



Shifting Language Patterns and Verbal Expression in Contemporary Television Speech

Leonard Cole*, Gerd Berget, Lipson Smith

Inholland University of Applied Science, Domain Technology, Design and Computation, Division of Built Environment, The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Television plays an important role in everyday communication and can have a strong influence on the way language is used and understood by the public. This study examines changing language practices in television speech, focusing on the occurrence of neologisms, barbarisms, and jargon in contemporary broadcasting. The analysis places these forms within the wider context of verbal communication and literary language norms rather than viewing them as separate linguistic features. Attention is given to differences between television program formats and the language choices made by journalists, presenters, and other media speakers.

The study shows that neologisms are more common in news and documentary programs, where television professionals frequently refer to new technologies, social developments, and emerging concepts. Barbarisms and jargon occur more often in entertainment and comic programs, where informal, expressive, and audience-oriented language is frequently adopted. These differences demonstrate how the purpose and style of a program can shape the language used in television communication.

The findings also point to a continuing interaction between linguistic innovation and established language norms. New words and expressions are an expected part of language development, but their repeated use in television can contribute to wider changes in public speech. Greater attention to clarity, appropriateness, and responsible language use can therefore help television maintain its communicative role while responding naturally to ongoing linguistic change.

KEYWORDS: Georgian Television; Broadcast Language; TV Speech Culture; Verbal Communication; Georgian Language; Language Change; Neologisms; Barbarisms; Jargon; Media Discourse; Television Communication; Literary Georgian; Language Use; Linguistic Innovation; Communication Practices.

INTRODUCTION

The development of television broadcasting in Georgia has brought considerable changes to the country's media environment. The emergence of new television companies has increased the diversity of programs available to viewers, with content ranging from news and documentaries to entertainment, discussion, and comic programs. These differences in format and purpose are also reflected in the language used by journalists, presenters, commentators, and other participants in television communication. Since television addresses a broad audience on a regular basis, its language has a noticeable place in the formation of contemporary speech habits [1].

Television performs more than an informational or entertainment function. It provides a public space in which linguistic forms are introduced, repeated, and heard by large

numbers of people. Words and expressions used by television professionals may gradually become familiar to viewers and may subsequently enter everyday communication. For this reason, television speech can be considered an important element of contemporary verbal communication and a useful indicator of changes occurring in the Georgian language [2].

The development of language is closely connected with changes in society. Technological progress, international communication, cultural exchange, and the appearance of new social realities continuously create a need for new terminology. The emergence of neologisms is therefore a natural part of linguistic development. At the same time, the increasing use of foreign-language forms, barbarisms, and jargon in public communication creates questions concerning their appropriateness and their relationship with the established norms of literary Georgian [3].

The problem becomes particularly significant when such forms appear in television programs that reach a large and varied audience. Linguistic choices are not necessarily the same across different genres. News and documentary programs often contain new terminology associated with political [4,5], technological, scientific, economic, and social developments. Entertainment and comic programs, on the other hand, frequently rely on informal vocabulary, colloquial expressions, jargon, and foreign-language elements to create a particular tone or establish closer contact with viewers.

The present research examines the occurrence of neologisms, barbarisms, and jargon in Georgian television speech and considers these forms in connection with verbal communication and the norms of literary Georgian. The study seeks to identify the linguistic tendencies present in different types of television programs and to determine how program format and communicative purpose influence vocabulary choice. Attention is also given to the wider role of television in shaping speech culture within Georgian society [6].

The relevance of the subject is determined by the continuing influence of mass media on contemporary communication. Television provides linguistic models that can be encountered repeatedly by viewers, making the quality and character of televised speech an important cultural and communicative concern. The introduction of new vocabulary cannot be prevented, nor would such prevention be consistent with the natural development of a living language. The important consideration is the way in which new forms are selected and used, particularly in communication intended for a wide public audience [7].

The study also considers the balance between linguistic change and adherence to literary language norms [8]. New words may be necessary for describing concepts that were previously absent from Georgian, while other forms may enter television speech simply because of habitual or fashionable usage. Distinguishing between these situations is important for understanding contemporary television language and its influence on public speech [9].

