

Familiarity and Use of Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies

Bon Eric A. Besonia¹, Krezia Jehannah D. Aruc², Musea Pearl V. Bantillo³, Lauro A. Calogmaton⁴, Nikki V. Morales⁵



ABSTRACT: This descriptive study aimed to determine the familiarity and use of particular Hiligaynon terminologies. The respondents were the 261 residents of the 25 barangays of one of the municipalities in Iloilo, Philippines. The data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire that tested reliability and validity. Results showed that respondents were no longer familiar with and did not use particular Hiligaynon terminologies. When classified as to sex and age, male and younger Estanciahanons were no longer familiar with particular mother-tongue terminologies and their usage. However, the female and older generations were still familiar with some particular mother-tongue terminologies, but they were no longer using some of them. No significant difference was found in the proportion of respondents who were familiar with particular Hiligaynon terminologies when classified as to sex, while a significant difference was found when classified as to age. Thus, the life of particular Hiligaynon terminologies depends on its speakers. If they are not spoken and used daily, it may lead to extinction and, later, die out.

KEYWORDS: Familiarity, Use, Hiligaynon Terminologies

I. INTRODUCTION

Every language represents a unique culture, melody, color, and asset. Language facilitates comprehension of surroundings, learning concepts, and achieving several skills (Gujarati, 2021).

Language is primarily oral, making it naturally susceptible to extinction or death (Osoba & Alebiosu, 2016). Few people are aware of a parallel crisis for languages, with predicted extinction rates ranging from 50 to 90% of the world's 7,000 languages by the end of this century (Romaine, 2015).

Globalization tends simplistically toward uniformity, and language is mainly seen as a helpful tool. As a result, the consequence is that many parents are refusing to talk to their children using their ancestral mother tongue, especially in the provinces (Mojarro, 2021). Many are going from mainstream to obsolete in the course of a generation, especially in the younger segment of the population (Li, 2013; Faridy & Syaodih, 2017), the lost values contained in the local languages (Faridy & Syaodih, 2017), and the decrease in the number of speakers (Nair, 2021).

Current projections indicate that only one-tenth of today's Philippine languages will survive into the twenty-first century. Languages are rapidly disappearing and show no signs of slowing. Many Filipino languages are near extinction. Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) reported that 11 of the country's indigenous languages are "dying," while 28 are "in danger" (Reysio-Cruz, 2019). More so, due to its high levels of borrowing from the major languages in the country, such as English, Tagalog (Filipino as the official name), and regionally essential languages, Filipinos are experiencing a period of language convergence. Because of this language convergence process, some languages are abandoned altogether and are endangered (Malabonga, 2016).

Hiligaynon is an Austronesian language used in the Western Visayas region of the Philippines. It is primarily spoken in Iloilo, Negros Occidental, Capiz, and Guimaras, as well as many parts of Mindanao, including Koronadal City, South Sultan Kudarat, and parts of North Cotabato. However, from 1948 to 1995, the percentage of people who speak this language fell from 12 percent to 9.11 percent (Senate of the Philippines, 2007 in Besonia, 2022). Also, there is a scarcity of literature documenting the evolution of Hiligaynon because it has gone up and down. As a result, it affects transmission from generation to generation, putting local terminologies in the community at risk or being forgotten. Thus, this study aimed to determine the familiarity and use of particular Hiligaynon terminologies.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive research design. Descriptive research is a type of research used to describe the characteristics of a population. It collects data to answer a wide range of what, when, and how questions about a particular population or group (Child Care and Early Education Research Connections, 2022). It mainly focuses on explaining the characteristics of a certain demographic

Familiarity and Use of Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies

segment. In other words, it "describes" the research's subject without explaining "why" it occurs (Bhat, 2021). It is an observational research method, as none of the variables in the study are influenced during the research process (Voxco, 2022). In this study, it determined the familiarity and use of particular Hiligaynon terminologies in Estancia, Iloilo.

B. Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study were the 261 residents of the 25 barangays of one of the municipalities of Iloilo, Philippines. Proportional allocation was done to identify the representation per barangay, and a systematic sampling technique followed.

C. Data Gathering Instrument

This study utilized a researcher-made questionnaire to determine the familiarity and use of particular Hiligaynon terminologies. It underwent validation from three experts in the field of English and research. It was submitted for reliability testing among 50 residents who were excluded as respondents of the study. Cronbach's alpha result was 0.917, retaining 21 terminologies out of 31. The terminologies were taken from the study of Besonia (2022).

