

**LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES OF GEORGIAN AND AMERICAN  
POLITICAL TALK SHOWS IN TERMS OF ETIQUETTE****Irine Goshkheteliani**

Doctor of Pedagogics,

Professor, Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University,  
Batumi, 32/35 Rustaveli/Ninoshvili Str, Batumi, 6010, Georgia,  
+995 599 55 89 47, irine.goshkheteliani@bsu.edu.ge  
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8879-640X>**Lola Beridze**

Doctor of Philology,

Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, Batumi, Georgia,  
Batumi, 32/35 Rustaveli/Ninoshvili Str, Batumi, 6010, Georgia,  
+995 577 65 80 00, lola3186@yahoo.com  
<http://orcid.org/0009-0001-6622-1469>

**Abstract.** Among the various media, television has a profound influence on language users. No other achievement of the scientific and technological revolution has so swiftly entered human life or had such a widespread and global impact on its development as television.

The aim of this study is the language of television as it is the language of a social institution responsible for shaping values, moral principles, societal norms, and traditions, and expressing the national mentality. This institution conducts complex communication with the potential for multifaceted impacts on the audience.

Media discourse has increasingly become the subject of linguistic research, as public interest in various types of discourse grows, particularly television discourse. This article examines talk shows (in 2019), a unique genre within television discourse, and identifies similarities and differences in speech etiquette between Georgian and American political talk shows through contrastive analysis.

**Keywords:** media, television discourse, talk show, speech etiquette

**Introduction.** The structure of television broadcasting is complex and diverse, encompassing various forms and genres, such as talk shows, interviews, discussions, and debates (Bahtin, 1979). Television conversations, particularly talk shows, play a significant role in contemporary media discourse, as they help shape public opinion. These shows present recipients with acceptable, exemplary, and culturally specific thinking models. This form of programming draws large audiences worldwide, including in Georgia, where interest in this genre is steadily growing (Svanidze, 2012).

It is worth exploring the term "talk show" and its defining characteristics.

The term "talk show" originates from English, meaning a "performance of a conversational nature." In mass media, a talk show refers to a structured, ongoing, natural conversation. As a distinct genre, it comprises a series of televised conversations resembling everyday speech due to its communicative spontaneity (Svanidze, 2012)

In the article "General Sociolinguistic Characteristics of Talk Shows as a Genre", Nebieridze (2011) defines talk shows as programs where guests discuss topics of public interest with a host. Guests can range from celebrities to individuals from the public.

According to Ilie (2001), talk shows exhibit a certain gradation of discursive features in terms of institutionalization, ranging from informal to formal speech. Depending on the host's personality, the nature of the topic, the participants' background, and the audience's characteristics, talk shows often feature a blend of spontaneous and purposeful dialogue, non-institutional and institutional roles, and unregulated versus host-controlled discussions.

The genre of talk shows originated in America in the 20th century and is now prevalent across the global television landscape. Munson (2000) traces the origins of the talk show to the 1930s, a period marked by the appearance of the first radio programs, which featured interactive audience participation. The success of such radio programs encouraged producers to create similar television programs (Signes, 2000: 9).

The history of talk shows varies across different countries. As noted, America was the first country to develop this genre, which spread globally later. Countries gradually adapted the American model to create local shows, influenced to varying degrees by American trends.

The first talk show in Georgia, the political interactive program “Night Courier”, aired in 1998. Since then, dozens of talk shows have emerged. These new programs quickly became popular as the style of audience interaction changed dramatically.

In the 1960s, British television shifted from an authoritarian to a more populist and democratic style (Scannell, 1998), with talk shows developing in the same direction. Martínez (2003) notes that the conversation between a host and a guest evolved into a performance, with more attention given to audience interaction.

In the 1980s, talk shows underwent further transformation as British and American broadcasters recognized the genre's versatility. Consequently, talk shows' popularity skyrocketed. Tolson (1997) cites Shattuck, who asserts that talk shows became one of the most popular genres on American television during the 1990s.

