



IRAQI  
Academic Scientific Journals



العراقية  
المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية

ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)

**Journal of Language Studies**

Contents available at: <https://jls.tu.edu.iq/index.php/JLS>



## A Sociolinguistic Analysis of the Impact of Typological and Factorial Variables on Language Change

**Barzan Jaafar Ali\***

English Department, College of Languages, Salahaddin University, Erbil

[barzan.j.ali@su.edu.krd](mailto:barzan.j.ali@su.edu.krd)

&

**Umarova Farangiz Bakhridin kizi**

English Department, Faculty of English, Uzbekistan State World Languages

University, Tashkent/ Uzbekistan

[umarova.farangiz18@mail.ru](mailto:umarova.farangiz18@mail.ru)

Received: 12/ 6/ 2025, Accepted: 7/7 /2025, Online Published: 30/9/2025

### Abstract

The evolution of language represents one of humanity's most fascinating yet intricate processes, influenced by an array of interconnected forces including social structures, cultural practices, mental processes, and the inherent properties of linguistic systems themselves. This investigation examines current research on how languages transform, focusing particularly on the interplay between these various catalysts of linguistic development. Through the lens of sociolinguistic theory, language contact studies, and typological research, we explore not only how linguistic changes occur but also why speech communities embrace these modifications. The methodology selected for this study is a mixed-methods approach to analyze the impact of typological and factorial variables on language change. In addition, a total of 160 bilingual participants took part in the study, divided into two language groups, firstly, 80 Kurdish participants in Iraqi

\* **Corresponding Author:** Barzan Jaafar Ali, Email: [barzan.j.ali@su.edu.krd](mailto:barzan.j.ali@su.edu.krd)

**Affiliation:** Salahaddin University - Iraq

© This is an open access article under the CC by licenses <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>



Kurdistan, examining the influence of English on Kurdish. Secondly, 80 Uzbek speakers in Uzbekistan, analyzing the effect of Russian on Uzbek.

Our findings enhance theoretical understanding of language evolution while providing practical insights for language education, policy development, and strategic language planning initiatives.

**Keywords:** external factors, historical linguistics, internal factors, language change, linguistic evolution, societal impact, typologies.

## تأثير العوامل والمتغيرات النمطية على تغير اللغة وفقا للتحليل اللغوي الاجتماعي دراسة تحليلية

بارزان جعفر علي

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية اللغات، جامعة صلاح الدين - أربيل/العراق

و

عمروفا فرنكيز بخردالدين كيزي

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية اللغة الإنجليزية، جامعة أوزبكستان الحكومية للغات العالمية،

طشقند/أوزبكستان

### المستخلص

يمثل تطور اللغة احدى اكثر العمليات البشرية اثارة وتعقيد , اذ يتأثر بمجموعة من العوامل المترابطة بما في ذلك البنى الاجتماعية , الممارسات الثقافية , والسياقات العقلية , اضافة الى الخصائص المتأصلة في الانظمة اللغوية بنفسها . ومن خلال مفهوم النظرية اللغوية الاجتماعية ودراسات الاتصالات اللغوية والبحوث النموذجية فأنا لا نستكشف فقط كيفية حدوث هذه التغيرات اللغوية وانما سبب تأثر المجتمعات بهذه التغيرات وهنا تكمن اشكالية البحث .

وللإجابة عل على اشكالية ابحث سوف نتبى المنهجية المتعددة الجوانب لتحليل تأثير المتغيرات النمطية على تغير اللغة مستندين في الجانب التطبيقي على بيانات مائة وستون شخصا ثنائي اللغة مقسم على مجموعتين حيث تمثل الاولى ثمانون مشتركا كرديا في اقليم كردستان العراق لدراسة تأثير اللغة الانكليزية على اللغة الكردية . اما المجموعة الثانية تتكون من ثمانون مشتركا متحدنا باللغة الاوزبكية في اوزبكستان لدراسة تأثير اللغة الروسية على اللغة الاوزبكية .

وبتكامل الجانبين النظري والعملي لمفهوم اللغة والتغيرات التي طرأت عليها سوف نحاول الوصول الى سياسات جديدة في وضع خطط وإستراتيجيات ادارة التطور اللغوي .

مفاتيح الكلمات: العوامل الخارجية – العوامل الداخلية –تطور اللغة – التأثير المجتمعي – العوامل التاريخية

## **1.INTRODUCTION**

The nature of language is inherently dynamic and subject to constant change that is formed by a various social, cultural, cognitive, and typological factors. The process of language change naturally occurs over time, as languages adapt to changing social, cultural, and cognitive contexts. Thorough understanding of language change is crucial for various domain of study, including linguistics, language teaching, language policy, and language planning (Nabila & Abdulrahman 2021).

