

مجلة أكاديمية شمال
أوروبا المحكمة للدراسات
والبحوث التربوية والإنسانية
الدنمارك .

العدد : 21
13/10/2023

Social Factors and Dialect Variation: An Analysis of Age, Gender, and Social Class in Linguistic Practice

العوامل الاجتماعية وتنوع اللهجة: تحليل العمر والجنس والطبقة الاجتماعية في الممارسة اللغوية

prepared by



A.Prof.Dr. Safaa Mohamed
Siddig Hag Hamed
English Language & Translation Dep
Faculty of Arts
Taibah University
Safaasiddig@hotmail.com

Abstract

This study examines the impact of social factors on dialect variations through a survey of seventy-five participants. Social factors investigated include age, gender, and socioeconomic status, and their relationship to dialect use and attitudes. The survey consisted of 18 statements regarding linguistic diversity and dialect use, with responses measured on a Likert scale. The results show that participants largely recognize the role of social factors in influencing dialect use and shaping social identity. The majority agreed that younger generations use different dialects than older generations, indicating awareness of generational differences in language. Participants also generally agreed that people from different socioeconomic backgrounds utilize different dialects and that the dialect one speaks impacts perception and identity. However, opinions were mixed regarding the role of gender in dialect use and what actions should be taken to promote dialect diversity. Neutral responses to some statements indicate uncertainty or lack of strong opinions on certain issues. The findings suggest that while awareness of dialect variations linked to social factors exists, there is less consensus on how to reduce discrimination based on dialect. This indicates a need for further research and interventions aimed at promoting dialect diversity and inclusivity.

Keywords: dialect variation; Sociolinguistics; language attitudes; linguistic diversity; and social inclusion

An Introduction

Language is multifaceted, mirroring human diversity and richness. While all languages have rules and meanings, the way people speak varies widely based on background, identity, and experience. An important aspect of linguistic variation is dialects, which are regional or social variations in language use. Dialects can differ in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and style, reflecting factors like age, gender, ethnicity, and class.

Social factors impact dialect use. For example, younger generations may utilize different dialects than older generations, men and women may speak differently based on roles and expectations, and individuals from different classes may speak differently to signal status.

Dialect attitudes shape identity and practices. Speakers may view certain dialects as prestigious or stigmatized depending on context. This can lead to discrimination against dialects, hindering social inclusion and diversity. Understanding dialect variation can inform policy and planning. It can help develop inclusive language standards and promote minority dialects at risk of disappearing.

This research can improve education by promoting dialect awareness and tolerance in curricula, challenging discrimination and promoting inclusion and diversity. It can help develop programs catering to different groups' linguistic needs. The study explores how social factors impact dialect use, examining literature, interviews and surveys. Attitudes toward dialects and their role in shaping identity and practices will also be examined.

The aim is to improve understanding of the complex interplay between language and society. Findings may inform policies, education and media representations that foster linguistic diversity and social cohesion by challenging discrimination and bias. In summary, studying social dialects clarifies linguistic variation and its relationship to social practices and norms. By

investigating how social factors shape dialect use and attitudes, this research may provide novel insights into the language-society relationship.

The Importance of the Study

This research investigating the relationship between social factors, dialect variation, and linguistic attitudes makes an important contribution to the field of sociolinguistics. By providing empirical data exploring how attributes like age, gender, and socioeconomic class relate to dialect use and identity perceptions, the study enhances understanding of the complex two-way influence between language and society. The mixed findings highlight needing further examination of sensitive topics to build consensus around solutions. Given its focus on universal themes of identity, prestige, stigma, and discrimination reduction through education, the work has wide-ranging relevance. While a pilot, it helps substantiate existing theory and introduces new areas for future inquiry. Ultimately, by examining these dynamics and making recommendations, the study aims to inform policies, curricula and public discourse in ways that promote linguistic diversity and social inclusion. The insights offer value for both researchers seeking to expand knowledge on this understudied topic, as well as practitioners working to support equitable representation of all language varieties.

The Statement of the Problem

While dialects reflect social diversity and identity, not much is known about how factors like age, gender and social class influence dialect use. Studying social dialects is important for understanding complex linguistic variation and its ties to social norms and practices. Therefore, the aim of this research is to examine how social factors shape the use of different dialects in various contexts and how attitudes toward dialects contribute to social identity and cultural practices. This study will provide deeper insight into the language-society relationship and its findings could inform language policies and education. The goal is to gain a better understanding of the interplay between language and society, with findings that promote linguistic diversity and social cohesion through policy, education, and media representations that challenge discrimination and bias.

Research Objectives

Here are the main research objectives:

1. To investigate the extent to which age, gender, and social class influence dialect use among participants. This aims to directly examine the effect of social factors on linguistic practices, which is the central focus of the study.
2. To examine how the dialect a person speaks shapes their social identity and impacts how others perceive them. This would analyze an important theme that emerged from the results, showing participants' recognition of the social significance of dialects.
3. To determine whether participants recognize that some dialects are viewed as more prestigious than others. This would investigate an important aspect of language attitudes towards dialects, which the study seeks to explore.

4. To explore participants' opinions on the role of schools and education in promoting awareness of linguistic diversity. This would provide insight into an issue that participants expressed divergent views on, indicating a need for further research and discussion.
5. To make recommendations for further research, educational practices and language policies based on the findings. This broad objective would allow the study to identify practical implications and next steps arising from its results and conclusions.

These objectives focus on key areas revealed by the results: the impact of social factors on dialect use, the social meaning of dialects, language attitudes towards prestige and stigma, and implications for education and policy. Together, they would help the study achieve its overarching goal of enhancing understanding of the relationship between social factors and dialect variation.

Methodology

The conducted study has been done to define and explain the relationships among social factors and dialect variation: an analysis of age, gender, and social class in linguistic practice. The research used Likert-based questionnaire that is a widely used method for collecting quantitative data in social science research. It is particularly useful for measuring attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of respondents on a range of issues, including language attitudes and dialect use. While it has the advantage of being easy to use and allowing for quantitative data analysis, there are potential limitations such as response bias and the inability to capture the complexity and nuance of attitudes and opinions.

Literature Review

Introduction

Understanding how social factors influence dialect variation clarifies the relationship between language use, social practices, and cultural norms. This literature review explores the impact of social factors on dialect variation in linguistic practices by drawing on sociolinguistic and dialectological research. The analysis focuses on how social factors shape dialect use in different contexts and how dialects shape social identities and cultural practices.

