

Jessica Hutchison

Paris, not France and the Dialogic World of the Celebrity

I. Introduction

The existence of the contemporary celebrity in American culture is one that is fraught with pressures to remain both elusive and knowable, to be enmeshed in a fantasy world and to be authentic, to be producible and consumable. Easing this tension is an act that renders the celebrity even further out of reach by constantly reconstructing their image. Identifying the real and essential entity that composes the celebrity is desired by the media and public alike (“Who *is* Paris Hilton?”). In moments where there arises a disjuncture between the projected identity and the true identity, such as when “acting betrays a lack of control, or off screen in what might be known about a star's private life,” fascination often becomes obsessive (Toslon 2001, 445). As a result, authenticity becomes a tenuous quality, one which a celebrity must project without allowing the public to understand it as a performance. This, however, is troubled even more for celebrities that are famous only for being famous—famous for being “themselves.” Paris Hilton is undoubtedly one of the most ubiquitous celebrities of this sort. In 2009, when MTV released the documentary *Paris, not France*, the implication that the Paris Hilton who dominated headlines at the time was an inauthentic persona of the real Paris arose. In order to understand the way in which Paris Hilton’s persona(e) is created both in this documentary and beyond it, this paper analyzes how certain interactions serve as manifestations of a Bakhtinian understanding of performativity. This analysis stands in contrast to J.L. Austin’s Speech Act Theory and performative utterances: notions by which contemporary understandings of performativity are defined. To explicate this understanding, this paper first outlines the primary components of Speech Act Theory in Austin’s *How to Do Things With Words* (1962), as well as

Mikhail Bakhtin's own approach to performativity, and how these perspectives differ. In establishing these differences, we turn to again *Paris, not France*, and observe the production of Paris Hilton as a contemporary celebrity entwined in a network of varied, ever shifting, multi-voiced selves.

II. Theoretical Contingencies and Developments of Performance

In *How to Do Things With Words*, J.L. Austin develops several concepts that would later form performance theory. Austin, through the elaboration of Speech Act Theory, broke with standard philosophical modes of thinking about language—rather than language simply describing the world and thereby acting as a vehicle of meaning, language is also used as a means of action. This theory is perhaps best illustrated in Austin's example of wedding vows: "when I say 'I do,' I am not reporting on the marriage, I am indulging in it" (Austin 1975, 6). As its name suggests, there are three types of speech acts that compose Austin's theory: a *locutionary act* (the act of saying), a *perlocutionary act* (the effect caused by saying something), and an *illocutionary act* (where in saying something, an action is accomplished through some sort of *force*). Although the final act is that which is of most interest in Speech Act Theory and for developing performance theory, it is important to note that for each locutionary act uttered, an illocutionary act follows simultaneously. That is, each utterance accomplishes something whether explicit or not. It is not always the case, however, that an illocutionary act will be successful, according to Speech Act Theory—this is dependent on what Austin called *felicity conditions*. These conditions, which a speech act must comply with in order to be performed successfully, are contingent on the sincerity of thoughts, feelings, and intentions of the individual

that utters it (39). A final component of Austin's theory is that of the *parasitic utterance*: "A performative utterance will, for example, be *in a peculiar way* hollow or void if said by an actor on the stage, or if introduced in a poem, or spoken in soliloquy... language in such circumstances is in special ways... used not seriously, but in ways *parasitic* upon its normal use" (22). Because these utterances, those that exist outside their proper context, are deemed to be unnatural and therefore corrupted, Austin disregards them completely. The concepts outlined above are no more than a rough summarization of Austin's Speech Act Theory, however they are ones that most notably differentiate this approach from Bakhtin's.

