Received: August 11, 2022
Revised: January 30, 2023
Accepted: February 9, 2023

การศึกษากลวิธีการวิจารณ์ในรายการเรียลลิตี้โชว์สัญชาติอังกฤษ "The Great British Bake Off ปีที่ 11"

ภัคจิรา เอื้อวงศ์[1] และ กิตตินาถ เรขาลิลิต[2]
[1,2]สาขาภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสารระหว่างประเทศ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์
[1,2]มหาวิทยาลัยเกษตรศาสตร์

บทคัดย่อ

บทความนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษากลวิธีการวิจารณ์ในเชิงวัจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ภายใต้บริบทของสื่อโทรทัศน์ โดยเก็บข้อมูลการวิจารณ์ของผู้ตัดสินในรายการ The Great British Bake Off ปีที่ 11 เป็นจำนวน 5 ตอน ซึ่งมีจำนวน 100 ช่วงของการให้คำวิจารณ์ ในส่วนของกรอบแนวคิดในการวิเคราะห์พัฒนามาจากงานวิจัยก่อนหน้าที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการวิจารณ์ซึ่งจำแนกประเภทของการวิจารณ์ออกเป็น 2 กลวิธีหลักคือ การวิจารณ์แบบตรงและการวิจารณ์แบบอ้อม ผลการวิจัยชี้ว่ามีการใช้การวิจารณ์แบบตรงมากกว่าการวิจารณ์แบบอ้อมเพียงเล็กน้อย ในเวลาที่ใช้กลวิธีแบบตรงผู้วิจารณ์เลือกใช้กลวิธีเสริมของการแสดงความเห็นในแง่ลบมากที่สุด โดยกลวิธีนี้จะเน้นการตัดสินใจของผู้วิจารณ์และยังส่งเสริมภาพลักษณ์ของการมีอำนาจตัดสิน ในส่วนของกลวิธีการวิจารณ์แบบอ้อม พบว่า มีการใช้กลวิธีเสริมแบบแสดงความคาดหวังและการให้คำแนะนำมากเป็นจำนวนเท่ากัน กลวิธีเสริมแบบแรกลดทอนการเผชิญหน้าโดยกล่าวถึงความคาดหวังที่แตกต่างไปจากผลงานที่ได้รับ ในขณะที่อีกวิธีแสดงให้เห็นถึงความหวังดีต่อการพัฒนาในอนาคตของผู้เข้าแข่งขัน โดยรวมผลที่ได้คาดว่าเกิดจากอิทธิพลของทั้งตำแหน่งหน้าที่ของผู้ตัดสินและความสุภาพ ดังนั้นงานวิจัยชิ้นนี้จึงเสริมสร้างองค์ความรู้และสนับสนุนต่องานวิจัยที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการวิจารณ์และสื่อโทรทัศน์

คำสำคัญ ; การวิจารณ์, กลวิธีการวิจารณ์, รายการโทรทัศน์

---

[1]นิสิตหลักสูตรมหาบัณฑิต สาขาภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสารระหว่างประเทศ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเกษตรศาสตร์
[2]อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาวิทยานิพนธ์หลัก คณะมนุษยศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเกษตรศาสตร์

A Study of Criticism Strategies in a British Reality Show "The Great British Bake Off Season 11"

Pakjira Auewong[1] and Kittinata Rhekhalilit[2]
[1,2]Department of Foreign Language, Faculty of Humanities
[1,2]Kasetsart University, Thailand

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the pragmatic strategies of critique within the setting of a television program. This study collected data of the British judges' criticism comments from five episodes of Season 11 of The Great British Bake Off, which contained 100 commenting sequences. The analytical framework was derived from criticism-related studies that divided criticism into direct and indirect categories. The findings indicated that direct types were employed more frequently than the indirect ones. British judges most frequently employed the sub-strategy of expressing a negative attitude while delivering direct criticism, emphasizing the judge's choice and generating a sense of authority. For the application of indirect criticism, the judges utilized both the sub-strategy of expressing an expectation and suggestion. The first method avoided direct confrontation by asserting that the outcome differed from the judge's expectations, while the second strategy offered positive suggestions for the contestant's future growth. In particular, it was hypothesized that the results of the criticism strategies were influenced by both the position of the competition program's judges and politeness. This research contributes to the existing criticism and media literature.

