



Morphological Shifts in Digital Communication: A Comparative Analysis of Generation Z and Alpha Content Creators

Pauleen Aubrey F. Reyes*, Mariell Grace D. Casaba, Jonielyn B. Tubigon, Princess Kaye C. Duron, Randall Edfer R. Señorón, Genesis B. Naparan, Aris Pet Angeli A. Suarez
College of Teacher Education, Arts, and Sciences, Saint Columban College, Pagadian City, Philippines

*corresponding author' email: pauleenaubrey.reyes@sccpag.edu.ph

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v8i3.2597>

APA Citation: Reyes, P. A., Casaba, M. G., Tubigon, J., Duron, P. K., & Señorón, R. E., Naparan, G., Suarez, A.P.A. (2025). Morphological Shifts in Digital Communication: A Comparative Analysis of Generation Z and Alpha Content Creators. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 8(3), 155-166. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v8i3.2597>

Received:
26/02/2026

Accepted:
05/04/2026

Keywords:
Generation Z, Generation Alpha, slang, morphological shifts, word formation, digital communication

Abstract

This study examined the morphological shifts present in the slang used by Generation Z and Generation Alpha content creators in digital communication. Employing a descriptive quantitative design supported by morphological word-formation theory and sociolinguistic concepts of language change, the corpora consisted of fifty (50) manually transcribed videos from ten (10) Filipino content creators across TikTok, Facebook, and YouTube, representing five creators from each generation. Results revealed that both generations actively use slang as a marker of identity, creativity, and social belonging, with conversion emerging as the most dominant morphological process. Findings further showed that Generation Z frequently employed clipping and acronyms typical of text-based interaction, while Generation Alpha preferred compounding, coinage, and audiovisual-influenced expressions shaped by fast-paced meme and gaming culture. The study concludes that differences in slang formation reflect the technological environments that shaped each generation's communication style. Based on the findings, educators, linguists, and parents are recommended to incorporate awareness of digital language trends into instruction, and future research should expand to larger datasets and additional platforms to deepen understanding of generational language evolution.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language continuously adapts to reflect cultural changes (Jeresano & Carretero, 2022). According to Reyes (2024), younger generations demonstrate remarkable creativity through the invention and circulation of new slang and digital expressions. These linguistic innovations do more than add novelty to conversation; they function as dense, socially loaded signs that encode values, attitudes, and group membership. Slang and emergent digital forms—such as emoji sequencing, deliberate misspellings, hashtag play, soundbite remixing, and platform-specific phrases—operate as tools for identity work: speakers selectively adopt, adapt, and amplify these forms to signal belonging, resistance, humor, or stance. The creativity involved is both combinatory and inventive: younger generations routinely blend lexical items, shorten words, repurpose existing words with new pragmatic functions, and graft paralinguistic cues onto text to produce meanings that are context-sensitive and often ephemeral.

Coined by generational researcher Mark McCrindle (2009), Gen Alpha is named after the first letter of the Greek alphabet. Their immediate predecessors, Generation Z, mark the end of Latin alphabets in the series of naming generations, paving the way for Gen Alpha to emerge. Research in the past decade provides evidence of common characteristics of Gen Z (born between 1997 and 2012) and Gen Alpha (born after 2012) (Emelu, 2025). According to Reyes

Morphological Shifts in Digital Communication: A Comparative Analysis of Generation Z and Alpha Content Creators

(2024), Generation Z develops its language through original slang, phrases, and acronyms that help them express themselves and navigate complex social environments. Slang has been a persistent linguistic trend, with pronunciations changing, new words emerging, and the pace varying across generations (Mantiri, 2010). Language also evolves differently as generations interact, making an understanding of register essential to analyze how social context influences communication (Biber & Conrad, 2019).

