Universiteit Leiden
The Netherlands

The Pronunciation Variation of Anglicisms in Georgian: The Effects of Social Factors

Thesis for the attainment of the Master of Arts degree in the Linguistics (Modern Languages) Programme (60 EC) supervised by Dick Smakman

Tekla Gabunia

Modern Languages (MA)

Leiden University

July 1, 2021

Table of Contents

Overview

Languages are not static, but rather diverse and changing. As noted by Ferdinand de Saussure (1959), "time changes all things: there is no reason why language should escape this universal law." (p. 77). Linguistic contact is one of the most obvious catalysts of language change. Languages have been in contact with one another for centuries, and these languages influence each other to different degrees. Lexical borrowing is the most common outcome of linguistic contact; and with English being the "global language", it is hardly surprising that Anglicisms are found in languages all around the world, including in the language explored in this paper – Georgian. Speakers of Georgian have had contact with numerous languages throughout history. In the 19th and 20th century, Russian had a strong influence on Georgian. However, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the Georgian language saw a new, big set of borrowings - Anglicisms; and even though efforts are made to purify a language, it is impossible to ignore a large influx of English vocabulary into Georgian.

Anglicisms (and loanwords, in general) usually show a greater degree of pronunciation variation than the native words. This is particularly true for recent loanwords: Poplack et al. (1988) believe that older loanwords are fully adapted to borrowing language, while newer ones are more 'source-like'. The age of loanwords is indeed a credible explanation, but by no means is it the only one. Borrowings are not merely the means to fill the lexical gap between languages; borrowing, as a process, has a social dimension as well. Therefore, it is only natural to ask the following question: are pronunciation variation in loanwords driven by sociolinguistic factors?

With this question in mind, the present paper falls into the fields of sociophonetics, concentrating on the pronunciation variation of Anglicisms based on various social factors (age, gender, attitudes towards the West, knowledge of English and technological advancement of the participants). Simply said, the paper employs social variables to understand what type of people use a specific variant of pronunciation. Thus, social factors can also be generally seen as "personality traits" that might determine the linguistic choices of the speakers. It also concentrates on participants' proclaimed pronunciation and perceptual evaluation of loanword pronunciations, as well as speakers' associations towards English-like and Georgian-like pronunciation variants. It also sheds the light on the activities of the State Language Department on the transcription and transliteration of the English phonetic system in Georgian.

Overall Methodology

The study is based on the experiment conducted online. At first, the participants were asked to fill out the questionnaire about their personality. In the experiment, the participants were asked to pronounce linguistic items (Anglicisms) in Georgian. The participants were also asked to make a choice between variants of Anglicisms upon hearing them. They were asked to explain their choice and attitudes when hearing those items.

Terms

Some terms are defined to make it easier to follow the process:

Articulatory Expressions - the term is employed to include 'actual pronunciation', ' 'perceptual evaluation' and 'proclaimed pronunciation'.

Actual Pronunciation – the linguistic choices the participants have made during the experiment.

Perceptual Evaluation – whether they chose English-like or Georgian-like pronunciation upon hearing the words during the experiment.

Proclaimed Pronunciation – in the follow-up interview, participants were asked to explicitly state which variant they used/liked better.

Research Gap

Not much has been done to analyse the influence of social variables in loanword pronunciation and to date, variation in pronunciation and its interrelationship with sociolinguistic factors remains a neglected research area. Lev-Ari and Peperkamp (2014) clearly state that the social factors influencing loanword adaptation have rarely been examined experimentally in general. This statement is particularly true for Georgian, where the attention to English is at its peak, but the experimental aspects of the language are not yet embraced. In addition, there is a scarcity of experiments comparing the difference between real pronunciations of speakers as compared to their proclaimed ones in loanwords.

Previous works in Georgia have addressed the issue of Anglicisms from various angles: the reasons for borrowing, the adaptation of Anglicisms into Georgian, the areas of their spread. Several of the authors mention that the pronunciation of Anglicisms show a high degree of instability, but mainly concentrate on reasons such as loanword age and the role of mediator language (Russian).

Willian Labov is often regarded as the founder of variationist sociolinguistics. His works have highlighted the importance of examining the interrelationship between the linguistic and social variables. As established above, borrowing is a social phenomenon and, therefore, pronunciation variation in loanwords might also be explained by social factors. Despite this, there is a clear research gap in this field.

Research Questions

The goal of this particular paper is to analyse the interrelationship between social factors and pronunciation variation in loanwords. It examines the 'articulatory expressions' of the participants, as well as speakers' associations towards English-like and Georgian-like pronunciation in loanwords. It also sheds the light on the activities of the State Language Department on the transcription and transliteration of the English phonetic system.

The research aims at answering the following research questions:

1. What are the effects of social factors on pronunciation variation of English loanwords?
2. How speakers perceive and think about the pronunciation variants in English loanwords?

Literature Overview

Language Policy, Planning and Management

"Language Policy" can be defined as language planning (explicit or implicit) by official institutions and bodies. Language policies refer to guidelines, rules or norms for language use, structure, and acquisition (Tollefson, 2011). The term "language planning" was first introduced by Haugen (1959). He defined it as "the activity of preparing a normative orthography, grammar, and dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community" (Haugen, 1959, p. 8). Scholars differentiate between Corpus planning (standardisation, purification, modernisation, vocabulary development) and Status planning (social position of varieties). This distinction was first proposed by Kloss (1968). Status planning and corpus planning serve distinct, but sometimes overlapping functions (Nahir, 1977; Eastman, 1983). In fact, Fishman (1971) stated that corpus planning usually involves status planning as well. Haugen, in his popular book "Blessings of Babel" noted that language planning could include anything 'from proposing a new word to a new language' (2012, p. 927). "Language Management Theory" (LMT) is closely connected to Language Policy & Planning (LPP). However, according to Jernudd (1990), these two have grown apart and Language Management has developed into an alternative theory.

When discussing the theory of language policy, Spolsky (2004) distinguished three components. The first is language practices, the second is beliefs or ideology. The third one is of particular interest: "any specific efforts to modify or influence that practice by any kind of language intervention, planning or management" (Spolsky, 2004, p. 5). The term language management was properly and systematically introduced by Jernudd & Neustupný (1987). Nekvapil (2007) developing LMT, demonstrated that these theories are able to respond to contemporary issues. LMT is based on the distinction proposed by Fishman (1971) language "behaviour" and "behaviour towards language". Nekvapil (2007) provided an example of language management: "a situation where speaker X repeats with careful pronunciation a foreign word which his interlocutor Y failed to understand or by the standardization of the pronunciation of foreign words carried out by an academic institution and authorized by a ministry" (p. 95). In the first case, the agent of such change is an individual in a particular communicative situation, while in the latter, a certain institution is a medium (Nekvapil, 2016). Nekvapil (2007) puts the pronunciation of foreign words in the framework of LMT. He postulated that even "simple management of a particular phenomenon (e.g., the pronunciation of foreign words in language X, or the communication between local and foreign employees in company Y) should be thoroughly researched" (p.97). It is obvious that LPP and LMT are thorough, well-thought-out processes. Scholars differentiate between different deliberate stages of LPP (Lewis, 1972; Haugen, 2013). However, it is one thing to introduce some guidelines or rules. But will people follow those proposed rules and guidelines? That is a completely different and complex issue. The implementation and "success rates" of LPP and LMT is not always so straightforward. Smakman (2017) discusses language ideologies and how they may or may not be affected by language policies. He introduces both the successful and unsuccessful impacts of LPP.

In 2018, the Department of the Official Language (or State Language Department) was created. As defined in an "Organic Law of Georgia: on Official Language", the Department of the Official Language is a legal entity under public law, ensuring the protection, popularisation and normalisation of the official language. Walking into Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia, one cannot help but notice that foreign brand names are written using the Georgian alphabet (along with the original). On the account of the aforementioned department, the Law on Official Language obliges companies operating in Georgia to submit inscriptions in shops, cafes, hotels and other establishments in the state language (Organic Law of Georgia on Official Language, 2017). The State Language Department has started developing transliteration-transcription rules for different languages into Georgian. The Georgian language transliteration system of the English language was developed together with the commission of experts of the State Language Department. It should be noted that government should approve the regulations provided by the State Language Department. Therefore, establishments are obliged to follow the transcription regulations proposed by the said department. However, when it comes to speakers, these regulations are merely seen as guidelines or recommendations; despite the language department's efforts speakers still show a high degree of variation when it comes to borrowings, especially the new ones.

Anglicisms

This work concentrates on lexical borrowings or "Loanwords" from English. Lexical borrowing (loanword) is the most likely and constituent manifestation of language contact. However, it should be noted that some loanwords are so deeply integrated into the borrowing language that people are no longer aware of their origins (Goshkheletiani and Kikvadze, 2018). Relevant to this paper is to discuss "barbarisms". They are often defined as loanwords that have equivalents in the recipient language (Goshkheletiani and Kikvadze, 2018). They are (actively) used by the speakers in conversations and writings (this is especially true for social media, blogs, vlogs, etc.).

In the 20th century, the study of language contact was established as a research field and since then, a lot has been done to give proper definitions of borrowings. However, since this work is not intended for providing views on terminological issues on borrowings, this sub-chapter will only provide simple definitions of the relevant terms. According to Haugen (1950), borrowing is "the attempted reproduction in one language of patterns previously found in another" (p. 212). Thomason and Kaufman (1988) provide the following explanation: "incorporation of foreign features" (p.37). According to them, the borrowing language is maintained, but altered and changed by these foreign features. Large numbers of works discuss different types of borrowings: lexical, semantic, syntactic, morphological, etc. The linguistic outcomes of language contact depend upon the intensity of contact between borrowing and source languages, or types of social, political, and cultural powers of source languages (Schreier, 2012).

Taking into consideration the power of the English language, the specific term was coined to denote a specific type of borrowing: Anglicism. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (Summers, 1987) defines Anglicism as "an English word or expression that is used in another language". The term refers to words borrowed not only from British English but also from other varieties as well.

In order to avoid terminological inconsistencies, the words employed and tested in this paper are referred to as "Anglicisms" or English Loanwords. These can be either loanwords or barbarisms. 'Anglicism' and 'loanword', in the present work, are understood in their broad sense.

Loanword Phonology

Usually, borrowed words sound quite different in borrowing language than in the source language (LaCharité & Paradis, 2005). However, there are cases when the pronunciation of borrowing is closer to the source language pattern. Borrowing language also borrows certain sound patterns that were not found in its sound system before (Thomason 2001; Sankoff 2002). This is in line with the "Category Preservation principle". According to Paradis & LaCharite (1997) "If a given L2 phonological category (i.e., feature combination) exists in LI, this L2 category will be preserved in LI in spite of phonetic differences" (p. 226). They also mention the "Category Proximity Principle". That is when a certain phonological category does not exist in borrowing language, so the source-category is replaced by the closest phonological category. Interestingly, this process can take place even if borrowing language has acoustically closer sounds. Therefore, borrowing can be discussed in terms of (un)nativisation or integration, or as Jaggers (2018) puts it, borrowings can be "more-source-like" or "less-source-like".

Adaptation of loanwords can be studied from various angles. Numerous works have been done in this area and almost all mention one common thing: loanwords are characterised by considerable variation and instability in pronunciation. Not surprisingly, various authors tried to identify and classify the adaptation of loanwords and systematically present them. Muhvić-Dimanovski (1997), while discussing the adaptation of Anglicisms into German, claimed that "Anglicisms reveal a considerable amount of variation on different levels of analysis" (p. 269). Retman (1978) also stated that loanwords might show greater variability in pronunciation. Duběda et al. (as cited in Duběda 2020) identified eight principles of adaptations: Phonological approximation, spelling pronunciation, original pronunciation, an analogy with the source language, analogy with the target language pronunciation influenced by a third language, pronunciation influenced by universals and unclearly motivated pronunciation. Filipović (1986) provided the classification of adaptations on the phonological level. According to him, "transphonemisation" is the substitution on a phonological level and this process forms the phonological shape of loanwords. The author distinguished between three types of transphonemisation: complete transphonemisation, partial (or compromise) transphonemisation and free transphonemisation. In line with this, various Georgian authors stated that changes that Anglicisms have undergone in Georgian have been determined by transphonemisation (Lomidze, 2008; Kirvalidze, 2017; Davitashvili, 2018; Abashmadze, 2019):

1. Zero transphonemisation - the pronunciation of Anglicism is very close to the pronunciation of the English etymon since similar sounds are found in both languages: *Deadline - dedlaini; Leader - lideri.*
2. Partial (or compromise) transfemonisation - the pronunciation of Anglicism only partially coincides with the pronunciation of its etymon because some elements are phonologically different in them. For example: *Television - televisia; Company - kompania; Sport - sporti.*

3. Free transphonemization – some English phonetical elements have no equivalents in the Georgian phonetical system and these elements are freely substituted in Anglicisms: W*eekend - uikendi; Flirt - flirti; Forward - foruardi.*

The above suggestions make it clear that this topic is actively discussed and analysed by the authors. There are some linguists who believe that older loanwords are fully adapted to borrowing language, while newer ones are more source-like (Poplack et al., 1988; Lomidze, 2008). The age of loanwords is indeed a credible explanation, but by no means is it the only one.

