

**RESEARCH PAPER****A Linguistic Analysis of the Social Dialect(S) Spoken by the Slum Dwellers in Lahore****¹ Jannat Nabeel, ²Dr. Farah Kashif* and ³Maryam Khurshid**

1. BS (Hons), Department of Applied Linguistics, Kinnaird College for Women University, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Associate Professor, Department of Applied Linguistics, Kinnaird College for Women University, Punjab, Pakistan
3. M.Phil. Applied Linguistics, Department of Applied Linguistics, Kinnaird College for Women University, Punjab, Pakistan

Corresponding Author

Farha.kashif@kinnaird.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to conduct a linguistic analysis of the sociolect(s) used by the slum dwellers in three areas of Lahore: Bahria Town, Model Town, and Wapda Town. The objectives were to find the sociolect(s) spoken by the slum community, analyze it based on linguistic features, and determine the extent the sociolect(s) of slum dwellers vary from the city dwellers. It has been years since the phenomenon of language was discovered and used by humans as the source of conveying perceptions. The qualitative research methodology and the two instruments: non-participant overt observation and semi-structured interviews have been used. The results elicited that the sociolects used by the slum community were mainly Punjabi, a mixture of both Urdu and Punjabi, and a hint of Saraiki was also found. Additionally, it is recommended to increase the sample size, incorporate participant observation, and conduct pilot testing to ensure clarity for the main study.

Keywords: Linguistics Analysis, Slum Dwellers, Sociolect**Introduction**

The study of social dialects in sociolinguistics focuses on the unique language patterns used by specific social groups, influenced by factors like place of birth, age, education, and social background. This research specifically examines the language practices of slum communities, highlighting how their sociolect reflects their identity and individuality. Sociolinguistics, as defined by Eble (2005), explores the relationship between language and society, emphasizing that language is dynamic and shaped by social contexts. The field intersects with disciplines such as anthropology and sociology and encompasses various dialects, including social, regional, temporal, standard, and non-standard dialects.

The paper also discusses the plight of slum dwellers, who often face socioeconomic challenges and communicate through specific sociolects, such as Bazaari Urdu, a non-standard variety used by the working class in regions like Lahore and Mumbai. This highlights the intersection of language use and social identity among marginalized groups.

Literature Review**Previous Related Researches**

The linguistic analysis of the varieties of a language in the form of dialects has been well-researched. The language analysis is based on certain language features that help to establish an explicit understanding. The following works are relevant to the topic and add to the literature. The approach of general to specific has been adopted, starting from linguistic analysis, moving to social dialect. Several studies explore the relationship between

language, context, and identity. For instance, Watt and Llamas (2014) examined Scottish English and found that speakers are conscious of language variation, shaping their social interactions. DeVito (2009) analyzed spoken versus written language among professors, identifying distinct grammatical patterns. Nazir et al. (2021) focused on the language of transgenders in Lahore, noting their use of a vernacular Punjabi dialect and code-switching.

Curtin (2020) investigated how social class influences dialect, highlighting unique speech patterns among different socioeconomic groups. Setiawan (2015) studied the Sasak community in Indonesia, linking sociolect usage to social status, while Schilling-Estes (2022) examined gender dynamics in language variation in the U.S.

Research also reflects historical perspectives on slum language, noting its evolution from a low-status form to a recognized global language, as highlighted by Diaries (2023). Other studies, like those by Backues (2023) and Mahfouz (2021), emphasized the social stigma attached to slum communities and the linguistic creativity emerging within them.

Overall, the reviewed literature spans multiple cultures and contexts, with a specific focus on Pakistani slum dialects in Lahore aimed at filling research gaps. This comprehensive analysis underscores the interplay of language, society, and identity in diverse communities.

Conceptual Framework

Framework for Language Analysis

The first theory, upon which the research was grounded was given as a framework on the website, "*Englicious, University College London*". This resource was team-made over several years in the course, Teaching English Grammar in Context. The notion of the framework was to provide a systematic and organized structure for analyzing a language. It can be applied to any literary or non-literary discourse. Linguistic features are discussed in it along with the potential meaning. They include Discourse and context, Construal, Textual intervention, Foregrounding, Voice, Verb Processes, World-building, Modality, Referencing, Negation, Tense, Metaphor, Deixis, Pronouns, Clause patterns, Cohesion, and Visual grammar.