Keywords; Criticism, criticism strategies, The Great British Bake Off

Introduction

Criticism is a linguistic action that expresses the feeling of discontent of the speaker toward the listener or something that they possess (El-Dakhs, 2020). It is a common action that any person can perform or encounter in their daily lives. When giving criticism, the speaker could be perceived as impolite or destructive due to the offensive nature of the comment. In addition, even though criticism might damage the feelings or reputation of the receiver, it is obliged to be given in various situations, such as giving feedback in the classroom (Lenz, 2020) or commenting on a book review (Zou & Hyland, 2020). The main reason for applying criticism is because it is a part of an assessment activity, which is essential for one's development (Lenz, 2020; Nguyen, 2005; Zhou & Hyland, 2020). In other words, criticism initiates the change for betterment from the speaker's perspective by pointing out an unpleasant quality to the listener. In general, it is also seen as one of the most important ways to guide improvement for the benefit of the hearer (Nguyen, 2005). Furthermore, it can be said that criticism is a conflicting act that can be used to devastate or provide a benefit to its listener. Criticism has received recognition from scholars in many fields, including linguistics. The primary linguistic literature of criticism has primarily been viewed through the lens of interlanguage (Farnia, Abdul Sattar, & Sattar, 2015; Nguyen, 2005, 2008) and academic writing (Diani, 2017; Etaywe, 2018; Hyland, 2004), in which the data were elicited from the written form rather than an oral form. However, attention of this phenomena in the oral form was increased in the domain of the media context. As some studies (Chen & Rau, 2015; Lin, 2020; Tang, 2016) pointed out, criticism has featured extensively in the reality show genre, especially in a competition format that required commentary as its primary activity. These programs have emphasized confrontation between the judge and contestant, encouraging aggressive behavior like criticism to occur (Blitvich, Bou-Franch, & Lorenzo-Dus, 2013; Culpeper & Holmes, 2013). The judge's commentary was

often placed as the climax to create such emotional or dramatic effect to its audience (Matwick & Matwick, 2019), which made criticism an essential component of the competition show.

Although criticism plays a significant role in reality competition programs, the topic of criticism in this context seems to have only recently emerged. Previous studies that dealt with criticism in the TV context (Chen & Rau, 2015; Culpeper & Holmes, 2013; Lin, 2020; Tang, 2016) aimed to account for criticism in oral communication from native speaker judges. For example, Culpeper and Holmes (2013) focused on impoliteness in the judges' criticisms of successful and unsuccessful auditions in American and British talent shows. The analysis criteria ranged from politeness, impoliteness, mitigation and non-verbal elements. They claimed that they tried to capture a particular linguistic pattern of the people in the judge's position rather than compare the cultural differences. Nevertheless, the result suggested that the judges were differed in their criticism style and value. American judges were often polite and encouraging to the contestant who failed, whereas British judges were more critical of both successful and unsuccessful performances.

Chen and Rau (2015) used discourse analysis to investigate both positive and critical comments in a Taiwanese singing show, finding that compliments far outweighed criticism throughout the commentary. Tang (2016) researched the pragmatic criticism and mitigation strategies used in American and Chinese fashion designer competitions. The framework of criticism strategies was built on politeness theory, and the results showed that judges from both programs tended to use direct criticism rather than indirect criticism. Furthermore, Chinese judges utilized many mitigation techniques, but American judges used fewer. Lin (2020) recently investigated the complimentary and critical conduct of judges in singing contests in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Taiwan to analyze how judges from different cultures created their judgements. Her results were the same as what Culpeper

and Holmes (2013) found, which was that British judges used criticism more than American culture, and that all judges from the three cultures preferred directness when giving a compliment and criticism.

Drawing on the results from earlier literature (Chen & Rau, 2015; Culpeper & Holmes, 2013; Lin, 2020; Tang, 2016), it was shown that there was a propensity for direct strategies to exceed the indirect strategies from the judges in both the Western and Asian cultures. Likewise, disparities between the English-speaking cultures of the United States and the United Kingdom appeared in various linguistic elements. Also, both Culpeper and Holmes (2013) and Lin (2020) said that British judges were likelier to criticize actions than judges from other countries. As the information of this phenomena is still limited to a few programs, it would be beneficial if there are more explorations on different programs to help generalize British judges' criticizing patterns. So, the goal of this study was to investigate this problem by only focusing on a criticism from the British side. The Great British Bake Off (GBBO), a British cooking competition show, was chosen as the subject of this study.

GBBO is a successful franchise that has maintained its popularity for over a decade. It was the first cookery show to surpass the ratings of other British talent shows and was second only to live sports and news programming in its native country (Esposito, 2018). GBBO was popular in the United Kingdom and worldwide because it was broadcast internationally and spawned numerous spin-offs, such as the Junior Bake Off. The format was also marketed to other nations so that they could create their own versions, such as Thailand, which created The Great Thai Bake Off. Notably, GBBO focuses on both the bakery product and the judges' comments, such that all bakery products, whether successful or not, must face the judges' verdict without the story being omitted. This study aimed to find out how the British judges on GBBO use language to criticize contestants on a reality show.

