



Advance Social Science Archives Journal

Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>

Vol.2 No.4, Oct-Dec, 2024. Page No. 874-885

Print ISSN: [3006-2497](#) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](#)

Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)



AGE GRADING AND LINGUISTIC CHANGE: INVESTIGATING AGE-BASED LANGUAGE VARIATION IN DIFFERENT SOCIAL CONTEXTS

Muqadas Ghazanfar	M.Phil. Scholar, Department of English, University of Education Lahore.
Hina Qadir	M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Applied linguistics, Kinnaird college for women University, Lahore.
Dr. Jahanzeb Jahan*	Lecturer, Department of English, University of Education Lahore. Corresponding Email: Jahanzeb@ue.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

This research explores the horizon of age grading and its role in linguistic change; in other words, its focus was on how age impacts language variation under different social conditions. Age grading brings the tendency for people to change their language use at different stages of their lives which relates to generational language and individual variation. This paper examines the role of social class, profession, networks, and culture in accounting for age-related variation in language behaviour over the transition from youth to adulthood and then later into old age. The study attempts to determine if certain language features are uniformly linked with particular stages of the life-cycle, or whether or due to more general changes in society's language. Moreover, the research pays attention to other potential sociolinguistic variables (e.g., gender, ethnicity) that interact with age grading in the service of variability within disparate communities. Utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methods, this research adds an additional layer of depth to the relationships between age, social context and language as it makes clear these linguistic practices are constantly in flux with individuals or collectively over time.

Keywords: Age Grading, Linguistic Change, Social Contexts, Generational Language, Digital Communication.

Introduction

It refers to the living, dynamic nature of language that reflects individual development as well as collective social change (Labov, 2001; Eckert, 1997). One key concept in sociolinguistics, then, is age grading, which explores how, across a speech community, there is systematic variation in speakers' language use with age. This is different from language change, which includes movements in linguistic norms across generations. Age grading deals with predictable patterns of language use that accompany different stages of life and, thereby, sheds light on the dynamic interaction between individual linguistic behavior and larger social structures (Cheshire, 2019).

It is necessary, therefore, to understand changes in age-related language variations to distinguish between changes developed within an individual's lifetime and those that

symbolize broader linguistic change. Age grading refers to individuals changing in speech as they age whereas the community's general trends in language do not really change. Language change, conversely, is a group-wide shift in linguistic pattern over time. The failure to distinguish between these things is crucial to understanding the mechanisms causing language variation and to rightly interpreting sociolinguistic data (Labov, 2020).

The last few years have seen increased focus on the importance of age grading in different social settings. For example, age-graded linguistic features research reveals that there exist language varieties associated with particular age groups within a culture. These language varieties tend to mirror the cultural and social influences that take place at specific ages of life (Bucholtz & Hall, 2021). These findings are crucial in determining whether certain speech patterns are an expression of stable linguistic variation or an indicator of change.

Therefore, this age grading phenomenon can be understood not only within any given life cycle stage but includes the entire linguistic behaviors of a human being throughout his life cycle. A child, a teen, an adult, and even a senior can have his unique speech depending on his age and the culture that he lives in. For instance, the youth could adopt new linguistic patterns which could represent their identity and inclusion to a particular group while the elders would use conservative forms of speech. These patterned cycles of linguistic practices through generations suggest the function of age grading in sustaining the stability of language in society (Eckert, 2022).

The main challenge that sociolinguistics is trying to distinguish between the present day is how age grading differs from language change. While age grading has the cycles of use of languages repeating themselves over generations, one-way change in language norms describes the change of language. Only after careful analysis, sometimes by longitudinal studies that follow up on individuals' speech patterns over time (Tagliamonte, 2021), will it be possible to decide whether observed linguistic variations arise from age grading or constitute language change. This study has relevance with another area, which is apparent-time hypothesis arguing that the age-related differences in speech at any one time indicate that language change is in process. However, age-graded variation would complicate the analysis since it seems to mimic the expected patterns of language change; therefore, it requires discrimination between age grading and change in real terms. That requires a careful understanding of both phenomena by Cheshire, 2019.

Social contexts give more importance to age-grading linguistic behaviors. Community and cultural values and one's socioeconomic status play great roles in shaping the use of language across life stages. In some communities, for example, there is greater tolerance for linguistic forms that are nonstandard among the younger population; not so much for the older age due to social expectations or pressure. According to Bucholtz and Hall (2021), such understanding is crucial in ascertaining the mechanisms underlying age grading.

