

English Blends in the Television Domain

Jurić, Anja

Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad

2023

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zadar / Sveučilište u Zadru**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:162:707948>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-02-02**



Sveučilište u Zadru
Universitas Studiorum
Jadertina | 1396 | 2002 |


Repository / Repozitorij:

[University of Zadar Institutional Repository](#)



Sveučilište u Zadru

Odjel za anglistiku
Sveučilišni prijediplomski studij Anglistike



Anja Jurić

English Blends in the Television Domain

Završni rad

Zadar, 2023.

Sveučilište u Zadru
Odjel za anglistiku
Sveučilišni prijediplomski studij Anglistike

English Blends in the Television Domain

Završni rad

Student/ica:

Anja Jurić

Mentor/ica:

Doc. dr. sc. Frane Malenica

Zadar, 2023.



Izjava o akademskoj čestitosti

Ja, **Anja Jurić**, ovime izjavljujem da je moj **završni** rad pod naslovom **English Blends in the Television Domain** rezultat mogega vlastitog rada, da se temelji na mojim istraživanjima te da se oslanja na izvore i radove navedene u bilješkama i popisu literature. Ni jedan dio mogega rada nije napisan na nedopušten način, odnosno nije prepisan iz necitiranih radova i ne krši bilo čija autorska prava.

Izjavljujem da ni jedan dio ovoga rada nije iskorišten u kojem drugom radu pri bilo kojoj drugoj visokoškolskoj, znanstvenoj, obrazovnoj ili inoj ustanovi.

Sadržaj mogega rada u potpunosti odgovara sadržaju obranjenoga i nakon obrane uređenoga rada.

Zadar, 2023.

Sadržaj

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Blending.....	6
2.1. Formation of Blends	9
2.2. Stress in English Blends.....	12
3. Previous Corpus-Based Research on Blends	15
4. English Blends in the Television Domain	22
4.1. Research sample	22
4.2. Methodology.....	23
4.3. Analysis	24
4.4. Discussion	48
5. Conclusion	53
6. References	54
Abstract.....	57
Sažetak.....	58

1. Introduction

Blends are a word formation that enrich the English language. They are a relatively new term in morphology although they have been around since the 19th century. They can easily be mistaken for compounds and acronyms. However, they have their own way of formation, which will be explained in this paper in the first chapter. Also, the way of placing stress in blends can be problematic as there are few approaches and theories, which will be elaborated in the first chapter along with formation. In the second chapter, a number of previous works will be mentioned, along with their methodology and data. Some of these papers researched frequency of blends in specific domains, some of them researched splinters and their productivity and others dealt with formation of blends. The main topic of this seminar, which will be dealt in the third chapter, is the use of blends in the television domain. Blends were mainly made for catching someone's attention, wittiness, humour and marketing. Therefore, I am interested to know the amount of usage of English blends in the entertainment industry, more specifically, movies, series and television shows. It will be researched which of these five chosen genres (comedy, fiction, action, horror and drama) uses blends the most. It will be done on the sample of 49 chosen blends in the penultimate chapter of this seminar paper. After researching the frequency between genres, in the fourth chapter I will research the frequency of blends between three different domains- blog, television and news. The data will be collected by using the *Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)*.

2. Blending

Blending is a word-formation process of coining new words by merging two, or more, existing lexemes (Škafar, 2016, p. 7). All lexemes involved in the process of blending suffer a partial loss, either phonological or graphic. Sometimes there is an overlap between the two original lexemes as in (1). In this example, there was an overlap of phoneme /əʊt/. The new word is called a blend or a *portmanteau*. New blend shares a similar meaning and form to the words that have formed it. Blends can be classified as transparent or opaque (Mattiolo, 2019, p.4). An example of a transparent blend would be (2). Blending with three lexemes is not common in English, but an example for such blend would be (3) (Mattiolo, 2019, p. 4). Blends like this one are usually considered opaque. Furthermore, Mattiolo (2019, p.4) argues that blends can be classified "according to a semantic criterion, differentiating the 'coordinate' type (frenemy is both 'friend' and 'enemy') from the 'headed' or 'attributive' type (e.g. slimnastics is 'gymnastics that slim you down')". The "headed" type has a bigger semantic value and therefore carries more meaning.

(1) *motor* + *hotel* --> *motel*

(2) *sitcom* --> *situation* + *comedy*

(3) *turducken* (a dish consisting of poultry) --> *turkey* + *duck* + *chicken*

Ljung (2003, p. 153) differentiates between regular and irregular word-formation processes. Prefixation, suffixation and compounding are all regular word-formation processes, while blending, back-formation and clippings are irregular. Blending is very similar to compounding, but unlike compounding, blending is seen as irregular. The reason for this is because, while compounding consists of two words, blending consists of two word parts, which complicates splitting blends into morphemes. Another difference between blends and compounds is that in blends both original lexemes' semantic meaning stays unchanged, while in compounding some semantic elements of a lexeme can stay the same and the others

abandoned. Also, compounds can be abstract, as seen in an example of the compound *shopaholic*, which carries a meaning "a person addicted to shopping". However, the suffix *-(a)holic* was originally taken from the word "alcoholic". The semantic element of alcohol was left out. This is called secretive affixing, which does not happen in blending.

Blends evolved from puns and word games, having been added to a quotidian vocabulary. They date back to the 15th century, but some blends that are still in use today go as far as to the 19th century (Lehrer, 2007, p. 128). They were mainly used in literature for children in order to draw their attention. Also, they were used in marketing to draw attention of the aimed consumer group (Mattiolo, 2019, p. 6). Lehrer (2007, p.128) claims that blends mostly appear in commercials, advertisements, as well as in newspapers' headlines. Lehrer (2007, p. 129) states that blends are usually used for a unique purpose, such as remembering a product for which a blend is used. However, they also claim that blends used in areas like biology and pharmacy are more stable and viable. Today, they play an important role in the English language, especially in the vocabulary of modern English. Blends are usually more accepted in language if their original lexemes are more understandable and if the meaning of a blend is more obvious. Furthermore, making them a part of a more prestigious speech is going to sustain a blend in a language. Lastly, some blends can fill in the lexical gaps in a language or if they "produce a stylistic and textual effect" (Mattiolo, 2016, p. 6).

New blends can be divided into three groups- slang, colloquial and specialized blends. The first two groups are a part of informal language, while the third group is not. Slang blends are supposed to catch listener's attention or be witty, sarcastic or even offensive as in (4-8) (Mattiolo, 2016, p.8). Furthermore, colloquial blends are a typical part of informal vocabulary, for example as in (9-13) (Mattiolo, 2016, p. 14).

(4) *feminazi* (feminist + nazi, meaning "a radical feminist")

(5) *gaydar* (gay + radar, meaning "the ability to identify gay people")

(6) *brainiac* (brain + maniac, meaning "a very intelligent person")

(7) *crunk* (crazy + drunk)

(8) *kidvid* (kid + video, meaning "television for children")

(9) *wuss* (wimp + puss, meaning "a weak person")

(10) *blaxploitation* (black + exploitation)

(11) *Socceroos* (soccer + kangaroo, meaning "Australian soccer team, but in a mocking way")

(12) *bromance* (bro + romance)

(13) *gayby boom* (gay + baby boom, meaning "a sudden increase in the number of homosexual parents")

On the other hand, specialized blends are a part of many separate fields such as economics, politics, science, technology and cinematic domain. Firstly, we will name some of the specialized blends concerning economics such as (14), (15), (16), (17).

(14) *freemium* (free + premium, meaning "a model in which basic needs are free, but premium features must be paid for)

(15) *flexecutive* (flexible + executive, meaning "an executive who allows flexibility concerning time and place of work)

(16) *Clintonomics* (Clinton + economics, meaning "Bill Clinton's economic policy")

(17) *politicide* (political + homicide, meaning "intentional destruction of an independent political entity)

Thirdly, the scientific domain has a lot of specialized blends concerning all of the scientific fields including mathematics, biology, chemistry, etc. For example, (18-20).

