and attach the particle –*yo*.

Excerpt 8.2  Green Tea Pound Cake

[male host: Kintoo, female chef: Ueda]

01  H:  ((bows toward the camera))
02  e. *kyoo no ryori(.) kongetsu no: o-kashi daisuki wa.* (0.2)
      SF today GN cooking this month GN sweets liking TC
03  →  *wa no sozai o toriireta yoogashi o. go-shookai shimasu.*
      Japan GN ingredient AC introduce western snack AC introduction do-MASU
      Today, we’ll introduce Western sweets using Japanese ingredients.
04  .hhh *ma: saikin de wa: koma ya toonyuu to itta*
      uh recently TC sesame or soymilk QT say
05  *wa no sozai o tsukatta o-kashi tte iu mono ga yoku hayatte*
      Japan GN ingredient AC use sweets QT say thing NM well popular
06  →  *imasu yo ne .hhh kyoo wa soo itta o-kashi no naka kara go-gatee demo.*
      exist-MASU SF SF today TC so say sweets GN in from home though
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hito: kuu:hu kuwaeru dake de(,) kantan ni tsukureru o-kashi o.
one method add only simple can make snack AC

08 → go-shoookai shite ikitai to omoimasu.
introduction do want to QT think-MASU
These kinds of Western sweets that use sesame seeds or soymilk have become popular recently. We will show you how to easily give a new twist to your recipes by incorporating Japanese ingredients into the sweets.

09 → kyoo oshiete kudasaru kooshi no go-shoookai shimasuu:
today teach give chef GN person(hon.) AC introduction do-MASU

10 → o-kashi kenkyuuuka no(,) ueda esuko san desu.
sweets researcher GN Mrs. DESU
Let me introduce the guest chef today. This is Chef Etsuko Ueda, a sweets specialist.

11 (Both the host and the chef bow to each other))

12 → hhh ueda san(,) yoroshiku [onegai shimasu.
Mrs. well wish do-MASU
Chef Ueda, welcome to the show.

13 C: [yoroshiku onegai shimasu.
well wish do-MASU
Thank you for inviting me.

Similar to the host’s dominant utilization of –supnita form in Korean opening remarks, the host employs the default ending –desu/masu form in lines 03, 06, 08, 09, and 10 in Excerpt 8.2. The host gives a slightly deep bow toward the camera before initiating the opening remark, which indicates that he is in a presentational mode on a public stage. The host delivers the opening remark in a restrained and articulate manner. The introduction of the guest chef is also made somewhat seriously without clapping or raising the tone of his voice in line 10, which is quite different from the introduction by the host Park in Korean cooking shows. Right after the introductory comment, the host turns toward the chef who is already standing next to him outside of the camera angle, and they both bow to each other. The employment of –desu/masu form and the use of the respectful form of noun such as go-shoookai (‘introduction’) or kata (‘honorific
word for a person’) by the host raise the degree of the formality of the opening remark. The popular greeting phrase *yoroshiku onegai shimasu* exchanged with a bow between the host and the chef is a fixed formulaic expression that gives no alternative choice to the speaker.

The following two excerpts display the closing remark by the hosts in both cultures.

**Excerpt 8.3 Pineapple Tiramisu**


01 H: ((looks at the camera))
02 자: 아, 한 주 동안 박주희 선생님과 함께 했는데요,
03 ((turns toward the chef))
04 → 너무 감사했습니다 이탈리아 요리:: 아:: 정말 (0.5)
05 → 맛진 요리들이 선사해 주셔서 감사합니다:: (0.2)
06 C: ((looks at the host))
07 → 에 저도 고맙습니다::=
08 H: =네.
09 C: 예:
10 → H: 다음에 꼭 다시 한 번(.) 나와주셔야 됩니다.
11 [조만간에요:: 네::]
12 C: [예::]
13 H: ((turns toward the camera))
14 .hhh 자 박주희 선생님과 함께 했구요.
15 저희는 다음 주에 새로운 요리::정보가지고::
16 → 찾아뵙겠습니다:: 감사합니다::.
17 ((Both the host and the chef give a deep bow toward the camera))

Well, we have Chef Joohee Park with the show for the past week.

01 H: ((looks at the camera))
02 ca: a: han cwu tongan pakcwuhuy sensayngnim-kwa hamkkye hay-ss-nuntes-yo, well one wee during Park Joohee Chef-with together do-PST-IE-FP
03 ((turns toward the chef))
04 → nemwu kamsahay-ss-supnita  ithallia yoli:: a:: cengmal (0.5)
05 → mesci-n yoli-tul sensahay cwu-si-ese kamsaho-pnita:: (0.2)
06 C: ((looks at the host))
07 Thank you so much for showing us such great Italian cooking recipes.
In the same way as the formal opening remarks, the closing remarks by the host also display a typical institutional narration. Let’s take a look at Excerpt 6.2. The deferential ending, –supnita form, employed by the host gives a formality to the show as shown in lines 04, 05, 07, 10 and 16. The expressions of gratitude, such as kamsaha-pnita (‘Thank you’) in lines 04, 05 and 16 in the host’s utterances and komap-supnita (‘Thank you’) in line 07 in the chef’s response, are fixed greeting phrases in formal contexts, regardless of the degree of formality of the context. There is no alternative choice among other speech levels. However, toy-pnita (‘to become’) in line 10 and chacapoyp-keyss-supnita (‘I will see you.’) in line 16 in the host’s utterances are seen as the
host’s conscious choice of speech style between –supnita and –eyo/ayo forms. Utilizing –supnita form in his utterance, the host obtains the desired result of raising the formality of the show when playing a public role of show host.

