

1 LOST IN TRANSLATION: TRANSLATING GENERATION
2 Z INTERNET SLANG USING MACHINE LEARNING

3 A Special Problem Proposal
4 Presented to
5 the Faculty of the Division of Physical Sciences and Mathematics
6 College of Arts and Sciences
7 University of the Philippines Visayas
8 Miag-ao, Iloilo

9 In Partial Fulfillment
10 of the Requirements for the Degree of
11 Bachelor of Science in Computer Science by

12 FLAUTA, Neil Bryan
13 GIMENO, Ashley Joy
14 GIMENO, Carl Jorenz

15 Francis DIMZON
16 Adviser

17 April 29, 2025

Abstract

19 Internet slang is an informal variation of language that is prominent to the younger
20 generation. The usage of this language brought generational divide between them
21 and the older generations. This study aimed to develop a translation tool leverag-
22 ing Large Language Models (LLMs) to bridge this issue. A dataset of Generation
23 Z slang sentences and their formal equivalents was used to fine-tune an existing
24 LLM. The model was trained to translate slang sentences into formal English, and
25 was compared against the baseline model using various evaluation metrics.

26 **Keywords:** Internet Slang, Generation Z, Generational Divide, LoRA,
LLM

27

Contents

28	1 Introduction	1
29	1.1 Overview	1
30	1.2 Problem Statement	3
31	1.3 Research Objectives	3
32	1.3.1 General Objectives	3
33	1.3.2 Specific Objectives	3
34	1.4 Scope and Limitations of the Research	4
35	1.5 Significance of the Research	4
36	2 Review of Related Literature	5
37	2.1 Communication Gap between Generations	5
38	2.2 Generative AI	6
39	2.3 Existing Studies	6
40	2.4 LoRA for Fine Tuning	7
41	2.5 Chapter Summary	7
42	3 Research Methodology	10
43	3.1 Research Activities	10

44	3.1.1	Data Gathering	10
45	3.1.2	Data Preprocessing	11
46	3.1.3	Model Fine-Tuning	11
47	3.1.4	Model Evaluation	12
48	3.2	Calendar of Activities	13
49	4	Results & Discussions	14
50	4.1	Dataset	14
51	4.2	Model Evaluation	14
52	4.2.1	Model Training	14
53	4.2.2	Text Generation	15
54	4.2.3	Automatic Evaluation Metrics	15
55	4.2.4	Manual Evaluation Metrics	15
56	5	Conclusion	16
57	5.1	Limitations	16
58	5.2	Recommendations	16
59		References	17
60	A	Figures and Tables	20

61 List of Figures

62 4.1 Automatic Evaluation of Dataset using BLEU and ROUGE metrics. 15

63 List of Tables

<small>64</small>	2.1 Summary of Existing Studies	9
<small>65</small>	3.1 Timetable of Activities	13

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Overview

Language is how humans communicate and express themselves (Crystal & Robins, 2024). It evolves, adapting to the changing needs of users (Jeresano & Carretero, 2022). New words are borrowed or invented (Mantiri, 2010), and most linguistic changes are initiated by young adults and adolescents (Thump, 2016 as cited in (Jeresano & Carretero, 2022)). This demographic tends to focus on belonging to self-organized groups of peers and friends, forming what can be described as the "we" generation. Through their interactions, language changes differently, making them remarkably distinct from previous generations.

Slang is a great example of the dynamic nature of language. Slang is an informal language used by people in the same social group (Fernández-Toro, 2016). It serves multiple social purposes: identifying group members, communicating informally, and opposing established authority (McArthur, 2003). Slang is highly contextual and pervasive, even in non-standard English. Its figurative nature and how it twists the definitions of the words used make it difficult for outsiders to understand.