Referencing

People, places, objects, and events are referents that are referenced by using referencing. The definite article (the), indefinite articles (a, an), proper nouns, common nouns, and pronouns are used for referencing.

Verb processes

The way verb choices are used to represent people, places, and events. It includes the action process (doing verbs), cognition process (thinking verbs), verbal process (saying verbs), and relational process (being/having verbs).

Tense

Tenses are used to represent the relation of time corresponding to the event. The past tense tells about the things that have taken place previously, the present tense is used for the current things, and the future tense represents the forthcoming event.

Voice

It means the structure of the clause that builds the relation between participants and things. The active voice is the participant doing something, and the passive voice is the participant having things done to them.

Deixis

Deixis means pointing things in various contexts to show how close or distant they are. These include personal deixis (I, you, we), spatial deixis (this, that, here, there), and temporal deixis (now, today, yesterday, tomorrow).

Modality

Modality means the extent of certainty and possibility expressed using modal verbs and adverbs. The two kinds are deontic modality (obligation, permission, commitment) and epistemic modality (choice, possibility, knowledge).

Clause Patterns

It means the particular form certain clauses follow. The three types are: declarative (facts, opinions), interrogative (questions using 5W's and 1H), and imperative (command, request).

Negation

Negation means the words that are used to negate or contradict parts of a complete sentence. It can be further divided into simple negation (no, not), and adverbial negation (never, nowhere, nothing).

Cohesion

Cohesion links the words and sentences together to make them coherent and consistent. Like, coordinating conjunctions (and, but, or), and subordinating conjunctions (if, whether, because).

Discourse Context

It means the context in which the discourse took place. It is the situation in which the language (written or spoken) is delivered. It can be related to the context in which the code-switching takes place during the conversation of the insiders, the members of a language community, or their interaction with outsiders who do not belong to that language community.

Theory on Social Dialect by Piekot

The second theory backing this research was given by Tomasz Piekot in 2008 in his book *“Language in the Social Group: An Introduction to the Research of Sociolects”*, originally written in the Polish language by the name *Język w grupie społecznej: Wprowadzenie do badań socjolektów*. The research was done on the sociolect of the Polish language and a theory was proposed that contained the tools, criteria, methods, and other concepts that help to analyze the sociolect with the combination of both social and linguistic elements (Piekot, 2008).

Describing the Speech community

This includes the description of the speech community, the bonds among the members of that community, the way they socialize with the outside world, the attitude towards other people, the various activities they perform, the identification of the type of communication and situation between the members of the group, the semantic categories they use like words and phrases.

Reshaping the Linguistic View of the World

This is about the view the speech community develops about the world. The way the people of the community speaking a social dialect experience and interpret reality. The analyst sees the lexico-semantic features that are related to word meanings and their systematic study. It helps to decipher how the speakers see the world in the light of language.

Reforming the Values of a Specific Community

This means that the traditions, values, and norms of a specific community are focused on. When analyzing a sociolect, three things are necessary to be kept in mind of the analyst. They include transcendental, existential, and cultural. Transcendental is good or bad, Existential is life or death, happiness or unhappiness, and the last one is Cultural which means the aspects of beauty or ugliness, welfare or harm of the humans, knowledge or ignorance, and agreeing or disagreeing with the customs.

Analyzing the Sociolect

This includes the analysis of the lexical features of the chosen sociolect. The focus is on the vocabulary, the words that are formal and commonly used, or a new concept of an existing word, semantic neologism.

Material and Methods

The nature of the research was qualitative. The population for this research was the slum dwellers in Lahore. Bahria Town, Model Town, and Wapda Town were the three slum areas that were taken into consideration for investigating the sociolect(s) of the slum community. Essentially, convenience sampling facilitated the research process. The research included a total of 30 participants. For further division, 5 observations and 5 interviews were conducted firstly in Bahria Town, secondly in Model Town, and finally in Wapda Town. The first tool of the research was non-participant overt observation. The reason it was chosen was that the participants knew that the researcher was present and that they were being observed. The second tool of the research was a semi-structured interview. There was a guided set of questions for the researcher, hence the freedom to follow the conversational pattern to explain the questions to the slum dwellers. The observation and interview protocols were designed via the framework for language analysis by Englicious and the theory of social dialect by Piekot respectively. All the ethical principles were followed and the consent of all the participants was taken. Moreover, the real names of participants and their voice recordings have been kept confidential.