**Excerpt 8.4** Green Tea Pound Cake

[male host: Kotoo, male chef: Kataoka]

01 H: ((looks at the camera))

02 e. kyoo wa o-kashi kenkyuuka no(,) ueda(,) esuko san ni::?
uh today TC snack researcher GN Mrs. from

03 → oshiite itadakimashita:. e:::. (3.0) <kyoo::(,) go-shookai-shita::>| teach receive-MASU SF today introduce-PST

04 kono ryokucha no paundo keeki(,) soshite:::. ryokucha no shiropu zeri|| wa::
this green tea GN pound cake and green tea GN cyrup zelly TC

05 kyoo no ryori gogatsugo ni mo notte imasu.
Today’s Menu May volume in also put exist-MASU
Today, we learned from our sweets specialist, Chef Ueda Etsuko. The recipes for green tea pound cake and green tea syrup jelly we introduced today can also be found in the May issue of Today’s Menu.

06 e:::. >suden< kuwashii: naiyoo no bunryoo ya(,) mata reshipi ga(,)
SF already detail content GN amount and again recipe NM

07 → notte imasu node:: doozo >sore a< sankoo ni shite::
put exist-MASU because please that AC referce do

08 e::.: tsukutte::: mite::: kudasa::i. (1.0) hai. yaa. hon:tooni kyoo kono:: (0.6)
SF make try please do yes really today this

09 wa no sozai o tsuka-tta yoogashi hontooni kanoosee ga
Japan GN ingredient AC use-PST western snack really possibility NM

10 → hirogaru tte iu koto o oshiite itadakimashita.
spread QT say thing AC teach receive(hum.)-MASU
Detailed recipes can be found in this issue, so please try to refer to it when cooking. Thank you for showing us how to use Japanese ingredients in Western sweets.

11 ((looks at the chef and bows and the chef also bows back to the host))

12 → doomo arigatoo gozaimashita=
really thank exist-MASU
Thank you very much.
Likewise, the host employs –desu/masu as the default ending form in lines 03, 07, 10, and 12 in the closing remark in Excerpt 8.4. The host raises the formality of his utterance by combining the humble expression –te itadaku and –masu form as shown in oshiete itadakimashita (‘learned’) in lines 03 and 10. The greeting phrase arigatoo gozaimashita (‘Thank you’) in line 12 is also a fixed formulaic expression that the speaker does not have any alternatives, such as yoroshiku onegai shimasu that is always said in opening remarks. However, given the fact that the plain form is usually used in an embedded clause, –masu form in notte imasu node (‘because it can be found’) in line 07 is a conscious choice by the host to index his presentational stance toward the TV audience.

8.3.2 Boundary marking: opening/closing activity

The institutional TV cooking show discourse between the host and the chef is composed of multiple activities within a stretched discourse, where the transition between activities is often marked by –supnita forms and –desu/masu forms. One of the crucial roles of the host is to close one activity and proceed to the next one, which is often demonstrated by the employment of the honorific level default form. In Korean data, where two honorific levels exist, the style shifts to –supnita form as shown in al-keyss-supnita from the default –eyo/ayo form occur in order to fulfill this communicative function of closing an activity. In the same way, wakarimashita is a fixed phrase in which the host indicates that the ongoing activity is finished and that s/he is ready to proceed to the next one. Excerpt 8.5 displays a transition where the host closes an activity and
opens a new one, indicating boundary marking functions. Excerpt 8.6 presents how the phrase 
wakarimashita uttered by the host signals the point of transition between the activities.

Excerpt 8.5 Mediterranean Seafood Pasta

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: J.-W. Park]

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>C:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>H:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>C:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>H:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>C:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>H:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>C:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>H:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>C:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>H:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>C:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>H:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>C:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>H:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>C:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>H:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>C:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Yes, we are going to cook very simple restaurant recipes, which you can make easily at home with ingredients in your refrigerator.

Oh, really? Easy to challenge recipes.

Yes, it's right.

I see. Well then, what is the first dish you would like to introduce today?

Yes, today.. I changed it a little bit into Korean style.

I named it Mediterranean style.
Excerpt 8.5 is the beginning part of the entire cooking show. After introducing the guest chef and greeting each other, the host expresses that it is difficult to cook Western restaurant dishes at home. In response to the host’s concern, the chef gives an explanation that he is going to introduce very simple restaurant recipes that the audience can make with the ingredients at home in line 06, employing –supnita form. Again, the chef utilizes –supnita form in line 23 when he announces the two simple dishes he is going to cook for the show.

The excerpt is drawn from the beginning part of the entire cooking show, which is very similar to the formulaic opening remark made by the host. Aligning with the degree of the formality in host’s utterances, the chef gives a similar degree of formality during the interaction. Moreover, like in the host’s opening/closing remarks, the speech act of announcement by itself is rather formal than informal, so the chef’s announcement of the cooking items at the beginning of the show is also often encoded with –supnita form. Some chefs use incomplete sentence fragments without any predicates in presenting the cooking dish of the day, but they employ –supnita form in most shows.
The host also begins a new topic by employing –supnita form in line 14, asking which dish
the chef would like to first introduce. With the use of the representative contextualization cue ca
in line 12, the host advances to the next step and starts a new activity.

