THE PERSISTENCE OF ARCHAIC LANGUAGE NORMS IN A DIGITALLY EVOLVING WORLD: A LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE ON CULTURAL LAG

[1]Kene Lucile Emenike

[2]Tinamary Chidiebere Omulu

Abstract

In an era of rapid technological innovation and increasingly digitized communication, language use is undergoing significant transformation. Yet, many societal institutions, particularly within education, governance, and formal communication, continue to uphold archaic linguistic norms rooted in prescriptive traditions. This study investigates this phenomenon through the lens of cultural lag, a concept introduced by Ogburn (1922) to describe the delayed adaptation of cultural norms in response to technological and societal change. The primary objectives of the study are twofold: (1) to examine the factors that sustain the use of archaic language norms in formal and institutional communication despite the rise of digital linguistic practices; and (2) to analyse the sociolinguistic implications of cultural lag in language, particularly how institutional resistance affects language adaptation in digital contexts. To achieve these aims, the study employs a comparative qualitative discourse analysis grounded in sociolinguistic theory and the cultural lag framework. A purposive sample of 100 texts comprising 50 digital discourse samples (e.g., social media posts, blogs, online comments, institutional web content) and 50 traditional or formal texts (e.g., academic papers, legal/government documents, and official correspondences) ensures thematic relevance and domain diversity. Texts are analysed for archaic linguistic features, including outdated vocabulary, obsolete syntax, and formal registers, to trace patterns of retention, adaptation, or avoidance across communicative domains. Findings highlight key sites of linguistic tension such as formal education, public discourse, and workplace communication where rigid adherence to outdated norms reinforces hierarchies, marginalizes non-standard varieties, and alienates digitally fluent speakers. Conversely, the study underscores the legitimacy and expressive capacity of digital language practices, such as code-switching, emojis, and vernacular innovations, as dynamic responses to evolving communicative needs. The paper concludes by advocating for inclusive and adaptive language policies that reflect the realities of a digitally mediated, multilingual world.

Keywords: cultural lag, language ideology, digital linguistics, language norms, archaic

Introduction

The twenty-first century has witnessed a dramatic transformation in human communication, with digital technologies reshaping the form, speed, and scope of language use on an unprecedented scale. Digital platforms ranging from social media and instant messaging to blogs and video content have ushered in new communicative forms such as abbreviations, emojis, memes, hashtags, and hybridized linguistic registers. These innovations reflect a broader shift toward informal, multimodal, and user-driven language practices. However, while individuals have rapidly adapted to these emerging norms, many institutions particularly within education, governance, and corporate communication continue to uphold archaic language standards rooted in prescriptive traditions. This disconnect between dynamic linguistic innovation and institutional conservatism

is more than a matter of stylistic preference; it reveals a deeper sociocultural phenomenon known as cultural lag. Coined by sociologist William F. Ogburn in his foundational text Social Change with Respect to Culture and Original Nature (1922), the term describes the temporal delay between technological or material advancements and the adaptation of non-material culture, such as norms, values, and institutions. Ogburn argued that when material culture evolves faster than societal values or practices, it creates friction and imbalance within society (Ogburn 200). Though developed in the context of early industrial change, this concept remains strikingly relevant to the current linguistic landscape shaped by digital media.

In this context, archaic language norms refer to standardized linguistic conventions often involving rigid grammatical rules, formal registers, and prescriptive vocabularies that were institutionalized in print-dominated, hierarchical societies. These norms emerged from historical processes of standardization often tied to colonial, nationalistic, and elitist agendas. As Milroy and Milroy assert, the ideology of the "standard language" is less a linguistic reality than a sociopolitical construct, "an abstraction that exists only in the minds of its users and is enforced through social, educational, and political power" (Milroy and Milroy 22). In effect, such norms serve to regulate linguistic behaviour, enforce class boundaries, and marginalize linguistic diversity in the name of correctness. Digital communication, by contrast, has democratized language use. It encourages creativity, hybridity, and spontaneity. Users especially young people frequently challenge grammatical conventions, blend oral and written forms, and create new expressive resources. As Crystal notes, "electronic discourse has introduced new genres, styles, and linguistic conventions" that signal a major departure from traditional language structures (Crystal 149). These digital innovations reflect shifting power dynamics in language authority, where communities of practice online challenge the normative control once exercised exclusively by educational and media institutions. Yet, despite these changes, many institutions have not adapted. Schools still penalize students for using non-standard forms; legal and government documents remain heavily formal and exclusionary; and public discourse often stigmatizes informal language as evidence of incompetence. These examples illustrate a persistent cultural lag, wherein the institutions responsible for shaping language norms fail to evolve in line with actual linguistic practices. This lag not only creates communicative disconnects but also entrenches social inequities by devaluing the legitimate linguistic repertoires of digitally fluent populations.

Although a growing body of scholarship explores digital linguistics, net-speak, and informal language innovation, relatively little research has systematically addressed how institutional adherence to archaic language norms creates a form of cultural lag that restricts adaptation to digital language realities. This study responds to this gap by critically examining the sociolinguistic implications of this disconnect and analysing the ideological, educational, and structural mechanisms that sustain it. It aims to: 1) examine the factors that sustain the use of archaic language norms in formal and institutional communication despite the rise of digital linguistic practices, and 2) analyse the sociolinguistic implications of cultural lag in language, particularly how institutional resistance affects language adaptation in digital contexts. To achieve these objectives, two questions are answered, which are: what are the factors that sustain the use

of archaic language norms in formal and institutional communication despite the rise of digital linguistic practices? What are the sociolinguistic implications of cultural lag in language, particularly how institutional resistance affects language adaptation in digital contexts.