The fast development of language, especially in online communication, brings about a necessity to understand morphological changes between Generation Alpha and Generation Z. The two generations, as native internet users, greatly depend on the internet to communicate. However, their patterns of language use vary with shifting technological environments. Generation Z came of age in the digital transition period when the internet and text-based social media like Facebook, TikTok, and Instagram dominated everyday life. As Eble (1998, as cited in Melissa et al., 2024) describes, "slang is often created to foster group identity and exclude outsiders," highlighting how slang is a tool for social bonding and differentiation. Words like "lit," "fam," and "yeet" became widely used among Gen Z, reflecting their identity in a text-heavy digital environment driven by meme culture.

In contrast, Generation Alpha was raised in a media landscape dominated by visual and video-based platforms like TikTok and YouTube (Tasyarasita et al., 2023). Wallwork (1971, as cited in Tasyarasita, 2023) notes that new media have "profound effects on language, particularly in the areas of vocabulary and interaction." Unlike Gen Z, whose slang developed primarily in text-based spaces, Gen Alpha's linguistic trends are shaped by fast-paced, interactive video content. Words like "cap" and "sus" illustrate how their slang adapts to modern digital communication's dynamic, visually driven nature.

Generation Z, who grew up during the rise of text-based social platforms such as Facebook and early Twitter, tend to favor acronymic and meme-influenced slang like "brb," "fr," or "lit," reflecting their immersion in written online communication (Jabeen & Nawaz, 2025). In contrast, Generation Alpha—immersed in highly visual platforms such as TikTok and YouTube—develops more performative and multimodal expressions such as "rizz," "slay," "it's giving," and "skibidi" (Tasyarasita et al., 2023, as cited in Melissa et al., 2024). Studies further suggest that while Gen Z's linguistic style emphasizes textual creativity and abbreviation, Gen Alpha's communication relies more on visual cues, sound trends, and algorithmic virality (Duisenbekova, 2023; Reyes, 2024). This shift illustrates how evolving media environments influence the form, speed, and morphology of slang creation among younger generations.

The influence of digital technology on language evolution has been extensively discussed in contemporary sociolinguistic studies. Crystal (2011) emphasized how digital technology, particularly the internet, has transformed traditional language norms by introducing abbreviations, clipped forms, and neologisms. Tagliamonte and Denis (2008) further explored the innovation in morphological constructions fostered by online communication, specifically among youth, identifying how inflected acronyms and novel blends have contributed to the rapid spread of linguistic trends. Similarly, Androutsopoulos (2006) examined the role of "language stylization" in digital media, where youth construct identity through slang, memes, and hybrid word formations. Baron (2008) explored how texting and instant messaging have reshaped language, with users adopting a "morphologically economical" form of communication evident in the widespread use of shortened and clipped terms.

Danesi (2016) observed how emojis, memes, and slang have become visual-morphological markers of Gen Z and Gen Alpha digital speech, serving as signals for emotion, context, and group belonging in multimodal ways. Melissa et al. (2024) conducted a sociolinguistic comparison between Gen Z and Gen Alpha, revealing distinct differences in their slang usage: Gen Z slang tends to be shaped by abbreviation and meme culture, while Gen Alpha's language is more influenced by video-based trends. Tasyarasita et al. (2023) highlighted how TikTok fosters the rapid creation and spread of slang through audio-visual trends, while Reyes (2024)

emphasized the localized adaptation of slang among Gen Z in the Philippines, demonstrating how neologisms are shaped by both global internet culture and local linguistic traditions.

To guide the study and address the identified gaps in the literature, the following research questions were formulated: (1) What are the common slang terms used by Gen Z and Gen Alpha content creators? (2) What are the most common word formations (e.g., blending, clipping, acronyms) used by content creators of each generation? (3) What similarities exist in how Gen Z and Gen Alpha content creators create, adopt, and modify slang terms? (4) What differences exist in how Gen Z and Gen Alpha content creators create, adopt, and modify slang terms?

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework of this study is grounded in Labov's Sociolinguistic Theory of Language Change (1994), which explains that language evolves as a result of social interaction, group identity, and community-based communication practices. According to this theory, linguistic changes—such as the emergence of new slang, word formations, and shifts in meaning—occur because speakers continually adjust their language to conform to the norms, trends, and communication styles of their social groups.