**Research Methodology.** The research methodology is directly related to the goal outlined in this study: when examining the linguistic features of conversational etiquette and television discourse in talk shows, it is essential to integrate disciplines such as linguistics, cultural studies, and journalism theory. Therefore, the main research methodology employed is interdisciplinarity, one of the key paradigmatic trends in modern humanities. We used different research methods: search for information, collection, and description of authentic materials; observation is one of the main means of obtaining information. The descriptive method reveals the linguistic reality of talk-show discourse; discourse analysis; lexical-semantic analysis, and pragmatic analysis. The contrastive method allowed us to identify the general and national peculiarities of Georgian and American political talk shows. This method examines the similarities and differences between languages from different groups and structures.

A corpus of approximately 50 examples from Georgian and American political talk shows was analyzed.

## Discussion

**Features of Television Speech Etiquette.** Doctor of Philology Goldin (1983) asserts that television speech etiquette does not differ significantly from general conversational etiquette. Television etiquette norms include using formal greetings and farewells during live broadcasts while prohibiting obscene and offensive language. According to Goldin, much depends on the TV host's tone, which should create emotional comfort and facilitate communication with guests and viewers.

Noncompliance with speech etiquette norms, particularly by politicians, is considered unacceptable in political relations. Speech etiquette is also used as a tool in political struggles to maximize influence on the audience. The speech culture of politicians has recently become a focal point of media attention, reflecting trends in the development of political language. Notably, even high-ranking politicians now address their opponents improperly, both domestically and on the international stage. Such behavior can be considered verbal aggression, employed to express negative emotions and intentions inappropriately (Shherbinina, 2008).

The same can be said of journalists, who often make grammatical or stylistic errors in their speech. While many errors go unnoticed by the audience, others can be jarring. This underscores the importance of adhering to communication standards that promote effective dialogue between the speaker and the audience.

The advent of broadcast media in the early 20th century, including the development of phonographs, radio, film, and television, significantly altered spoken language and linguistic

interaction. Television, as one of the most popular media outlets, plays a vital role in shaping public opinion, as the words and phrases used on television directly influence the viewer's mind.

The abolition of censorship on television led to the prevalence of spontaneous speech, while democratization fostered more authentic interpersonal relations, reflecting various conversational cultures and levels of education. During the Soviet era, strict censorship and proofreading were common practices. Such censorship persists in some European countries, particularly those where television is state-funded, such as the BBC and CNN. In the past, broadcasters frequently consulted dictionaries to address challenges related to standard language usage, but this practice is now largely abandoned, with broadcasters often violating literary norms.

Some linguists view language as a self-organizing system that naturally corrects deviations from norms, eliminating unnecessary elements over time. Others argue that language development is a spontaneous process that requires no regulation, as language inherently selects the best and discards the superfluous. Unfortunately, debates surrounding language regulation often become politicized and overly emotional (Karaulov, 2000).

Politicians and journalists play a key role in preserving the integrity of language, as their speech has a powerful, unconscious influence on the public. Violations of speech etiquette by politicians are considered unacceptable in political contexts and are often used strategically to influence audiences. As noted earlier, even high-ranking politicians now engage in improper speech, both at home and on the global stage, reflecting broader trends in the politicization of language (Shherbinina, 2008).

Television requires adherence to certain basic standards. In addition to mastering colloquial speech, diction, correct pronunciation, and emphasis, broadcasters must possess a deep understanding of the language and the ability to communicate logically and clearly with viewers.

Upholding speech etiquette is crucial in television communication. It must be professional, systematic, multifaceted, and accessible to non-specialists. It is important to remember that journalists and their use of language on radio and television are integral components of culture.

#### **Peculiarities of the Political Talk Show:**

1. **Television's Role:** As a medium, television holds significant power in shaping public opinion, especially in political talk shows where societal, political, and ideological conflicts are explored. (k'ublashvili, 2015)

2. **Purpose of Political Talk Shows:** The goal is to represent and mirror the political interests of the public by engaging diverse segments of society in discussions on state and public issues. These programs are often characterized by tension, passion, and direct involvement from the public and high-ranking officials (Kuznecov, 1998).

3. **Structure and Dialogue:** Political talk shows are centered around the presenter (moderator), who facilitates dialogue by asking questions but does not participate in debates. The shows often feature controversy, intending to present conflicting viewpoints and resolve these through argumentation. (Larina, 2004; t'alakhadze, 2015: 58)

4. **Moderation and Participation:** The host plays a key role in ensuring balance, neutrality, and objectivity. They guide the conversation without taking sides, promoting equal opportunity for all participants to express their views.