(18) *flexagon* (flex + hexagon, meaning "a flat model made from paper that reveals many sides")

(19) *algeny* (alchemy + gene, meaning "the transformation of genetic material")

(20) *biolistic* (biological + ballistic, meaning "particle-mediated gene transfer")

Technological domain includes computer science, electronics and cybernetics. Concerning computer science we have blends such as (21) and (22). In electronics there are blends such as (23); in cybernetics-(24).

(21) *netiquette* (net + etiquette, meaning "Internet etiquette")

(22) *netizen* (net + citizen, meaning "a user of the Internet")

(23) *molelectronics*(molecular + electronics, "subdivision of nanotechnology that uses nanoelectronics")

(24) *cyborg* (cyber + organism, meaning "a being with both organic and biomechatronic body parts")

Finally, cinematic domain blends include: (25), (26), (27), (28). Mattiello (2016, p. 15) claims that specialized blends are a useful tool in specialized language because their forms mostly mirror their meanings. All examples in this paragraph were obtained from Mattiello's paper *A corpus-based analysis of new English blends*. Furthermore, Mattiello (2016, p. 16) states that informal blends can be used in various situations, such as getting the reader's or listener's attention, while specialized blends, such as *Clintonomics* refer to a concrete situation. New formal specialized blends create unity among people from the same field by providing special terminology (Mattiello, 2016, p. 17).

(25) *britcom* (British + comedy)

(26) *Japanimation* (Japan + animation)

(27) *animatic* (animated + schematic, meaning "animated storyboard")

(28) *gengineering* (gene + engineering)

2.1. Formation of Blends

As it was mentioned before, blends are words formed from two, or more, different words. In blends, there is no obvious analysis of morphemes. However, Bauer (2004, p. 234)

argues that sometimes at least one part of a blend can be recovered. This usually happens when the root of the blend is etymologically obvious. Blends usually consist of one part of one lexeme and one part of the other lexeme, excluding the possibility of randomly mixing phonemes or putting one word in the middle of the other. There is more than one possible way to blend several lexemes together, which means that the maker of the blend has the freedom to choose how much they will take from one of the lexemes. Bauer gives an example for this statement (2004, p. 235): the blend *mimsy* comes from the words "miserable" and "flimsy", but if the blend was *flimserable*, it would carry the same meaning. There may be some boundaries to coining new blends because of the pronunciation or spelling. In this example, the aforementioned blends have more sense than *misimsy*, *miserasy* or *miserlimsy* (Bauer, 2004, p. 235). Some blends contain both lexemes entirely, but there is an overlap, either in phonology or in orthography, sometimes even in both, for example, (29). Bauer (2004, p. 236) says that the third kind of blends can be analyzed as neo-classical compounds, for instance, (30). Sometimes, these kinds of blends are not seen as blends, but rather compounds. This is why the category of blends is not well defined, as it can slip into the category of compounding, clipping, affixation and even acronyms.

(29) *slanguage* (slang + language)

(30) *autocide* (automobile + suicide)

Also, there are numerous ways of forming blends.

a) Blends formed by overlapping

In this form, there is no shortening, but there is an overlap of phonemes. Generally, the first part of the first lexeme overlaps with the first part of the second lexeme. An example of this is (31). One more way of overlapping is when we add the initial or the last part of one lexeme to one full lexeme. Blends formed this way can only be recognised through spelling. For instance, (32).

(31) *filmania* (film + mania)

(32) *cartune* (cartoon + tune, meaning "musical cartoon")

b) Blends formed by clipping

This way of forming blends includes excluding part(s) of words. The first method is to leave the initial part of the first lexeme and exclude the first part of the second lexeme. For example, (33). The second method is to exclude the last part of the first lexeme and leave the entire second lexeme. For instance (34). When we clip both lexemes, we usually put together the first part of the first lexeme and the last part of the second lexeme, e.g. (35). We can also merge two initial parts of both lexemes- (36).

(33) *fanzine* (fan + magazine)

(34) *Eurasia* (Europe + Asia)

(35) *smog* (smoke + fog)

(36) *aldehyde* (alcohol + dehydrogenatum)

c) Clipping at morpheme boundaries

Blends merged this way are made by clipping lexemes at the boundaries of their morphemes. For instance, (37).

(37) *paratroops* (parachute + troops)

d) Blends with both clipping and overlapping

Both of these methods can be used in various ways, e.g. (38).

(38) *Californication* (California + fornication)

The examples from this paragraph were obtained from Škafar's paper (2016, p. 7-10).

Furthermore, Plag (2003, p. 155) states that there are two semantic types of blends.

a) Blends in which the initial lexeme modifies the final lexeme.

For example, (39). The first lexeme gives us an explanation of the type of the hotel.

(39) *motel* (motor + hotel)

b) Lexemes where the new blend has parts of both words.

For instance, (40). It is clear that a *boatel* is both a boat and a hotel.

(40) *boatel* (boat + hotel)

Lehrer (2007, p. 117) claims that there are more types of blends.

a) The most common type of a blend is when the first lexeme stays whole and just a part of the second lexeme is added (Lehrer, 2007, p. 117), for example, (41).

(41) *vodkatini* (vodka + martini)

b) The first lexeme is clipped and the second stays the same (Lehrer, 2007, p. 117) - (42).

(42) *Amerindian* (American + Indian)

c) The blends that are made from just parts of both original lexemes (Lehrer, 2007, p. 118) - (43).

(43) *sitcom* (situation + comedy)

d) Blends with either syllable or phonetic overlap (Lehrer, 2007, p. 118). For example, (44).

(44) *cocacolonization* (Coca Cola + colonization)

e) Blends where one of the lexemes is contained inside the other (Lehrer, 2007, p. 118) - (45).

(45) *enshocklopedia* (encyclopedia + shock)

f) Blends where some letters appear in both of the original lexemes (Lehrer, 2007, p. 119) - (46).

(46) *wintertainment* (winter + entertainment)

2.2. Stress in English Blends

Bat-El and Cohen (2012, p. 193) state that main stress in English blends is fixed on the position of the stress on original words that the blend is made of. Mainly the stress will be the

stress of the longer word. Bat-El and Cohen (2012, p. 194) claim that there are two views on the position stress in blends, but they are also adding the third. One of the existing views is the position-based view. It says that the word that provides stress is the fundamental word. The other view, the size-based view, says that the original lexeme that is the same size as the blend provides the stress of the blend. Concerning the position-based view, stress syllable will always be on the second word regardless of its size. However, size-based view argues that the stress will reside on a longer word, regardless of its position. Bat-El and Cohen (2012, p. 196) state that the first view is irrelevant if both base words have the same length and that the second view does not apply when the size of the blend is different from both base words. Bat-El and Cohen have adopted the third view which states that when both of these factors, size and position, are involved, there is intra-word variation (2012, p. 194). First, they analyse blends whose original lexemes are polysyllabic. Here they take into consideration their size (the number of syllables), including blends whose size is the same as the size of both of the original lexemes, blends whose size is the same as the size of one of the original lexemes and blends whose size is different from both sizes of the original lexemes. Furthermore, they continue to analyze blends where one of the original lexemes is monosyllabic. Here, they differentiate between blends that have the same size as their polysyllabic base words and those that have a different size. Next variation is whether the monosyllabic base is on the left or the right side of the blend. Usually, the stress is in agreement with the stressed syllable in the original lexeme. If only one syllable stays whole, it will be stressed. Bat-El and Cohen (2012, p. 195) research the position of stress in the next situations: two stressed syllables stay whole, none of the two syllables stay whole and if one of these original lexemes is monosyllabic. They follow a size-position based view. They concluded that the stress will be on the longer base word or/and on the right side of the blend. Also, they claim that if only one syllable stays whole, it will carry the stress. They came to the conclusion that if both base

words have the same amount of syllables, the position of the base words will decide which syllable is stressed, but if the base words have different sizes, the size of the base words will determine the position of stress. In most cases, if the sizes of base words are the same, priority will be on the second base word, e.g. *motél* < *mótor* + *hotél*. Similarly, in blends that have the same size as one of the base words, stress will be on that same-sized word. In cases where blends have the same size as the first base words, the chances of a stressed syllable being on the first or the last word are similar. Furthermore, in most cases, where blend has a different size from both of the base words, the position of the base words dictates where the stress will be. Bat-El and Cohen (2012, p. 204) found that blends with one monosyllabic base words did not differentiate from those that have two polysyllabic base words.