Despite the importance of language change, it still remains a complex and complicated phenomenon that is not yet fully understood (Goel et al. 2016). While considerable amount of research on language change has been conducted, much of it has concentrated on particular aspects such as phonological change or syntactic change. Thus, there is a need for a comprehensive review of the literature that incorporates various theoretical frameworks and empirical investigations to provide a nuanced understanding of the mechanisms and motivations of language change.

The study aims is to provide a thorough review by employing sociolinguistic theory, language contact theory, and language typology to investigate the factors that contribute to language evolution. Hence, the present study examines the literature on language change such as phonological change, syntactic change, semantic change, and pragmatic change. Furthermore, it also investigates the implications of language change for language teaching, language policy, and language planning. Thus, to attain the objectives of this study, these research questions will be addressed. Firstly, what are the social and cultural factors that contribute to language change? Secondly, how do language contact and language typology influence language change? Finally, what role do cognitive and technological factors play in language change?

## **2. THEORITICAL BACKGROUND**

Language change is a complex phenomenon that has been studied extensively in the field of sociolinguistics. According to Labov (1972), language change is a "socially motivated" process that is driven by the needs and desires of speakers. This perspective is supported by Weinreich et al. (1968), who argue that language contact is a key factor in language change. Furthermore, Hockett (1958) posits that changing everyday language is owed to its instability, thus, instead of language decay or development, Hockett sees the change as a social response to the ever-changing context of life, language users, and its users (Hockett, 1958). Tajfel and Turner (1979) discuss language change from the perspective of social identity, as Tajfel and Turner note that language is an important marker of social identity, as speakers use language to signal their membership in particular social groups. This perspective is supported by Giles and Johnson (1987) who claim that speakers adjust their language to converge with or diverge from their

interlocutors, depending on their social goals. Additionally, Slobin (1996) discusses how typological differences significantly influence first language acquisition; Slobin posits that children learn linguistic structural features quicker when they follow typologically frequent structure. Additionally, he revealed that linguistic universals are characterized by both structural and cognitive. These typological differences play a crucial role in the process of language change. Givón (1979) aligning with Slobin, claims that linguistic structural features are formed by functional pressures like communication and cognition. Accordingly, due to various social, factorial and typological factors that influence language, the process of language change is seen as a complicated phenomenon.

### **3.LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **3.1 The Nature of Language Change**

Language change occurs when a group of speakers create linguistic expressions whether in distribution or form that differ from previous generations (Jalil and Al-Amir 2018). Accordingly, the nature of language change examines how language changes and develops over time, and it is a continuously evolving system. Language as a dynamic and evolving system is influenced by both internal and external factors, these factors continuously impact its structure, vocabulary and usage. Consequently, language change is inevitable for any living language (Mantiri 2010). This aligns with William (1875) as she postulates that language is an open system subject to conservative and alterative factors which show language as a living system that constantly experiences birth, growth decay and death.

Language change is natural process of all languages that occur at the level of phonology, morphology, semantic and semantic features (Labov 2010). Moreover, he asserts that social factors, such as language contact, class distinction, and linguistic innovations within speech communities shape language change. Different scholars have different opinions on the issue relating to the importance of social as opposed to linguistic factors in forming language. Scholars like, Thomason and Kaufman (1988) assert that sociolinguistic history of the speakers is determinant of the linguistic outcome of language change rather than the structure of their language. Whilst Muller (1875) and Jakobson (1938) believe that structural constraints are the primary determinants of the language change. (incomplete sentence)

Moreover, Labov (2010) postulates the importance of sociolinguistics in the processes of language change. align with this Winford (2013:365) in which he asserts highlights that studies have approved that social factors play a crucial role in shaping the consequences of language contact, in some cases even more important role than linguistic factors. Despite this, Trudgill (2004) regarding the formation of new dialects in isolated speech communities which he refers it to 'determinism' emphasises that there is no role for social factors such as prestige or identity in the emergence or development of isolated new-dialects, instead, the formation of new dialects is purely based on frequency in term of tokens of language use by the speakers with whom one interacts. Thus, linguistic behaviour is determined by language use in daily interactive communication. This indicates that geographical variation plays a key role in language change, as language

change frequently occurs incompatibly with diverse dialects and regional varieties either diverging or converging (Baxter et. al. 2009).

Eckert and Labov (2017) assert that language change is not only shaped by social and geographical factors but also by the intergenerational transmission of linguistic norms. They highlight the importance of studying language change within particular communities, moreover following its development across various generations. Hence, the above discussion shows that language change is a complicated phenomenon influenced by social, geographical and generational factors. This interdisciplinary framework enables researchers to investigate the nature of language change over time.