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Familiarity with Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies

Respondents were not familiar of particular Hiligaynon terminologies like *gaud* (M = 0.25, SD = 0.44), *hangkilan* (M = 0.20, SD = 0.40), *haris* (M = 0.13, SD = 0.33), *kainayahan* (M = 0.15, SD = 0.35), *kurob* (M = 0.18, SD = 0.39), *lamgod* (M = 0.23, SD = 0.42), *maibitar* (M = 0.30, SD = 0.46), *pasikawan* (M = 0.15, SD = 0.36), *sablawon* (M = 0.31, SD = 0.47), *tudok* (M = 0.21, SD = 0.41), and *tutos* (M = 0.19, SD = 0.39). However, they were partially familiar of the terminologies like *banihot* (M = 0.34, SD = 0.48), *kalat* (M = 0.49, SD = 0.50), *kayog* (M = 0.35, SD = 0.48), *maambong* (M = 0.44, SD = 0.50), *moda* (M = 0.35, SD = 0.48), *paghinun-anon* (M = 0.43, SD = 0.50), *pigos* (M = 0.52, SD = 0.77), *pulakan* (M = 0.34, SD = 0.47), and *singki* (M = 0.46, SD = 0.50). This implies that most respondents were no longer familiar of some Hiligaynon terminologies. It is similar to the findings of the study of Gillani & Mahmood (2014) where they found that Punjabi language is losing its status because people are shifting their language to Urdu according to their needs and requirements of the modern age.

Table 1. Familiarity with Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies

| Terminologies | Entire Group | |
|---------------|--------------|------|
| | M | SD |
| Banihot | 0.34 | 0.48 |
| Gaud | 0.25 | 0.44 |
| Hangkilan | 0.20 | 0.40 |
| Haris | 0.13 | 0.33 |
| Kainayahan | 0.15 | 0.35 |
| Kalat | 0.49 | 0.50 |
| Kayog | 0.35 | 0.48 |
| Kurob | 0.18 | 0.39 |
| Lamgod | 0.23 | 0.42 |
| Maambong | 0.44 | 0.50 |
| Maibitar | 0.30 | 0.46 |
| Moda | 0.35 | 0.48 |
| Paghinun-anon | 0.43 | 0.50 |
| Pasikawan | 0.15 | 0.36 |
| Pigos | 0.52 | 0.77 |
| Pisitas | 0.40 | 0.49 |
| Pulakan | 0.34 | 0.47 |
| Sablawon | 0.31 | 0.47 |
| Singki | 0.46 | 0.50 |
| Tudok | 0.21 | 0.41 |
| Tutos | 0.19 | 0.39 |

* Note: 0.00 – 0.33, Not Familiar; 0.34 – 0.66, Partially Familiar; 0.67 – 1.00, Familiar

Familiarity and Use of Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies

B. Usage of Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies

There were 171 (65.5%) respondents who did not use the term *banihot* while 90 (34.5%) of them used it. There were 195 (74.7%) who did not use the term *gaud* while 66 (25.3%) of them used it. There were 210 (80.5%) who did not use the term *hangkilan* while 51 (19.5%) of them used it. There were 228 (87.4%) who did not use the term *haris* while 33 (12.6%) of them used it. There were 223 (85.4%) who did not use the term *kainayahan* while 38 (14.6%) of them used it. There were 132 (50.6%) who did not use the term *kalat* while 129 (49.4%) of them used it. There were 169 (64.8%) who did not use the term *kayog* while 92 (35.2%) of them used it. There were 213 (81.6%) who did not use the term *kurob* while 48 (18.4%) of them used it. There were 202 (77.4%) who did not use the term *lamgod* while 59 (22.6%) of them used it. There were 147 (56.3%) who did not use the term *maambong* while 114 (43.7%) of them used it. There were 183 (70.1%) who did not use the term *maibitar* while 78 (29.9%) of them used it. There were 170(65.1%) who did not use the term *moda* while 91 (34.9%) of them used it. There were 150 (57.5%) who did not use the term *paghinun-anon* while 111 (42.5%) of them used it. There were 222 (85.1%) who did not use the term *pasikawan* while 39 (14.9%) of them used it. There were 134 (51.3%) who did not use the term *pigos* while 126 (48.3%) of them used it. There were 158 (60.5%) who did not use the term *pisitas* while 103 (39.5%) of them used it. There were 173 (66.3%) who did not use the term *pulakan* while 88 (33.7%) of them used it. There were 179 (68.6%) who did not use the term *sablawon* while 82 (31.4%) of them used it. There were 142 (54.4%) who did not use the term *singki* while 38 (45.6%) of them used it. There were 206 (78.9%) who did not use the term *tudok* while 55 (21.1%) of them used it. There were 212 (81.2%) who did not use the term *tutos* while 49 (18.8%) of them used it. This suggests that the respondents no longer used particular Hiligaynon terminologies. This was congruent with the findings of Cruz & Mahboob (2015), which revealed that students were low proficient in Tagalog and/or their non-Tagalog mother tongue.