The research addresses an area that remains significant for the study of Georgian media language and speech culture. Previous discussions have considered individual problems associated with language use in the media, yet the relationship between television speech, verbal communication, linguistic change, and literary Georgian requires examination from a broader perspective. By considering material from several television channels and different program formats, the study seeks to provide a more comprehensive view of current tendencies in Georgian television speech [10].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research is concerned with verbal communication and

language use in Georgian television programs. The focus is placed on the identification and analysis of neologisms, barbarisms, and jargon occurring in the speech of journalists, presenters, and other television participants. These linguistic forms are examined according to their communicative context and their relationship with the norms of literary Georgian [11].

The research material was obtained from six Georgian television channels: First Channel, Imedi, POSTV, Formula, Mtavari Channel, and Ajara [12,13]. The observation period covers 2022–2023. Programs representing different genres and formats were considered to identify variations in language use and to avoid limiting the analysis to one television discourse.

A complex, systemic, and descriptive approach was applied in the study. The observation method was used to identify recurring linguistic forms in televised speech and to record the contexts in which they occurred. The collected material was examined with attention to the type of linguistic phenomenon, the nature of the program, and the communicative purpose of the expression [14].

The comparative-contrastive method was also used to examine differences between television programs and genres. This approach made it possible to identify whether certain linguistic forms appeared more frequently in particular types of programs. Special attention was given to the distinction between the language of news and documentary programs and that of entertainment and comic programs.

The analysis treats television language as part of a wider process of social communication rather than as a collection of unrelated linguistic examples. The use of new words, foreign-language expressions, jargon, and other non-standard forms is considered in relation to changes in society, developments in communication, and the continuing evolution of Georgian vocabulary [15].

The selected research methods provide a basis for examining the relationship between television language and contemporary verbal communication [16–18]. They also make it possible to consider how linguistic innovation is reflected in Georgian broadcasting and how repeated exposure to forms may contribute to changes in public speech culture. The findings can therefore contribute to a better understanding of the current state of Georgian television speech and its relationship with literary language norms [19,20].

LANGUAGE, COMMUNICATION, AND THE FORMATION OF SPEECH CULTURE

Language is fundamental to human interaction. People use it to formulate and communicate thoughts, exchange information, express opinions, and maintain relationships. Communication gives language its practical function, while

language provides communication with the means through which meaning can be expressed and understood. The two are therefore closely connected and cannot be considered separately when examining human interaction [21].

The term *communication* comes from the Latin *communico*, which carries meanings associated with sharing, informing, establishing contact, conversation, and relationship. Different fields have approached the concept from various perspectives. According to the American lexicographical source M. Webster, communication refers to the exchange of information between individuals through a common system of symbols, signs, or behaviour. The term also includes transmitted information, personal interaction, and verbal or written messages [22].

Communication is not limited to the movement of information from one person to another. It includes the creation of a message, its transmission, reception, and interpretation. Darsavelidze, Vekua, and Kacharava describe communication as a process in which messages are formulated, exchanged, and interpreted. In their discussion of mass communication, they emphasize the role of professional communicators who employ media to distribute messages to a broad audience, as well as the role of the audience in receiving and interpreting those messages [23].

The communicative process is also determined by the circumstances in which interaction takes place. Manana Tandashvili points to several essential characteristics of a communication act. It occurs at a particular time and place, develops dynamically, and involves participants whose actions demonstrate control and volition [24]. These features indicate that communication is an active process in which speakers and recipients participate within a specific social and situational context.

Mark Deuze approaches communication from the perspective of information transmission. According to the transmission view, communication involves the movement of a message from a source to a recipient and is traditionally represented through the relationship between sender, message, and receiver [25]. This model is particularly relevant to mass media, where a message produced by a communicator is directed toward a large audience. At the same time, media communication involves interpretation, and the meaning received by an audience may depend on linguistic, social, and contextual factors [26-30].

Human communication takes different forms, including written, oral, verbal, and nonverbal communication. Verbal communication has particular importance for the present study because spoken language is central to television broadcasting. Through spoken words, television professionals present information, explain events, express opinions, conduct interviews, and establish relationships with viewers. The effectiveness of this process depends on

vocabulary, clarity of expression, pronunciation, context, and the way the message is delivered [31].

Effective speech requires attention not only to the information being communicated but also to the linguistic form used to communicate it. The vocabulary suitable for an informal conversation may be inappropriate in a formal public setting. Similarly, the language of a news broadcast may differ from that used in an entertainment program. The source Effective Speaking emphasizes the importance of both the content of speech and the way in which it is delivered, noting that word choice changes according to the communicative situation and the intended audience [32].