3. Previous Corpus-Based Research on Blends

While I will be comparing blog, television and news domain, Škafar (2016, p. 15) used 50 different blends from 5 different categories- food and drink, television, technology, travelling and science. She also used COCA in order to gather data. She compared the frequency of blends between 5 different domains- spoken, fiction, magazine, newspaper and academic. Other than researching frequency of blends, she researched whether these blends were a part of dictionaries. She found that 49 out of 50 blends were included in the Oxford Dictionaries and that only the blend *lupper* (lunch + supper) was not included in any of them (Škafar, 2016, p. 75). One of her hypotheses was that blends from the technology category were more common than blends from other categories. The results showed that the hypothesis was correct, technology blends really do prevail over blends from other categories. This category earned 12,441 tokens, while the travelling category holds the second place with 9,907 tokens (Škafar, 2016, p. 80). The blends from the television category are the least common with only 2,182 tokens, which is similar to what my research will prove. Furthermore, out of 10 most frequent blends, 5 belong to the technology category (Škafar, 2016, p. 81). She also proved their second hypothesis, which was that the magazine domain has the highest frequency of blends. She found that 25 out of 50 blends are most commonly used in the magazine domain. Next domain concerning the frequency of blends was the newspapers domain, with 9 blends being the most common. This also supports my research, as the news domain was also in the second place when I was comparing domains. Fiction domain holds the third place with 7 blends being prevalent in it. In the spoken domain, there were 6 prevalent blends. Academic domain is in the last place with only 3 most common blends and all of them are from the science category (*positron*, *qubit*, *redox*) (Škafar, 2016, p. 83).

Another corpus-based study of English blends was written by Mattiello (2016). She researched newly coined blends in English and their frequency. In order to obtain data for her study, she used both COCA and *Oxford English Dictionary*. She chose 245 blends from their sources, of which 209 are nouns, 32 are adjectives and 4 of them are verbs. She excluded some of the nouns because they were names of firms or corporations. The blends that were used were coined in the span of 60 years. They claim that some blends correspond to the existing ones, such as *Clintonomics* and *Obamanomics*, which means that the splinter - *(o)nomics*, merged with name or surname of one of the presidents, will carry the similar meaning (Mattiello, 2016, p. 25). However, she claims that some blends are coined for specific dialogues or occasions (Mattiello, 2016, p. 6), which is probably why the blends from the television domain are not that present in other domains. While these witty and humorous blends (usually in the television domain) are short-lived, specialized blends (economics, pharmacy, medicine, technology domain) are more stable, which makes them more frequent. She also proved that the right side of the specialized blend carries more meaning. Sometimes when the blend is used more frequently, or when its splinter is often a part of coining new blends, it may be seen as a suffix or at least a regular combining form (Mattiello, 2016, p. 23). Her study found that the number of new lexical blends is increasing, especially in specialized domains and that they are important in filling the lexical gap in language (Mattiello, 2019, p. 24).

Glavak researched creativity of English blends and innovative blends, which are blends that are coined and used in specific contexts. He used Sketch Engine corpus in order to filter data. These innovative blends cannot be used out of context. For example, the blend (48) is mentioned 116 times in the whole corpus, but it is only related to Mike Tyson, who coined it. Glavak claims that innovative blends are popular in fictional works (Glavak, 2023, p. 23). For instance, the blend (49) has 439 mentions in the corpus, of which most of them are from

the movie, television or even video games. These odd examples show that even though there are some mentions of these specialized blends in the corpus, we should be careful, as many of them were coined for a unique purpose, context, situation or even dialogue.

(48) *Cablinasian* (Caucasian + black + Indian + Asian)

(49) *San Fransokyo* (San Francisco + Tokyo)

Just like Mattiello proved that a splinter can become a regular combining form in English, Jurado (2018) researched the splinter *-gasm* and its productivity as it is a frequently used splinter in blends. He achieved that by calculating token frequency of these blends. He created his own corpus of blends that have *-gasm* as a splinter. He collected the words by using three different corpora- COCA, *English Web Corpus and Global Web-Based English*. He used 173 different words, of which 6 were obtained from social networks like Twitter. The high number of blends that have *-gasm* as a splinter is the proof that it is a highly productive splinter and that it can be used without *orgasm* being the second source word (Jurado, 2018). However, some blends have the whole second base word and have directly derived from the word *orgasm*. It does not have to happen because of the graphemic or phonetic overlap, but because the author of the blend might want to highlight the fact that the blend came from the word *orgasm*. The splinter may change in some blends and can be found in the form of *-agasm* or *-ogasm*, as shown in examples (50) and (51), which is explained by the need of vocalic support (Jurado, 2018). They also found that 125 chosen blends have a noun as their first base word. Jurado concluded that blends consisting of this splinter can have the meaning of "physical or bodily pleasure" or "feeling of excitement or enthusiasm". Jurado concluded that the splinter *-gasm* is highly productive because it appears in words that have minimal frequency, which means that the blends with that splinter are often formed by speakers. He also found that in some cases the splinter maintains the whole meaning, while in others its meaning slightly changes.

(50) *exploragasm* (exploration + -agasm)

(51) *luxogasm* (luxury + -ogasm)

Another paper that studied blends was written by Kjellander and it observed quantity and quality of blends collected from the US web news published on the Internet from January 2010 to March 2018. He collected data from the NOW corpus and he used 2000 blends all in forms of common nouns, but he limited that number to 78 because of their irrelevance to the study. His research found that 72% of those blends are formed by only one of the base words being shortened, of which it was mostly the second base word that was truncated. In more than 50% of blends, the first base word stayed complete. Concerning the frequency of blends in this research, he found that web news is one of the most prolific domains for forming new blends and that this is one of the domains, in which blends are more frequent. This conclusion also supports my finding that news domain is filled with blends. However, he states that there are not many previous research and that it should be more thoroughly explored.

Furthermore, Cannon conducted a research in which he used 132 blends, of which 118 were nouns, 11 were adjectives and 3 were verbs. He states that he used mostly nouns because they have become more dominant (Cannon, 1986, p. 740). Most of the blends he used were coined from two splinters. He used blends collected from other papers. His chosen blends derive from different domains- sport, travelling and entertainment (17%), science and technology (32%), home (6%) and the rest of them come from domains such as substances, objects and physics. All his blends come from two source words and he claims that blends deriving from three source words are not viable today (Cannon, 1986, p. 754). His corpus contains only blends from American and British English and only 25% of American blends were slang, which means that only 5% of their whole corpus were slang blends. He states that blends are especially suitable for trademarks, especially in English (Cannon, 1986, p. 745). However, his research showed that 53% of chosen blends are more used in science and

technology than in any other domain they researched. This was also mentioned earlier in this chapter and explained by Mattiolo, who claims that blends from specialized domains, which science and technology are a part of, are more frequent than the blends from more general domains because they are needed to fill the lexical gap. Cannon (1986, p. 746) also noticed that blends are common in marketing because companies name their products in forms of blends. Although he agrees that blending is a creative process and that the number of oral and written blends is huge, he states that blending is probably not going to become one of the processes that greatly enriches the English language, as opposed to compounding and affixing, because only a small number of blends survived the time span of 60 years (Cannon, 1986, p. 750).

