

THE CONSTRUCTION OF MASCULINITY IN THE REALITY SHOW *MASTER CHEF US SEASON FIVE*

Adithea Rake Sanjaya
Universitas Sebelas Maret
Email: rakeadithea@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Culture of masculinity has been constructed since the day men were born. It is constructed by state apparatus of a culture; family, law, religion, and media. Professional kitchens are today, and have historically been, male dominated. This masculinity is in male domination in kitchen definitely that is in contrast to women gender role regarding to kitchen. One of reality show was *Master Chef US* season Five took three professional male chefs as judges, they are: Gordon Ramsay, Graham Elliot and Joe Bastianich. This competition has 50% male contestants. The masculinity domination was reflected in Judges who managed and implemented the competition by their own characteristic related to masculinity. Because they had the best experiences about culinaries, business and networks. Some of masculine areas are physical, functional, sexual, emotional and intellectual. It also includes gender stereotype. But in this competition there were special masculinity domination as the result of research that reflected and represented Judges' power. The results of masculinity domination were playing leadership role, aggressiveness, discipline, strength, independence and determination. Most of them related to the judges' experiences, characteristics, expressions and attitudes during competition went on. However, this research had lack that had to be completed. It might to be complemented by researching one of masculinity domination stereotypes in order to be focus and get much discussion, understanding and knowledge. It also needs comparison with other variable to know the differences each other.

Keywords: Master Chef US season five, masculinity domination, gender, power and culture.

INTRODUCTION

Culture of masculinity has been constructed since the day men were born. It is constructed by state apparatus of a culture; family, law, religion, and media. It constructs a vision on how men should behave in the society and it descends from generation to generation making the vision of how the "real man" is (Althusser, 1970).

Nowadays, men are not only considered as worker in hard job as mechanist, miner, soldier and so on but they are also considered as able to take a "softer"

job such as being a chef. Media is properly used to promote a social change in worldwide effectively. Through media, society in wide world will start to believe a new gender role and start to follow it. It will create a new power, a new domination and new hegemony in social culture.

Professional kitchens are today, and have historically been, male dominated (Platzer, 2011). Times of wars in the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries became the beginning of men entering kitchen. The male domination in kitchen definitely is in contrast to women gender role regarding to kitchen. It will rise question regarding the opposite between social construction of women and the reality in employment. Rosalie Platzer mentions that work-family conflict is one reason why women are less represented at the top of the kitchen hierarchy. Deborah A. Harris and Patti Giuffre argue that the work-family conflict acts as a “gendered mechanism,” that prevents women from reaching higher levels of representation in male dominated fields (Platzer, 2011). It means that work-family conflict have created wide hole of discrimination in society, that continue in the media representation.

There are several reality show themed kitchen in America that presents male judges (*Hell's Kitchen US*, *Master Chef US*, and *Top Chef*). *Master Chef US* is one of the most interesting cooking competition in US, The show got second ranked in US top cooking competition chart.

THEORY AND METHOD

Since the issue of gender draws more attention in the field of American studies, this research will be conducted under the American studies framework. This research will deal with the masculinity constructed in Reality Show in modern American society. It certainly needs some theories and approaches to analyze this phenomenon. Furthermore, American studies are interdisciplinary studies, so this research is allowed to borrow and crosscut some disciplines and theories which are related the topic of the research.

America is an immigrant country. There are a lot of people from all around the world live there and bring their culture. Salad bowl is a metaphor for this differences because there are so many ethnic around the world migrate to America for new life, mostly from Europe. Eventhough they are different, they can live as a single identity; America. Historically, it can be seen from the government of 13th colonies in early America. All of them were male, and this phenomenon leads to the big possibility that they practiced masculinity in the government. As the time passes by, masculinity is not only practiced in government, but also in the kitchen. Under the umbrella of the American Studies, this concern becomes an academic area that tries to find an integrated and interdisciplinary understanding of American culture.

Bradburry and Temperly in "*An Introduction to America Studies*", state that some important aspects of American Studies are the process of building the text, such as American myth and symbol. American Studies tries to explain its national character and ways of life. American Studies tries to reveal American experience in achieving dreams, using certain values, and constructing their own identity (1998:27).

Following the concept of the cooking show nowadays, *The Master Chef US* Season Five brings the new study about masculinity domination. This study is specifically to prove the domination of men in the professional kitchen. It means that the physical activity in cooking is dominated by men. When it comes to the basic, cooking is one area that women have been included in, and women have long been associated with being in the kitchen. Culturally, women are expected to cook. They have been the ones providing the family with nourishment by putting warm meals on the table. Some even argue that it is a woman's "biological role," to nurture the family through her cooking (Whitney, 2009). So, it seems logical to assume that a woman's dominance in the home kitchen would be reflected in professional restaurant kitchens. With years of experience of handling the heat of the kitchen, so to speak, women would be able to transfer their domestic skills into the professional field. But, the numbers

suggest otherwise, Estimates place women as only about ten percent of executive chefs in the United States (Flint Marx, 2009).

