

Gay language: Impact on colloquial communication in Barangay Sto.Tomas, City of Binanm Laguna

Hazel V. Cortez

Faculty, College of Arts and Sciences,
University of Perpetual Help System Laguna, Philippines

Abstract:

Many communication disputes and misunderstandings came from not being able to understand a culture that is different than the one that people are comfortable. When a person is trying to learn about another sub culture that is different from their own understanding the speech style is important in order to learn about the other rules and norms within the group. It has been found out that homosexuals have vocabulary of their own popularly known as "Gay Language" that sets them apart from the mainstream heterosexual. In the Philippines, sexual orientation has become a moral, political and social issue of acceptability. This study determined the impact of gay language on colloquial communication in terms of understanding acceptability and usage in Barangay Sto. Tomas, City of Binan, Laguna. The study used the descriptive method of research since it can describe the situation objectively. The results revealed that there is no significant difference in the impact of gay language on colloquial communication when grouped according to age and gender.

Keywords:

Gay Language, Impact, Colloquial Communication, Understanding, Acceptability, Usage

Citation:

Cortez, Hazel V. (2017); Gay language : Impact on colloquial communication in Barangay Sto.Tomas, City of Binanm Laguna; Journal of Social Sciences (COES&RJ-JSS), Vol.6, No.2, pp: 375-382.

According to Marquez (Philippine Star, September 9, 2012), one of the most dynamic yet informal language models ever to evolve in the country is the baklese, also known as gay language. For the Pinoys, it is inevitable not to hear this gay language because they are spoken openly on TV, on the streets, in schools and offices, even in homilies of some priests. Like Morse Code, the gay language is a specialized language developed by gay people and very few of their closes heterosexual friends. Chances are you've heard the following words: chuva, churva, ek-ek, vongga, charot, Charito Solis, echos, akish, itey, anitch or sinitch, the language is so colourful and dynamic that, more terms are being invented and added to the growing list in the glossary.

Gay Language is forever advent, forever beginning, forever new. The gay words of the 1970's still exist but they are continuously updated in the beauty parlors, offices, universities, streets, media and boutiques. Gay Language are widely known in Metropolitan areas because of the higher numbers of gays within the area but may not be well known more in rural areas since usually smaller towns have fewer gays.

Difference in language of the homosexual or gays from the heterosexual can have profound effects or impact on the colloquial communication. Gays use a language which heterosexuals may not be aware of.

This study determined the impact of gay language in colloquial communication to respondents in Barangay Sto. Tomas, City of Binan, Laguna in terms of understanding, accepting and using it.

Methodology

The descriptive method of research was used in this study in order to determine the impact to the respondents of gay language in colloquial communication. Descriptive research is used to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena to describe "what exists" with respect to variables or conditions in a situation (James P. Key, 1997).

The respondents of the study are the residents of Barangay Sto. Tomas, City of Binan, Laguna which consists of 396 randomly selected heterosexual and homosexual.

The researcher used a survey questionnaire to gather information and also conducted informal interview to support the data gathered from the questionnaire. The survey questionnaire was divided into four parts: Part I dealt with the demographic profile of the respondents such as age and gender Part II covered the impact of gay language on colloquial communication in terms of understanding and Part III and IV covered the impact of gay language on colloquial communication in terms of acceptability and usage.

Questionnaire was distributed to the respondents personally by the researchers. The letter attached to the questionnaire explained to the respondents, the purpose of the study and the need for their participation. Instructions on how to accomplish the questionnaire will be provided. The respondents was furthered assured that the information would be treated in confidence and handled as a group data. A week will be allotted for each respondent to answer the question.

The statistical tools used in this study were the following: percentage to describe the respondents' profile as to age and gender, to determine the impact of gay language on

Difficulties encountered, learning strategies and academic performance ...

colloquial communication in terms of understanding using the scores that follow: Outstanding (41-50), Very Satisfactory (31-40), Satisfactory (21-30), Fair (11-20) and Poor (0-10). Weighted mean to determine the respondents' impact on colloquial communication in terms of (a) acceptability and (b) usage. The following measures were used: for the impact of colloquial communication in terms of acceptability and usage: 5 (4.51-5.00) for Strongly Agree, 4 (3.51-4.50) for Agree, 3 (2.51-3.50) for Fairly agree, 2 (1.51-2.50) for disagree and 1 (1.00-1.50) for strongly disagree. Mann Withney U-test were used to determine the significant difference between the respondents impact of gay language on colloquial communication when grouped according to age and gender

Permission to conduct and distribute the questionnaire was sought from the Barangay, Captain of Barangay Sto. Tomas, City of Binan, Laguna. The Researcher personally distributed and collected the survey questionnaire from the respondents to ensure a 100% retrieval of the accomplished questionnaires. After data were gathered and collected, they were tabulated statistically treated, analyzed and interpreted.