In this study, Generation Z and Generation Alpha function as distinct speech communities, each shaped by different digital environments and social experiences. Generation Z grew up using text-based platforms—early Facebook, Messenger, and Instagram—which encouraged shorter, text-friendly slang including clipped forms (e.g., "LOL," "OMG") and acronyms. Meanwhile, Generation Alpha is more exposed to audiovisual environments such as TikTok, YouTube Shorts, and interactive gaming platforms, where slang is more visual, performative, and sound-influenced (e.g., "rizz," "gyatt," "skibidi"). These digital spaces act as social contexts that shape how each generation creates, adapts, and spreads slang.

The analysis was further guided by three theoretical frameworks: Neologism Theory (Algeo, 1991; Crystal, 2006), which helped understand how and why new words or expressions emerge, especially within digital environments that encourage linguistic creativity and trend-based innovation; Morphological Word-Formation Theory (Plag, 2018), which guided the classification of each slang term through structural processes such as clipping, blending, and compounding; and the Sociolinguistic Theory of Language Change (Labov, 1994; Halliday, 1978), which provided insight into why different generations adopt and modify slang differently, emphasizing the role of social interaction, technology, and generational identity in shaping language use and evolution.

3. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employs a descriptive quantitative analysis to examine the comparative differences in digital communication between Generation Z and Generation Alpha. Descriptive research, as recognized by Pangestu (2016), is effective for analyzing textual data such as online conversations, memes, and digital interactions to identify recurring linguistic patterns and communication styles. A quantitative approach is suitable for this study, as it enables in-depth exploration of slang formation, usage, and variations across different generations within their natural online and social contexts.

This study also employs comparative analysis to investigate the differences between the digital languages of Generation Z and Generation Alpha, focusing particularly on slang, word usage, communication preferences, and the impact of technology on language evolution. Data were collected from multiple social media platforms—TikTok, Facebook, and YouTube—ensuring a broad and authentic representation of digital slang across generations.

Research Environment and Corpus

The research environment for this study was the digital landscape of social media platforms, specifically TikTok, Facebook, and YouTube. These platforms were chosen because they are among the most widely used by Generation Z and Generation Alpha in the Philippines, serving as primary spaces for entertainment, communication, and self-expression (Statista, 2024). This study examined a total of 50 videos—25 from Generation Z content creators and 25 from Generation Alpha content creators—with each video ranging in length from 2 to 30 minutes. The corpus of this study consisted of ten Filipino content creators—five representing Generation Z and five representing Generation Alpha. All ages are known and verified by the researchers as all the content creators are publicly known. These creators were selected based on the following criteria: consistent use of generational slang, verified age or publicly recognized accounts, active audience engagement, and a minimum follower count of 50,000 and an average of 20,000 views per video. Each influencer contributed five publicly available videos that were analyzed for their use of slang expressions.

Table 1

Corpus of the Study

Content Creator	Generation	Platform(s)	Follower Count
Content Creator A	Generation Z	TikTok	6.1 million
Content Creator B	Generation Z	TikTok	6.3 million
Content Creator C	Generation Z	YouTube	2.53 million
Content Creator D	Generation Z	Facebook	4.2 million
Content Creator E	Generation Z	YouTube	19.8 million
Content Creator F	Generation Alpha	YouTube	15.8 million
Content Creator G	Generation Alpha	YouTube	1 million
Content Creator H	Generation Alpha	TikTok	3.6 million
Content Creator I	Generation Alpha	TikTok	281.6 thousand
Content Creator J	Generation Alpha	Facebook	549.1 thousand

Data Gathering Procedure

The study examined and identified slang terms used in digital communication by Generation Z (born approximately 1997–2012) and Generation Alpha (born roughly 2013–2025). A total of 50 videos were analyzed, consisting of 25 from Generation Z and 25 from Generation Alpha content creators, selected through purposive sampling. Relevant videos were identified through a manual keyword search using hashtags such as #GenZSlang, #GenAlphaSlang, #PinoyTrends, and #TiktokLingo. All selected videos were viewed in full. No automated transcription or subtitle tools were used; the researchers manually transcribed all spoken words and phrases to ensure accuracy and contextual fidelity.