Literature Review

1. Theoretical background

To send and receive meaningful messages, people rely on more than just their language abilities. Instead, individuals use the functional components of language, or a speech act, to communicate or convey the communication purpose of a message, such as requesting, apologizing, or criticizing. Austin (1962) established the speech act hypothesis, which states that when individuals speak and express words, they initiate activities. A speech act refers to the intention of a communication message embedded in utterances (Yule, 1996). Diverse utterances are deployed to accomplish various acts; hence, the execution of any speech act depends on three levels. An initial level refers to a locution or grammatical form of speech (Austin, 1962). Level two depicts an action-operating illocutionary act or intention force. This is the most essential level and is commonly referred to as the illocutionary force (Yule, 1996). The third level is the perlocutionary act, or the listener's response to the force's interpretation. Based on this knowledge, the identification of speech acts requires illocutionary ability. To identify a particular speech act, it is necessary to determine the illocutionary force behind the utterances. This speech act concept was seen as a universal quality of language across cultures (Nguyen, 2005), and it enabled the researcher to examine unique linguistic behavior.

According to Searle (1979), the structural formula distinguishes between direct and indirect speech processes. The function and form of a direct spoken act are directly related (ibid.). In other words, a speech's locutionary structure must precisely match its illocutionary intensity. These methods of communication facilitate the recipient's comprehension of the message. This refers to statements whose meaning does not match their form or indirect speaking acts "performed by means of another" (Searle, 1979, p. 60). Context is required to establish the illocutionary force of indirect communication (Yule, 1996).

2. Criticism strategies

Criticism is the type of feedback that show the speaker's negative feeling to the listener. It is inherently offensive and varies in its semantic structure. (Nguyen, 2005; Tang, 2016). Nguyen (2005) defines the speech act of criticism as "an illocutionary act whose illocutionary point is to give negative evaluation on the hearer's (H) actions, choice, words, and products for which he or she may be held responsible. This act is performed in hope of influencing H's future actions for the better for his or her own benefit as viewed by the speaker (S), or to communicate S's dissatisfaction/ discontent with or dislike regarding what H has done but without implying that what H has done has undesirable consequences for S" (p.7). According to this definition, criticism is a negative opinion from the critic that is meant to change the way the listener will act in the future, in which this opinion would not imply the speaker's disadvantages caused by the listener's action but rather bring improvement to the listener themselves.

In classifying critique, previous studies (Chen & Rau, 2015; Lin, 2020; Nguyen, 2005) appear to have followed a similar logic of distinguishing between direct and indirect structures. The first coding taxonomy of critique strategies proposed by Nguyen (2005) was constructed from a paper-based activity administered to university English language learners. In contrast, Tang (2016) suggested that the criticism results produced from a written task were likely to differ from those acquired in a natural speaking setting and that responses could be limited to a certain extent. She also created a coding scheme based on the politeness theory and data from television shows. Her taxonomy was based on Brown and Levinson (1987) classification system and distinguished between on-record and off-record strategies. Chen and Rau (2015) developed their own Taiwanese data framework. The most recent framework from Lin (2020) was derived from Nguyen (2005) and data from a singing show to analyze the compliment and criticism strategies in

a television scenario. Many previous studies (Chen & Rau, 2015; Lin, 2020; Nguyen, 2005; Tang, 2016) showed a different way to build a taxonomy of critique strategies from the targeted data.

On the direct and indirect aspects, the current study agreed with previous research (Chen & Rau, 2015; Lin, 2020; Nguyen, 2005) and followed Lin's (2020) framework split direct criticism into two sub-strategies and indirect criticism into eight sub-strategies. Direct types and its sub-strategies (e.g., expressing a negative attitude and indication of the problem) were borrowed from the study of Lin (2020). On the indirect side, eight indirect sub-strategies (e.g., comparison, explanation, expressing uncertainty, indication of standard, question, wat statement, sarcasm, and suggestion) were proposed by Lin (2020), two of them were modified. About the modification, the indirect sub-strategy of sarcasm in Lin's (2020) study was altered to humor. Broadly speaking, sarcasm usually contains the opposite meaning of what has been said to deliver mockery intended (Sharma, Singh, Agarwal, Kim, & Sharma, 2022). Sarcasm in Lin's (2020) categorization however was differed and did not reflect this characteristic. The present study decided to adjust due to the conflicting in Lin's (2020) description of sarcasm category, in which she explained it as the use of funny expression and overstatement to make the listener realize their inappropriate behavior. Additionally, her given example "You look like something out of a zombie movie or something right now." (Lin, 2020, p.51) suggested a humorous tone by the speaker rather than a sarcastic one. It seemed that renaming this sub-strategy from sarcasm to humor would be more appropriate. Changes were also made to the want statement sub-strategy to reflect expectations from the research of Tang (2016). This was owing to the relevant aspect, but it was challenging to distinguish from the suggested sub-strategy. So, it seemed like the framework for figuring out how to criticize strategies in the context of television needed more work.