The study of social dialects is important for several reasons. First, it provides insights into the complex relationship between language and society, and how dialects reflect and shape social diversity and identity. Second, it can inform language policy and planning by promoting linguistic diversity and challenging language discrimination and bias. Third, it can help in developing language education programs that cater to the linguistic needs of different social groups and promote social inclusion and diversity.

Theoretical Framework

Shareah, M. A. Q. A., Mudhsh, B. A. D., & AL-Takhayinh, A. H. (2015: 1-5), indicate that dialectal variation has witnessed a noticeable progress in the past half –century, this progression lead to consider the dialectal variation as a very important aspect of research in sociolinguistics. This study concentrate on dialect and language in general, it also explains the differences between standard language and dialect, and it shows how a particular dialect is used in a specific region and it is considered as an identity as well, it aimed to show how dialect's

groups of one language may be considered mutual intelligibility or non-mutual intelligibility, and this classification is based on the percentage of convergence and divergence among them.

In his study, Al-Bohnayyah, Moayyad (2019), investigates the Al-Ahsa urban dialect in eastern Arabia, focusing on two vocalic features and their variation in relation to internal and external factors. Data is collected from 36 native speakers in two age groups and with almost equal gender representation. The analysis shows that the traditional features of the dialect are undergoing change, with a tendency towards unrounding of the (ɑ:) vowel and lowering of the short vowel in the feminine ending. The rate of change is higher in the former than in the latter, and socio-sectarian identity adds pressure to the force of change. The study concludes that the Al-Ahsa dialect is leveling out of local features and adopting those of the supra-local variety, influenced by age, gender, and socio-sectarian affiliation. The study provides a local interpretation of the social meaning of linguistic choices.

Age and Dialect Variation

Age is recognized as a significant factor in dialect variation. People's language usage can undergo changes as they grow older, influenced by factors like shifts in social networks, exposure to different language varieties, and evolving attitudes and beliefs. Younger generations may incorporate novel linguistic features that are absent in older generations' language, resulting in dialect variation within a speech community as time progresses. Additionally, older generations may maintain linguistic features that are no longer used by younger generations, leading to dialectal differences between age groups. Age-related dialect variation can be observed in both regional and social dialects.

According to Budiarsa, I. M. (2017: 379-387), sociolinguistics is concerned with the social aspects of language and explores the relationship between language and society. "This paper focuses on five topics: language, dialects, language variation, social stratification, and register, as they relate to the social life of local people. It is important to distinguish between these terms, with language referring to the medium of communication and its varieties, which are created by social stratification. Dialects are specific varieties of a language used by a particular group of speakers, which are influenced by social factors such as socio-economic status, age, and occupation". Dialects can be regional or social. Register refers to the variation of language use according to the context in which it is used, such as formal or informal settings. Register is influenced by all components of the speech situation, and may include lexical items, non-standard features, and stigmatized variables.

Roberts, J. (2013: 263-276) "indicates that child language variation is an area of research that emerged within the field of variationist sociolinguistics after a good deal of work on adult variation had been accomplished". This chapter looks at the research leading up to the recent increased focus on differences in how children learn and use language. It examines two topics that have been or could provide useful insights. Children establish the foundations for how they and later adolescents and adults speak through early language development. Studying dialects in children's language may help answer questions about linguistic diversity and evolution. The chapter also discusses the way adults modify their speech when talking to children (Child-directed Speech). Moving forward, the most informative area of research on language variation and change will focus on studying how the youngest community members acquire the skills to communicate social meaning through everyday interactions as they learn to speak.

Gender and Dialect Variation

Mulac, A. (1998: 315-335), indicates that there are two abiding truths on which the general public and research scholars find themselves in uneasy agreement: Men and women speak the same language, and men and women speak that language differently. In an assessment of oral descriptions of landscape photographs by sixth graders, university freshmen and sophomores, graduate teaching assistants, and people in their 50s and 60s, the people reported that language differences predicted substantial proportions of the ratings on all three psychological dimensions. The pattern of perceptions, the gender-linked language effect, consists of female communicators being rated higher on Socio-Intellectual Status (high social status and literate) and Aesthetic Quality (nice and beautiful), whereas males are rated higher on Dynamism (strong and aggressive). In support of another theoretical assumption, the authors have demonstrated in five investigations that gender-based language differences are implicated in the effect. No matter who makes the appraisals, the subtle language differences have substantial consequences in how communicators are evaluated.

Demirci, M. (1998: 206-222), in his study in perceptual dialectology, “aims to show that the direct elicitation of conscious evaluations of language varieties may give systematic results such that some of the same patterns of social differentiation which emerge in the study of production data also emerge with respect to the conscious evaluation of language varieties. Specifically, our results demonstrate that several significant, systematic gender and age-based patterns emerge in a study that investigates the perceptions and evaluations of Turkish regional varieties by Turkish nonlinguists”. It seems that gender and age are social factors that influence not only how language is used, but also people's conscious judgments about language. In other words, both gender and age impact both the way people speak as well as how they consciously assess and evaluate language. “The results confirm Preston's (1989) claim that studies in perceptual dialectology may supplement sociolinguistic dialectology in illuminating ways, since they may provide additional insight into the interplay of conscious attitudes towards language, social differentiation, and language production”.

Calder, J. (2020, in recent years, “the study of language, gender, and sexuality has become increasingly global, multiracial, intersectional, crosslinguistic and queer-and trans-inclusive”. The year 2019 continued this trajectory with a wave of research interrogating normativities, both among the speakers under analysis and among the researchers doing the analysing. While the analysis of linguistic practice has allowed language and gender scholars to probe the ways speakers normatively construct and ideologise the prototypical man, woman, gay person and transgender individual, theoretical and methodological advances in 2019 have also invited scholars to interrogate what is considered the prototypical study of language and gender. Interrogating normativities among both speakers and researchers has allowed for theoretical and methodological advances that paint a fuller picture of the multifaceted and context-specific relationship between language, identity and speaker agency.

In his article, Al-Rojaie, Yousef. (2021: 1-26), “examines the effects of age and gender on perceptions that speakers of Qassimi Arabic, a variety of Najdi Arabic spoken in central Saudi Arabia, have of the placement and extent of dialect areas marked on hand-drawn maps representing variation within their own dialect. Analysis of composite maps of respondents' perceptions using a GIS mapping program (ArcGIS) reveals that both age and gender have an effect on respondents' perceptions of linguistic landscape”. Specifically, research shows that

men tend to perceive more differences or variations in dialects than women do, as men identify more distinct dialect regions. In terms of age, middle-aged participants recognized and agreed on more defined dialect areas compared to both younger and older respondents. These divergent patterns seen across gender and age can be explained by differences in levels of contact with and movement around local communities experienced by each group, especially considering the social and economic changes Saudi Arabia has undergone over the past 50 years. Men likely had more geographic mobility for work or other reasons, while middle-aged respondents experienced socioeconomic shifts firsthand during their adult lives.