A term was classified as slang if it met at least one of the following linguistic criteria: (a) it was a newly created or recently popularized word within online youth communities, (b) it demonstrated a morphological process such as clipping, blending, compounding, borrowing, acronym formation, coinage, or back formation, or (c) it exhibited a semantic shift from its original or standard meaning. To maintain generational accuracy, words already established before the birth of a given generation were excluded from that group's dataset. To ensure transcription accuracy, a verification procedure was implemented in which one researcher

produced the initial transcript and a second researcher systematically reviewed it against the original audio-visual material.

Data Analysis

The data analysis focused on identifying, categorizing, and comparing the slang terms used by Generation Z and Generation Alpha content creators. After transcription, the slang words were grouped according to their morphological formation—clipping, blending, compounding, coinage, borrowing, acronym, conversion, back formation, and nonce formation. This classification allowed the researchers to determine which word-formation processes were most frequently used by each generation. After categorization, a comparative analysis was conducted to identify similarities and differences between the two groups. The frequency of each morphological shift was compared to determine which processes were dominant.

Ethical considerations were upheld throughout the study. Privacy was protected by anonymizing all sources through coded identifiers and analyzing data solely for linguistic features. Beneficence was maintained by using publicly available content strictly for academic purposes. Justice was ensured by applying uniform selection criteria and analytical procedures across all generational groups. Transparency was maintained by clearly documenting research objectives, data selection criteria, and limitations.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets data on slang usage and morphological processes observed in the digital communication of Generation Z and Generation Alpha content creators, drawn from a corpus of selected influencers on TikTok, Facebook, and YouTube. The analysis employs frameworks including Neologism, Morphological Word-Formation Theory, and the Sociolinguistic Theory of Language Change to provide insights into (1) common slang terms used by both generations, (2) the morphological processes underpinning their word formations, (3) similarities in their linguistic practices, and (4) differences in how they create and adapt slang.

Common Slang Terms Used by Generation Z Content Creators

Table 2 presents how Generation Z uses different slang words in their content creations on TikTok, Facebook, and YouTube. This study proves that Generation Z actively employs slang in digital communication, reflecting linguistic creativity, generational identity, and cultural belonging.

Table 2
Generation Z Slang Words

Slang Word	Translation	Frequency	Percentage
OMG	Oh my god/Oh my gosh	14	56%
Grabe	Wow! / Extreme	11	44%
Crave/Craving	Desire to eat	9	36%
Periodt	End	7	28%
Prank	Joke	7	28%
Layag	Ship	5	20%
OA	Overacting	5	20%
Trip	Mood/Thing	4	16%

Morphological Shifts in Digital Communication: A Comparative Analysis of Generation Z and Alpha Content Creators

Gets	Get it	4	16%
BRB	Be right back	3	12%
Ferson	Person	3	12%
Bongga	Impressive	3	12%
Slay	Giving amazing visual	2	8%
Budol	Tricked into buying something	2	8%
Glow-up	Positive transformation in looks/style	2	8%
FOMO	Fear of Missing Out	1	4%
NGL	Not gonna lie	1	4%
FR	For real	1	4%
Marites	Gossipmonger	1	4%
Total (selected terms)	—	140	100%

Note. Table shows selected high-frequency slang terms. Total corpus for Generation Z: 55 morphological instances from 140 slang entries.