Results and discussions

Profile of the Respondents in Barangay Sto. Tomas, City of Binan, Laguna

Table 1
Profile of the Respondents in Barangay Sto. Tomas, City of Binan, Laguna

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
20-39 years old	240	60.61
40-59 years old	61	15.40
60 years old and above	95	23.99
Total	396	100.00
Gender		
Male	154	38.89
Female	242	61.11
Total	396	100.00

As shown in the table, in terms of age, two hundred forty or about 60.61 percent are 20-39 years old. Sixty-one respondents or about 15.40 percent are 40-59 years old. Ninety-five or 23.99 percent are 60 years old and above. The biggest group of respondents are those belonging to 20-39 years old bracket. The age range of respondents indicates significant number of young adult respondents. In terms of Gender, one hundred fifty-four or 38.89 percent male comprised the respondents and a higher proportion of 242 or 61.11 percent comprised the female respondents. This shows that respondents are mostly female.

1. Impact of Gay Language on Colloquial Communication

Impact of gay language on colloquial communication were rated in terms of: understanding, acceptability and usage.

2.1 Understanding

Table 2
Impact of Gay Language on Colloquial Communication
in terms of Understanding

Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
Outstanding (41-50)	204	51.52
Very Satisfactory (31-40)	78	19.70
Satisfactory (21-30)	107	27.02
Fair (11-20)	7	1.77
Poor (0-10)	0	0.00
Total	396	100.00

Table 2 shows the impact of gay language on colloquial communication in terms of understanding. As shown in the table, majority of the respondents or 51.52 percent obtained an Outstanding rating. One hundred-seven or 27.02 percent obtained a Satisfactory rating. Seventy-eight or 19.70 percent obtained a Very Satisfactory rating. Seven or 1.77 percent obtained a Fair rating and no one obtained a Poor rating in terms of understanding gay language. This shows that most of the respondents achieved an outstanding rating in the test given to them and revealed that they fully understand gay language and their impact on colloquial communication.

2.2 Acceptability

Table 3
Impact of Gay Language on Colloquial Communication
in terms of Acceptability

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
I am not ashamed when using gay lingo.	3.81	Agree	1
I have the desire to understand gay lingo.	3.71	Agree	3
I have desire to remember gay lingo.	3.70	Agree	4
I accept gay lingo as another language.	3.77	Agree	2
I am interested to learn more gay lingo words.	3.57	Agree	5
Average	3.71	Agree	

Legend: 4.51-5.00-Strongly Agree, 3.51-4.50-Agree, 2.51-3.50-Fairly Agree, 1.51-2.50-Disagree, 1.00-1.50-Strongly Disagree

As reflected in Table 3 in terms of acceptability, indicator number 1 which states “ I am not ashamed when using gay lingo” got the highest mean of 3.81, interpreted as “Agree”, indicator number 4, “: I accept gay lingo as another language” got the second highest weighted mean of 3.77, interpreted as “Agree”. Indicator number 2, “I have the desire to understand gay lingo” is rank 3 with a weighted mean of 3.71 and interpreted as “ Agree”,

Difficulties encountered, learning strategies and academic performance ...

indicator number 3 “I have the desire to remember gay lingo” is rank 4 with a weighted mean of 3.70, interpreted as “Agree” and indicator number 5 “I am interested to learn more gay lingo words” got the least weighted mean of 3.57 interpreted as “Agree”. The over-all weighted mean is 3.71 interpreted as “Agree”. It implies that the respondents accepted gay language on colloquial communication.

Red (2003) narrates his exposure and experience with gay language and its variations from year to year and from area to area. He found out that gay speak in suburban areas like Antipolo differs from that spoken in Metro Manila. Although there are standard gay expressions in the general gay population, there are also regional variations. But despite these variations, gays from various regions can still communicate with each other using gay speak.

2.3 Usage

Table 4
Impact of Gay Language on Colloquial Communication
in terms of Usage

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
I speak gay lingo at home.	2.81	Fairly Agree	4
I use it with friends.	3.18	Fairly Agree	1
I use it in school workplace.	2.71	Fairly Agree	5
I am using gay lingo when texting and sending messages in social networking sites.	3.16	Fairly Agree	2
I am willing to use gay lingo all the time.	2.88	Fairly Agree	3
Average	2.95	Fairly Agree	

Legend: 4.51-5.00-Strongly Agree, 3.51-4.50-Agree, 2.51-3.50-Fairly Agree, 1.51-2.50-Disagree, 1.00-1.50-Strongly Disagree

As reflected in Table 4 in terms of usage, indicator number 2 which states “I use it with friends” got the highest mean of 3.18, interpreted as “Fairly Agree”, indicator number 4 “I am using gay lingo when texting and sending messages in social networking sites” got the second highest weighted mean of 3.16, interpreted as “Fairly Agree”. Indicator number 5, “I am willing to use gay lingo all the time” is rank 3 with a weighted mean of 2.88 and interpreted as “Fairly Agree”, indicator number 1 “I speak gay lingo at home” is rank 4 with a weighted mean of 2.81, interpreted as “Fairly Agree” and indicator number 3 “I use it in school workplace” got the least weighted mean of 2.71 interpreted as “Fairly Agree”. The over-all weighted mean is 2.95 interpreted as “Fairly Agree”. It implies that the respondents use gay language sometimes. According to Remoto (Philippine Star, 2016) in his article, gay language as a mediator in the universe of Philippine languages comes from carnival sources, a bricollage, as Claude Levi-Strauss would put it. This language has been appropriated by the heterosexual mainstream. But they never considered the fact that Philippine gay language is a language of slippages: it sits on a site full of fractures and fissures.