The reason is because women are still expected to be the primary care giver of their children. This goes back to the idea that even though children also have father, women are biologically more nurturing, and therefore, naturally suited to raise children. “Mothering,” is still the tradition when it comes to parenting (Stone, 2007).

Professional kitchens are today, and have historically been, male dominated. This is explained by military history in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, during times of wars, members of the army were expected to cook (Reinhold, 1998). This developed into a military style hierarchical structure in the professional kitchen (Cooper, 13). At the top of the kitchen hierarchy was the executive chef. This “machismo,” atmosphere still exists in many professional kitchens even to this day (Stein, 2008). For decades, men have controlled restaurant kitchens, distancing their work from the mere cooking that women have been doing at home (Cooper, 13). It was not until the second half of the twentieth century that women began making inroads into professional kitchens. Especially in the 1980s and 1990s a surge of successful women chefs began making their name in restaurant kitchens (Katalinich, 1987). Women have also increasingly been entering and graduating from culinary schools. In the 1970s and 1980s, women represented about five to ten percent of those enrolled in culinary schools. However, even with the increase of women culinary graduates, women are still not equally represented in the higher restaurant kitchen positions.

Though women have made some inroads and achieved some successes in the restaurant industry, women still have not gained true equality in the professional kitchen. There are many possible explanations as to why they have not. One of the most pervasive arguments is that professional kitchens are still a “boys club” (Baker, 2000). According to Gary Alan Fine, though women may have more access to male dominated occupations, women still have to work on

being accepted by the “boys” (Fine, 1987). Becoming “one of the boys,” entails accepting the “informal” work structure of men, such as vulgar or sexual joking and language, discrimination and harassment (Fine, 1987). Fine argues that for women to be accepted they have to, at the minimum, accept and play the rules of the “boys club”. Joan Acker argues that organizational structures are never gender neutral and thus push women out of organizations. In addition, the idea of the “abstract worker” is also male gendered. This means that any bodied processes, such as pregnancy, menstruation, expressing emotions, which are bodied processes of women; do not fit into the organizational structure or the idea of the ideal worker. Kitchen is a hard place for anyone to succeed. It requires hard work, determination, practice and so forth. Thus, it is really hard for women to reach top position as a chef. Gender still works in classifying the proper job for men and women.

When it comes to the methodology to analyze the issue of the research, Power in discourse is applied to analyze the Gender stereotype. Gender refers to how an individual sees himself or herself and how he or she acts in terms of masculine and feminine traits (*Wood in “Gendered Live”*). Gender approach is needed to understand how those voice and body language become the part of gender construction/ representation and work in the culture. Gender concepts works in the ideological system of political-cultural position based on men and women stereotypes and roles in society (2000: 19). In this process, power and gender approaches show how masculinity is constructed in the three male judges.

The use of gender approach can be supported by the use of semiotic. Here, Roland Barthes semiotic approach is employed. The main consideration why the research employs Barthes semiotic is that the method enables to relate the ideology of men with the reality. In other words, it is possible to understand the relation of the men stereotype represented in the professional kitchen.

To support the semiotic approach, the Critical Discourse Analysis by Fairclough was chosen to analyze the language between the conversation of the

judges and the contestant. There are various discourse that can be found in a society. Those discourses contain a certain issues based on the topic of the issues they involved to. It can be politic, law, entertainment, or even medical issue. A discourse may use language to express the main issue and further explanation about it. Therefore, language is a crucial aspect which forms the discourse. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is one of method which can be employed to analyze a discourse socially. It analyzes the language use and the power relation among the participants involved in a discourse.

The use of CDA is necessary because it can reveal the relation of power domination between the judges and the contestant through the text. The transcript of the conversation was cropped into more specific sentence to gain proper result about the ideology of masculinity domination in professional kitchen.

This research is descriptive qualitative research. Burns and Grove (2003:19) describe a qualitative approach as “a systematic subjective approach used to describe life experiences and situations to give them meaning”. Researchers use the qualitative approach to explore the behaviors, perspectives, experiences and feelings of people and emphasize the understanding of these elements. This research analyzes the masculinity constructed in three male judges in the Reality Show named “*Master Chef US*” Season Five. In this case, masculinity can be recognized through the behaviors, perspective, experience and feelings of the three male judges. Therefore, Qualitative research fits to this research.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The three juries in America Master Chef show their respective roles as juries with a high level of credibility and experience. This is evident from the variety of experiences and backgrounds belong to them. However, playing a role as a leader must be able to master the object or human being whom are led in order to be fit their expectations.