With a total percentage of 100%, Table 2 shows that Generation Z most commonly used "OMG" (56%), suggesting text-based abbreviations were central to their communication style. The findings are consistent with previous studies that have examined the role of neologisms and morphological processes in online communication, suggesting that slang formation is a widespread practice across various forms of digital interaction. Grandez et al. (2023) note that this study adds to the continuous evolution of language by providing vital insights into the morphological structure and usage trends of Generation Z slang. Abella et al. (2024) analyzed Gen Z slang and documented similar word-formation strategies such as clipping, blending, and semantic shift, while Paoletti & Mujahidah (2024) observe that Gen Z relies more on text-based neologisms and ironic tone.

These findings show that Gen Z's language use is not random but purposeful and creative, reflecting how they express humor, identity, and connection online. This highlights that slang is more than just "internet talk"; it is a tool that allows Gen Z to build their own culture and strengthen their sense of belonging in the digital world.

Common Slang Terms Used by Generation Alpha Content Creators

Table 3 presents Generation Alpha's usage of slang words. As Halliday & Matthiessen (2014) point out, language serves as a powerful tool for expressing thoughts, emotions, and social identities. In the case of Gen Alpha, their use of slang on digital platforms highlights both the creation of solidarity within peer groups and the construction of boundaries between different generations.

Table 3

Generation Alpha Slang Words

Slang Word	Translation	Frequency	Percentage
Spoiled	Overindulged or pampered	6	24%
Sigma	Best of the best	6	24%

Clout	Popularity	6	24%
High end	Top-tier quality	6	24%
Atake	Attention grabbing	5	20%
Vibes	Energy	5	20%
Sus	Suspicious	5	20%
Rizz	Charisma	3	12%
Ohio	Weird	3	12%
Skibidi	Cool/Bad/Humorous	2	8%
Fanum tax	Stealing food	2	8%
Delulu	Delusional	2	8%
Brain rot	Low-quality internet content	1	4%
NPC	Non-Player Character	1	4%
Gyatt	Bottom	1	4%
ASMR	Autonomous Sensory Meridian / Satisfying	1	4%
Total (selected terms)	—	158	100%

Note. Table shows selected high-frequency slang terms. Total corpus for Generation Alpha: 88 morphological instances from 158 slang entries.

With a total percentage of 100%, Table 3 shows that the most commonly used words by Generation Alpha were "spoiled," "sigma," "clout," and "high-end," each with 24% frequency. The term "spoiled" means allowed to do or have anything they want; "sigma" refers to a self-assured and extremely capable man; "clout" refers to social influence or popularity in social media; and "high-end" refers to being the most expensive or technically sophisticated. Ziatdinov & Cilliers (2021) note that Generation Alpha has been socialized in an environment where digital media, social platforms, and rapid technological advancements have become dominant forces. De Leon (2024) emphasized that slang often fulfills social purposes such as humor, identity construction, and trend participation. The term "Ohio," which originally denotes the U.S. state, has acquired new meanings such as "something weird, cringey or odd" from the many references to strange incidents happening "only in Ohio" within the informal lexicon of this generation (Fox, 2024). Similarly, the word "cap," originally signifying "hat," has come to represent "lie" in Generation Alpha's slang.

Morphological Word Formations

In this study, the researchers gathered 143 slang words—55 from Generation Z and 88 from Generation Alpha—and classified them into ten morphological processes: conversion, clipping, acronym, compounding, borrowing, coinage, nonce word, blending, back formation, and eponym.

Table 4
Slang Language Common Word Formations

Morphological Shift	Gen Z Frequency	Gen Z %	Gen Alpha Frequency	Gen Alpha %
Conversion	16	25.81%	27	28.72%

Morphological Shifts in Digital Communication: A Comparative Analysis of Generation Z and Alpha Content Creators

Clipping	5	8.06%	8	8.51%
Acronym	6	9.68%	4	4.26%
Compounding	5	8.06%	15	15.96%
Borrowing	14	22.58%	14	14.89%
Coinage	4	6.45%	8	8.51%
Nonce word	3	4.84%	7	7.45%
Blending	1	1.61%	1	1.06%
Back formation	0	0%	0	0%
Eponym	1	1.61%	4	4.26%
Total	55	100%	88	100%

Table 4 compares the frequency and percentage of morphological shifts, illustrating how each generation adapts language to its digital environment. Conversion emerged as the most frequent process for both groups, showing how existing words gain new meanings through online use. The higher number in Gen Alpha (88 instances versus 55) occurred because some slang terms functioned under more than one morphological category depending on context.