Although Cannon stated that blends are not very viable, Plag and Arndt-Lappe conducted a research, in which they asked 29 native speakers (from Ireland) to make a blend of two words that were given to them. The research had both oral and written part. The participants were asked to write the blend and pronounce it. After eliminating the unnecessary data, they obtained 1357 word formations that were made from 107 pairs. The total number of blends was 1269, out of which they made their own corpus. They studied both the structure and the stress of newly coined blends. In 16,5% of blends there was a medial overlap. They came to conclusion that the participants managed to coin new blends like they would be coined in a more natural setting (Plag, Arndt-Lappe, 2013, p. 548). Concerning stress, the study showed that most participants put stress on the second base word. They concluded that the length of the blend mostly conforms to the longer base word and that there is a preference that blend should have no more than three syllables (Plag, Arndt-Lappe, 2013, p. 558). The blends they obtained during the research were very similar to existing blends in terms of structure. This supports the idea that research on blends is legit and that it gives valid data (Plag, Arndt-Lappe, 2013, p. 548).

Another corpus study that includes blends was conducted by Gandin. She researched the use of loan words in the tourism domain, which also included blend words. She used the BBC-travel corpus, which was created by merging 572 travel articles from the BBC's website. Her research also focused only on nouns. She manually checked the words and excluded names and toponyms. She incorporated many categories within the tourism domain, such as: food and drinks, religion, culture, festivals and local events, arts, music, literature, etc. Blends did not have a high percentage in this corpus, which was 5,09%. They made 4,40% in the foods and drink category, 1,87% in places category, 10,53% in people category, 3,70% in objects category, 4,76% in customs and traditions, 14,29% in arts, music and literature category, 7,14% in greetings and idiomatic expressions category, 23,08% in plants category, 7,69% in architecture and 0% in religion, animals, festivals and colours category. Gandin states that the blends that appeared in the texts and the corpus were used to attract the attention of readers (Gandin, 2014, p. 9). She also researched in which areas these different types of words were the most present. For this paper, I will only mention blends. They were mostly used in articles concerning Australia and Oceania and the least in Central and South America. She explains this as logical because that is the only continent where English is the only language (Gandin, 2014, p. 13). Overall, blends had the lowest frequency percentage in the corpus out of all of the other word forms.

Other than research in English, there has also been a study conducted on blends in Romanian. Niculescu-Gorpin and Vasileanu offered a corpus-based study on Romanian blends. In their research, they made their own corpus and used 324 blends mostly from journals, magazines, blogs and forums. 100 of these blends are international words and 224 are formations in Romanian. 137 of the blends chosen as a sample are accepted and widely used by Romanian speakers and 187 of them were coined for specific occasions, therefore, they are not commonly used. They found that Romanian does accept and produce new blends,

which are not of international origin. Most native Romanian blends were coined in journals or magazines, therefore, it seems that in Romanian language, blends are mostly made to attract someone's attention or evoke interest. They also concluded that Romanians prefer more obvious blends that are simple, but one third of these blends structurally corresponds to English blends (Vasileanu, Niculescu-Gorpin, 2018, p. 374). Also, they found that some Romanian blends usually have a hybrid meaning, which is the effect of English blends, and that differentiates them from the original Romanian blends, whose meaning is usually the synonym for the original meaning. Since more blends from their corpus are originally Romanian, they concluded that blending is becoming more and more common word formation process in contemporary Romanian (Vasileanu, Niculescu-Gorpin, 2018, p. 374).

4. English Blends in the Television Domain

Using the corpus COCA (Corpus of Contemporary English Language), which is an online corpus consisting of 1.1 billion words, I researched the use of English blends in the television domain, their general frequency and their frequency in specific genres. Currently, this corpus provides research in more than 100 languages and was last updated in 2021. By using this corpus, we can search for certain words, phrases, collocations, etc.

Research questions

This paper and research are based on these questions.

1. Research question: Is the frequency of blends high in the television domain?
2. Research question: Are English blends in the television domain more frequent in specific genres?
3. Research question: Does the comedy genre contain more English blends than the action genre?

4.1. Research sample

Blends for this research were obtained from multiple online sources, including Wikipedia and movies and series I have watched myself. I used blends only in the forms of nouns. All blends are a part of either the film or series category. Before I chose blends for this research, I checked whether they were a part of the corpus I used. The sample consists of 49 different blends. The blends I will be using are: sitcom (situation + comedy), romcom (romantic + comedy), muppet (marionette + puppet), telethon (telephone + marathon), Brangelina (Brad + Angelina), Bollywood (Bombay + Hollywood), bromance (brother + romance), Californication (California + fornication), Draculaura (Dracula + Laura), faction (fact + fiction), infotainment (information + entertainment), rockabilly (rock + hillbilly), showmance (show + romance), tragicomedy (tragic + comedy), Zootopia (zoo + utopia), melodrama (melody + drama), psychodrama (psychological + drama), cineplex (cinema +

complex), newscast (news + broadcast), blog (web + log), wintertainment (winter + entertainment), greenatopia (green + utopia), docudrama (documentary + drama), horrorthon (horror + marathon), biopic (biographical + picture), botox (botulinum + toxin), cyborg (cyber + organism), glamping (glamorous + camping), moped (motor + pedal), motel (motor + hotel), freeware (free + software), malware (malicious + software), podcast (ipod + broadcast), screenshot (screen + snapshot), camcorder (camera + recorder), spork (spoon + fork), chocoholic (chocolate + alcoholic), brunch (breakfast + lunch), cheeseburger (cheese + hamburger), modem (modulator + demulator), staycation (stay + vacation), taxicab (taxi + cabriolet), motorcycle (motorized + bicycle), travelogue (travel + monologue), liger (lion + tiger), labradoodle (Labrador retriever + poodle), burkini (burka + bikini), metrosexual (metropolitan + heterosexual) and jeggings (jeans + leggings).

4.2. Methodology

In order to confirm or deny these hypotheses, I used COCA while analyzing the frequency of every chosen blend in each one of the 5 genres I chose. This way, I was able to compare in which genre are blends more frequent and in which genres are they almost non-existent. The genres I chose are comedy, fantasy, action, horror and drama.

For example, the blend "sitcom" is more frequent in comedies, fantasies, documentaries and thrillers:

SECTION	M:Act	M:Adlt	M:Adv	M:Anim	M:Bio	M:Com	M:Crim	M:Doc	M:Dram	M:Fam	M:Fant	M:Hor	M:Mus	M:Myst	M:Rom	M:SF	M:Shrt	M:Thrl
FREQ	3	0	0	1	3	56	2	20	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
WORDS (M)	9.2	0.2	2.4	2.3	2.3	18.4	3.8	6.9	11.6	0.3	0.4	3.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4
PER MIL	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.44	1.29	3.04	0.52	2.90	0.34	0.00	2.48	0.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.56
CLICK FOR CONTEXT																		

Source: COCA

This table also showed us that this specific blend is more prevalent in the comedic genre than in the action genre, which proves my second hypothesis.

I obtained all the data for 49 chosen blends and put them in the tables below to show the results.

4.3. Analysis

In this chapter, the data collected from COCA will be analyzed. I will analyze observed and normalized frequency of the sample blends in chosen genres. In the end of this chapter we will be able to see which one of these genres has the highest frequency of blends.

Table 1. Frequency of the blend *sitcom* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency(per mil)
Comedy	sitcom	56	3,04
Fantasy	sitcom	1	2,48
Action	sitcom	3	0,33
Horror	sitcom	1	0,31
Drama	sitcom	4	0,34

As we can see in the Table 1, the blend "sitcom" mostly appears in comedies and is not common in genres like action and horror. According to COCA, it appears mostly in the movie *Pauly Shore is Dead* from 2003.