The provision to play a role as a leader is not meant to be merely a leader, but it is contained within each jury's character in managing the America MasterChef environment as well as possible, and thus demanded an ideal leadership character. Here it appears that playing the role of leader as well as having the ability in leadership are things that are related to doing something right (Cover, 1989). Although in the concept of playing the role in a structured and systemic way is very difficult to do in the process of assessment of America MasterChef, because it is entirely based on the experience of each jury in the field of culinary and cooking, and the results of the three juries in assessing the results of each contestant's dish.

The role of leaders conducted by the juries shows the existence of efforts to mobilize, motivate and revive the potential possessed by the contestants and be able to control and handle all the problems that occurred during the competition of America MasterChef took place. Therefore, playing a leading role in the contest means deciding the right and best course for America's future MasterChef.

The role of leader gives its own characteristics for the audiences so that the audiences are able to interact with them (Forsyth, 2010: 149). The character is especially felt by the contestants as people who are judged directly by the juries who play their role as leader of America Master Chef.

The role process as a leader in America Master Chef is demonstrated by them selves-introduction through the welcoming of all contestants consisting of men and women. This could be seen analyzed from the words of Ramsay's as a jury in the first episode of season 5 that is *"Welcome to the masterChef Kitchen. You are about to do battle in the biggest culinary competition. Anywhere in the world today. This is the search for the best home cook in America (00.03.00-->00.03.16)"*.

These words show that America MasterChef competence is the largest competition of culinary in the world and is followed by selected experts. While in reverse, the statement of Ramsay hints the quality and strength of those people who become the juries in the prestigious event, he is also a quality jury

who has the best quality in the world. Therefore, this statement seems to indicate that leadership is done with regard to special strength/ quality (Forsyth Keating,1994:5). In other words, the juries who lead the event are people who have an incredible breadth and strength about the culinary and cooking. This is in accordance with some of their backgrounds and experiences which have been mentioned above in his short biography.

The jurie's statement *"this is the search for the best home cook in America"* emphasized that this competition was a competence that was very interested by the citizens of America to develop and improve their quality and potential of cooking and culinary. In addition, the statement indicated that the judging or assessment process was very strict because it was based on the assessment of the judges of the international standard. Furthermore, the role of the jury as a leader in the competition was more clearly seen in the words that reflected the duties and responsibilities of the jury. Because the reflection of leaders was very important and can provide clarity to something related to it and what to do (Galati,2008:28). This finding and result of analysis could be look in three jurie's statement as follows:

Elliot said *one of you 30 home cooks standing here before us will become America's next MasterChef. One of you home cooks will win \$250 million. One of you will be immortalized in the kitchens of America with your very own cookbook (00.03.1--> 00.03.35)"*.

Ramsay completed the statements before, that is *"and that't not all. There's another prize. The MasterChef trophy. This trophy is the validation of one person's incredible journey from home cook to MasterChef (00.03.36-->00.03.50)"*.

Joseph reconfirmed what had to be done by contestants through his statement *"Before any of you get near that trophy, you still have to earn one of these (Elliot: A MasterChef Apron). Win an apron and you are in with the chance of becoming this year's MasterChef. If you don't win one, well you go home"*.

Some of these statements generally indicated the compactness of their duties and responsibilities as leaders in the America MasterChef competition. The

words of the Elliot indicated that the specified limits were limitations that has undergone several screening processes performed by the judges in assessing the performance and quality of the contestants. He then publicly announced the competition rule pattern to win \$ 250 million and the existence of award for the dish quality that belonged to one of contestant who was considered the best so that be immune toward the applicable procedures. This was also done by Ramsay as his responsibility and duty to explain another prize and trophy to be won by the contestants. But the victory could only be done if each contestant got a MasterChef Apron, which was a symbol in this contest to determine the next step of the participant. In other words, the jury assumed the characteristic of leadership that all activities in the competence had stages and procedures that all contestants had to adhere to, and the jury had full power to determine who was eligible to continue the competition and who should return or go home.

The role of the leader in reflecting on his duties and responsibilities is time in a competition needed to think, re-think, act and provide the jury's energy and ability to direct all contestants selectively and responsibly.

The jury also directs the contestants to form their spirits with orders to win a series of stages in America MasterChef through apron winning. The order is a precise reflection in the beginning of a competition to spur the spirit and the best possible competition.