Results and Discussion

This research encompassed the following demographics: gender, age, and occupation. There were a total of 30 research participants. For the gender, there were 17 females and 13 males. For the age group, 4 participants were from 15-19, 6 were from 20-24, 4 were from 25-29, 3 were from 30-34, no one was from the age bracket 35-39, 3 were from 40-44, 3 were from 45-49, 3 were from 50-54, no one was from the age bracket 55-59,

and 4 were from the age group of 60-64. For the occupation, 4 were not working, 10 were housewives, 4 were paper collectors, 3 were sweepers, 3 were house cleaners, 2 were sellers of handmade stuff, and 4 were garbage collectors.

Sociolects Spoken by the Slum Community

To answer the first research question, no specific framework but both non-participant observations and semi-structured interviews were used. Both of the tools were used in the data collection process and showed that the social dialects that were spoken by the slum dwellers had three basic types.

The first one was pure sociolect, the second was the mixture of sociolects, and the third was simply the other one that cannot be classified in the first two types. The pure sociolect has further three divisions: Punjabi, Lahori Punjabi, and Gulabi Punjabi. The mixture of sociolect involved the combined usage of Urdu and Punjabi. The last category had Saraiki.

The majority of speakers used pure sociolect, Punjabi to communicate. They considered it their mother language and a gift of God specifically to their community. Then some speakers used a mixture of both Urdu and Punjabi language during the conversations (code-switching) it was mainly because they initiated the conversation in Punjabi language and then switched to Urdu to explain what they were saying to the listeners in the first place. Moreover, they believed in providing their children with an environment where civilized language was being used. According to them, certain words of Punjabi make the entire language uncivilized and they want their children to speak a cleaner version so they had to inculcate words from Urdu (code-mixing). There was a very small amount of people who spoke the other sociolect, Saraiki. Well, the reality was that they were not exactly aware of the names of the language they used while communicating. For instance, the Saraiki language has a major portion of Punjabi words and phrases and the word is added at the end making it an entirely different language which they called Saraiki.

In addition to this, the people from the slum community used certain words that belonged to neither of the earlier-mentioned categories. There were vocabulary items and linguistic expressions from English, Hindi, and Persian/Farsi language. This advocates the fact that the slum dwellers as a speech community were not well aware of the language they used in their routine lives as they didn't mention these three languages when asked about the social dialect they speak. Most of the words from the English language explain the influence of lingua franca on this unprivileged community as well. They have gathered certain words from the conversations of the people of the city, social media, and television. Also, when we talk about the Hindi language the words from this language were used during the interaction of slum dwellers as they had learned it from Indian dramas and songs they played and listened to in their free time. Moving to Persian/Farsi, the words from this language were due to the highly influential Peer-Murshid culture. Some of the participants were interested in Persian/Farsi poetry, learned it from various peers, and practiced the language in their speech community. As a result, the borrowing of words from the previously mentioned language was noted. Similar research on code-switching, code-mixing, and borrowing was conducted in the Pakistani context. The results revealed that numerous words are borrowed from some other language and are mixed with our language. In this case, it was English. The Pakistani culture is highly influenced by English and hence, people end up mixing its vocabulary and lexical items (Jabeen, 2018).

The targeted three areas of Lahore: Bahria Town, Model Town, and Wapda Town also had a common usage of certain words, phrases, and sentences that state that linguistic expressions spoken by the slum communities are analogous. Not only the usage but the way they were spoken showed that the slum community of Lahore possesses a collective and mutual ideology of language and dialect. The lexical items and vocabulary used by the slum

dwellers displayed their reality of them. All of the talk, their interaction, communication, and conversations involved the activities they performed, the daily chores, and the necessities they lacked. Apart from the adverse situation they were living in the language usage also reflected the sense of optimism and generosity they practiced.