Methods

1. Source of the data and data collection

The Great British Bake Off (GBBO), a baking competition, was employed in this study to evaluate the pragmatic strategies of British judges in a competition program. The structure of GBBO includes three baking tests in one episode, with all contestants competing and facing the judges' opinions at the end of each test. To account for the recent behavior of judges' commenting, this study selected season 11 which is among the latest complete aired season of GBBO during the time of Covid-19 outbreak. It was originally released in September to November 2020. Moreover, the chosen season 11 made a phenomenon for its current station, Channel4. Season 11 was GBBO biggest draw, as it broke all viewer records of Channel4 since the records started in 2002. Hence, this particular season was extremely popular, and it can display current demeanors of GBBO judges.

Season 11 had 12 participants, with one eliminated each week. The destiny of the contestants was in the hands of the judges, Paul Hollywood and Prue Leith, who developed the exam and handed out their verdicts. In the context of competition shows, the commentary process was part of the format requirement. It is the show's obligation to have the judges comment to the participants according to the contest rules given in the show. That means the judge could not give opinions freely or choose to not comment as they desire. Nevertheless, the judges can apply as many strategies as possible in their comments to entertain its viewers (Matwick & Matwick, 2019).

GBBO emphasized the process of making a baked product and the judges' feedback. The second test, known as a blind challenge, differed from the first and third tests regarding commenting and grading. Instead of immediately commenting on each other as they had in the previous two assessments, the judges conversed and ranked the candidates for this post from worst to best. Since the comments for

this challenge were different from those for the second test, they were left out of the corpus for this study. As a result, the current study gathered all of the judges' comments from the first and third challenges, yielding a corpus of five episodes, including 100 sequences of criticism. The official English subtitles on the GBBO video from Channel4.com were used to create a transcript of what the judges said and how they said it.

2. Data analysis

After compiling the corpus of judges' comments, the data transcript was manually reviewed for any criticism in the judges' statements. Nguyen's (2005) definition of criticism was used. As we examined dynamic and unexpected oral communication, the criticism of illocutionary force could be seen in the range of durations and patterns (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Lin, 2020; Tang, 2016). For example, criticism may be contained in incomplete sentences where some information was omitted because the speaker assumed the listener would guess or understand their intended meaning, as shown in excerpt (1), where the speaker did not complete the criticism according to the grammar structure but instead allowed the listener to fill in the blanks themselves. Alternatively, the sequential activity of several speaking acts employed to express the same intent was occasionally utilized to convey the illocutionary impact of criticism (Tang, 2016; Zhou & Hyland, 2020). Excerpt (2) shows how a mix of informative sentences and questions was used for one purpose to implicitly criticize on a brownie's texture rather than the performed action independently.

(1) Brownies are one of the most basic things to bake. If you can't get that right...

(2) It's very sponge-like rather than brownie-like. See? Look like a chocolate sponge.

Concerning identifying criticism strategies in the judges' utterances, the framework utilized to categorize the strategies was taken from previous studies (Lin, 2020; Tang, 2016), which classified the strategies into two primary types: direct and indirect criticism. For categorizing as direct criticism, utterances must have at least one visible semantically negative vocabulary (e.g., bad or lousy) in their format (Nguyen, 2005), or employ the negation with a positive word to communicate a negative connotation (e.g., It does not look good). In addition, direct criticism can be divided into two sub-strategies: expressing a negative attitude and indication of the problem.

In excerpt (3), the form clearly expressed the speaker's unfavorable psychological emotion regarding the appearance of the bakery product with the term "terrible" which immediately amplified the illocutionary force of criticism. Therefore, this utterance was coded as expressing a negative attitude. Excerpt (4) was encoded as indication of the problem. The judge identified the flaw in the contestant's behavior by saying, "Your recipe was at fault, or you've weighted something up wrong" This utterance was addressed directly to the listener and included the word "fault" and "wrong" to convey an illocutionary force of censure that they had done something wrong.