5. **Audience Engagement:** The audience is a vital part of the political talk show structure whether in the studio or through broadcasting. They are not only spectators but often contribute to shaping the tone and direction of the discussion.

#### **Similarities in Etiquette Formulas:**

1. **Speech Etiquette:** Speech etiquette in political talk shows is formalized, though it allows for some variation depending on the context. This includes greetings, introductions, discussions of the main topic, and farewells. Greetings and farewells are crucial, as they set the tone for the program and create a professional yet approachable atmosphere.

#### **2. American vs. Georgian Talk Shows:**

- **American Political Talk Shows:** These shows often display informality in speech, with moderators and participants addressing each other by first names to create a sense of intimacy and relatability. Examples include Steve Hilton and Robert Costa, who begin with political intrigue before greeting the audience. The farewell format in American shows often includes phrases designed to maintain viewer engagement for future content.

- **Georgian Political Talk Shows:** In contrast, Georgian hosts maintain more formal structures in speech etiquette, often using official titles (e.g., "Mr.," "Mrs.") and formal expressions of gratitude, indicating stronger adherence to traditional norms of politeness. However, the farewells in Georgian shows tend to be more concise than those in American talk shows.

3. **Speech Formulae:** American and Georgian political talk shows utilize formulaic expressions of greeting and farewell, reflecting broader cultural norms in communication. The overall structure remains consistent with the political and media discourse norms while the style of addressing the audience and guests may differ.

4. **Farewell Expressions:** In American talk shows, farewell phrases often hint at upcoming content or involve idiomatic expressions, creating an atmosphere of continuity. Georgian farewells, on the other hand, are more straightforward and formal, although they include a balance of neutral and official tones.

Here's a breakdown of the main ideas and observations:

#### 1. **Impact of Television and Political Programs:**

- Television plays a dominant role in shaping public opinion, particularly in Georgia, where it overshadows other media forms.

- Political talk shows have become a central feature of television, attracting large audiences and maximizing influence.

#### 2. **Subjectivity of Political Talk Show Hosts:**

- In American and Georgian political talk shows, hosts and correspondents, shape public perception, often by expressing subjectivity or bias.

- In the U.S., the subjectivity is more overt, as seen in shows like 'The Next Revolution' and 'The Piers Morgan Show', where hosts openly express their political affiliations and opinions, sometimes engaging in aggressive or hostile exchanges.

- Jeanine Pirro's positive assessment of Trump illustrates how hosts can influence the audience's views through passionate and emotive language, even using metaphors to convey strength and power.

#### 3. **Georgian Political Talk Shows:**

- Georgian political talk shows are generally more restrained in terms of open bias. While sometimes expressing support for certain politicians or policies, hosts do so implicitly.

- The example of Irakli Chikhladze illustrates how Georgian hosts praise political figures more subtly, without directly offending or engaging in confrontational dialogue.

#### 4. **Verbal Aggression and Etiquette Violations:**

- Verbal aggression, often seen in American talk shows, is a form of subjectivity where hostility escalates between hosts and guests. Examples include Piers Morgan's insults such as "you're an unbelievably stupid man" to Larry Pratt, leading to an aggressive back-and-forth.

- Such aggressive exchanges are not commonly observed in Georgian political talk shows. Georgian hosts like Irakli Chikhladze manage conflicts with compliments or by shifting the conversation, avoiding overtly aggressive language.

#### 5. **Use of Dysphemisms and Hate Speech:**

- Georgian political talk shows tend to avoid direct personal attacks but may use political dysphemisms directed at the opposition or the parliamentary minority. Harsh language is less common, especially against individuals, reflecting a more controlled approach to political discourse.

#### 6. **Sympathy and Praise:**

- American and Georgian talk show hosts express political sympathies, but the methods differ. In American shows, praise is often direct and exaggerated. Praise is more implicit and restrained, sometimes relying on subtle affirmations of political figures or policies in Georgian shows.