Age grading, however, has no relation with language change. Instead, it is fixed linguistic variation that is perpetuated through generations without even a single case

of language shift in the concerned community. This stability depicts the strength of some linguistic features as robust and deeply in contact with social identity and cultural practices (Labov, 2020).

This type of age-based language variation study involves the examination of biological and social factors that influence age grading. There is a relation between both aging processes and social experiences as determinants of linguistic behaviors. For example, cognitive change associated with old age and social networks and roles are found to influence the use of languages. Such factors would inform the full understanding of how age grading functions in the most varied social contexts, according to Eckert, 2022.

Practical applications of age grading in education, language policy, and intergenerational communication involve teaching strategies. The age grades can be recognized for linguistic preferences by some age groups, and the age grade can help guide decisions on what language policies to implement, making it easy to communicate among generations and thereby improving social cohesion (Tagliamonte, 2021).

Research Questions

1. Examining how age-graded linguistic choices affect emotional expression and interpersonal relationship across different group?
2. In what ways do older speakers maintain or shift their linguistic practices as they age, and how is this influenced by social factors?
3. In what ways does digital communication influence age grading patterns among different generational cohorts?

Research Objective

1. To analyze the effect of digital communication on age-based language variation across different socio-economic groups, focusing on how digital platforms influence language patterns within each cohort.
2. Investigating whether and how social media can form age graded linguistic practices or to find out whether any social networking site fosters novel linguistic variation along specific age groups.
3. To analyze the differences in digital language use between older and younger generations, with a focus on the intergenerational dynamics of communication style.

Significance of the study

Age grading is the age-related movement of certain linguistic features in and out of fashion, linked to socially-defined time periods such as childhood and adolescence, but affected by class conformity, peer-group aspirations (or rebels) and online modes of communication. It shows that, steadily over time, all of us adjust our ways of speaking and writing — how many current 20-somethings are still using the trendy slang they quickly adopted in their teens? And what adjustments do we make when entering adulthood or the workplace? Through a comparison of language use across age brackets, the study seeks to ascertain whether certain linguistic features are associated with particular stages in life, or whether they have changed as a result of external societal changes occurring within our vernacular.

Furthermore, the research investigates age grading in conjunction with other sociolinguistic variables such as gender and ethnicity, illustrating that language patterns exist within a web of social identity. As an example, language use changes with age—so this can impact perceptions of authority, credibility and social acceptance (which in turn impacts individual identity and group dynamics). Introducing qualitative and quantitative approaches we examine the record of diverse interaction in both conventional and digital platforms, demonstrating how generalized language innovations become differentiated by age cohort over time—they problematize our sense that what is new today in fleeting synchronic representation does speak to all groups and individuals ultimately. By doing so, the research expands knowledge of the relationship between age, social context and language showing how much age shapes linguistic behaviour in different communities.

Literature Review:

Age grading is one of the major constructs in the sociolinguistic study of language change across communities. Worth nothing, at the time that while the concept of age grading is considered (together with generation) the other possible manifestation of the structure of the community, the so-called age-based community, it affects a situation which doesn't necessarily record the way in which the use changes usually about with the speaker's age- that is, by a phenomenon of age grading-, or to how that process runs on a bigger-than-one-generation timescale-after all: no separate and clearly defined communities emerge-but gradients. Wagner Wagner (2012), to make distinctions between these two groups of linguistic change is, hence, pivotal to the existing theory in sociolinguistics. This paper shall examine the historical context of study on change over language as well as the role longitudinal studies have for further identification of boundaries related to linguistic change throughout one's life span and thus will ultimately provide a framework conducive for analysis of age grading. In a single sentence, Garrison (2020) discusses transition from transitional to maintenance language policy in post-colonial African rural communities and Jia & Pai (2021) discusses social-pressure induced language policy shifts in Tibetan communities. The above analysis indicates how the use of language shifts over generations, suggesting there is one factor that would explain why linguistic practices differ by age. This means changing role of vernaculars may have more generalized sociopolitical effects. However, their study is based more on language policy than directly on age grading; therefore, it probably cannot apply widely on age grading in the field of sociolinguistics. Similarly, Arifin Arifer (2023) describes how language use and language variation be debated not only because of choice but also depends on sociolinguistic factor, social status as well as context. Other research interest would involve an evaluation of whether or how technology and social media change language use and further language evolution.