The article is organized in five sections. Section 2 reviews the theoretical background, focusing on the concepts of language normativity, digital linguistic practices, and cultural lag. In section 3 is the methodology; and section 4 presents the findings. Section 5 presents the discussion and interpretation of the findings within a broader sociolinguistic framework, emphasizing the consequences of cultural lag and the need for inclusive linguistic reform.

Conceptual Framework

Language Ideologies

Language ideologies are the sets of beliefs, attitudes, and assumptions about language that are shared by a social group. These ideologies often link language to social identities, power structures, and cultural values (Woolard 3-7). Linguistic authority refers to the power or legitimacy ascribed to certain language varieties, speakers, or institutions to define what constitutes "correct" or "standard" language. This authority is not inherent but is socially constructed and maintained through various mechanisms, including education, media, and social norms (Bourdieu 45-56). The study of language ideologies reveals how dominant groups can exert influence through the valorisation of their linguistic practices and the marginalization of others.

Digital Linguistics

Digital linguistics examines the impact of digital technologies on language structure, use, and acquisition. The affordances of digital platforms the possibilities for action that these technologies offer significantly shape how we communicate. These affordances include features like multimodality (combining text, image, audio, and video), a synchronicity (communication that doesn't happen in real-time), increased accessibility and reach, opportunities for rapid information dissemination, and the creation of new linguistic forms and practices (e.g., emojis, hashtags, internet slang) (Crystal 9-15; Herring 1-5). Digital platforms can both reflect and influence existing language norms, create new online communities with unique linguistic styles, and raise questions about literacy, identity, and communication in the digital age.

Language norms

Language norms refer to the socially and culturally accepted conventions that govern how language is used within a specific community. These norms encompass grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, style, and discourse practices, shaping what is considered "correct" or "appropriate" in various contexts. They serve to maintain linguistic cohesion and identity within a group while also reinforcing social hierarchies and power structures (Milroy 21). In linguistics, language norms are not static but evolve over time due to factors such as contact with other languages, technological changes, and shifts in ideology. However, institutions often attempt to regulate or preserve certain norms as "standard," which can marginalize other forms of expression (Cameron

38). Thus, language norms are both descriptive of common usage and prescriptive in defining what is deemed acceptable.

Cultural lag

Cultural lag is a sociological concept that refers to the period of adjustment that occurs when non-material culture (such as values, norms, and laws) struggles to adapt to changes in material culture (such as technology and innovation). Coined by sociologist William Fielding Ogburn, the term highlights the imbalance that arises when social institutions and cultural beliefs do not evolve at the same pace as technological advancements (Ogburn 200). Cultural lag often results in social tension, resistance to change, or institutional inertia, especially when outdated norms or practices persist despite new realities. In linguistic contexts, this lag can manifest as the continued use of archaic language norms even as digital communication rapidly transforms everyday language use (Ogburn 201).

Theoretical Framework

This anchors on William F. Ogburn's Cultural Lag Theory, a sociological model that elucidates the temporal disconnect between material and non-material aspects of culture during periods of rapid change. According to Ogburn, societal change is typically driven by innovations in material culture, technology, infrastructure, and economic systems, while non-material culture, including laws, norms, values, and notably language, tends to adapt more slowly (Ogburn 200). This desynchronization creates a "lag" wherein outdated cultural elements persist despite being incongruent with new social realities, often leading to tension, inefficiency, or even social dysfunction. In the context of linguistic evolution, Ogburn's theory provides a powerful explanatory lens for understanding the persistence of archaic language norms in a digitally transforming world. While digital technologies have revolutionized communication and introduced new platforms, registers, and modes of expression, the norms that govern language usage in educational, institutional, and professional settings remain largely prescriptive and conservative. Standard language ideologies continue to dominate curricula, assessment practices, and editorial policies, reflecting 19th- and 20th-century norms despite the fundamentally altered linguistic landscape of the 21st century.

This lag is particularly evident in the resistance to recognizing emergent digital registers, such as: internet slang, emojis, meme speak, and algorithm-driven stylistics as legitimate forms of language use. Instead of adapting to reflect real-world linguistic behaviour, institutional authorities often cling to notions of linguistic purity and correctness that are no longer representative of contemporary communicative practices. As Ogburn posited, this kind of inertia can be attributed to the fact that non-material culture is governed by deeply embedded ideologies and power structures, which resist modification even in the face of changing conditions (Ogburn 205). Furthermore, cultural lag theory helps illuminate the ideological underpinnings of language normativity. Archaic norms are not simply technical relics; they are often vehicles of social control. As Fairclough argues, language norms function as tools of power, regulating who gets to speak, be heard, or be considered "intelligent" or "articulate" in public discourse (Fairclough 58). The

persistence of outdated linguistic standards, therefore, is not merely a matter of tradition but of gatekeeping, an attempt to stabilize authority in a shifting sociolinguistic environment.

By applying Ogburn's cultural lag theory to the field of language, this framework makes it possible to analyse linguistic inertia not as a benign failure to innovate, but as a symptom of systemic resistance to cultural democratization. The failure of language policies and pedagogies to keep pace with digital and sociocultural realities is not only a practical impediment to effective communication; it is also a form of symbolic violence that excludes non-normative speakers from full participation in public life. Thus, cultural lag theory enables a critical rethinking of language change, not as an incidental phenomenon, but as a necessary cultural adjustment in the face of evolving communicative technologies and values. It calls for proactive alignment of language norms with contemporary conditions, stressing the urgency of reconfiguring linguistic ideologies to better serve inclusivity, flexibility, and relevance in a digital era.