There are several notions developed in Mikhail Bakhtin's "Discourse in the Novel" (1935) that are fundamental in approaching performance in a way distinct from Austin. One primary notion is that of *dialogism*, which might be understood as the existence of a vast network of social relationships and processes that are constantly in tension with one another and are conditioning one another. In understanding performativity, one cannot possibly separate the word or any utterance of language from use in the social world. There cannot exist a true monologue—at the very least, the word is always aimed toward something whether that is a past or present *self* or an imagined audience. This he refers to as internal dialogism, through which "the word is at the same time determined by that which has not yet been said but which is needed and in fact anticipated by the answering word" (Bakhtin 1935, 280). Dialogism is an important component of what Bakhtin calls *heteroglossia*—the coexistence, and thus the tenuous relationships between, different types of voices. That said, all language is thoroughly heteroglossic in nature in that "it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, [...] These 'languages' of heteroglossia intersect each other in

a variety of ways, forming new socially typifying ‘languages’” (291). It is through heteroglossia that wider contexts are granted more authority than the word itself. Even further, the notion of *voices* introduced above can be best understood, especially for this paper, as entities that are linguistically constructed and imbued with the social worlds and types of the speaker. Speech, even that of a single person within the same utterance, is constituted by various voices, a phenomena that referred to as *hybridization* or as being *multi-voiced*. A final notion from Bakhtin’s theory to be discussed is that of *genre*, or the expectations and implications that follow the imposition of certain features of language that will “knit together with the intentional aim and with the overall accentual system inherent” to that genre (288). Genre therefore, is not unlike Erving Goffman’s notion of participation frameworks¹—there are norms that permeate a certain interaction with which participants are expected to comply.

It is clear, then, that Bakhtin’s approach to performativity departs from Austin’s in many ways—although it is not a direct critique given that Bakhtin wrote “Discourse in the Novel” decades years prior to Austin’s own seminal work, the two are largely incompatible. For one, Austin’s focus on intention as a means of success emphasizes the individual in a way that ultimately conflicts with heteroglossia and dialogism. Bakhtin’s approach to performativity speaks largely to the intersubjective nature of language—its meaning is always emerging, always modifying and being modified in relation to other meanings. Simply, Bakhtin’s understanding of performativity challenges that of Austin’s in its anti-functionalist mode of analysis. Rather than language simply representing or affecting the world, it is deeply enmeshed with the social

¹ See Goffman’s chapter entitled “Footing” in his work *Forms of Talk* (1981) for more on participation frameworks

contexts that it and its users exist in. The following sections of this paper use Bakhtin's alternative approach to performativity to understand the manner through which Paris Hilton, as a celebrity brand, is both manufactured and maintained through a dialogic relationship between herself and the world.

The network of selves in which Paris Hilton operates throughout *Paris, not France* is comprised of many voices, ranging from that which she inhabits herself to those that inform her behavior. These voices are those of Paris Hilton moving through public space (and private, at least to the degree that one is allotted in the film) as a celebrity, the tone with which she speaks, the way she aligns her body language, the changing contexts she is observed in. Similarly, there are those voices that are in conversation with that celebrity—the media and tabloids, her fans (both who are assumed and known), producers and other professionals. The voice of Paris Hilton-as-celebrity is always, in this heteroglossic world, aligned toward those of the varying entities that surround her. Further, given that this relationship is presented to viewers in *Paris, not France* through a documentary medium, this paper reflects on how the film itself is heteroglossic, as well as the implications of the camera's physical and symbolic presence.

III. *Paris, not France*

Released on MTV in mid-2009, *Paris, not France* is a documentary directed by Adria Petty that details not only the daily life of one of the most ubiquitous celebrities of the time, but also attempts to theorize the development of the cult of the celebrity throughout the 2000s. The documentary presents the viewer a certain slice of 2000s pop-culture, a slice that is characterized in one account as a period where “the rules were still being invented in social media, reality

television, and ‘famewhoring,’ with chaotic, messy and wildly unpredictable results” (Stegemoeller 2016). This, alongside unprecedented access to an internet that constantly circulated news about celebrities (and the rest of the world too), produced a frenzied, fast-paced media atmosphere.