Excerpt 8.5  Host’s opening/closing activity (Mediterranean Seafood Pasta)

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: J.-W. Park]

01 C: ((talks toward the host))
02 예 오늘은저희가집에서 그냥 냉장고만 열면 특별히 준비해도 되지 않아요.
03 H: 네.
04 C: 쉽게 구할 수 있는, 재료를 가지고 요리할 수 있는 간편한 레스토랑 요리를.
05 만들기 쉽고, 요리도 훌륭하게 하겠습니다.
06 H: (also looks at the chef)
07 아: 그럴까요? [도전하기 쉬운.
08 C: 네, 그렇죠.
09 ((turn toward the camera))
10 H: 알겠습니다.: >자 그릴시면 오늘은 첫 번째:.
11 (toward the chef)
12 C: 어떤 요리를 선보이시겠습니까?
13 H: [네 오늘은:.
14 C: 여: 한국 스타일로 재료 좀 변형을 시켜봤는데요.
15 H: 네, 오늘은.
16 C: 이: 지중해식이라고 이름은 붙여 봤는데요.
17 H: 네.
18 C: 아: 지중해식: 해산물 파스타.
19 H: 네:.
20 C: =와 그 다음에: 구운 버섯 샐러드.
21 H: =네.
22 C: 두 가지를: 만들어 보도록 하겠습니다.
23 (turn toward the camera)
24 H: 알겠습니다: . hhh 자. 지중해식? 해산물 파스타와:?
25 H: . hhh 구운 버섯 샐러드. 재료부터. (0.3) ((sticks out hand)) 알아보죠.
26
01 C: ((talks toward the host))
02 yey onul-un: cehi-ka. (0.3) cip-eyse kunyang. nayngcangko-man yel-myen:.
03 yes today-TC we(hum.)-NM home-in just refrigerator-only open-if
04 H: ney.
05 Yes.
06 C: swipkey kwuha-l swu iss-nun. caylyo-lul kaci-ko: (0.3)
07 easily find-RL possibility be-RL ingredient-AC have-and
Yes, we are going to cook very simple restaurant recipes, which you can make easily at home with ingredients in your refrigerator.

Oh, really? Easy to challenge recipes.

I see. Well then, what is the first dish you would like to introduce today?

I named it Mediterranean style.

Uh, Mediterranean Seafood Pasta.

Yes.
And the other is a Roasted Mushroom Salad. I will be making those two dishes.

Excerpt 8.5 also illustrates the host’s employment of –supnita form in closing an activity. The phrase al-keyss-supnita is a fixed formulaic expression to wrap up an activity or something that participants get involved in discourse (Chang, 2014; M. Y. Park, 2009, 2014; Strauss & Eun, 2005), so the host usually uses this phrase when he finishes up a verbal activity in the course of managing the time of the cooking show. This phrase signals a transition point where the speaker, who is often an emcee in talk shows or a show host in cooking show, wants to proceed to the next activity or topic. The phrase is often followed by the contextualization cue ca or kurum.

Let’s take a look at the occurrence of the same phrase in Japanese wakarimashita, in the next excerpt.

Excerpt 8.6 Seafood Pilaf
[female host: Murakami, male chef: Sawaguchi]
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H: *dewa. hakumai to onaji yoo ni:* (0.2)
then white rice with same seem

C: >soo desu. soo desu<.
do DESU so DESU
That’s right. That’s right.

H: take [ba yoroshii desu ne?]
cook if good DESU FP
So, it is okay if we cook the brown rice in the same way as the white rice, right?

C: [hai. issho desu. hai.] 
yes same DESU yes
Yes, it is the same.

H: ano:: genmai moo::do to iu fuuna moodo ga aru mono mo
SF brown rice mode QT say seem mode NM exist thing also
aru to omou n desu [ga. (0.2)]
exist QT think NOM DESU NM
Well, I think the rice cookers have a cooking mode specifically set for brown rice.

C: [e:::]
Yeah.

H: aete koo shinaide. [hakumai to onaji yoo ni] [take ba yoroshii] desu ka.
purposely like this do-Neg white rice QT same seem cook if good DESU Q
Even if we don’t set it to a special cooking mode, is it okay to cook the brown rice in the same way as the white rice?

C: [e:::tto.]
Well, it doesn’t matter if you cook the brown rice in the same way as the white rice
because the husk of the brown rice gets soft in the process of germination.

H: [ha::i. wakarimashita.]
All right.

C: =hai. (0.2)
Yes.

H: ((moves toward a pan on the stove))

dewa. tomato beesu no hoo o [tsugi ni onegai shimasu.
then tomato base GN side AC next please do-MASU
Now, would you show us how to make the tomato sauce?

C: [hai.
Yes.
The host and the chef talk about how to cook brown rice in a rice cooker. Previously, the chef has explained that the germinated brown rice can be cooked in a similar way as white rice. Because brown rice normally needs more water and takes more time to cook than regular white rice, the host checks with the chef if it is okay to cook the brown rice in the rice cooker in the same way as the white rice in line 06. Despite the chef’s positive confirmation in line 07 to the host’s question, the host asks again if the audience do not have to set the rice cooker in a special cooking mode for brown rice in line 11. Eventually, the chef gives a detailed explanation that the germinated brown rice is not as hard as regular brown rice, so it can be cooked in the same way. This is critical information that the host tries to instigate from the chef. Satisfied with the sufficient explanation from the chef, she decides to wrap up the talk of how to cook the germinated brown rice in a rice cooker by saying ha::i. wakarimashita in line 16. The clear declaration of closing an activity by the host in line 16 and the overlap of elongated ha:i between the chef and the host in lines 15-16 indicate the agreement on the transition point between the interactants. As expected, by uttering the contextualization cue dewa in line 19, which has the same communicative function as ca in Korean data, the host proceeds to the next cooking topic of making tomato sauce, and both the host and the chef physically move towards the pan on the stove.