Table 2. Frequency of the blend *romcom* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	romcom	5	0,27
Fantasy	romcom	0	0,00
Action	romcom	1	0,11
Horror	romcom	0	0,00
Drama	romcom	1	0,09

Another blend that is mostly heard in comedies is "romcom", which is logical because the blend itself means romantic comedy. However, according to COCA, it appears 33 times generally in the whole movie-based corpus.

Table 3. Frequency of the blend *muppet* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	muppet	16	0,87
Fantasy	muppet	0	0,00
Action	muppet	1	0,11
Horror	muppet	0	0,00
Drama	muppet	4	0,34

Again, another blend that is usually found in comedies, according to Table 3. However, it is mentioned 253 times in the whole corpus, mostly because of *The Muppet Show* cartoon, which is not on the list of the studied genres.

Table 4. Frequency of the blend *telethon* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	telethon	17	0,92
Fantasy	telethon	0	0,00
Action	telethon	5	0,54
Horror	telethon	0	0,00
Drama	telethon	1	0,09

Table 4 shows that, although this blend is most common in the comedy genre between these five genres, it is actually the most frequent in the adventure genre. It is mentioned 578 times in the corpus, mostly in the movie *Tenure* and in the sitcom *Parks and Recreation*.

Table 5. Frequency of the blend *Brangelina* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	Brangelina	2	0,11
Fantasy	Brangelina	0	0,00
Action	Brangelina	2	0,22
Horror	Brangelina	1	0,31
Drama	Brangelina	0	0,00

The blend is mentioned 155 times in the whole corpus, mostly in the comedy series *The Office*. The Table 5 shows that it is equally present in comedies and actions.

Table 6. Frequency of the blend *Bollywod* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	Bollywood	22	1,20
Fantasy	Bollywood	0	0,00
Action	Bollywood	0	0,00
Horror	Bollywood	0	0,00
Drama	Bollywood	18	0,00

The blend "Bollywood" appears mostly in dramas and comedies. The main drama it appears in, according to the COCA corpus, is *The O.C.* In the whole corpus it appears 50 times. Out of all existing genres, it is mostly used in the adult genre.

Table 7. Frequency of the blend *bromance* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	bromance	2	0,11
Fantasy	bromance	0	0,00
Action	bromance	0	0,00
Horror	bromance	1	0,31
Drama	bromance	1	0,09

Although not that frequently, this blend appears in comedies as well as in horrors and dramas, according to Table 7. It is mentioned 50 times throughout the whole corpus and it most frequently appears in the *Hungover Games* and *Awkward*.

Table 8. Frequency of the blend *Californication* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	Californication	17	0,85
Fantasy	Californication	0	0,00
Action	Californication	0	0,00
Horror	Californication	0	0,00
Drama	Californication	0	0,00

It is obvious from Table 8 that this blend will appear only in the comedy genre as it is the literal name of the comedy show *Californication*. Also, it is fairly mentioned in a movie called *Just Go With It*. It appears 162 in the whole corpus.

Table 9. Frequency of the blend *Draculaura* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	Draculaura	0	0,00
Fantasy	Draculaura	0	0,00
Action	Draculaura	0	0,00
Horror	Draculaura	0	0,00
Drama	Draculaura	0	0,00

Although this blend is not found in any of these genres, it is highly frequent in animated movies, as the blend itself is the name of one of the characters from an animated movie called *Monster High*. This is also why it has 156 mentions in the whole corpus.

Table 10. Frequency of the blend *faction* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	faction	5	0,27
Fantasy	faction	2	4,97
Action	faction	35	3,80
Horror	faction	1	0,31
Drama	faction	11	0,95

This blend is very frequent as it is mentioned 1759 times in the whole corpus. It mostly appears in *Hamlet*, *Doctor Who*, *Dog Day Afternoon* and *Galactica 1980*. This is the first case in this research where a blend is more frequent in the action genre than in any other. Also, comedy is in the third place concerning frequency, right behind drama, which is very different from what we have previously seen.

Table 11. Frequency of the blend *infotainment* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	infotainment	0	0,00
Fantasy	infotainment	0	0,00
Action	infotainment	0	0,00
Horror	infotainment	0	0,00
Drama	infotainment	0	0,00

"Infotainment" is very unlikely to be found in the above-mentioned genres, however it makes some appearance in the animation genre. It has 22 mentions in the whole corpus, making an appearance in the comedy-drama series *Boston Legal*, however, it is not enough for it to get tokens.

Table 12. Frequency of the blend *rockabilly* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	rockabilly	4	0,22
Fantasy	rockabilly	0	0,00
Action	rockabilly	0	0,00
Horror	rockabilly	1	0,31
Drama	rockabilly	1	0,09

Although this blend has 91 mentions in the whole corpus, it mostly appears as a part of a musical genre in the movie *The History of Rock-n-Roll, vol.4*. It also appears a few times in the drama series *Knight Rider*, *The Mentalist* and in an Australian sitcom *Kath&Kim*.

Table 13. Frequency of the blend *showmance* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	showmance	0	0,00
Fantasy	showmance	0	0,00
Action	showmance	0	0,00
Horror	showmance	0	0,00
Drama	showmance	0	0,00

Table 13 shows that this blend has a very low frequency in any of these genres. It is mentioned 19 times in the whole corpus and it mostly belongs to the reality show *Big Brother*.

Table 14. Frequency of the blend *tragicomedy* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	tragicomedy	0	0,00
Fantasy	tragicomedy	0	0,00
Action	tragicomedy	0	0,00
Horror	tragicomedy	0	0,00
Drama	tragicomedy	1	0,09

This example is very specific because it shows that this blend appears more in dramas than in comedies, although the base words of the blend are drama and comedy combined. It appears only 6 times in the whole corpus and is mostly used in the drama movie *Will Brave New World*.

Table 15. Frequency of the blend *Zootopia* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	Zootopia	3	0,16
Fantasy	Zootopia	0	0,00
Action	Zootopia	0	0,00
Horror	Zootopia	0	0,00
Drama	Zootopia	0	0,00

Although this blend is mentioned 206 times in the whole corpus, it mostly appears in an animated movie *Zootopia*, which is not one of our aimed genre groups.

Table 16. Frequency of the blend *melodrama* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	melodrama	15	0,82
Fantasy	melodrama	0	0,00
Action	melodrama	2	0,22
Horror	melodrama	1	0,31
Drama	melodrama	19	1,64

This blend is mostly used in the drama genre, according to Table 16, which is logical taking into consideration its splinter is literally the name of the genre. Also, it is most commonly used in the drama TV series *The King of Drama*.

Table 17. Frequency of the blend *psychodrama* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	psychodrama	2	0,11
Fantasy	psychodrama	0	0,00
Action	psychodrama	3	0,33
Horror	psychodrama	0	0,00
Drama	psychodrama	1	0,09

The results from the Table 17 show that this blend is mostly used in action genre, which is expected because it holds *psycho-* as a part of the newly coined blend. There are a lot of mentions of this blend in *D.O.A.*, *Law and Order*, *Taled from the Cript* and *Century of Cinema*.

Table 18. Frequency of the blend *cineplex* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	cineplex	4	0,22
Fantasy	cineplex	0	0,00
Action	cineplex	1	0,11
Horror	cineplex	0	0,00
Drama	cineplex	0	0,00

The corpus shows that *cineplex* appears in the comedy TV series *Critical Condition* and in the comedy movie *Neighbors*.

Table 19. Frequency of the blend *newscast* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	newscast	6	0,33
Fantasy	newscast	0	0,00
Action	newscast	2	0,22
Horror	newscast	0	0,00
Drama	newscast	3	0,26

According to COCA, this blend has higher frequency in other domains, but lower in the television domain. However, it does appear often in the drama movies *Ace in the Hole*, *The Harder They Fall* and in *Destination Tokyo*. Table 19 shows that it does appear in comedies.