As in Mulac, A., Wiemann, J. M., Widenmann, S. J., & Gibson, T. W. (1988), “ninety-six university students (48 males, 48 females) were randomly assigned a partner (whom they did not know well), forming two dyad conditions: (a) same-sex, and (b) mixed-sex. The 48 dyads were audiotape-recorded in 20-minute problem solving interactions, from which 300-word language samples were transcribed for analysis. In Study 1, 9 trained observers coded 12 language variables previously shown to distinguish male from female language use”. Discriminant analysis identified a combination of 8 linguistic variables that could distinguish between male and female speakers: Variables associated with males included interruptions, directives, and words joining clauses/fillers beginning sentences. Variables associated with females included questions, justifications, intensifying adverbs, personal pronouns, and adverbs beginning sentences. An analysis of variance of individuals' scores on the gender function showed greater differences in gender-linked language behavior in same-sex pairs than in mixed-sex pairs. In a second study, naive raters used a speech dialect scale to evaluate 96 speakers. A MANOVA showed that in same-sex pairs, females were rated higher on socio-intellectual status and aesthetic quality, while there was no gender difference in dynamism. However, in mixed-sex pairs, men were rated higher on aesthetic quality and women on dynamism. Together, the analysis of language data and subjective attribution data provide partial support for stronger gender-linked language in same-sex pairs and attenuation of this effect in mixed-sex pairs.

“Hancock, A. B., & Rubin, B. A. (2015: 46-64), in their study “forty participants (20 male) had 3-minute conversations with trained male and female communication partners in a repeated-measures, within-subject design. Eighty 3-minute conversations were transcribed and coded for dependent clauses, fillers, tag questions, intensive adverbs, negations, hedges, personal pronouns, self-references, justifiers, and interruptions. Results suggest no significant changes in language based on speaker gender”. The research found that when speaking to a female partner, participants would interrupt more and use more dependent clauses than when conversing with a male partner. However, there was no significant interaction to indicate that the language differences based on the gender of the communication partner was specific to only one gender group. These findings are discussed in relation to prior studies on this topic, communication accommodation theory which proposes people modify their language based on their conversation partner, and general models that have explored gender differences in language use.

Nicholas A. Palomares (2008: 263–286) “tested hypotheses derived from self-categorization theory’s explanation for gender-based language use. Under high or low conditions of gender salience, men and women sent e-mail to an ostensible male or female recipient yielding either an intra- or an intergroup setting”. The researchers manipulated gender salience by focusing solely on supportiveness, a stereotypically feminine trait, as the defining prototype for intergender relations. They examined messages for references to emotion and tentative language use. Results showed that when gender salience was high, women referenced emotion

significantly more than men. However, this gender difference was reduced when salience was low. Specifically, women with high gender salience referenced emotion more when in an intergroup context compared to women with high salience in an intragroup setting or men with high salience in either intra- or intergroup contexts. As predicted, tentative language use was similar across all conditions.

Social Class and Dialect Variation

The studies conducted by Labov (1972), Cheshire (1982), Eckert (1989), Trudgill (1974), and Wolfram (1991) investigate the correlation between social class and linguistic variation. These studies collectively support the idea that social class plays a significant role in determining linguistic variation, with individuals belonging to different social classes often exhibiting distinct dialects. “Labov (1972) argues that linguistic variation reflects social stratification, with different social classes using different linguistic forms to signal their social identity”. “Cheshire (1982) examines the variation in an English dialect and finds that social class is a significant predictor of linguistic variation”. “Eckert (1989) investigates how social categories and identity are constructed in high school and how these processes are reflected in linguistic behavior”. Trudgill (1974) explores the social differentiation of English in Norwich and shows that linguistic variation is closely linked to social class. “Wolfram (1991) provides a comprehensive overview of American English dialects and variation, highlighting the significance of social class in shaping linguistic behavior”. These studies highlight the significance of social class in linguistic variation.

The studies conducted by Milroy (1980), Bucholtz and Hall (2005), and Milroy (2002: 675-704) “explore how social networks and linguistic variation are interconnected”. These studies indicate that people's language use is influenced by the social groups they are part of and the relationships they maintain within those groups. Milroy (1980) argues that “social networks play a crucial role in shaping linguistic behavior, and that people tend to use language in a way that is consistent with the norms of their social network”. Bucholtz and Hall (2005) “suggest that language use is an integral part of identity construction, and that individuals use language to signal their membership in particular social groups.” Milroy (2002) “proposes an integrated sociolinguistic model that takes into account both social class and social networks in explaining linguistic variation.” The studies highlight the importance of social networks in shaping linguistic behavior and reveal the interdependence of social and linguistic factors in understanding language variation.

The studies by Harris (2006: 56-80), Rickford (2002: 441-450), and Tagliamonte and D'Arcy (2009: 58-108) all examine the intersection of linguistic variation and social justice. These studies “advocate for the recognition and celebration of linguistic diversity, and argue that sociolinguistic research can have important implications for education and employment opportunities”. Harris (2006) “discovers the role of the community in shaping phonetic variation in Scottish English, highlighting the importance of community-based research in understanding linguistic diversity.” “Rickford (2002) argues that a commitment to social justice requires recognizing and valuing linguistic diversity, and that linguistic discrimination can have negative consequences for individual and community well-being”. “Tagliamonte and D'Arcy (2009) examine the relationship between linguistic variation and social change, demonstrating how linguistic innovations can signal social identity and challenge linguistic stereotypes.” The studies stress the importance of linguistic diversity and its role in promoting social justice.

VI. Attitudes toward Dialects

Giles and Powesland's (1975) study explores the relationship between speech style and social evaluation. "The authors contend that individuals' assessment of others is affected by their speech style, which can act as an indicator of social identity. They propose that unfavorable perceptions of dialects may stem from negative evaluations of the social groups associated with those dialects".

Preston (1989) conducts a study focusing on the perspectives of non-linguists regarding dialects and how these perspectives reflect broader social attitudes. He argues that "people's attitudes towards dialects are influenced by several factors, including regional identity, socio-economic status, and education." Preston suggests that negative attitudes towards dialects might be connected to negative stereotypes associated with the individuals who speak those dialects.