The following three excerpts are all drawn from Korean cooking shows. The first two occur in the host’s utterances and the last one occurs in the chef’s utterances.
8.3.3 Formal report

Excerpt 8.7  Sesame Leaf Noodle

[male host: S.-H. Park, female chef: Kim]

01 H: 선생님 저 설레어요.
02 C: 을.
03 H: 아::: hhh [나 드디어 국수 먹는구나.
04 C: [얼마나 맛있을까.
05 H: 아니요? [인제 국수 먹는다구요.
06 C: [아::::::::::.
07 H: [아:::::::
08 C: [아:::::::((laughs toward the host)) 이거 묵고 잡으면 내가 진작할 걸?
09 (1.4) ((both laughs loudly toward camera))
10 H: [아니 진짜.
11 C: (((laughs toward the host)) 진작 했으면 국수 제대로(.)
12 참 국수를 먹을건데 [그자?
13 H: [그러니까. 아니 근데 국수에 대한
14 한이 있어(가지구’선생님’ 제가.
15 C: [예::::. ((laugh))
16 H: 이 국수:: 오::: ((toward the camera)) 내 거:예요.: ((laugh))
17 C: ((laugh)) 예:::=
18 H: =자::::::. 이렇게 해서 들깨소스 adipisicing을 손 칼국수.
19 → 완성 .hhh ((sticks out both hands toward noodle)) 됐습니다::.

01 H: sensayng-nim ce sellay-eyo.
   chef-HT l(hum.) excited-POL
   Chef. I am so excited.
02 C: um.
   Yeah.
03 H: a::: hhh [na tutie kwukswu mek-nunkwuna.
   oh I finally noodles eat-IE
   Oh! Finally I will have a chance to eat noodles.
04 C: [elmama masiss-ulkka.
   how much delicious-Q
   How delicious!
05 H: aniyo? jicey kwukswu mek-nunta-ku-yo.
   no now noodles eat-PLN-and-FP
   No, I mean I will eat the noodles now.
06 C: [a:::::::
   Oh.
If I had known that you would like this, I should have made it earlier.

You're right. But I have had a deep resentment about noodles.

This noodles, uh, are mine. These noodles, uh, are mine.

Well, like this do-and-sea sauce sesame leaf handmade noodles you right. But I have a deep resentment about noodles.

If I had made it earlier, you could have eaten real noodles, right?

Theses noodles, uh, are mine.
excitement must be from tasting the delicious noodle dish that she just made and wonder how
delicious it is, which overlaps with his exclamatory utterance in lines 03-04. Immediately, the
host denies the chef’s assumption and stresses that he is finally able to eat the noodles now,
which is an intended joke by the host.

Noodles traditionally are served in Korean wedding ceremonies. Eating noodles conveys a
metaphoric message that someone is getting married. So when someone remains single for a long
time, s/he is often asked when s/he will have noodles. However, the actual meaning of the
question is when is s/he going to get married. The host then makes a joke by displaying his
excitement of eating noodles as if he were getting married, although it is just a tasting activity for
a cooking show. The chef produces an acknowledge marker a:...... in line 06 as if she
understood the host’s intended meaning, but she still assumes that he is simply excited at the
opportunity to eat real, authentic noodles and mentions that she should have made the noodle
dish earlier so that the host could have had the noodles in lines 08, 11, and 12, after laughing
loudly with the host in line 09. When he realized that the chef did not take up his joke as he had
intended, but rather displayed a warm-hearted concern about him, the host aligns with the chef
saying that kulenikka (‘You’re right’) in line 13. Promptly, however, he tries again to deliver his
joke by mentioning that he has a deep resentment about noodles because he is still single. Still in
a playful mode, the host declares that the noodles are his in line 16, while looking at the camera.

Beginning with the contextualization cue ca in line 18, the host changes his footing as a
professional show host and officially reports to the audience that the noodle dish is completed.
He employs the –supnita form for making the formal report to the audience and closing the
activity. In this excerpt, the speech style shift to –supnita form in line 19 draws a very clear line
between the playful mode and the formal presentational mode of the host. When the host is in the
playful mode, he uses non-honorific level fragments without –yo as seen in lines 03, 10, 13, and 14. Even when he employs –eyo/ayo forms in lines 01 and 16, the host intentionally uses a longer form of the verb conjugation sellay-eyo (‘excited’) instead of sellay-yo which is a shortened form often used in conversation. Also, nay ke:-yey-yo in line 16 is uttered in a whining voice as if he were claiming for the ownership of the noodle, which he does not have to do because they are for him to taste in the first place.

Furthermore, the chef also aligns with the host’s playful mode by interacting in non-honorific level fragments in lines 08 and 13, although she does not realize the host’s effort to make a joke with the noodle dish. Lots of laughter between interactants and the employment of non-honorific level fragments in the interaction naturally create playful modes of speech environment. The contextualization marker ca in line 18 initiates the transition from the playful mode to the formal presentational mode, and the employment of –supnita form in the formal report made by the host increases the formality to the given context.

8.3.4 Getting attention

Excerpt 8.8  Pepper and Eggplant

[male host: S.-H. Park, female chef: Kim]

01  H: (points a bowl of soup))
02  요거는::육수::.
03  C: 뭐::.육수::. 저거:이게: (0.3)
04  H: ((moves the bowl close to the chef))
05  [무슨 육수예요.]
06  C: [저::.멸치 다시 물이에요. 저는 [쪽:
07  H: [아:::::]. 멸[치:::].
08  C: [육수::에:::]. 멸치 [ 다시
09  멸치 [ 다시
10  H: ((leans toward the chef and asks))
11  멸치하고 다시마? (0.3) > 멸치만<
C: (looks back at the host))

H: (toward the chef) 디포리? [아........
C: [세 가지. 네:
H: (turns toward the camera and leans forward)) hh디포리가 여러분 원지 >아심니가<?
C: [멸::친데 :: 멸치 (0.4) 좀:: 큰: 거::
H: [예.
C: 그렇죠.

01 H: ((points a bowl of soup))

02 yoke-nun:: yukswu::
this thing-TC broth
This is broth.

03 C: yey.: yukswu:: ceki: ikey: (0.3)
yes soup DM this thing
Yes. Broth. Uh, this is,

04 H: ((moves the bowl close to the chef))

05 ["mwusun yukswu-yey-yo."
what soup-CP-POL
What kind of broth is this?