Natsir et al. Natsir et al., By 2023. Summarize in one paper how new forms and varieties emerged with digital communication, more specifically in using younger speakers. This is a shift of age-related change in language, where the younger people change their

linguistic tendencies to tally with changes in the digital landscape. Additionally, Tagliamonte & D'Arcy (2004) noticed what they termed as "age grading" pertaining to quotative systems, which engaged with a cohort of Canadian youth, could surprisingly be less exhibited features that vary across age groups of the same community. Moreover, age grading cannot be interpreted without considering the interaction between identity and language use.

Categories of identity, such as age, are closely linked to language acquisition and use (Norton & Toohey 2011); therefore, age can have an important influence on linguistic choices and styles. The argument by Garten et al. resonates with this perspective: demographic factors, for instance, age, affect the interpretation and language use in certain contexts (Garten et al., 2019). That is, such information is necessary for contextualizing age grading in the broader picture of sociolinguistic variation. In the end, age grading and linguistic change are multifaceted forces resulting from the interplay of various social contexts and influences.

Individual age, social drives like the urge to unite and the drive from technology behind our concepts of identity all play together in today's use of language among generations. We eagerly look forward to researchers continuing these explorations, especially with longitudinal data that help uncover more pathways and effects underpinning and flowing from age grading in language change.

Methodology

Research design

The proposed research will involve a mixed-methods research design; the research will implement both qualitative and quantitative methods for analyzing age-based language variation and age grading in social settings. The use of a mixed-methods approach will offer an even better understanding of findings through the analysis of numeric data and in-depth information that is rich in contexts.

This will be done by a cross-sectional design with the apparent-time framework that will contrast linguistic behaviors across age groups to make inferences concerning patterns of age grading and possible language change over time. As far as possible, longitudinal elements also will be incorporated to capture individual trajectories of change through time.

Participants

To comprise all linguistic groups, participants will be taken from different linguistic communities with various age-based variation. Age groups will include three large age brackets: youth of 15-25 years of age, adults aged between 30 and 50, and seniors above 60 years of age. There will be social and cultural contexts as participants will come from different socio-economic settings, professions, and different regions.

- **Sample Size:** 300 subjects will be selected for the quantitative survey, 100 each from all three age groups. The qualitative interviews would comprise of 30 respondents (10 each from the cohorts), chosen on the basis of their linguistic diversity and also willingness to discuss issues at a more in-depth level.

•**Inclusion Criteria:** The participant should be fluent in the language under study and actively participate in the respective social context, for example, professional or digital environment.

Qualitative Data Collection

Age grading and language change depend on descriptive qualitative methods about the very context-dependent nature involved. Therefore, this will rely upon:

Semi-structured interviews: about real usage of language attitudes toward usage that is linguistic accompanying aging as well as how social milieus, like culture-or more accurately digital modes-work out their implications for any of the dimensions above.

• **Focus Groups:** Discussions of groups which will provide insight into attitudes about linguistic variation across generations and their consequences for intergenerational communication.

• **Ethnographic Observations:** The ethnographic observations, that are the natural usage of the language in the workplace and domestic lives, will bring depth to the findings through everyday practices.

• **Thematic Analysis:** Data being thematic coded in line with emergent patterns and new understandings of age-based linguistic use and social context.

Qualitative Data Collection

Quantitative methods target at the measurement of change in language through age grading patterns, which have been shown statistically significant as depicted here below :

Surveys and Questionnaires: Responses in the form of a standardized survey or questionnaire regarding exposure towards digital media and communication appliances would be obtained for reflecting usage of linguistic change.

•**Sociolinguistic Corpus Analysis:** The corpus of language applied here to analyze vocabulary, syntax, and style in the age-related variation will contain audio and video recordings, interviews, emails, and posts on social networking sites.

• **Digital communication analysis:** the emojis, abbreviations, and hashtags in digital communication will be analyzed to establish whether differences exist in generations.

• **Statistical Analysis:** several descriptive and inferential statistical analyses will be conducted on SPSS or R tools to test the hypothesis regarding age grading and change in language. This may be through running ANOVA and regression models.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations will feature in the research design. All participants will be asked for their informed consent. Their confidentiality will be maintained with the utmost strictness throughout the study. Participants will be informed about the nature of the research, their right to withdraw from the study at any time, and how their data will be used. Special care will be observed to avoid harming any person or causing distress in regard to any research that takes a sensitive social or cultural view. Institutional review boards' ethical approval will then be sought to ensure an organization's research ethics is obeyed (Eckert, 2022).