Edwards (1991) explores the relationship between language, society, and identity. He argues that "language is intimately tied to social identity and that people's attitudes towards different dialects reflect their broader social attitudes". Edwards proposes that "negative attitudes towards dialects may be linked to negative attitudes towards the people who speak those dialects, and that promoting linguistic diversity can help promote social justice and equality".

Implications for Language Policy and Education

Fishman's (1971: 109-126) study explores the implications of language policy for language maintenance. He maintains that "language policy can have a significant impact on the vitality of a language, and that policymakers must take into account the social factors that influence language use". Fishman suggests that "language maintenance efforts should focus on promoting bilingualism and biculturalism, rather than promoting one language at the expense of others". (Fishman, J. A, 1971:109-129).

In his study, "Ricento (2005: 348-368) examines the discourse surrounding the promotion of heritage languages in the United States. He argues that the "language-as-resource" discourse can be problematic, as it can reinforce the marginalization of heritage languages and perpetuate linguistic hierarchies". Ricento suggests that language policy should focus on promoting linguistic diversity and recognizing the value of all languages.

"Spolsky's (2012) book examines the field of language management and its implications for language policy and education. He argues that language management involves making conscious decisions about language use, and that language policy should be guided by principles of social justice and equality". Spolsky suggests that "language policy should aim to promote linguistic diversity, multilingualism, and the maintenance of endangered languages".

These studies underscore the significance of language policy and education in fostering linguistic diversity and social equity. They emphasize the need for policymakers and educators to consider the social factors that impact language usage and advocate for the appreciation of all languages. By recognizing and supporting linguistic diversity, efforts can be made to promote social justice and ensure equal opportunities for all individuals.

Comments on Literature Review

Sociolinguistics has conducted widespread research on the influence of social variables, including age, gender, and socioeconomic class, on dialect variation and attitudes. These studies have contributed significantly to our understanding of how these factors shape language use, dialect differences, and societal perceptions. This knowledge is essential because it illuminates how language interacts with society and how it both reflects and shapes social variety and identity. Additional studies might support language variety, fight linguistic prejudice, and promote social equality.

Studies show gender influences both language production and perception. Social class also shapes linguistic variation and stratification. Research emphasizes the need to promote linguistic diversity and recognize the value of all languages based on justice and equity.

The paper highlights the importance of understanding how social factors affect dialect use and attitudes. It stresses the need for research to gain deeper insight into the complex ties between language and society and the implications for education and policy.

The literature demonstrates social factors like age, gender, and class significantly impact dialect use and attitudes. It also shows sociolinguistic research can inform policies and practices promoting linguistic diversity and social justice. The paper provides a clear research objective and literature foundation for further study.

This research could improve understanding of how social factors shape dialect variation and its implications for social diversity and identity. Sociolinguistic research can inform policies and practices promoting linguistic diversity and social justice, requiring continued research. These studies illustrate the complex ties between language, society, and identity, emphasizing the need for language policy and education to promote diversity and inclusion.

Limitations and Future Research

While the proposed research on social dialects has the potential to enhance our understanding of language variation and its link to social practices and norms, there are limitations to the existing body of research in this area. One limitation is that most studies have examined English and other widely spoken languages, with little investigation of less studied or endangered languages. Additionally, existing studies have primarily focused on how social factors like age, gender and social class impact dialect use, with limited exploration of other factors such as ethnicity or language contact.

Another limitation is that research has largely examined the attitudes of dominant or majority language speakers towards dialects, with little investigation of minority language speakers or speakers of non-standard dialects. This is particularly important given the potential for language discrimination and marginalization of non-standard dialects in some social contexts.

In short, the proposed study has the promise of providing novel insights. However, current research has limitations such as a focus on major languages, certain social factors, and the attitudes of dominant language speakers. Future studies investigating less studied languages, additional social factors, and the perspectives of minority language speakers could help address limitations and generate a more comprehensive understanding of social dialects. Areas for future investigation in the study of social dialects could include:

1. Investigation into the impact of other social factors such as ethnicity or language contact on dialect use and variation.
2. Investigation into the attitudes of minority language speakers or speakers of non-standard dialects toward dialect use and variation.
3. Investigation into the impact of dialect use and variation on social mobility, social status, and economic opportunities.
4. Investigation into the potential of dialect use and variation as a means of maintaining cultural heritage and promoting linguistic diversity.
5. Investigation into the effectiveness of language policies and educational programs in promoting linguistic diversity and addressing language discrimination.
6. Investigation into the impact of dialect use and variation on language attitudes and perceptions of speakers from different social backgrounds.

Research is needed to develop our understanding of the complexities of language variation and its relationship to social practices and cultural norms, particularly in less studied or endangered languages and for non-standard dialects. Such research can inform language policy and education, promoting linguistic diversity and social inclusion.

Data Analysis

Section One: The demographic information

The demographic information section in a questionnaire aims to collect data about participants' attributes and background. This allows researchers to understand the makeup of their sample group and explore potential connections between demographic factors and the research topic or results. Common demographic questions include age, where participants supply their age or select an age bracket; gender, which asks participants to identify as male, female or another option, or share their gender identity; education, which inquires about the highest level of schooling completed such as a high school diploma, bachelor's degree, master's degree or doctoral degree; and occupation, where participants list their current job title or career. Collecting these details gives researchers critical information to analyze and interpret their data comprehensively.

This research provides some understanding of how social factors such as socioeconomic status, gender, and age influence communication styles. The participant size of 75 provides adequate data to determine helpful conclusions, even if a larger sample could generate more reliable findings. While the insights are valuable, expanding the number of respondents in future studies may strengthen confidence in the results regarding social influences on language variation.

Table (1) with the gender distribution data and a comment:

Gender	Percentage
--------	------------

Gender	Percentage
Female	48%
Male	52%

The gender distribution in table (1), also provides useful context about the sample composition. With a nearly even split of 48% female and 52% male participants, gender is relatively balanced and unlikely to skew the results. This even gender distribution allows for comparisons between males and females in the data analysis. It is very promising that the gender distribution was fairly balanced between men and women. This means we can better understand whether differences in dialect exist between genders. Having a more equal representation of both perspectives is important for a comprehensive analysis.

Table (2) summarizes the age distribution of participants in the study:

Age Range	Percentage
Under 30	12.1%
30-40	9.1%
40-50	27.3%
50-60	51.5% (Main focus)
Total	100%

The age distribution also provides useful context. It seems the study focused mainly on people in their 50s and 60s, which likely reflects the researchers' interest in linguistic patterns within that particular generation. It would have been beneficial to include more participants from a wider range of ages to compare differences across generations. Table (2).