(3) The look of it's terrible.

(4) Your recipe was at fault, or you've weighted something up wrong. It could have been the white chocolate with the water.

Regarding the identification of indirect criticism, the transparency of criticism's illocutionary force was lower than the direct types. As such, indirect criticism needs more effort in interpretation due to the form, which does not contain any visible negative lexical format (Nguyen, 2005). The formula of these types varies, so the interpretation of it relies on the contextual meaning that could signify the illocution of criticism. Under the indirect types, this was made up of eight sub-strategies found

in this study: comparison, explanation, expressing uncertainty, indication of standard, expressing expectation, question, humor, and suggestion.

In excerpt (5), the statement illustrated the force of criticism by comparing the intention of "lining up" and referencing a past action "what happened yesterday". This utterance implied that the judge was not satisfied with the current and previous performance of the contestant. This showed that the result of today was as bad as yesterday in the judge's perspective and classified as comparison. In excerpt (6), the judge described the cause and consequences of an undesirable outcome that the contestant had without putting the obvious mark of the mistake. The force of criticizing was disguised in the process and explained as if these utterances were coded as an explanation category.

(5) Now, this is lining up with what happened yesterday as well.

(6) When you try and push a load of fruit into a loaf if you shape it too tight, all the fruit goes to the outside. If you look inside there is nothing in there. I like the flavor but unfortunately, all the fruit burnt on top of the loaf, not in it.

By showing doubt or concern toward something, the speaker can raise awareness of the listener to question their action, as shown in excerpt (7). This strategy implied an issue without using a negative word to express the discontent or problem from the speaker. The use of an uncertain expression, such as a question or not sure could indicate the force to criticize, so these utterances were identified as expressing uncertainty. The strategy of the indication of standard in excerpt (8) implied that the criticism was intended to refer to "Battenberg". The judge shifted the attention to the standard of all Battenberg types of cake or typical rule rather than focusing on the individual. The judge made it sound like they were disappointed with the quality of the product by telling the contestant that they thought all Battenberg cakes should be the best.

(7) I just question the ginger with the orange, and then on the outside, the pistachio. It's too complicated.

(8) The one thing I think you expect from a Battenberg is incredible neatness.

In excerpt (9), this strategy was similar to the indication of the standard sub-strategy in terms of showing the speaker's anticipation, but it was lowered the importance of the actual issue by turning into just a person's expectation instead. The term "could be" was used to show the expectation, and the judge expressed a critical force through the comparative term "better" to hint at their disappointment or though the product needed improvement. These utterances were categorized as expressing expectation. Sometimes, criticism comes in the form of rhetorical or tag questions, as illustrated in excerpt (10). By raising curiosity and answering it themselves without seeking an honest answer or response from the listener as "I think one of the reasons it squashed so easily is it is very moist, isn't it?", the speaker attempted to point out subtly that too much moisture was the cause that made the cake collapse from its shape. This strategy was categorized as a question.

(9) Could be better.

(10) I think one of the reasons it squashed so easily is it is very moist, isn't it?

In a normal situation, the word "consistent" would suggest a positive meaning, but in this excerpt (11) context, the judge expressed a funny or sarcastic remark. This statement was delivered after the judge mentioned the contestant's mistake in the earlier test, which made the meaning alternated between criticizing and saying that the contestant was consistent in making flaws. This strategy, encoded as humor, was due to how the judge avoided aggravating on the error and made a pun with a positive word. In excerpt (12), giving advice or suggesting change could also satisfy the illocutionary force of criticism. This is because a modal verb such as "should"

implied the speaker's disagreement or dissatisfaction, and they want the listener to change and follow their instruction. This act was often used by the judge to suggest what the participant should do next (Nguyen, 2005); so, it was called a suggestion.

(11) You are consistent, absolutely.

(12) That's a nice bread. You should've done more with that rather than the white.

The current study, in particular, did not involve with interpretation based on the participants' gender or socioeconomic position. To ensure trustworthiness, the framework used in the study was checked by an expert on the English language. The investigator and two interceders, who were experienced researchers in the linguistic field, examined the categorization results to determine the reliability of the analysis. We discovered that 83% of the outcomes were identical.

In the next part, the overall distribution of the criticism strategies and sub-strategies employed by the judges of GBBO were illustrated and discussed compared to prior studies.

Results and Discussion

The findings of the study are illustrated as follows. First, on the corpus of the judges' comments consisting of 100 commentary sequences, there were 252 criticism data that were identified in the study.

1. Overall use of criticism strategies

Table 1 Distribution of the overall use of criticism strategies by the judges of GBBO.