## Results

### **Similarities Between the Formulas of Greeting, Farewell, Gratitude, and Address.**

An integral part of speech etiquette is the use of specific formulas, which depend on the peculiarities of communication. Every communication act typically has a beginning, a main part, and an end, where speech etiquette varies based on the situation. For instance, established and polite speech formulas are used in formal meetings.

One of the most important elements of courtesy is the greeting. Various forms of greeting are used in different social contexts and they play a significant role in the interpersonal communication process.

While etiquette is regulated by speech norms, it does not strictly prescribe formulas for greetings, farewells, or addressing an audience. However, the material examined demonstrates that over time, traditional forms of greeting, consisting of fixed vocabulary and template structures, have been developed in political programs:

1. Greeting the audience
2. Introducing oneself
3. Presenting the main theme of the program.

Moderator Jeanine Pirro: *"Hello and welcome to Justice. I am Judge Jeanine Pirro. We have a special show on tap for you tonight"* (Fox News, 2019a).

Journalist Irakli Chikhladze: *"სალამო მშვიდობისა, პირდაპირ ეთერშია საზოგადოებრივ-პოლიტიკური თოქ-შოუ პირისპირ, მე ვარ ჟურნალისტი ირაკლი ჩიხლაძე. გვისმენთ რადიო იმედზე და გვიყურებთ ტელე იმედზე."* (*"Good evening. You are watching the social-political talk show Pirispir (Face to Face), I am a journalist Irakli Chikhladze. Listen to us on Imedi Radio and watch us on Imedi Television"*) (TV Imedi, 2019).

Most American and Georgian talk shows reveal that the greeting in political programs follows a strict style framework. Presenters use nearly identical phrases to greet the audience, although some introduce the main topic before greeting the viewers.

In some political talk shows, the topic is presented first, followed by a greeting:

Moderator Steve Hilton: *"Breaking tonight as Democrats face a growing scandal over racism and hypocrisy. President Trump puts the finishing touches on his State of the Union address, and in case it's not too late, we have a few suggestions. Good evening, everyone, and welcome to \*The Next Revolution\*. I'm Steve Hilton, and this is the home of positive populism"* (Fox News, 2019 b).

Steve Hilton's greeting is similar to Robert Costa's style: both present an intriguing political theme before greeting the viewers. Hilton also uses inverse sentence order, an elliptical sentence, and the oxymoronic phrase "positive populism" to evaluate his program positively. These welcome formulas are formal and often include vocatives, addressing the audience directly.

Traditionally, formal etiquette includes addressing individuals with titles such as "Mr." or "Mrs." However, due to the democratization of language, these forms are being replaced with anthroponymic and emotional vocatives, even in official contexts.

In Georgian political talk shows, formal speech etiquette is observed. Presenters frequently express gratitude while introducing guests, a notable aspect of polite speech:

*"ძალიან დიდი მადლობა რომ ხართ ჩვენი სტუმარი, მადლობა ბატონო ირაკლი"*. (*"Thank you very much for being our guest, Mr. Irakli"*) (TV Pirveli, 2019).

*"სალამო მშვიდობის, ქალბატონო ირმა მადლობა რომ ჩვენთან ერთად ხართ."* (*"Good evening, Mrs. Irma, thank you for being with us"*) (TV Imedi, 2018).

*"თქვენ რას ფიქრობთ ბატონო გიორგი მონარქიაზე?"* (*"What do you think about the monarchy, Mr. George?"*) (Georgian Labour Party, 2017).

In contrast, American political talk shows are characterized by a more informal tone. Television presenters and participants often address each other by first name, reducing status distance and fostering a comfortable atmosphere for interactive communication. Addressing high-profile politicians with familiar forms is not considered inappropriate in American contexts but rather signals a sense of intimacy. This informality extends to expressions of gratitude:

Steve Hilton: *"Morgan, first time on the show, it's very exciting!"*

Morgan: *"Thank you, I'm happy to be here"* (Fox News, 2019 d).

Piers Morgan: *"What I find so extraordinary, Jeffrey, is this..."* (Piers Morgan Tonight, 2013).

Robert Costa: *"And the president, Ashley, this weekend is heading to his private club in Los Angeles"* (Washington Week, 2019b, ).

Farewell formulas are equally important in maintaining speech etiquette. The host typically concludes the conversation, and the farewell formula depends on the program's format. In American

political talk shows, fixed farewell phrases are standard, becoming an official form of politeness that adheres to speech etiquette norms.