Television occupies a distinctive position among the means of verbal communication because it allows spoken messages to reach a large audience simultaneously. A television viewer does not simply receive information; through repeated exposure to presenters, journalists, commentators, and other speakers, the viewer also encounters patterns of vocabulary and expression. This repeated contact gives television language a potential influence on everyday speech [33-36].

The relationship between television and speech culture becomes particularly important in the context of contemporary Georgian. Changes in society, technological development, international communication, and the rapid exchange of information have introduced concepts that require new linguistic forms [37]. Neologisms can emerge as a natural response to these developments. Their presence in television speech may reflect genuine changes in society and the need to name new objects, processes, and phenomena.

Not every newly introduced expression, however, has the same linguistic status. Television programs may also contain foreign-language elements, barbarisms, jargon, colloquial expressions, and other forms that differ from the established norms of literary Georgian. Their use may relate to the subject of a program, the speaker's individual style, the intended audience, or an attempt to create a particular communicative effect. For this reason, the analysis of television language requires attention to the context in which a particular linguistic form is used [38].

The wide reach of television gives this issue an additional dimension. A linguistic expression used by a presenter or journalist can be heard by thousands of viewers and may subsequently become familiar beyond the original program. Repeated use can contribute to the spread of vocabulary and speech patterns. Television consequently functions not only as a channel for conveying information but also as an environment in which linguistic practices are publicly displayed and circulated [39].

This makes the role of television professionals important in the development of speech culture. Journalists, presenters,

editors, and program authors make linguistic choices that can influence the quality of public communication. Respect for literary Georgian does not require rejecting linguistic change. Rather, it involves recognizing the difference between necessary linguistic innovation and forms whose use may be inappropriate in a particular communicative context [40].

The connection between verbal communication and television language therefore deserves attention from both linguistic and media perspectives. Television reflects changes occurring in society, while its language can also contribute to the wider acceptance of those changes. Studying televised speech makes it possible to observe how new vocabulary, foreign elements, jargon, and other linguistic forms enter public communication and how they relate to the norms of Georgian literary language.

For the purposes of the present research, verbal communication is considered an important component of television speech and speech culture. The language presented through television provides a valuable basis for examining contemporary linguistic tendencies in Georgia. It reveals not only how speakers communicate with their audiences but also how language responds to social change, technological development, and the evolving needs of public communication [41].

CONTEMPORARY GEORGIAN SPEECH CULTURE: TELEVISION LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC CHANGE

Georgian speech culture is rooted in the literary language, which has developed over many centuries and represents an important part of the country's cultural and linguistic heritage. The continuity of literary Georgian has provided a stable basis for communication while allowing the language to respond to changes in social life. Speech culture, however, cannot be reduced to grammatical correctness or the observance of individual linguistic rules. It also concerns the relationship between language and society, the responsibility of speakers, and the way linguistic forms are used in different areas of public life [42].

Arabuli points out that speech culture is closely connected with the general spiritual and everyday culture of the society in which it develops and functions [43]. This relationship becomes particularly visible in the language of mass media. Media communication reflects social attitudes, cultural changes, and new communicative needs, while the language presented through the media can itself influence the way people speak and understand linguistic forms.

The linguistic environment of a society is constantly changing. The development of vocabulary and patterns of expression is influenced by internal processes within the language as well as by factors outside it. Technological development, globalization, international relations, political and social

changes, the rapid expansion of information sources, and the translation of foreign-language literature all contribute to the transformation of contemporary Georgian. These influences may become visible at different linguistic levels, including vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, orthography, terminology, and style.

Changes in language are especially noticeable in public communication. Both written and spoken forms respond to new social realities, although spoken communication can spread new expressions particularly quickly. Television is significant in this respect because it combines spoken language with a communication platform capable of reaching a very large audience. The words and expressions used in television programs are therefore not limited to the immediate interaction between a presenter and a viewer; they may enter broader public usage through repeated exposure [44].

The relationship between language and culture provides an important framework for understanding media language. Luginbuhl stresses that communication is inseparable from cultural context and that the analysis of media texts requires attention to the way language is used within a particular cultural environment [45]. Television language should therefore be examined as part of the wider cultural and social conditions in which Georgian communication takes place.