Loanwords as Social Phenomena

Numerous works have been done to explore the linguistic mechanisms behind loanword adaptation. However, classifying and analysing loanwords and Anglicisms in terms of linguistic factors is by no means the sole approach of loanword adaptation among scholars. Across the academic spectrum, there are authors who believe that loanword variation can be studied from extralinguistic perspectives as well. For instance, Boberg (1999) discussed the sociolinguistic roots of variation in loanwords. On the example of American English, he suggested that some variants are not phonologically dictated but are rather subject to sociolinguistic influences. Therefore, it can be argued that when languages display variations in the pronunciation of loanwords, social context and factors may be behind the emergence and use of these variants, not the phonological systems of the languages. When discussing the motivations for borrowing, Hock and Joseph (2019) distinguish between two factors: NEED and PRESTIGE. NEED could be understood in terms of the lexical act, while PRESTIGE can be seen as a social phenomenon. Therefore, it is relevant to discuss the interrelationship between linguistic dimension and social variables with regards to loanwords. PRESTIGE is further analysed by Hock and Joseph (2019) on the example of the English language history. Authors also discuss the process of nativisation or foreignisation of borrowed words, including the most radical cases of these two: ‘exotic’ nativisation on the example of Russian, and Hyper-foreignisation.

To sum it up, People use loanwords to fill up a lexical gap or replace longer words and expressions with shorter ones. However, borrowing goes beyond linguistic needs. The use of borrowings is not just a lexical act – it is a social phenomenon as well. The following sub-chapters discuss some of the most relevant works around this topic.

Actual Pronunciation, Perceptual Evaluation and Proclaimed Pronunciation

How speakers evaluate and think of the language variation falls into the field of folk linguistics. Though some authors argue that lay opinions may be loosely organised (Bloomfield, 1944) and not always reliable or correct (Bauer & Trudgill, 1998), speakers’ perception and associations still provide an interesting insight and may reveal clear patterns on language variation. The inconsistency between actual usage of variants, perception and speakers’ proclaimed variants is a fascinating area of sociolinguistic research. Interestingly, previous studies suggest that speakers’ actual usage of language and their perceptual or proclaimed usage may contradict each other. According to Labov (1973), irrespective of their actual language use, people might lean towards standard usages when explicitly expressing their opinion. It can be assumed that when speakers are confronted to indicate their opinions on language, they are more likely to express more socially acceptable views (Milroy & Milroy, 2012). This claim is supported by a number of

experiments conducted by Labov (2006) and Milroy (1981). Perceptual evaluation and its interconnection to social factors was reported by Hay et al. They observed that the reaction to audio stimuli was affected when they were accompanied by the pictures of speakers clearly belonging to upper or lower social class. With all this in mind, it becomes clear that perceptual evaluation and proclaimed pronunciation of speakers might carry certain social values. That is why, the present study aims at combining these three articulatory expressions (actual pronunciation of speakers, perceptual evaluation of loanword variants and participants' proclaimed pronunciation) to show a broader picture.

'Power' of English and Indexicality of Pronunciation Variants

Bourdieu (1991) discusses language in terms of symbolic power, highlighting economic and cultural capital amongst groups of people. Because of that, people want to maintain their symbolic power by speaking in a certain way. When speaking about lexical borrowings, one cannot help but notice the impact of English on languages around the world. According to Görlach (2001) English has become "by far the world's biggest lexical exporter" (p. 353). Fishman (1996), elaborating on why most languages are linguistically dominated by English, stated: the world of large scale commerce, industry, technology, and banking, like the world of certain human sciences and professions, is an international world and it is linguistically dominated by English almost everywhere" (p. 1996). The role of the internet in the spread of English is explored by Crystal (2004). His famous quote "If the Internet is a revolution, therefore, it is likely to be a linguistic revolution (p. viii) yet again established the impactful role of English. Such a role of English is sometimes even referred to as "linguistic imperialism" (Phillipson, 2008). It can be concluded that the strong interest in Anglicisms can be explained by the powerful position of English language on the languages around the world. English, in general, holds a great symbolic power and carries a prestige.

The symbolic power of source-like pronunciation is examined by numerous researchers. Lev-Ari and Peperkamp (2014) examine the role of social factors in loanword variation. They determined how social factors affect variation on individual level and how it leads to the emergence of standard norms for adapting foreign sounds. They identified donor language's prestige as vital factor in retaining foreign sounds. This claim is further supported by Boberg (1997, 1999) and Jaggers (2018), who highlighted that source-like pronunciation is usually associated prestige. In line with this, the findings of Boberg (1999) and Jaggers (2018) suggest that source-like pronunciation is associated with 'being educated' and 'intelligence'. Naturally, all these associations indicate a social and symbolic power to the variants in question. Sociolinguistic variation can be discussed in terms of indexicality of these variants. This topic is thoroughly discussed by Silverstain (2003) and Eckert (2008), who suggest that indexicality of variation is a complex and fluid phenomenon. They argue that particular variant might also have diverse interrelated indexicalities and the interplay of social factors is a meaningful 'indexication' force.

Linguistic (in) Security and Overt Prestige

The use of more source-like pronunciation, as discussed above, carries a social prestige. This topic is examined by numerous authors. As observed by Preston (1999), source-like pronunciation is usually considered to be more 'correct' and generally carry overt prestige and linguistic security. This claim is further supported by Jaggers (2018) and Boberg (1997, 1999). Of

course, certain loanword variants may arise depending on the intensity of contact between two languages, but generally, as proposed by Labov (1973) the emergence of variants might depend on how much speakers identify/want to identify with certain groups. In the same vein, Calude et al. (2020) discussed the association between using loanwords in speech and the expression of identity. Another important aspect is the effect of purist language ideology, as described by Poplack et al. (1988) on the example of Anglicisms in French. Many languages try to resist the power of English by employing various strategies. Loanword variation is interesting from the perspective of language regulation and codification (Havlík & Wilson, 2017). Speakers also might reveal purist language views, favouring native variants of pronunciation and holding more negative attitudes towards source-like pronunciation. This tendency was observed by Jaggers (2018), who observed that some speakers perceive source-like pronunciation as 'pretentious'. All these claims indicate that loanwords variation can be discussed in the frame of language ideology and variants of loanwords might carry overt or covert prestige and can be associated with linguistic security, while some groups might experience linguistic insecurity.

Effects of Individual Sociolinguistic Variables

To date, numerous researchers have proposed that individual choices of pronunciation variants may correspond to different sociolinguistic variables, such as sex, region, age, and education. Following Halliday's (2012) terminology, two main factors affecting the loanword variation can be distinguished: language use and language user. By language user, we mean a speaker, whose speech is affected by different social factors, such as age, education, social status, etc. Therefore, it is argued that the selection of variants among loanwords has sociolinguistic roots as well, and the way loanword is pronounced might reveal information about the status of the speaker (Hashimoto, 2019; Dubeda, 2020). Some authors concentrate on specific social factors that might affect the loanword variation: it is suggested that the speaker's attitude towards the source might affect the choice of more-source-like or less-source-like pronunciations. Loanword variation might also depend on the channel of transmission, as observed by Smith (2006). In a study conducted by Havlík and Wilson (2017), it was shown that age is an important sociolinguistic variable, showing patterns of variation across the generations. They suggest that older speakers tend to use more traditional forms and are slower in adapting to modern changes in loanword pronunciation.

Havlik and Wilson (2017) also suggest the prominent role of the sex on loanword variation, observing that women use more prestigious forms as compared to men. It is suggested that women are generally more sensitive to prestige forms (Labov, 1963; Trudgill, 1972; Smakman, 2017), which can be explained by the fact that women hold a socially and economically lower position in society (Milroy, 1981; Eckert, 1989; Paulston and Tucker, 2003; Lakoff, 2004; Milroy and Milroy, 2017). In the same vein, Lev-Ari and Peperkamp (2014) also examined the role of social factors in loanword variation. They determined how social factors affect variation on an individual level and how it leads to the emergence of standard norms for adapting foreign sounds. They identified donor language's prestige as a vital factor in retaining foreign sounds. These works are complemented by the findings of Poplack et al. (1988), who observed that English language proficiency affects the choice of pronunciation variant in French speakers. Kang (2010, 2011) also suggested that familiarity with the source language can be a powerful factor affecting the variation and linguistic choice of the speakers. Echoing these studies, Silva et al. (2011) also proposed that source-like pronunciation variants are associated with multilingualism. Georgian scholars have

written about the subject of loanword adaptation, but, unfortunately, there are hardly any works discussing the interrelationship of social factors and loanword variation.

Several important themes emerge from the studies discussed so far. First of all, the suggestions provided by numerous authors make it clear that variation in loanwords goes beyond phonological mechanisms and can be affected by various social factors. The studies concentrating on the loanword variation are diverse in nature: some are theoretical, while some experimentally analyse the social effects on loanword variation. Another important theme that emerged from the studies is that numerous languages around the world are affected by English, which to date holds a powerful position in the linguistic marketplace.

Brief History of Anglicisms in Georgian

The Georgian language is the official language of Georgia. It is one of the oldest continuously spoken languages and has a rich literary tradition. Georgian, together with the related Megrelian, Laz, and Svan languages, make up the Kartvelian, or South Caucasian, language family. This language family does not have relatives with other known language families (Tsagareli, 1872; Javakhishvili, 1937; Chikobava, 1979, Kakachia, et al., 2013).

Georgia is located on the crossroads of Asia and Europe, so it has been influenced by various languages throughout its existence by different languages families: Turkish, Arabic, Greek, Russian, English, etc. (Lomidze, 2008; Goshkheletiani & Kikvadze, 2018).

In the 19th century, after the expansion of the Russian Empire, Georgian was mainly influenced by the Russian. The same tendency was observed during the Soviet Union as well. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the political situation in the country has changed drastically. In the ’90s, the Soviet Union countries were facing a “shock therapy” approach to the introduction of market economies (Zizek, 2009). A fair part of this shock was caused by the language barrier. As Gerry Abbot pointed out, “things have changed linguistically and demographically since imperial days. What was the British Empire is now the English Empire” (1991, p. 55). Being the lingua franca in almost every aspect of life, such as business, politics, technology, science, mass media, education, entertainment, etc., much effort has been done to replace Russian with English in Georgia. The expansion of international contacts, the superiority of English-speaking countries in almost all spheres of activity, contribute to the continuous appearance of English borrowings in the Georgian language and the growing interest in analysing the influence of English on Georgian. However, it should be noted that even in this regard, the impact of the Russian language is still relevant. One interesting point made by Lomidze (2008) is that numerous Anglicisms entered Georgian vocabulary through the mediatory language (Russian) and was mainly based on written sources. Anglicisms were entering the Russian lexicon based on the written forms; because of the Russian influence, many Anglicisms were borrowed into Georgian via the Russian language. Due to this fact, a fair number of Anglicisms in Georgian are more ‘mediatory-language-like’, rather than source-like: *television – televisia; revolution – revolutsia; jury – jiuri; Budget – biujeti; Partner – partniori*, etc. Nowadays the situation has changed, but this influence can be observed in various words, where the ‘English markers’, or ‘Englishness’ are completely lost (Lomidze, 2008). Apart from the influence of the mediatory language on English borrowings, various authors also discussed the different reasons why Anglicisms enter the Georgian vocabulary (Lomidze, 2008; Kirvalidze, 2017; Goshkheletiani & Kikvadze, 2018; Davitashvili, 2018). These include:

1. No equivalent concepts in Georgian: laptop, computer, internet, blog, site, etc. As professor Tinatin Margalitadze remarks, in this case the language has two choices: it creates words for the new concepts from their own language resources, or the word is borrowed as a foreign word (Margalitadze 2016).
2. Using Anglicisms instead of their descriptive equivalent, because they are more economical: *workshop* instead of *samushao shekhvedra* (*სამუშაო შეხვედრა)*. This is also due to the increase of international business relations and the emergence of modern professions, such as marketing, copywriting, PR, etc.
3. One meaning of English polysemous words (resulting from metaphorical extension) are usually borrowed directly from English: mouse denotes both an animal and a computer device in English. In Georgian, we have *tagvi* to denote an animal, but use the word *mausi* (*mouse*) to denote the computer device.
4. Using Anglicism to show off or look "cool", mainly barbarisms. This trend has eventually affected the speech of teenagers and adolescents and is gradually becoming natural to use these words, without the intention of feeling "cool" or "trendy".

Naturally, such a heavy inflow of Anglicisms has caught the eye of language purists in Georgia. The movement, "No to Barbarisms" began in Georgia intending to reduce the use of barbarisms in the language. Following Gamkrelidze's (1989) claim that small nations are concerned about the issues in cultural ecology, and they are doing everything in their power to preserve their language, culture and aesthetic and ethical values, Margalitadze (2020), suggests that the Georgian language is facing a new threat – English. According to her, "the whole process needs further and elaborate analysis and understanding" (p. 1). However, no matter such views, it is impossible to ignore the heavy influx of English words in Georgian. It is even clearer that they reveal a high degree of instability in pronunciation. As mentioned above, the State Language Department has developed the Georgian language transliteration system of the English language. However, the guidelines proposed by the department are not always executed in speech and they still show a great degree of variation.

Comparing Sound Systems of English and Georgian

Before concentrating on specific phonetic segments, it is important to outline the sound systems of English and Georgian. Georgian and English belong to different languages families, Kartvelian and Indo-European, respectively. The phonemic structures of Georgian and English are significantly different, both in terms of vowels and consonants. Georgian is the so-called phonetic alphabet, meaning that each phoneme has a corresponding grapheme (Apridonidze 2011; Tkemaladze 2020). Georgian has 33 sounds (and 33 letters) – 28 consonants, and 5 vowels. The situation in English is drastically different: 26 letters of the English alphabet are realised by 44 consonants – 24 consonants and 20 vowels.