Gen Z often employed clipping, borrowing, and acronyms—strategies linked to brevity in text-based communication—while Gen Alpha favored compounding, borrowing, and coinage (e.g., brain rot, party people, skibidi), reflecting the influence of audiovisual and meme culture (Tasyarasita et al., 2023). Guided by Neologism and Sociolinguistic Theories (Labov, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014), the findings suggest that Gen Z's slang reflects linguistic efficiency, whereas Gen Alpha's shows greater experimentation and multimodal creativity. Back-formation was included as a morphological category even though it yielded zero instances for both generations, as its inclusion ensures the analysis remains comprehensive and aligned with established frameworks of word formation (Plag, 2003).

Similarities in Slang Formation Between Gen Z and Gen Alpha

Table 5

Similarities in how Gen Z and Gen Alpha Content Creators Create, Adopt, and Modify Slang Terms

Word Formation Process	Examples for Gen Z	Examples for Gen Alpha	Similarities
Clipping	Sus, bestie, fam, vid, prof, notif	Delulu, stan, simp, app, sub, rec	Both shorten longer words for quicker, more casual communication that fits fast online chats and captions.
Acronyms / Initialisms	FR, POV, TBH, LOL, IDK, BTW	IKR, NGL, TMI, YAP, GG, ICYMI	Both use acronyms to make communication faster and more efficient, expressing shared understanding among peers.
Compounding	Glow-up, brain rot, catfish, soft launch	Core memory, fan cam, aura check	Both combine familiar words to describe trends, feelings, or shared digital experiences.

		delulu arc, NPC energy	
--	--	---------------------------	--

Table 5 illustrates that both Generation Z and Generation Alpha consistently employ similar word-formation processes in constructing slang. Their shared use of clipping, acronyms, compounding, and other linguistic strategies reflects a common tendency toward linguistic efficiency and innovation shaped by contemporary digital communication. This parallelism suggests that, despite generational differences, both groups are influenced by the fast and dynamic nature of online interaction, where brevity and expressiveness are highly valued. The similarity in their linguistic behavior indicates that digital environments provide comparable conditions for language adaptation, leading both generations to develop slang that is concise, multifunctional, and responsive to emerging social and technological trends. This aligns with Crystal's (2011) and Baron's (2008) view that internet language favors morphological economy and expressive innovation.

Differences in Slang Formation Between Gen Z and Gen Alpha

Table 6

Differences in how Gen Z and Gen Alpha Content Creators Create, Adopt, and Modify Slang Terms

Word Formation Process	Examples Gen Z	Examples Gen Alpha	Differences
Blending	Boogsh, hangry, bromance, vibecheck	Delulu, skibiditoilet, mewing, slorp	Common in text-based posts; used for humor and individuality.
Borrowing / Localization	Budol, ferson, pak ganern, petmalu	Sigma, rizz, kiwi, rizzler	Mixes Filipino and English to reflect local identity and humor.
Coinage / Invented Forms	Yeet, clout, oomf, simp	Fanum tax, gyatt, skibidi	Created from memes or internet humor.
Eponym / Reference-Based	Karen, mother, Tita Girl, Kween	Rickrolled, Grimace Shake, Ohio Rizzler	Based on pop culture figures and memes.
Nonce / Temporary Words	Bruh, bet, finna, okurrr	Goon, boing boing, pookie bear	Used briefly during text or meme trends.
Back Formation	—	—	Rarely or never used in either generation's slang.