Types	Frequency	Percentage
Direct criticism	131	52%
Indirect criticism	121	48%
Total	252	100%

Table 1 shows that the GBBO judges employed direct criticism slightly more than indirect criticism, which corresponded to earlier studies (Culpeper & Holmes, 2013; Lin, 2020; Tang, 2016) that found the occurrence of direct criticism outperformed indirect criticism. To minimize ambiguity, British judges in talent or cooking competitions appeared to communicate their comments immediately. Respectable authority figures or those with good authority prefer direct communication due to its effectiveness. Direct criticism may also be beneficial in the case of judges on a competition show. Previous research Blitvich, Bou-Franch, & Lorenzo-Dus (2013) highlighted the relevance of judges as professional image presenters, which transmitted their illocutionary intent and contributed to the judge' credibility. It would be easier for the listener to interpret an illocutionary force of criticism if it were expressed clearly for the listener's benefit. For instance, the judges give their criticism about white chocolate cake made by the participant such as "It's just the color of that sponge, I don't like" would be clearly understood by the listener that the color of this cake sponge was disapproved by the judges. Because of this, it was thought or expected that judges would give direct feedback in all competition categories.

2. Use of direct criticism strategies

Table 2 Distribution of the direct criticism sub-strategies in GBBO.

Sub-strategies	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Expressing a negative attitude	111	85%
Indication of the problem	20	15%

About the use of direct criticism sub-strategies in GBBO, Table 2 showed that more than 80% of the direct criticism conveyed an unfavorable attitude. This technique was based on the judge's view, reflecting the value of individualism in British society. The GBBO judges selected this strategy to inform what not pleased

them directly and intensify the illocutionary force of criticism to its fullest in most of the time throughout the evaluation. The results of this study differed from previous literature (Lin, 2020) that found the problem indicating more frequent than expressing negative attitude. It is not surprising to find some differences from former studies (Lin, 2020) as the target programs and the judges in the present study were not the same. Cooking competitions are usually judging on both taste and look of cooking creations, that is why the judges could express their opinions more frequently than dispute on the problems in their cooking. For example, in evaluation of salted caramel brownie made by the competitor, the judge gave multiple criticisms such as "yeah, it does look a mess" about the brownie's look, "far too sweet" to criticize the taste, and "It's underbaked" for the brownie's texture. This indicated that the judges can delivered many negative thoughts for each baking creation. In addition, this method indicated the contestant's assignment to satisfy the judges' preferences to win the contest. This sub-strategy undoubtedly showed how British culture respected a person's beliefs and made the judges' role more important in a competition.

3. Use of indirect criticism strategies

According to the results in Table 1, the frequency of indirect criticisms found in this study was fairly high (48%). This evidence was in contrast with the results from previous research (Culpeper & Holmes, 2013; Lin, 2020; Tang, 2016) that indicated a huge difference between the use of direct and indirect types, while the current study found that the judges of GBBO used indirect strategies when criticizing almost as much as they used direct strategies. Although the judges can be indifferent in commenting due to their authority roles, the GBBO judges demonstrated a more of caring side compared to past investigation (Culpeper & Holmes, 2013; Lin, 2020; Tang, 2016). This study believed that this phenomena was related to politeness and the judges' decision to deliver indirect criticism repeatedly might be due to the following reasons.

First, the GBBO judges are probably concerned about the contestants' faces. Prior studies (Culpeper & Holmes, 2013; Lin, 2020) informed that politeness conventions were not only the rules that govern our interaction in daily life it also expands to the content of television programs. According to the politeness perspective, every individual has a "face" (Goffman, 1955); thus, a person's social value is formed through interaction and can be preserved or diminished during a conversation. (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that forceful action, such as criticism, necessitates indirect communication. Indirect speech was universally accepted by the plethora of literature (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Goffman, 1955; Lin, 2020; Nguyen, 2005; Tang, 2016) as more polite than direct speech. As a result, using indirect methods to decrease the criticism's force for the listener really showed the judges consideration towards the competitors. For example, the judge responded to the contestant after asking what their decoration theme of the cookies "A peacock? I thought it was a tennis racquet! Uh, it's to celebrate Wimbledon!". Rather than condemning the cookies' dissimilarity to the determined peacock design, the judge expressed humor and exaggerated their appearances in comparison to tennis equipment and the tennis championship. Additionally, the study of Eskreis-Winkler and Fishbach (2020) mentioned that criticism could affected (e.g., discouragement) to non-expert receivers more than an expert group. In the case of GBBO, the participants were non-professional bakers, so it was reasonable for the judges to conserve the contestants' faces with indirect criticism.