A social dialect means a variety of language that is used by a specific social class. So, being the laborer, working or lower class the vernacular variety was being practiced. It had certain informal lexical items and slang that the slum dwellers were habitual of using in daily life. It can be said that the sociolect formed by the slum community was due to social, cultural, and economic influences. Participants from both genders, various age groups, and occupations were considered to identify diverse language usage and apprehend the sociolect patterns.

Linguistic Features in the Sociolects of Slum Dwellers

The second question is addressed using the framework for language analysis by Englicious and non-participant observations. There were a total of ten linguistic features that were observed during the observations of the slum dwellers.

According to Richard (2020), linguistic features hold the utmost value as they convey semantic meaning. These features include references, nouns, verbs, etc. If there is a change in any of these linguistic features, the meaning and the value of the sentence will change automatically. Linguists believe that these features are added to the meaning of a sentence or utterance.

Referencing was a feature that was eminent in the observations. It depicted that the members of the slum speech community used proper nouns, common nouns, and pronouns to refer to each other. For proper nouns, nicknames were preferred, for common nouns non-specific individuals were called, and for pronouns, the typical Punjabi pronouns were used. The following examples were taken from the study:

- Proper nouns: Deemay, Guria, Sony, Fanni, Daamru, Raju
- Common nouns: kudi, munday, shakhs
- Pronouns: asi, onu, tusi, aenay, jeera, tuannu

Verb processes were also identified during the observations. The action process indicates the daily activities performed by the slum dwellers, and the cognition process involved their thought process, the verbal process depicts what they had to say, and the relational process indicates the sense of being. The following examples were taken from the study:

- Action process: khanda, lawani, chukda, sulaa, bandna, khilar
- Cognition process: sochda, samaj, sochia,
- Verbal process: kaya, bolday, akhan
- Relational process: hai, ho, haiga

Tenses were also present in the conversation of slum dwellers. All three tenses were used in the form of simple sentences. The past tense showed the previous events, the present represented the current situation and the future tense reflected the action they would perform in the coming days. The following were the examples from the study:

- Past tense: si, tha, sa, saan
- Present tense: hain, raha, hoara, paiya, riha, rawaan
- Future tense: dawangi, jawangi, hona ae

Voice types were also noted in the observations. The active voice was about the subjects, slum dwellers doing the actions related to their chores, and the passive voice the slum dwellers having actions done to them. The following were the examples from the study:

- Active voice: mai, ownay, maine, munda, tuaday, peer ji, kuri, asi, oo
- Passive voice: rae thay tum, litta aenu, sikhi si mai, milgai si mainu, pilayi si mai, bechda si para mera

Deixis was also part of the observation notes. The personal Deixis reflected the belongingness of slum community members, spatial pointed to the location, and temporal pointed to the particular time. The following were the examples from the study:

- Personal Deixis: sadi, tadi, sannu, annu, asi, meri
- Spatial Deixis: athay, authon, ithay
- Temporal Deixis: kal, aj, parson, aus velay, parson choth, ae waqt

Modality was also an important part of observation notes. The deontic modality expressed the necessity, and compulsion of the tasks of slum dwellers, and the epistemic expressed the probability and certainty of events that could take place in the life of members. The following were the examples from the study:

- Deontic modality: chaly jawo, chaie da, har soorat, hona chaieda, lazmi, ijazat hai, lazman, ahi hona, pora krna
- Epistemic modality: sakda, lagta hai, shiad, ho sakta, sakna, mumkin

Clause Patterns were also noticed in the observations. The declarative sentences expressed information about the slum dwellers, the interrogative showed the questioning nature of members and the imperative was about the commanding or requesting tone used by the people of slums. The following were the examples from the study:

- Declarative pattern: akhbar parda, rutta rung, shadi hui, hakoomat buri, malang hega, barish ai
- Interrogative pattern: kia, kion, kab, kon, kahan, kia
- Imperative pattern: chala ja, authay ja, mehrbary kr

Negation was also there in the conversation of the slum dwellers. the simple negation showed the opposing nature and adverbial negation expressed the negative nature of sentences used by the slum community. The following were the examples from the study:

- Simple negation: nahin, nai, na
- Adverbial negation: kade nai, kise nahin, kuch nahin, hor nahin, bilkul nai, hamesha nahi