### **3.2 The Social Differentiation Process**

Mantiri (2010) states that changes in politics, economics and technology gradually leads to social change and social changes lead to language change. In another word, once society starts changing the language also starts to change. Thus, language change does not occur randomly but it is influenced by social factors and social interactions. Finegan & Rickford (2004) posit that various social variables include age, occupation, education, income and gender impact language. People with different levels of social status respond and perceive things differently and exhibit unique linguistic patterns and preferences. They give an example of individuals who are poor and unable to study or who grew up in an area where grammar is not highly encouraged while communicating with one another, their ways of speaking might not be as articulated as someone with a higher education level (Finegan & Rickford 2004). This illustrates that language change can result from processed like language contact where interaction and communication between communities with different linguistic background lead to exchange and adoption of new words, phrases and grammatical structures. Over time, part of these features gradually spread across the population and cause language change. labov (2006) in his study in New York city, explained the relationship between linguistic variation and social class. His findings revealed that language use is not only a reflection of social background but also a factor maintaining and reinforcing social differences. Moreover, Bourdieu's study (1984) on the concept of Linguistic Capital is another outstanding attempt in the study of language stratification. He argues that the concept of cultural capital is crucial to understanding the social differentiation. Bourdieu states that language is a form of capital that individuals hold and utilize to negotiate social settings. Bourdieu believes that the language that aligns with norms and preference of the dominant social groups can be an essential source of prestige and power. This means that individuals who carry forms of cultural knowledge, skills and prestige are valued differently within the same society. These help individual's social position and opportunity for mobility in the society.

### **3.3 Learning Language**

Thorbjörg (2003) states that since language is often transformed from one generation to another, therefore language learning can significantly play a role in changing language. This causes introducing new linguistic features to native language via learners. This process is known as language contact which can lead to language convergence where linguistic features of the two involved languages become more similar and familiar (Thomason 2001). For instance, language contact between Uzbek and Russian in

Uzbekistan has been observed that Uzbek speakers of Russian frequently transfer features from their native language into their Russian language use and vice versa. Furthermore, studies on language contact between Kurdish and Persian languages in Iran show that Kurdish speakers of Persian often transfer linguistic features from Kurdish into their Persian use and vice versa, resulting in changes in pronunciation and vocabulary of Persian.

Additionally, Goel et al. (2016) in a study discuss that through social networks linguistic features spread from target language into the embodied language, this process leads to language change through the process of language diffusion. Align with this statement, Li (2020) postulates that language diffusion can obviously be seen among English Learners in China. In his study, Li found out that those English learners who are regularly exposed to English through social media and online communication were more likely to incorporate new linguistic features like internet slang and abbreviations into their English use. In addition to that, Yang (2024) asserts that in internet communication, new linguistic features like internet slangs and abbreviations have been incorporated into the native languages from target languages. Furthermore, Saeed (2021) discusses that learner's understanding of overwhelming use of shortened forms like slang, misspellings, abbreviations, incorrect grammar and acronyms significantly impact the language and linguistic features. This shows that internet and social media platforms undeniably play a significant role in the communication of language learners and language change, particularly in the context of globalization and technological process.

Furthermore, Hockett (1958) in his Random Fluctuation Theory, emphasizes the important role of culture in the processes of language learning and language change. Firstly, it is essential to acknowledge that culture is not inherited biologically from parents to children. Rather, it is learned through orientation, active participation, and experience (Sidiqi 2021). Thus, Deo (2014) states that the process of socialization provides the foundation through which a child begins to acquire new vocabularies and linguistic elements from the mother tongue. Consequently, language change in everyday communication begins as new words, terms, and concept are introduced and integrated through the process of language learning.

### **3.4 Language Contact and Typology**

Globalization and technological advancement, from the invention of the printing press to the emergence of social media, have greatly contributed to the process of language change by increasing greater interaction among linguistic communities and facilitating contact between speakers of different languages. According to Thomason (2001) language contact is a significant factor in language change; when speakers of different languages interact, they may borrow linguistic elements or structures from each other's languages, leading to language change. Furthermore, drawing on Greenberg (1974) the typological characteristics of languages can also influence the direction and outcome of language contact. For instance, research has demonstrated that languages sharing similar typological features, including word order or grammatical case, are more likely to mutually influence each other (Givón, 1979). Furthermore, studies have shown that