Second, the GBBO judges may be persuaded to communicate their disapproval out of respect for the audience. Unlike earlier studies research (Culpeper & Holmes, 2013; Lin, 2020; Tang, 2016) that took on singing and fashion shows, which target on teenager and adult, the GBBO cooking competition leaned toward diverse kind of viewers. Food and cooking were culturally sensitive concepts (Cakici, Erdem, & Sunnetcioglu, 2020), and several food programs were created to

be a family-friendly. Family shows like GBBO are expected by the viewers to portray more of polite behaviors. In addition, GBBO was broadcasted on primetime schedule which generally covered a wide range of audiences from youths to elderly. The language used by the judges could be affect by the potential viewer groups. Hence, it is reasonable to assume that the judges frequently employ indirect strategies in order to maintain the show's positive reputation and audience expectations. It seems that the judges on the GBBO cooking show tend to care more about being friendly than other talent show judges.

4. Use of indirect criticism sub-strategies

Table 3 Distribution of the implicit criticism sub-strategies in GBBO.

Sub-strategies	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Comparison	3	3%
Explanation	21	17%
Expressing uncertainty	6	5%
Indication of standard	5	4%
Question	15	12%
Expressing expectation	31	26%
Humor	9	7%
Suggestion	31	26%

Speaking of indirect criticism sub-strategies that illustrated in Table 3, it was intriguing that two indirect sub-strategies were selected most frequently. It indicates that the GBBO judges were innovative and employed various indirect criticism strategies. The first sub-strategy, expressing anticipation, hinted at the disappointment in the speaker's viewpoint and strengthen the importance of the judge's position. Tang (2016) argued that sub-strategy was speaker-centric because it offered neither

consideration nor benefit to the listener. However, the current study found that what is expected by the expert judge could reveal more than just their personal preference. The reference attributes can show what the judges were looking for in the competition, which can be deemed as valuable information for the listener. For example, the judge gave their opinions about afternoon tea biscuits set "The flavor of the biscuits quite nice. It's got a nice kick to it as well from the spices but in four hours, we wanted something a little bit neater.". In this comment, the judge gave a positive judgment on the flavor but implied a letdown feeling about the biscuit's presentation compared to the time given in this round. From this critique, we can conclude that the contestant should be cautious about time organization and decoration to meet the judges' anticipation.

About the suggestion sub-strategy, several scholars (Hyland, 2004; Lin, 2020; Nguyen, 2005) shared the same notion that suggestion form is considered as an ideal or good type of criticism. Typically, giving advice delivers ideas and benefits to its audience, demonstrating the speaker's constructive thought (Nguyen, 2005). For instance, the judge commented on two breads made by the participant "You should've baked it higher, and it would've been spot on for both of them". This statement not only advised on the baking temperature choice but also encouraged the participant to improve her future performance. The GBBO judges' frequent use of ideas may be related to their job as judges. As the show's specialists, often referred to as mentors or teachers (Lin, 2020), the judges were intended to offer participants a solution or educate them so they might perform better in the next round. It meant that giving advice could fulfill a judge's obligations.

Besides the functions, the selection of these two indirect sub-strategies by the judges might be associated with perlocutionary force or the effect from the receivers. Indirect criticism in general contained potential risk of misunderstanding from the listeners. The reason that the GBBO judges used these two sub-strategies the most could be because they viewed both sub-strategies as effective to deliver

criticism intention. As illustrated above, some of the indirect sub-strategies were rarely used (less than 10%), the judges may consider them harder to interpret the hidden intended or they might confuse the receiver. From the observation, when the judges given these two sub-strategies, the listener always reacted in the form of body language, such as nodding or saying yes, to show acceptance and acknowledgement of the judge's criticism, which could be counted as successful communication. To give indirect criticism comments, the judges must be aware of successful interpretation of both the audiences and participants. From the analysis, it can be said that the GBBO judges were strategic and mindful in their criticizing.

Conclusion

The present study aimed to examine the criticism strategies employed by British judges on a reality cookery show. The taxonomy for the analysis was derived from previous studies (Lin, 2020; Tang, 2016) and the findings shared some similarities with previous literature (Culpeper & Holmes, 2013; Lin, 2020) in that British judges used direct strategies to express illocutionary force more frequently when criticizing. Unlike earlier studies (Culpeper & Holmes, 2013; Lin, 2020; Tang, 2016), this study discovered that cooking show judges were more likely to use indirect criticism than singing or talent competition judges. Overall, it was thought that the judges' critiquing strategies were influenced by politeness and the function of expert judges. The GBBO judges tended to express self-preference and project an image of skeptical authority. To boost their legitimacy, the judges frequently explained their comments and occasionally offered baking-related tips for sharing their knowledge. However, when addressing the issue with the participants' baking method, the judges often applied indirect strategies that showed awareness towards the contestant's feeling. The study's findings prove that British judges are "critical" (Culpeper & Holmes, 2013, p.17), yet the preponderance of indirect kinds cannot

be dismissed. According to this study, a British judge is "practical". Because of the small amount of data and the results must be refined before they can be generalized. It may be stated that the current inquiry attempted to add to the pragmatic fields of culture, criticism, and media studies.