The command shown by the jury is an affirmation in leadership that came from a person who had a higher class, so that automatically had superiority, strength and characteristics that were different from others (Locke, 1999:13). Aside from being a form of duty and responsibility of the juries, the power of the command was directly functioned to provoke the power within the contestants. They were motivated by the challenges given by the juries, which were actually commands, because the challenge indicated to limit the time that should really be applied for cooking until finished within one hour. This was seen in Ramsay's statement who was impressed to ask, but actually he led a

command to obey the rules and described statements and other commands, namely *“Are you ready to face the challenge that can earn you a MasterChef apron? Are you ready? (Contestants): Yes, Sir (cheering). You’ll be given just one hour to conceive, create and plate one stunning dish. One the face of it, this challenge is simple. Please turn over your chopping boards (contestants were laughing looking themselves at chopping boards) to win an apron, we need you to put yourself on a plate (00.04.20-->00.05.09)”*.

Furthermore, the role of the competition as a leader that's conducted by the juries was seen in the implementation process of America MasterChef. The juries supervised and controlled the cooking process of contestants and ensured what they did accordance with everything that was mastered by them and predictable results to be achieved. This is exemplified in some of the juries' actions as follows:

Joseph: *“This smells good. What is it? (Getting closer to contestant) it’s may ramen stock. It’s smell amazing (00.09.02-->00.09.09).*

Ramsay: *“What is in there (Willi): Apricote Preserve, white wine, but I am adding a kick to it. So it’s all gonna be balance, good luck (00.09.15--> 00.09.23)”*.

Elliot: *“Tyler (by getting closer to him), Hey Chefs, How Are you? (Tyler): Good.Good. What are you making? (Tyler): Venison. Is the sauce finished already? (Tyler): yes, sir. It’s a chimichurri. (00.09.25).*

The three examples above were more visible in their role in leading as controllers and advisors. Because of their competence and credibility, they were able to demonstrate their leadership characteristic through ensuring contestants' steps right or suitable with competition standards.

What the juries did, besides as supervision and controlling, was a means to give them a description as a leader in order to objectively estimate the dishes and contestants who could enter the next stage. At this stage, the juries provided each evaluation and assessment that would be discussed simultaneously as the cooking process was completed. The reality show in America Master Chef impressions shapes public opinion that cooking and culinary-related issues were not only limited to issues related to gender, such as

women, but it was a social reality that could change anytime and anywhere, especially in America.

On the other hand, the way of leadership which was performed by the three juries proved that there was a connection between expertise and experiences, language or words used in leading the competition based on field realities and the inescapable reality that men and women had similarity in understanding, exploring and developing their potential in the field of cooking and culinary. The role as leader in this competition that's discussed through semiotics as the basis for knowing social discourse and reality was the application of Fairclough's perspective on discourse (Fairclough, Jossep and Sayer, 2004). The social reality reflected in America MasterChef showed no difference at all between men and women related to culinary. They put greater freedom in choosing work, contribution to an organization (in this case competition) and independence to do something (Hofstede, 1998: 42).

The freedom implied by the jury and his expertise, strength and authority were also visible in his escort to Gavin, one of the contestants who expressed his expertise using some of method and techniques to cook. The freedom that was wrapped up in the supervision of a jury's power to make sure it was made in accordance with the goals and standards in America Master Chef. This could be seen through the following conversations:

*Ramsay: Gavin, (Gavin): Yes Sir. You're making so many things. You're doing the ricotta.
(Gavin): Yes. You're making fresh pasta. (Gavin): Yes.
Ramsay: Why something so complicated? Cause you know what?
Gavin : I don't think anybody here else has the tehcniques that I do.
Ramsay: so that is....
Gavin : the chicken liver.
Ramsay: Taste it! Quick!. What's the one thing that needs?
Gavin : salt. (00.09.35-->00.09.53).*

The above conversation indicated the authority and responsibility of a jury to ascertain what cooking was being cooked by the contestant and the results which was achieved. The jury authority as the leader who played the competition pattern in this contest was crucial that could encourage contestants to improve their cooking quality. Moreover, the contestant who owned the

technique was a man and declared himself to be the only person who had the technique done. However, the power of the jury didn't concern the technique that was implemented, but ensured what was done successfully or not, that was something contained in the words "*taste it. Quick!*".

The command as the appointment of jury's authority and power toward the contestant had to be obeyed. Not only that, the command was proven by ensuring what the contestants did was lack in salt. Tasting lack in salt well was a manifestation of evidence of jury strength that had the precision and ability to control and ensure the competition.