It was in this climate that, starting around 2001, Paris Hilton rose to fame apparently just for the fact that she was famous—at this point, although she was modeling through Donald Trump’s agency T Management, her name became prevalent in the tabloids as a result of partying. This party-girl image followed Paris Hilton as she began to delve into acting, first by starring in the TV show *The Simple life* with her best friend Nicole Richie in 2003, and later in less successful movie roles. Right before the premiere of her show, however, a sex tape was released without her consent (she had not even known it existed), putting her name even further at the forefront of the tabloid news cycle. In these years, one would find it difficult to not see reports on Paris Hilton. Yet no more than nine days after the release of the tape, the Associated Press reported on Paris Hilton’s arrest (Piazza 2009). Given the obsession that the media had with Hilton in the 2000s, the headlines, photos, and videos that were circulated influenced the way she was conceived by the American public. Not only was she considered the quintessential contemporary celebrity of the decade (that is, famous for her fame), this consideration was extremely defined by gendered, and often misogynistic, stereotypes. For example, if one reads the Wikipedia entry for “Blonde Stereotypes,” her photo appears at the top of the page and is captioned with “blonde people, especially blonde women, are exemplified by the *public image* of Paris Hilton” (Wikipedia contributors, emphasis added).

Although this image of Paris Hilton expresses a certain amount of distaste, it is undeniable that she, as a celebrity, possesses a certain allure. Even as Paris Hilton began to fade

from the public eye in 2009, her very absence stirred interest and theorizations—in an article published on CNN in mid-2009 entitled “Why has Paris Hilton Disappeared?”, Samantha Yanks is quoted saying that “[Hilton] built the ultimate how-to guide on building a celebrity brand. Now she is in the second phase of the program, the disappearing act” (Piazza 2009). It is in this recognition of a “second phase” of building a celebrity brand that frames the conception of *Paris, Not France*. This documentary, then, follows Hilton throughout the 2000s by combining clips from childhood home movies, interviews, photo shoots, and reflections from Paris herself as well as her family, friends, and various media commentators. In creating this assemblage, it is clear (as well as made explicit) that the documentary aims to present a different image of Paris Hilton: one that purports to be more authentic. When asked about the nature of the film, Hilton said, “I think there's a lot of misconceptions in the media. This movie is very personal. It's kind of like a diary” (Vena 2009). For this authentic self to be made manifest for the viewer, the film does refer to Paris Hilton as a brand, but it does so in an attempt to reject or reconstruct it in some manner. Although she likens it to a diary, *Paris, not France* is not nearly as revealing nor as candid as that would imply. That said, there is a clear tension that permeates the film. The very first clip comes from Hilton’s childhood—perhaps a home movie given the shakiness of the camera, the viewer sees a young Paris standing with a stuffed rabbit. She smiles and makes faces at the camera, and an older woman laughs and speaks to her—the clip ends when the woman says, “look at me this way—not with that mean face! Make no face, just look at me blank” (*Paris, not France* 2008, 0:28). Her face then drops to a neutral position.

The film cuts to an older Paris on the runway—this scene is colorless. The frame is focused on her face which smiles slightly as she poses on for a crowd of cameras, and soon the yelling of the photographers and the light of their flashes engulfs the screen before cutting again

to a new scene. Still in black and white, there is a montage of numerous headlines being printed, all of which are about Paris Hilton. This is the manner in which the film progresses—a fast-paced, feverish collection of clip after clip that alternates between being either full of, or completely devoid of, color. There comes from this editing a dizzying atmosphere, one that appears to be added yet still cognizant. Although this atmosphere is fully manufactured through editing, it only adds to its enigmatic aura. Such a world, one that is characterized by heavy mystique, is that which is constantly evoked in Paris Hilton’s everyday life as a celebrity.