Before concentrating on specific phonemes, it is important to mention that Georgian words always end on vowels. If that is not the case, words (loanwords) usually take suffix -i [i], which is the marker of the nominative case:

Certificate – სერთიფიკატი [sɛrtiphikati]

Vowels

Georgian has a simple vocalic system. Unlike English, all Georgian vowels are short, therefore vowel length is not significant for Georgian. Another important distinction is that there are no diphthongs in the Georgian vowel system (Uturgaidze, 1976).

Surprisingly enough, while doing preliminary research, it became obvious that despite the drastic differences between the systems, the variation in the pronunciation of vowels is not proportionally drastic. The use of vowels in borrowed Anglicisms is rather systematic. Usually, vowels take on a form that is phonologically close to the source sound. English long and tense vowels are substituted by more-or-less corresponding short vowels. As for diphthongs, they can be adapted in two ways:

1. Diphthongs might be simplified/monophthongised:
   - *Goal [gəʊl] – goli [gɔli]*
   - *Bacon [ˈbeɪ.kən] – bekoni [bɛkɔni]*
2. Two separate vowels represent single diphthong:
   - *Biker [ˈb**aɪ**.kər] – baikeri [b**ai**keri]*

/ei/

The preliminary study has revealed that variation was evident between ɛ and a in *mail*. Georgian /ɛ/ is a mid-vowel, front, non-labial vowel, unrounded. Georgian /a/ is an open, central, non-labial vowel, unrounded. This variation can be explained by the fact that some speakers pronounce the words based on the orthography of the English etymon, while others pronounce acoustically closer sounds.

Consonants

Georgian has a rather complex consonant system. According to existing linguistic tradition, two types of consonants are distinguished: obstruents and sonorants. Table 1 shows Georgian consonants based on the place of articulation and the manner of articulation.

Table 1.1
Georgian Consonants based on Chikobava (2008):

Manner of Articulation \ Place of Articulation					Bilabial	Labiodental	Dental	Prealveolar	Postalveolar	Velar	Postvelar	Laryngeal
Obstruent	Plosives	Explonent	Voiced		b		d			g		
			Voiceless	Aspirated	p^h		t^h			k^h		
				Ejectives	p’		t’			k’	q’	
		Affricates	Voiced					dz	dʒ			
			Voiceless	Aspirated				ts^h	$tʃ^h$			
				Ejectives				ts’	tʃ’			
	Fricatives		Voiced			v		z	ʒ		ʁ	
			Voiceless					s	ʃ		χ	h
Sonorant	Vibrant							r				
	Lateral						l					
	Nasal				m		n					

Some Georgian consonants are not found in English: ʒ ʁ q’ ts^h dz ts’ $tʃ^h$ χ. However, these sounds are not relevant to the present study. English consonant sounds not found in Georgian are as follows: /f/ /θ/ /ð/ /ŋ/ /j/ /w/. /ŋ/does not show variation in Georgian and is substituted by /n/ as in “never”. /j/ is also more or less stable. Even though Georgian does not have the equivalent letter, it is not difficult for speakers to pronounce /j/, because its corresponding phoneme existed in the past - ჲ. In addition to this, we should also mention the influence of Russian: ё [jo], ю [ju], я [ja] (close to English palatal approximant /j/), were familiar sounds for Georgian speakers. Nowadays, this letter is removed from the Georgian alphabet and is graphemically substituted by /i/ - *yoghurt – iogurti (იოგურტი).* It can be said that even though it is not graphically present in Georgian, ჲ (or /j/) still exists as an allophone. When learning English, the most sensitive segments for Georgians are inter-dental fricatives: dental voiceless fricative /θ/ and dental voiced fricative /ð/. /θ/ is usually adapted as /t/ th/ or /s/, while /ð/ shows variation between /t/, /d/ and /z/. However, the variation occurs during adaptation. The pronunciation of the adapted words, as suggested by the guidelines, are more or less stable.

/w/

Approximant /w/ might show a great deal of variation among speakers. Graphemically, semivowel /w/ might be replaced by two successive vowels ([ui], [uɔ], [uɛ], [ui] or [ua] -depending

on source word). In pronunciation, these successive vowels coincide with the pronunciation of the approximant /w/. Therefore, it can be concluded that, acoustically, they are more English-like (source-like). Traditionally, however, the semi-vowel /w/ is rendered as labio-dental voiced fricative /v/: *Washington – vashingtoni*. The official transliteration and transphonemisation guideline compiled by the State Language Department follows this tradition. Despite this, in speech, there is a variation between /v/ and /w/ (or two successive vowels that are acoustically close to /w/) in loanwords containing approximant /w/.

/f/

Though not presented in the alphabet, Georgian people have long been familiar with the phoneme /f/. First of all, /f/ is a positional allophone of /v/ before the voiceless consonant. In addition to this, the 20th c. Cyrillic /f/ (ф) was used in borrowings: *ფილოსოფია* (philosophy – via Russian). The examples of such writing are found in Journal Iveria, published from 1877 to 1905. However, this tendency was later rejected. Nowadays, borrowings with /f/ is graphemically realised by ფ - /p^h/, but it might show pronunciation variation. In some cases, /p^h/ is more stable (*ფირმა /p^{h}irma/ - firm*), but there are various words, where there is the variation between /p^h/ and /f/ among speakers of Georgian. The sound /p^h/ is more thoroughly discussed in the following chapter.

/p/, /t/, /k/

The highest degree of variation is observed in Anglicisms with voiceless plosives /p/, /t/ and /k/. To understand this variation, it is important to thoroughly inspect the difference between phonetic inventories of these two languages. The voiceless plosives show the greatest deal of variation both in adaptation and pronunciation variation of loanwords.

Table 1.2

English consonants

	Bilabial		Labio-dental		(Inter-) dental		Alveolar		Palato-alveolar		Velar		Glottal	
Plosives (Stop)	**p**	**b**					**t**	**d**			**k**	**g**		
Fricative			f	v	θ	ð	s	z	ʃ	ʒ			h	
Affricate									ʧ	ʤ				
Nasal		m						n				ŋ		
Lateral								l						
Approximant		w						r		j				

Shaded = _voiced Unshaded = voiceless

As seen from Table 1.2, English plosives (stops) come in voiced/voiceless pairs.

The English language has six plosive consonants:

Bilabial: b – p

Alveolar: d – t

Velar: g – k

In Georgian, plosives come in triad of correlatives phonemes: voiced, voiceless aspirated, and voiceless abruptive (ejective) (Nebieridze, 1991). Ejective sounds are "produced using simultaneous constrictions in the oral cavity and at the glottis" (Vicekin, 2010, p. 59). Glottis remains closed and the air leaves the compressed space between vocal cords and larynx (Putkaradze & Mikautadze, 2014):

Bilabial: b - p^h - p'

Alveolar: d - t^h - t'

Velar: g - k^h- k'

The experiment conducted by Doty & Guion (2009) provided evidence that though English speakers do indeed perceive ejectives as being similar to voiceless plosives, they still claim that they are poor representations of these sounds. The participants of this experiment were native speakers of English with no linguistic background. Acoustically, voiceless aspirated sounds /p^h, t^h, k^h/ are closer to English /p, t, k/ sounds than voiceless ejectives. Despite this, English voiceless plosives /p, t, k/ are usually replaced by ejective plosives in Georgian. According to Apridonidze (2007) there are numerous reasons behind this decision. First of all, she discusses the example of *Theater*, where both /θ/ and /t/ are present. θ is replaced by Georgian t^h, and /t/ is replaced by Georgian ejective /t'/. A similar situation is found in *Philips* – ph (/f/) is replaced by p^h, while /p/ is replaced by /p'/. In addition to this, she discusses that even though we have acoustically closer sounds present in Georgia, "we cannot rely solely on our hearing" (Apridonidze, 2007, p. 139) and we should "take into consideration the long literary tradition of adapting foreign sounds" (p. 139). Georgian guidelines for transliterating English sounds follow Apridonidze's view and English /p, t, k/ sounds are rendered as Georgian ejectives /p', t', k'/. However, just like in the case of /f/, there are some words, where pronunciation is stable, but the highest degree of variation is observed in the adaptation and use of Anglicisms with voiceless plosives (Lomidze, 2008).

Methods

The study is based on an experiment conducted online. The research is qualitative in nature and aims at analysing the interrelationship between social factors and articulatory expressions (actual pronunciation, perceptual evaluation and proclaimed pronunciation) of the participants, as well as speakers' associations towards English-like and Georgian-like pronunciation.

At first, the participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire about their personalities. The social variables employed in this paper are as follows: age and gender, knowledge of English, their values (attitudes towards the West) and their technological advancement.

In the experiment, the participants were asked to pronounce linguistic items (Anglicisms) in Georgian. The specific techniques were employed to avoid "Observer's Paradox" (Labov, 1972) and biased answers as much as possible. The idea was to create "task-sentences" where the participants would unconsciously employ the items relevant to this study. In the next stage of the experiment, the participants were asked to make a choice between variants of Anglicisms upon hearing them. Additional interview questions were provided to study their associations towards English-like and Georgian-like pronunciations and their opinions on the activities of the State Language Department.

At the initial stage of the research, preliminary research was conducted about the language policies towards Anglicisms in Georgia, including guidelines about transliteration and pronunciation of English phonemes/sounds. Apart from this, the relevant scientific sources were analysed to understand the foregrounding of those policies. After that, an online research method was employed to locate the frequently used Anglicisms. The next stage was to find the patterns of the pronunciation of Anglicisms in Georgian and locate actual language items for the study. The chosen items are loanwords from English with a certain degree of pronunciation variation. The website barbarisms.ge and Dictionary of Barbarisms (2017) were used to obtain a bulk of Anglicisms for this study. However, some additional sources were also used, as the Dictionary of Barbarisms is concentrated only on barbarisms, does not include other types of loanwords. These additional sources include various relevant scientific papers around the topic of Anglicisms in Georgia that are discussed in the Introduction section. Platforms, such as YouTube and Google Search were used to find the items with a degree of pronunciation variation. To do this, the Georgian alphabet was used to search words with either Georgian-like orthography or more source-like orthography. In addition to this, having lived in Georgia for 23 years, the choice of these items was done intuitively as well.

Generally, the elicitation of loanwords in spontaneous speech is relatively difficult. Georgian is a so-called 'phonemic language', where spelling usually coincides with pronunciation and each character represents one phoneme. Therefore, it was impossible to give the participants a list of random words/sentences containing keywords and ask them to read it out. Anglicisms written in the Georgian alphabet would dictate speakers how to pronounce words. Simply said, if *snack* would be written like ს ნ ე კ ი /snek'i/, Georgian people would not even consider saying another variant (ს ნ ე ქ ი /snek^{h}i/). A specific 'test' was designed, containing picture description and gap-fill tasks. Picture description tasks contained various interconnected pictures, including the key items. Slides were created around one topic, including both Georgian words and

Anglicisms. There were both lexical and visual prompts on slides. However, lexical prompts were introducing the topic (see Appendix D for the sample slide).

It should also be mentioned that the test was improved after conducting the trial experiment on 5 people. The specifics of the trial are discussed below.

Linguistic Items

At the initial stage of the experiment, there was a total of 30 key linguistic items introduced in the test. They were thematically distributed among non-key items: social networks, band names, brand names, words connected to technology/internet, words related to leisure activities, etc. However, some of them were excluded from the research, taking into consideration the Russian influence on these loanwords. For instance, *costume* showed an influence of mediatory language (Russian). English [ˈkɒs.tjuːm] is either rendered as Georgian /kɔstʼ umi/ or partially Russian-like version /kɔsʲtʲˈʉmi/ (as opposed to kʊsʲtʲˈʉm). After excluding such words, there was a total of 24 linguistic items taken into consideration for the analysis. Among those items, some words are relatively old loanwords, such as brand and rock-band names, words connected to computer/internet. However, some words were relatively newly entered loanwords: fake news, check-in, reception, lockdown, etc. The list of all items used in the study can be accessed in Appendices section (see Appendix B).

24 items included one or two. These segments were:

1. /p/
2. /t/
3. /k/
4. /w/
5. /f/
6. /ɛ/

Table below depicts the results obtained from the preliminary research on the pronunciation variants (allophones) for English phonemes in loanwords.

Table 2.2
English phonemes and pronunciation variants

	/f/		/p/		/t/		/k/		/w/		/ei/	
n	4		5		5		8		4		1	
	Eng -like	Geo -like	Eng -like	Geo -like	Eng -like	Geo -like	Eng -like	Geo -like	Eng -like	Geo -like	Eng -like	Geo -like
Geo	[f]	[p^h]	[p^h]	[p']	[t^h]	[t']	[k^h]	[k']	[w]	[v]	[ei]	[ai]

Initially, the idea was to label the pronunciation of loanwords as English-like, Georgian-like and in-between. However, there was practically no English-like pronunciation due to the fact that all loanwords take Georgian suffix -i [i]. Besides, Georgian has weak stress, in which stress syllables are not clearly distinguished: 'The Georgian stress is so faintly distinguished that one has to really search for it' (Chikobava, 2008, p. 98). The Georgian stress falls on the first syllable. Therefore, the pronunciation of loanwords is affected by these factors and it is quite rare to pronounce words with fully English pronunciation and such instances can be seen as the cases of code-switching, rather than as usage of English loanwords in Georgian. With all this in mind, a total of 4 labels was given: Geo-like, Eng-like, Mixed, and Very Eng-like.