06 C: [ce:: myelch i tasi-n mwul-iyey-yo. ce-nun [kkok::
SF anchovy boil-RL water-CP-POL (hum.)-TC surely
Uh, this is an anchovy broth. I always make sure to.

07 H: [a:::::::: myel [chi::::::::
oh anchovy
Oh, anchovy.

08 C: [yukswu::ey::::::
broth-in
In broth

09 myelchi [tasi
anchovy dashi
Anchovy Dashi

10 H: ((leans toward the chef and asks))

11 [myelchi-hako tasima? (0.3) >myelchi-man<=
anchovy-and kelp anchovy-only
Anchovy and kelp? Or just anchovies?

12 C: (looks back at the host))
=kelp anchovy
Kelp and Diphori?
In this excerpt, the chef finishes filling up the cut eggplants with the mixture of minced meat and chopped vegetables and presents the anchovy broth she had prepared in advance. When the host asks what kind of broth she had prepared in line 05, the chef says that it is anchovy broth. The host asks again for the detailed ingredients of the broth, listing the possible ingredients that may have been used in the broth in line 11. She corrects the host and introduces diphori, a new ingredient. After the elongated acknowledgement marker a:::::. in line 13, the host abruptly turns toward the camera, leans forward to the TV audience, and asks if the audience know what diphori is, employing –supnita form. And then he gives further information on the difference between a regular anchovy and diphori, a different kind of anchovy.
As a person who is responsible for conveying important information regarding recipes, cooking process, and food ingredients to the unseen audience, the host employs the \textit{–supnita} form here in order to get attention of the audience and to deliver the information on the new food ingredient that may be unfamiliar to some members of the audience. The use of the address term \textit{yele-pwun} (‘you all’) as well as the employment of \textit{–supnita} form, is also a supporting evidence that the host is trying to get attention from the audience who is not ratified addressee of the cooking show, despite the fact that cooking shows are made to target TV viewers.

### 8.3.5 Joke

\textbf{Excerpt 8.9} Mediterranean Seafood Pasta

[male host: S.-H. Park, male chef: J.-W. Park]

\begin{verbatim}
01  H: 알단테가 뭐예요? [그게?]
02  C: [알단테는요.]
03  H: 네.
04  C: 우리가 스파게티 면을 살고 나면요?=
05  H: =네.
06  C: >면을 살고 나면 반을 이렇게< (.) 잘:라보면, 안에: 심이:: (0.5) 그:: 동: 그렇게 이렇게 박혀 있는, 그런 상태를 말하는 거예요.
07  H: .hhh 심이: [하: 야 심이::]
08  C: [네.예예예].
09  H: [아:.........]
10  C: [가운데 정 중앙에.]
11  H: [아:.........]
12  C: [네. (0.3) 고개 알단테라고. 이태리 용어로.
13  H: 아 그걸 알단테라고요?]
14  C: [네네.그게 잘 맛있게 알맞게 익은]
15  H: 정도를: 이렇게 표현하는 거거든요.
16  C: [아:....: 아:..그 심:.. 알아:?: (.) (laughs) 네:.
18  C: [(smiles)] [알이 박혔다고.
19  H: ((puts the left hand on his waist and slightly tilts his head to the right and left))
20  C: [해나면< 음악용어로 알단테는?]
21  H: .hhh 아:.. >왜나면< 음악용어로 알단테는?
22  C: [보통 빠르긴가 ’그럼텐데’.
23  C: [laughs loudly])
24  H: ((leans forward to the chef))
25  .hhh 제가 군악대 출신이거든요.
\end{verbatim}
C: [네.
(0.8) (looks toward the host) 출렁하십니다. (laughs and gives a light bow))
H: 네. (laughs loudly) 아하하 ((toward the camera) 아이 뭐. 출렁까지는 (0.3)
C: .hhh 그래서 이렇게.
H: 네.
C: 면을 넣으시구요
H: altanthey-ka mwe-yey-yo? [kukey?
Al Dente-NM what-CP-POL that thing
What is Al Dente?
C: [altanthey-nun-yo.
Al Dente-TC-SF
H: ney.
Yes.
C: wuli-ka suphakeythi myen-ul salm-ko na-myen-yo¿= we-NM spaghetti noodle-AC boil-and then-FP
H: =ney.
Yes.
C: >myen-ul salm-ko na-myen pan-ul ilehkey< (. ) ccal:lapo-myen,
oodles-AC boil-and then half-AC like this cut-if
aney:: sim-i:: (0.5) ku::: tong:kulahkey ilehkey pakhye iss-nun,
inside core-NM SF round like this embedded be-RL
H: kule-n sangtay-lul malha-nun ke-yey-yo.
be so-RL condition-AC say-RL thing-CP-FP
Al Dente is a phase when spaghetti noodles are cooked until the center is slightly hard and white when boiled.
C: [ney. yey yey.
H: .hhh sim-i: [ha:ya-n sim-i::
core-NM white-RL core-NM
A white hard center.
C: [ney. yey yey.
H: a:........ Oh I see.
C: [kawuntey ceng cwungang-ey.
middle right center-in
Right in the middle.
H: a:[:........ Oh.
[ney. (0.3) kokey altanthey-lako. itayli yonge-lo.

yes that thing Al Dente-QT Italy terminology-in

Yes. It is called Al Dente in Italian.

H: a ku ke-l altanthey-lako-[yo?

oh that thing-AC Al Dente-QT-FP

Oh, it's called Al Dente?

C: [ney ney. kukey cal masisskey almaskey ik-un

yes yes that thing suitably delicious-cook-RL

cengo-lul. ilehkey phyohyenha-nun ke-ketun-yo.

degree-AC like this express-RL thing-because-FP

Yes. It expresses the degree in which noodles are the most deliciously cooked.