III. Voices and the Constitution of Paris Hilton in *Paris, not France*

The first few minutes of the film, then, construct one voice (following Bakhtin’s terminology) that constitutes the Paris Hilton celebrity persona. As a camera flashes and a rush of headlines dissipates, a clip of Paris Hilton walking from a building through a crowd of paparazzi to a car appears. Over this, she says “I didn’t really plan this, it just happened,” and another voice emerges to produce this persona (*Paris, not France* 2008, 1:07). Hilton speaks in a register that is soft, but firm and low—this, coupled with her rejection of ownership in her fame, presents a voice that stands more in contrast to the aura of mystique that the first voice embodied. This juxtaposition becomes even clearer as the frame shifts to a clip of Paris’s silhouette, she is applying makeup in a car as a jazz tune plays, embodying again the enigmatic celebrity voice (1:11). Soon after, Paris walks from her car into a building and greets someone, looking back toward them over her shoulder and saying “hello,” in a breathier, higher pitched tone than her last utterance (1:34). This series of clips introduces the dialogic nature of the construction of Paris Hilton’s brand—emerging through multiple voices that are imbued with the social worlds that, despite sometimes clashing, comprise Paris Hilton.

One voice that is present is that of Paris Hilton as a celebrity, which in turn occupies a lofty, hyper-feminine world. This is the voice that emerges as she says “hello,” which is indexed by her use of characteristically feminine voice qualities. These characteristics are those that might be most immediately associated with femininity—a higher average pitch and a breathy voice quality (Van Borsel 2007, 291). In invoking a hyper-feminine world, Paris Hilton also manifests stereotypical female traits, such as being affectionate, cheerful, gentle, soft-spoken, shy, warm, and yielding (Prentice 2002, 269). This is not to say that a celebrity is an inherently gendered entity, but rather that the way in which Paris Hilton is perceived as a celebrity by the general American public is one that is gendered. In employing this voice, then, Hilton is engaged in a dialogic relationship with the voice of that imagined audience—the performance that follows anticipates that audience either implicitly or explicitly.

That said, the voices discussed above speak to the way in which the celebrity brand appropriates not only ideologies held by the public about the celebrity in question, it also appropriates certain signifiers from the past. The multi-voiced construction of a celebrity brand proves to be heteroglossic—the scholar Rosemary Coombe goes so far as to define the ‘celebrity image’ as “a cultural lode of multiple meanings, mined for its symbolic resonances, and, simultaneously, a floating signifier, inverted with libidinal energies, social longings, and political aspirations” (Coombe 1992, 59). This definition references the heteroglossic nature of performing a celebrity brand, but also hints again at the dialogic relationship between the celebrity and those who consume (and thereby reproduce) the brand.

Although the discussion thus far has been of the intersubjective construction of the Paris Hilton celebrity brand, it is important to consider Hilton’s agency in her own representation. Within dialogism, it is not as though she lacks agency in the construction of her public image—

this already is apparent in the clips described above. Rather, she must constantly (re)negotiate her brand in order to exert some attempt at control over it. This tension appears several times throughout *Paris, not France* as she frequently shifts voices by accentuating the most decidedly ‘feminine’ vocal characteristics. In this shift, Hilton not only makes her vocal quality breathier and raises her pitch, she also increases her use of creaky voice: “a vocal effect produced by a very slow vibration of only one end of the vocal cords” (Crystal 1997, 98). This phenomena is largely associated with Paris Hilton as a celebrity and other females placed into the Valley Girl stereotype and is This feature is not linked only to Valley Girls, however, and its use appears to be rising among college-aged people who identity as female (Wolk et al. 2012, e114). Even further, although still imbedded in dumb blonde stereotypes, college-age Americans increasingly regard creaky voice as “hesitant, nonaggressive, and informal but also educated, urban-oriented, and upwardly mobile” (Yuasa 2010, 315). One will notice in watching *Paris, not France*, that creaky voice is almost always present in Hilton’s utterances—it is a feature that spans different voices, and perhaps exists then as a voice in and of itself. Its constant presence therefore suggests that Hilton is always performing the role of a feminine, urban, social elite.