In recent years, the Internet has become a significant medium for the evolution and spread of language, giving rise to 'Internet slang' (J. Liu, Zhang, & Li, 2023). Internet slang is a collection of everyday language forms used by various online groups (Barseghyan, 2014). Ujang et al. (2018, as cited in (binti Sabri, bin Hamdan, Nadarajan, & Shing, 2020)) state that internet slang is not easily understood by people outside the social group or people who are not fluent in the language where the slang is used. This phenomenon is particularly prominent among the

91 younger generation (Maulidiya, Wijaya, Mauren, Adha, & Pandin, 2021), where
92 they use it to communicate and interact with friends.

93 Generation Z, individuals born between 1996 and 2009, are regarded as "dig-
94 ital natives" because technology is an integral part of their upbringing (Dua et
95 al., 2024). Even the language of this generation is greatly affected by technology,
96 where newly coined terms and phrases, called Gen Z slang, are tied to the me-
97 dia culture they've grown up with (Jeresano & Carretero, 2022). However, this
98 evolution of language often creates communication barriers with older generations
99 (Venter, 2017 as cited in (Ghazali & Abdullah, 2021)). Furthermore, studies show
100 that even within Generation Z, people with limited exposure to social media may
101 struggle to understand the prevalent slang (Vacalares, Salas, Babac, Cagalawan,
102 & Calimpong, 2023).

103 These gaps highlight the need for a tool that can bridge the generational di-
104 vide, making it easier for individuals to understand the language of Generation Z.
105 Multiple studies have tried translating slang into a formal language using machine
106 learning. Khazeni et al. achieved a 81.91% accuracy in translating Persian slang
107 to formal Persian language using deep learning. Another study by Nocon et al.
108 created a translator to translate Filipino colloquialisms into the Filipino language
109 using Tensorflow's sequence-to-sequence model and Moses' phrase-based statis-
110 tical machine translation. Furthermore, Ibrahim and Sharief developed a slang
111 translator using models from Hugging Face.

112 Building on these studies, this study proposes to create a translation tool
113 specifically to translate Gen Z slang. The tool will utilize Low Rank Adaptation
114 (LoRA) to a selected Large Language Model (LLM). The results will be evaluated
115 using the Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation (ROUGE).

116 By fostering mutual understanding, this tool aims to promote more effective
117 and harmonious interactions across age groups, ultimately enhancing relationships
118 and reducing miscommunication.

119 The main contributions of this study are as follows:

- 120 • Enhance linguistic understanding between generations by using fine-tuning
121 a LLM to translate Gen Z slang to formal language, leveraging the strengths
122 of advanced NLP techniques
- 123 • Bridge communication gaps between generations using the proposed model
124 to foster better relationships
- 125 • Create a scalable framework that can be adapted to translate slang in other
126 languages

1.2 Problem Statement

Internet slang fosters informal, relatable communication within the younger generation (Ghazali & Abdullah, 2021), especially Generation Z, but it presents challenges in understanding for people outside this demographic. The gap in comprehension with older generations widens as internet slang evolves, often leading to miscommunication affecting social relationships that contribute to the generational divide (Vacalares et al., 2023). A more specific translation tool developed using language models can be used to bridge this divide.

By leveraging the ability of LLM to generate a more nuanced and properly constructed answer, a better tool can be made to translate the slang into proper sentences. It has already been proven by the likes of GPT being modified and tailored for use in several automated chatbots to provide customer service.

1.3 Research Objectives

1.3.1 General Objectives

This study aims to fine-tune the zephyr-7b LLM for use in the translation of Generation Z internet slang used by Filipinos in social media.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

- To create a dataset of sentences containing Generation Z slang used in differing contexts and its formal translation
- To create a LoRA implementation for fine-tuning an existing model
- To fine-tune an existing LLM to translate sentences containing Generation Z slang into formal sentences
- To evaluate the performance of the trained model and compare it to the baseline model using several performance metrics

151 **1.4 Scope and Limitations of the Research**

152 This study focused on the use of internet slang by Filipino Generation Z, with
153 an emphasis on the English language, as it is widely used on different digital
154 platforms, such as social networks.