Table 20. Frequency of the blend *blog* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	blog	128	6,96
Fantasy	blog	0	0,00
Action	blog	9	0,98
Horror	blog	7	2,15
Drama	blog	27	2,33

One of the most frequent blends we have presented so far is common in every of these five genres except in fantasy, as shown in Table 20. However, it is frequent in *Doctor Who*, *Poirot, 1984*, *The Dead Zone* and *Beverly Hills, 90210*.

Table 21. Frequency of the blend *wintertainment* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	wintertainment	2	0,11
Fantasy	wintertainment	0	0,00
Action	wintertainment	0	0,00
Horror	wintertainment	0	0,00
Drama	wintertainment	0	0,00

As we can see from the Table 21 the blend *wintertainment* has a low frequency in every genre. Although it does show up in the comedy genre, it is not specific for any TV shows or films.

Table 22. Frequency of the blend *greenatopia* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	greenatopia	0	0,00
Fantasy	greenatopia	0	0,00
Action	greenatopia	0	0,00
Horror	greenatopia	0	0,00
Drama	greenatopia	27	2,08

This blend is most commonly used in drama series, as seen in Table 22, more specifically in *Brothers and Sisters*.

Table 23. Frequency of the blend *docudrama* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	docudrama	2	0,11
Fantasy	docudrama	0	0,00
Action	docudrama	0	0,00
Horror	docudrama	0	0,00
Drama	docudrama	1	0,09

This word is most commonly used in documentaries, but as they are not an object of research in this seminar, it is most common in the comedy genre between these five. This may be surprising as it has a splinter *-drama*. It appears in *Havoc, To Die For* and *Los Angeles Plays Itself*.

Table 24. Frequency of the blend *horrorthon* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	horrorthon	8	0,43
Fantasy	horrorthon	0	0,00
Action	horrorthon	0	0,00
Horror	horrorthon	0	0,00
Drama	horrorthon	0	0,00

This blend has an oddly specific high usage in the comedy genre and not in the horror genre, taking into consideration its meaning consists of the word horror.

Table 25. Frequency of the blend *biopic* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	biopic	1	0,05
Fantasy	biopic	0	0,00
Action	biopic	0	0,00
Horror	biopic	1	0,31
Drama	biopic	0	0,00

Biopic appears mostly in comedies and horrors, as it is shown in Table 25, which may be surprising. One of the comedies it appears in is the movies *Walk Hard: The Dewey Cox Story* and *Private Valentine: Blonde and Dangerous*.

Table 26. Frequency of the blend *botox* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	botox	33	1,79
Fantasy	botox	0	0,00
Action	botox	1	0,11
Horror	botox	1	0,31
Drama	botox	2	0,17

According to Coca and Table 26, the blend *botox* mostly appears in comedies and dramas and the biggest number of this blend appear in *Sex and the City*, *Everwood* and *Gilmore Girls*.

Table 27. Frequency of the blend *cyborg* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	cyborg	5	0,27
Fantasy	cyborg	0	0,00
Action	cyborg	85	9,23
Horror	cyborg	1	0,31
Drama	cyborg	2	0,17

As we can see from the collected data, *cyborg* appears mostly in the action genre. It has by far the most mentions in anime series *Cyborg 009: Call for Justice* and in *The Orion Loop*.

Table 28. Frequency of the blend *glamping* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	glamping	1	0,05
Fantasy	glamping	0	0,00
Action	glamping	0	0,00
Horror	glamping	1	0,31
Drama	glamping	0	0,00

Glamping is a relatively new blend so it does not have many mentions in the television domain, but it is somewhat used in sitcoms such as *American Dad!*.

Table 29. Frequency of the blend *moped* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	moped	11	0,60
Fantasy	moped	0	0,00
Action	moped	5	0,54
Horror	moped	0	0,00
Drama	moped	2	0,17

This blend has the biggest frequency in comedies, according to Table 29. However, we cannot put it in only a few comedies in which it is used. However, it is commonly used in the television series *Degrassi: The Next Generation*.

Table 30. Frequency of the blend *motel* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	motel	308	16,74
Fantasy	motel	8	19,87
Action	motel	99	10,75
Horror	motel	95	29,21
Drama	motel	247	21,30

This blend is so common in the television domain because it has become so frequent in the English language that many people would not consider it as a blend. It is common in every genre, but the highest usage is still in the comedy and drama genre, as can be seen in Table 30.

Table 31. Frequency of the blend *freeware* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	freeware	0	0,00
Fantasy	freeware	0	0,00
Action	freeware	0	0,00
Horror	freeware	0	0,00
Drama	freeware	1	0,08

As a blend from the technology domain, it does not have big frequency in the television domain. However, it does appear in some drama series such as *The X-Files* and *Sanctuary*.

Table 32. Frequency of the blend *malware* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	malware	0	0,00
Fantasy	malware	0	0,00
Action	malware	4	0,43
Horror	malware	0	0,00
Drama	malware	1	0,08

Again, a technology blend that is frequent in the action genre. It appears mostly in the movie *Terminator: Sarah Connor Chronicles* and in *Through the Wormhole*.

Table 33. Frequency of the blend *podcast* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	podcast	49	2,66
Fantasy	podcast	0	0,00
Action	podcast	2	0,22
Horror	podcast	5	1,54
Drama	podcast	9	0,78

As a relatively newly coined blend, *podcast* has a surprisingly high frequency in television. It appears in all genres excluding fantasy, but the comedy genre still has the highest frequency of its usage. It appears in *One Three Hill*, *NUMB3RS*, *Dexter* and *Psych*.

Table 34. Frequency of the blend *screenshot* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	screenshot	1	0,05
Fantasy	screenshot	0	0,00
Action	screenshot	0	0,00
Horror	screenshot	0	0,00
Drama	screenshot	0	0,00

Although this blend is frequently used in conversation and on the Internet, it has surprisingly low frequency in all of the five genres, as shown in Table 34. Again, the comedy genre still has the highest frequency.

Table 35. Frequency of the blend *camcorder* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	camcorder	13	0,71
Fantasy	camcorder	0	0,00
Action	camcorder	3	0,33
Horror	camcorder	1	0,31
Drama	camcorder	8	0,69

According to Table 35, this blend is frequent in comedies, dramas and actions and can be found in series like *The Simpsons*, *The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air* and in *Only Fools and Horses*.

Table 36. Frequency of the blend *spork* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	spork	1	0,05
Fantasy	spork	0	0,00
Action	spork	2	0,22
Horror	spork	0	0,00
Drama	spork	3	0,26

According to COCA and Table 36, this blend has the highest usage in dramas, which may be surprising. It is mentioned in *The Darwin Awards*, *Alias* and *April Fool's Day*.

Table 37. Frequency of the blend *cheeseburger* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	chocoholic	2	0,11
Fantasy	chocoholic	0	0,00
Action	chocoholic	0	0,00
Horror	chocoholic	0	0,00
Drama	chocoholic	0	0,00

Chocoholic has a relatively low frequency in all of the five genres, even in comedies, which have the highest frequency of the mentioned blend.

Table 38. Frequency of the blend *brunch* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	brunch	121	6,58
Fantasy	brunch	0	0,00
Action	brunch	17	1,85
Horror	brunch	2	0,62
Drama	brunch	31	2,67

As *brunch* is one of the most common blends and is one of the first blends that come to mind, it is not unusual that it has a really high usage in all of the genres, except in the fantasy genre. This can be seen in Table 38. It appears in *The Bank Dick*, *Dark Passage*, *The Dolly Sisters* and in many more television shows and movies.