The summation of these vocal features is integral to the production of Paris Hilton’s celebrity persona. This voice, referred to colloquially as her “sexy voice” or as her “baby voice” (which undoubtedly begs the question of popular conceptions of feminine performance of desirability), emerges throughout the film in dialogue with her “normal voice,” alongside other less explicit voices. This shifting between voices within and between utterances, what Bakhtin refers to as hybridization, appears to serve as a way for Hilton to attempt to rebrand her celebrity persona, first by creating it using her “baby voice” and then by distancing herself from it using her “normal voice.” Given that *Paris, not France*’s release was ostensibly an opportunity for

viewers to meet the “real” Paris Hilton, understanding dialogic tension throughout the film as an attempt at rebranding follows this claim of promoting an authentic image. One such interaction where this difference between voices is emphasized as a means of performing a certain image of Paris Hilton. This scene follows a clip of Hilton saying that music is what she is most passionate about and is highly contingent on a successful presentation not of Paris Hilton as a celebrity, but of Paris Hilton as a musician (*Paris, not France* 2008, 43:38).

This clip, like many others in the film, is devoid of color, perhaps due to the clip being characterized by the presence of Hilton’s celebrity brand. At the beginning, there appears a caption that tells the viewer that this footage comes from a Top 40 Radio Listening Party—numerous people fill a small recording studio and face Paris Hilton and a few men beside her that presumably are associated with her brand. The camera is behind Hilton—she begins addressing her audience as she is faced away from the documentary viewer, and it is not until after she has greeted the others in the room that the camera moves so that her face is visible². This interaction begins as highly structured, one that fits a specific genre, and in order to navigate the context, Hilton often shifts voices to assert herself as both Paris Hilton the celebrity and musician. The genre of this interaction appears to be not too dissimilar from a business meeting in that Hilton is in the position of selling a product, and the hybridization throughout the interaction indicates that she is selling a new Paris Hilton brand through her album. From line 1 of the interaction, she speaks using her “sexy voice” (most discernable as instances where the [pp] diacritic appears) as she addresses her audience. This voice, given the camera’s framing, is almost disembodied from the Paris Hilton that sits at the front of the room. However, the camera

² See Appendix A, line 4

moves to reveal her face as she begins to talk about, in her more “normal voice,” how earnestly and passionately she has worked on the album³. This is stated in order to provide an alternative Paris Hilton to that which she mentions in the following lines⁴, thereby explicitly revealing the dialogic relationship between Paris Hilton as a celebrity and Paris Hilton as an authentic musician.:

=={[raises hands, palms facing upward, lowers] you’ve probably *read about me, or {[camera cuts to show audience member smiling] seen me in..}
 {[camera pans across audience] I dunno.. on TV and}
 [but uh] I seem like some {[camera cuts back to P] crazy weirdo.. **but**

These lines continue the use of her “normal voice,” which only furthers the notion that the “crazy weirdo” that the audience may have seen on TV or in a tabloid exists separately from Paris Hilton as a real person/musician⁵. She attempts to reject that image by asserting that she worked hard on the album and cares deeply about it, so much that she says that she “really put like [her] heart and soul into [it]”⁶. This line, seemingly a very honest one, contains the beginnings of a shift from her “neutral” voice to her “sexy voice.” One might understand this shifting to be contradictory, however it appears to deepen the dialogical tension that exists between the voices, the worlds that they invoke, and their roles in constructing Paris Hilton as celebrity brand. Directly following this, Hilton shifts completely into her “sexy voice,” complete with breathiness, raised pitch, and more accentuated instances of creaky voice. Such a shift

³ See Appendix A, lines 4-6

⁴ These lines are taken from Appendix A, lines 8-10

⁵ See Appendix A, line 10

⁶ See Appendix A, line 14

appears to be logical given that Hilton says in these lines that her audience will really like the album because it's fun before thanking them for being there⁷. In the final lines of her pitch, Hilton switches to her “sexy voice,” perhaps in awareness that even if she wants to separate herself from the party-girl persona, the celebrity brand that this voice is emblematic of has been and continues to be extremely profitable for her. Hilton’s music, which the viewer of the documentary receives a sample of at the end of this clip, is itself very sexy and very feminine—it emerged in dialogue both with Hilton’s celebrity brand and the manners in which that brand is perceived by the American public. Given the genre of this interaction, for Paris Hilton to attempt to fully distance herself from her celebrity brand would be a denial of the dialogic construction of any version of her public image. Thus, even when Hilton is speaking in a “normal voice” and dismissing her celebrity brand, her body language serves as another voice that persists throughout the interaction. All of her movements, such as shrugging with her hands and shoulders and smiling through her words, remain feminine in their air of coyness, shyness, docility, and other stereotypically feminine traits.