H: a::::. a:: ku sim:: al-i::? (.) (laughs)) n ey::

oh oh SF core round thing-NM yes

Oh, that hard center? Yes.

.C: ((smiles)) [al-i pakhye-ss-ta-ko

round thing-NM embed-PST-PLN-and

They say there is an egg in the center because it is white.

H: ((puts the left hand on his waist and slightly tilts his head to the right and left))


well cook-PAS-RL time-and Al Dente yes

It is the phase when noodles are well cooked, Al Dente. Yes.

H: ((leans forward to the chef))

.hhh [pothong ppalu-ki-n-ka "kulelthey-ntey".

normal fast-NOM-RL-IE be so-and

I see. But I believe that 'Andante' in musical term means a moderate tempo.

.C: [[[laughs loudly])

H: ((leans forward to the chef))

.hhh cey-ka kwunaktay chwulsin-i-ketun-[yo.

(lhum.-)NM military band former-CP-because-FP

I used to serve in the military band.

.C: [ney.

Yes.

(0.8) ((looks toward the host)) hwullyungha-si-pnita. ((laughs and gives a light bow))

excellent-SH-DEF

How amazing you are!

H: ney. ((laughs loudly)) a h a ((toward the camera)) ai mwe. hwullyung-kkaci-nun (0.3)

yes DM excellent-to-TC

Yes. Ahaha, I am not that amazing.
In the process of boiling spaghetti in the pot, the host asks the chef about the *Al Dente* phase and the chef gives a detailed explanation of the phase in lines 02-17. The host tries to connect the terminology *Al Dente* to the cooked degree of spaghetti by repeating the term slowly in line 19, which overlaps with the chef’s utterance in line 20. Smiling at the host’s effort to understand the term, the chef also tries to explain in a different way saying ‘there is an egg in the center because it is white’ in line 20. The chef’s explanation of the terminology and the host’s effort to understand it is concluded when both interactants overlap in lines 19-20.

In line 21, the host produces a slightly longer exclamatory marker `a::,`, followed by the gestures of tilting his head a little bit to the right and holding his waist with his left hand as if he is trying to come up with something. He then say that *Andante* in musical term means a moderate tempo in a normal loudness. The host’s utterances in lines 22-23 are not directly addressed at the chef because he tilts his head and avoids making an eye contact with the chef. However, the host is conscious of the chef’s reaction toward his soliloquy. The chef is already smiling in line 20 and finally bursts into laughter in line 24 when the host shows off his knowledge on the meaning of the music term *Andante* and makes a connection with the word *Al Dente* that he just learned from the chef. Satisfied with the chef’s reaction to his soliloquy, the host leans forward toward the chef to narrow the space between them and immediately mentions that he used to serve in the
military band in line 26, implying that he gained such musical knowledge while serving in the military band.

Despite the host’s claim that *Andante* refers to a moderate tempo, *Andante* actually means walking pace tempo and the correct term for mid-tempo is *Moderato*. Whether or not the chef already knows about the mistake the host has made, the chef, regardless, makes a joke by saying *hwullyungha-si-pnita* (‘How amazing you are!’) in line 28. When he utters this line, the chef turns toward the host to make an eye contact with him and even gives a light bow in order to show his respect for the host, while smiling. In line 29, the host bursts into laughter and faces the front camera, feeling a little embarrassed from the unexpected compliment and the bowing gesture by the chef.

The interesting part of the excerpt here is the employment of –*supnita* form as a joke by the chef. The highest degree of formality created by the use of the combined form of the subject honorific marker –*usi* and the deferential form –*supnita* supposedly conflicts with a playful joke often encoded by non-honorific speech style such as –*ta* form or –*e/a* form. However, the employment of –*supnita* form in this excerpt with respectful gestures like a bow by the chef, who is an expert and therefore is of a higher status than the host in terms of cooking knowledge, gives an ironical twist to the context. Because of the chef’s laughter and his bowing gesture, not only the formality of –*supnita* form is diluted but also the utterance is easily interpreted as a playful joke. That is, –*supnita* form can be used as a joke when the speaker intentionally produces in a playful manner by indexing the speaker’s solidarity toward the addressee. It is very meaningful to see such case produced in cooking shows because it implies how flexible the speech levels are when they are utilized in a naturally occurring discourse.
8.4 Chapter summary

This chapter demonstrates the communicative functions of the style shifts to –supnita forms and –desu/masu forms, the dominant default speech styles in the host’s opening/closing remarks of TV cooking shows. –supnita and –desu/masu forms are utilized in 1) formal report and 2) boundary marking between activities by indexing the speaker’s presentational stance of playing a show host role. Additionally, the Korean host shifts to –supnita forms 3) to get attention of the unseen audience, while the Korean chef utilizes the form 4) to make a joke and to create a playful environment by indexing solidarity toward the host. The chef’s employment of –supnita form as a solidary marker in TV cooking shows is a good evidence of the creative usage of the formal speech style.
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSION

9.1 Introduction

Recent empirical data-based studies regarding style mixtures in various contexts have observed that the speaker naturally shifts to marked speech styles to foreground a certain situational meaning over the others (Chang, 2014; Cook, 1998, 2008a, 2008b, 2008c; Geyer, 2008; Okamoto, 1997; M. Y. Park, 2014; Saito, 2010; S. Yoon, 2010). Consequently, matching the linguistic form to social attributes of the speaker on a one-to-one basis cannot fully elucidate the fluidity and dynamism of the style shifts occurring in a given context because multiple indexical sociolinguistic meanings are productively created by each speech style depending on a situated context, which can be supported by the creative aspects of indexicality (Silverstein, 1976) and the dynamic notion of frame and schema (Goffman, 1974, 1981; Tannen & Wallat, 1993).