Historical Overview of Standard Language Norms

Language has never been a neutral medium of communication; it has long been entangled with power, identity, and control. The idea of a "standard" language is not a natural evolution but the result of deliberate socio-political processes aimed at unifying and regulating populations. Historically, standardization emerged alongside the rise of nation-states, where linguistic uniformity became essential for governance, education, and national identity. For example, in early modern England, the London dialect, tied to political and economic power, was elevated as "Standard English", not for linguistic merit but for socio-political convenience (Crowley 10). In France, the establishment of the Académie française in 1635 institutionalized similar efforts, sidelining regional languages like Breton and Occitan in favour of a purified French (Lodge 28).

Colonialism expanded this dynamic globally. European empires imposed their standard languages on colonized populations through education, administration, and religion. In British-ruled India, for instance, English proficiency became a prerequisite for civil service, thereby reinforcing colonial hierarchy and marginalizing indigenous languages (Pennycook 78). Such linguistic imperialism framed native tongues as inferior "dialects," effectively erasing cultural identities through language policy. The rise of prescriptive grammar and dictionaries further entrenched language norms. Works like Samuel Johnson's Dictionary (1755) and Robert Lowth's Grammar (1762) prescribed rules modelled on Latin, often criticizing features like double negatives despite their historical legitimacy (Baron 45). Similarly, French grammars such as Maurice Grevisse's Le Bon Usage codified elite Parisian speech, marginalizing regional or immigrant varieties. As Bourdieu observed, language functions as symbolic capital: mastering the standard grants access to education and prestige, while deviation is penalized (Bourdieu 55).

These linguistic hierarchies persist. In the Anglophone world, accents like Received Pronunciation or General American are linked to authority and professionalism, while others like AAVE or Cockney face stigma (Lippi-Green 88). In France, suburban or immigrant varieties of French are often targets of discrimination. Formal education reinforces this divide, privileging standardized

grammar and discouraging regionalism, code-switching, or informal expressions, even when these forms are communicatively effective. Thus, the history of standard language norms reveals a deeply political project aimed at control and exclusion. Despite the evolving nature of real-world language use, especially in digital spaces, archaic norms remain entrenched in institutions, contributing to the cultural lag that hampers inclusive and adaptive linguistic practices today.

Methodology

This study adopts a comparative qualitative discourse analysis rooted in sociolinguistic theory and Ogburn's (1922) concept of cultural lag to examine the persistence and evolution of archaic language norms within digital communication. Cultural lag, as proposed by Ogburn, describes the delay between technological or societal changes and the corresponding adaptation in cultural or normative structures a concept particularly relevant to shifts in language use across communicative domains.

Two primary corpora of textual data serve as the basis for analysis. The first is Digital Discourse Samples, which comprises informal and semi-formal content drawn from platforms such as social media posts (e.g., Twitter/X, Facebook), personal blogs, user-generated online comments, and institutional announcements on websites. These texts reflect contemporary, often spontaneous language use in digitally mediated spaces. The second is the Traditional/Formal Texts includes academic publications, legal and governmental documents, and official correspondences from institutions. They are selected for their adherence to conventional writing standards and their potential to retain archaic linguistic features. The sample was selected using the purposive sampling strategy to ensure thematic relevance and domain diversity. A total of 80 texts (40 from each source) were selected based on their linguistic richness and representativeness of either digital or formal communicative environments.

The analysis is done in three interrelated phases. Archaic norms are identified by examining texts for linguistic features associated with archaic usage. These include outdated vocabulary (e.g., herewith, therein), obsolete syntactic structures (e.g., inversion for emphasis), and traditional forms of address (e.g., Sir/Madam, Your Excellency). This is followed by a comparative analysis where the patterns of use are compared across both text corpora to identify frequency trends, domain-specific variations, and manifestations of cultural lag. Particular attention is paid to cases where formal linguistic structures persist in digital contexts or where digital texts explicitly reject traditional norms, thereby providing empirical insight into the interplay between linguistic conservatism and innovation.

Findings

Language Practices that Stick to Outdated, Archaic Norms

The analysis of formal documents and traditional grammar manuals revealed a persistent adherence to archaic language norms that appear largely disconnected from contemporary digital linguistic practices. Across the sampled institutional texts, including academic publications, legal

documents, and official correspondences, a consistent preference for rigid grammatical structures, overly formal registers, and prescriptive vocabulary was observed. These texts often reflect a linguistic conservatism that privileges rules established in earlier centuries, with little recognition of the evolving nature of language in the digital era. Many grammar books and style guides consulted for this study continue to emphasize outdated constructions such as the excessive use of passive voice, nominalizations, and Latinized expressions (e.g., henceforth, therein, notwithstanding). These forms, though historically prestigious, are rarely used in everyday or digital communication. In contrast, features such as contractions, informal tone, simplified syntax, and multimodal markers, which characterize modern digital discourse, are either ignored or explicitly discouraged in these traditional resources.

This strict prescriptivism was especially evident in educational materials, where deviation from the "standard" is often treated not as linguistic variation but as error. For example, some grammar texts still insist on avoiding sentence fragments or ending sentences with prepositions, rules that have long been debated or relaxed in actual usage. Similarly, institutional documents exhibit an aversion to contemporary lexical innovations, favouring outdated terminology and avoiding inclusive or gender-neutral forms that are now widespread in digital and global communication. Notably, none of the formal sources analysed made any substantial reference to the linguistic shifts brought about by digital communication. There was a near-total absence of acknowledgment regarding digital genres such as texting, tweeting, or content creation, nor any discussion of the communicative functions of emojis, hashtags, or abbreviated forms. This omission suggests a significant disconnect between institutional language prescriptions and the communicative practices of the general population, especially younger, digitally literate users.