In this single 38 second interaction, the nature of brand (re)construction through performance as a dialogic process expressed through hybridity and informed by genre (both spatial and situational) is evident. Such is the case throughout *Paris, not France*, as discussed earlier in this paper. This is evident not only in interactions that can be isolated like that which can be found in Appendix A, but also in the documentary in its entirety. For one, whether or not the presence of the film camera serves as a mediating agent or interlocutor of sorts in the film is difficult to discern. Paris Hilton as a celebrity brand is already in dialogue with a sort of

⁷ See Appendix A, lines 15-18

imagined audience, and she may view the camera as a representation of that audience. In fact, at one point in the film, she claims that she already is always considering an audience. Even further, Paris Hilton already recognizes the camera (in a general sense) as something she has a relationship with. What does appear to be influential in framing representations is the settings in which the film-specific commentary takes place. For example, the film includes clips of Camille Paglia, “author / intellectual,” where she is seated in an academic office and is gesticulating wildly while theorizing about Paris Hilton’s celebrity persona (*Paris, not France* 2008, 13:38). Clips such as this are highly informed by genre, which in turn affects the voice(s) present.

In considering *Paris, not France* as an interaction in and of itself, the role the documentary has in contributing to the creation of Paris Hilton’s brand becomes clearer. The film is comprised of what seems to be a manic stringing together of clips that follows a relatively loose timeline. However, in considering the different types of clips as voices, the film is revealed to be heteroglossic. There are clips from Hilton’s childhood, clips of her being photographed on the red carpet, clips of her being interviewed by the media, clips of her being interviewed for the film, and so on. Each clip is internally hybridized, however each type composes a voice that enters into an internally dialogic construction of Paris Hilton as a celebrity. Even further, the film includes clips of people who are not Paris Hilton talking about her or their relationship to her in some way, as well as clips of fans and paparazzi. The inclusion of these clips reflects the intersubjective nature of dialogism—Paris is not the only agent that participates in the creation of her brand. There are voices that Hilton might feel negatively towards that inform the continuous construction of her celebrity brand just as much as her own intentioned voice(s). Understanding the film *Paris, not France* itself as a participant in this process has been mentioned elsewhere in this paper, but in understanding the heteroglossic composition of the film, its existence within the

dialogism of Paris Hilton's brand becomes even more salient.

V. Conclusion

The documentary *Paris, not France* serves primarily as a vehicle through which Paris Hilton attempts to shift perception of her celebrity brand from one defined by partying and scandals to one that is oriented more toward business. In order to fulfill this aspiration, the film strains to publicize the toll that public opinion has taken on Paris Hilton, and how such opinion is incongruent with the apparently much more grounded person that she is, or is attempting to become. Notably, the documentary expresses the dynamic and performative nature of the celebrity brand. In analyzing this performativity using a Bakhtinian approach, it becomes clear that the celebrity is not only dynamic, but is in fact heteroglossic and enmeshed in complex dialogical networks. This understanding, especially in contrast with J.L. Austin's approach to performativity, is important even beyond the context of understanding the manufacturing of celebrity brands and identities as represented in *Paris, not France*. Discerning the importance of intersubjectivity in the construction and performance of identity in broader sociopolitical contexts is crucial, and doing so allows one to understand the complexities of the human agent coexisting with other entities in a dialogic reality.

Appendix A
Transcript 43:38 – 44:06

This transcript of a 38 second interaction from *Paris, not France*, uses two systems of signification. The first is that of Gumperz and Berenz (1993), which employs diacritics to index both verbal and bodily cues. Most notable in this transcription is the shifts in pitch that occur throughout the dialogue, which relates to Paris Hilton’s shift in voice, as discussed in the paper. Additionally, this system allows one to index physical movement, which is important not only to represent how Paris Hilton uses bodily cues in her performance, but also how spatial orientation and frame changes interact with that performance. A second system is used to mark occurrences of creaky voice in the speech (the Gumperz and Berenz system does not have a specific diacritic for this phenomena). These occurrences are important to include because they too index a shift in voice.