Cohesion was an integral part that was observed in the observations. There was the use of both coordinating and subordinating conjunctions that elicited the way people of slums used to connect the sentences and form coherent linguistic expressions. The following were the examples from the study:

- Co-ordinating conjunctions: te, na, par, ya, magar, so
- Sub-ordinating conjunctions: jay, jadoo, jaway, taan, ic liay, takay, varna, jese jese, aur bhi

Discourse context in terms of language usage in a particular situation was also noted while observing the slum community. The findings of this particular linguistic feature revealed that the slum dwellers used pure Punjabi when talking with the members of the speech community (insiders), and they did code-switching from Punjabi to Urdu when conversing with the city dwellers that were not part of their speech community (outsiders). The following were the examples from the study:

- Pure Punjabi: Mai onu aakhaya si ki gaal haigi ae, Ki pareshani hai tusi lokan nu, Onu hor koi kaam nai haiga, Tusi ki kr day pai si outhay, Mai ni jana tere naal hun, Authay ja kr bai ja, Ae pi le te ja aithon, Vada sa kum pi gaya ae, Hun pani kitho lawan gay
- Code-switching from Punjabi to Urdu: Mai dasda paiyan ahi cheez thi tab bhi, Viyaah di sab tayarian jaari hain baji, Tuadi hun kesi tabiat ha, Kuriay hun mri baat sun lay, Dig jaway gi uthon udher nahin jao, Aethay vadi ronaq lagai hui hai apnay

Based on the analysis of the social dialect spoken by the slum dwellers, it can be said that their dialect consisted of multiple linguistic features and they had further sub-categories that helped to grasp their language usage and develop a thorough understanding. Also, Crossley (2020) described in a paper that linguistic features and analysis together provide a better understanding of the language. The three concepts that help the analysis include cohesion, syntax, lexicon, etc. These help to determine the discourse structures and evaluate them efficiently. Also, language usage varies from one person to the other, so it creates a difference in linguistic features.

Variation of Sociolects of Slum Dwellers from City Dwellers

The third question was catered to with the help of the theory of social dialect by Piekot and the semi-structured interviews. There were a total of ten variation aspects that were recorded during the interviews of the slum dwellers.

According to Barzan and Heidary (2019), the language variation is a natural phenomenon. A language has variations because of social, contextual, and regional factors. For the social dialect, it is necessary to consider the class or group of people we are talking about. The speakers may have differences in the grammar, pronunciation, or word choices they make while speaking a social dialect.

Speech community name was the most significant aspect from the point of slum dwellers. There were different names told by the participants during the interview session and each of them described the identity of the speech group. The following were the examples from the research:

- Speech community name: khanabadosh, tapir vaas, ouber, phaki vaas, jhuggi nasheen, jhuggi jhompri walay, gareeb ilaka walay, tambay walay, bastee walay, gareeb da muhalla, chotay tabqay de lok, ode, kachi abadian walay loki, jhuggi sangat, jhumpri walay

Communication with slum dwellers represented the various terms the community used to call the family members and the closest relations. This shows that just like any other speech community, for the members natural and informal style is used. The following were the examples from the research:

- Communication with slum dwellers: mian sahib, ghar wali, nikkay, baba jee, sadi vadi, khassam, budhia, baal, pain, para, kaar wala, swani, chuer, dee, puttra

Communication with the city dwellers was an aspect that elicited the formal usage of language by the slum dwellers. The words that were used to address the city people were not natural and seemed formal. The reason was they were conscious of the language they were using and intentionally molded it to show respect towards the city dwellers. The following were the examples from the research:

- Communication with the city dwellers: baji, paieen, madam, sir jee, maan sa, shehri lok, ameer loki, vaday log, aunty, uncle, sahib, laala, sister, behna, bhai

Differences in language are a very common aspect but hold a lot of essence as it leads to the comparison of language usage between slums and city dwellers. According to the understanding of the slum community, of them believe there is a lot of difference between the language variety they use and the one used by the people of the city. They consider their language their identity and they have the command over its correct usage. Moreover, few of them think the language usage is similar but their language is poor compared to the language of city dwellers. The following were the examples from the research:

- Differences in language: tuadi Urdu sadi Punjabi, do alag zaban, tuadi boli saaf, tusi Urdu asi Saraiki, tuadi sadi zaban alag, tu Urdu asi Punjabi, Punjabi Urdu farq haiga, sadi karak Punjabi, sadi Saraiki, wo bhi Urdu aur ham bhi, tuadi Urdu, farq siraf Urdu de lafzan da, ye zaban gareeb apki baar, shehri Punabi galt istaml krdaian, bohat farq

Uniqueness of sociolect was another integral aspect that clearly showed the extent of variation between the language of slum and city dwellers. For the slum community, the majority of them thought that their language was unique as it is spoken by only the members of their speech community and the people who live nearby. For them their language has individuality. Only those who had some education have a different language, but for the rest to effectively communicate their language is the same for all the members and unique to outsiders. The following were the examples from the research:

- Uniqueness of sociolect: aik hi zaban boldain saray, naal de kaarahi boli, aik hi qom aik hi zaban, bs apni baradri de log bolday, aik hi bolengay, dosray jugli boli bolday, aik jesi zaban, aik boli, sab se alag hai, zaban bs agay ilakay de log jande, ahi zaban, koi log laida bolday, alag nai hosakdi, apni apni zabanay, alag hai jo parh gae

Language is the same traditional one or it has changed was an important question asked by the slum dwellers. The findings revealed that almost every person thought that there had been no changes in the language and that it was the same old, traditional one spoken for ages, running from one generation to the other. Although a participant thought that there were a few changes, the major chunk of the language was the same as the old one. The following were the examples from the research:

- Language is the same as the traditional one or it has changed: shuru nu ahi zaban, paida honday naal ahi zabaan, ahi boli pehla ton, aik hi jaisi, wahi porani, nasli zaban chali jarai, hmesha bolday, shuru tun ic tarah hi bolday, wahi ki wahi zaban chaldi arai ae, kion badalni si, shuru se ab tak, kuch farq nai, thori tabdeeli lagdi, zada pehlay jesei, yahi, koi change vi nai

Vocabulary from other languages is an essential aspect. There were different languages inculcated in the language of slum dwellers. There were several words borrowed from English, Hindi, and Persian/Farsi language but they did not know about it. This is where the difference between slum and city dwellers arises again, as city dwellers are well aware of the fact, that what language words are they using, but slum dwellers being the unprivileged community had no idea about it. The following were the examples from the research:

- Vocabulary from other languages: (English) emotional, very sorry, name, beautiful, books (Hindi) ped poday, putri, sapna, viyan, rupiya (Persian/Farsi) khoob, gareeb khanay, salam, faqeer, khoodrak

Vocabulary commonly used meant the words, phrases, and sentences that were used daily or in the routine life of the slum community. These highlighted the activities performed by the members and were the true reflection of their lifestyle. The following were the examples from the research:

- Vocabulary commonly used: uray, waar, roti shoti, wagti, paiyan, Allah saiyan, aa pai, ser, kiddy, hassa, hoy, cha te tuker, velay, manji daa, handi sake

Vocabulary informal/slang meant all the words, phrases, and sentences that were used in an informal context and were casually spoken by the members of the community. Most of the words were slang that were used to express anger and annoyance. All of the findings tackling this aspect portrayed the vernacular usage of the language by the slum dwellers. The following were the examples from the research:

- Vocabulary informal/slang: sanrain ja mawa saain, paray mar, phoot ja, khasman nu kha, chulay wich pai, dafa dur, yamla, achay ho achay raho, jaangli, pondian urian ne, bera dub jaway, chakkay ur jaingay, marya khapya ae, pani wich doob mar, bhairi shakal choti akal

Prestige and ownership together make the last aspect. It was the core question and all the answers revealed a mixed perception. For most people, the language they used to interact was a good one. It held the status of mother language for them and they could easily understand each other. But some people thought their way of using the language was not right, and that they could not explain to outsiders what they were saying. But for the majority of the slum dwellers, their language was prestigious and they completely owned it. The following were the examples from the research:

- Prestige and ownership: acha samajdai, changi zaban, buri ae, fakhar, bolnay da andaz bura, changi lagdi, achi hai, sahi hai, dadaay pardadaay bolday, sadi malkiat, ic zaban to ilawa koi changi nai, baday te chotay sab aik hi bolday, achi hai, sadi izzat ae, maadri zabaan ae changi