Some of the dialogues between the juries and some of the contestants shown in the first video tended to show the jury's escort process as the leader of the competition in order to run well as desired. The jury usually created comfort and familiarity with the contestants by calling his name and asking what was done or cooking what. The characteristics of the jury who played his leadership turned out to be able to shape the attention and improve their spirit and trust. Confidently the participants or contestants demonstrated the cooking process, what should be done and what dishes that wanted to be served to juries.

Based on the reality of the field through the language used by the jury showed the strength in a language that was conveyed to the contestants. So the language used by the juries looked different from one contestant to another contestants, because the juries looked to use non-formal language for some participants or contestants. Thus it was mentioned by Norman Fairclough that power has a complex concept and word power is used in various senses (Fairclough, 2009).

As for the power of language used by the juries tended to use two terms namely power to and power over. Power to be a language ability that is owned by everyone, especially in this case the juries. Power to be owned by the juries is evident in the dialogue done to provide certainty of cooking and to form the spirit of the contestants. Therefore, the power to change the attitude and

manner of the juries in delivering the language and leading the America MasterChef contest well.

Furthermore, based on the ability to change attitudes and behavior in power to could create power over. The overall power over in the America MasterChef season 5 video demonstrated that the characteristics of the power held as a contest leader as well as the used language was able to move and control all participants or contestants well. Conversely, contestants who did not heed what the juries were saying could lead them out of the contest, either directly or through the appraisal stage as appropriate.

Ramsay: All of you, stop! Knives down! Now! I told you, we were watching every move. (00.10.12--> 00.10.20).

Ramsay's words above showed that power over had greater capacity than others to control all the movements performed by the contestants. Power over other people creates a strong impression for others that what the jury says must be obeyed and can bring negative things to those who do not heed. Therefore, this power over can be termed communicative power, which is the power to control others in a communication which in this case is interaction in America Master Chef Contest.

The interactions and communications that were built into Ramsay's words above all showed commands that all contestants had to comply with and obey. Words "All of you, stop!" Provide an impression and an important aspect of generating communication codes to ensure what is said to all contestants and to be obeyed. Therefore, the command shows the message function contained in it in the form of diachronic and synchronic time (Catt, 2017: 95). The meanings of diachronic messages in these words indicate a certain length of time that has been given to all participants to explore themselves and be confined to a contest space that make them to have to obey competition provisions. The contestants were required to process maximally and the jury as the holder of the control who played the leader didn't discriminate between one contestant with others. However the diachronic message contained in the above command is

limited to a certain space in a contest which also limits the contest process so that the command function is like an anchorage.

While in the synchronic function shows the strength of the language used to be an important code for the contestants to stop all forms of activities in cooking. This function of command strongly demonstrates and proves the power of the jury is an absolute power that could not be disturbed and violated by anyone in the contest. So that the jury could unequivocally remove some contestants who disobeyed the form of the command directly.

Furthermore, the phrase "Knives down! Now! "was a command that confirmed the previous sentence. This means that this command confirmed that all contestants should not cook anymore because the specified time had run out. While the word "now" led more to the assertion of time that explained that however and whatever the contestants did immediately had to be stopped without exception. The emphasis of using the word "now" clearly proved the firm action taken by the jury to play its role as a leader in the competition well.

While the jury's words "I told you, we are watching every move" confirm some of the previous command words and tell, even scare the contestants that the contestants' gestures from start to cooking to ending which are limited to the word have received special attention and care from the jury. The merger between the attention in the process and the final limits of this competition that led to the action of the jury.

The three models of command and the appointment of affirmation of the final limit of cooking in the competition are very important to note and do. This is due to the enforcement of the discipline of time and rules set by the jury as the control holder or leader who played its part during the competition was running.

Then when viewed from the distance of command and body language used to show the role of jury as a leader in the competition was very serious and not kidding to give sanctions for those who violate. For Ramsay said the above words (command) in a loud voice and repeated assertion, even an

ultimatum for the contestant not to be left out because of ignoring the jury as the event leader. This is seen in the next jury's words indicating the firmness and discipline he performed as a leader in America MasterChef competition against participants who disregarded the rules and what was said by the jury, that was *"turn off your gas. You are out of the competition"* (00.11.38-->00.11.40), and jury's comment to Natanyanya firmly because of unstandard to cook and make some mistake in cooking technical which was reflected from Joseph's comment *"Natanya, turn your gas off. Your sauce is broken, over-acidulated. Raw wine. Too many technical errors"* (00.14.18-->00.14.26).