Extra Features:

- Creaky voice: also known as vocal fry, phonation characterized by vibration of vocal folds at an irregular rate, which causes the pitch to lower

Key:

- (**bolded**): Accentuated creaky voice—it is safe to assume that creaky voice exists in this transcript beyond the highlighted instances

1. P: {[pp][hi][ac] *thank you all} for coming::, [shrugs left shoulder]
2. I really: appreciate it.. um::
3. I’m {[raises both hands slightly][ac]really excited for everyone} to hear **it**
4. [camera changes angels, we now view P’s left side from the audience, she drops her hands into her lap and we see that she is holding a fur shawl]
5. I’ve.. worked {[head tilts to the left]*so hard on this album}. a:nd,
6. {[looks toward right side of audience]I’m} really serious about **it**
7. ==and {[ac]I know} {[p] like}

8. =={[raises hands, palms facing upward, lowers] you've probably *read about me,
or {[camera cuts to show audience member smiling] seen me in..}
9. {[camera pans across audience] I dunno.. on TV and}
10. [but uh] I seem like some {[camera cuts back to P] crazy weirdo.. **but**
11. =={[ac][shrugs left shoulder, smiles] *in real life I'm not,}
12. ==I'm a {[camera cuts to audience] *hard **worker**:,}
13. ==I wrote most the so:ngs:,
14. and I {[p]really **put** like my heart} and soul into this,
15. ..{[pp][hi][camera cuts back to P, who looks across audience] I think you're
gonna **like it**}
16. =={[P shakes head slightly, camera cuts to audience] it's really *fun music
a::nd..}
17. {[pp][hi][camera cuts to P, who raises hands again] thank you for coming and}
18. =={[drops hands to lap, shrugs both shoulders][hi] I hope you like **it**}

Bibliography

- Austin, J.L. 1975. *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. "Discourse in the Novel." In *The Dialogic Imagination*. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Coombe, Rosemary J. 1992. "The Celebrity Image and Cultural Identity: Publicity Rights and the Subaltern Politics of Gender." *Discourse* 14, no. 3: 59-88.
- Crystal, David. 1997. *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 4th ed., updated and enlarged. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Paris, Not France*. DVD. Directed by Adria Petty. New York: MTV, 2008.
- Piazza, Jo. 2009. "Why Has Paris Hilton Disappeared?" *CNN.com*. December 5.
- Prentice, Deborah A., and Erica Carranza. 2002. "What Women and Men Should Be, Shouldn't Be, Are Allowed to Be, and Don't Have to Be: The Contents of Prescriptive Gender Stereotypes." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 26: 269-281.
- Stegemoeller, Kristen. 2016. "Pop Culture Died in 2009: This Tumblr Revisits the Shame and the Glory of '00s Celebrity Gossip." *Paper*. February 10.
- Tolson, Andrew. 2001. "'Being Yourself': the pursuit of the authentic celebrity." *Discourse Studies* 3, no. 4: 443-457.
- Van Borsel, John, Joke Janssens, and Marc De Bodt. 2007. "Breathiness as a Feminine Voice Characteristic: A Perceptual Approach." *Journal of Voice* 23, no.3: 291-294.
- Vena, Jocelyn. 2009. "'Paris, not France' Aims to Reveal the Real Paris Hilton." *MTV news*. July 28.
- Wikipedia contributors, "Blonde stereotype." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. N.d.

Wolk, Lesley, Nassima B. Abdelli-Beruh, and Dianne Selvin. 2012. "Habitual Use of Vocal Fry in Young Adult Female Speakers." *Journal of Voice* 26, no.3: e111-e116.

Yuasa, Ikuko Patricia. 2010. "Creaky Voice: A New Feminine Voice Quality for Urban-Oriented Upwardly Mobile Women?" *American Speech* 85, no.3: 315-337.