155 **1.5 Significance of the Research**

156 The study contributed to understanding the evolving linguistic landscape shaped
157 by Internet slang, especially as used by Generation Z. The insights gained from
158 this study aid educators, parents, and communication professionals in bridging
159 inter-generational communication gaps and fostering better understanding across
160 age groups.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

2.1 Communication Gap between Generations

Language is dynamic in nature and thus, constantly evolving over time. One example of this behavior is the development of internet slang. Internet slang is a result of language variation and is often regarded as informal (S. Liu, Gui, Zuo, & Dai, 2019). In the study, *The Use of Online Slang for Independent Learning in English Vocabulary* (Ambarsari, Amrullah, & Nawawi, 2020), students used internet slang to express their feelings and emotions, and to align their communication style with their peers.

However, this development has its challenges. It is suggested that younger generation should use slang to communicate with each other instead of older generations because it might cause confusion between them (Jeresano & Carretero, 2022).

This miscommunication is prominent between generations with differences in linguistic familiarity as Suslak (Suslak, 2009) argues that age influences language use, noting that language evolves across generations. Supporting this, a study by Teng and Joo (Teng & Joo, 2023) found that the older a person is, the less likely they are to understand internet language.

Studies have shown that using internet slang improves relationships between those who use it. However, using internet slang for inter-generational communication can be a hindrance to proper and effective communication (Gonzaga, 2025).

184 2.2 Generative AI

185 Generative AI encompasses machine learning models that create new content,
186 such as text, images, and audio, based on patterns learned from extensive data
187 (Euchner, 2023). These models, including LLMs like those used in ChatGPT and
188 Bing AI, use neural networks to predict the next word or phrase in a sequence,
189 enabling them to generate human-like text (Brynjolfsson, Li, & Raymond, 2023).
190 The ability of generative AI to understand and produce diverse content, ranging
191 from creative writing code, makes it potentially useful for various applications,
192 such as language translation (Fui-Hoon Nah, Zheng, Cai, Siau, & Chen, 2023).

193 2.3 Existing Studies

194 Verghe et al. (Verghe, Godbout, Rabbany, & Pelrine, 2024) used multiple open
195 source LLMs and compared them with the latest version of GPT-3.5 and 4.0 models
196 at that time. They determined zephyr-7b-beta is a viable open-source alternative
197 to these models and is comparable with the latest GPT-4.0 model.

198 Khazeni et al. (Heydari, Albadvi, & Khazeni, 2024) used deep learning to
199 create a model for translating Persian slang text into formal ones. The researchers
200 explored the challenges of translating Persian slang into English within the context
201 of film subtitling, specifically focusing on the performance of three neural machine
202 translation (NMT) systems, namely Google Translate, Targoman, and Farazin.
203 The primary interest of the paper lies in the understanding of how these NMT
204 systems handle the complexities of slang translation. It was revealed that the
205 NMT systems often struggle to capture the nuances of slang, leading to unnatural
206 and inaccurate translations. Targoman performed best in naturalness, but it
207 fell short of human translation quality. This implies the need for specialized
208 algorithms or training data suitable for slang, and potentially human post-editing,
209 to achieve accurate and culturally appropriate translations in this domain.

210 The study by Nocon et al. (Nocon, Kho, & Arroyo, 2018) explores translating
211 Filipino colloquialisms, such as Conyo and Datkilab, into standardized Filipino,
212 addressing comprehension barriers for non-familiar speakers. Two machine
213 translation (MT) approaches were evaluated: Tensorflow’s Sequence-to-Sequence
214 model using Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) and Moses’ Phrase-based Statistical
215 MT. Moses outperformed Tensorflow on test data due to its handling of
216 phrase combinations and unfamiliar words, while Tensorflow excelled on training
217 data, indicating potential with refinement and more training data. The research
218 underscores the need for robust datasets and highlights the strengths of phrase-

219 based statistical MT in tackling slang translation challenges.