For example, Robert Costa uses a farewell formula that is consistent and polite: *“We’ll keep our eyes on all these phases. This is just one tonight. More news will happen this weekend. We’ll keep reporting on all of it. Thanks, everybody, for being here. Our conversation will continue on Washington Week Extra. Watch it on our website, Facebook, or YouTube at 8:30 p.m. Eastern every Friday night. I’m Robert Costa. Have a great weekend, and we’ll see you next time”* (Washington Week, 2019 a, ).

Similarly, Steve Hilton uses pre-farewell idiomatic expressions, making the upcoming topics more intriguing for viewers: *“That’s all for tonight. Don’t forget to sign up for Fox Nation, where you can see my deep dive tomorrow...”* (Fox News, 2019 c ).

In Georgian political talk shows, farewell formulas are as standardized as in American ones. However, Georgian hosts tend to mix neutral and formal vocabulary. For example:

Inga Grigolia: *“ახლა ჩვენი საინფორმაციო გამოშვების დროა, დიდი მადლობა რომ გვიყურეთ, კარგად ბრძანდებოდეთ.”* (*“And now it’s time for our news release. Thank you for watching us. Goodbye”*) (TV Pirveli, 2019).

Unlike American hosts, Georgian presenters often blend neutral and official register vocabulary, using formal and conversational phrases in their farewells. Political talk shows in both American and Georgian contexts follow structured speech etiquette. Hosts initiate and conclude conversations, while respondents rarely say goodbye to the audience or host. Despite changes in conversational stages, the use of classic formulas for greetings, farewells, and expressions of gratitude remains firmly rooted in traditional norms of politeness and communication

**Various Ways of Expressing Subjectivity in Political Talk Shows (Sympathy-Antipathy, Abuse/Praise, Hatred, and Dysphemic Vocabulary).** Television plays a dominant role in shaping public opinion in Georgia, as no other media platform can currently compete with its reach and influence. Television has the greatest impact on people's values, politics, economics, and culture. Among television programs, political talk shows are central, attracting the largest group of viewers and profoundly influencing their opinions.

Political talk shows typically revolve around a central topic proposed by the presenter, which invites discussion. Presenters and correspondents are key figures, and their task is to convey information convincingly. One tool they use to accomplish this is adherence to speech etiquette norms. However, in recent years, the speech culture in political talk shows has become a topic of debate, reflecting broader trends in televised discourse. Notably, hosts often express their subjectivity through implicit or explicit bias.

In American political talk shows, presenters frequently express their opinions about politicians and political events openly. For example, Jeanine Pirro voiced her support for Donald Trump in *The Next Revolution*:

*“I’ve known a man for almost three decades, and that is not how this man responds to anything like, ‘Oh, it’s over; the walls are closing in.’ That’s not Donald Trump. This is a guy who pokes the eye of the tiger; he walks into the cave and pokes the eye of the tiger”* (Fox News, 2019a.).

Pirro's metaphor, used twice—*“This is a guy who pokes the eye of the tiger”*—illustrates Trump's power. Her emotionally charged praise demonstrates the subjective stance taken by the presenter. In response, her guest, Corey Lewandowski, further echoed these sentiments by calling Trump a “winner” in various fields:

*“Look! This guy’s a winner, whether it’s real estate, best-selling books, television, or politics. He is a winner in everything he does.”*

The host's and the guest's profuse praise of Trump is a prime example of how political sympathies are openly expressed in American media.

In Georgian political talk shows, while presenters also express their subjectivity, it is generally more implicit and restrained compared to their American counterparts. For example, on Imedi TV, Irakli Chikhladze subtly praised the government when discussing the participation of senior officials in a political program:

“*მე აქვე უნდა აღნიშნო, რომ მსგავს ფორმატში უმაღლესი თანამდებობის პირების მონაწილეობა ადასტურებს, რომ განათლება დღევანდელი მთავრობის რეალური პრიორიტეტია. (...) ზოგადად არ უყვართ პრემიერებს საზოგადოებასთან ერთად ამა თუ იმ საკითხზე მსჯელობა, ამისთვის განსაკუთრებული მადლობა თქვენ.*“ (“*I must also note that the participation of senior officials in a similar format proves that education is a real priority for the current government. As a rule, prime ministers do not like to discuss issues with the public. Thank you very much for this*”) (Imedi TV, 2019).