1. Geo-like – voiceless plosives are replaced by voiceless ejectives (Shukia Apridonidze introduced this approach, and the State Language Department follows it). Fricative /f/ is replaced by voiceless aspirated /p^h/ (closest to English voiceless plosive /p/). Graphemically, semivowel /w/ might be replaced by two successive vowels ([ui], [uɔ], [uɛ], [ui] or [ua] -depending on source word) or it might be pronounced with labio-dental voiced fricative /v/. The latter was labelled as Geo-like. Some speakers might pronounce Anglicisms based on the orthography of the English etymon: *'mail'* can be pronounced as '*m-**a**-ili'* (მაილი).

2. Eng-like – it is in fact in-between variant.

3. Mixed – in some words, where two segments were present (usually fricative /f/ + voiceless plosive), some participants used mixed-pronunciation – one segment with more Geo-like, one segment with Eng-like. It can also be argued that some of these variants are affected by Russian, as Russian phonetic system has both fricative/f/ and more ejective-like /p/, /t/ and /k/.

4. Very Eng-like – in a few cases, the participants have also used pronunciations there were very similar to the original.

Social Variables

The social variables employed in this study were divided into the following sub-groups:

1. Age – participants were categorised between two age-groups: Young (17-44) and Old (45-56).

2. Gender – Female or Male. Naturally, the participants were given the opportunity to indicate 'other', but they were all binary.

3. Knowledge of English – participants were asked to indicate their knowledge of English (Advanced, Intermediate, Elementary, Beginner). These answers were categorised into 'Good' or 'Poor'.

4. Sympathy Towards West – participants who were more 'West-centrist' and globalist were given a value of (+), while participants with more nationalistic and anti-Western views were given a value of (-).

5. Technological Advancement – Participants who were technologically advanced were given the value of (+), while participants who were less advanced were given value of (-).

Participants

Convenience sampling was applied for this experiment. However, age balance was taken into consideration. Age is a very important factor in sociolinguistic research. The pronunciation variation between age groups is certainly relevant in the case of Georgia. According to Smakman (2017), most researchers choose chronological age to group participants, as it is difficult to apply further age categorisations. However, such an approach might disregard the various aspects shaping the concept of age. That is why age was not the only criterion in choosing the participants of this study. Echoing previous researchers in this field, the main aim was to find people with different social, educational backgrounds and varying views. The participants were found through the friend-of-a-friend technique. In addition to this, several large-sized Facebook groups were used to seek out the participants. Given that the experiment was conducted online, it was not feasible to approach random people in the streets and ask them to participate in the study.

A total of 55 people participated in the experiment. The table below presents the distribution of the participants in different social groups.

Table 2.1

Number of participants in different social sub-groups (N = 55)[1]

			n
Social Variables	Age of Speakers	Young	27
		Old	28
	Gender of Speakers	Female	31
		Male	24
	Command of English	Good	34
		Poor	21
	Sympathy towards the West	+	49
		-	6
	Technological Advancement	+	34
		-	21

[1] The two age groups distinguished were: young-adult (17-44) and adult-old (45-56).

Procedures

The material for this paper was an experiment conducted for this study, followed by additional interview questions and a questionnaire. The experiments were conducted online via different software programmes: Microsoft Teams, Zoom, Skype, and Facebook Messenger. It is noteworthy that their choice of a medium also contributed to making assumptions about their technological advancement. Some of these participants were not able to use Teams, Zoom or even Skype and would rather use Messenger. All these responses were noted and compared to the answers provided in the questionnaire.

Every participant was asked to fill out a questionnaire the aim of which was to determine their personality. By 'personality' we mean the interplay of various social aspects. The independent variables such as gender and age were taken into consideration. In addition to this, the participants were asked to specify their knowledge of foreign languages (according to their knowledge level, as well as the order of acquisition). Participants' 'technological advancement' were also determined by asking explicit as well as implicit questions. They were asked to evaluate their computer literacy along a 4-point scale. After that, they were asked to answer some basic questions (how to copy-paste, how to send an attachment via e-mail, etc.). Besides, informants were asked to indicate their values concerning European Union and Russia and their general ideological stance.

There were different types of questions used in the questionnaire. Open-ended questions were combined with Likert scales and dichotomous questions. These combined questions allowed more room for identifying their values and views and their technological advancement (see Appendix C). The Google Forms software was used to create the questionnaire and it was sent to the participants via E-mail/Facebook Messenger.

Experiments conducted with the first 5 participants were trials with the aim of testing the effectiveness of the prompts. The trials have revealed that the experiment lasted for too long (about 30 minutes) and 2 participants have not mentioned 2 key items. The length of the task was altered by giving participants only 10-15 seconds on each slide. During the trials, the time frame was not set. In addition to this, the verbal cues were added to each slide, and the instructions became more specific: listing the words, describing pictures in 2-3 sentences, filling the gaps, finding the single word for several pictures. The instructions were designed specifically for each slide. The experiment was divided into two main parts: in the first part, the participants were expected to employ Anglicisms. The first part was subdivided into 4 blocks; all of these blocks included pictures. The participants were not aware that they were taking a part in an experiment on loanword pronunciation. If asked, they were told that the study was about the interconnection of visual prompts and linguistic items.

The first block was listing objects; in addition to pictures, verbal prompts were also provided, such as '*could you please list the most frequently used social media*?'. Among many pictures, there were key items. Other pictures were extra words, not relevant to the study, but were introduced to ensure the representativeness (confuse the informants). The second block also included pictures and verbal prompts. The participants were asked to find ONE word to describe several pictures. There was a total of 8 slides, 4 of which were intended to elicit key-words. In the third block, pictures were presented and the participants were asked to describe the pictures; the

participants were instructed to state what situation was depicted in the pictures and where the situation was taking place. The fourth block was a gap-fill exercise but included pictures as well; there was a total of 8 gap-fill exercises; 4 of them were extra words, and 4 were the key-words. In the second part of the experiment, the informants had to make a choice between variants of pronunciation of each Anglicism they have uttered and explain why they have made that choice. The words were pronounced by me. I have listened to various videos with different pronunciations and practised pronouncing these items before conducting the experiment. The participants had to decide which pronunciation variant they liked better and say '*first'* or '*second´* based on the order presented to them.

After the experiment, the participants were asked some additional questions about their proclaimed pronunciation and associations towards English-like and Georgian-like pronunciation variants. In the proclaimed pronunciation aspect, participants' answers were categorised into English-like, Georgian-like or neutral. As for the 'associations' aspect, participants' answers were thematically categorised. Tokens were given to each statement (or category). Some keywords from the interviews were identified and tokens were distributed based on that.

The process lasted between 10 to 20 minutes. The experiment was recorded via in-built recording systems of Zoom, Skype or Microsoft Teams. However, Facebook Messenger does not offer such a service, therefore IOS Voice Memo was used to make the recordings. Throughout the experiment, I was also communicating with participants, forming a more relaxed and personal atmosphere. That way, I could also influence their answers by giving additional subtle prompts. It is worth mentioning that people finished the experiment faster than older people. This might be explained by the fact that younger people are generally more familiar with the newly entered Anglicisms in Georgian.

Analysis

Pronunciation per Phonological Context

Before proceeding to analyse the main set of data (the effects of social factors on loanword pronunciation), it seemed plausible to take analyse the linguistic items per phonological context. To achieve this, the linguistic items were categorised into groups based on the positions of linguistic variables (plosives) in words. It should also be noted that only Anlaut (word-initial) and Inlaut (medial position) positions are distinguished, as consonant sounds in Auslaut position are very rare in Georgian. The number of participants using these variants was counted and indicated to reveal the tendencies.

Articulatory Expressions (combined) and Types of Speakers

Each pronunciation variant of English loanwords was labelled as 'English-like', 'Georgian-like', 'Mixed' and 'very English-like' (see Appendix B). They were given values of '1', '2', '3' and '4', respectively.

The evaluation of loanword pronunciation was analysed in a similar way. However, participants were to choose between two variants: Georgian-like and English-like. Therefore, the variants were labelled as 'English-like' or 'Georgian-like' and given values of '1' and '2'. After that, each

participant was labelled as ‘Eng’ or Geo’ based on the number of English-like or Georgian-like pronunciations they have used. Participants using 70% or more English variants were labelled as ‘Eng’. Apart from making a choice between variants of pronunciation, the participants were also explicitly asked whether they used/liked ‘English-like’ pronunciation, ‘Georgian-like’ pronunciation or were neutral. The values of ‘1’, ‘2’ and ‘0’ were given to each answer respectively.

At the initial stage, all linguistic variables were analysed separately to find the general tendencies. After that, the coded variables and participants’ actual pronunciation, perceptual evaluation and proclaimed pronunciation were presented in a single Excel Worksheet. Using the ‘FILTER’ function (Ctrl+Shift+L), it was possible to narrow down the data. By doing so, it was possible to analyse each articulatory expression based on the social variables in the study. Dplyr package in R was used to categorise people into different groups taking into consideration all possible combinations for the social variables in the study to determine the types of speakers.

Associations

Additional interview questions were analysed based on the tokens given to each statement. This way, it was possible to analyse the associations and stereotypes connected English-like or Georgian-like pronunciations, as well as understanding proclaimed social values of the loanword pronunciation.

Results

The general purpose of the research was to analyse how specific social variables relate to pronunciation variation in loanword pronunciation. The participants' proclaimed pronunciation and associations towards English-like and Georgian-like pronunciations were also studied.

As explained in the previous chapter, the results were obtained with the help of the questionnaire, experiment, and interviews with the participants. The questionnaire aimed to categorise people according to the social variables employed in the study. The purpose of the experiment was to elicit Anglicisms from the participants and determine whether their variants were more English-like or Georgian-like. Besides, perceptual evaluation of English-like and Georgian-like pronunciation variants were also examined. The interview questions aimed to examine participants' proclaimed pronunciation and the associations connected to pronunciation variants (Georgian-like and English-like).

The results, in general, can be thematically divided into several categories:

a. General trends
b. Pronunciation per phonological context
c. Articulatory Expressions of English loanwords
   b.1. Actual Pronunciation
   b.2. Perceptual Evaluation
   b.3. Proclaimed Pronunciation
d. Associations towards pronunciation variants
e. Types of Speakers

General trends

Before moving on to the effects of social factors on the loanword variation, it seems plausible to discuss general trends. Table 3.1 presents the number of times the English-like, Georgian-like, Mixed, or Very-English-like pronunciations were used throughout the experiment by the participants, irrespective of the social variables employed in the study.

Table 3.1
Pronunciation of English loanwords by speakers of Georgian (N. 59)

	Pronunciation Variants			
N	1320			
	Eng-like	Geo-like	Mixed	Very-Eng-like
n	**788**	**488**	**39**	**5**

What stands out in the table is that the number of English-like variants is remarkably higher than the Georgian ones. It is apparent from this table that in general people tend to use more English-like pronunciations as compared to Georgian when it comes to loanwords. English-like pronunciation was used 788 times, which makes 59.6% of the total pronunciation variants used by the participants. In comparison, Georgian-like pronunciation has a value of 36.9%. The small number of Mixed and very English-like pronunciations can be explained by the fact out of 24

linguistic variables, only 4 of them had more than two pronunciation variants. Interestingly, all the items having fricative /f/ were subject to more variation (see Appendix B). In three of the cases, the variation occurred in the items with fricative /f/ + voiceless plosive. This Table also reveals that the transliteration and transphonemisation guidelines by the State Language Department are not always successfully actualised in speech, as Eng-like variants are generally favoured over the variants proposed by the guidelines of the State Language Department (Geo-like).

Pronunciation per Phonological Context

Before introducing the main set of data, let us discuss the phonological contexts of linguistic variables. However, it should be highlighted that only individual phonemes, namely plosives were examined and other segments in the same words were ignored. The total number of linguistic items with plosive sounds was 19 out of 24. Since plosives had only two pronunciations variants (/p^h, t^h, k^h/ and /p', t', k'/), Mixed and very-Eng-like pronunciations were not taken into consideration.

The next table presents linguistic variables in various phonetic positions and the percentage of participants using English-like and Georgian-like pronunciations in each position.

Table 3.2
Pronunciation of voiceless plosives based on phonological context (%)

Position	Anlaut (aCV)		Inlaut (CCV)		Inlaut (VCV)		Inlaut (VCC)	
Total Number	220		220		275		385	
Pronunciation	Geo	Eng	Geo	Eng	Geo	Eng	Geo	Eng
%	**43.7**	**56.3**	**84.1**	**15.9**	**26.5**	**73.5**	**43.4**	**56.6.**

Closer inspection of the table shows that Georgian-like pronunciation was preferred only in one specific position, namely in Inlaut (medial position), when the segments are preceded by consonants. In fact, there is the biggest gap between Georgian-like and English-like pronunciation exactly in this aspect, with Georgian-like pronunciation having the value of 84.1%. Another interesting aspect of this table is that the second biggest gap was found in Inlaut, if segments were in-between vowels. In this position, the percentage of English-like pronunciation used throughout the experiment is 70.6 %. In all other position, the percentage of English-like and Georgian-like pronunciation is evenly distributed, with the number slightly leaning towards favouring English-like pronunciation.

