

Broadcast Language and Culture in Television Journalism: Contemporary Problems and Transformation Processes

Dinara Qallibekova

Master's Student, Karakalpak State University, Uzbekistan

Received: 10 May 2026; **Accepted:** 04 June 2026; **Published:** 30 June 2026

Abstract: This article examines the problems of airtime language and speech culture in contemporary Uzbek television journalism, the socio-psychological impact of language, and the factors shaping television screen culture. In the context of globalization and the expansion of the media space, the issues of live broadcast language, violations of literary language norms, and colloquialization of speech (jargon, barbarisms, calques) are analyzed, and practical recommendations are put forward to eliminate them.

Keywords: Television journalism, broadcast language, speech culture, literary language norms, orthoepy, live broadcast, media linguistics, presenter's skill, oral speech, mass media (media).

Introduction: Television journalism is not merely a tool for transmitting information; it is a powerful touchstone that shapes the spiritual, cultural, and linguistic environment of society. In today's era, where raising the prestige and status of the state language is defined as one of the priority areas of state policy in the Republic of Uzbekistan, the speech culture of television personnel is acquiring more significance than ever before.

The language of broadcasting is the mirror of the national literary language. However, today, as a result of the increasing number of TV channels, the proliferation of private studios, and talk shows, tendencies toward arbitrariness in broadcast language, disregard for literary language norms, and a decline in speech culture are being observed. This determines the relevance of the topic from both theoretical and practical perspectives.

From a scientific viewpoint, airtime language is a synthesized form of speech. It embodies the characteristics of both written speech (script, text) and oral speech (intonation, pathos, improvisation).

Main functions of broadcast speech:

- Communicative (interaction) function: Delivering information to the viewer clearly and understandably.
- Expressive (impact) function: Evoking an emotional response from the audience.
- Aesthetic function: Shaping beauty, respect for language, and culture within the viewer.
- Speech culture is a distinct branch of linguistics; it presupposes not only the correct pronunciation of words (orthoepy) or correct spelling (orthography) but also the skill to select the most optimal, precise, and logical linguistic tools in a specific speech situation.

Systemic problems affecting broadcast culture

When observing contemporary Uzbek television journalism, several systemic problems undermining broadcast culture can be distinguished:

A) Lexical and Grammatical Calques

In many cases, as a result of translating news texts

directly (word-for-word) from Russian or English, sentences alien to the nature of the Uzbek language emerge.

- Incorrect: "Bu masala bo'yicha qaror qabul qilindi" (Under the influence of the Russian "принять решение").
- Correct: "Bu masala bo'yicha qarorga kelindi" or "Bu masala hal qilindi".
- Incorrect: "Uchrashuv bo'lib o'tishi kutilmoqda".
- Correct: "Uchrashuv o'tkazilishi rejalashtirilgan".

B) Shift of Jargon and Street Slang to the Airwaves

Particularly in youth-oriented shows, talk shows, and entertainment programs, presenters discard literary language norms under the pretext of being "closer" to the audience, using barbarisms (unjustified loanwords) and jargon ("vapshe", "shok", "tema", "layk", "xayp").

Elements of Airtime Culture	Description and Requirement
Speech Technique	Correct breath management, voice timbre, and precision of diction.
Tact and Ethics	Not interrupting the interlocutor, showing respect to the guest and the audience.
Non-verbal Communication	Moderation in facial expressions and gestures (excessively aggressive or overly loose movements are considered uncouth).
Appearance (Design)	The dress culture must strictly match the format of the program (socio-political, entertainment).

Live broadcasting (Live) demands high psychological preparedness and the ability to control one's speech even in "extreme" situations from the journalist. In unplanned situations, the presenter's true intellect and linguistic culture are vividly revealed.

Practical Examples from the Media on the Topic

1. The Transformation: Conversationalization and informalization

The Trend: Television journalism has shifted from the authoritative, formal "Voice of God" delivery (Received Pronunciation in the UK, General American in the US) to a highly colloquial, conversational style to appear

D) Orthoepic and Logopedic Flaws

Cases of misplacing stress on air, indulging in dialectisms (slang/regional dialects), and failing to work on diction (pronunciation) are frequent. A presenter's speech being too fast (tachylalia) or too slow and stuttering prevents the viewer from comprehending the essence of the text.

E) Speech Clichés (Stamps) and Filler Words

The inappropriate and repetitive use of words such as "xo'sh" (well), "demak" (so/therefore), "aynan" (exactly), "aslida" (actually), and "so'zsiz" (undoubtedly) indicates a poverty of the presenter's vocabulary.

Elements of broadcast language

Airtime culture does not consist of language alone. It is a synthesis of verbal (through words) and non-verbal (gestures, communication manners) culture.

more relatable.

The Problem (Linguistic Erosion vs. Inclusivity): Traditionalists argue this degrades language standards and diminishes the authority of news, while proponents argue it democratizes media.