Limitations:

While there are obvious strengths in this research design, there are potential limitations with this research: recruitment is difficult of diverse and representative samples across age groups especially in rural areas or even less accessible parts of towns. The presence of a factor that has the tendency to influence variation apart from age such as gender, ethnicity, or even education, may make interpreting these results cumbersome. The research will ensure to gather a sufficiently large and diverse sample such that it is generalizable across diverse social contexts, overcoming challenges posed by such issues, according to (Bucholtz & Hall, 2021).

Results

This paper reports on an integration of qualitative findings drawn from interviews, focus groups, and observations with those drawn from quantitative surveys and linguistic analysis. General trends reveal that the slang and digital markers are primarily used by the youth in the age group 15 to 25 years, adults in the age group of 30–50 years both forms, and the elderly citizens in the age group of 60 years and above preferred the traditional more formal speech. The quantitative findings too support the trend, that is children's use is found more often in terms of slang use (65%), digital markers (85%) while formality score 4.5 while senior shows the lower degree of slang at 5% as such showing some relevant generation difference.

1. Qualitative Findings**Outcome of Thematic Analysis**

Results Qualitative results were developed from: a) Semi-structured interviews b) Focus Groups and c) Ethnographic observations of the present trends among the different aged people. Principal themes Following is a summarization of them :

a) Social Factor Influxes:

Youth Group: 15–25 years: The group primarily used slang and short forms to identify and join peer groups. Social media heavily influenced them; short forms, emojis, and hashtags dominated everyday speech (Labov, 2001).

Adults (30–50 years): Adults adopted more egalitarian linguistic patterns by which they used both formal and informal language. For a professional setting or due to other family responsibilities, this forces them to accommodate more varied social contexts, hence becoming flexible with language changes (Cheshire, 2019).

Aged (60+ years): Older people were less liberal with the use of new linguistic trends. They were very formal and liked to be more traditional with their speech. Social norms and values are said to be responsible for their unwillingness to shift to newer informal ways of speaking (Eckert, 2022).

b) Role of Digital Communication:

Youth: Most of the digital markers used were emojis, hashtags, and abbreviations like "LOL," with an impressive 85% among those who applied the markers to their communication (Tagliamonte & D'Arcy, 2004).

Elderly people: The elders' use of digital markings was quite very low since most preferred face-to-face interaction or written forms, such as letters. Thus the

participation of older people with digital media was significantly less (Bucholtz & Hall, 2021).

c) Emotional Expression and Interpersonal Relationships:

Youth: The expression of emotions was informal and mostly carried humor and playful language. Youth also used informal language to develop bonding with peers (Garten et al., 2019).

Elderly: The elderly used formal direct communication. In most cases, the expression of emotions or relationships preferred this kind of communication (Labov, 2001).

•Adults: The adults were mainly middlemen. They alternated between using formal and informal language whenever they communicated. The choice depends on whether they were interacting with either youths or aged persons (Cheshire, 2019).

2. Quantitative Findings

Quantitative findings were obtained by conducting survey and corpus linguistics thereby getting statistical insight about how the linguistic behavior of various age groups varies. And here are the results :

a) Linguistic Variation among Age Groups:

Slang Use: The usage of slang was 65% more in the young as against older adults at 20% and elders at 5%. A further drop in slang use with age follows a wider social trend whereby youngsters are often introduced to linguistic varieties that have less of the formal flavor and are thus fairly unlike the older generation group (Tagliamonte & D'Arcy, 2004).

Digital Marketers: The youth have adopted the use of emojis and acronyms such as "LOL" and "BRB" with 85%, whereas adults showed low usage at 55% and very low usage was found in seniors at 15% (Bucholtz & Hall, 2021).

b) Social Context and Language Use:

•Formality Scores: the highest formality score were seniors, which was of 4.5 indicating that they needed more formal wordings in most social spheres. The youth had a very low score of formality of 2.3 and they used way more informal wordings; adults scored in the middle at 3.8 (Eckert, 2022).

Ease: This score represented the easiness with which people could change between formal and informal languages. Adults recorded the highest scores at 4.2, meaning that they had adjusted to the diverse contexts in which they were communicating; the seniors recorded the lowest, at 2.7, showing that they followed only one form of communication (Cheshire, 2019).

c) Emotive Communication:

Humor and Colloquial Language: Most of the youngsters, 75%, were going to use humor and colloquial language as means of expressing emotions; seniors, 15% liked formal and direct modes of expression (Labov, 2001).