Recommendations

1. Future research could use the presented framework to investigate the phenomena of criticism in other competitive shows or programs of a different genre.

2. This study could be used to teach English language learners about criticism in a practical way.

3. In addition to giving criticism, it is crucial to bring up the issue of how to respond to criticism in order to learn how to handle it better.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

Blitvich, P. GC., Bou-Franch, P., & Lorenzo-Dus, N. (2013). Identity and impoliteness: The expert in the talent show Idol. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 9(1), 97–121.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press.

Cakici, C., Erdem, S. H., & Sunnetcioglu, A. (2020). The Effect of Travel Lifestyle, Cultural Sensitivity and Food Neophobia on Local Food Preference. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 8, 746-761.

Chen, Y-L., & Rau, V. (2015). Compliments and Criticisms Given by Judges on Singing Competition Series in Taiwan. *Studies in English Language and Literature*, 35, 1-19.

Culpeper, J., & Holmes, O. (2013). (Im)politeness and exploitative TV in Britain and North America: The X Factor and American Idol. In: Lorenzo-Dus, N., Blitvich, P.GC. (eds) *Real Talk: Reality Television and Discourse Analysis in Action* (pp. 169-198). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Diani, G. (2017). Criticism and politeness strategies in academic review discourse: a contrastive (English-Italian) corpus-based analysis. *KALBOTYRA*, 60-78.

El-Dakhs, D. (2020). How do celebrities respond to criticism in media interviews: The case of an Egyptian TV show. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 7, 1-17.

Eskreis-Winkler, L., & Fishbach, A. (2020). When praise—versus criticism—motivates goal pursuit. In: Brummelman, E. (ed) *Psychological perspectives on praise* (pp. 47-54). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Esposito, A. (2018). International Food Television Show Formats in the Digital Era. (Ph.D), University of Glasgow. Retrieved from https://theses.gla.ac.uk/30925/1/2018espositophd.pdf

Etaywe, A. (2018). A Pragmalinguistic and Sociopragmatic Study of Praise and Criticism in Academic Writing: The Case of Arabic Academic Book Reviews. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 4(2), 87-121.

Farnia, M., Abdul Sattar, H., & Sattar, A. (2015). A Sociopragmatic Analysis of the Speech Act of Criticism by Persian Native Speakers. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 2(3), 305-327.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. Psychiatry. *Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 18, 213- 231.

Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing. University of Michigan Press.

Lenz, M. (2020). Criticism and Silencing in Academia: The Ambivalence of Feedback. *Zoon Politikon*, (11), 257-280.

Lin, C.-Y. (2020). Exploring judges' compliments and criticisms on American, British, and Taiwanese talent shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 160, 44-59.

Matwick, K., & Matwick, K. (2019). Evaluations on Cooking Shows. In *Food Discourse of Celebrity Chefs of Food Network* (pp. 79-118). Springer International Publishing.

Nguyen, T. T. M. (2005). Criticizing and responding to criticisms in a foreign language: a study of Vietnamese learners of English. (Ph.D), The University of Auckland. New Zealand. Retrieved from https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/docs/uoa-docs/rights.htm

Nguyen, T. T. M. (2008). Criticizing in a L2: Pragmatic strategies used by Vietnamese EFL learners. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 5(1), 41-66.

Searle, J. R. (1979). Indirect speech acts. In J. R. Searle (Ed.), *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts* (pp. 30-57). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharma, D. K., Singh, B., Agarwal, S., Kim, H., & Sharma, R. (2022). Sarcasm Detection over Social Media Platforms Using Hybrid Auto-Encoder-Based Model. *Electronics*, 11(18).

Tang, C.-C. (2016). Managing criticisms in US-based and Taiwan-based reality talent contests: A cross-linguistic comparison. *Pragmatics*, 26, 111-136.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics: Oxford University Press.

Zou, H., & Hyland, K. (2020). Managing evaluation: Criticism in two academic review genres. *English for Specific Purposes*, 60, 98-112.