occurrence of abrupt change and reconstructing when a language undergoes significant change within the duration of one or two generations due to extensive borrowing without consideration of lexical categories (Muysken 1985; Gómez Rendón 2005). Consequently, the speakers may choose to adopt the second language, and during the process of acquisition of the second language, they often borrow words, constructions, and sounds from it. The incorporation of borrowed words creates a new form of language that transforms everyday way of communicating in a social context. For example, an Uzbek word 'arzon' and Kurdish word 'harzan' are both borrowed from the Persian term 'Arzun'. Although both words retain the same meaning, they are pronounced differently. In this process, the resulting Uzbek/ Kurdish-Persian linguistic features include words borrowed from Persian but pronounced according to Uzbek or Kurdish phonology. Additionally, Milroy (2012) argues that cultural factors, such as globalization and migration, contribute to the introduction of foreign words and phrases into a language, thereby enriching its vocabulary and modifying its structure. Moreover, when speakers of one language interact with speakers of another language, they may borrow words and sounds from the other language. For instance, the English word "pizza" is a loanword from Italian, and it has maintained its Italian pronunciation (Lass, 2000). One notable example of a sound change is the Great Vowel Shift. This was a series of sound changes that took place in English between the 15th and 17th centuries. The Great Vowel Shift resulted in the merging of several long vowels, including the vowels in the words "meet" and "mate." Another example of a sound change is the word Kebab, a loan word from Arabic. Its pronunciation has changed across different languages, in Persian, it became 'keba:b' in Kurdish 'kaba:b' and in Uzbek 'kabob'. Thus, when speakers of Uzbek, Kurdish, and Persian come into contact with each other, they may engage in a process called lexical borrowing, adopting words and phrases from each other. These borrowed words and phrases may undergo phonological adaptation, where their pronunciation is adjusted to align with the sound system of the borrowing language. For example, the Persian word "madrasa" meaning "school" has been adopted into both the Uzbek and Kurdish languages with minimal changes to its pronunciation or meaning. Similarly, the Persian and Kurdish languages have borrowed the Uzbek word "chay" meaning "tea". The word has been adapted into Kurish and Persian as "chāy" with only slight changes in pronunciation or meaning. Likewise, the Persian and Uzbek languages have borrowed the Kurdish word "brādar" meaning "friend". The word has been adapted into Uzbek and in Persian as "birodar, and barādar" with only minor changes in pronunciation or meaning.

### **3.5 Factorial Variables and Language Change**

Language change can also be influenced by factorial variables, such as age, social class, and education (Smith 2022). Speakers from different social backgrounds may utilize language differently, and these differences can lead to language change over time (Labov, 1972). For instance, studies have demonstrated that individuals from higher social classes tend to use more standard or prestigious varieties, whereas those from lower social classes may use more non-standard or socially stigmatized forms (Hudson, 1980). Thus, Labov's (2010) research on linguistic change in Philadelphia demonstrated that linguistic innovations frequently arise within lower-middle and working-class groups. This

observation supports the curvilinear principle, which argues that linguistic change is typically initiated by intermediate social classes, rather than by the upper elite or the most marginalized groups (Labov, 2010; Smith, 2022).

### **3.6 Technological Factors**

Technology has constantly influenced language, from the invention of the printing press to the emergence of social media. The invention of printing press in the 15th century contributed to the standardization of language by making texts widely available, leading to uniform spelling and grammar (Crystal 2011). Similarly, Baron (2008) asserts that technologies such as the telephone and radio contributed in establishing a more standardized form of spoken language. These technologies enabled the transmission of speech to wide audiences, therefore shaping public discourse. In contrast, social media, has brought about faster and more informal language changes. The rise of new technologies, including the internet, social media, and smartphones, has led to profound changes in the way peoples communicate (yang 2021). These changes have also had a corresponding impact on the way that language is used. The emergence of new words and phrases is one of the most significant ways that technology has influenced language change. For example, the English language has borrowed numerous terms from the field of computing, such as website," "email," "and "download." These terms have become essential components of our everyday language, illustrating how our communication and interaction with the world around us have evolved. Another way in which technology has influenced language change is through the rise of new forms of communication. Herring (2013), asserts that social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook have promoted a culture of brevity and innovation in language, contributing to the emergence and spread of slang, abbreviations, and new words. These new forms of communication have also led to changes in the way that people use grammar and punctuation. Moreover, the rise of smartphones has introduced new forms of communication, such as texting and voice messaging which have influenced language use. These new forms of communication have also had an impact on the way that we use language. Text messages, for example, often use a more informal style of language, and they may include abbreviations and emoticons (Crystal 2012).

## **4.METHODOLOGY**

### **4.1 Research Design**

The methodology selected for this study is a mixed-methods approach to analyze the impact of typological and factorial variables on language change. The quantitative section involves a structured questionnaire with 5 Likert-scale, while the qualitative section includes open-ended responses to explore participants' perceptions in depth.