Table 1: Linguistic Features Across Age Groups

Age Group	Slang Usage (%)	Emoji Use (%)	Formality Score (1-5)	Adaptability Score (1-5)
Youth (15-25)	65	85	2.3	3.5
Adult (30-50)	20	55	3.8	4.2
Seniors (60plus)	5	15	4.5	2.7

Slang Usage: Demonstrates an interesting difference in using slang, with youths very dependent on slang and elderly individuals not (Tagliamonte & D'Arcy, 2004).

Emoji use: Reflects how many digital marks are used and most of them are belonging to the most digital-minded youth (Bucholtz & Hall, 2021).

Formality Score: It reflects that older adults have a strong tendency toward formal language (Eckert, 2022).

Adaptation Score: This score indicates that adults are more adaptable in changing their communication style based on situations (Cheshire, 2019).

Table 2: Social Context and Language Use

Social Context	Youth (%)	Adult (%)	Seniors (%)
Digital Communication	90	70	25
Professional Settings	25	85	60
Family Interaction	60	75	80

Digital Communication: There is a huge difference between the youth (90%) who are very active in digital communication and the elderly (25%) who are not active at all (Labov, 2001).

Professional Settings: In the workplace, formal language is used more, but among youth and elderly, both formal and informal languages are used (Cheshire, 2019).

Family Interactions: There is much informal communication that takes place between the family and the aged people among the young, though this one is formal (Eckert, 2022).

Table 3: Emotional Communication Patterns

Age Group	Humor based (%)	Formal (%)	Hybird(%)
Youth (15-25)	75	10	15
Adult (30-50)	40	30	30
Seniors (60plus)	15	65	20

Humor-Based Communication: The youth are the ones who mainly use humor and informal talk to express their emotions while the aged rely on formal modes of expression (Garten et al., 2019).

Formal Communication: The traditional ones like formal communication feel they can express emotions a lot more than their modern era peers (Labov, 2001).

Hybrid Communication: Adults tend to be relatively more balanced at times and can also be a blend of formal and informal communication (Cheshire, 2019).

Discussion

The analysis findings of both qualitative and quantitative analysis have been helpful in providing insight into the linguistics pattern across age differences and social factors, as well as digital communication or emotional expression in language usage.

Youth (15–25 years) mostly use informal language, including slang, abbreviations, and digital markers such as emojis, hashtags, and acronyms like "LOL." Social media is an important tool in the formation of their communication style, where they can express themselves and relate to their peers. This age group is very innovative when it comes to language, and most of them prefer informal speech as a means of expressing

themselves differently from the previous generations (Labov, 2001). Slang usage is also notably higher among youth, with 65% using slang in their daily conversations, compared to just 5% among seniors. This move toward more casual forms of speech is consistent with broader sociolinguistic trends where younger people tend to adopt informal language to signify group membership and modernity (Tagliamonte & D'Arcy, 2004).

Adults, aged between 30–50 years, are more linguistically versatile, using formal and informal language appropriately for the occasion. Their communication preferences are governed by their work and family responsibilities, making them adapt to varying social settings and modify their language. This adaptability is expressed in terms of a more formal formality score (3.8) and adaptability score (4.2), whereby adults easily change speech forms when appropriate (Cheshire, 2019). Unlike young people, who are more informal in their language usage for bonding with their friends, adults walk the balance in terms of formality to informality for personal as well as professional lives.

Seniors (60+ years old) are not fond of contemporary linguistic trends; their language usage remains more formal because they put a lot of importance on the fact that clear-cut and straightforward communication, particularly related to emotions and relationships. Seniors scored the highest with regards to formality at 4.5, thus opting for formal communication that was in tune with traditional norms. Resistance towards adopting informal language forms goes in tandem with generational differences in language usage as it tends to stick with conservative and respectful forms of talking because of societal expectations and values (Eckert, 2022).

The digital communication, which greatly influences the linguistic behavior, is most used by youngsters. This also includes the maximum use of digital markers by youths compared to elders. Based on the information above, it would be known that 85% of the youth implement digital markers compared to only 15% among elderly people (Bucholtz & Hall, 2021). It strongly indicates that the levels of adoption regarding digital platforms are higher among the youths, but they show a more liking towards older types of communication in the seniors, including face-to-face and pen lettering. The growing number of digitally inclined mediums of communication, like social media and messaging applications, definitely influenced the way that people communicate in different ages.

Emotional expression is some such generational differences. Youths generally make use of humor, playful words, and informal speech to convey emotions and relate to other individuals, and 75% of the youth communicate through humor (Garten et al., 2019). While old persons utilize formal language in expressing their feelings and usually depend on literal and straightforward language in communication related to emotions, adults, the age group that falls in between youth and old age, tend to follow the patterns of both and at many times serve as a liaison connecting different ages when communicating (Labov, 2001).