To sum up the results of the table 3.2, only in Inlaut, if preceded by a consonant sound, aspiration is presumably less noticeable (i.e., the Geo-like variant (ejective) is used by the participants); In all other positions of Inlaut, as well as in Anlaut, English-like pronunciation is tendentially more favoured, therefore it might be assumed that aspiration in these positions is more easily perceivable for the Georgian speakers and they opt for voiceless aspirated plosives /p^h/, /t^h/, /k^h/ (acoustically similar to English voiceless plosives).

The following paragraph presents the short overview of individual linguistic items that showed a considerable gap between pronunciation variation and examines them more closely. The full list of the items can be seen in the appendix section (Appendix B). For instance, *Queen* is an

interesting example, in which a plosive is followed by labial /w/ or /v/ sounds. Interestingly, the difference between Geo-like and Eng-like variants emerged in the segment of /w/, but none of the participants used ejective and opted for more English-like pronunciation of /k/. Most other loanwords with the combination of plosive + labial sound, usually also preserve the source-like pronunciation and are rendered as Georgian voiceless aspirated plosives (*quiz, cooler, Queens,* etc.). The exceptions are old loanwords (*computer, contact (n), coronation,* etc.) which entered the Georgian lexicon via mediator language, Russian and are not examined in the present research, as they are fully adapted to the Georgian lexicon. Another interesting example is the variation between /ɛ/ and /a/ in *mail* – the variation can be explained by the fact that some speakers might adapt the Anglicism based on the orthography of the English etymon. For instance, some people pronounce *mail* as *m-**ɛ**-ili (მეილი),* while others prefer *m-**a**-ili (მაილი).* It is worth mentioning, however, that the Geo-like variant was chosen only by 4 participants, while others opted for a more Eng-like version. Two items, containing segment /t/ and /k/ were of interest as well: *Twitter* and *Shopping*. In both of these cases, Georgian-like pronunciation was more popular among the participants. The possible explanation for this might be the fact that in both of these items the linguistic variables in question (/p/ and /t/) are reduplicated. In the case of *Twitter,* there might be an additional condition: if an item consisted of two plosives, the participants would always use either English-like or Georgian-like plosives in both cases (*casting, Twitter, speaker*).

These are the general linguistic results observed based on the experiment conducted within the scope of this paper. Though the analysis of the phonological context of sounds in a word has revealed some tendencies, the data is still too small to make any assumptions. Taking into consideration the phonological context of linguistic variables would complicate the process of analysis. The phonological context of the items was ignored in the analysis of the social effects of loanword variation only general trends were taken into consideration. Therefore, these results are preliminary in nature, merely presenting the tendencies that emerged during the analysis.

The following sub-chapters concentrate on the interrelationship between social variables and articulatory expressions (pronunciation, perceptual evaluation and proclaimed pronunciation of the English loanwords by speakers 55 Georgian speakers).

Articulatory Expressions of English Loanwords

(Actual) Pronunciation of English Loanwords

As mentioned before, the first part of the experiment aimed at eliciting Anglicisms from the participants. The elicited data is referred to as ‘pronunciation’. The results below concentrate on the pronunciation variation of loanwords based on the social variables employed in the study. In other words, after calculating the total number of times English-like, Georgian-like, Mixed and very English-like variants were pronounced (Table 3.1), the same was done, but this time social variables were also taken into consideration.

The table below shows the total number of participants in different groups and the percentage of English-like, Georgian-like, Mixed or very English-like pronunciation used by the participants. It should be noted that the number of participants in some variables is more equally distributed, while in some cases there is a big gap between the numbers of participants. Before moving on to the table, it should be once more highlighted that the total number of participants in

the experiment was 55 and the total number of linguistic items was 24. Therefore, the total number of variants elicited from the participants is 1320.

Table 3.3

Pronunciation of English loanwords (%) by Georgian speakers (N = 55) based on social variables

			Pronunciation Variants %			
			Eng-like	Geo-like	Mixed	Very Eng-like
Social Variables	Age of Speakers	Young (n = 27)	72.9	24.9	1.9	0.3
		Old (n = 28)	46.9	48.7	4	0.4
	Gender of Speakers	Female (n = 31)	66.9	31.2	1.7	0.2
		Male (n = 24)	50.5	44.5	4.5	0.5
	Command of English	Good (n = 34)	68.6	28.2	1.9	0.3
		Poor (n = 21)	45.5	49.7	4.5	0.3
	Sympathy towards the West	+ (n = 49)	62.3	34.6	2.7	0.4
		- (n = 6)	38.9	56.3	4.8	0
	Technological Advancement	+ (n = 34	70.4	27.4	1.7	0.5
		- (n = 21)	42.3	52.5	4.9	0.3

This table is quite revealing in several ways. First of all, it shows that younger participants are more inclined towards English-like pronunciation, while Georgian-like and Mixed pronunciation is more common for old participants. 72.9% of the participants in the young age group chose English-like pronunciation, as compared to 46.9% in the old age group. Not surprisingly, the young age category has the highest percentage of English-like variants. However, participants in the old age group chose more Very English-like pronunciation, but the difference is not drastic.

Just like age, gender also proves to be a relevant factor. Females tend to choose more English-like pronunciations compared to males. Georgian-like and Mixed pronunciations are

favoured by males. 66.9% of the female participants used English-like pronunciation as compared to males with a value of 50.5%. Closer inspection of this variable has revealed one interesting finding: in general, males do indeed have a lower value as compared to females. However, only in this variable, the percentage of English-like variants in males is higher than the percentage of Georgian-like variants.

Another relevant variable that revealed a considerable difference between pronunciation variants is the Command of English, as there is a general tendency for the people with intermediate/poor knowledge of English to use more Georgian-like pronunciation rather than English-like one. 45.5% of the participants with poor knowledge of English used Georgian-like pronunciation, while 68.6% of the participants with good English skills opted for English-like ones.

It is apparent from this table that the number of participants who showed sympathy towards the West is considerably higher than the number of participants who consider themselves more nationalistic and less globalist. Only 6 out of 55 participants were categorised as 'less-West'. Nonetheless, one cannot ignore the tendency of more 'West-oriented' participants to use more English-like pronunciation. As could be expected, very English-like pronunciation was not used by the participants with non-Western values and views.

Further inspection of the data also revealed that there also a considerable difference in the pronunciation of loanwords between people who are technologically more advanced as compared to the participants with poor knowledge of modern technology. Participants with good technological skills tend to use more English-like pronunciation, while Georgian variants are used by the participants who are in the second group (42.3%). In fact, closer inspection of the data reveals that 70.4% of the participants with good smartphone knowledge used English-like pronunciation, which is the second-highest value in the entire table. Very English-like pronunciation was also mainly used by the participants with good technological skills (0.5%) and Mixed pronunciation was preferred by the participants with poor technological skills (4.9%).

Having discussed the 'actual pronunciation' of loanword variants, now we turn our attention to the results elicited from the second part of the experiment – perceptual evaluation of loanword variants.

Perceptual Evaluation of Georgian-like and English-like Variants

After eliciting Anglicisms (English loanwords) from the participants, the participants were asked to make a choice between English-like and Georgian-like pronunciation upon hearing the variants. It should be mentioned that variants with three or more pronunciation variants were excluded from this aspect, as it would make the experiment more complicated (N =1100). In total, participants chose English-like pronunciation 761 times (69.2% of the total number of pronunciation variants), while Georgian-like pronunciation was favoured 413 times (30.8%). The table below shows the number of times Georgian-like and English-like pronunciations were chosen based on the social variables employed in the study.

Table 3.4
Perceptual evaluation of variants (%) by Georgian speakers (N = 55) based on social variables

			Perceptual Evaluation of Variants	
			%	
			Eng-like	Geo-like
Social Variables	Age of Speakers	Young (n = 27)	72.5	27.5
		Old (n = 28	65.8	34.2
	Gender of Speakers	Female (n = 31)	72.3	27.7
		Male (n = 24)	65.2	34.8
	Command of English	Good (n = 34)	70	30
		Poor (n = 21)	67.8	32.2
	Sympathy towards the West	+ (n = 49)	68.6	31.4
		- (n = 6)	73.3	26.7
	Technological Advancement	+ (n = 34)	80	20
		- (n = 21)	63	37

Comparing to the data presented in table 3.3, it becomes obvious that participants' actual pronunciation and perceptual evaluation of variants are inconsistent. The inconsistency is more obvious for the participants in the second rows in each variable (old, male, poor technological and English, 'less-West'), but even in the first rows, there is a slight difference between the values. Therefore, it is apparent that participants generally favour English-like pronunciation as compared to Georgian-like ones when it comes to choosing the variants of pronunciation. It is striking that this tendency is revealed in all participants, regardless of their age, gender, knowledge of English, technological advancement, or alignment with the Western views. In all social variables, the percentage of English-like pronunciation variants by the Georgian speakers is over 60%. One interesting finding that emerged is that English-like variants had a higher percentage in the 'less West-oriented' sub-group (73.3%) as compared to the 'more West-oriented' sub-group (68.6%). An even closer inspection of the table shows that there are slight differences between numbers in all variables.

To sum up the results of the above table, in all sub-groups, English-like pronunciation variants are more widely chosen, and the general trend is for the participants to choose more English-like pronunciation variants regardless of which sub-group they belong to.

Proclaimed Pronunciation

After the experiment, the participants were asked to explicitly state their proclaimed pronunciation. Participants' proclaimed pronunciation were given values of '0' (neutral), '1' (English-like), or '2' (Georgian-like). The table below depicts the number of people indicating that they prefer English-like, Georgian-like, or neutral pronunciations.

Table 3.5
Proclaimed pronunciation of Georgian speakers (N = 55)

			Proclaimed Pronunciation of Participants		
			Number		
			Eng (n = 39)	Geo (n = 11)	Neutral (n = 5)
Social Variables	Age of Speakers	Young (n = 27)	22	2	3
		Old (n = 28	17	9	2
	Gender of Speakers	Female (n = 31)	23	5	3
		Male (n = 24)	16	6	2
	Command of English	Good (n = 34)	25	4	5
		Poor (n = 21)	14	7	0
	Sympathy towards the West	+ (n = 49)	36	8	5
		- (n = 6)	3	3	0
	Technological Advancement	+ (n = 34)	25	4	5
		- (n = 21)	14	7	0

It is evident that the proclaimed pronunciation of the majority of the participants is English-like (39). Only 16 out of 55 people indicate neutral (5 participants) and Georgian-like (11 participants) pronunciation. Just like previous table 3.4, the data on this table also shows a clear tendency – English-like pronunciation is favoured among the participants. Though this tendency is true regardless of the social variables employed in this study, each social factor still provides at

least a slight difference between the proclaimed pronunciation of the participants. Surprisingly, the proclaimed pronunciation of the participants appeared to be only slightly affected by participants' attitudes towards the West. Half of the participants who were categorised into the 'less-West' sub-group went with English-like variants.

The above sub-chapters have revealed that each individual variable had an effect on the articulatory expressions (actual pronunciation, perceptual evaluation and proclaimed pronunciation) of the Georgian speakers. In the actual pronunciation aspect, there is a comparatively big gap between the number of English-like and Georgian-like pronunciation variants in different social sub-groups. In the perceptual evaluation and proclaimed pronunciation aspect, the gap is still existing, but there is usually a minor difference. In other words, participants' actual pronunciation was more greatly affected by social factors.

To see an even bigger picture, actual pronunciation, perceptual evaluation and proclaimed pronunciation of the participants are presented side-by-side in the table below. In order to make data more easily perceivable, all participants were labelled based on their pronunciation of English loanwords and their perceptual evaluation of English-like and Georgian-like variants. It should be noted that only the linguistic items with two pronunciation variants (N. 20) were taken into consideration in this analysis, as the number of Mixed and Very English-like pronunciations was relatively low. Participants who pronounced or chose (in perceptual evaluation aspect) more than 70% English-like pronunciation variants were labelled as 'Eng'. In the pronunciation aspect, 20 out of 59 participants were labelled as 'Eng', while in the perceptual evaluation aspect, the number of 'Eng' participants was higher – 34.

Table 3.6 presents the number of people who were labelled as 'Eng' in actual pronunciation and perceptual evaluation of aspect. In addition to this, it presents the number of participants whose proclaimed pronunciation was English-like. The numbers are distributed based on the social variables employed in the study.

Table 3.6
Articulatory Expressions of labelled participants (N = 55) based on social variables[2]

			Articulatory Expressions of Labelled Participants		
			Actual Pronunciation	Perceptual Evaluation	Proclaimed Pronunciation
			'Eng' (n = 20)	'Eng' (n = 33)	English-like (n = 39)
Social Variables	Age of Speakers	Young (n = 27)	17	19	22
		Old (n = 28	3	14	17
	Gender of Speakers	Female (n = 31)	14	22	23
		Male (n = 24)	6	11	16
	Command of English	Good (n = 34)	17	21	25
		Poor (n = 21)	1	12	14
	Sympathy towards the West	+ (n = 49)	19	29	36
		- (n = 6)	1	4	3
	Technological Advancement	+ (n = 34)	19	24	25
		- (n = 21)	1	9	14

The data presented in this table brings together all the aspects discussed above. This table can be read horizontally and vertically. Rading the table horizontally, it becomes obvious that in each variable, the first sub-group (young, female, good command of English, more West-oriented, technologically balanced) has more English-like pronunciation than the second sub-group. Vertical reading of this table reveals that in every sub-group, the number of people who opt for English-like pronunciation raises from left to right. In other words, the actual pronunciation has the lowest number of 'Eng' participants, followed by perceptual evaluation of English variants having a higher number. The highest value is observed in proclaimed pronunciation of the participants.