Table 6 highlights the differences in how Generation Z and Generation Alpha create, adopt, and modify slang terms, suggesting that technological environments have a significant influence on generational language practices. Generation Z's slang, which often develops through text-based interaction and social contexts, tends to be more stable and culturally grounded, reflecting their roots in meme-driven abbreviation and localized English-Tagalog hybridization (Reyes, 2024). In contrast, Generation Alpha's slang is primarily driven by audiovisual media, gaming culture, and viral trends, resulting in expressions that are more transient and rapidly changing. Duisenbekova (2023) corroborates this, observing that Gen Alpha's engagement with interactive, gamified, and algorithmic environments encourages

linguistic experimentation analogous to digital play. These distinctions support Crystal (2011) and Labov (1994), confirming that language evolution mirrors technological environments and generational engagement.

5. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that both Generation Z and Generation Alpha content creators actively reshape language through slang, which serves as a marker of creativity, identity, and belonging in digital spaces. The analysis revealed that conversion is the most dominant morphological process in both generations, showing their shared tendency to give new meanings to existing words for faster and more expressive communication. However, the two generations differ in their preferred word-formation strategies. Generation Z favors clipping and acronyms such as BRB, OMG, and bestie, reflecting their roots in text-based platforms like Facebook and early YouTube. In contrast, Generation Alpha prefers compounding and coinage, producing slang such as brain rot, party people, and skibidi, reflecting the influence of audiovisual media, gaming culture, and viral internet trends.

These results contribute to sociolinguistic and morphological research by showing how generational identity interacts with digital media to create distinct linguistic behaviors. In education, the findings highlight the need for teachers and linguists to recognize slang as part of language evolution; integrating examples of digital slang into classroom discussions can help students appreciate language as dynamic and culturally responsive. The study further demonstrates that slang is not merely playful or informal speech but a living reflection of how young people construct identity, adapt to new media, and redefine communication in an ever-changing linguistic landscape.

This study is subject to several limitations. First, it utilized a small sample size consisting of only ten Filipino content creators, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, the study is confined to the Filipino context; therefore, the results may not be applicable to other cultural or linguistic settings. Lastly, the transcription and interpretation of linguistic data may involve a degree of subjectivity, which could influence the analysis despite efforts to maintain accuracy and consistency. Future studies should include a larger and more diverse sample of content creators from different cultural contexts, expand the study period, and incorporate additional online platforms to strengthen and expand these findings.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are offered for educators and linguistics professors, policymakers, parents, and future researchers.

Linguistics courses should dedicate sessions to analyzing slang formation on TikTok, comparing it to written platforms like early Facebook, helping students understand how technological context shapes morphological innovation. Policymakers are encouraged to integrate digital literacy programs into the curriculum, including instruction on modern language use and slang, and to provide teacher training on digital communication trends and linguistic change. Establishing national guidelines promoting respectful and responsible online language use can be developed as part of broader digital citizenship initiatives.

Parents and guardians are encouraged to engage in open conversations with their children about the slang they encounter online, asking questions about the meaning and origin of specific terms. While monitoring digital content, parents should also allow room for creative expression, helping children understand when informal slang is appropriate and when formal language is required. For future researchers, future studies should include a larger and more diverse sample of content creators from different cultural contexts to better understand how culture influences digital slang. Expanding the study period and incorporating additional

quantitative methods may also provide deeper insights into the evolution of online language across generations.