Here, Chikhladze’s praise is more subtle, expressed through an implicit compliment to the government’s prioritization of education. This demonstrates the differences in the expression of subjectivity between American and Georgian presenters, with Georgian hosts favoring a more formal and polite tone.

**Verbal Aggression and Violations of Speech Etiquette.** The inability of politicians to follow speech etiquette norms, such as using inappropriate language or derogatory expressions, has become a contentious issue in political discourse. In particular, the use of invective and offensive language, which can escalate into verbal aggression, is frequently seen in American political talk shows. Tamar Makharoblidze (2019: 7) notes, invectives, and obscene language are forms of verbal aggression that lead to violations of speech etiquette.

For example, a heated exchange between Piers Morgan and Larry Pratt on Piers Morgan Tonight showcased verbal aggression on both sides:

Larry Pratt: *"Because the problem occurs, sir, in those areas precisely where we have said no guns. The problem doesn't occur where guns are allowed freely to be carried and used by people. We have very low murder rates in those areas."*

Morgan: *"You're an unbelievably stupid man, aren't you?"*

Pratt: *"It seems to me that you're morally obtuse."*

Morgan: *"What a ridiculous argument. You have absolutely no coherent argument whatsoever."* (Piers Morgan Tonight, 2013).

In this exchange, Morgan’s insult (*"You're an unbelievably stupid man"*) and Pratt’s counter-insult (*"You're morally obtuse"*) highlight how violations of speech etiquette can lead to verbal conflicts that escalate quickly. Both host and guest engage in aggressive rhetoric, which is common in American political media but less so in Georgian talk shows.

**Dysphemic Language in Georgian Political Talk Shows.** In contrast, Georgian political talk shows tend to use more restrained language, even when disagreements arise. An illustrative example is from an exchange between Irma Inashvili and Irakli Chikhladze on Imedi TV:

Irma Inashvili: *“ვიდრე დავიწყებდე შენიშვნა მინდა მოგცეთ, როცა ფორმატზე შევთანხმდებით ის ფორმატი დაიცვას თქვენმა ტელეკომპანიამ, თუმცა მე არა ვარ წინააღმდეგი ამ ფორმატივს დავაფიქსირო ჩემი აზრი. თქვენი ტელევიზია მე მიმაჩნია ერთ-ერთ მიკერძოებულ ტელევიზიად, მხარედ, რომელიც იყენებს არასწორ და ბინძურ მეთოდებს ოპონენტების გასანადგურებლად და ცალკე დამპატიჟეთ ამ ეთერში ამ თემაზე სასაუბროდ.”* (“Before I start, I would like to note that when we agree on a format, your television company should adhere to it. I am not against expressing my opinion in this format. However, I believe that your television is one of the biased channels that use dirty methods to destroy opponents.”)

Chikhladze: *“(…) მე ვფიქრობ რომ თქვენ ხართ ერთ-ერთი სასურველი სტუმარი და გადავიდეთ მთავარ საკითხზე თუ შეიძლება.* (“I think you are one of our most desirable guests. Let’s move on to the main issue, if possible”) (Imedi TV, 2018).

In this example, Inashvili makes a pointed critique of the television station, accusing it of using “dirty methods.” However, Chikhladze responds diplomatically, steering the conversation back to the central topic with a polite compliment. This contrasts sharply with the confrontational approach seen in American media, where insults are more common.

**The Role of Dysphemism in Political Discourse:** Dysphemic language, or the use of offensive terms, is another tool used in political discourse, primarily aimed at discrediting political opponents. In American political talk shows, dysphemisms are often directed at individuals. Conversely, in Georgian media, dysphemic language is more likely to target political groups or governing bodies. For instance,

the use of political dysphemisms in Georgian talk shows often critiques the ruling party or parliamentary majority but avoids harsh, personal attacks.

As seen from the discussion, this section successfully illustrates the contrasting norms of political discourse and speech etiquette across different cultures, emphasizing the role of media in shaping public perception and the varying levels of aggression tolerated in political talk shows.