220 Ibrahim and Mustafa (Ibrahim & Sharief, 2023) developed a system to trans-
221 late slang into formal language, addressing challenges posed by slang’s informality
222 and variability. Using updated datasets of slang words, formal equivalents, and
223 contextual sentences, they fine-tuned pre-trained models from Hugging Face’s
224 Transformer library. While the T5-base model showed promise during training,
225 it performed poorly in testing. In contrast, the “facebook/bart-base” model ex-
226 celled, demonstrating high accuracy and low loss values. The study highlights the
227 importance of fine-tuning and updating datasets for effective slang translation
228 and emphasizes the potential of transformer models like “facebook/bart-base” in
229 bridging informal and formal language gaps.

230 2.4 LoRA for Fine Tuning

231 Low Rank Adaptation, or LoRA, is an efficient Parameter Efficient Fine Tuning
232 (PEFT) method proposed by Hu et al (Hu et al., 2021). This can significantly
233 decrease the required storage for training while producing comparable results and
234 in some cases even outperforming other adaptation methods. In addition, it has
235 minimal chance of catastrophic forgetting as the original weights are not being
236 tampered with, unlike other fine-tuning methods. These factors make it a suitable
237 option for slang translation as a quick yet accurate solution. In a study conducted
238 by Zhao et al. (Zhao et al., 2024), they determined that some LLMs using LoRA
239 for fine tuning can outperform GPT-4, one of the most advanced LLM models
240 currently. A study by Nguyen et al. (Nguyen, Wilson, & Dalins, 2023) used
241 LoRA in fine tuning a pre-trained Llama 2 7B model for text classification of
242 a dataset that contains slang. They were able to create a more accurate model
243 compared to models by existing studies at that time.

244 2.5 Chapter Summary

245 This chapter shows how generational differences create communication gaps, espe-
246 cially due to internet slang. Younger people tend to use slang to express emotions
247 and connect with friends, but this can confuse older generations who aren’t as
248 familiar with these terms. Research shows that as language changes over time,
249 older people are generally less likely to understand the newest internet language.
250 To bridge this gap, some recent studies have utilized machine learning to translate
251 slang into more standard language. For instance, Khazeni et al. (Heydari et al.,

252 2024) used deep learning to translate Persian slang, while Nocon et al. (Nocon et
253 al., 2018) created a Filipino slang translator using statistical models. Moreover,
254 Ibrahim and Mustafa (Ibrahim & Sharief, 2023) fine-tuned pre-trained models to
255 learn slang meanings. One promising technique for this is Low Rank Adaptation
256 (LoRA), which is a fine-tuning method that keeps the original model stable while
257 using less storage. Studies by Zhao et al. (Zhao et al., 2024) and Nguyen et al.
258 (Nguyen et al., 2023) show that LoRA models are not only efficient but can even
259 outperform advanced models like GPT-4 when it comes to slang translation and
260 text classification.

Table 2.1: Summary of Existing Studies

Author	Focus	Gaps	Problem Solved
Nocon et al.	Developing machine translators for Filipino colloquialisms using sequence-to-sequence models and statistical machine translation (Moses).	Tensorflow models had issues with unknown tokens and repetitions, and limited ability to generalize to unseen data.	Demonstrated the feasibility of machine translation for Filipino colloquialisms, with Moses as a viable solution.
Ibrahim et.al	Developing an intelligent system to transform English slang words into formal words.	The study noted that more powerful processors could improve the training and testing, and that previous datasets were outdated and needed updating.	Demonstrated an effective model for translating English slang to formal English and highlighted the importance of fine-tuning pre-trained models.
Khazeni et al.	Persian slang text conversion to formal and deep learning of Persian short texts on social media	The BERT models used did not align well with the informal data used in the sentiment analysis.	Created a tool to convert Persian slang to formal text and improved sentiment analysis of short texts using deep learning.

Chapter 3

Research Methodology

This chapter lists and discusses the specific steps and activities that will be performed to accomplish the project. The discussion covers the activities from pre-proposal to Final SP Writing.