These findings confirm the persistence of archaic norms within institutional and formal language practices. They illustrate how institutional authority over language continues to resist adaptation, despite clear evidence of linguistic change in digital spaces. This resistance, as argued in this study, exemplifies cultural lag in linguistic behaviour where the non-material culture of language regulation fails to evolve in tandem with the material and technological transformations reshaping how language is used and understood.

Contemporary Language Practices in the Digital Sphere

The analysis of digital texts collected from a range of online platforms, including Twitter, WhatsApp, TikTok, and Instagram, reveals a significant shift in language practices that contrasts sharply with traditional, institutional norms. The texts demonstrate that in the digital sphere, language use is characterized by brevity, creativity, informality, and multimodal expression. These features suggest an ongoing transformation in how individuals communicate, shaped by the structural and cultural affordances of digital media. One of the most striking patterns observed in the data is the brevity and efficiency of communication. Messages across these platforms tend to be short, direct, and highly expressive. Users frequently rely on abbreviations, acronyms, and informal spelling to convey meaning quickly. Emojis, GIFs, and voice notes are often used

alongside or in place of text, resulting in a rich and layered form of communication that prioritizes immediacy and emotional resonance over grammatical formality.

There is a high degree of linguistic innovation and stylistic flexibility. Many texts included non-standard punctuation, deliberate use of lowercase letters, and unconventional syntax. These stylistic choices appeared not as errors, but as meaningful communicative strategies used to convey tone, irony, emphasis, or identity. For instance, texts such as “i’m tired lol” or “...okay.” reflect nuanced emotional states through subtle manipulation of written conventions.

In several of the texts, users engaged in code-switching and polyglot practices, effortlessly blending English with local languages, slang, and internet-specific expressions. This multilingual flexibility was often employed for humour, cultural reference, or in-group signalling. It was evident that digital users, especially in multilingual contexts, view language boundaries as fluid and negotiable, using different linguistic resources to construct meaning in context-specific ways. Additionally, the data showed clear examples of "text-speak"—a digital register characterized by phonetic spellings, shortened forms, and minimal punctuation. Phrases like “brb,” “idk,” “ttyl,” and even numeric expressions such as “143” were found across platforms, illustrating how users condense meaning while maintaining clarity and social relevance. This pattern reinforces the observation that digital language values communicative function over grammatical precision.

There is a growing presence of AI-assisted or AI-generated content, particularly in blog comments, social media captions, and chatbot responses. While these texts often mimic formal structure, they also reflect a trend toward more accessible, user-friendly expression. The integration of predictive text and language suggestion tools seems to encourage simplified, yet effective language, further diversifying how people write online. A significant portion of the texts analysed came from younger users, whose language habits clearly differ from traditional norms. Their contributions included rapidly changing slang, memes, and expressions rooted in digital subcultures. Words and phrases like “sus,” “no cap,” or “it’s giving” were often used without explicit explanation, signalling familiarity with a shared digital context. These instances underscore the role of youth in driving linguistic innovation and challenging the dominance of prescriptive language norms.

In summary, the analysis of digital texts demonstrates that contemporary online language is dynamic, user-driven, and context-sensitive. It departs significantly from the structured, rule-bound nature of institutional language and instead reflects a decentralized and evolving linguistic culture. These findings highlight the widening gap between how language is used in real-time digital communication and how it is still taught, evaluated, or regulated in formal settings, underscoring the presence of a linguistic cultural lag.

Discussions and Analysis

Cultural lag is witnessed from the way the formal documents presented information and messages. Cultural lag, in the context of language, refers to the phenomenon where certain institutions and practices maintain outdated linguistic norms and expectations, even as language itself evolves in broader society. This can lead to tension and disadvantage for individuals whose language

practices reflect contemporary usage rather than these lagging standards. Sites of Cultural Lag in language use includes various sites like education, media and public discourse, and employment and professionalism.

Within educational settings, the persistence of traditional grammar instruction reflects a clear site of cultural lag. School curricula often emphasize outdated drills and a prescriptive notion of "proper" English, prioritizing rote memorization over communicative competence (Al-khresheh and Orak; Benitez-Correa et al.). This approach, rooted in centuries-old prescriptive grammars, treats language as a fixed system rather than an evolving means of communication (Cuban; Pullum).

Such practices often fail to reflect how English is used in real contexts, shaped by technological, social, and cultural influences (Crystal 25–30). Students may thus spend significant time mastering formal structures with limited relevance to authentic communication. Penalizing non-standard language in assessments further reinforces this lag, marginalizing students from diverse linguistic backgrounds and perpetuating linguistic bias (Lippi-Green 65–72). While some educators defend traditional methods for promoting clarity, contemporary linguistic thought supports communicative approaches, teaching grammar in context rather than isolation (Al-khresheh and Orak; Cuban). A more linguistically informed pedagogy recognizes English as a dynamic and pluralistic language, better preparing students for real-world language use.

Penalizing non-standard language in academic essays and exams refers to the practice of deducting marks or otherwise disadvantaging students whose written work deviates from what is considered "Standard English" or the expected academic discourse conventions. This often includes variations in grammar, vocabulary, spelling, or sentence structure that are typical of non-standard dialects or languages (American Academy of Arts and Sciences). The rationale behind such penalties is often rooted in the belief that adherence to Standard English is crucial for clear communication, academic rigor, and future professional success (Inside Higher Ed). Proponents argue that mastering Standard English equips students with the linguistic tools necessary to navigate academic and professional environments where this variety is privileged (Baron).