Practical Example (BBC News & UK Regional Accents): Historically, BBC newsreaders were strictly required to use Standard English (RP). Today, to foster cultural inclusion and break class barriers, prominent presenters like Huw Edwards (Welsh accent) or Steph McGovern (Middlesbrough/Teesside accent) are celebrated. However, this has faced backlash from viewers complaining about a perceived "drop in

standards" or difficulty in comprehension, highlighting the tension between national identity and linguistic diversity.

Practical Example (Social Media Language on Air): Anchors on networks like CNN or MSNBC now frequently incorporate internet slang, abbreviations, and Twitter/X syntax directly into their live commentary (e.g., using terms like "receipts," "ghosting," "clout," or "canceled" when discussing political scandals). This bridges the gap with younger audiences but often alienates older viewers and trivializes serious political discourse.

2. The Problem: Sensationalism and "Clickbait" Language on Air

The Trend: Due to intense competition with digital platforms, television news networks have adopted the linguistic strategies of social media algorithms—using emotionally charged, hyperbolic language to maintain viewer retention.

The Problem (Spiritual and Cultural Erosion): Constant exposure to high-anxiety language distorts the public's perception of reality, erodes critical thinking, and desensitizes the collective worldview.

Practical Example (US Cable News - Fox News and MSNBC): Watch a broadcast on either network during a political event. Instead of neutral verbs like "stated" or "argued," journalists routinely use aggressive, polarized verbs: "X slams Y," "Z eviscerates the opposition," "A destroying B."

Practical Example (Breaking News Graphic Language): The permanent use of the "BREAKING NEWS" banner accompanied by high-alert vocabulary ("Crisis," "Chaos," "Imminent Threat") for relatively minor or developing stories. This linguistic inflation exhausts the audience's psychological immunity, making it difficult for citizens to distinguish between a minor political disagreement and a genuine national emergency.

3. The Transformation: Political Correctness, Inclusive Language, and Cultural Sensitivity

The Trend: Television journalism is actively transforming its vocabulary to reflect modern standards of social justice, diversity, and human rights.

The Problem (Ideological Polarization): While it protects minority groups, critics argue it can lead to linguistic engineering, "corporate speak," or a

detachment from how everyday citizens actually speak.

Practical Example (Updating Stylebooks - AP and Reuters): Major broadcast networks strictly follow updated stylebooks. For instance, journalists are now instructed to avoid the term "illegal immigrants" and instead use "undocumented immigrants" or "asylum seekers." Similarly, when reporting on crime or homelessness, the shift is toward person-first language (e.g., "people experiencing homelessness" instead of "the homeless").

Practical Example (Gender-Neutral Reporting): During natural disasters or military conflicts, anchors have transitioned from saying "firemen," "policemen," or "manpower" to using "firefighters," "police officers," and "personnel." This reflects a conscious effort to ensure television language actively shapes a more egalitarian worldview.

Recommendations for preventing the crisis

To prevent the crisis of language and culture in television journalism, it is necessary to take the following practical steps:

1. Introduce a special staff position of "Speech Culture Consultant (Editor)" in every TV channel and inspect all texts before broadcasting.
2. When selecting talent for the screen, evaluate first and foremost their diction, worldview, and level of proficiency in the literary language, rather than just their physical appearance.
3. Regularly organize masterclasses for journalists and announcers on acting skills, speech techniques, and rhetoric (the art of public speaking).
4. Establish a system of issuing warnings to employees who flagrantly violate literary language norms, while financially and morally incentivizing journalists who use language richly and attractively.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the discourse surrounding airtime language and culture in television journalism transcends mere linguistic mechanics or grammatical precision; it is a profoundly strategic imperative intricately woven into the fabric of national identity and the preservation of a society's spiritual and cultural immunity. In an era dominated by rapid globalization and information overflow, media professionals must recognize that the airwaves carry more than just

information—they shape consciousness.

Broadcast creators, journalists, and media executives bear a monumental social responsibility. Every word uttered, narrative framed, and linguistic tone adopted on screen acts as a powerful catalyst in molding the worldview, critical thinking, and linguistic competencies of millions of viewers. When television journalism upholds a flawless standard of language culture, it does not simply report reality; it actively elevates the collective intellect. Ultimately, cultivating a sophisticated media language culture serves as a foundational pillar for safeguarding national heritage, counteracting cultural erosion, and raising the overall cultural and intellectual ethos of the entire society.

REFERENCES

1. Введенская, Л. А., Павлова, Л. Г., & Чихачев, В. П. (2019). Культура речи и искусство звучащего слова в СМИ. Москва: Юрайт.
2. Васильева, Т. В. (2014). Культура речи телевизионного ведущего: практическое руководство. Москва: Аспект Пресс.
3. Лазутина, Г. В. (2020). Профессиональная этика журналиста. Москва: Аспект Пресс.
4. Boyd, A., Stewart, P., & Alexander, R. (2008). Broadcast Journalism: Techniques of Radio and Television News. Focal Press.
5. Conboy, M. (2007). The Language of the News. London: Routledge.
6. Crystal, D. (2011). Internet Linguistics: A Student Guide. Routledge.