7. REFERENCES

- Abella, C., Gacusan, M., Pasahol, A., & Ablang, Y. (2024). Neologism: The language formation among Generation Z. *International Journal of Research*, 13(14).
- Almeida, R., Barbosa, L. C., & Gomes, A. (2020). The use of digital slang among youth: A sociolinguistic analysis. *Journal of Language and Communication*, 7(2), 115-129.
- Androutsopoulos, J. (2006). Introduction: Sociolinguistics and computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10(4), 419-438. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2006.00286>
- Baron, N. S. (2008). *Always on: Language in an online and mobile world*. Oxford University Press.
- Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2019). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2011). *Internet linguistics: A student guide*. Routledge.
- Danesi, M. (2016). *Teen talk: The language of adolescents*. Walter de Gruyter.
- De Leon, K. M. B. (2024). Navigating the functions of emerging neologisms: A sociolinguistic study. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(6), 556-564.
- Djohan, A., Pratama, R., & Lestari, S. (2024). The role of social media in language innovation. *Journal of Digital Communication*, 11(2), 120-136.
- Duisenbekova, M. (2023). Comparative analysis of the Alpha and Z generations: Key characteristics and implications. *Eurasian Science Review: An International Peer-Reviewed Multidisciplinary Journal*, 1(1).
- Eble, C. (1996). *Slang and sociability*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Emelu, M. N. (2025). Gen Z and Gen Alpha: Designing theology courses for a digital and AI generation. *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal*, 14(1), 9.
- Fox, J. (2024). Digital communication and linguistic creativity. *Language and Media Journal*, 15(2), 66-81.
- Gallaher, R. (2023). Slang development in online communities. *Journal of Internet Linguistics*, 4(1), 12-28.
- Grandez, M., Santos, P., & Cruz, L. (2023). Youth language trends in Southeast Asia. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 9(2), 88-105.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Jabeen, S., & Nawaz, A. (2025). Digital slang and youth communication in online platforms. *Journal of Language and Social Interaction*, 12(1), 45-60.
- Jeresano, E. M., & Carretero, M. D. (2022). Digital culture and social media slang of Gen Z. *United International Journal for Research & Technology*, 3(4), 11-25.
- Jingzi, L. (2023). Internet language and identity construction. *Journal of Contemporary Linguistics*, 7(3), 90-104.
- Labov, W. (1994). *Principles of linguistic change: Internal factors*. Blackwell.
- Mantiri, O. (2010). Factors affecting language change. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2566128>
- McCrinkle, M., & Wolfinger, E. (2009). *The ABC of XYZ: Understanding the global generations*. UNSW Press.
- Melissa, P., Siregar, M. B. N., Shakira, F. M., Haz, L., & Rangkuti, R. (2024). Sociolinguistic study: Variation of slang words between Gen Z and Gen Alpha. *Philosophica: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, 7(2), 114-125.
- Pangestu, R. (2016). Morphological processes in modern slang formation. *Indonesian Journal of Linguistics*, 5(1), 23-34.

Morphological Shifts in Digital Communication: A Comparative Analysis of Generation Z and Alpha Content Creators

- Paoleti, L., & Mujahidah, S. (2024). Multimodal communication and linguistic shifts. *Journal of Multimodal Studies*, 6(1), 33-49.
- Parambikovna, T. (2023). Language evolution in the digital age: A comparative generational study. *Journal of Sociolinguistic Research*, 8(2), 101-118.
- Plag, I. (2018). *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge University Press.
- Reyes, M. (2024). Translating Filipino slang: Localization of neologisms. *Scientia: The International Journal on the Liberal Arts*, 13(2), 44-53.
- Sitohang, H., & Ristia, D. (2025). Language variation among digital natives. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 55-70.
- Statista. (2024). Global social media usage statistics. Statista. <https://www.statista.com>
- Sundaram, V., Krishnan, P., & Devi, R. (2023). Generational differences in communication styles. *International Journal of Social Linguistics*, 9(4), 200-215.
- Tasyarasita, A. Z., Duhita, M. E., Yulianti, W., & Yustanto, H. (2023). Ragam bahasa slang oleh remaja Gen Z pada media sosial TikTok (kajian sosiolinguistik). *Translation and Linguistics (Transling)*, 3(2), 98-109.
- Tufail, M., Ahmad, S., & Khan, R. (2024). Technological influence on language evolution. *Global Journal of Linguistic Studies*, 13(2), 140-156.
- Ugoala, B. (2024). Sociolinguistic perspectives on digital communication. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 10(3), 77-92.
- Wallwork, J. (1971). Language and the individual. *ELT Journal*, 25(2), 140-147. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/25.2.140>
- Ziatdinov, R., & Cilliers, J. (2021). Generation Alpha: Understanding the next cohort of university students. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 10(3), 783-789.