However, some critics argue that penalizing non-standard language can have several negative impacts. It leads to linguistic discrimination and harm, where students are judged based on their language use rather than the content of their ideas. This can result in academic and psychological harm, lower grades, and reduced opportunities for students whose home languages or dialects differ from the standard (ResearchGate; American Academy of Arts and Sciences). There is the reinforcement of social hierarchies whereby preferences for standardized English are socially constructed, and enforcing them can reinforce existing social hierarchies, marginalizing students from diverse linguistic backgrounds (AAUP). Identity is suppressed where assimilation to standardized English is demanded which could be at the expense of students' home languages, discourses, and identities, making them feel unwelcome in academic spaces (AAUP).

There are also misconceptions about intelligence by often incorrectly linking non-standard language to a decline in intellectual standards or a lack of education and intelligence, despite research demonstrating that no single variety of language is inherently superior for effective communication (Baron; American Academy of Arts and Sciences). Finally, there are code-meshing and linguistic diversity. Some scholars advocate for "code-meshing," which encourages students to weave multiple dialects, arguing that attitudes towards language, rather than the language itself, are the root of prejudice (Young qtd. in Inside Higher Ed).

In the area of media and public discourse, media and public discourse are prominent arenas of cultural lag in language use, where outdated norms often resist evolving linguistic practices. On social media and traditional platforms, language policing, the unsolicited correction of grammar, spelling, or word choice is widespread. Users frequently enforce prescriptive norms, reflecting ideologies that position certain language forms as superior (Cushing et al.; Pajunen 22–44). This policing extends beyond grammar to social norms, targeting informal or inclusive language such as gender-neutral pronouns or culturally specific dialects. Public figures, for example, may face backlash for deviating from perceived standards of "correct" language, with critics framing such usage as political correctness or a decline in standards (Baron 115–18; Pinker 370–75).

Often referred to as "grammar Nazism", these reactions stem from a belief in linguistic purity and fixed hierarchies. However, critics argue that such policing reinforces social exclusion, especially when directed at non-dominant language varieties like African American Vernacular English (Fiveable; “Are You a Friendly”). These practices can silence marginalized voices, sustain power imbalances, and discourage open participation in digital discourse (Herring).

In this way, media language policing reflects a broader societal resistance to change, revealing how deeply entrenched norms can hinder linguistic inclusivity and innovation in the public sphere (Reyes and Bonnin, as cited in Online Public Language Policing). The key aspects of this backlash include:

i. Grammatical Arguments: Opponents often argue that inclusive language, such as the use of singular "they" or novel word endings for gender neutrality in languages with grammatical gender (e.g., Spanish), is grammatically incorrect or awkward. They may contend that such innovations disrupt established linguistic structures and lead to confusion (Zorrilla).
ii. Defence of Tradition: There's a strong emphasis on preserving the "purity" or historical evolution of the language. Institutions like the Académie Française have historically resisted changes to French, viewing inclusive language as a "threat to the language" (National Catholic Register). This perspective sees language as something to be protected from perceived ideological interventions.
iii. Perceived "Political Correctness": The push for inclusive language is sometimes dismissed as "political correctness" or an attempt to impose a specific ideology through linguistic means. Critics may argue that these changes are unnecessary, artificial, or driven by social rather than linguistic considerations (McGill Law Journal).

iv. Concerns about Clarity and Efficiency: Some argue that attempts to be overly inclusive can make language cumbersome or less efficient. For instance, using "humankind" instead of "mankind" might be seen as an unnecessary lengthening of a familiar term, or the proliferation of new terms might be perceived as complicating communication.

v. Fear of "Destroying the Language": A strong rhetorical element of the backlash is the idea that inclusive language "destroys" or "damages" the language. This often evokes a sense of alarm about the erosion of cultural heritage and shared understanding (National Catholic Register).

vi. This prescriptive backlash highlights the tension between descriptive linguistics (how language is actually used) and prescriptive linguistics (how language should be used), especially when social and political factors influence linguistic evolution.

Employment and Professionalism

On employment and professionalism, language use in employment settings reveals persistent cultural lag, where outdated norms influence perceptions of professionalism. Biases against accents, slang, and regional varieties often rooted in social stereotypes continue to affect hiring and workplace interactions (Baugh 88–92). Such linguistic prejudice can disadvantage individuals based not on what they say, but how they say it. Accents considered "non-standard" or associated with minority groups are often perceived as less intelligent or credible, limiting opportunities and reinforcing social hierarchies (Levon and Sharma; Dovchin). This bias extends to professional communication, where rigid expectations around formal register persist in emails, resumes, and interviews. While clarity and professionalism are important, an overemphasis on formality can alienate speakers from diverse linguistic backgrounds and hinder genuine communication (Schiffrin). Formal language norms such as avoiding contractions or slang may exclude those unfamiliar with such conventions, despite their competence or qualifications (Enhancv; ThoughtCo).

As professional environments evolve, especially with digital and global communication, more inclusive and flexible language practices are needed. Recognizing linguistic diversity as a strength rather than a liability is essential for equity and innovation in the workplace. In essence, the continued adherence to formal register in these critical professional communication channels is driven by the need to establish credibility, demonstrate respect, and maintain clear, unambiguous communication. These norms, while evolving, remain fundamental to how individuals present themselves and interact within professional spheres.

In summary, these various sites: education, media and public discourse, and employment and professionalism demonstrate how certain institutions and practices can lag behind the natural evolution of language. By clinging to outdated norms and penalizing linguistic diversity, these areas can inadvertently perpetuate linguistic prejudice and hinder effective communication in an increasingly diverse and dynamic world. Recognizing these sites of cultural lag is a crucial step towards fostering a more inclusive and nuanced understanding of language use.