The study examines the style alternation occurring in TV cooking shows in Korean and Japanese from an indexical perspective. According to the analysis of distributions of each speech styles employed in Korean and Japanese TV cooking show data, –eyo/ayo form in Korean data (–supnita form in opening/closing remarks) and –desu/masu form in Japanese data are utilized as the default style. As shown in the excerpts in the analysis chapters, however, the host and the chef in Korean and Japanese TV cooking shows do not keep the default speech style throughout the interaction and occasionally shift to other styles such as the –ta, –e/a, –supnita forms in Korean and to the plain forms in Japanese in order to fulfill the speaker’s communicative goals in a given situation.
By comparing Korean and Japanese TV cooking shows, I aim to understand how the participants of two different cultures create similar and different indexical meanings through speech style shifts, a specific linguistic phenomenon, in a given context. In terms of the content of the cooking discourse, the major difference is that the Korean participants produce more non-task-oriented talk by making a joke and telling an irrelevant story of a movie or personal life experiences, whereas the Japanese participants focus more on task-oriented talk while cooking. Consequently, the Korean participants often switch to non-honorific style in non-task-oriented talk, whereas the Japanese participants shift to the plain form only in task-oriented talk.

In addition, style shifts to non-default form occur more dynamically in Korean cooking show where more speech style choices are available, making the given context the most powerful factor in creating the indexical meanings of each speech style. For example, both –supnita form and –eyo/ayo form index the speaker’s presentational stance, whereas –e/a form index the speaker’s solidarity in KFL classroom (M. Y. Park, 2009, 2014). –Supnita form directly indexes epistemic stance and indirectly indexes an identity of an expert, whereas –eyo/ayo form directly indexes affective stance and indirectly indexes an individual personhood (Chang, 2014). S. Yoon (2010) also argues that –supnita forms index ritualized self-presentation, whereas –eyo/ayo forms index soft affective stance. After all, in a highly formal context such as TV debate or formal interviews where only –supnita and –eyo/ayo forms are available, –supnita forms are employed to index presentational stance of playing an expert role, whereas –eyo/ayo forms are used to index affective stance of expressing intimacy or solidarity. However, in a rather casual setting such as TV entertainment shows or classrooms, –ta or –e/a forms are employed to index intimacy or solidarity instead of –eyo/ayo forms.

However, in Japanese data where only two speech styles are available, the indexical
meaning of –desu/masu form and the plain form is more clearly distinguished. –desu/masu forms are employed to index the speaker’s presentational mode, whereas the plain forms index the lack of presentation (Cook, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2008a, 2008b, 2008c, 2008d), even though Geyer (2008) claims that –desu/masu forms function as a solidarity and deference marker, whereas the plain forms function as a solidarity and mitigation marker.

Looking into the communicative functions of the style shifts occurred in TV cooking shows in detail, I find that both Korean and Japanese hosts switch to non-honorific levels 1) to give spontaneous response, 2) to conduct evaluative remarks on the food, and 3) to check or confirm the information. Furthermore, the Korean host also shifts to –ta or –e/a forms 4) to make a joke and 5) to tell a story in a reported speech. The Japanese host shows a typical pattern of employing the naked plain form 6) to summarize the chef has said.

Since the chef’s primary role in TV cooking show is to display cooking recipes to the unseen TV audience, the communicative goals of the chef’s speech style shifts is very different from that of the host. Both Korean and Japanese chefs switch to the naked plain form 1) to demonstrate expert knowledge, which is closely related to the chef’s primary role. Additionally, the Korean chef shifts to –ta or –e/a forms 2) to express opinions and 3) to give an instructive warning, whereas the Japanese chef shifts to the plain form 5) to evaluate what the host has made and 6) to give a soliloquy remark.

The default –eyo/ayo forms and –desu/masu forms are mainly utilized when the host asks questions to instigate important information from the chef and when the chef gives instructions and explanations in task-oriented talk. –Supnita forms and –desu/masu forms are similar in that both forms are employed in 1) opening/closing remarks and 2) boundary marking of opening/closing activities in both cultures. Moreover, the Korean host shifts to –supnita form 3)
to deliver a formal report, 4) to get attention, and 5) to make a joke.

In the current data, the –ta form covers a wider range of communicative functions than –e/a form, foregrounding an immediacy and a sudden emotional surge, which is pointed out by S. Iwasaki (2006) and S. K. Maynard (1991) as a feature of the plain form in Japanese. The –e/a form is utilized more often to exhibit interactional performance such as acting out in an animated and exaggerated manner in reported speech or storytelling. The Korean male host, Park, sporadically switches to the –e/a form in his storytelling or reported speech to convey the vividness of his acting or his creation of comical situations, where he displays his intimate and friendly stance toward the chef and further builds up his identity as a comedian rather than that of a show host. Meanwhile, the chef’s employment of –e/a form in both task-oriented and non-task-oriented talk are unique examples that are produced by one female chef who occasionally interacts with the host as if she were a caring mother.

The situational meanings between the shifts to the plain form in Japanese and the shifts to –ta or –e/a form in Korean mostly overlap with an exception that the Japanese naked plain form is employed when the host summarizes what is being said, which is the primary communicative function of the host in Japanese data. However, the host’s summarizing turn occurring in Korean data not only takes a very small portion of his entire interaction with the chef, but it is also often realized in –eyo/ayo form.

Additionally, although both Korean and Japanese hosts give an evaluative remark on the food in a similar way in task-oriented talk, the Korean host gives an evaluative remark on the chef’s life experiences by utilizing the –usita suffix, the combination of the subject honorific marker –usi with the –ta form, in order to reduce the burden of judging one’s life styles or experiences and to avoid sounding too rude from using only the non-honorific speech style –ta
form toward the chef. In these evaluative remarks on the food and the chef’s techniques/life experiences produced by the interactants in TV cooking show are mostly realized with emotion-laden voice, exclamation marker, and smiles/laughters, which tend to invite the chef’s uptake in the following line.