3.1 Research Activities

3.1.1 Data Gathering

A dataset of sentences containing Generation Z slang and its formal translation was used in this study. This dataset was created using several source: data obtained from social media posts and manually translated by the researchers, existing datasets from HuggingFace, and machine generated and translated sentences using GPT-4o from OpenAI.

The data obtained from social media posts were from verified users of X whose ages are within the Generation Z, so that the dataset is accurate. The data was manually translated by the researchers to ensure that the translation is accurate and reflective of the target demographic. Data obtained from existing datasets and GPT-4o was checked manually to check if whether the sentence is one used by Generation Z. These processes ensured that the dataset is of high quality and representative of what and how Generation Z slang is used.

280 3.1.2 Data Preprocessing

281 The dataset used for the fine-tuning of the model was preprocessed to ensure opti-
282 mal performance of the model. Unnecessary information such as email addresses
283 and URLs was removed. The data was then manually cleaned up to remove
284 unnecessary characters such as emojis and fixed issues such as typos. A simi-
285 lar approach was done with existing and machine generated datasets to ensure
286 consistency within the training dataset.

287 The dataset is then split into train and test datasets in a 90/10 ratio to maxi-
288 mize the data learned by the model without compromising on the model’s ability
289 to generalize to new data. The train dataset is then split again into a 90/10 ratio
290 to ensure no overfitting while still allowing the model to adapt to the pattern
291 of slang. The cleaned up dataset was then tokenized through the Transformers
292 library provided by HuggingFace as the library already has tokenizers available
293 for their pretrained models. This ensures that the data is formatted properly as
294 required by the model to be used.

295 3.1.3 Model Fine-Tuning

296 The model used in this study was zephyr-7b-beta because it is open-source and
297 was proven to perform better than other models of the same size. In addition,
298 it can be trained in a GPU with 16GB of VRAM, necessary as we are using the
299 free tier of Google Colab as the platform of choice for prototype fine-tuning of the
300 model.

301 This study used the example codes provided by HuggingFace in the documen-
302 tation of their various libraries and sample notebook provided in the zephyr-7b-
303 beta repository.

304 The model was loaded using the Transformers library and was quantized into 4
305 bits through BitsandBytes library to fit the entire model in the allocated resources
306 while having enough headroom for training. In addition, the Unsloth library was
307 used to speed up the training time and reduce the resources used even more
308 (Daniel Han & team, 2023). A LoRA adapter was then attached to the model to
309 further reduce the parameters to be trained.

310 To evaluate the model training process and ensure that the model is not overfit-
311 ting, Bilingual Evaluation Understudy (BLEU) and Recall-Oriented Understudy
312 for Gisting Evaluation (ROUGE) are used. BLEU is used to measure the preci-
313 sion of the model by determining how much of the generated text appear in the

reference text (Papineni, Roukos, Ward, & Zhu, 2001) while ROUGE is used to measure recall as it determines how much of the reference text is in the generated text (Lin, 2004). These metrics use n-grams, making them superior to standard recall and precision metrics as they take into account the positioning of the words. These two metrics were implemented using the Evaluate library by HuggingFace, making it easier to integrate with the rest of the model training process. These metrics was calculated at every epoch of the training process and is used for an early stopping callback to immediately stop the model training if the model seems to be overfitting.

The model was then trained using SFTTrainer from the TRL library of HuggingFace to simplify the training process. The model was trained with the following parameters: batch size of 8, learning rate of 2e-5, and maximum number of epochs of 50. These parameters were chosen based on the GPU provided in Colab and the default parameters of SFTTrainer.

3.1.4 Model Evaluation

The model was evaluated using both automatic and manual evaluation metrics. The model was then prompted to generate a formal sentence for each sentence in the test dataset. The generated sentences were then compared to the formal translation of the sentence using BLEU and ROUGE metrics. The base zephyr-7b-beta model was also prompted to generate sentences for the BLEU and ROUGE metric and the pairwise comparison for human evaluation. Identical answers between the finetuned and the base model were removed to in the test set to ensure that the model is evaluated properly. A total of 144 sentences were used to evaluate the model.