Table 2. Usage of Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies

| Terminologies | Entire Group | |
|---------------|--------------|------|
| | f | % |
| Banihot | 90 | 34.5 |
| Gaud | 66 | 25.3 |
| Hangkilan | 51 | 19.5 |
| Haris | 33 | 12.6 |
| Kainayahan | 38 | 14.6 |
| Kalat | 129 | 49.4 |
| Kayog | 92 | 35.2 |
| Kurob | 48 | 18.4 |
| Lamgod | 59 | 22.6 |
| Maambong | 114 | 43.7 |
| Maibitar | 78 | 29.9 |
| Moda | 91 | 34.9 |
| Paghinun-anon | 111 | 42.5 |
| Pasikawan | 39 | 14.9 |
| Pigos | 126 | 48.3 |
| Pisitas | 103 | 39.5 |
| Pulakan | 88 | 33.7 |
| Sablawon | 82 | 31.4 |
| Singki | 119 | 45.6 |
| Tudok | 55 | 21.1 |
| Tutos | 49 | 18.8 |

C. Difference in the Proportion of Respondents who were Familiar with Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies when Classified as to Sex

A Chi-square test for independence indicated no significant difference in the proportion of respondents who were familiar with particular Hiligaynon terminologies when classified as to sex, $\chi^2 (1,261) = 1.54, p = 0.21, \phi = -0.08$. The p-value was greater than 0.05 alpha level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant difference in the proportion

Familiarity and Use of Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies

of respondents familiar with particular Hiligaynon terminologies when classified as to sex was rejected. The results coincided with the findings of Afsahi & Afghari (2017), where they found no significant relationship between mother-tongue and gender.

Table 3. Difference in the Proportion of Estanciahanons who were Familiar with Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies when classified as to Sex

| | n | Chi-square | df | P | Phi Coefficient |
|-------------|-----|------------|----|------|-----------------|
| Familiarity | 261 | 1.54 | 1 | 0.21 | -0.08 |

D. Difference in the Proportion of Respondents who were Familiar with Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies when Classified as to Age

A Chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) indicated a significant difference in the proportion of respondents who were familiar with particular Hiligaynon terminologies when classified as to age, $\chi^2(1,261) = 81.27$, $p = 0.00$, $\phi = 0.57$. The p-value was less than 0.05 alpha level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant difference in the proportion of respondents who were familiar with Hiligaynon terminologies when classified as to age, failed to reject. The results contradicted the findings of Afsahi & Afghari (2017), where they found no significant relationship between mother-tongue and age.

Table 4: Difference in the Proportion of Respondents who were Familiar with Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies when classified as to Age

| | n | Chi-square | df | p | Phi Coefficient |
|-------------|-----|------------|----|--------|-----------------|
| Familiarity | 261 | 81.27 | 1 | 0.00 * | 0.57 |

*p <0.05 significant at 0.05 alpha level

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Younger respondents are no longer familiar with and do not use particular Hiligaynon terminologies. This phenomenon can be attributed to a failure of transgenerational transmission where elders are unsuccessful in passing those terminologies to the younger generation. It happens when there is no constant conversation between them. Also, due to the nature of language, particular Hiligaynon terminologies in the past are obsolete and not applicable in the current trend. Thus, the younger generation prefers to use the language they are comfortable with, they can freely express themselves, and everyone understands.

On the other hand, older respondents are still familiar with and use those particular Hiligaynon terminologies. This is because of their normative roles of staying with the elders, where the possibility of communication often occurs. It may not be ideally passed on, but the concepts lie in exposure; thus, it becomes familiar to them.

