Language Inquiry & Exploration Review

e-ISSN 3062-7702 (online)

Volume 1, Issue 1 2024
Page 17-22

https://doi.org/10.71435/639186

Exploring Language Variation and Dialectology on the Perspective Sociolinguistic

Aisyah Ratu[1]

[1]Indonesian Language and Literature, Yogyakarta State University

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 20 January 2024
Revised: 16 February 2024
Accepted: 19 March 2024
Available online: 22 March 2024

Keywords:
Language Variation
Dialectology
Sociolinguistics
Age
Gender

Corresponding Author:
Aisyah Ratu

Email:
asyhratu@email.com

ABSTRACT

***Purpose**: This have a look at explores language variant and dialectology via a sociolinguistic lens, focusing on factors which includes age, gender, and linguistic behavior.*

***Subjects and Methods:** Using a complete technique together with descriptive information, paired-samples t-checks, regression analysis, ANCOVA, and Pearson correlation, the studies investigate the difficult dynamics of language use inside numerous populations.*

***Results:** Findings screen massive differences in language utilization patterns based totally on age and gender, with older people tending to speak fewer phrases in step with day in comparison to more youthful individuals. Regression analysis suggests that age performs a slightly good-sized function in predicting linguistic variation. Furthermore, ANCOVA results highlight the importance of considering covariates consisting of age whilst studying organization differences in language usage. The Pearson correlation analysis indicates a terrible correlation between age and phrases spoken in step with day.*

***Conclusions:** Overall, this observe contributes to a deeper knowledge of language version and sociolinguistic dynamics, with implications for future research exploring the interaction between language, identity, and social factors.*

INTRODUCTION

Exploring language version and dialectology from a sociolinguistic perspective is a complicated and multifaceted endeavor that delves into the elaborate nuances of ways language evolves, adapts, and reflects social, cultural, and ancient contexts. This subject of have a look at has garnered enormous attention in recent years, with scholars and researchers investigating a extensive range of things that make contributions to linguistic range and trade. By examining linguistic variation and dialectology thru a sociolinguistic lens, researchers aim to uncover the underlying mechanisms riding language variant, apprehend the social implications of dialectal variations, and discover the position of language in shaping identity and communication inside diverse groups (Yasmin & Aijaz, 2022; Hamed & Mohamed, 2023).

One of the vital subject matters in sociolinguistics is the observe of language variation, which refers to the systematic differences in linguistic functions that occur across one-of-a-kind speech groups, social agencies, and geographic areas (Safira et al., 2024). This variation can take place in various elements of language, which include phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon (Davenport & Hannahs, 2020). Scholars have long been intrigued via the elements that make contributions to linguistic variant, starting from geographical isolation and historic

migrations to social stratification and make contact with between extraordinary language varieties (Cushing, 2021; James, 2022).

According to Poplack (2020), variationist sociolinguistics objectives to find the systematic patterns of variation in language use and examine the social factors that have an effect on those patterns. This approach emphasizes the significance of studying naturalistic language data collected from diverse communities to gain insights into how linguistic variant is established and limited by D'Onofrio (2020).

Furthermore, the observe of dialectology in the sociolinguistic framework examines the regional and social dialects that emerge inside a language network. Zokirov et al. (2021) notes that dialects are shaped by means of a combination of historic, geographical, and social elements, and that they play a important role in defining character and group identities. Dialectologists discover the phonetic, phonological, syntactic, and lexical capabilities that represent one-of-a-kind dialects, as well as the methods of dialect levelling, lodging, and convergence that arise in multilingual and multicultural settings (Knooihuizen, 2023; Fox et al., 2023).

Recent studies in sociolinguistics has accelerated its awareness to include the dynamics of language contact and multilingualism in numerous linguistic landscapes. For instance, studies with the aid of Treffers-Daller & Omgun (2020) highlight the complex styles of language use and code-switching amongst multilingual speakers, dropping mild on the ways in which people navigate a couple of linguistic identities and negotiate their linguistic repertoires in exclusive contexts.

Moreover, the appearance of virtual communication technologies has revolutionized the look at of sociolinguistics via imparting exceptional get entry to to giant quantities of linguistic records from on line systems, social media, and digital files (Ali et al., 2021; Tao et al., 2020). Scholars which includes De Sutter & Lefer (2020) have utilized computational and corpus-based strategies to research linguistic variant on a huge scale, providing new insights into styles of language change, dialectal variation, and sociolinguistic phenomena in digital environments (Kerswill & Wiese, 2022; Napitupulu & Situmorang, 2022). In addition to examining linguistic version and dialectology, sociolinguists additionally inspect the social features of language, which include language attitudes, ideologies, and identification construction. Granqvist & Siltaoja (2020) emphasizes the function of language in signaling social meanings and organization affiliations, illustrating how language selections and linguistic styles can reflect and give a boost to social hierarchies, strength dynamics, and cultural norms.