While the study offers some valuable insights, larger and more diverse samples in future research could generate more robust and generalizable conclusions about the complex relationships between language, society and identity. With continued studies in this area, we can develop educational practices, media representations and language policies that celebrate linguistic diversity and promote social justice. The substantial portion of participants within the 40-60 age bracket possibly suggests the researchers' aim to examine linguistic differences potentially linked to upbringing during a shared era or cultural milieu. Smaller percentages represented other age ranges - 12.1% under 30, 9.1% 30-40, and 27.3% 40-50. This distribution demonstrates respondents spanning multiple age categories participated, permitting exploration of changes to speech patterns and dialect variability connected to life stage. Including viewpoints from a range of ages enabled initial analysis regarding the potential linkage between generational distinctiveness and linguistic behaviors.

Table (3) summarizes the distribution of participants' educational backgrounds:

Educational Background	Percentage
Doctorate	63.6%
Master's Degree	21.2%
Graduate Degree	15.2%
Total	100%

The distribution of participants' educational backgrounds reveals significant details about the sample's educational background and its possible impact on the link between social variables and dialect variance. According to the statistics, the majority of participants (63.6%) have doctorates, followed by master's degrees (21.2%) and graduate degrees (15.2%). This distribution implies that most of the study's participants had advanced degrees and specialized knowledge. Table (3).

The large proportion of participants with a doctorate degree suggests that the study likely targeted a specific population, such as academics, researchers, or professionals who have pursued extensive education in their areas of specialization. This focus on individuals with higher educational attainment may provide valuable insights into the relationship between educational background and dialect variation, particularly within this specific group.

The distribution of designations among the participants provides insight into the professional roles and positions represented within the study. It offers valuable information about the occupational diversity of the sample and its potential impact on the relationship between social factors and dialect variation in linguistic practice.

Table (4) summarizes the distribution of participants' professional designations:

Professional Designation	Percentage
Other	33.3%
Teaching Assistant/Lecturer	21.2%
Assistant Professor	18.2%
Associate Professor	12.1%
Professor	12.2%
Total	100%

The data shows that the largest category of participants (33.3%) falls under the "other" designation, indicating a diverse range of professional roles not specifically listed in the given

categories. The inclusion of participants across multiple designations implies the research encompassed individuals from diverse backgrounds and occupational fields. This broader range of perspectives can facilitate deeper insight into connections linking professional roles and linguistic diversity. Represented designations referenced academic positions within educational institutions - teaching assistants/lecturers (21.2%), assistant professors (18.2%), associate professors (12.1%), and professors (12.2%). Table 4). These categories likely differed in seniority, experience, and specialization levels within academic settings. Involving viewpoints from educators at various career stages allowed for a preliminary examination of how occupational roles may correlate with dialect use. The distribution of designations can be significant in assessing potential variations in dialects and linguistic practices across different professional roles within academia. It allows for an exploration of how individuals' roles and positions may influence their language use and dialectal variations, considering factors such as teaching responsibilities, research focus, and levels of authority or seniority.

In conclusion, the distribution of designations in the study reflects the occupational diversity of the participants and provides an opportunity to examine the relationship between professional roles and dialect variation. Here is a paraphrase of the passage:

Section two

This section of the questionnaire commonly aims to gather information or reactions connected to the unique goals of the research study. Questions utilizing a Likert scale prompt respondents to rate their degree of agreement or disagreement with a set of statements employing a numerical ranking system (for example strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree).

1. Younger people tend to use different dialects than older people.

Table (5) summarizes the responses to the statement “Younger people tend to use different dialects than older people.”

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	24.2%
Agree	30.3%
Neutral	6.1%
Disagree	15.2%
Strongly Disagree	24.2%
Total	100%

The responses to the statement about younger and older people speaking differently provide insight into participants' perspectives on a possible connection between dialect variation and age differences. By gauging the level of agreement or disagreement with the claim, the distribution reveals insights into whether participants perceived dialect diversity in relation to

generational differences in speech patterns. Examining the distribution allows us to gauge the level of agreement or disagreement with the claim. The results show that 24.2% of respondents firmly rejected the notion, indicating they do not perceive language differences related to age. Likewise, only 15.2% were in agreement with the assertion. This suggests that close to a quarter strongly disagreed youth and older generations speak differently, with slightly over half that proportion concurring they speak differently. Therefore, the responses did not overwhelmingly support the idea that dialect diversity correlates with age differences according to most of the participants. In contrast, 30.3% of participants responded in favor of the statement, indicating they concur that younger and older individuals speak different dialects. Furthermore, 24.2% of participants strongly agree with the assertion, demonstrating their steadfast confidence in the existence of age-related dialect use variance.

In summary, while over a third of participants disagreed with the statement, around half agreed - either somewhat or strongly - indicating that many participants perceive a link between age and dialect variation. The responses provide useful insight into how participants viewed the possible impact of age on dialect use. The neutral response of 6.1% suggests some neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, potentially reflecting uncertainty or no formed opinion on the issue. Table (5). These responses demonstrate the range of perspectives among participants concerning the link between age and dialect variation. While some saw substantial differences in how younger and older people speak, others did not consider age a major influence on dialect variation. It's important to note these responses represent individuals' subjective perceptions and beliefs, which could be shaped by personal experiences, cultural backgrounds, and linguistic communities rather than objective fact. Different life exposures and communities may inform why some feel age impacts dialects whereas others do not see it as influential. Overall, the mixed response distribution highlights diverse views on this issue within the participant group, potentially stemming from personalized lenses each brings dependent on their distinct lived experiences and linguistic environments. The responses do not necessarily reflect objective linguistic patterns or empirical evidence regarding age-related dialect variation.

In conclusion, the responses to the statement indicate a range of perspectives regarding the relationship between age and dialect variation. While some participants strongly agree or disagree with the statement, others hold more neutral positions. Analyzing these responses in conjunction with additional variables can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the complex dynamics between age and dialect variation.

2. Women and men tend to use dialects differently in society.

Table (6) summarizes the responses to the statement "Women and men tend to use dialects differently in society"

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	15.2%
Agree	39.4%
Neutral	18.2%
Disagree	12.0%
Strongly Disagree	15.2%
Total	100%

The responses to the statement "Women and men tend to use dialects differently in society" suggest the participants hold varying opinions on the matter. While 39.4% of respondents agreed and 15.2% strongly agreed, indicating a majority believe there are differences in how men and women use dialects, a notable proportion disagreed.

The fact that 15.2% strongly disagreed and 12.0% disagreed suggests there is a significant minority who do not think gender significantly influences dialect use. Additionally, 18.2% choosing neutral suggests some uncertainty or lack of consensus among participants. Table (6).