The life of particular Hiligaynon terminologies is dependent on its speakers. If they were not spoken and used daily, it might lead to extinction and, later, die out.

REFERENCES

- 1) Afsahi, S., & Afghari, A. (2017). The Relationship between Mother Tongue, Age, Gender and Critical Thinking Level. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(1), 116–124.
<http://repository.umy.ac.id/bitstream/handle/123456789/21314/10.%20DAFTAR%20PUSTAKA.pdf?sequence=9&isAllowed=y>
- 2) Besonia, B. E. (2022). The Death of Hiligaynon Terminologies in the Coastal Community in Northern Iloilo, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Approach and Studies*, 9(3), 7–21.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364154830_International_Journal_of_Multidisciplinary_Approach_and_Studies_The_Death_of_Hiligaynon_Terminologies_in_the_Coastal_Community_in_Northern_Iloilo_Philippines
- 3) Bhat, A. (2022, August 24). *Descriptive Research: Definition, Characteristics, Methods, Examples and Advantages*. QuestionPro. Retrieved October 15, 2022, from <https://www.questionpro.com/blog/descriptive-research/>
- 4) Child Care and Early Education Research Connections. (2022). *Descriptive Research Studies/Research Connections*. Retrieved March 5, 2022, from <https://www.researchconnections.org/research-tools/study-design-and-analysis/descriptive-research-studies>

Familiarity and Use of Particular Hiligaynon Terminologies

- 5) Cruz, P. A. T., & Mahboob, A. (2018, January 9). Mother-Tongue-Based Multilingual Education in the Philippines. *Plurilingualism in Teaching and Learning*, 37–53. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315392462-3>
- 6) Faridy, F., & Syaodih, E. (2017). Analysis on the Importance of Mother Tongue in Early Childhood. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Early Childhood Education (ICECE 2016)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icece-16.2017.33>
- 7) Gillani, M., & Mahmood, M. A. (2015). Punjabi: A Tolerated Language Young Generations' Attitude. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(5), 129–137. <https://core.ac.uk/download/234673850.pdf>
- 8) Gujarati, G. (2021, October 22). *Importance of Mother Tongue Learning*. GAJERA VIDYABHVAN UTRAN. Retrieved February 15, 2022, from <https://www.gvgublog.org/post/importance-of-mother-tongue-learning>
- 9) Li, C. W. C. (2013, November 25). Shifting Patterns of Chinese Diglossia: Why the Dialects May Be Headed for Extinction. *Divided Languages?*, 65–86. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-03521-5_5
- 10) Malabonga, R. L. (2016). Linguistic Suicide and The Challenges of Heritage Transmission in the Philippines: The Case of the Ayta Alabat Island Language. *Apheleia*. https://www.academia.edu/37183296/Linguistic_Suicide_and_The_Challenges_of_Heritage_Transmission_in_the_Philippines_The_Case_of_the_Ayta_Alabat_Island_Language
- 11) Mojarro, J. (2021, October 4). Linguistic diversity in the Philippines. *The Manila Times*. Retrieved June 4, 2022, from <https://www.manilatimes.net/2021/10/05/opinion/columns/linguistic-diversity-in-the-philippines/1817130>
- 12) Nair, P. (2021, July 30). *Many Mother Tongues are Dying & We have To Save Them*. ReDefiners WL. Retrieved June 4, 2022, from <https://www.redefinierswl.org/post/many-mother-tongues-are-dying-we-have-to-save-them>
- 13) Osoba, J. B., & Alebiosu, T. A. (2016, September). Language Preference as a Precursor to Displacement and Extinction in Nigeria: The Roles of English Language and Nigerian Pidgin. *Journal of Universal Language*, 17(2), 111–143. <https://doi.org/10.22425/jul.2016.17.2.111>
- 14) Reysio-Cruz, M. (2019, August 19). Saving PH diverse languages from extinction. *INQUIRER.Net*. Retrieved October 15, 2022, from <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1155014/saving-ph-diverse-languages-from-extinction+F>
- 15) Romaine, S. (2015). The Global Extinction of Languages and Its Consequences for Cultural Diversity. *Cultural and Linguistic Minorities in the Russian Federation and the European Union*, 31–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10455-3_2
- 16) Voxco. (2022, September 19). *Descriptive Research: Definition, Methods & Examples*. Retrieved January 15, 2022, from <https://www.voxco.com/blog/descriptive-research/>



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution–Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.