2. Difference in the impact of Gay Language on Colloquial Communication when grouped according to Profile Variables.

Table 5
Difference in the Impact of Gay Language on Colloquial Communication When Grouped According to Age

Level of significance = 0.05

Impact of Gay Language on Colloquial Communication in terms of	Weighted Mean			Calculated p-value	Prob Level
	20-39 years old	40-59 years old	60 years old and above		
1. Understanding	38.19	38.22	37.82	0.50	Not Significant
2. Acceptability	3.72	3.72	3.68	0.24	Not Significant
3. Usage	2.97	2.90	2.92	0.23	Not Significant

Test Statistics used: Mann-Whitney Test

As shown in Table 5, for the difference on the impact of gay language on colloquial communication when grouped according to age, in terms of understanding it has a p value of 0.50 greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as not significant, in terms of acceptability it has a p value of 0.24 which is also greater than 0.05 level of significant and interpreted as not significant and in terms of Usage it has a p value of 0.23 that is greater than 0.05 level of significance interpreted as not significant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the impact of gay language on colloquial communication when the respondents were grouped according to age. This means that the respondents rating in terms of understanding, acceptability and usage are similar. According to Gianan (2012), gay language is widely used in our society not only by the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community but also with the people outside the said community.

Table 6
Difference in the Impact of Gay Language on Colloquial Communication When Grouped According to Gender

Level of significance = 0.05

Impact of Gay Language on Colloquial Communication in terms of	Weighted Mean		Calculated p-value	Prob Level
	Male	Female		
Understanding	38.62	38.39	0.39	Not Significant
Acceptability	3.67	3.74	0.41	Not Significant
Usage	2.80	3.05	0.051	Not Significant

Test Statistics used: Mann-Whitney Test

Difficulties encountered, learning strategies and academic performance ...

As shown in Table 6, for the difference in the impact of gay language on colloquial communication when grouped according to gender, in terms of understanding it has a p value of 0.39 greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as not significant, in terms of acceptability it has a p value of 0.41 which is also greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as not significant and in terms of Usage it has a p value of 0.051 that is greater than 0.05 level of significance interpreted as not significant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the impact of gay language on colloquial communication when the respondents were grouped according to gender. This means that the respondents rating in terms of understanding, acceptability and usage are similar. According to the statement, “to better understand the present use of the term gay, we asked a 25-year old male college graduate to provide us with sentences in which he had used or heard the phrase “so gay” used in high school or college. Young men tend to use the phrase more often than young women because women are more likely to interpret this usage in a negative context. (Lalor & Rendle-Short, 2007)

Conclusion

The following conclusions were derived after analyzing the findings: as to profile of the respondents, most were relatively under the young adult bracket and majority of the respondents were female. Majority of the respondents had an outstanding rating in terms of understanding gay language, in terms of acceptability the respondents agreed that they accepted fully gay language and as to usage the respondents fairly agreed that they used gay language sometimes in their daily living. There was no significant difference noted in the impact of gay language on colloquial communication when the respondents were grouped according to age and gender.

Future Directions

Educators and media need to pay more attention and cultivate awareness to 20-39 age bracket of young female as to the proper use of gay language especially in communication. People should be involved in the issues of using gay language as colloquial communication in order to protect a safe environment and protect people from bullying and meanness. Gay language can be accepted and used by many people but should be properly guided to avoid offensive language. Further studies maybe conducted to validate the findings of this study.

References

Books

- Key, James P.** (1997) Qualitative – Oklahoma State University Home Up Data Tools 2 Reliability Historical Descriptive Experimental Qualitative, Copyright 1997
- Lalor and Rendle, Short** (2007) Gay Language Use and Anti Gay bias Among Heterosexual College Students on Incheonody et al. 2012
- Maruja, Empress** (27 July 2007) “Deciphering Filipino Gay Lingo” United SEA. Retrieved 23 December 2010.
- Red, Murphy Gay Speak in the nineties** ncca.gov.ph/about-culture-and-arts/in/the-Filipino-gay-speak-filipino-gay-lingo/
- Suguitan, Cynthia Grace B.** “A semantic Cook at Feminine Sex and Gender terms in Philippine Gay Lingo University of the Philippines Retrieve 25 December 2010.

Internet

Granan, Rainbow Tide Raising: How Latin America Became a Gay Rights. www.alternet.org/world/how-latin-america-became-have-gay-rights

Marquez, Phoebe. “Lets talk baklese/allure, other Star Sections”, The Philippine Star, September 9, 2012. www.philstar.com.8080/allure/2012-09-09/846807/lets-talk-baklese

Remoto, Danton. On Philippine Gay Lingo / Opinion / Philippine Star. www.philstar.com/opinion/2016/03/12/156206/philippine-gay-lingo