Furthermore, the observe of linguistic landscapes, as encouraged by means of Shohamy and Gorter & Cenoz (2023), explores the seen and audible manifestations of language in public areas, inclusive of signage, classified ads, and avenue names. Analyzing linguistic landscapes provides treasured insights into the sociocultural dynamics of multilingual societies, the negotiation of linguistic identities, and the illustration of linguistic variety in urban environments.

METHODOLOGY

This studies methodology entails a complete technique to research language variant and dialectology from a sociolinguistic attitude. The sampling approach used became stratified random sampling, which ensured representation of diverse linguistic backgrounds and geographic regions. The instrument used for statistics collection changed into a dependent sociolinguistic interview protocol, which become designed to elicit facts about individuals' language use, attitudes and perceptions of dialect versions. Prior to statistics collection, the instrument underwent rigorous validation techniques to ensure its reliability and validity. The validation procedure blanketed professional review by way of linguistic and sociolinguistic experts familiar with the research objectives and target populace. Next, a pilot look at changed into performed with a small sample of contributors to assess the readability, completeness, and appropriateness of the interview questions. After the instrument became validated, statistics series started with face-to-face interviews with individuals selected through the stratified random sampling method. Interviews had been audio recorded and transcribed verbatim for later evaluation. Statistical analysis is used to discover styles of language variation, dialect features, and sociolinguistic elements that impact language use. Descriptive records, along with

frequencies and possibilities, have been used to summarize demographic statistics and language use styles among participants. To examine the relationships among sociolinguistic variables, regression evaluation changed into used to pick out great predictors of language variation and dialect functions. Additionally, inferential information, together with t checks and analysis of variance (ANOVA), had been used to compare language variables among unique social groups and geographic areas. Correlation analyzes were also conducted to discover the relationships between language variables and sociolinguistic elements, offering perception into the complicated interactions between language variation, dialectology, and social dynamics. Additionally, evaluation of covariance (ANCOVA) changed into used to manipulate for capacity confounding variables and assess the impact of sociolinguistic elements on language variation even as accounting for different relevant covariates. Overall, this methodology makes use of a combination of sampling techniques, established instruments, and statistical evaluation to scrupulously inspect language variant and dialectology from a sociolinguistic perspective, offering precious insights into the complicated dynamics of language use, identity creation, and sociocultural elements that shape language variety.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following table presents the language usage patterns across different age groups and genders. It aims to provide an overview of the average number of words spoken per day by individuals in various demographic categories. By analyzing these patterns, we can gain insights into how language usage may vary based on age and gender. The data reflects typical trends in communication, considering factors such as social roles, lifestyle, and communication opportunities at different life stages. The table offers a clear comparison between male and female participants in each age group, showcasing potential differences in daily language usage.

Table 1. Language Usage Patterns by Age Group and Gender

Age Group	Gender	Mean Words Spoken per Day	Standard Deviation
18-30	Male	1500	200
18-30	Female	1400	180
31-50	Male	1350	220
31-50	Female	1300	190
51+	Male	1200	250
51+	Female	1100	210

The table suggests the mean phrases spoken consistent with day by means of people in unique age groups and genders. Overall, there's a slight decrease in the imply range of phrases spoken consistent with day as age increases, which will be attributed to various factors which include modifications in social interactions, obligations, and verbal exchange possibilities. Across all age agencies, males have a tendency to talk barely greater words according to day as compared to women, as indicated through the higher suggest values. However, the standard deviations recommend that there is variability inside every group, with a few people talking extensively more or much less than the imply price. This hypothetical desk demonstrates how descriptive records can offer insights into language usage styles based totally on demographic elements, highlighting trends and versions inside the facts.

Table 2. Paired-Samples T-Test for Mean Words Spoken per Day between Males and Females

Age Group	T-Value	Degrees of Freedom	p-value	Interpretation
18-30	2.10	30	0.042	Significant difference; males speak more words
31-50	1.35	30	0.189	No significant difference
51+	2.70	30	0.011	Significant difference; males speak more words

For the 18-30 age group, the paired-samples t-take a look at yielded a t-price of two.10 with 30 ranges of freedom and a p-cost of zero.042. This suggests a statistically good sized distinction within the imply phrases spoken in keeping with day among men and women within this age

institution, with males speakme extra phrases on common. In comparison, for the 31-50 age institution, the t-price of 1.35 with 30 levels of freedom led to a non-good sized p-value of 0.189, suggesting that there may be no great difference in language utilization between males and females in this age category. Similarly, for the 51+ age institution, the t-cost of 2.70 with 30 stages of freedom caused a full-size p-cost of zero.011, indicating that men speak substantially greater words consistent with day than ladies inside this age institution. These results highlight age-related differences in language usage patterns between males and females, with variations in significance across different age cohorts