Overall, the responses indicate a divergence of opinion among individuals regarding the relationship between gender and dialect use. It's worth noting responses to a single statement may be insufficient to draw firm conclusions about this complex issue, requiring further research for deeper insight.

In summary, while a majority perceived gender differences in dialect use, a significant minority disagreed and some were uncertain. This suggests varying opinions among participants that single statement responses cannot fully capture, highlighting the need for more nuanced research to better understand the interaction between gender and dialect.

3. People from different social classes use different dialects.

Table (7) summarizing the responses to the statement "Individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds tend to speak differently":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	30.3%
Agree	42.4%
Disagree	9.1%
Strongly Disagree	18.2%
Total	100%

The responses to the statement "Individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds tend to speak differently" show the participants hold varying perspectives on the potential link between socioeconomic status and dialect use. A large proportion of respondents, with 42.4% agreeing and 30.3% strongly agreeing, believe there is an association between socioeconomic background and the dialects people speak. This suggests the majority think people from different socioeconomic statuses tend to use distinct dialects. On the other hand, 18.2% strongly disagreed and 9.1% disagreed, indicating a notable minority who do not see a strong connection between socioeconomic status and dialect variation. This suggests some respondents disagree or are skeptical of the statement. This divergence of opinions among participants highlights the need for further nuanced research to gain a more holistic view of how socioeconomic status may shape dialect variation. Table (7).

4. The dialect a person speaks shapes their social identity.

Table (7) summarizing the responses to the claim "The dialect a person speaks shapes their social identity":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	21.2%
Agree	45.5%
Neutral	3.0%
Disagree	12.1%
Strongly Disagree	18.2%
Total	100%

Participants responded to the claim that "The dialect a person speaks shapes their social identity." 18.2% strongly disagreed with this notion, and an additional 12.1% disagreed. A small percentage, 3%, were neutral. Nearly half (45.5%) agreed that dialect influences social identity. The largest group, 21.2%, strongly agreed. In summary, over two-thirds or 66.7% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that the dialect one uses helps mold their social identity. This distribution thus implies a substantial portion of participants hold the view that dialect plays an important part in defining one's social identity. The findings suggest many believe the dialect one speaks is pivotal to shaping how they are socially identified. Table (8).

5. Some dialects are viewed as more prestigious than others in society.

Table (9) summarizes the responses to the statement "Some dialects are considered more prestigious than others in society":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	15.0%
Agree	48.5%
Neutral	9.0%
Disagree	3.0%
Strongly Disagree	24.2%
Total	100%

A statement suggesting that "Some dialects are considered more prestigious than others in society" was rated on a scale. A survey examined responses to the statement that some dialects are considered more prestigious in society. Nearly one-quarter or 24.2% of respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. An additional 3% disagreed. Around 9% were neutral. Conversely, almost half or 48.5% agreed with the statement. Just over 15% strongly agreed. The distribution of responses revealed that over half, specifically 63.7%, either agreed or strongly agreed that

some dialects are viewed as holding more value or status in society compared to others. The findings suggest it is a commonly accepted view that certain dialects possess greater prestige, as over 60% of participants agreed that some dialects are perceived as more prestigious within society, signifying a widely held belief regarding prestige differences between dialects. However, over 25% disagreed, showing not everyone believes this. Perceptions of prestige can vary by region, culture, and context. Table (9).

6. Certain dialects face discrimination more than other dialects.

Table (10) summarizes the responses to the statement "Some dialects experience more discrimination than others":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	21.5%
Agree	42.4%
Neutral	12.1%
Disagree	12.1%
Strongly Disagree	12.1%
Total	100%

A statement proposing that some dialects experience more discrimination than others was presented to respondents. The results showed that 12.1% strongly disagreed with the proposition. Another 12.1% disagreed. An additional 12.1% took a neutral stance. However, 42.4% agreed that certain dialects face greater discrimination. An even higher percentage, 21.5%, strongly agreed. The majority of respondents, over 60%, concurred that discrimination impacts some dialects to a higher degree than others. This distribution implies that it is a commonly accepted view that discrimination affects certain dialects more so than others, as most participants perceived this to be the case. However, over 20% disagreed, demonstrating not all believe discrimination differs across dialects. Perceptions of discrimination may depend on contextual factors. Table (10).

7. People make assumptions about others based on the dialect they speak.

Table (11) summarizes the responses to the statement "Certain dialects face discrimination more than other dialects":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	21.5%
Agree	42.4%
Neutral	12.1%

Response	Percentage
Disagree	12.1%
Strongly Disagree	12.1%
Total	100%

A statement proposing that "Certain dialects face discrimination more than other dialects" was presented to respondents. A minority of respondents, 12.1%, strongly disagreed with the idea that certain dialects face more discrimination. Another 12.1% disagreed as well. 12.1% were neutral on the subject. However, 42.4% agreed with the proposition that some dialects experience higher levels of discrimination. An additional 21.5% strongly agreed. Over three-fifths of respondents, or over 60% precisely, were in agreement that discrimination impacts some dialects to a greater degree than others. This distribution of responses implies discrimination against specific dialects is widely regarded as a common perception. However, over 25% disagreed, indicating not all think dialect strongly impacts social perceptions. Regional and cultural influences may shape views on this. Table (11).

8. Schools should teach and promote awareness of diverse dialects.

Table (12) summarizes the responses to the statement "Schools should teach and promote awareness of diverse dialects":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	21.2%
Agree	36.4%
Neutral	15.2%
Disagree	6.0%
Strongly Disagree	21.2%
Total	100%

The statement "Schools should teach and promote awareness of diverse dialects" was distributed as follows: 21.2% of the respondents Strongly Disagreed with this statement, 6% Disagreed, 15.2% were Neutral, 36.4% Agreed, and 21.2% Strongly Agreed. Though over 50% agreed schools should promote dialect awareness, a significant minority (over 25%) disagreed, revealing differing opinions on schools' role in linguistic diversity. Table (12).

9. The media plays a role in shaping attitudes towards different dialects.

Table (13) summarizes the responses to the statement "The media plays a role in shaping attitudes towards different dialects":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	36.4%
Agree	27.3%
Neutral	5.9%
Disagree	15.2%
Strongly Disagree	15.2%
Total	100%

A statement proposing that "The media plays a role in shaping attitudes towards different dialects" was presented to respondents. 15.2% strongly disagreed with the proposition. Another 15.2% disagreed. A small percentage, 5.9%, took a neutral stance. However, 27.3% agreed that the media influences views of various dialects. The largest group, 36.4%, strongly agreed that the media shapes attitudes toward dialects. In summary, over 60% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that the media has an impact on how dialects are perceived, while just under one-third disagreed or strongly disagreed. Most respondents (over 60%) agreed media shapes dialect attitudes, but over 25% disagreed, presenting mixed views on media influence. Table (13).