Table 39. Frequency of the blend *workaholic* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	workaholic	22	1,20
Fantasy	workaholic	0	0,00
Action	workaholic	2	0,22
Horror	workaholic	1	0,31
Drama	workaholic	6	0,52

Workaholic is a moderately common blend in the television domain, but we cannot pinpoint on any specific movies or shows, where it appears the most. Table 39 shows that it is most common in comedies.

Table 40. Frequency of the blend *cheeseburger* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	cheeseburger	82	4,46
Fantasy	cheeseburger	0	0,00
Action	cheeseburger	23	2,50
Horror	cheeseburger	11	3,38
Drama	cheeseburger	29	2,50

One of the most common blends in this research, it is not surprising it has a wide usage in all of the chosen genres, except in the fantasy genre. This blend is also so common that many might even not consider it to be a blend.

Table 41. Frequency of the blend *staycation* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	staycation	2	0,11
Fantasy	staycation	0	0,00
Action	staycation	0	0,00
Horror	staycation	0	0,00
Drama	staycation	0	0,00

As we can see in Table 41, *staycation* is not a really common blend in any of these genres. It appears mostly in comedies such as *Awkward* and *Growing Up Fisher*.

Table 42. Frequency of the blend *taxicab* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	taxicab	10	0,54
Fantasy	taxicab	0	0,00
Action	taxicab	6	0,65
Horror	taxicab	0	0,00
Drama	taxicab	5	0,43

Taxicab has a surprisingly high frequency in three genres- comedy, action and drama. It appears in *Born Reckless*, *Murder at the Vanities*, *Manhattan Melodrama*...

Table 43. Frequency of the blend *motorcycle* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	motorcycle	126	6,85
Fantasy	motorcycle	2	4,97
Action	motorcycle	64	6,95
Horror	motorcycle	14	4,31
Drama	motorcycle	36	3,10

Again, a highly common blend in the English language in general that is present in all of the chosen genres, which is rare. The comedy genre still has the highest frequency of usage, but the frequency in the other genres is not low, as presented in Table 43.

Table 44. Frequency of the blend *travelogue* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	travelogue	3	0,16
Fantasy	travelogue	0	0,00
Action	travelogue	0	0,00
Horror	travelogue	0	0,00
Drama	travelogue	0	0,00

This blend is not a common one according to Table 44 and it only appears in comedies, such as *Easy To Love*.

Table 45. Frequency of the blend *liger* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	liger	2	0,11
Fantasy	liger	0	0,00
Action	liger	0	0,00
Horror	liger	0	0,00
Drama	liger	0	0,00

It is not surprising that this blend has a low frequency as it is not very well known nor common. If it appears, it happens in comedies, such as *Napoleon Dynamite* and in *Big Time Rush*.

Table 46. Frequency of the blend *labradoodle* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	labradoodle	5	0,27
Fantasy	labradoodle	0	0,00
Action	labradoodle	0	0,00
Horror	labradoodle	0	0,00
Drama	labradoodle	0	0,00

As the Table 46 shows, a relatively new blend specifying the dog breed appears only in comedies and sitcoms, such as *Scrubs* and *Entourage*.

Table 47. Frequency of the blend *burkini* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	burkini	1	0,05
Fantasy	burkini	0	0,00
Action	burkini	0	0,00
Horror	burkini	0	0,00
Drama	burkini	0	0,00

A blend used mostly in the fashion domain is not common in any of these genres and only appears in comedies. It is mentioned a few times in the series *Sex and the City*.

Table 48. Frequency of the blend *metrosexual* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	metrosexual	7	0,38
Fantasy	metrosexual	0	0,00
Action	metrosexual	1	0,11
Horror	metrosexual	0	0,00
Drama	metrosexual	0	0,00

Although a widely known term, it mostly appears only in comedies and, surprisingly, in the action genre. It appears in comedy series such as *Gilmore Girls*, *Rescue Me*, *Queer as Folk* and *South Park*.

Table 49. Frequency of the blend *jeggings* across different genres

Genre	Blend	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	<i>jeggings</i>	2	0,11
Fantasy	<i>jeggings</i>	0	0,00
Action	<i>jeggings</i>	0	0,00
Horror	<i>jeggings</i>	0	0,00
Drama	<i>jeggings</i>	0	0,00

A not very well known fashion term that has very low frequency in any of the five genres, but it does appear in comedies, according to data presented in Table 49. The number of mentions is so low that we cannot pinpoint to any specific movies or series.


4.4. Discussion

As we can see in Table 50, I have added observed and normalized frequency of all sample blends and put the results in the table. This provides a better view of total frequency of blends in each genre. This way, we can see which genres have the highest frequency of blends.

Table 50. Summed frequency of chosen blends in each genre

Genre	Observed frequency	Normalized frequency (per mil)
Comedy	1174	60,74
Fantasy	13	32,29
Action	378	40,57
Horror	146	45,47
Drama	502	41,49

The results of this research are also shown in the diagram below:



These 49 sample blends from the cinematic domain are most common in the comedy genre. The difference between the amount of blends in comedies and fantasy is tremendous. As we can see from the chart above, the comedy genre is by far the most lucrative field for blends, it is followed by the drama genre, which has only a few points more than the action genre. It can be that drama is placed relatively high because romantic comedies can also be considered as drama movies. Also, a lot of series that are put in the drama genre have comic elements. For example, *Californication* is classified as drama series, but while watching it one may notice the wittiness and humour of the main character Hank Moody, his daughter and his wife. The horror genre is poor with blends, but fiction is even below. This may be surprising to some because fiction is opposed to reality, which is why some may think it would be a prolific environment for making up new words and blends. This kind of divergence among genres and the frequency of blends in them answers the second research question. While it is expected that comedy might have the highest amount of blends because of its nature, which is catching someone's attention or being witty with new words, it may come as a surprise that the action genre is so high on the scale.


Concerning the third question, which is that comedies have more blends than the action genre, it has also been proven as correct. Although action is placed third on the chart, the number of blends in action does not come close to the number of blends in comedies. That can be explained by knowing that action is generally a more serious genre than comedy.

After I researched the frequency of these chosen blends within the television domain, which includes films and series, and after I compared them between five chosen genres, I also compared the frequency of the same blends within three different domains- blog, television and news. The results of this research are shown in the table below. The first number in the table is observed frequency and the second one is normalized frequency(per mil). These results and data are collected from the whole COCA.

Table 51. Frequency of blends in other domains

Blend	Blog		Television		News	
sitcom	289	2,25	211	1,65	852	7,00
romcom	13	0,10	2	0,02	4	0,03
muppet	138	1,07	133	1,04	75	0,62
telethon	31	0,24	98	0,77	47	0,39
Brangelina	16	0,12	21	0,16	11	0,09
Bollywood	95	0,74	41	0,32	152	1,25
bromance	19	0,15	17	0,13	14	0,11
Californication	9	0,07	39	0,30	18	0,15
Draculaura	0	0,00	58	0,45	1	0,01
faction	531	4,13	144	1,12	588	4,83
infotainment	42	0,33	6	0,05	60	0,49
rockabilly	46	0,36	27	0,21	114	0,94
showmance	8	0,06	6	0,05	0	0,00
tragicomedy	11	0,09	1	0,01	35	0,29
Zootopia	0	0,00	27	0,21	3	0,02
melodrama	135	1,05	86	0,67	318	2,61
psychodrama	11	0,09	18	0,14	18	0,15
cineplex	10	0,08	19	0,15	44	0,36
newscast	48	0,97	50	0,39	264	2,17
blog	40788	317,14	557	4,35	1691	13,89
wintertainment	1	0,01	2	0,02	0	0,00
greenatopia	0	0,00	27	0,21	0	0,00
docudrama	12	0,09	9	0,07	44	0,36
horrorthon	0	0,00	8	0,06	0	0,00
biopic	110	0,86	10	0,08	163	1,34

The chart below is the graphic overview of the commonness of blends within domains.