Both of these facts provided shock therapy to other participants, that the jury as the leader of the contestants and knew all the movements of the contestants, was very firm, disciplined and objective in assessing the dish of each participant. Furthermore it was actually implemented during the contest. Nevertheless, the jury's role not only evaluated or even judges the contestants, but directed them to do the best, especially in the cooking results by serving them as best they could and first test them before they were served before the jury-it's understanding of the words could be reflected from Elliot commands *"Taste everything before it goes on that plate"*. Conversely, any contestant who could meet the expectations of juries get a ticket to continue the competition with apron given in recognition of his work.

The role of other juries as leaders was conceptualized well, namely through the manufacture of standard dish performed by Ramsay. In other words, the jury made the concept of cooking along with the contestants to become the standard of dish that contestants had to achieve. The uniqueness of the way this standard dish was part of playing the role of a jury to shape the spirit and familiarity of the participants with the jury so that the impression arose for the contestant that the jury could not only evaluate or judge them, but practically he was able to do what they did according to the certain time limit. The participation of the jury to provide a new atmosphere, new spirit and deep impression for the contestants was reflected from Elliot words, as follows:

Elliot: *"one of us is going to cook alongside you (contestants were laughing) Are you kidding me? So wich of us three do you challenge (00.21.34-->00.21.46)*

Elliot: *Astrid. Gordon Ramsay. (Astrid: I Respect the hell out of you, so let's bring it, baby. You and I, mano-a-mano (Elliot and contestants were yelling and laughing) (00.21.46-->00.21.55).*

Ramsay: *I accept that challenge. I'll cook alongside all of you (all: yelling and claping the hands) (00.21.55-00.21.58).*

The role played by Ramsay indicated a provable commitment that the three judges, reflected through Ramsay, were the jury of choice and have quality and credibility in the field of cooking and culinary. Therefore, the participation of the Ramsay for cooking with the contestants did not diminish the leadership character and the values of a jury. For what he did could set a good example or standard and the standard of cooking expected by other jurors. Furthermore, the results of the Ramsay served as a benchmark in assessing the dishes of the remaining contestants.

In addition, acceptance of challenges from the contestants was welcomed by Ramsay and accompanied by boisterous and applause from other contestants. Yet what Ramsay did has the potential to defeat in a challenge that could degrade as a jury. But the challenge was firmly accepted by Ramsay jury as proof that what he offered could be done by him, not limited to the level of a jury who merely judged without being able to do what the contestants did.

Ramsay statement "I accept that challenge" determines that he was completely able to counter the challenges posed by one of the contestants to cook alongside all the other contestants. His statements and attitudes were expressed through his words "I was born ready, Graham" (00.23.04), whereas according to Graham Elliot, Ramsay had been 10 minutes behind other contestants for cooking. Therefore, the ability to control and lead oneself was demonstrated in the action it did in cooking with other contestants. In addition, the statement also affirms that however the role of the jury was not limited to being above the contestants, but could be conceptualized by mixing with participants to give them a psychological impact in the competition.

Implicitly, however, the appointment of participants to Ramsay to accept the challenge occurred because he was the jury favored by the participants, quick to get along and have more experience than the other juries. This means that the character of leadership and experience was very unquestionable and its role as a leader, which was a jury able to create a comfortable and controlled atmosphere during the competition. It was this leadership role that he felt dominated in himself compared to other jurors.

Furthermore, the role played by the jury as the leader in the first video is seen in Astrid's station with the dirtiness of the cooking place. Here the jury as the leader of the competition played a role in stabilizing, disciplining, controlling and providing direction objectively and thoroughly to all participants. The attitude was done by Jury Joseph to give an example to others that done by Astrid in the form of dirtying the cooking station, was not the standard desired by the restaurant in general, especially in America MasterChef competition. As for Joseph was meant as follows:

Joseph : *this is not gonna fly. This is disgusting. This is not how you work in restaurants. Everyone listen up a second. We're not gonna tolerate disgusting working conditions. This is a kitchen. Weh have sanitary standards. This is dangerous. You're gonna fall. You're gonna hurt yourself. You're gonna hurt me, and I'm just not gonna tolerate it. 00.25.02-->00.25.22).*

The above statement also showed that all male juries understand the meaning of hygiene and sanitation standards established in America MasterChef, as well as the comforts that had been designed in such a way. Therefore, the role of the jury represented by Joseph in this case indicated the responsibility of the leader in arranging and ensuring the happiness and cleanliness of the cooking for all contestants. This means that the contestants were required not to interfere with other contestants, even juries related to cleanliness and comfort when cooking.