10. Language policies should protect minority dialects at risk of disappearing.

Table (14) summarizes the responses to the statement "Language policies should protect minority dialects at risk of disappearing":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	30.3%
Agree	27.3%
Neutral	18.0%
Disagree	9.1%
Strongly Disagree	15.2%
Total	100%

Participants were presented with the statement "Language policies should protect minority dialects at risk of disappearing." 15.2% strongly disagreed with this position, and 9.1% disagreed. Around 18% took a neutral stance. However, 27.3% agreed that language policies should safeguard endangered minority dialects. The greatest proportion of respondents, 30.3%, strongly agreed with using language policies to protect endangered dialects. To summarize, a majority expressed support as over half (57.6%) either agreed or strongly agreed with such an approach. However, close to a quarter (24.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, representing a considerable segment who did not support implementing language policies for dialect

conservation according to the distribution of responses. Overall, responses revealed diverse perspectives on the role of such policies in shielding minority dialects, with ample yet not overwhelming backing as well as noteworthy opposition. Table (14).

11. Dialect diversity enriches a society's linguistic culture.

Table (15) summarizes the responses to the statement "Dialect diversity enriches a society's linguistic culture":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	33.3%
Agree	27.3%
Neutral	12.0%
Disagree	9.1%
Strongly Disagree	18.2%
Total	100%

Participants indicated their level of agreement with the statement "Dialect diversity enriches a society's linguistic culture." 18.2% strongly disagreed with this perspective, and an additional 9.1% disagreed. Approximately 12% took a neutral position. However, 27.3% agreed that linguistic variety through dialects enhances a culture. The highest proportion, 33.3%, strongly agreed with this notion. In summary, over half (60.6%) were in support of the idea that dialect diversity cultivates a richer language environment within a society, compared to under one-third (27.3%) who disagreed or remained impartial. Over 50% agreed but a significant minority (around 25-30%) disagreed, showing diversity in views on value of dialect diversity. Table (15).

12. Children should be exposed to a variety of dialects at school.

Table (16) summarizes the responses to the statement "Children should be exposed to a variety of dialects at school":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	18.2%
Agree	36.4%
Neutral	18.0%
Disagree	15.2%
Strongly Disagree	12.1%

Response	Percentage
Total	100%

Participants responded to the statement "Children should be exposed to a variety of dialects at school." Slightly over 10% (12.1%) strongly disagreed with this perspective. Another 15.2% disagreed. Approximately 18% took a neutral stance. However, over one-third (36.4%) agreed that students should experience different dialects in their education. An additional 18.2% strongly agreed. In summary, while just over half (54.6%) supported exposing children to various dialects in school, close to one-third (27.3%) disagreed or were impartial. Overall, views varied somewhat on this issue, though there was a preference among respondents for dialect exposure in schooling. Over 50% agreed but a notable minority (around 25-30%) disagreed or took a neutral stance. Table (16).

13. People should not face discrimination or prejudice based on their dialect.

Table (17) summarizes the responses to the statement "People should not face discrimination or prejudice based on their dialect":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	57.6%
Agree	15.2%
Neutral	3.0%
Disagree	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	24.2%
Total	100%

The distribution of responses to the statement "People should not face discrimination or prejudice based on their dialect" is as follows: 24.2% of participants strongly disagree with the statement, 0% of participants disagree with the statement, 3% of participants have a neutral stance on the statement, 15.2% of participants agree with the statement, and 57.6% of participants strongly agree with the statement. An overwhelming majority (over 80%) agreed discrimination based on dialect is unacceptable. Table (17).

14. Some dialects have higher social status than others.

Table (18) summarizes the responses to the statement "Some dialects have higher social status than others":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	18.2%
Agree	30.3%

Response	Percentage
Neutral	19.0%
Disagree	3.0%
Strongly Disagree	30.3%
Total	100%

Participants indicated their level of agreement with the statement "Some dialects have higher social status than others." Nearly one-third (30.3%) strongly disagreed with this perspective. A small percentage (3%) disagreed. Close to 20% adopted a neutral stance. However, the same proportion as those who strongly disagreed (30.3%) agreed that certain dialects are seen as having greater status socially. Additionally, 18.2% strongly agreed. In summary, views were divided, with approximately half (48.5%) agreeing dialects have unequal status but over 30% strongly against the notion that dialects carry different social prestige. Opinions were mixed as to whether dialects are ascribed to varying levels of status in society. Table (18).

15. Dialects are connected to social identity and cultural values.

Table (19) summarizes the responses to the statement "Dialects are connected to social identity and cultural values":

Response	Percentage
Strongly Agree	39.4%
Agree	30.3%
Neutral	3.0%
Disagree	6.1%
Strongly Disagree	21.2%
Total	100%

Participants provided their level of agreement with the statement "Dialects are connected to social identity and cultural values." Over 20% (21.2%) strongly disagreed with this idea. An additional 6.1% disagreed. Just 3% had a neutral position. Around 30% (30.3%) agreed that dialects are tied to social identity and culture. The largest group, 39.4%, strongly agreed with this relationship between dialects and social/cultural aspects. In summary, the majority (69.7%) supported the statement that dialects are linked to social identification and cultural values, while a sizeable minority (27.3%) disagreed or had no opinion on this proposed association between dialects and social/cultural constructs. A majority (nearly 70%) agreed dialects are linked to identity and culture. However, around 25-30% held differing views, showing diversity in understanding this relationship. Table (19).

Conclusion

Based on the results obtained, here is a conclusion of the survey results in summary. For the statement that younger people tend to use different dialects, many participants agreed. This suggests an awareness of generational differences in language use. However, responses for gender differences in dialect use were more neutral, with participants neither strongly agreeing nor disagreeing that gender influences dialect.

Most participants agreed that people from different social classes use different dialects, indicating an awareness of the relationship between socioeconomic status and language variation. The majority also agreed that the dialect a person speaks shapes their social identity, showing recognition of the role of language in social perception and group membership.

There was general agreement that some dialects are viewed as more prestigious than others, though a significant minority disagreed. Regarding discrimination towards certain dialects, opinions were mixed but trended towards agreement, suggesting some awareness of dialect bias. The responses showed mixed opinions on what role schools should play in promoting dialect awareness and diversity.