Contemporary Georgian television contains a mixture of established literary forms and newer linguistic elements. Viewers may encounter newly created words, borrowed vocabulary, international terminology, calqued expressions, colloquial forms, and professional jargon. Foreign influence may also appear in pronunciation, articulation, stress patterns, and sentence construction. Such features do not necessarily have a single explanation. Some emerge because speakers need terms for new concepts, while others become popular through professional environments, international communication, entertainment culture, or habitual media usage [46].

The language of journalists has received attention from Georgian researchers. In his 2004 work *Language of Mass Media*, Gucha Kvaratskhelia examines the connection between mass media and mass culture and discusses the linguistic consequences of the interaction between different cultural and social environments. He notes that questions concerning the adaptation of linguistic and cultural forms originating in other societies remain relevant to the development of national communication practices. His observations provide a useful basis for considering the changing linguistic character of Georgian mass media.

Manana Kvashvadze addresses the relationship between standardized speech and Georgian-language media in her 2013 study *Standardized Speech and the Language of Georgian-Speaking Media*. She considers mass media an

important environment for the formation and dissemination of literary Georgian norms. She also stresses that media language should be understandable to recipients with different educational and personal backgrounds. Since journalism and language are both social phenomena, changes occurring in society naturally leave their mark on media language [47].

This point is especially relevant to television, where a single program may address viewers with very different linguistic experiences. Journalists and presenters must communicate information clearly while adapting their language to the purpose and format of the program. The vocabulary appropriate for a news report may not be suitable for an entertainment program, just as the language of a comic show may not correspond to the requirements of formal public communication. Program genre therefore has an important role in determining the linguistic choices made by television participants [48].

The question of borrowed vocabulary is another important part of the discussion. Vakhtang Maghradze, in *International Word-Terms or Barbarisms*, considers the increasing use of foreign words in contemporary writing and media. He recognizes borrowing as a natural feature of language development and notes that borrowed terms may be justified when they respond to a genuine linguistic or communicative need. At the same time, unnecessary replacement of an existing Georgian word with a foreign expression is problematic when an appropriate Georgian equivalent is already available [49].

This distinction is useful when evaluating television speech. The presence of a foreign word does not automatically make its use incorrect. Some international terms have become established in Georgian because they represent concepts that are widely shared across countries and professional fields. The question becomes more complicated when foreign expressions are selected without a clear communicative reason or when they replace familiar Georgian words simply because of fashion, professional habit, or frequent exposure to another language.

Television has an additional influence because of the frequency with which viewers encounter its language. Expressions used repeatedly by well-known journalists, presenters, and commentators may become familiar beyond the original program. In this way, television can contribute to the spread of linguistic forms and may influence everyday verbal communication. Its role is therefore not limited to reflecting linguistic change; it can also participate in the process through which new or less-established forms gain social visibility.

The responsibility of media professionals becomes important in this context. Journalists and television presenters address a large public audience, and their linguistic choices can affect

perceptions of appropriate speech. Clear expression, suitable vocabulary, and awareness of literary language norms are therefore important components of professional television communication. At the same time, maintaining language standards should not be understood as a rejection of natural linguistic development. Georgian, like every living language, must respond to new social realities and communicative requirements [50].

The study of television language consequently provides an opportunity to examine the interaction between linguistic stability and linguistic change. The coexistence of literary forms, neologisms, borrowings, barbarisms, jargon, and colloquial expressions demonstrates the variety of contemporary Georgian media speech. Their distribution across different television formats can also reveal differences in communicative purpose and audience expectations.

The previous research discussed above establishes an important background for examining the language of Georgian television. It demonstrates that media language relates to speech culture, social change, borrowing, and the development of literary norms. Building on these perspectives, the present study focuses specifically on the use of neologisms, barbarisms, and jargon in Georgian television programs, considering their occurrence within different program types and their relationship with contemporary verbal communication [50].

Such an examination is important for understanding the current linguistic environment of Georgian television. It can show which forms are associated with linguistic innovation, which relate to informal or specialized communication, and where tension may arise between frequently used media expressions and the norms of literary Georgian. Television, as both an information source and a linguistic model for a broad audience, occupies an important position in this continuing development of Georgian speech culture [51].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Material and Television Program Categories

The analysis of linguistic change in Georgian television speech is based on programs representing different genres, communicative purposes, and audience groups. The research material was collected from television companies operating in Batumi and Tbilisi. The selected programs include informational, documentary, entertainment, and comic formats, allowing the study to examine language use across different types of televised communication [52].