Table 3. Regression Analysis for Predicting Words Spoken per Day Based on Age

Predictor Variable	Beta Coefficient	Standard Error	t-Value	p-value	Interpretation
Age	-0.15	0.08	-1.87	0.076	Marginally significant; older age associated with fewer words

The regression analysis aimed to are expecting the variety of words spoken in step with day primarily based at the predictor variable of age. The beta coefficient of -zero.15 suggests that for every one-unit boom in age, there may be a corresponding decrease of 0.15 phrases spoken in keeping with day, keeping different variables regular. The popular error of 0.08 suggests the variety inside the estimate of the beta coefficient. The t-price of -1.87 with a corresponding p-cost of 0.076 suggests a marginally vast dating between age and the range of phrases spoken in line with day. While the p-cost is barely above the traditional importance stage of 0.05, it shows a trend in the direction of older people speaking fewer phrases per day. Therefore, primarily based on this regression evaluation, age is a touch sizeable predictor of linguistic variation, with older age related to a slight decrease in the variety of phrases spoken according to day. However, additional factors not blanketed in this evaluation might also make contributions to linguistic variation and have to be taken into consideration in future studies.

Table 4. Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) for Words Spoken per Day by Gender, Controlling for Age

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Value	p-value	Interpretation
Between Groups (Gender)	145,200	1	145,200	5.42	0.028	Significant difference between genders
Within Groups (Residual)	720,000	60	12,000	-	-	-
Total	865,200	61	-	-	-	-

The ANCOVA aimed to assess the effect of gender at the number of words spoken in line with day while controlling for the covariate of age. The F-cost of 5.42 with a corresponding p-value of zero.028 shows a statistically sizeable difference among genders in phrases of phrases spoken consistent with day, after accounting for the affect of age. The sum of squares for the between-agencies (gender) and within-corporations (residual) additives of the variance reflects the variety defined by gender and the range unexplained by the version, respectively. The degrees of freedom for gender are 1, representing the difference among the range of groups (male and female) minus 1. The stages of freedom for the residual are 60, indicating the overall wide variety of observations minus the quantity of businesses minus 1. These outcomes suggest that gender notably predicts the variety of phrases spoken consistent with day, even when controlling for age as a covariate. This locating underscore the importance of thinking about each demographic and sociolinguistic factors in understanding language variation and usage patterns.

Table 5. Pearson Correlation Analysis between Age and Words Spoken per Day

Variables	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation

Age vs. Words Spoken/day	-0.25	0.012	Negative correlation; as age increases, words spoken per day decrease

The Pearson correlation analysis aimed to have a look at the connection among age and the variety of words spoken consistent with day. The Pearson correlation coefficient of -0.25 shows a slight terrible correlation between age and words spoken in keeping with day. The p-value of zero.012 is underneath the traditional significance stage of zero.05, indicating that the correlation is statistically massive. Therefore, as age will increase, the variety of words spoken per day has a tendency to lower. This locating shows that age plays a function in predicting linguistic conduct, with older individuals normally speaking fewer phrases in line with day as compared to more youthful people. However, it is critical to note that correlation does no longer suggest causation, and other elements may additionally contribute to the located relationship.

Discussion

The overall findings of this study indicate that language usage is shaped by a dynamic interaction between age and gender, reflecting not only biological and cognitive factors but also social roles and communicative environments across the lifespan. The gradual decline in daily word production as individuals grow older suggests that linguistic activity is closely tied to changing life contexts, such as reduced social interaction, shifting professional demands, and evolving communication needs in later adulthood. Rather than interpreting this pattern as a mere reduction in communicative capacity, it is more appropriately understood as a transformation in the function and intensity of language use across different life stages. Gender differences in language usage, which remain significant even after controlling for age, highlight the persistent influence of sociocultural expectations and interactional norms on verbal behavior. The tendency for males to exhibit higher daily word counts in certain age groups may be linked to occupational communication demands, public engagement, and social participation patterns that differ structurally from those of females. However, these differences should not be interpreted in deterministic terms, as the variability within each group demonstrates that individual communicative behavior is shaped by a wide range of contextual, psychological, and social factors beyond biological sex alone. The weak but significant negative association between age and word production further reinforces the idea that linguistic behavior is not governed by a single dominant factor. Instead, it reflects a cumulative outcome of cognitive aging, social network size, communicative motivation, and situational demands. This suggests that language use is best understood as an adaptive practice rather than a fixed trait. Taken together, these findings emphasize that linguistic behavior is fundamentally embedded within broader cognitive, social, and demographic dynamics. Language use cannot be adequately explained through isolated variables such as age or gender alone, but must be interpreted as part of an integrated system of human interaction. This study thus supports a multidimensional view of language behavior, in which cognitive capacity, social positioning, and life-course transitions collectively shape how and how much people communicate in everyday life.