A survey was conducted to compare the finetuned model to the base model to determine if the finetuning was effective. The survey was conducted online using Google Forms asked the participants to pick which of the following sentences is the more accurate translation of the given sentence based on accuracy, naturalness, and context. The order in which sentences from the two models were shown was randomly selected to avoid bias. To improve the response rate of the survey, the survey was split into multiple sets, answered by the same groups of people, allowing them to answer any or all of the survey forms.

3.2 Calendar of Activities

Table 3.1 shows a Gantt chart of the activities. Each bullet represents approximately one week's worth of activity.

Table 3.1: Timetable of Activities

Activities (2024-2025)	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Creation of the dataset	•						
Identification of potential LLM to be used	•						
Lookup on available GPU on demand services	•						
Study on LoRA implementation for LLM	•						
Preprocessing of data	•••						
Prototype implementation of LoRA	•	••••					
Implementation of LoRA on selected model			••				
Implementation of LLM Evaluation Metrics			••				
Model Evaluation and Analysis of Results				••••			
Documentation	••	••••	••••	••••	••••		

Chapter 4

Results & Discussions

4.1 Dataset

We built a dataset containing a total of 1155 Gen Z internet slang sentences and their corresponding formal translations. The created dataset was then combined with another dataset from Hugging Face that contains 698 Gen Z internet slang and their corresponding formal translation.

4.2 Model Evaluation

4.2.1 Model Training

The model was trained for 7 epochs before the early stopping callback was triggered because the evaluation metrics has not improved by at least 0.01 for 3 consecutive epochs. This prevented the overfitting seen in the following figure.

Here, we can see that the while the training loss is decreasing, the validation loss is increasing and other metrics are not improving. This indicates that the model is overfitting to the training data and may not generalize well to new data. The model training was stopped in just 7 epochs and the best model amongst the epochs, the one with the lowest validation loss and highest metrics, was chosen as the final model.

Figure 4.1: Automatic Evaluation of Dataset using BLEU and ROUGE metrics.

Epoch	Training Loss	Validation Loss	Rouge1	Rouge2	RougeL	RougeLsum	Bleu
1	2.303800	1.268362	0.672177	0.467319	0.641333	0.669745	0.497899
2	0.793800	0.637890	0.760193	0.593917	0.728189	0.757228	0.595286
3	0.606600	0.588256	0.775976	0.610833	0.748757	0.773886	0.615690
4	0.543100	0.571621	0.784202	0.621421	0.758633	0.782125	0.620381
5	0.474800	0.565389	0.783062	0.623826	0.758653	0.780710	0.620449
6	0.408300	0.582480	0.782192	0.623898	0.759282	0.779676	0.612101
7	0.331900	0.613242	0.778451	0.619570	0.758207	0.775850	0.614556

4.2.2 Text Generation

A total of 197 sentences were translated using both the base zephyr-7b-beta model and the finetuned model. These served as the dataset used to evaluate the performance of the model and comparing it with the other base model.

4.2.3 Automatic Evaluation Metrics

The dataset was automatically evaluated using BLEU and ROUGE metrics, specifically the ROUGE-L metric as the dataset do not contain newlines that ROUGE-Lsum uses to separate the input with. These scores were then averaged to determine the score of the models. The base model obtained a BLEU score of 0.8112 and ROUGE-L Score of 0.8390 and the finetuned model obtained a BLEU score of 0.8125 and ROUGE-L Score of 0.8412. While the difference between the models are very minimal, this does not completely represent the performance of the models as these metrics are only used to determine if the generated text is close to the reference text, regardless of the context and the overall quality of the generated text. However, it does show that the finetuned model, while not significantly better than the base model, is close to the reference model.