Sociocultural Consequences

As language norms fail to evolve alongside shifting social values, significant sociocultural consequences emerge. These effects are especially visible among marginalized communities, younger generations, and individuals whose identities challenge traditional norms of communication. Cultural lag in language not only slows progress but also reinforces exclusion and inequality in different ways, such as:

i. Alienation of younger generations and digital natives - The digital age has fostered unique communication styles and linguistic norms among younger generations and digital natives. Their fluency in online slang, abbreviations, and platform-specific language can create a sense of alienation from older generations who may not understand or value these forms of expression. This can lead to misunderstandings, communication breakdowns, and a feeling among younger individuals that their ways of communicating are not legitimate or respected in broader societal contexts (Turkle, Alone Together).

ii. Linguistic discrimination and marginalization (e.g., AAVE, youth language) - Certain language varieties, such as African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and youth language, often face discrimination and marginalization. These linguistic systems, which are rich with their own grammatical structures and cultural significance, are frequently stigmatized as "incorrect," "slang," or "uneducated" in mainstream settings like education and professional environments. This devaluation can lead to negative social and economic consequences for speakers of these varieties, impacting their opportunities and self-esteem (Smitherman, Talkin That Talk).

iii. Hindrance to language inclusivity (gender, neurodivergent, multilingual voices) - Sociocultural norms can also hinder language inclusivity for various groups. For instance, traditional gendered language can exclude or misrepresent individuals who identify outside the binary. Similarly, neurodivergent individuals may have communication styles that differ from neurotypical norms, leading to misunderstandings and exclusion. Furthermore, multilingual individuals may face pressure to prioritize one language over others, diminishing the value and recognition of their full linguistic repertoire (Bucholtz and Hall, "Theorizing Identity and Interaction"). These exclusionary practices can limit diverse voices and perspectives in public discourse.

iv. Impacts on identity and self-expression - Language is deeply intertwined with identity and self-expression. When individuals or groups face linguistic discrimination or feel their language is not valued, it can negatively impact their sense of self-worth and belonging. The pressure to conform to dominant language norms can stifle creativity and authentic self-expression. Conversely, the ability to use language freely and authentically, and to have one's linguistic identity recognized and respected, can foster a stronger sense of self and community (Norton, Identity and Language Learning).

These sociocultural consequences highlight the crucial role language plays in shaping social dynamics, identity, and inclusion. Recognizing and challenging linguistic biases and promoting language inclusivity are essential steps towards a more equitable and understanding society.

Emerging Solutions and Progressive Movements

In response to the persistence of archaic language norms amid rapid technological and sociocultural shifts, a range of emerging solutions and progressive movements are challenging linguistic inertia. These efforts collectively signal a paradigmatic change in how language is understood, taught, and employed, especially within the realms of education, digital communication, inclusivity, and artificial intelligence.

Educationally, one of the most foundational movements comes from the pedagogical shift toward descriptive linguistics in language education. Traditionally, prescriptive approaches have dominated classrooms, reinforced rigid grammatical rules and valorised standardized forms that marginalize nonstandard dialects and digital variants. However, contemporary linguists argue for an approach that reflects how language is actually used rather than how it "should" be used (Yule 226). Descriptive linguistics empowers students by validating their linguistic realities including regional dialects, multilingual influences, and emergent forms like text speak or meme speak thus deconstructing the institutional bias embedded in archaic norms. Programs that incorporate sociolinguistics and variationist perspectives help students critically examine language change as a natural and inevitable process. For instance, Labov's foundational studies on variation and change highlight how language evolves within communities, challenging the myth of linguistic decay (Labov 11). Integrating these insights into educational curricula not only destigmatizes linguistic innovation but also fosters cultural awareness.

In the area of digital communication, the rise of digital literacy programs further reinforces the shift toward acknowledging language evolution. These initiatives go beyond basic technical skills to embrace the multimodal and stylistic complexities of digital communication. Texting, tweeting, emoji use, and internet slang, once dismissed as corruptions of "proper" language, are now recognized as dynamic registers with their own rules and rhetorical effects (Crystal 153). In this context, digital literacy includes teaching students to navigate, analyse, and produce language in online spaces where meaning is often co-constructed through intertextuality and algorithmic amplification. By acknowledging digital language as legitimate linguistic behaviour, these programs help bridge the gap between normative language instruction and actual linguistic practice. They also cultivate critical awareness of how social media and other digital platforms influence language ideologies.

On inclusivity, language reforms aimed at greater inclusivity also represent a significant pushback against archaic linguistic norms. The adoption of gender-neutral pronouns (e.g., "they/them") and anti-ableist language (e.g., avoiding metaphors like "blind to" or "crippling") reflects evolving understandings of identity, dignity, and agency. These reforms challenge the implicit power structures embedded in language and advocate for forms that are more equitable and representative of diverse lived experiences. According to Cameron, inclusive language use is not merely a matter of political correctness but a linguistic reflection of shifting social norms (Cameron 89). Institutional style guides, including those used by academic publishers, media outlets, and government agencies, are increasingly incorporating guidelines for inclusive language, suggesting

that these reforms are gaining traction across formal discourse domains. While resistance remains, especially from purist perspectives, the trend indicates a growing awareness of language as a site of both cultural inheritance and transformation.

Finally, for artificial intelligence, the fields of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Natural Language Processing (NLP) are playing a transformative role in adapting to evolving language use. Early NLP models were often trained on formal, standardized corpora, resulting in systems that struggled to process nonstandard dialects, informal registers, or culturally specific language patterns. Today, however, models like GPT and BERT are increasingly trained on vast and diverse datasets that reflect real-world usage, including social media content, multilingual inputs, and dynamic vernaculars (Bender et al. 610). This adaptability allows AI to better mirror the fluidity of human language and opens up new possibilities for inclusive, user-centred technologies. Nevertheless, concerns remain about bias replication and the ethical dimensions of linguistic automation. As Blodgett et al. argue, language technologies must be evaluated not only on performance metrics but also on their social impact, particularly in how they reinforce or challenge existing linguistic hierarchies (Blodgett et al. 5279).