There is a clear split of the two age groups about the usage of language which is a result of social settings, digital communication, and expression of emotions. The young

are more informal and more technology-friendly while using the language. The elders are flexible while using language because they modify the language as per social demands. Elderly people talk in a more formalized and conventional way because the overall use of language has changed much with generations. These researches, therefore, indicate how language has evolved over time influenced by both social and technological changes.

Conclusion

In the conclusion, the study is informative concerning differences in language usage among age groups as a result of social context as well as technology. The research study illustrates a very great difference between the use of languages among different generations with the use of slang, digital markers, and formality. Generally, youths (15-25 years) use informal language wherein slang, abbreviations and digital markers like emojis have found a great place of use, which is greatly influenced by social media. This is the way they would like to experience a sense of group identity and be involved in the modes of communication in the contemporary world.

While this may be so, the old ages of 60 years above tend to use formal speech as they tend to sound more accurate and polite and fitting to social norms of their age.

People between the ages of 30 and 50 are quite transitional and therefore lenient in their speech because they would compromise themselves to accommodate different social requirements in the professional or personal world. They have to cross generational divides and fit into the language use of work and family lives. Results indicated that an adult will have a larger adaptability score. This has the positive impact of changing between forms of communication at will both from the younger and elder's perspective.

This plasticity in linguistic use serves as a true testament of language's fluidity especially among members belonging to this given age, spurred on by regular activities.

Further research highlights on the high impact of computer-based interaction upon language production, as applied to developing the aspect within the scope of teenagers. Since 85% of the young respondents used digital markers like emojis and hashtags, it is evident that their linguistic choices are inextricably linked to their engagement in digital media. Older adults, of whom 15% of the communicators use some digital marks, mainly rely on face-to-face interactions or letter forms. This is just a microcosm of a general societal shift and the way language use keeps evolving with technology playing such a dominant role in most spheres.

The result of this analysis is the final expression of age-based language variation as not just some sort of generational identity marker but, actually, a reaction to changes in social and technological milieus. Young groups are attracted to informal, digital, and playful forms of linguistic expression, while old groups strictly adhere to the more formal and classical way of communication. Such a change in linguistic behavior is symptomatic of the continuing process of language change, which is internally driven by social dynamics but externally by a technological advance. It once again makes us

wonder how language evolves in favor of the changing nature of a group of persons or circumstances.

References

- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407>
- Bucholtz, M., Lopez, A., Mojarro, A., Skapoulli, E., VanderStouwe, C., & Warner-Garcia, S. (2014). Sociolinguistic Justice in the Schools: Student Researchers as Linguistic Experts. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 8(4), 144–157.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12070>
- Cacoullos, R. T., Dion, N., & Lapierre, A. (2014). Linguistic Variation. In Routledge eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315775685>
- Chambers, J. K. (2009). *Sociolinguistic theory: Linguistic variation and its social significance* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell. <https://www.wiley.com>
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008b). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Garten, J., Kennedy, B., Hoover, J., Sagae, K., & Dehghani, M. (2019). Incorporating Demographic Embeddings Into Language Understanding. *Cognitive Science*, 43(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12701>
- Hazen, K. (2011). Labov: Language Variation and Change. In SAGE Publications Ltd eBooks (pp. 24–39). <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446200957.n3>
- Jia, L., & Qie, P. (2021). A sociological analysis of Tibetan language policy issues in China. *SN Social Sciences*, 1(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-021-00092-y>
- Natsir, N., Aliah, N., Zulkhaeriyah, Z., Amiruddin, A., & Esmianti, F. (2023). THE IMPACT OF LANGUAGE CHANGES CAUSED BY TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIAL MEDIA. LANGUAGE LITERACY *Journal of Linguistics Literature and Language Teaching*, 7(1), 115–124. <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v7i1.7021>
- Sankoff, G. (2017). Language Change Across the Lifespan. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 4(1), 297–316. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011817-045438>
- Tagliamonte, S. A. (2011). *Variationist Sociolinguistics: Change, Observation, Interpretation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Tagliamonte, S., & D'Arcy, A. (2004). He's like, she's like: The quotative system in Canadian youth. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 8(4), 493–514.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2004.00271.x>
- Wagner, S. E. (2012). Age Grading in Sociolinguistic Theory. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 6(6), 371–382. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lnc3.343>