The informational programs included *Moambe*, *Chronicle*, *Daily News*, *Guest of the Day*, and *Newscast*. Documentary and entertainment material was drawn from *The Voice* and *Projection*, while comic and entertainment programs included *Men*, *The Night Show*, and *Nika Arabidze's Show*.

These programs were selected because they represent different approaches to television communication and address viewers with varied interests, ages, occupations, and social backgrounds [53].

The analysis focuses on three linguistic categories: neologisms, barbarisms, and jargon. The examples identified during the observation are presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3, with the relevant television channel and program indicated for each example. The comparison of these materials provides an opportunity to examine whether particular linguistic forms are associated with specific genres or communicative situations.

The selected programs also make it possible to compare formal and informal television speech. News programs generally require precise and informative language, while entertainment and comic programs allow greater freedom in vocabulary and expression. Such differences are important when considering the relationship between linguistic form and communicative purpose [54].

Neologisms in Contemporary Georgian Television

A neologism refers to a newly introduced word or expression that emerges in response to a new concept, object, phenomenon, or communicative requirement [55]. New vocabulary may develop internally through the resources of a language or may enter through contact with another language. Neologisms are therefore closely related to social development, technological progress, cultural exchange, and changes in the needs of speakers.

The development of new vocabulary is a normal characteristic of a living language. Scientific discoveries, technological innovations, political developments, economic changes, and new forms of social interaction create concepts that require linguistic expression. Georgian has also responded to these developments through the creation and adoption of new lexical forms.

Globalization has intensified this process. International communication has increased the circulation of words between languages, while English has acquired a particularly strong position in science, technology, business, media, culture, and digital communication. The influence of English can also be observed in contemporary Georgian television speech [56].

The neologisms identified in the present research are listed in Table 1, together with information about the television channel and program in which they were recorded. The collected material shows that nouns represent the largest group of observed neologisms. Adjectival forms occur less frequently, while adverbs constitute a relatively small part of the material.

A significant proportion of the identified nouns have an English origin. Many relate to technological development, international communication, political and economic processes, social changes, science, culture, and contemporary media. Their presence indicates the close relationship between changes in society and changes in vocabulary.

The influence of English on Georgian television speech can also be viewed against the background of earlier linguistic influences. Russian previously occupied a much stronger position in Georgian public and everyday communication. In contemporary television discourse, however, English-derived words and expressions are considerably more visible, especially in areas connected with technology, international relations, business, media, and popular culture.

Not every foreign-derived word should be regarded as problematic. Some borrowed terms are introduced because a new concept requires a name and no established Georgian equivalent is available. With continued use, such forms may become integrated into the Georgian vocabulary. A different situation occurs when a foreign expression is used despite the existence of a clear Georgian equivalent.

The television material indicates that many of the observed neologisms relate to changes in technology, globalization, science, politics, economics, and contemporary culture. Their presence demonstrates the ability of Georgian to respond to new realities. At the same time, their use raises the question of whether each new foreign-derived form represents a genuine linguistic need or simply reflects the growing influence of international communication [57].

Barbarisms and Foreign-Language Influence in Television Speech

Barbarisms represent a different type of foreign-language influence. The term originates from the Greek *barbarous* and has traditionally been associated with foreign or non-

Table 1: Neologisms Observed in Georgian Television Programs.

No.	TV Channel	Program	Program Type	Linguistic Origin	Main Area of Use
1	First Channel	Moambe	Informative	Neologisms	Socio-political issues
2	Imedi	Chronicle	Informative	Neologisms	Current affairs
3	POSTV	Daily News	Informative	Neologisms	Political and social developments
4	Formula	Guest of the Day	Informative	Neologisms	Contemporary social issues
5	Mtavari Channel	Newscast	Informative	Neologisms	Political and international affairs
6	Ajara	Selected documentary programs	Documentary	Neologisms	Technology, science and culture

native linguistic forms. In the context of literary language, a barbarism may be understood as a foreign word or expression that has not been accepted within the standard language or is used unnecessarily when an appropriate Georgian equivalent already exists.