[2] Data for Actual Pronunciation and Perceptual Evaluation indicate the number of participants who were labelled as 'Eng'. The data for Proclaimed pronunciation indicates the number of participants whose proclaimed pronunciation is English-like.

Associations

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the participants were instructed to imagine a situation, whereby a person was calling them on the phone and was pronouncing a loanword in a 'wrong' way; this was followed by a question: how would you describe that person? What would your first impression be? The answers were coded and labelled:

Table 3.7 shows the number of participants who have mentioned these associations connected to English-like or Georgian-like loanword pronunciation. Many participants have mentioned more than one association.

Table 3.7
Associations towards English-like and Georgian-like pronunciations

Pronunciation	Labels	Number
English	Pride/Identity	13
	Modernity	13
	Prestige	9
	Showing off	9
	Educatedness	8
Georgian	Low Eng. Proficiency	21
	Old Age	21
	Linguistic Insecurity	6
	Native Language Loyalty	3

A variety of views were expressed during an interview. A common view amongst interviewees was that Georgian-like pronunciation is associated with low English proficiency. A number of participants have simply stated that hearing Georgian-like pronunciation was an indicator of the fact that the speaker had low competence in the English language. It was also suggested that participants expect older people to use more Georgian-like pronunciation. The highest number of participants mention low English proficiency and old age (21 participants). A number of participants also explicitly mention familiarity with technology and modern social networks and trends. 13 participants mentioned that English-like pronunciation was associated with actively using and following modern trends on social media. 'Modernity' and 'old age' were often mentioned together. The same number of participants also state that using Georgian-like pronunciation is 'uncool'. 13 participants evaluated Georgian-like pronunciation as 'uncool', 'lame', or 'provincial' as compared to English-like pronunciation. Such evaluations can be seen as a marker of pride and identity. English-like pronunciation was also mentioned in the context of proper education and a prestigious way of speaking. Another discourse that emerged during the interview was that some people use English-like pronunciation to "boast and want to seem cool" (showing off). Some of them reported that it is always possible to tell whether people use English-like pronunciation naturally or not. 6 participants also remarked that they were "a bit ashamed of

their Georgian-like pronunciation" and "concentrate hard to pronounce modern words more correctly" (by correctly they mean more English-like). Surprisingly, all of the participants who expressed linguistic insecurity were women. Another theme that emerged during an interview was 'Native Language Loyalty'. Some participants mentioned that they appreciate when speakers sound more 'Georgian'; it is noteworthy that such views were not particularly prominent in the interview data - only 3 participants mentioned that they prefer "Georgian-sounding sharp consonants".

Speaker Types

As seen in the above section, analysis of each individual variable has revealed a certain tendency and the variables proved to have an effect on the number of English-like or Georgian-like pronunciations used and chosen by the participants. However, it would also be interesting to turn our attention to the interplay of these variants and discuss different types of speakers.

Speaker Type 1

Now, if we turn to types of speakers, it can be presumed that young speakers, more likely females, who are advanced in technology, are exposed to the global trend and have good English skills, will generally use English-like pronunciation. Their perceptual evaluation of variants and proclaimed pronunciation are also likely to be inclined towards English. Such speakers will presumably perceive Georgian-like pronunciation as outdated. Let us discuss one of the participants as an example. We will call her Liza. Liza is a student, doing her bachelor's studies in one of the universities in Georgia. She speaks good English, and her computer literacy is also quite high. Just like many other young people, she is heavily dependent upon her smartphone. Liza's views are aligned with that of Western values. Unsurprisingly, Liza used and chose a high number of English-like variants in the experiment. In both pronunciation and evaluation aspects, she went for Georgian-like variants only once. Liza's proclaimed pronunciation of variants was also explicitly English. She also mentioned throughout the interview that she pays close attention to how others pronounce words and always corrects when her parents or grandparents 'mispronounce' some modern terms.

Speaker Type 2

We will call the next participant Oto, who can be seen as the complete opposite of Liza. Oto is male, around 55. Oto rarely uses a computer. He owns a smartphone, but he is not familiar with most of its features – he only uses it to make and receive calls. Oto does not speak English very well. We should keep in mind that he was born and raised when Georgia was part of the Soviet Union and people in his generation were mainly living in a Georgian-Russian environment, almost completely isolated from the English world. Oto sees himself as nationalistic, and to him, western values are sometimes far too radical. Not surprisingly, throughout the experiment, he used more Georgian like pronunciation and he usually chose Georgian-like variants as well. Oto's proclaimed pronunciation was also Georgian.

Speaker Type 3

The next participant proves that older age does not necessarily equal Georgian-like pronunciation. Though tendentially that was the case, the next participant, whom we will call Temo, showcases a different picture. Temo is male. He is around 50 and speaks English perfectly. He knows everything about modern technology, uses various features of his smartphone and has fairly globalist views. Just like Liza, Temo also used a fair amount of English-like pronunciation in the experiment and his evaluation and proclaimed pronunciation was also inclined towards English-like pronunciation. During an interview, Temo shared that he has some prejudiced views on people who pronounce loanwords incorrectly (by 'incorrectly' he means Georgian-like).

Speaker Type 4

One more participant type is worth discussing. Manoni, as we shall call her, is a woman. She is mobile, educated, speaks English well and is more or less familiar with modern technology. However, during an additional interview, it became obvious that Manoni's language ideology is quite purist. She tends to follow all the rules proposed by the State Language Department and is concerned by the influx of barbarisms into the Georgian language. Throughout the interview, she mentioned that a lot of people use English words in their speech to seem cool and show off. In addition to this, she repeatedly highlighted the uniqueness of the Georgian language. Interestingly, her actual pronunciation was leaning towards more English-like variants, but she showed a tendency to favour Georgian-like variants in the perceptual evaluation and proclaimed pronunciation aspects.

Needless to say, that the paragraphs above merely show some observed tendencies. Naturally, there are exceptions and some participants who fitted certain patterns perfectly showed unexpected results throughout the experiment. It should also be mentioned that gender, though as an independent variable had an effect on pronunciation choices of the participants, in this categorization was merely conditionally applied.

Together these results provide important insights into the topic of pronunciation variation in loanwords and the social nature of borrowings in general. The next chapter discusses and analyses the findings and provides concluding remarks.

Conclusions

The current study attempted to analyse the pronunciation variation (actual pronunciation and perceptual evaluation) and proclaimed pronunciation of Anglicisms in Georgian and how specific social variables relate to them. Associations towards English-like and Georgian-like pronunciations were also examined.

Various methods were used to obtain the results: first of all, the participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire; the experiment was conducted to elicit specific linguistic items and after that participants were asked to choose between Georgian-like and English-like variants of loanwords; this was followed by a small interview-questions to study the proclaimed pronunciation and associations with English-like and Georgian-like pronunciation.

Summarising Findings

Linguistic Items per Phonological Contexts

Before concentrating on the social factors affecting loanword pronunciation, the linguistic data should also be discussed. The analysis of the position of the sounds in a word has revealed some tendencies: in Inlaut (only if preceded by a consonant sound), aspiration seems to be less noticeable, and therefore participants tend to use Georgian ejectives instead of voiceless aspirated plosives. In all other positions of Inlaut, as well as in Anlaut, the tendency was to use more English-like variants (voiceless aspirated plosives). The orthography of the English etymon seems to have an insignificant effect on the choice of the variants. One interesting finding is that linguistic items containing fricative /f/ produced more pronunciation variants (see Appendix B). This can be explained by the familiarity of the Georgian speakers with fricative /f/ ([f] is a positional allophone of /v/ in voiceless consonants and Russian influence). As mentioned above, due to the limited scope of this thesis, the phonological contexts of the items were ignored in analysing the social effects of loanword variation. However, the tendencies revealed within this preliminary analysis suggest that a similar study should be repeated concentrated on both phonological context and social variables affecting the variation.

Moving on to analysing the main set of data, the results, in general, can be divided into several categories: Articulatory Expressions (actual pronunciation of English loanwords, perceptual evaluation of English-like and Georgian-like pronunciation variants, and proclaimed pronunciation of participants), associations connected to Georgian-like and English-like pronunciations, and Types of Speakers.

Articulatory Expressions (combined)

One interesting finding of this study was that English-like pronunciation is generally more widely used. This claim is supported by the number of times English-like pronunciation was used by the participants in this experiment (see Table 3.1). This also proves that the guidelines for the transliteration and transphonemisation of the English phonetic system are not always executed in speech (this mainly applies to replacing English plosives with ejectives). However, it should be highlighted that the written data was not tested in the present study.

Another interesting finding of this study was that the rate of participants' perceptual evaluation of English-like pronunciation variants and the number of people, whose proclaimed pronunciation was English-like was even higher than the number of actual English-like pronunciations.

Together, the above findings indicate a clear pattern: participants, regardless of the social variables employed in the study, usually opt for English-like pronunciation. This is applied to all aspects: pronunciation of English loanwords, the participants' perceptual evaluation of pronunciation variants and their proclaimed pronunciation.

Moving on to the social factors affecting the pronunciation variants, another promising finding was that social variables such as age, gender, technological advancement, attitudes towards the West and knowledge of English level do have an effect on the articulatory expressions of the participants (see Table 3.3, Table 3.4, Table 3.5, Table 3.6). Our findings on the interrelationship between social variables and linguistic choices of the participants at least hint at certain tendencies. First of all, young participants tend to use more English-like pronunciations. Female participants were also more inclined towards English-like pronunciation. Knowledge of English, attitudes towards the west, and technological advancement also influence the choices of the participants when it comes to loanwords. This statement applies to all three aspects of 'articulatory expressions' – actual pronunciation, perceptual evaluation, and proclaimed pronunciation of the participants.

To sum up the findings, the combined results of articulatory expressions suggest that each variable examined in the study had an effect on the articulatory expressions of the participants. It also highlights that proclaimed pronunciation and perceptual evaluation of English-like variants is higher compared to participants' actual pronunciation of English-like pronunciation variants.

Associations towards Pronunciation Variants

The study has also revealed that there are some stereotypical attitudes connected to Georgian-like and English-like pronunciations and some features are indexical. For the number of participants, English-like pronunciation is indexical of being 'cool' and 'modern', while Georgian-like pronunciation is usually associated with low English proficiency. It is also worth mentioning that participants expect older people to use more Georgian-like pronunciation (see Table 3.7).

An initial objective of the study was to determine how social factors relate to the pronunciation variation of English loanwords in Georgian. The answer to the first research question can be summarised in the following way: despite the fact that the English-like pronunciation is generally more favoured, the role of social factors is evident in the participants' use of English-like or Georgian-like pronunciation of loanwords. In other words, all factors considered in this study affected the choices of the participants. However, it should be taken into consideration that some of these variables had an unevenly distributed number of participants.

The second question of this paper sought to determine how participants perceive and think about English or Georgian variants of Anglicisms in Georgian. With respect to the second question, it was found that regardless of their age, gender, or other social factors, most participants prefer English-like variants and their proclaimed pronunciation is also more inclined towards English-like pronunciation. Besides, English and Georgian variants are loaded with social

meanings as they have certain indexical values, such as identity, prestige, linguistic (in)security, education, etc.

Discussing Findings

Prior studies have noted that loanwords usually show a great degree of variation in pronunciation. At the preliminary stage of the research, it became obvious that this claim is true for the English loanwords in Georgian as well, relating to the finding reported by Muhvić-Dimanovski (1997), Dubeda (2020), and Havlík & Wilson (2017). A strong relationship between social factors and pronunciation variants of loanwords were reported in previous literature. The results of this study echo these views and are in line with previous studies. The following sub-chapters combine and discuss the findings that emerged within the scope of this study.

Loanwords as Social Phenomena

Actual Pronunciation, Perceptual Evaluation Proclaimed Pronunciation

Researchers have examined how speakers explicitly evaluate or respond to a variety of speech (Giles 1970; Coupland et al. 1994). In addition to this, proclaimed pronunciation of speakers is another interesting area of research. Speakers might claim that they speak norm, or a prestigious variant and their proclaimed variant can be different from their actual usage of language. The results of this paper indicate that there is a noticeable inconsistency between the actual pronunciation of English loanwords, perceptual evaluation of loanword variants and proclaimed pronunciation of the participants - participants' evaluation and proclaimed pronunciation differed from that of their actual usage of the linguistic items. These results are in line with that of previous researchers on the mismatch between actual usage of variants and proclaimed norms (Labov, 1973, 2006; Milroy, 1981; Milroy & Milroy, 2012). The fact that English-like pronunciation was favoured in the perceptual evaluation aspect might simply be explained by the fact that source-like pronunciation is acoustically more pleasing and natural for the participants. However, taken into consideration that participants' proclaimed pronunciation was also more English-like, other explanations might be more plausible: it might indicate the high status of the English language, which is also referred to as "linguistic imperialism" by Phillipson (2008). Another possible explanation would the non-traditional understanding of the Accommodation Theory (Giles, 1973), whereby participants assumed that English-like pronunciation was a correct way of pronouncing loanwords and therefore their perceptual evaluations were influenced by this factor.