**Conclusion.** Political talk shows in both countries maintain a balance between established norms of speech etiquette and expressions of subjectivity. American talk shows tend to lean towards more direct and often confrontational exchanges, while Georgian talk shows, though still subjective, adhere more closely to formal politeness and avoid direct verbal conflicts or hate speech. The use of political dysphemisms in Georgia is generally aimed at institutions rather than individuals, preserving a veneer of respect in political discourse.

In essence, American political talk shows frequently exhibit overt subjectivity, characterized by emotional appeals and aggressive exchanges. In contrast, Georgian shows maintain a more formal, controlled discourse, though subjectivity and bias are present in more subtle forms.

The analysis demonstrates that political talk shows in both cultures follow formalized norms of speech etiquette while reflecting distinct cultural differences in communication style. American shows favor informal, dynamic interaction, whereas Georgian shows maintain a more formal and structured approach. This cultural contrast highlights different modes of audience engagement and underscores the role of television in shaping public discourse.

The key points are:

1. **Television's Influence:** In Georgia, television is a dominant medium, especially for political discourse. Political talk shows play a major role in shaping public opinion, and presenters are key figures in steering these discussions.

2. **Subjectivity in American Talk Shows:** American political talk show hosts tend to openly express their opinions and political allegiances, often praising or criticizing specific figures. The example of Jeanine Pirro's open admiration of Donald Trump demonstrates this tendency, using metaphor and emotionally charged language to highlight Trump's perceived strength and success.

3. **Subjectivity in Georgian Talk Shows:** Georgian presenters also express their subjective views but tend to do so more implicitly compared to their American counterparts. For instance, the presenter Irakli Chikhladze subtly praises the government while maintaining a more formal and restrained approach, indicating a preference for maintaining polite speech etiquette.

4. **Violation of Speech Etiquette and Verbal Aggression:** The discourse around political speech often involves breaches of etiquette, especially when politicians fail to adhere to respectful language norms. American talk shows, like the example from the \*Piers Morgan Show\*, sometimes include open verbal aggression, where both the host and the guest resort to insults and heated exchanges. This direct verbal conflict is seen less in Georgian media.

5. **Contrast Between American and Georgian Talk Shows:** Georgian political talk show hosts generally avoid overtly aggressive language and conflict escalation. They are more focused on maintaining a balanced tone, even when confronted with hostility. For example, Irakli Chikhladze skillfully defuses the tension by complimenting his guests and steering the conversation back to the main issue, which contrasts with the more combative approach seen in American shows.

6. **Dysphemic Language:** Dysphemism, or the use of derogatory language, is a common feature in political discourse. In American shows, this is often more personal and directly aimed at individuals. In contrast, Georgian political talk shows use dysphemism primarily against groups, such as political parties or governing bodies, rather than targeting specific people with harsh language.

7. **Cultural Differences in Political Discourse:** The comparison highlights significant cultural differences in how the two countries convey subjectivity, aggression, and respect in political talk shows. While American media is more open to personal attacks and expressive language, Georgian media prioritizes maintaining etiquette, even in politically charged discussions.

In summary, the use of subjectivity, sympathy, antipathy, and dysphemic vocabulary in political talk shows reflects broader cultural differences between American and Georgian media. American talk shows often feature open displays of bias, verbal aggression, and personal attacks, while Georgian media tends to adhere to more formal and restrained speech etiquette. Despite these differences, both media



landscapes reflect the central role of television in shaping political discourse and influencing public opinion.