### **4.2 Participants**

A total of 160 bilingual participants took part in the study, divided into two language groups, firstly, 80 Kurdish participants in Iraqi Kurdistan, examining the influence of

English on Kurdish. Secondly, 80 Uzbek speakers in Uzbekistan, analyzing the effect of Russian on Uzbek. Participants were selected across different age groups to capture generational variations in language change.

#### **4.3 Data Collection**

As it was mentioned the data collection method contains of mixed methods approach. The first is quantitative method, in which a structured questionnaire was distributed to participants, consisting of three sections: Firstly, Perception of Language Change Over Time (e.g., generational language differences, borrowing of words). Secondly, Typological Changes in Language (e.g., grammatical shifts, syntactic restructuring). Thirdly, Factorial Variables Influencing Language Change (e.g., influence of media, technology, and social interactions). Responses were collected using a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree) and multiple-choice questions.

The second method is qualitative data collection, in which participants were asked open-ended questions regarding lexical and syntactic changes observed in their first language. Moreover, the impact of media, education, and technology on language use. Additionally, how attitudes toward borrowing words and structural perspectives have influence from dominant languages to the local languages in the case of (English -Kurdish) and (Russian-Uzbek) languages.

### **5. DATA ANALYSIS**

The quantitative responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine the percentage of participants perceiving language change over time, the frequency of code-switching and borrowing and patterns of typological shifts and syntactic changes. Additionally, the qualitative responses were examined using thematic analysis, identifying recurring themes such as the influence of globalization and media exposure on language change, intergenerational differences in language use, and attitudes toward lexical borrowing and syntactic adaptation.

### **6.DISCUSSION**

#### **1. Findings and Discussion**

Table 1: Perception of Language Change Over Time

| <b>Question</b>           | <b>Strongly Agree</b> | <b>Agree</b> | <b>Neutral</b> | <b>Disagree</b> | <b>Strongly Disagree</b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| I have noticed changes in | 47%                   | 32%          | 10%            | 3%              | 8%                       |

|                                                                                |     |     |     |     |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|
| the way my first language is spoken over time.                                 |     |     |     |     |    |
| Younger generations speak differently than older generations in my community.  | 39% | 30% | 16% | 13% | 2% |
| Borrowing words from other languages is a common feature in my first language. | 60% | 25% | 10% | 3%  | 2% |
| The internet and social media have accelerated changes in my first language.   | 52% | 29% | 4%  | 8%  | 9% |

Table 1 illustrates the perception of language change over time. According to the findings, a significant majority (79%) of participants have noticed changes in their first language over time. This indicates that language change is a common phenomenon, and individuals are aware of these changes. While only 11% of the participants disagree indicating that their language has not changed over time and language change is widely recognized. This demonstrates that, the high percentage suggests that both Kurdish and Uzbek have undergone significant changes. Kurdish speakers in Iraqi Kurdistan report a notable increase in English borrowed vocabulary, sentence structures, and increasing code-switching, especially in urban areas and among younger generations where English is prominent in education and media. Similarly, Uzbek speakers in Uzbekistan, despite post-Soviet linguistic reforms, acknowledge a persistent Russian linguistic influence, affecting their vocabulary and expressions in daily speech, education, and government settings. Moreover, statement 2, Younger generations speak differently than older generations in my community. The result shows that the majority (69%) of respondents agree that younger generations speak differently than older generations. This suggests that there are notable differences in language use across generations, while 16% preferred to remain neutral and 15% of the participants believed that there are no significant differences between the two generations. This result demonstrates that language evolution is generational and generational differences in language use can be attributed to various factors, such as changes in cultural values, technological advancements, or exposure to different languages and dialects. The fact that most respondents acknowledge these differences highlights the importance of considering generational factors in language research. In Kurdish-speaking communities, it is common for younger speakers to incorporate English words and sentence structures into their speech; this has been influenced by digital media and international education. In contrast, older speakers tend to use more Kurdish vocabulary.