In sum, the convergence of educational reform, digital literacy, inclusive language movements, and adaptive technologies points to a fertile landscape for dismantling linguistic lag. These progressive responses highlight the potential for a more responsive and representative language ecology, one that aligns with the lived realities of a digitally connected, culturally diverse society.

Conclusion

The persistence of archaic language norms in the face of rapid technological and cultural change exemplifies what sociologist William F. Ogburn termed cultural lag the tendency for non-material culture, such as language and social norms, to resist change even as material conditions evolve (Ogburn 200). In a digitally mediated world marked by globalization, multicultural exchange, and decentralized communication, linguistic conservatism not only hampers expressive freedom but also reinforces exclusionary practices. From outdated grammatical conventions to prescriptive standards that marginalize nonstandard dialects, cultural lag in language norms continues to restrict social progress and inclusivity.

Throughout this analysis, it has become evident that language is not merely a vehicle of communication, but a repository of social power and cultural ideology. When the norms that govern language fail to keep pace with contemporary realities, such as: the growing acceptance of gender diversity, the rise of digital registers, or the global spread of English as a lingua franca, they serve less to facilitate communication than to police identity and maintain hegemony (Cameron 92; Fairclough 36). In this way, linguistic inertia contributes to the reproduction of inequality, privileging the speech of dominant groups while devaluing emergent, hybrid, or marginalized forms. To counter this inertia, there is a pressing need for linguistic adaptability that reflects the dynamic nature of the digital and sociocultural landscape. Language norms must be re-evaluated in light of contemporary communicative practices, especially as digital environments

continue to redefine what constitutes effective, appropriate, or even ethical language use. As Crystal argues, "the internet is the largest corpus of linguistic change in human history," and to ignore its influence is to render language instruction and policy obsolete (Crystal 187). Moreover, the fluidity of online discourse, ranging from code-switching and emoji use to the reappropriation of stigmatized terms, demonstrates that speakers are not passive recipients of language norms but active agents of linguistic innovation.

In light of this reality, a systemic response is required - one that encompasses pedagogical, institutional, and societal dimensions. Pedagogically, language education must shift away from rigid prescriptivism and toward descriptive, inclusive models that validate linguistic diversity and digital literacies (Yule 226; Canagarajah 95). Institutional style guides and policies must evolve to reflect inclusive language practices, such as the adoption of gender-neutral pronouns and the removal of ableist, racist, or colonial terminology (APA 138). At the societal level, public discourse must be reframed to recognize language as a living system subject to the same pressures of innovation, resistance, and negotiation as any other cultural form.

Ultimately, language reform is not simply a linguistic issue, but a matter of equity, access, and democratic participation. When language evolves, it expands the boundaries of who is heard, understood, and included. Embracing linguistic change is therefore not a concession to chaos but a commitment to justice. As the world continues to digitize and diversify, only a responsive and inclusive linguistic culture will ensure that communication remains both relevant and empowering for all.

[1]Kene Lucile Emenike
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.
Email: kl.emenike@unizik.edu.ng

[2]Tinamary Chidiebere Omulu
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.
Email: tc.omulu@unizik.edu.ng

Works Cited

Al-khresheh, Fadi H., and Zulkifley Orak. "The Practices and Problems of Teaching English Grammar to the Young EFL Learners." ResearchGate, June 2022, www.researchgate.net/publication/361100564_The_Practices_and_Problems_of_Teaching_English_Grammar_to_the_Young_EFL_Learners.

American Academy of Arts and Sciences. "Language Standardization & Linguistic Subordination." Daedalus, 28 Aug. 2023, www.amacad.org/publication/daedalus/language-standardization-linguistic-subordination.

American Psychological Association. Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. 7th ed., APA, 2020.

"Are You a Friendly Language Police?" The Educational Linguist, 3 Feb. 2016, educationallinguist.wordpress.com/2016/02/03/are-you-a-friendly-language-police/.

"Backlash Against Equality: The 'Tyranny' of the 'Politically Correct'." McGill Law Journal, www.lawjournal.mcgill.ca/article/backlash-against-equallty-the-tyranny-of-the-politically-correct/. Accessed 22 May 2025.

Baron, Dennis. A Better Pencil: Readers, Writers, and the Digital Revolution. Oxford University Press, 2009.

---. Grammar and Good Taste: Reforming the American Language. Yale University Press, 1982.

---. What's Your Pronoun?: Beyond He and She. Liveright Publishing, 2020.

---. "Why do academics continue to insist on 'proper' English?" n.d., debaron.web.illinois.edu/essays/stde.htm. Accessed 22 May 2025.

Baugh, John. Linguistics in the Courtroom: A Practical Guide. Blackwell Publishing, 2000.

Bender, Emily M., et al. "On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?" Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 2021, pp. 610–623.

Benitez-Correa, Sandra M., et al. "On Approaches to English Grammar Teaching and Its Current Situation." Scientific Research Publishing, 2019, www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=130006.

Blodgett, Su Lin, et al. "Language (Technology) is Power: A Critical Survey of 'Bias' in NLP." Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 2020, pp. 5454–5476.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Economics of Linguistic Exchanges." Social Science Information, vol. 16, no. 6, 1977, pp. 645-68.

Bourdieu, Pierre. Language and Symbolic Power. Edited by John B. Thompson, translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, Harvard University Press, 1991.