Arabuli connects the problem of barbarisms with the activation of foreign neologisms and explains that a foreign word may be considered a barbarism when its use is unjustified, particularly when the language already contains a word with the same meaning or when the foreign form has not been sanctioned by specialists [58].

The foreign origin of a word alone does not make it a barbarism. Georgian, like other languages, has developed through continuous contact with other languages. Many borrowed words have become established components of Georgian vocabulary. The important distinction concerns the necessity and status of the borrowed form.

The barbarisms identified in the television material are presented in Table 2, accompanied by the relevant channel and program information. The observation shows that journalists and presenters occasionally use such expressions, although their number is considerably smaller than the number of neologisms identified in the research material.

A notable feature of the observed barbarisms is their connection with Russian. This differs from the pattern found among the neologisms, where English is the dominant foreign source. The difference reflects changes in the sociolinguistic environment of Georgia. English currently functions as a major international language and provides terminology for many emerging areas, while Russian-derived forms may reflect earlier linguistic influence or established habits of speech [59].

The distinction between a neologism and a barbarism therefore requires more than an examination of etymological origin. The function of the word, its degree of acceptance, its communicative necessity, and the availability of a Georgian equivalent must also be considered.

Television gives this issue particular importance because repeated exposure can increase the familiarity of foreign expressions. When a presenter or journalist uses a particular form regularly, viewers may gradually begin to perceive it as an ordinary part of public speech. Media professionals consequently have an important role in determining which linguistic forms receive wider public circulation [60].

Jargon and Informal Language in Television Programs

Jargon refers to vocabulary and expressions associated with a particular profession, social group, class, or community. Such expressions may have specialized meanings that are immediately understood within a particular group but may be less familiar to the public. Jargon can also include newly created expressions, shortened forms, or familiar words that acquire a special meaning in a particular social environment [61].

The examples of jargon identified during the research are presented in Table 3, together with information about the relevant television channel and program. The material indicates that jargon occurs most visibly in entertainment and comic programs.

The communicative purpose of such programs partly explains this tendency. Entertainment and comic television frequently seek to create an informal relationship between presenters and viewers. Colloquial expressions, unconventional vocabulary, and group-specific language can contribute to humour, spontaneity, and emotional engagement. In these

Table 2: Barbarisms Observed in Georgian Television Programs.

No.	TV Channel	Program / Show	Program Type	Observed Linguistic Feature	Predominant Foreign Influence
1	First Channel	Moambe	Informative	Barbarisms	Russian
2	Imedi	Chronicle	Informative	Barbarisms	Russian
3	POSTV	Daily News	Informative	Barbarisms	Russian
4	Formula	Guest of the Day	Informative	Barbarisms	Russian
5	Mtavari Channel	Newscast	Informative	Barbarisms	Russian
6	Ajara	Selected programs	Informative / Entertainment	Barbarisms	Russian/ Other foreign forms

Table 3: Jargon Observed in Georgian Television Programs.

No.	TV Channel	Program / Show	Program Type	Observed Linguistic Feature	Communicative Character
1	First Channel	The Voice	Entertainment	Jargon	Informal and expressive
2	Imedi	Projection	Entertainment	Jargon	Informal and expressive
3	POSTV	Men	Comic	Jargon	Humorous and colloquial
4	Formula	The Night Show	Comic	Jargon	Humorous and colloquial
5	Mtavari Channel	Nika Arabidze's Show	Comic	Jargon	Humorous and colloquial
6	Ajara	Selected entertainment programs	Entertainment	Jargon	Informal and expressive

circumstances, the use of non-formal language may be an intentional part of the program's style.

The communicative context should therefore be considered when assessing jargon. An expression that may be inappropriate in a formal news report can have a legitimate expressive function in a comic program. The presence of informal language does not automatically indicate poor speech culture [62].

At the same time, television reaches an audience far beyond the social group that originally uses a particular expression. Repeated exposure can introduce specialized or informal vocabulary to viewers who may not otherwise encounter it. Excessive reliance on jargon may therefore influence wider speech habits and contribute to the normalization of expressions that are not suitable for all communicative contexts.

The responsibility of television presenters is especially important in programs with large audiences. Creating humour or an informal atmosphere does not necessarily require excessive use of jargon or foreign expressions. Effective television communication can maintain its entertainment value while remaining attentive to clarity and appropriate language use [63].