'Power' of English and Indexicality of Pronunciation Variants

Generally, how speakers evaluate the variation falls into the field of folk linguistics. Lately, Sociolinguists have been interested in conducting a combined analysis of lay beliefs and expert views, or a more objective description of language variation (Smakman, 2017). As Hoenigwald (1966) and Preston (1996) suggest, non-linguists' opinions on language should not be overlooked, as these beliefs might have great symbolic power. Various themes emerged when participants were asked to state their associations towards loanword variation and some of them hint at the symbolic power of the English language.

First of all, the findings of the association aspect are in line with that of Boberg's (1997, 1999) claim that source-like pronunciation is usually associated with prestige. The prestige of English is also evident in the proclaimed pronunciation aspect, whereby a majority of participants lean towards English-like pronunciation. Another interesting theme that hints at the symbolic power of English were the expression of identity and pride. Calude et al. (2020) discuss the association between using loanwords in speech and the expression of identity. Though the present paper concentrated on the pronunciation variants of English loanwords, the findings also hint that using source-like pronunciation is regarded by the participants as 'cool', while Georgian-like pronunciation is seen as old-fashioned. The same can be said about the aspect of 'educatedness' as labelled in the present study. The findings of Boberg (1999) and Jaggers (2018) suggest that source-like pronunciation is associated with 'being educated' and 'intelligence'. Participants in this study have also reported that when hearing source-like pronunciation, they assume that the speaker is familiar with modern technology and trends on social media. Once more, the prestige or power of English is evident in these evaluative associations.

The combination of these findings provides some support for the conceptual promise that social factors indeed affect the pronunciation variation in loanwords. The results at least hint that variables employed in this study, as well as their interplay, can be seen as meaningful indexation forces. These findings are in line with the theories developed by Silverstain (2003) and Eckert (2008). Roughly put, the results from the experiment suggest that participants having certain social traits or belonging to a certain group based on the social variables were more likely to use English-like pronunciation, while participants lacking those traits were more likely to use more Georgian-like pronunciation. According to the combined data of the experiment and the additional interviews, we can also assume that the symbolic power of English is prominent in Georgia, affecting the proclaimed pronunciation and perceptual evaluation of variants of the informants. This claim can also be generalised to suggest that pronunciation variants that are closer to the source language can be understood in terms of Bourdieu's (1977) views on power paradigms of language variation and symbolic resource in the linguistic marketplace.

Linguistic (in) Security and Overt and Prestige

Preston (1999), Boberg (1997, 1999) and Jaggers (2018) suggest that using a source-like pronunciation provides linguistic security. The findings of this paper further support their claims as English-like pronunciation was associated with numerous traits that generally can be seen as positive and prestigious. Some of the participants explicitly mentioned that they feel insecure about their Georgian-like pronunciation. This also highlights the fact that though prescribed norms of loanword pronunciation suggest Georgian-like variants, the English-like pronunciation carries an overt prestige among Georgian speakers. This finding is in line with that of Jaggers (2018), who discussed the overt-prestige of source-like pronunciation. However, not all participants shared the same view: although this aspect was also reported by a very small number of participants, the following finding is in accord with the study of Poplack et al. (1988): purist language ideology might also affect the variation in pronunciation. Some participants in this study showed a degree of native language loyalty and highlighted the 'unique nature of the Georgian language'. Some participants have explicitly mentioned that they prefer when speakers follow the prescribed guidelines for pronouncing English loanwords. Another interesting finding of this paper is in agreement with that of Jaggers' (2018) findings that the source-like pronunciation variant may also carry negative connotations. The participants in the present study reported that people using

English-like pronunciation do it to show off, which can be related to the label used by Jagger: ‘pretentious.

Effects of Individual Sociolinguistic Variables

To date, numerous researchers have proposed that individual choices of pronunciation variants may correspond to different sociolinguistic variables, such as sex, region, age, and education. Consistent with the literature, the findings of this experiment also found that age is an important sociolinguistic variable when it comes to pronunciation of loanword variants. These results match those obtained by Havlík & Wilson (2017), who identified variation patterns across generations. Another interesting claim they make is that “older speakers tend to apply ‘old’ rules to ‘new’ borrowings (p. 217), which seems to be true for the participants in the present study as well. The experiment has shown that pronunciation variants proposed by the State Language Department are usually used by the older participants, even when they are not familiar with the activities and guidelines of the State Language Department (following Shukia Apridonidze’s views, the department follows the long literary tradition of adapting foreign sounds). The fact that age proved to be an important sociolinguistic factor in loanword pronunciation was a predictable and expected outcome. Grouping participants according to the social variables employed in the study has demonstrated from the very early stage that all non-categorical social variables employed in the study tend to be tied to that of the age factor. The number of young participants with poor knowledge of computers, smartphones and English was lower than the number of older participants in the same category. It should be mentioned, however, that even older participants with poor knowledge of English, computer and smartphones used a certain number of English-like variants, which hints at the global and universal nature of the English language.

This study confirms another claim by Havlík & Wilson (2017) that gender affects the choice of the pronunciation variant. Following other researchers, it can be argued that source-like pronunciation is usually prestigious and ‘more correct’. The data of the present study has shown that there seems to be a clear pattern: females tend to use more English-like pronunciation variants. These results are by no means surprising, as the previous studies in the field of sociolinguistics have also revealed that females are usually inclined to use more standard, or even prestigious forms (Eckert, 1989; Paulston and Tucker, 2003; Lakoff, 2004; Milroy and Milroy, 2017). Broadly translated, all these results can be generalised to indicate that using the prestigious form is a status marker for female speakers: in a male-dominated society, they try to establish themselves through the use of prestigious language.

One result which supports evidence from previous observations (Poplack et al., 1988; Kang 2010; Lev Ari and Peperkamp, 2014; Jaggers, 2018) is that familiarity with the source language affects the number of source-like pronunciations among the speakers. Familiarity with English proved to influence the linguistic choices of the participants, whereby English-like pronunciation was generally used by speakers with good knowledge of English. These results are not particularly surprising, as speakers who are familiar with the source language are more or less familiar with the phonetic inventories of that language as well. In other words, speakers are aware of how these words sound in the source language. In the case of Georgia, the guidelines suggest replacing English phonemes with that of the closest phonological categories found in Georgian. However, those who are familiar with English sounds, are more likely to use sounds that are acoustically closer to the source language. This further supports Boberg’s (1999) findings that variants might

seem more correct and sophisticated, even in the cases when other variants are prescribed by the dictionaries.

Global orientation as a relevant sociolinguistic factor was discussed by Jaggers (2018), who demonstrated that the linguistic choice of the speakers was affected by their ideological stance. The findings of this paper also demonstrate a similar tendency. However, it should be taken into consideration that only a few participants were categorised as nationalistic. This can be explained by the fact that the questionnaire was not anonymous, and some participants might not have been completely truthful.

The interrelationship between computer and smartphone skills and loanwords variation has not been described widely in the previous studies. The present study, however, proves that familiarity with modern technology can affect the linguistic choice of the participants. Not surprisingly, categorising participants into groups based on the social variables has shown that the familiarity with modern technology decreases with the age of the participants. Therefore, it can be assumed that these factors too are closely tied to that of age.

To summarise the discussion of individual variables, findings of the experiment conducted within the scope of this paper broadly support the work of other studies in this field. These results are consistent with the data obtained by numerous researchers who propose that individual choices of pronunciation variants may correspond to different sociolinguistic factors and the selection of loanword variants has sociolinguistic roots as well.

Limitations and Future Research

The main weakness of the present study is the limited number of participants; therefore, the generalisability of these results is subject to certain limitations. Given that the experiment was conducted online, the friend-of-a-friend technique was employed to find the participants for this study. Usually, the traditional method for conducting such experiments is to approach people in the streets and ask them to participate in the study. Such an approach provides the possibility for finding participants with diverse social backgrounds. Therefore, undertaking research from a different country was inherently limiting. However, it should be noted that the number of participants in each social category was imbalanced as it is. Approaching random people in the streets would make it even more difficult to balance the number of participants with certain social traits. In line with the above-mentioned limitations, it was more difficult to assess the effect of West-centrism (or globalist versus nationalistic views) on loanword variation. The number of participants with nationalistic views was rather small. The study is also limited by the lack of information on the participants' region of origin. Taking into consideration that the differences between the capital city, Tbilisi and other regions in Georgia are quite drastic, this factor might have proved to be relevant. In line with this, Havlík & Wilson (2017) found that region of origin can affect the variation in pronunciation. However, considering the aforementioned limitations (conducting research from outside of Georgia and a small number of participants), the participants' regions of origin was not taken into consideration. It is also unfortunate that the study did not include participants representing the language minorities in Georgia. This factor is also closely tied to that of the region of origins, as Azerbaijani and Armenian language minorities usually reside in specific regions and come to the capital after enrolling in universities.

Another source of weakness in this study that could have affected the results was that the participants' ability of English was not tested; they were simply asked to evaluate and indicate their own level of English and the categorisation of participants was based on their declared ability. Though this decision might be an additional limitation, it was done so purposefully. The process of the experiment and interviews is extensive and made of so many parts that adding a formal English test would simply overwhelm both the researcher and participants. Instead of the test, the categorisation has relied on self-reported levels of English knowledge. Hopefully, the drawbacks of this decision are outweighed by the benefits of a simplified process. Another unfortunate limitation is that the study did not include participants above the age of 56. Given that the interview was conducted online, it was relatively difficult to include older participants. In addition to this, as explained above, the phonological context of linguistic items was also ignored.

Taken into consideration the limitations mentioned above, further work is needed to understand the effects of phonological contexts of the linguistic items on loanword variation in combination with social variables. Future research should also include participants' region of origin as one of the social factors influencing the pronunciation variation. It might also be fruitful to employ a more systematic method for sampling the participants so that the number of participants belonging to certain categories is more balanced and equally distributed. A greater focus on the indexicality of variants could also produce interesting findings in this field. Due to the lack of participants, there are still many unanswered questions left. Conducting a similar experiment and analysing the data with the quantitative approach to the study would make the study generalisable. Though my research took on the methodology of analysing how the interplay of several social factors influenced loanword variation, it would be interesting to see future studies that concentrate on single factors and do a narrower analysis of how they affect the same phenomenon. Such an approach would allow researchers to employ more complex and accurate methods of categorising groups into different sub-groups.

Although the current research is based on a small sample of participants and is preliminary in nature, this study offers some insight into the social factors influencing the pronunciation variation in loanwords and the indexicality of English-like and Georgian-like variants.

References

Abashmadze, G. (2019). *Linguistic and cultural peculiarities of English adaptation and integration in Georgian in the context of globalization.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gori State Teaching University.

Abbott, G. (1991). English across cultures: The Kachru catch. *English Today*, 7(4), 55-57.

Apridonidze S. (2007). *Tchveni ena Kartuli* [Our language - Georgian]. Tbilisi: Sulakauri Publishing

Bauer, L., & Trudgill, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Language myths*. Penguin UK.

Bloomfield, L. (1944). Secondary and tertiary responses to language. *Language*, 45-55.

Boberg, C. (1997). *Variation and change in the nativization of foreign (a) in English*. University of Pennsylvania.

Boberg, C. (1999). The attitudinal component of variation in American English foreign (a) nativization. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *18*(1), 49-61.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistic exchanges. Social science information, 16(6):645–68.

Calude, A., Miller, S. & Pagel, M. (2020). Modelling loanword success – a sociolinguistic quantitative study of Māori loanwords in New Zealand English. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, *16*(1), 29-66. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1515/cllt-2017-0010

Chikobava, A. (2008). *Introduction to Linguistics*. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Publishing.

Crystal, D. (2004). *Language and the Internet* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511487002

Davitishvili, N. (2018). On the Integration of Anglicisms Into Present-Day Georgian. *Studies in Literature and Language*, *17*(3), 22-27.

De Saussure, F. (1959). *Course in general linguistics*. Philosophical Library.

Doty, C. S., & Guion, S. G. (2009). The perception of Georgian ejective stops by native English speakers. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *125*(4), 2772-2772.

Duběda, T. (2020). The Phonology of Anglicisms in French, German and Czech: A Contrastive Approach. *Journal of Language Contact*, *13*(2), 327-350.

Eastman, C. (1983) Language Planning: An Introduction. San Francisco, CA: Chandler and Sharp.

Eckert, P. (1989). The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language variation and change*, *1*(3), 245-267.

Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. Journal of sociolinguistics, 12(4):453– 476. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00374.x

Filipović, R. (1986). *Teorija jezika u kontaktu: uvod u lingvistiku jezičnih dodira* (Vol. 59). Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

Fishman, J. A. (1971). The Sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), Advances in the sociology of language (pp. 217–404). The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J.A. (1996). Summery and interpretation: Post-imperial English 1940 -1990. In Conrad, A. W., & Rubal-Lopez, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Post-imperial English: Status change in former British and American colonies, 1940-1990* (Vol. 72). Walter de Gruyter

Georgia: Organic Law of Georgia on Official Language. (2017). Available at https://matsne.gov.ge/en/document/view/2931198?publication=3

Giles, H. (1973). Accent mobility: A model and some data. *Anthropological linguistics*, 87-105.