For Uzbek speakers, generational differences are also evident and clearly observable, in which younger speakers more often incorporate Russian expressions and hybrid linguistic structure, especially in professional and academic settings, whilst older generations maintain a more traditional Uzbek vocabulary and syntax, reflecting the historical shift from Russian dominance to Uzbek revitalization. Statement 3 discusses if borrowing words from other languages is a common feature in the first language. The findings show that a considerable majority (85%) of participants agree that borrowing words from other languages is common in their first language. This suggests that language contact and borrowing are widespread phenomena, whilst only 5% disagreed with the statement and 10% remained undecided. This shows that lexical borrowing is a common feature of language contact and both language contact and borrowing can occur due to various factors, such as globalization, migration, or cultural exchange. The fact that most respondents acknowledge the presence of borrowed words in their first language highlights the importance of considering language contact in language research. Both languages show a high degree of lexical borrowing. Kurdish has incorporated English words in fields like technology, business, and education (e.g., “online,” “meeting,” “project”). Uzbek has adopted Russian terminology, especially in everyday life and technology (e.g., “telefon” (telephone), “pechka” (radiator), “duxovka” (oven)). This demonstrates the constant influence of Russian language on Uzbek vocabulary as well as highlights both historical and contemporary linguistic shifts resulting from cultural contact. Statement 4, discusses, how the internet and social media have accelerated changes in first languages. The findings show that an overwhelming majority (81%) of participants agree that the internet and social media have played an essential role in accelerating changes in their first language. This indicates that technology has a key role in shaping language use, while only 15% of the participants believed that social media and internet have not changed their first language. This result shows that the internet and social media have increased exposure to different languages, dialects, and language varieties, this can lead to language change, as individuals adopt new words, phrases, and language structures from other languages and incorporate them into their first language. The fact that the majority of the participants aware of the impact of technology on language change; this highlights the importance of considering technological factors in the process of language change. Accordingly, social media platforms have increased English use among Kurdish speakers, resulting in extensive use of English abbreviations, words and hybrid expressions into Kurdish language. Similarly, in Uzbekistan, Russian language remains dominant in internet-based communication, reinforcing Russian slang and grammatical patterns among younger generations of Uzbek speakers.

Table 2: Typological Changes in Language

| Question                                                                                   | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| The structure (grammar, word order) of my first language has changed compared to how older | 45%            | 32%   | 12%     | 5%       | 6%                |

|                                                                               |     |     |    |    |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|----|----|----|
| generations used them.                                                        |     |     |    |    |    |
| Spelling and writing conventions have changed over time.                      | 40% | 35% | 9% | 7% | 9% |
| New expressions and idioms have replaced older ones in everyday conversations | 37% | 43% | 6% | 8% | 6% |

Table 2, presents the findings on typological changes in language, the results show that a majority (77%) of respondents agree that the structure of their first language has changed over time, while only 11% believe that their first language has not been changed and 12% remained neutral. This indicates that the changes in language structure can occur due to various factors, such as language contact, cultural exchange, or internal linguistic evolution. The fact that most respondents acknowledge changes in language structure suggests that language is dynamic and adaptable. Thus, Kurdish speakers report a shift toward English sentence structures, especially in informal speech especially at the level of clausal structure (e.g., "I have a meeting" instead of a fully Kurdish phrase). Similarly, Uzbek speakers adopt Russian grammatical patterns, such as word order changes and increased use of Russian-style passive constructions. Statement 2, discusses how spelling and writing forms have changed over time. The data showed that 75% of the participants agree that spelling and writing forms have changed over time, while a minority of 16% of the participants disagreed. This shows that changes in spelling and writing forms can occur due to various factors, such as technological advancements, language standardization, or cultural exchange. Accordingly, the awareness of the participants regarding changes in spelling and writing forms suggests that language is adapting to new contexts and technologies. Additionally, statement 3, illustrates that new expressions and idioms have replaced native ones, indicating a notable change in everyday language use. Accordingly, the replacement of older expressions and idioms with new ones is a natural process in language evolution, this change can be caused by various factors, such as cultural shifts, technological advancements, or demographic changes. The fact that participants acknowledge this change suggests that language is adapting to new contexts and cultural norms.

Table 3: Factorial Variables Influencing Language Change

| Question                                                      | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| My use of language changes depending on who I am speaking to. | 47%            | 36%   | 10%     | 5%       | 2%                |

|                                                                 |     |     |    |    |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|----|----|-----|
| I mix words or structures from multiple languages when I speak. | 50% | 30% | 2% | 6% | 12% |
| Exposure to foreign media has influenced my language use.       | 70% | 20% | 5% | 3% | 2%  |