Multiple social meanings are negotiated to be chosen by the speaker depending on the situated context. It is hard to categorize these four Korean speech styles simply in terms of (+/−) distance and (+/−) interactions while trying to match them with two Japanese speech styles. It needs to be noted that the most formal speech style – supnita is also employed as a joke in the chef’s utterances, creating a playful speech environment between the interactants. – ta forms are utilized when the chef foregrounds the importance of the content and when the host responds spontaneously or gives an evaluative remark on the chef’s life experience. In Korean data, the chef’s use of – ta form is not interactional in that the chef focuses on the content itself, which is similar to the function of the naked plain form in Japanese, but the host’s utilization of – ta form is rather interactional in that he gives a spontaneous response and an evaluative remark on the food, which is similar to the non-naked plain form in Japanese. Indisputably, between – supnita and – eyo/ayo forms in Korean and – desu/masu form in Japanese, and between – e/a and – ta forms in Korean and the plain form in Japanese, they share some range of communicative functions. However, each speech level has its own area that cannot be shared with the counterpart in other language.

To conclude, I argue that in TV cooking show discourse, – supnita and – eyo/ayo forms in Korean and – desu/masu forms in Japanese are employed to index the speaker’s presentational stance on public stage. – Supnita forms function similarly to the high end of – desu/masu forms in terms of formality. On the other hand, – ta and – e/a forms in Korean are employed to index the
speaker’s solidarity toward the addressee. –ta form is functionally similar to the naked plain form in Japanese in that both forms are utilized to index content focus of the information conveyed. –ta form is also similar to the non-naked plain form in that both forms index self-addressed spontaneity and solidarity. –e/a forms and the non-naked plain forms are also similar in that both forms index solidarity and intimacy.

9.2 Practical implications of the study

In a speech environment of any honorific-rich languages, the speaker must choose either honorific or non-honorific speech level to communicate. Korean and Japanese are typical languages that include multiple honorific levels. In particular, Korean has six or seven (including ‘neutral level’ for the plain form) different speech levels for the speaker to choose in a speaking event. Fortunately, four speech levels (–supntia, –eyo/ayo, –e/a, and –ta) out of six classified by Sohn (1999) are actively utilized in Contemporary Korean language, while the other two (–so and –ney) are gradually disappearing. These two honorific speech styles (–supnta and –eyo/ayo) and two non-honorific speech styles (–e/a and –ta) are introduced at school in grammar textbooks to teach native speakers as well as learners of Korean. Influenced by the traditional and ideological notions of each speech style, it is taught that honorific speech levels are used to address those who are older or in a higher social status and non-honorific speech levels are used to address those who are younger or in a lower social status.

Whether it is conscious or unconscious, the choice of one speech style in a given context may not be simple and easy, even for the native speakers of Korean or Japanese. The inappropriate choice of speech style toward the addressee often results in creating awkward situations. There are various factors that trigger the choice in a speech event and lots of
negotiations going on among those factors. In recent studies using naturally occurring data from the indexical perspective, native speakers of Korean or Japanese do not keep one speech style in the interaction. Many scholars present the phenomenon of style mixture in a variety of contexts such as interviews, school setting, TV talk shows, and etc.

In particular, Korean has four different speech levels for the speaker or the learners of Korean to negotiate at every moment in the interaction. It is meaningful to explore the whole picture of the speech style usage in a naturally occurring talk. The analysis of the distributions of each style shift and micro-analytic qualitative examination conducted in this research shed a light on further understanding of how the speaker alternates speech styles to achieve desired communicative goals, to project one’s stance toward the addressee, and to further construct one’s identity. Most of all, no comparative research has been conducted regarding style shifts between Korean and Japanese. The micro-analytic approach of this comparative study will contribute to the better understanding for the indexical meanings of the dynamic style shifts occurring in the actual language use in both languages.

9.3 Limitation of the study

There are limitations in the research. First, generalization of the findings in the study is an issue because the data may not sufficient to draw a conclusion on how the style shifts occur in TV cooking shows. Since the study focuses on qualitative analysis and uses the frequency numbers of style distributions as supportive device, it is hard to get a simple generalization, which is not normally considered for qualitative analysis. Second, all the data have been coded by one person for consistency, but it may have been a good idea to hire other coders to check inter-rater reliability of the coding results. Third, the selections used in this study from Korean
and Japanese cooking shows are not entirely the same for a perfect comparative study. The format of the selected Korean and Japanese cooking shows is very similar, but the interactions between the chef and the host in both cooking shows are quite different. If both shows in Korean and Japanese had the same format and the same interactions between the host and the chef, the study may have produced a different result. Finally, the data is collected by capturing movie clips played on TV, so it is impossible to extract wave files from the movie clips because lots of voice data are lost during the process of extracting. In view of the fact that prosody conveys a lot of information about the speaker, the examination of the prosody as well as the discourse data will be considered in the follow-up studies.

9.4 Suggestions for further study

The scope of this research has been narrowed down from what it was initially proposed. The current study examines the situational indexical meanings of the style shifts in Korean and Japanese TV cooking shows. This research can be expanded to conduct a follow-up study examining gender difference. Since the Korean cooking show, Best Cooking Recipes, has had a few women host in the program before the host, S. Park, it may be interesting to examine and compare the ways of the host interact with the chef based on the host’s gender. Another idea for a follow-up study is to conduct a comparative study on the real cooking classes as Mayes (2003) have between Japanese and American cooking classes. Then, the prosodic features can also be analyzed when the participants interact each other.
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