Görlach, M. (Ed.). (2001). *A dictionary of European anglicisms: A usage dictionary of anglicisms in sixteen European languages*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Goshkheteliani, I., & Kikvadze, M. (2018). The Influence of English Borrowings on the Georgian Language. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*.

Halliday, M. (2012). THE USERS AND USES OF LANGUAGE. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (pp. 139-169). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1515/9783110805376.139

Hashimoto, D. (2019). Sociolinguistic effects on loanword phonology: Topic in speech and cultural image. *Laboratory Phonology: Journal of the Association for Laboratory Phonology*, *10*(1).

Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, *26*(2), 210-231.

Haugen, E. (1959). Planning for a Standard Language in Modern Norway. *Anthropological Linguistics*, *1*(3), 8-21. Retrieved March 2, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/30022188

Haugen, E. (2012). *Blessings of Babel: bilingualism and language planning. Problems and pleasures* (Vol. 46). Walter de Gruyter.

Haugen, E. (2013). *Language conflict and language planning*. Harvard University Press.

Havlik, M., & Wilson, J. (2017). Sociolinguistic variation in loanword pronunciation in Czech. *Slavonic & East European Review*, *95*(2), 181-220.

Hay, J., Warren, P., & Drager, K. (2006). Factors influencing speech perception in the context of a merger-in-progress. *Journal of phonetics*, *34*(4), 458-484.

Hock, H. & Joseph, B. (2019). *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1515/9783110613285

Jaggers, Z. (2018). *A Combined Sociolinguistic and Experimental Phonetic Approach to Loanword Variation and Adaptation* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University).

Javakhishvili, I. (1937). The original nature and kinship of Georgian and Caucasian languages. Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Publishing.

Jemudd, B. H. (1990): Two approaches to language planning. In: V. Bickley (ed.) *Language Use, Language Teaching and the Curriculum.* Hong Kong: Institute of Language in Education, Education Department, 48-53.

Jernudd, B. H., & Neustupný, J. V. (1987). Language planning: for whom. In *Proceedings of the international colloquium on language planning* (pp. 69-84). Québec: Les Presses de L'Université Laval.

Kakachia, et al. (2013). Kartvelur enaTa morfosintaksis sakitkhebi. Tbilisi: meridiani

Kang, Y. (2010). The emergence of phonological adaptation from phonetic adaptation: English loanwords in Korean. *Phonology*, 225-253.

Kang, Y. (2011). Loanword phonology. *The Blackwell companion to phonology*, 1-25.

Kirvalidze, N. (2017). Linguo-cultural and pragmatic peculiarities of the phenomenon of Anglicisation in Georgia. *Journal of Teaching and Education*, *6*(02), 269-280.

Kloss, H. (1968). Notes concerning a language-nation typology. *Language problems of developing nations*, *69*, 85.

Labov, W. (1963). The social motivation of a sound change. *Word*, *19*(3), 273-309.

Labov, W. (1972). Some principles of linguistic methodology. *Language in society*, 97-120.

Labov, W. (1973). *Sociolinguistic patterns* (No. 4). University of Pennsylvania press.

Labov, W. (2006). *The social stratification of English in New York city*. Cambridge University Press.

LaCharité, D., & Paradis, C. (2005). Category preservation and proximity versus phonetic approximation in loanword adaptation. *Linguistic inquiry*, *36*(2), 223-258.

Lakoff, R. (2004). Language and woman's place: Text and commentaries. Revised and expanded edition.

Lev-Ari, S., & Peperkamp, S. (2014). An experimental study of the role of social factors in language change: The case of loanword adaptations. *Laboratory phonology*, *5*(3), 379-401.

Lewis, E. G. (1972). *Multilingualism in the Soviet Union: Aspects of language Policy and Its Implementation*. The Hague: Mouton.

Lomidze, K. (2008). *Adaptation of Anglicisms and areas of their spread*. [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation] Georgian Technical University.

Margalitadze, T. (2020). Language and ecology of culture. *Lexicographica*, *36*(1), 225-240.

Milroy, J. (1981). *Regional accents of English, Belfast*. Blackstaff Press.

Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (2012). *Authority in language: Investigating standard English*. Routledge.

Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (2017). Varieties and variation. *The handbook of sociolinguistics*, 45-64.

Muhvić-Dimanovski, V. (1997). Anglicisms in German: the problem of variants. *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia: Revue publiée par les Sections romane, italienne et anglaise de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Zagreb*, *42*, 269-273.

Nahir, M. (1977). The five aspects of language planning-a classification. *Language problems and language planning*, *1*(2), 107-123.

Nebieridze, G. (1991). Introduction to Linguistics. *Tbilisi: Ganatleba*.

Nekvapil, J. (2007). From language planning to language management. *Sociolinguistica Jahrbuch (2006)*, *20*(2007), 92-104.

Nekvapil, J. (2016). Language management theory as one approach in language policy and planning. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *17*(1), 11-22.

Paradis, C., & LaCharité, D. (1997). Preservation and minimality in loanword adaptation. *Journal of linguistics*, 379-430.

Paulston, C. B., & Tucker, G. R. (Eds.). (2003). *Sociolinguistics: The essential readings* (pp. xviii+-502). Oxford: Blackwell.

Phillipson, R. (2008). The linguistic imperialism of neoliberal empire. *Critical inquiry in language studies*, *5*(1), 1-43.

Poplack, S., Sankoff, D., & Miller, C. (1988). The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation.

Retman, R. (1978). L'adaptation phonétique des emprunts à l'anglais en français. *La linguistique*, *14*(Fasc. 1), 111-124.

Sankoff, G. (2002). 25 Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact. *The handbook of language variation and change*, 638.

Schreier, D. (2012). The impact of migratory movements on linguistic systems: Transplanted speech communities and varieties from a historical sociolinguistic perspective. *The handbook of historical sociolinguistics*, 534-551.

Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. Language and communication, 23(3):193–229. doi:10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00013-2

Smakman, D. (2017). *Discovering Sociolinguistics: Theory and Practical Applications*. Macmillan International Higher Education.

Smith, J. L. (2006). Loan phonology is not all perception: Evidence from Japanese loan doublets. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, 14*, 63-74.

Spolsky, B. (2004): *Language Policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Summers, D. (1987). *Longman dictionary of contemporary English*. Harlow, Essex, England: Longman.

Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language contact*. Edinburgh University Press.

Thomason, S. J., & Kauffman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Tkemaladze, R. (2020). THE ENGLISH PHONETICS HANDBOOK. Tbilisi

Tollefson, J. (2011). Language planning and language policy. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics, pp. 357-376). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511997068.027

Trudgill, P. (1972). Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in society, 1*(2), 179-195.

Tsagareli, A. (1872). Comparative review of the morphology of the Iberian group of Caucasian languages. Tbilisi: (n.p.).

Uturgaidze, T. (1976). Kartuli enis ponemat'uri st'rukt'ura.[The phonemic structure of the Georgian language]. *Tbilisi: Mecniereba*.

Vicenik, C. (2010). An acoustic study of Georgian stop consonants. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association*, 59-92.

Žižek, S. (2009). *First as tragedy, then as farce*. Verso.

Appendices

Appendix A

Questionnaire:

1. Name
2. Age
3. Gender
    - Female
    - Male
    - Other (please, indicate)
4. Native Tongue
    - Georgian
    - Other (please, indicate)
5. Which languages do you speak?
    - English
    - Russian
    - German
    - French
    - Other (please, indicate)

Please, indicate the level of each language you speak.

6. Please, asses your Computer Literacy
    - Very good
    - Good
    - Average
    - Poor
7. Please, provide steps of how to Copy and Paste a text?
8. Do you use Microsoft Word?
9. Which internet browser do you use?
10. Can you send an e-mail with an attachment?
11. Do you have smartphone? (if no, skip the next three question)
    - Yes
    - No
12. Please, asses your Smartphone Literacy
    - I can use smartphone quite well
    - I cannot use smartphone very well
13. Do you know how to set an alarm on your smartphone?
    - Yes
    - No
14. Do you know how to download an app on your smartphone?
    - Yes
    - No
15. How would you evaluate yourself politically?

- Globalist
- Nationalist

16. Should Georgia join NATO/EU?
    - Yes
    - No
17. Russia and Georgia should be allies
    - Agree
    - Disagree
18. My views are very close to that of the Western countries
    - Agree
    - Disagree
19. Do you feel closer to the Western culture or the Eastern culture? Elaborate, please

Appendix B

List of linguistic items and their pronunciation variants:

Variables	Pronunciaiton	Variants
Lockdown	Geo-like	/l ɔ k’ d a u n i/
	Eng-like	/l ɔ k^h d a u n i/
Instagram	Geo-like	/i n s t’ a g r a m i/
	Eng-like	/i n s t^h a g r a m i/
Twitter	Geo-like	/t’ v i t’ ɛ r i/
	Eng-like	/t^h v i t^h ɛ r i/
Winston	Geo-like	/v i n s t o n i/
	Eng-like	/u i n s t o n i/
Queen	Geo-like	/k^h v i n i/
	Eng-like	/k^h u i n i/
Beatles	Geo-like	/b i t’ l z i/
	Eng-like	/b i t^h l z i/
Speaker	Geo-like	/s p’ i k’ ɛ r i/
	Eng-like	/s p^h i k^h ɛ r i/
Chat	Geo-like	/tʃ a t’ i/
	Geo-like	/tʃ a t^h i/
Like	Eng-like	/l a i k’ i/
	Geo-like	/l a i k^h i/
Mail	Geo-like	/m a i l i/
	Eng-like	/m ɛ i l i/
Windows	Geo-like	/v i n d ɔ u s i/
	Eng-like	/u i n d ɔ u s i/
Background	Geo-like	/b ɛ k’ g r a u n d i/
	Eng-like	/b ɛ k^h g r a u n d i/
Chips	Geo-like	/tʃ i p’ s i/
	Eng-like	/tʃ i p^h s i/
Snack	Geo-like	/s n ɛ k’ i/
	Eng-like	/s n ɛ k^h i/
Puzzle	Geo-like	/p’ a z l i/
	Eng-like	/p^h a z l i/
Casting	Geo-like	/k' a s t i n g i/

	Eng-like	/kʰ a s t i n g i/
Shopping	Geo-like	/ʃ ɔ pʼ i n g i/
	Eng-like	/ʃ ɔ pʰ i n g i/
Reception	Geo-like	/r ɛ s ɛ pʼ ʃ ɛ n i/
	Eng-like	/r ɛ s ɛ ph ʃ ɛ n i/
Check in	Geo-like	/ʧ ɛ kʼ i n i/
	Eng-like	/ʧ ɛ kʰ i n i/
Weekend	Geo-like	/u i kˈ ɛ n d i/
	Eng-like	/u i kʰ ɛ n d i/
Facebook	Geo-like	/pʰ ɛ i s b u kʼ i/
	Eng-like	/f ɛ i s b u kʰ i/
	Mixed	/f ɛ i s b u kˈ i/
Duty free	Geo-like	/d u tʼ i pʰ r i/
	Mixed	/d u tʼ i f r i/
	Eng-like	/d u tʰ i f r i/
	Very Eng-like	/dj u tʰ i f r i/
Fake News	Mixed	/f e i kʼ n i u s i/
	Eng-like	/f e i kʰ n i u s i/
	Geo-like	/pʰ ɛ i kʼ n i u s i/
iPhone	Very Eng-like	/a i f əʊ n i/
	Geo-like	/a i pʰ ɔ n i/
	Eng-like	/a i f ɔ n i/

Appendix C

Social Variables employed in the study:

Participants	Social Variables					
	Age	Gender	English	Computer	Smartphones	West
1	+			+		+
2	+	+	+			+
3			+	+	+	+
4			+	+	+	+
5		+	+	+	+	+
6		+		+	+	+
7	+	+	+	+	+	+
8	+					+
9	+			+		+
10			+	+	+	+
11			+	+		+
12		+	+	+	+	+
13			+	+	+	+
14		+	+	+	+	+
15		+	+	+	+	+
16			+	+	+	+
17	+		+	+	+	+
18			+	+	+	+
19		+	+	+	+	+
20	+	+				
21	+	+	+	+	+	+
22	+			+		
23	+		+			+
24	+	+	+			+
25	+					+
26	+					
27	+			+		+
28		+	+	+	+	+
29	+	+		+		+
30	+	+	+	+	+	+
31		+	+	+	+	+
32		+	+	+	+	+
33		+	+		+	+
34	+	+				+
35	+					
36	+	+		+	+	+
37		+	+		+	

38			+	+	+	+
39				+	+	+
40	+	+		+		+
41	+	+	+		+	+
42		+	+	+	+	+
43				+		+
44	+					+
45		+	+	+	+	+
46		+	+	+	+	+
47		+	+	+	+	+
48	+	+				+
49	+			+	+	
50	+	+		+	+	+
51	+		+	+		+
52		+	+	+	+	+
53	+	+				+
54		+	+	+	+	+
55	+		+	+	+	+

Appendix D

Sample Task (extracted from the original PPT and translated into English):

Appendix E

Interview Questions:

After the experiment, the participants were asked some additional questions:

1. Which pronunciation is more correct? English-like or Georgian-like?
    1.1. Which one do you think you are using?
    1.2. Which one do you like more?

2. Could you please imagine a situation, whereby a person is calling you on the phone and pronounces a loanword in a ‘wrong’ way.

    1.3. What would be a wrong way of pronouncing it?
    1.4. How would you describe that person?
    1.5. What would your first impression be?