4.2.4 Manual Evaluation Metrics

4.3 Summary

Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1 Limitations

Language is dynamic and constantly evolving, making it difficult to establish clear boundaries on when slang terms emerge or fade within a generation. Additionally, the dataset created for this study was relatively small, and the number of evaluators involved was limited. In addition, as stated in Section 3.1.3, the computational constraints posed a challenge—loading a model with 7 billion parameters requires approximately 66 GB of memory, while Google Colab provided 16GB of VRAM which is insufficient for high-capacity models.

5.2 Recommendations

Future researchers are encouraged to expand the vocabulary of slang terms on the Internet and explore more recent trends, taking into account the dynamic nature of language. It is also recommended that future studies utilize a larger and more diverse dataset to improve the robustness of the findings.

References

- Ambarsari, S., Amrullah, A., & Nawawi, N. (2020, Aug). The use of online slang for independent learning in english vocabulary. *Proceedings of the 1st Annual Conference on Education and Social Sciences (ACCESS 2019)*, 465, 295–297. doi: 10.2991/assehr.k.200827.074
- Barseghyan, L. (2014). *On some aspects of internet slang*. Retrieved from <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:51730779>
- binti Sabri, N. A., bin Hamdan, S., Nadarajan, N.-T. M., & Shing, S. R. (2020, Jun). The usage of english internet slang among malaysians in social media. *Selangor Humaniora Review*, 4(1), 16–17.
- Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. R. (2023). *Generative ai at work* (Tech. Rep.). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Crystal, D., & Robins, R. H. (2024, Oct). *Language*. Encyclopædia Britannica, inc. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/language>
- Daniel Han, M. H., & team, U. (2023). *Unsloth*. Retrieved from <http://github.com/unslothai/unsloth>
- Dua, A., Jacobson, R., Ellingrud, K., Enomoto, K., Cordina, J., Coe, E. H., & Finneman, B. (2024, Aug). *What is gen z?* McKinsey & Company. Retrieved from <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/mckinsey-explainers/what-is-gen-z>
- Euchner, J. (2023). Generative ai. *Research-Technology Management*, 66(3), 71–74.
- Fernández-Toro, M. (2016, Jun). *Exploring languages and cultures*. Retrieved from <https://www.open.edu/openlearn/languages/exploring-languages-and-cultures/content-section-3.2>
- Fui-Hoon Nah, F., Zheng, R., Cai, J., Siau, K., & Chen, L. (2023). *Generative ai and chatgpt: Applications, challenges, and ai-human collaboration* (Vol. 25) (No. 3). Taylor & Francis.
- Ghazali, N. M., & Abdullah, N. N. (2021, Dec). Slang language use in social media among malaysian youths: A sociolinguistic perspective. *International Young Scholars Journal of Languages*, 4(2), 69. Retrieved from <https://www.iium.edu.my/media/>

77652/Slang%20Language%20Use%20in%20Social%20Media%20Among%
 20Malaysian%20Youths_A%20Sociolinguistic%20Perspective.pdf

Gonzaga, M. (2025, Feb). “forda convo ang ferson”: Analysis of
 gen z slang in the lens of batstateu faculty members. Retrieved
 from [https://www.academia.edu/102575643/_FORDA_CONVO_ANG_FERSON](https://www.academia.edu/102575643/_FORDA_CONVO_ANG_FERSON_ANALYSIS_OF_GEN_Z_SLANG_IN_THE_LENS_OF_BATSTATEU_FACULTY_MEMBERS)
 ANALYSIS_OF_GEN_Z_SLANG_IN_THE_LENS_OF_BATSTATEU_FACULTY_MEMBERS

Heydari, M., Albadvi, A., & Khazeni, M. (2024). Persian slang text conversion to
 formal and deep learning of persian short texts on social media for sentiment
 classification. *Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering Innovations*
 (JECEI). Retrieved from https://jecei.sru.ac.ir/article_2172.html
 doi: 10.22061/jecei.2024.10745.731

Hu, E. J., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., ... Chen, W.
 (2021). Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. Retrieved
 from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.09685>

Ibrahim, A., & Sharief, B. (2023, 10). Intelligent system to transform slang
 words into formal words. *NTU Journal of Engineering and Technology*, 2.
 doi: 10.56286/ntujet.v2i2.689

Jeresano, E., & Carretero, M. (2022, Feb). Digital culture and social media slang
 of gen z. *United International Journal for Research & Technology*, 3(4),
 11–25. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1314/RG.2.2.36361.93285>

Lin, C.-Y. (2004, Jul). Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries.
Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 74–81.