The social dialect spoken by the slum dwellers is different from the one used by the city dwellers as there is a difference in background, class, education, occupation, and many other social factors that add to the divergence of the languages used by both communities. The formal and informal language usage is the major distinction. Slum dwellers, despite knowing that the social dialect used by them inclined more toward the vernacular variety when compared to the standard variety of city dwellers, were consistent in their stance that the language and social dialect they speak is their identity and it mirrored their ownership over it. Related research on vernacular language variety and its social significance was conducted. It revealed that people who are educated tend to use standard language and people who share a common social environment and culture interact by using a vernacular variety of language. Vernacular language is mostly spoken by the community that has lower

social status. It is the casual and informal usage of the language as compared to the standard language variety (Ming, 2020).

Conclusion

The entire research process was based on addressing the answers to the questions about the social dialect used by the slum community, the analysis of the linguistic features found in their sociolect, and the extent their dialect varies from the city dwellers in terms of their perception and language usage. However, it was seen in the previous studies that different communities have distinguishing language usage. This specific research was dedicated to the task of identifying and analyzing the exact social dialects used by the slum dwellers in their daily routines. Conclusively, this piece of work highlights the social dialects spoken by the slum community in Lahore, Pakistan. It contributes to the field of sociolinguistics by reassessing the concept of the social dialect spoken by a marginalized community promoting the importance of the social identity which is also indispensable for an inclusive society.

Recommendations

The sample size of the research can be increased and more slums in the city can be considered. The greater number of participants will result in a rich and broader perspective of language usage and sociolect. Moreover, participant observation can be a suitable research tool as it involves the researcher becoming part of the group. This will enable us to get a closer insight into the spoken language of the speech community and conversation in a natural context. In addition to this pilot testing is always a better approach. The set of interview questions can be asked from a small group first and adjusted timely so there is no issue of interpretation or irrelevant answers when the real fieldwork of the research initiates.

References

- Backues, L. (2023). *Language And The Slums*. Academia
https://www.academia.edu/29944930/Language_And_The_Slums
- Barzan, P., & Heydari, B. (2019). Language Variation. *Research Gate*.
<https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.36761.36969>
- Crossley, S.A. (2020). Linguistic features in writing quality and development: An overview. *Journal of Writing Research*, 11(3), 415-443.
- Curtin, M. L. (2020). Dialect: Social Class. *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology*, 1-9
- DeVito, J. A. (2009). A linguistic analysis of spoken and written language. *Central States Speech Journal*, 18(2), 81-85
- Diaries, W. (2023, October 17). *From Slum Language to Global Dominance*. Medium.
- Eble, C. (2005). *Sociolinguistics Basics*. Public Broadcasting Service.
- Jabeen, S. (2018). Code-mixing, Code-switching, and Borrowing In Urdu and Pakistani Englishlanguage in Media and Daily Life Conversations. *IJAR*, 6(11), 805-811.
- Mahfouz, A. R. (2021). Lexical Variation in the Cairene Slum Vernacular and Its Impact on the Prestigious Variety. *Al-Kindi*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.4.2>
- Ming, L. (2020). Vernacular: Its Features, Relativity, Functions and Social Significance. *Science Publishing Group*, 8(2), 81-86
- Nazir, N., Zahara, S. R., Akhtar, P., Balti, G. A., & Bashir, M. (2021). Linguistic And Paralinguistic Analysis Of The Text Produced By Hijra (Transgender) Community Located In Lahore, Pakistan, *Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology* 18(10), 3068-3077
- Piekot, T. (2008). *Język w grupie społecznej: Wprowadzenie do badań socjolektów*. Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa im Angelusa Silesiusa w Wałbrzychu
- Richard, M. (2020). Is Reference Essential to Meaning? *Metaphysics*, 3(1), 68-80.
- Schilling-Estes, N. (2022). American English Social Dialect Variation and Gender. *SageJournals*, 30(2), 122-137
- Setiawan, I. (2015). Social Dialect Variations in Sasak Monolingual Society: A Lingual Critical Study. *Sloap*, 1(1), 1-8.
- Watt, D., & Llamas, C. (2014). *Language, Borders and Identity*. Edinburgh University Press.