On the other hand, the attitude shown by Joseph showed to the audiences and other contestants that the jury was not only in charge of ensuring the cooking process and assessing the contestants' merchandise, but also guarding and controlling the entire contest well, including judgment and jury attitude

towards cleanliness. Therefore, the phrase "You're gonna hurt yourself. You're gonna hurtme, and I'm just not gonna tolerate it "is a phrase that suggests that what Astrid did was self-defeating, potentially even getting rid of it because the jury could not tolerate what she did. Furthermore, Astrid's attitude as if underestimated and ignored the jury rules so offensive, even underestimate the provisions that actually did not need to be explained, the cleanliness must be guaranteed in cooking and in the restaurant environment as the implementation of the field in general. Therefore, as a jury who led the whole process of competition this became a serious concern and could not be tolerated. However, the overall assessment of the results and tastes was objectively demonstrated by the entire jury towards Astrid. That is, even if Astrid was facing errors over very dirty cooking conditions, the jury knew and analyzed carefully the results of her cooking in accordance with the terms and standards set by America Master Chef, so Astrid still got the apron as a sign he could proceed to the next competition.

The juries' power in assessing all the contestants objectively and rewarding the best cooking results was seen in the second episode. The juries' power authority was awarded to the top two dishes, which were two objectively assessed contestants who had the most skill and result in cooking, Courtney and Willie.

However, such judgments wre only determined for a person of the highest quality according to the jury. The best quality was not only from the results of cooking, but also viewed in accordance with the look of the cuisine. Therefore, the juries' authority in this competition, as the control holder and the event leader, might be taken over by the winner of the best cooking work, so that the person was able to pass the cooking assessment (not cooking / free of competition once) and be entitled to dispensation or ease for other participants.

Thus, provision could only be done by Courtney as the best winner in the second episode for the top two dishes category. This was what Elliott said that the winner got a huge advantage, because the winner was able to save and give

a definite ticket for the next competition to 10 other contestants. Therefore, the transfer of judgment control based on the award was as if replacing the position of the entire jury, even though it was still within the scope of command and supervision of the entire jury.

The role play process played by the entire jury is impressive for the audience, while providing more space for the contestants to spur their skills and cooking skills. In other words, what the judge decided against Courtney was nothing more than the strategy and management of the game that the jury played as the leader of the competition to look more attractive.

The competition is getting more interesting with the rescue management of the contestants not to be eliminated by Courtney. As seen in the second video, the minutes of 00:21 to 26.23.52 Courtney's role became a very important role to be decisive for other contestants based on permit and assessment results from all judges. The flexibility it had to select 10 contestants was nothing but proof of the power and authority of the juries capable of changing and doing anything to make the competition more interesting. It was very apparent that Courtney did not vote for Willie because she was the toughest opponent for the time, so Courtney hoped Willie could be eliminated at a later stage.

While the responsibility of the jury as the leadership of the competition controlled and even seemed to let it happen, so it seemed as if authorization and juries powers were made a chance by Courtney after winning the best food to play her competition pattern like playing chess full of strategies to win herself. As a result, what Courtney did based on the legitimacy of the entire jury launched the next step and was able to map the competitor's abilities. The jury authorization was seen once in the classification of contestants' remaining results. The juries deliberately left the three worst contestants in cooking meat loaf. This was where the jury's role as the leader of the competition to decide who was entitled to advance to the next competition and who should return or could not continue the competition. The power to classify and objectively assessed the three contestants was juries performance in playing the game as a

leader who had absolute power over his subordinates during the event was running.

CONCLUSION

The reality of *Master Chef US* Season Five showed the domination of masculinity to master and manage this television program show. The success of program was supported by experienced judges who has a lot of experiences, knowledges, and business in many countries in the world and high level of credibility. However there were a lot of things that could be analyzed within this reality show, one of it was in the masculinity domination because all of judges were male and had their own characteristic to lead this reality show program.

As for the construction that supported the success of this reality show program in the masculinity domination included leadership role, aggressiveness, discipline, strength, independence, and determination. Those domination of masculinity became the main character and masculinity of male in this reality show that had many aspects to support all of session in this reality show program.

Firstly, the masculinity domination in leadership role was proven through judges' capability and existence of efforts to mobilize, motivate, and revive the potential possessed by the contestants and be able to control and handle all the problems that occurred during the competition of *Master Chef US*. Therefore, playing a leading role in the contest meant deciding the right and best course for America's future *Master Chef*.

Secondly, the masculinity domination in judges' aggressiveness was implemented to realize and achieve their desired goal. Therefore all of behaviors or attitudes within this reality show was more focused and considered as well as possible to achieve the goal. The judge aggressiveness was also implemented and proven from their purposes to provide the best competition to get expert and credible contestant in cooking. Thereby if there

was contestants broke the regulation of this reality show program, the judges would decided them to stop their cooking, even disqualified them directly without any forgiveness and dispensation, because the tendency and aggressiveness in setting rules by the judges was an absolute matter and could not be underestimated.