Liu, J., Zhang, X., & Li, H. (2023, Aug). Analysis of language phenomena in
 internet slang: A case study of internet dirty language. *Open Access Library*
Journal, 10(08), 1–12. doi: 10.4236/oalib.1110484

Liu, S., Gui, D.-Y., Zuo, Y., & Dai, Y. (2019, Jun). Good slang or bad slang?
 embedding internet slang in persuasive advertising. *Frontiers in Psychology*,
 10. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01251

Mantiri, O. (2010, 03). Factors affecting language change.
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=2566128>. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2566128

Maulidiya, R., Wijaya, S. E., Mauren, C., Adha, T. P., & Pandin, M. G. R. (2021,
 Dec). *Language development of slang in the younger generation in the digital*
era. OSF Preprints. Retrieved from osf.io/xs7kd doi: 10.31219/osf.io/
 xs7kd

McArthur, T. (2003). *Concise oxford companion to the english language* (1st ed.).
 Oxford University Press.

Nguyen, T. T., Wilson, C., & Dalins, J. (2023). *Fine-tuning llama 2 large lan-*
guage models for detecting online sexual predatory chats and abusive texts.
 Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.14683>

Nocon, N., Kho, N. M., & Arroyo, J. (2018, Oct). Building a filipino colloquialism
 translator using sequence-to-sequence model. *TENCON 2018 - 2018 IEEE*
Region 10 Conference, 2199–2204. doi: 10.1109/tencon.2018.8650118

- 474 Papineni, K., Roukos, S., Ward, T., & Zhu, W.-J. (2001). Bleu: a method for
 475 automatic evaluation of machine translation. *Proceedings of the 40th Annual*
 476 *Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics - ACL '02*. Retrieved
 477 from <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1073135> doi: [https://doi](https://doi.org/10.3115/1073083.1073135)
 478 [.org/10.3115/1073083.1073135](https://doi.org/10.3115/1073083.1073135)
- 479 Suslak, D. F. (2009). The sociolinguistic problem of generations. *Lan-*
 480 *guage & Communication*, 29(3), 199–209. Retrieved from [https://www](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0271530909000196)
 481 [.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0271530909000196](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0271530909000196) (Re-
 482 flecting on language and culture fieldwork in the early 21st century) doi:
 483 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2009.02.003>
- 484 Teng, C. E., & Joo, T. M. (2023). Is internet language a destroyer to communica-
 485 tion? In X.-S. Yang, R. S. Sherratt, N. Dey, & A. Joshi (Eds.), *Proceedings of*
 486 *eighth international congress on information and communication technology*
 487 (pp. 527–536). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
- 488 Vacalares, S. T., Salas, A. F. R., Babac, B. J. S., Cagalawan, A. L., & Calimpong,
 489 C. D. (2023, Jun). The intelligibility of internet slangs between millennials
 490 and gen zers: A comparative study. *International Journal of Science and*
 491 *Research Archive*, 9(1), 400–409. doi: 10.30574/ijrsra.2023.9.1.0456
- 492 Verghe, T., Godbout, J.-F., Rabbany, R., & Pelrine, K. (2024). *Comparing gpt-4*
 493 *and open-source language models in misinformation mitigation*. Retrieved
 494 from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.06920>
- 495 Zhao, J., Wang, T., Abid, W., Angus, G., Garg, A., Kinnison, J., ... Rishi, D.
 496 (2024). *Lora land: 310 fine-tuned llms that rival gpt-4, a technical report*.
 497 Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.00732>

498 **Appendix A**

499 **Figures and Tables**