As we can conclude from this table and this chart, the blog domain has the most frequent usage of blends. This can be explained by the fact that blends are mostly used in informal speech and blogs are usually written in informal language. However, the blend *blog* was included to get data and to create this chart and it is logical that the domain of the same name as the blend will have the biggest frequency number of the mentioned blend. Furthermore, the news domain is placed in the second place. As it was already explained in this seminar before, one of the main reasons why blends exist is because of catching someone's attention. The news domain is an excellent example of that because, in order to sell newspapers, get more clicks on the Internet or have more views on news broadcasts, journalists and editors need to coin new words, which are usually blends. Lastly, television domain has by far the lowest usage of blends, which answers the first research question. Blends that are used in television, movies and series are usually coined for specific scenes or dialogues, which is why they are mentioned only a few times through the whole corpus. This excludes blends such as *sitcom* and *romcom*, which are used as names of genres.

5. Conclusion

To summarise, the first chapter of the seminar analyzes blending as a term in morphology and explains its features and usages. It also clarifies the controversy between blending and compounding and why blending is seen as an irregular word formation while suffixation and compounding are seen as regular. It also gives an insight into the history of blends and their primary purpose. Furthermore, different types of groups are being explained, depending on formality, context and situation in which they are being used. In the next part of the paper, the formation of blends is thoroughly explained (blends merged by overlapping, clipping, clipping at boundaries of morphemes, etc.). I have also researched semantic types of blends. Furthermore, the stress of the blends was discussed as there is more than one view, depending on the formation of the blend. In the following chapter, I have presented the data on the frequency of blends in the television domain. It is shown which genre has the most blends and which has the least. The most prolific genre for blends is the comedy genre, followed by drama and action, while fantasy is in the last place. I have also researched which domain contains more blends. The results showed that there is the highest number of blends in the blog domain, then in the news domain and the television domain holds the last place concerning the frequency of blends.

6. References

Adams, V. (1988). *An introduction to modern English word-formation*. essay, Longman.

Algeo, J. (1977). *Blends, a structural and systematic view*. *American Speech*, 52 (1/2): 47-64.

Arndt-Lappe, S., & Plag, I. (2013). The role of prosodic structure in the formation of English blends. *English Language and Linguistics*, 17(3), 537–563.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/s1360674313000154>

Balteiro, I. (2013). Blending in English charactoons. *English Studies*, 94(8), 883–907.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0013838x.2013.839139>

Bat-El, O., & Cohen, E.-G. (2012). Stress in English blends: A constraint-based analysis.

Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending, 193–212.

Bauer, L. (2003). *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*. 2nd edn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. Original Edition 1988.

Beliaeva, N. (2019). Blending in morphology. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.511>

Bryant, M. M. (1974). *Blends Are Increasing*. *American Speech*, 49(3/4), 163–184.

Cannon, G. (1986). *Blends in English Word Formation*, 725-753.

Corpora: Coca. English. (n.d.). <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>

Danilović Jeremić, J. (2021). Blend-O-RAMA: Blending in the titles of episodes of Animated television series for children. *Nasledje Kragujevac*, 18(48), 53–69.

<https://doi.org/10.46793/naskg2148.053dj>

- Fandrych, I. (2008). Submorphemic elements in the formation of acronyms, blends and Clippings. *Lexis*, (2). <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.713>
- Gandin, S. (2014). Investigating loan words and expressions in tourism discourse: a corpus driven analysis on the bbctravel corpus. *European Scientific Journal ESJ*, 10(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj>
- Glavak, J. (2023). Analyzing the Creativity of English Blends: a Corpus Study. <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:853845>
- Jurado, A. B. (2018). A study on the ‘wordgasm’: the nature of blends’ splinters. *Lexis*, (14). <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.1249>
- Kemmer, S. (2003). Schemas and lexical blends. *Motivation in Language*, 69–97. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.243.08kem>
- Kjellander, D. (2018). Gold punning: Studying multistable meaning structures using a systematically collected set of lexical blends. *Lexis*, (14). <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.3962>
- Klinar, S., & Davis, M. (1996). *English word-formation: With exercises*. essay, Filozofskafakulteta, Oddelek za germanskejezike in književnosti.
- Lehrer, A. (2007). Blendalicious. *Studies in Functional and Structural Linguistics*, 115–133. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sfsl.58.16leh>
- Ljung, M. (2006). *Making words in English*. essay, Studentlitteratur.
- Mattiolo, E. (2019). A corpus-based analysis of New English blends. *Lexis*, (14).

Mattiolo, E. (2013). *Extra-grammatical morphology in English: Abbreviations, blends, reduplicatives, and related phenomena*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Mohsin, E. A. (2021). *Blending, from English to Arabic*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Niculescu-Gorpin, A.-G., & Vasileanu, M. (2018). Acceptability and diffusion of luxury anglicisms in present-day Romanian. *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 25(1), 364–376.

<https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.18007.nic>

Vasileanu, M., & Niculescu-Gorpin, A.-G. (2022). Romanian lexical blending: From zero to hero. *Proceedings of International Conference of Experimental Linguistics*.

<https://doi.org/10.36505/exling-2022/13/0045/000587>

Rua, P. L. (2004). The categorial continuum of English blends. *English Studies*, 85(1), 63–76.

Plag, I. (2003). *Word-formation in English*. essay, Cambridge University Press.

Sketch engine. Sketch Engine. (n.d.). <https://app.sketchengine.eu/>

Syntactic and semantic issues in word-formation. (1983). *English Word-Formation*, 140–200.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139165846.008>

Škafar, B. (2016). *The Use of Blends in English: A Corpus Analysis*.

Turner, D. (1993). In *Portmanteau dictionary: Blend words in the English language, including trademarks and brand names*. essay, McFarland & Company.

Wikimedia Foundation. (2023, September 25). *List of portmanteaus*. Wikipedia.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_portmanteaus

English Blends in the Television Domain

Abstract

This paper provides a corpus-based research on English blends in the television domain. On a sample of 49 English blends I calculated their observed and normalized frequency in the television domain and compared their frequency between 5 different genres- comedy, fantasy, action, horror and drama. After I got the results in which genre blends are the most common, I compared the frequency of blends between three different domains- television, blog and news. This paper gave an insight which domain is the most prolific in creating and using blends. Also, since the conclusion cannot be made from only one research, I collected a number of other corpus-based research that researched similar variables- frequency or productivity of blends. Some of their data matched the data collected in this research, which might give a better view on the commonness of blends in different domains.

Key words: blending, blends, corpus-based research, frequency of blends, movies, television domain, genres, news domain, blog domain

Stopljenice u engleskom jeziku u televizijskoj domeni

Sažetak

Ovaj rad pruža korpusno istraživanje o stopljenicama u engleskom jeziku unutar televizijske domene. Na uzorku od 49 stopljenica, izračunala sam njihovu izmjerenu i normaliziranu frekvenciju u televizijskoj domeni te usporedila njihovu učestalost između 5 žanrova- komedije, fantastike, akcije, horora i drame. Nakon što sam dobila rezultate u kojem žanru su stopljenice najzastupljenije, usporedila sam učestalost stopljenica između 3 domene- televizijske, blog i vijesti. Ovaj rad pružio je uvid u to koja domena je najplodnija za stvaranje i korištenje stopljenica. Osim toga, s obzirom da jedno istraživanje nije dovoljno kako bi se donijeli konkretniji zaključci, prikupila sam nekoliko drugih korpusnih istraživanja koja su se bavila sličnim varijablama- učestalošću i produktivnošću stopljenica. Neki od podataka su se poklapali s podacima sakupljenim u ovom istraživanju, što može dati bolji uvid o učestalosti stopljenica u različitim domenama.

Ključneriječi: tvorba stopljenica, stopljenice, korpusno istraživanje, učestalost stopljenica, filmovi, televizijska domena, žanrovi, domena vijesti, blog domena