## REFERENCES

- k'ublashvili, b. (2015). *reit'inguli t'ok'shouebi skhva rak'ursit [Rated talk shows from a different angle]*. Tbilisi.
- makharoblidze, t. (2019). *k'omunik'atsia [Communication]*. Iliia State University. <http://eprints.iliauni.edu.ge/3063/1/Communico.doc>
- nebieridze, m. (2011). t'ok'shous, rogoris zhanris, zogadi sotsiolingvist'uri makhasiateblebi [General Sociolinguistic Characteristics of Talk Shows as a Genre]. *saenatmetsniero dziebani [Linguistic Research]*. XXXII. Tbilisi.
- sakartvelos leiborist'uli p'art'ia [Georgian Labour Party]. (2017, June 20). *archevani. monarkia da k'onst'it'utsiuri tsvlilebebi [Choice. Monarchy and Constitutional Amendments]*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TIQHWbmuerg>
- svanidze, r. (2012). *t'okshous t'ekst'is st'ilis taviseburebani germanul da kartul enebshi [Peculiarities of talk show text style in German and Georgian languages]*. Doctoral dissertation. Kutaisi.
- t'alakhadze, n. (2015). *samauts'qeblo media – radio [Broadcast media – Radio]*. TSU. Tbilisi.
- Fox News. (2019, April 20)a. *Judge Jeanine: No collusion. No Obstruction. Enough already*. [Video file]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Izn4EvMGdeU>
- Fox News. (2019, February 3)b. *The Next Revolution with Steve Hilton 2/3/2019*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nkyTAEc0iSU&t=1421s>
- Fox News. (2019, March 2)c. *The Next Revolution with Steve Hilton 3/2/2019*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t24JVP5IwT8&list=PLrnVUhOzqsURLwR-IV2dSq8HNZWt0Afuk>
- Fox News. (2019, April 5)d. *The Next Revolution with Steve Hilton 4/5/2019*. [Video]. YouTube. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_orCj9ER5u4](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_orCj9ER5u4)
- Piers Morgan Tonight (2013, January 9). *Piers Morgan and Larry Pratt discuss gun control on Piers Morgan Tonight*. [Video]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3C1d4onZsyw>
- Ilie, C. (2001). Semi-institutional discourse: The case of the talk show. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 33(2), 209-254. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00133-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00133-2)
- Martínez, E. (2003). *Accomplishing closings in talk show interviews: A comparison with news interviews*. *Discourse Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456030053001>
- Scannell, P. (1998). *Media – language – world*. In A. Bell & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Signes, C. A. (2000). *A genre-based approach to daytime talk on television*. Monographs Volume 1, *Studies in English Language and Linguistics*, Universitat de Valencia, Valencia.
- Tolson, A. (1991). *Televised chat and the synthetic personality*. London.
- Bahtin, M. M. (1979). *Problema rechevyh zhanrov. Jestetika slovesnogo tvorchestva [The problem of speech genres. Aesthetics of verbal creativity]*. Moscow: “Iskusstvo”.
- Gol'din, V. E. (1983). *Rech' i Jetiket [Speech and etiquette]*. Moscow.
- Karaulov, Ju. N. (2000). *Kul'tura rechi i jazykovaja kritika russkij jazyk v jefire: problemy i puti ih reshenija [Speech Culture and Russian language critics on the air: Problems and solutions]*. Moscow.
- Kuznecov, G. V., (1998). Tok-shou: neizvestnyj zhanr? [Talk show: Unknown genre?]. *Zhurnal'ist [Journalist]*. №11/12. Moscow.
- Larina, E. G. (2004). *Lingvopragmaticheskie osobennosti tok-shou kak zhanra televizionnogo diskursa (na materiale amerikanskih televizionnyh programm) [Lingvopragmatic peculiarities of the talk show as a genre of television Discourse (based on American television programs)]*. Volgograd.
- Shherbinina, Ju. V. (2008). *Verbal'naja agressija [Verbal aggression]*. Moscow: “KomKniga”.

- TV Imedi. (2019, March 19). *p'irisp'ir (Face to Face)*. March 19, 2019. [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wqFg0V9ivQ0>
- TV Imedi. (2018, May 15). *p'irisp'ir (Face to Face)*. May 15, 2018. [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4OvRRsjyIIM>
- TV Pirveli. (2019, January 31). *reaktsia (Reaction)*. January 31, 2019. [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QBJRdlPOLyY>
- Washington Week. (2019, April 5)a. *EXTRA: What does a Mar-a-Lago security breach mean for President Trump?* [Video]. PBS. <https://www.pbs.org/weta/washingtonweek/web-video/extra-what-does-mar-lago-security-breach-mean-president-trump>
- Washington Week. (2019, March 22)b. *Special counsel Robert Mueller submits a report to the Justice Department.* [Video]. PBS. <https://www.pbs.org/weta/washingtonweek/episode/special-counsel-robert-mueller-submits-report-justice-department>