The majority agreed that people make assumptions about others based on dialect, showing recognition of dialect bias. There was strong agreement that the media plays a role in shaping attitudes towards dialects, indicating awareness of media influence on language ideologies. The responses for language policies to protect minority dialects were also mixed but trended towards agreement.

In summary, most participants recognized the social significance of dialects and how they shape perceptions and identity. However, there was less consensus on actions to promote dialect diversity and reduce discrimination. The neutral responses to some statements also indicate uncertainty or a lack of strong opinions on certain issues.

Recommendations

Based on the results obtained and the conclusion of the survey, here are some recommendations for teachers, educationalists, language policymakers, planners, and researchers for further studies:

1. Further investigate generational differences in language use: Conduct more in-depth research to explore the specific linguistic practices and dialect variations among different age groups. This can provide insights into language change over time and inform educational approaches that cater to the needs of different generations.
2. Explore the role of gender in dialect use: Conduct studies that specifically examine the relationship between gender and dialect variation. Examine if gender impacts linguistic tendencies or social influences on dialect choices. Studying gender dimensions can enhance comprehension of intersections between sex and dialect variation.
3. Conduct research on socioeconomic status' role in dialect usage: Pursue broader analyses exploring connections between social class and linguistic diversity. Examine how socioeconomic factors influence dialect preferences and usage patterns. This can inform educational strategies that address linguistic diversity within different social contexts.

4. Examine the effectiveness of promoting dialect awareness and diversity in schools: Conduct research to evaluate the impact of various educational interventions aimed at promoting dialect diversity and reducing discrimination. Investigate the attitudes and experiences of students, teachers, and parents regarding dialects in educational settings. This can guide the development of inclusive language policies and pedagogical practices.
5. Study the relationship between media and language ideologies: Investigate the ways in which the media shape attitudes towards dialects and language variation. Analyze the portrayal of dialects in different forms of media and explore how media representations influence language perceptions and biases. This research can contribute to media literacy initiatives and promote more accurate and inclusive portrayals of linguistic diversity.
6. Further explore language policies protecting minority dialects: Investigate the effectiveness and implementation of language policies aimed at protecting and preserving minority dialects. Examine the impact of these policies on language attitudes, community identity, and language maintenance. This research can inform policy development and language planning initiatives.
7. Investigate interventions to reduce dialect bias and discrimination: Conduct studies that explore effective strategies to reduce dialect bias and discrimination in various social contexts. Explore how education, awareness initiatives, and community involvement influence efforts to dispute prejudiced generalizations and foster linguistic incorporation.

Additional studies in these domains would augment comprehension for educators, policymakers, planners, and researchers around dialect differentiation, social repercussions, and impactful methods for endorsing linguistic variety, inclusive attitudes, and impartiality. This enhanced knowledge could aid in the development of strategies to challenge biases and promote equitable respect for all language variations.

References

1. Al-Bohnayyah, Moayyad (2019) **Dialect Variation and Change in Eastern Arabia: Al-Ahsa Dialect**. PhD thesis, University of Essex.
2. Al-Rojaie, Yousef. «The effects of age and gender on the perceptions of linguistic variation in the Qassimi Arabic dialect». *Dialectologia: revista electrònica*, 2021, Núm. 26, <https://raco.cat/index.php/Dialectologia/article/view/384808>.
3. Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). **Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach**. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614.
4. Budiarsa, I. M. (2017). *Language, Dialect And Register Sociolinguistic Perspective*. *RETORIKA: Journal Ilmu Bahasa*, 1(2), <https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.1.2.42.379-387>

5. Calder, J. (2020). **Language, gender and sexuality in 2019**: interrogating normativities in the field. *Gender & Language*, 14(4).
6. Cheshire, J. (1982). **Variation in an English dialect**: A sociolinguistic study. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
7. Demirci, M. (1998). **Gender and age-based variation in the perception of Turkish dialects**. *Language Awareness*, 7(4).
8. Eckert, P. (1989). **Jocks and burnouts**: Social categories and identity in the high school. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
9. Edwards, J. (1991). **Language, society, and identity**. Oxford: Blackwell.
10. Fishman, J. A. (1971). **Sociolinguistics and the measurement of language maintenance**. *Language in Society*, 1(2).
11. Giles, H., & Powesland, P. F. (1975). **Speech style and social evaluation**. London: Academic Press.
12. Hancock, A. B., & Rubin, B. A. (2015). **Influence of communication partner's gender on language**. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 34(1).
13. Harris, J. (2006). **Phonetic variation and change in Scottish English**: The role of the community. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10(1).
14. Labov, W. (1972). **Sociolinguistic patterns**. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
15. Milroy, J. (1980). **Language and social networks**. Oxford: Blackwell.
16. Milroy, L. (2002). **Social network and social class**: Toward an integrated sociolinguistic model. *Language in Society*, 31(5).
17. Mulac, A. (1998). **The Gender-Linked Language Effect**: Do Language Differences Really Make a Difference? In *Sex Differences and Similarities in Communication* (1st ed., pp. 28). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315805870>
18. Mulac, A., Wiemann, J. M., Widenmann, S. J., & Gibson, T. W. (1988). **Male/female language differences and effects in same-sex and mixed-sex dyads**: The gender-linked language effect. *Communications Monographs*, 55(4).
19. Nicholas A. Palomares(2008).**Explaining Gender-Based Language Use**: Effects of Gender Identity Salience on References to Emotion and Tentative Language in Intra- and Intergroup Contexts, *Human Communication Research*, Volume 34, Issue 2, 1 April 2008, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2008.00321.x>
20. Preston, D. R. (1989). **Perceptual dialectology**: Nonlinguists' views of areal linguistics. Dordrecht: Foris.
21. Ricento, T. (2005). **Problems with the "language-as-resource" discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the USA**. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3).
22. Rickford, J. (2002). **Sociolinguistics and social justice**. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 6(3-4).
23. Roberts, J. (2013). **Child language variation**. The handbook of language variation and change.
24. Shareah, M. A. Q. A., Mudhsh, B. A. D., & AL-Takhayinh, A. H. (2015). **An overview on dialectal variation**. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 5(6).

25. Spolsky, B. (2012). **Language management**. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
26. Tagliamonte, S., & D'Arcy, A. (2009). **Peaks beyond phonology**: Adolescence, incrementation, and language change. *Language*, 85(1).
27. Trudgill, P. (1974). **The social differentiation of English in Norwich**. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
28. Wolfram, W. (1991). **American English**: Dialects and variation. Malden, MA: Blackwell.- Analysis of how social class affects dialect use in different contexts