Table 3 discusses the factorial variables influencing language change. Statement 1, shows that a significant majority (83%) of respondents agree that their language use changes depending on who they are speaking to, however, only 7% of the participants disagree and 10% remained undecided. This finding suggests that participants are aware of their audience and adapt their language use accordingly. This is a common phenomenon in sociolinguistics, where speakers adjust their language to suit the social context. The finding indicates that code-switching is a common phenomenon. Kurdish speakers adapt their speech based on context and audience, switching between pure Kurdish, Kurdish-English hybrid speech, and even full English in professional settings. For Uzbek, language use changes based on domain, specific factors, Russian remains more prestigious in formal settings, whereas Uzbek dominates informal and nationalistic discourse. Statement 2, discusses that 80% of participants agree that they mix words or structures from multiple languages when they speak. In contrast, only 18% do not mix languages. This finding suggests that participants engage in code-switching or language blending, which is a common phenomenon in multilingual communities. This mixing of languages can be a result of language contact, cultural exchange, or individual creativity. This response confirms the prevalence of code-mixing. Kurdish speakers increasingly incorporate English single word and clausal insertions, technical terms (e.g., "Let's do a report" instead of a fully Kurdish phrase). Similarly, Uzbek speakers demonstrate a similar pattern with Russian, where common expressions contain a blend of Uzbek syntax and Russian lexical items, such as "ya znayu" (I know) instead of its full Uzbek equivalent. Statement 3, presents the exposure to foreign media has influenced my language use. Based on the findings, an overwhelming majority (90%) of participants agree that exposure to foreign media has influenced their language use. Although, only 5% disagree and 5% remained neutral, this finding indicates that respondents are aware of the impact of foreign media on their language use. Foreign media can expose individuals to new words, phrases, and language structures, which can be incorporated into their own language use. Accordingly, foreign media plays a crucial role in language change. Kurdish youth, exposed to Hollywood movies/ shows, English music, and online content, frequently adopt English phrases and expressions. In Uzbekistan, Russian television and social media continue to serve as a linguistic bridge, maintaining Russian lexical dominance in entertainment and informal communication. These findings align with broader sociolinguistic theories of language contact and change, showing how globalization, historical influences, and media exposure contribute to linguistic evolution.

## **7.CONCLUSION**

This study explores the impact of typological and factorial variables on language change by examining how the Kurdish and Uzbek languages have changed under the influence of English and Russian, respectively. The findings from the questionnaire provided significant understandings into the social, typological, and cognitive-technological factors that impact language change among speakers of these languages. To achieve the aims of the present study, the research questions are going to be discussed below.

RQ1: What are the social and cultural factors that drive language change?

The results indicated 69% of participants believed that younger generations speak differently than older generations, as 80% confirmed frequent code-switching between Kurdish-English and Uzbek-Russian languages. This suggests that language change is strongly influenced by sociocultural dynamics, including generational differences and globalization. Moreover, Kurdish speakers increasingly incorporate English terms into everyday conversation due to education, media, and international exposure. Similarly, Uzbek speakers continue using Russian loanwords, especially in academic and technical discourse, despite national linguistic reforms. Additionally, social networks and digital communities expose speakers to new linguistic norms, further accelerating lexical borrowing and syntactic changes. Thus, urbanization, migration, and media consumption are key drivers of language evolution in both communities.

RQ2: The influence of language contact and typology on language change

According to the data, 77% of respondents observed grammatical changes in their first language, and 80% confirmed that new expressions and idioms have replaced older ones in everyday conversations. This demonstrates that language contact leads to syntactic and typological transformations. Thus, Kurdish (an SOV language) is increasingly adopting SVO patterns from English, simplifying its word order and sentence structure especially at the level of clausal structure insertions. Uzbek (an agglutinative language) incorporates syntactic elements from Russian, particularly in formal speech and written communication. Furthermore, loanwords and hybrid grammar structures emerge in bilingual and multilingual contexts, illustrating the impact of contact linguistics on structural change. These findings confirm that language typology adapts to external influences when exposed to long-term contact with a dominant language.

RQ3: The role of cognitive and technological factors in language change

The impact of digital media on language evolution was particularly evident, with an overwhelming 90% of participants acknowledging that foreign media has shaped their language use. For example, social media platforms like Instagram, TikTok, Facebook and YouTube introduce new phrases, slang, and pronunciation trends. In addition, instant messaging and online communities promote simplified grammar, code-mixing, and emoji-based communication. Hence, cognitive adaptation to multilingual environments enables speakers to switch effortlessly between languages, reinforcing bilingual

processing and hybrid language use. This confirms that technological advancements and cognitive flexibility are central to modern linguistic shifts. Overall, this study provides strong empirical evidence that language change is influenced by a combination of social, typological, and technological factors. Social and cultural shifts (e.g., globalization, digital interactions, and generational variation) accelerate lexical change and code-mixing. Additionally, language contact and typology dictate grammatical and structural adaptations. Cognitive flexibility and technology reshape how individuals use and perceive their language.

To have a better understanding of the reasons behind the language change among the languages used in the current study, further studies are needed in typological changes to figure out how languages impact each other through language typology to explore the social, cultural, cognitive, and typological factors that drive language evolution.