Linguistic Patterns Across Different Television Genres

The comparison of the selected programs reveals differences in the distribution of neologisms, barbarisms, and jargon. These categories are not equally represented across all television genres.

News and informational programs demonstrate a stronger presence of neologisms and newly established terminology. This tendency is understandable because journalists frequently discuss political, economic, technological, scientific, and social developments that require contemporary vocabulary. New terms allow speakers to refer to concepts that may not have been part of ordinary communication in earlier periods.

Documentary programs also provide conditions for the use of specialized terminology. Their subject matter may require scientific, historical, cultural, or technical vocabulary. In such cases, the introduction of new terms can serve a clear informative function [64].

Entertainment and comic programs demonstrate a different linguistic pattern. Informal expressions, jargon, colloquial vocabulary, and expressive forms occur more frequently because these programs depend to a greater extent on conversational style and emotional interaction with viewers.

Barbarisms appear less frequently than the other two categories in the observed material. Their occurrence nevertheless remains significant because unnecessary

foreign forms raise questions about the relationship between television speech and literary language standards.

The differences between genres demonstrate that television language cannot be evaluated without considering the communicative situation. The same word or expression may have different functions depending on the program, speaker, audience, and purpose of communication.

Relationship Between Television Language and Literary Georgian

The linguistic forms identified in the study illustrate the continuing interaction between language development and established literary norms. Georgian television reflects this interaction particularly clearly because it combines formal public communication with spontaneous and informal speech [65].

Neologisms demonstrate the ability of Georgian to adapt to social and technological change. Some newly introduced words may eventually become accepted components of the language, particularly when they fulfil a genuine communicative need. Their emergence should therefore be considered part of normal linguistic development.

Barbarisms raise a different question. When a foreign expression is used unnecessarily despite the availability of an established Georgian equivalent, its repeated presence in television speech may create difficulties for maintaining consistent public language. The issue is not borrowing itself but the unnecessary replacement of existing Georgian vocabulary [66].

Jargon occupies an intermediate position because its appropriateness depends strongly on context. In entertainment and comic programs, informal expressions may contribute to the intended communicative effect. In formal informational contexts, however, excessive jargon can reduce clarity or make communication less accessible to a general audience.

Television therefore occupies a sensitive position between linguistic innovation and language standardization. Its programs reflect the vocabulary already circulating in society, but they can also give expressions greater visibility and social acceptance [67].

The material examined in this study indicates that neologisms, barbarisms, and jargon have different functions and distributions within Georgian television speech. Neologisms are closely associated with new social realities and international terminology; barbarisms are linked primarily to unnecessary foreign-language usage; and jargon is more strongly associated with informal and entertainment-oriented communication.

These findings demonstrate the importance of examining television speech within its social and communicative

context. The language of Georgian television is not static [68]. It changes alongside society, technology, international communication, and cultural practices. At the same time, television professionals influence how these changes are presented to the public. Careful selection of vocabulary can therefore support effective communication while maintaining an appropriate relationship with the norms of literary Georgian [69,70].

CONCLUSION

The study of Georgian television speech demonstrates that broadcasting has an important place in the changing linguistic environment of contemporary Georgian society. The examined programs show that neologisms, barbarisms, and jargon do not occur with equal frequency or serve identical communicative purposes. Neologisms are particularly visible in news and documentary programs, where new political, technological, scientific, and social realities require appropriate vocabulary. Barbarisms occur less frequently and are mainly associated with unnecessary foreign-language forms. Jargon is more noticeable in entertainment and comic programs, where informal and expressive speech contributes to the intended style of communication.

These findings indicate that linguistic change cannot be separated from social and technological development. At the same time, frequent television exposure can give expressions wider public visibility. Television professionals therefore have an important responsibility to balance linguistic innovation with clarity, contextual appropriateness, and respect for literary Georgian. The appropriate response is not to prevent language change, but to encourage thoughtful and responsible language use in Georgian broadcasting.