Thirdly, judges discipline. It started in implementation of team provision in competition that couldn't be changed and became judges' assessments so that there was no tolerance limitation of time. The judges discipline was also reflected from the whole process and contestants movements during the competition and the prohibition of not exceeding the deadline so that there was a contestant, Gavin, broke the discipline in time and he got punishment to turn off his gas (disqualification).

Fourthly are strength, independence, and determination. These masculinity domination related each others during *Master Chef US* competition. Judges power was reflected not only in their physical forms, but in their characters and attitudes to implement everything within competition. The independence could be proven from their assessments, attitudes, words, and ways of judging from each different of Judges. For example Ramsay judged contestant to the point language, selective and dominant in judgment and decisions. Furthermore, strength and independence created judges determination to implement all the rules and time, consider and assess all contestant so that they had created their own characteristic that completed judges each others.

REFERENCES

- Ann Cooper. (1998). *A Woman's Place is in the Kitchen: An Evolution of Women Chefs*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Bradbury, M. and Temperley, H. (1998). *An Introduction to American Studies. Second Edition*. London: Longman.
- Burns, N. & Grove, S. K. (2003). *Understanding Nursing Research 3rd ed.* Philadelphia, PA.
- Catt, I.E. (2017). *Embodiment in The Semiotic Matrix*. London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

- Fairclough, N., Jessop, R. & Sayer. (2004). "A Critical realism and semiosis", J.M. Roberts and J. Joseph, (eds), *Realism, Discourse and Deconstruction*. London: Routledge.
- Fineman, M.A. and Thomson, M. (2016). *Exploring Masculinities: Feminist Legal Theory Reflections*. London: Routledge.
- Forsyth, D.R. (2010). *Group Dynamics*. USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Galati, C.S. (2008). *A Man in Transition: Reflection on Relationship, Leadership and Life*. New York: iUniverse, Inc.
- Gary, A.F. 1987. "One of the Boys: Women in Male-Dominated Settings," in *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity*, Michael S. Kimmel (ed.). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Habsari, S.K. (2014). "Masculine Domination and Power in Indonesian TV Cook Shows". *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 155 (2014) 320 – 325.
- Hofstede, G. and Associates. (1998). *Masculinity and Femininity; The Taboo Dimension of National Cultures*. London: Sage Publications.
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Graham_Elliot (accessed: 20 Januari 2018).
- <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1623401800180>, on July 20, 2017, 10.55 am.
- Jaya, B.K. (2016). *Kuliah Jurusan Apa? Broadcasting*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Keating, C.J. (1994). *The Leadership Book*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Locke, E.A. (1999). *The Essence of Leadership: The Four Keys to Leading Successfully*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Lois, B. (2000) "Woman in the Boys Club: Ann Giordano Endured the Roadblocks to Becoming a Chef." *Buffalo News*, 2 January 2000, M12.
- Mummendey, A. (1984). *Social Psychology of Agression*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Navarre, S. (2012). *Masculinity, Bullying, and Aggression*. New York: The Rosen Publishing Group, Inc.
- Pamela Stone, *Opting Out? Why Women Really Quit Careers and Head Home* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2007).
- Peggy, K. (1987), "Now Starring in the Nation's Best Kitchens, The road has been long and often rocky, but more and more women chefs are making it to the top." *Newsday*, 19 August 1987.
- Piliang, Y.A. (1998). *Dunia yang Dilipat; Tamasya Melampaui Batas-batas Kebudayaan*. Yogyakarta: Jalasutra.
- Platzer, R. (2011). *Women Not in the Kitchen: A Look at Gender Equality in the Restaurant Industry*. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.
- Rebecca, F.M. (2009), "Plenty of female chefs run New York City's kitchens. So why are men getting all the fame?" (15 January 2009) <http://newyork.timeout.com/articles/restaurants-bars/70474/bitchin-confidential>
- Sadie, Stein, "Are Women 'Chefs' Or Just 'Cooks?'" (20 November, 2008) <http://jezebel.com/5094682/arewomen-chefs-or-just-cooks>

- Safa, A.F. and Kurniawan, E. (2015). "Gordon Ramsay's Politeness Strategies in MasterChef and MasterChef Junior US". *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, Vol. 14, No. 1, April.
- Sobur, A. (2001). *Analisis Teks Media; Suatu Pengantar Untuk Analisis Wacana, Analisis Semiotik, Dan Analisis Framing*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Steno, A.M. & Nanna Friche. (2015). "Celebrity chefs and masculinities among male cookery trainees in vocational education" *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 67:1,47-61, DOI: 10.1080/13636820.2014.927901.