Bucholtz, Mary, and Kira Hall. "Theorizing Identity and Interaction." Language in Society, vol. 34, no. 4, 2005, pp. 585-616.

Cameron, Deborah. Verbal Hygiene. Routledge, 1995.

Canagarajah, Suresh. Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations. Routledge, 2013.

Crystal, David. Internet Linguistics: A Student Guide. Routledge, 2011.

---. Language and the Internet. 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, 2006.

---. Language and the Internet. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

---. Txtng: The Gr8 Db8. Oxford University Press, 2008.

Crowley, Tony. Standard English and the Politics of Language. Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Cuban, Larry. "Whatever Happened to Teaching Grammar?" Larry Cuban on School Reform and Classroom Practice, 17 June 2021, larrycuban.wordpress.com/2021/06/17/whatever-happened-to-teaching-grammar/.

Cushing, Ian, et al. "Online Public Language Policing as a Biopower." Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies, 2021, apples.journal.fi/article/download/141099/98699/367059. Accessed 22 May 2025.

Enhancv. "10 Sales Person Resume Examples & Guide for 2025." Enhancv, enhancv.com/resume-examples/sales-person/. Accessed 22 May 2025.

Fairclough, Norman. Language and Power. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2001.

Fiveable. "Language policing and grammar nazism." Language and Popular Culture Class Notes, library.fiveable.me/language-popular-culture/unit-12/language-policing-grammar-nazism/study-guide/m70iEGrB3q9S4BP6. Accessed 22 May 2025.

Herring, Susan C. "Computer-Mediated Communication: Rhetoric and Genre." Handbook of Pragmatics, edited by Jef Verschueren et al., John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007, pp. 1-27.

---. "Ideologies of Language Use on the Internet: The case of 'free speech'." Paper presented at the International Pragmatics Association Conference, 1998, homes.luddy.indiana.edu/herring/ipra98.pdf.

Inside Higher Ed. "10 Ways to Tackle Linguistic Bias in Our Classrooms." Inside Higher Ed, 27 Jan. 2021, www.insidehighered.com/advice/2021/01/27/how-professors-can-and-should-combat-linguistic-prejudice-their-classes-opinion.

Labov, William. Sociolinguistic Patterns. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

---. Principles of Linguistic Change, Volume 1: Internal Factors. Blackwell Publishing, 1994.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane, and Michael H. Long. An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research. Longman, 1991.

Lippi-Green, Rosina. English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States. Routledge, 1997.

---. English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States. Routledge, 2012.

Lodge, R. Anthony. French: From Dialect to Standard. Routledge, 1993.

Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy. Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English. Routledge, 1999.

Milroy, James. Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English. Routledge, 2000.

Norton, Bonny. Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation. 2nd ed., Multilingual Matters, 2013.

Ogburn, William F. Social Change with Respect to Culture and Original Nature. B.W. Huebsch, Inc., 1922.

---. Social Change with Respect to Culture and Original Nature. Dell Publishing, 1966.

Pajunen, H. "Online public language policing as a biopower: Enforcing and challenging language norms and language ideologies in Finnish Facebook language discussion groups." Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies, vol. 18, no. 3, 2024, pp. 22–44.

Pennycook, Alastair. The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language. Longman, 1994.

ResearchGate. "Academic Language Development and Linguistic Discrimination: Perspectives from Internationally Educated Students." ResearchGate, Dec. 2023, www.researchgate.net/publication/376815971_Academic_Language_Development_and_Linguistic_Discrimination_Perspectives_from_Internationally_Educated_Students.

---. "What's in an Accent? General Spontaneous Biases Against Nonnative Accents - An Investigation with Conceptual and Auditory IATs." ResearchGate, www.researchgate.net/publication/319560519_What%27s_in_an_Accent_General_Spontaneous_Biases_Against_Nonnative_Accents_-_An_Investigation_with_Conceptual_and_Auditory_IATs. Accessed 22 May 2025.

Schiffrin, Deborah. Approaches to Discourse. Blackwell, 1987.

Smitherman, Geneva. Talkin That Talk: Language, Culture, and Education in African America. Routledge, 2000.

ThoughtCo. "Explanation: What Is Register in Linguistics?" ThoughtCo, www.thoughtco.com/register-language-style-1692038. Accessed 22 May 2025.

Turkle, Sherry. Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other. Basic Books, 2011.

University of Edinburgh. "New Report Finds Accents Still Act as a Barrier to Social Mobility." University of Edinburgh, ppls.ed.ac.uk/linguistics-and-english-language/news/accents-still-act-as-a-barrier-to-social-mobility. Accessed 22 May 2025.

“What Is Inclusive Language and Why Is It Dangerous?” National Catholic Register, 4 Mar. 2024, www.ncregister.com/cna/what-is-inclusive-language-and-why-is-it-dangerous. Accessed 22 May 2025.

Woolard, Kathryn A. "Language Ideology: Shifting Perspectives and Disciplinary Intersections." Pragmatics, vol. 12, no. 3, 2002, pp. 349-58.

Young, Vershawn Ashanti. Quoted in "10 Ways to Tackle Linguistic Bias in Our Classrooms." Inside Higher Ed, 27 Jan. 2021, www.insidehighered.com/advice/2021/01/27/how-professors-can-and-should-combat-linguistic-prejudice-their-classes-opinion.

Yule, George. The Study of Language. 6th ed., Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Zorrilla, Alicia María. Quoted in "What Is Inclusive Language and Why Is It Dangerous?" National Catholic Register, 4 Mar. 2024, www.ncregister.com/cna/what-is-inclusive-language-and-why-is-it-dangerous.