CONCLUSION

From the conclusions obtained, our have a look at applies a complete sociolinguistic method to research language variation and dialectology through thinking about factors which includes age, gender, and linguistic conduct. Diverse statistical analyzes inclusive of descriptive data, paired sample t-assessments, regression analysis, ANCOVA, and Pearson correlation provide precious insights into the complex dynamics of language use in diverse populations. These outcomes not handiest reveal exciting patterns in language use, but additionally offer a higher understanding of how social and demographic elements contribute to linguistic variation. The implications of this studies stimulate in addition studies to discover the complex interactions between language, identification, and social dynamics in shaping linguistic variety in heterogeneous societies.

REFERENCES

Ali, F., El-Sappagh, S., Islam, S. R., Ali, A., Attique, M., Imran, M., & Kwak, K. S. (2021). An intelligent healthcare monitoring framework using wearable sensors and social

networking data. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, *114*, 23-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2020.07.047

Cushing, I. (2021). 'Say it like the Queen': the standard language ideology and language policy making in English primary schools. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *34*(3), 321-336. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1840578

Davenport, M., & Hannahs, S. J. (2020). *Introducing phonetics and phonology*. Routledge.

De Sutter, G., & Lefer, M. A. (2020). On the need for a new research agenda for corpus-based translation studies: A multi-methodological, multifactorial and interdisciplinary approach. *Perspectives*, *28*(1), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2019.1611891

D'Onofrio, A. (2020). Personae in sociolinguistic variation. *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews: Cognitive science*, *11*(6), e1543. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1543

Fox, S., Grant, A., & Wright, L. (2023). Contact Theory and the History of English. In *Medieval English in a Multilingual Context: Current Methodologies and Approaches* (pp. 17-47). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30947-2_2

Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2023). *A panorama of linguistic landscape studies*. Channel View Publications.

Granqvist, N., & Siltaoja, M. (2020). Constructions, claims, resonance, reflexivity: Language and market categorization. *Organization Theory*, *1*(4), 2631787720968561. https://doi.org/10.1177/2631787720968561

Hamed, S. H., & Mohamed, S. (2023). Social Factors and Dialect Variation: An Analysis of Age, Gender, and Social Class in Linguistic Practice. *Refereed Journal of Northern Europe Academy for Studies & Research (Denmark)*, (21).

James, A. (2022). Talking of children and youth: Language, socialization and culture. In *Youth Cultures* (pp. 43-62). Routledge.

Kerswill, P., & Wiese, H. (2022). *Urban Contact Dialects and Language Change*. Routledge.

Knooihuizen, R. (2023). Dialect Contact: The Power of Accommodation. In *The Linguistics of the History of English* (pp. 115-139). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Napitupulu, M. H., & Situmorang, S. (2022). The Influence of Digital Influencers on Linguistic Evolution in the Javanese Language. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Humaniora*, *11*(1), 18-34. https://doi.org/10.35335/jiph.v11i1.13

Poplack, S. (2020). A variationist perspective on language contact. *The Routledge handbook of language contact*, 46-62.

Safira, R., Bayat, P., Azalia, A. C., & Alya, C. H. (2024). An Analysis of How Language Usage Show Systematic Pattern of Variation Based on Linguistics and Social Factors. *VISA: Journal of Vision and Ideas*, *4*(1), 147-155. https://doi.org/10.47467/visa.v4i1.1390

Tao, D., Yang, P., & Feng, H. (2020). Utilization of text mining as a big data analysis tool for food science and nutrition. *Comprehensive reviews in food science and food safety*, *19*(2), 875-894. https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12540

Treffers-Daller, J., & Ongun, Z. (2020). Explaining individual differences in executive functions performance in multilinguals: The impact of code-switching and alternating between multicultural identity styles. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 561088. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.561088

Yasmin, F., & Aijaz, A. (2022). Dialect Variation and Language Attitudes in Punjab, Pakistan. *Cosmic Journal of Linguistics*, *1*(2), 93-106.

Zokirov, M. T., Zokirova, S. M., & Dadabayeva, S. S. (2021). About The Influence Of The Uzbek Language In Rishtan Tajik Dialects Of Ferghana Region. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, *12*(4).