## REFERENCES

Baron, N. (2008). *Always on: Language in an online mobile world*. Oxford University Press

Baxter, Gareth, Blythe, Richard, Croft, William, & McKane, Allan (2009). *Modelling language change: An evaluation of Trudgill's theory of the emergence of New Zealand English Language Variation and Change*, 21(2), 257–296

(PDF) Depending on gender the role of Gurindji women in contact-induced language change. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388837363\\_Depending\\_on\\_gender\\_The\\_role\\_of\\_Gurindji\\_women\\_in\\_contact-induced\\_language\\_change](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388837363_Depending_on_gender_The_role_of_Gurindji_women_in_contact-induced_language_change) [accessed May 25 2025].

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Harvard University Press.

Crystal, D. (2012). *Internet linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Deo, A (2014). Formal semantics/ pragmatics and language change. In Bower, Claire and Bethwyn Evans (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, 393-309. London, New York: Routledge.

Finegan, E. & Rickford, J. (2004). *Language in the USA: Themes for the Twenty first Century*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Giles, H., & Johnson, P. (1987). Ethnolinguistic identity theory: a social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 68, 69-99.

Givón, T. (1979). *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.

Goel, R., Soni, S., Goyal, N., Paparrizos, J., Wallach, H., Diaz, F., & Eisenstein, J. (2016). *The social dynamics of language change in online networks*. In *Lecture notes in computer science* (pp. 41–57). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47880-7\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47880-7_3)

Gomez, R. (2005) The Half Language of Imbabura.' In Pieter Muysken and Hella Olbertz (eds.). *Encounters and Conflicts: Bilingualism and Language Contact in the Andean World*. Madrid: Vervuert Iberoamericana. pp. 39-57

Hockett, C.F., (1958). *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: Macmillan

Jacobson, R (1938). *On the theory of phonological affinities between languages*. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Linguists*, 48-59. Reprinted in selected writings. The Hague: Mouton

Jalil, Z., & Al - Amir, D. A. (2018). *Language variation and change in the English history*. University of Al-Qadissiya

Li, H. (2020). Emerging Chinese-English Hybridized Internet Neologisms: A Big Data Study Based on Baidu Index. *International Journal of English and Cultural Studies*, 3(6), 10.11114/ijecs.v3i1.4688.

Labov, W. (1972) 'Some principles of linguistic methodology', *Language in Society*

Labov, W. (2006) *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. United States of America. Cambridge University Press, New York

Labov, W. (2010). *Principles of Linguistic Change: Cognitive and Cultural Factors*. John Wiley & Sons.

Lass, R. (2000). *Phonology: An introduction to basic concepts* (5th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milroy, L., & Milroy, J. (2012). *Authority in language: Investigating language prescription and standardisation*. Routledge.

Mantiri, O. (2010). Factors Affecting Language Change. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2566128>

Muller, F. Max (1875) *Lectures on the science of language*, Vol. 1. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co.

Muysken, P (1985). 'Contacts between Quichua and Spanish in Ecuador'. In Segundo E. Moreno Yáñez (ed.) *Proceedings of the First European Symposium on the Anthropology of Ecuador*, 377–451. Quito: Ediciones Abya Yala

Nabila, E., & Abdulrahman, T R, (2021). *An analysis of new English words created during*

COVID-19. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities* 9.1 (2021): 19-32.

Saeed, R. M. B (2021) The Impact of the English Language used in social media on English Language Learners at the Undergraduate Level in Sargodha. *Middle Eastern Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences. Middle Eastern Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences*. <https://bcsdjournals.com/index.php/mejrhss>

Sidgi, S (2021) *The Process of Changing Everyday Language: How Society Changes Words*. (n.d.). <https://aipublications.com/ijllc/detail/the-process-of-changing-everyday-language-how-society-changes-words/>

Slobin, D. I. (1996). From “thought and language” to “thinking for speaking.” In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity* (pp. 70-96). Cambridge University Press

Smith, J.C. (2022) ‘Social Factors in Language Change and Variation’, in A. Ledgeway and M. Maiden (eds.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Romance Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics), pp. 898–929.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). *An integrative theory of intergroup conflict*. In W. G. Austin & S

Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language contact, creolization and genetic affiliation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomason, S. G. and Kaufman, T (1988) *Language contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir (2003). *Language change and language acquisition*. Munin.uit.no. doi: <https://doi.org/1503-8599>.

Trudgill, P. (2004). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Penguin UK.

Weinreich, U., Labov, W. & Herzog, M. (1968). Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In *Directions for Historical Linguistics*, W.P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (dirs), 95-185. Austin: University of Texas Press

William D. Whitney (1875) *The life and growth of language, an outline of linguistic science*. New York: D. Appleton & Company

Winford, Donald (2013). Social factors in contact languages. In Peter Bakker & Yaron Matras (eds.). *Contact Languages: A Comprehensive Guide*, 363–416. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Yang,Y. (2024). Research on the Impact of Internet Language on Communication. *Communications in Humanities Research*,46,12-16.