REFERENCES

1. Kvaratskhelia, G. (2004). Language of mass media. [Publication information to be confirmed], 1–2.
2. Kvashvadze, M. (2013). Standardized speech and the language of Georgian-speaking media. *Actual Problems of Kartvelology*, 2, 61–70.
3. Maghradze, V. (2016). International word-terms or barbarisms. [Publication information to be confirmed], 103–104.
4. Darsavelidze, N., Vekua, M., & Kacharava, N. (2017). *Communication and mass communication*. Tbilisi: [Publisher information to be confirmed].
5. Deuze, M. (2021). *Media Life and the Mediatization of Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Luginbühl, M. (2005). Media language and cultural context. [Publication information to be confirmed], 18.
7. Tandashvili, M. (n.d.). *Functional Grammar*. [Web resource].
8. *Effective Speaking*. (n.d.). [Web resource].
9. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Crystal, D. (2006). *How Language Works*. London: Penguin Books.
11. Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language* (4th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Aitchison, J. (2013). *Language Change: Progress or Decay?* (4th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society* (4th ed.). London: Penguin Books.
14. Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (6th ed.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
15. Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
16. Meyerhoff, M. (2011). *Introducing Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
17. Romaine, S. (2000). *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
18. Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Fasold, R. (1990). *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
20. Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
21. Milroy, L., & Gordon, M. (2003). *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
22. Chambers, J. K. (2009). *Sociolinguistic Theory: Linguistic Variation and Its Social Significance* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
23. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
24. Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
25. Bell, A. (1991). *The Language of News Media*. Oxford: Blackwell.
26. Bell, A., & Garrett, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
27. Montgomery, M. (2007). *The Discourse of Broadcast News*. London: Routledge.
28. Tolson, A. (2006). *Media Talk: Spoken Discourse on TV and Radio*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
29. O'Keeffe, A. (2006). *Investigating Media Discourse*. London: Routledge.

30. Cotter, C. (2010). *News Talk: Investigating the Language of Journalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
31. Scannell, P. (Ed.). (1991). *Broadcast Talk*. London: Sage Publications.
32. van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
33. van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage Publications.
34. Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
35. Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
36. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Arnold.
37. Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
38. Bednarek, M. (2018). *Language and Television Series: A Linguistic Approach to TV Dialogue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
39. Herring, S. C. (2013). Discourse in Web 2.0: Familiar, reconfigured, and emergent. In D. Tannen & A. M. Trester (Eds.), *Discourse 2.0: Language and New Media* (pp. 1–25). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
40. Androutsopoulos, J. (2014). Mediatization and sociolinguistic change. *Media, Culture & Society*, 36(8), 1–15.
41. Scannell, P. (1996). *Radio, Television and Modern Life*. Oxford: Blackwell.
42. Silverstone, R. (1994). *Television and Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.
43. Thompson, J. B. (1995). *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
44. McQuail, D. (2010). *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory* (6th ed.). London: Sage Publications.
45. Livingstone, S. (2009). On the mediation of everything: ICA presidential address 2008. *Journal of Communication*, 59(1), 1–18.
46. Couldry, N. (2008). Mediatization or mediation? Alternative understandings of the emergent space of digital storytelling. *New Media & Society*, 10(3), 373–391.
47. Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
48. Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
49. Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231.
50. Haspelmath, M., & Tadmor, U. (Eds.). (2009). *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
51. Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
52. Campbell, L. (2013). *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction* (3rd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
53. Trask, R. L. (1996). *Historical Linguistics*. London: Arnold.
54. Bauer, L. (2001). *Morphological Productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
55. Bauer, L. (2002). *An Introduction to Morphological Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
56. Aronoff, M., & Fudeman, K. (2011). *What Is Morphology?* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
57. Plag, I. (2003). *Word-Formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
58. Lieber, R. (2016). *Introducing Morphology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
59. Katamba, F. (2005). *English Words: Structure, History, Usage* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
60. Mattiello, E. (2008). *An Introduction to English Slang: A Description of Its Morphology, Semantics and Sociology*. Polimetria.
61. Eble, C. (1996). *Slang and Sociability: In-Group Language Among College Students*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
62. Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006). *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
63. Auer, P. (2007). *Style and Social Identities: Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
64. Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
65. Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell.
66. Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A., & Leap, W. L. (2009). *Introducing Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
67. Tagliamonte, S. A. (2012). *Variationist Sociolinguistics: Change, Observation, Interpretation*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
68. Milroy, J. (1992). *Linguistic Variation and Change: On the Historical Sociolinguistics of English*. Oxford: Blackwell.

69. Romaine, S. (1994). *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
70. Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Citation: Cole L, Berget G, Smith L. "Shifting Language Patterns and Verbal Expression in Contemporary Television Speech". *American Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol 11, no. 3, 2026, pp. 142-152.

Copyright © 2025 Cole L, et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.