

American Journal of Communication (AJC)



**Influence of Language use in Comedic Movies on
Attitudes towards Sexual Orientations of University
Students in Kenya.**

**Francis Maina Mararo, Professor Hellen K. Mberia,
and Dr. Lillian K. Omoke**



Influence of Language use in Comedic Movies on Attitudes towards Sexual Orientations of University Students in Kenya.

Francis Maina Mararo

Ph.D. Student, Department of Media Technology and Applied Communication, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT), Kenya.

Corresponding author's email: francoliswamaina@gmail.com

Professor Hellen K. Mberia

Lecturer, Department of Media Technology and Applied Communication, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT), Kenya.

hellenmberia@gmail.com

Dr. Lillian K. Omoke

Lecturer, Department of Humanities, University of Embu (UoEm), Kenya.

omoke.lilian@embuni.ac.ke, mokeira2012@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The intention of this research was to establish the influence of language use in Comedic movies on attitudes towards sexual orientations of University students in Kenya. Comedic movies explore and depict contentious topics among them sexual orientations such as lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgenders-LGBTs. Comedians often use sarcasm and stereotypes for comicality purposes. This research used social learning theory (SLT).

Methodology: Mixed methods research design that also used a convergent parallel mixed method model to get quantitative and qualitative data were used. The targeted population was University students from 7 main, chartered public and private Universities in Nairobi County. A sample size of 467 students was used. Multi-stage sampling of respondents was done using probability sampling techniques involving stratified sampling and simple random sampling. Additionally, a focus group discussions involving 30 FGDs participants were used. Further, content analysis using a comedic movie, Modern Family that contains sexual orientations contents was conducted. Data was then analyzed and presented using inferential statistics, descriptive, correlation, regression and ANOVA analysis.

Findings: The findings showed that comedic movies use laughter to introduce and eventually influence attitudes towards sexual orientations of University students in Kenya. Specifically, most of those sampled agreed that nowadays there are more comedic movies using positive language while describing sexual orientations. Relatedly, a majority of those sampled agreed that they have become more tolerant and accepting of sexual orientations/LGBTs after watching comedic movies containing sexual orientations. The findings also noted that there is a significant number of University students who openly admitted to be LGBTs.

Unique contribution to theory, practice and policy: Media has a role in influencing the youths' attitudes towards sexual orientations. Language use in comedic movies had a significant relationship with attitudes formed towards sexual orientations/LGBTs. This was also linked to the increased open and more positive debates and discussions of sexual orientations/LGBTs, their challenges, predicaments and rights in Kenya. Therefore, the language used in the comedic movies was noted to have a significant role in influencing the attitudes towards sexual orientations of the University students in Kenya.

Key words: *Language use, Comedies, Attitudes, Sexual Orientations*

1. INTRODUCTION

Different scholars have differing views on comedy. Comedy can be viewed as contents featuring light-hearted plots continuously and intentionally made to amuse and cause laughter (using single-words, puns, etc.) through amplifying scenarios, language, activities, and roles of relations and actors (Dirks & Tim 2010; Rovella, Geringer & Sanchez, 2015). Researchers concur that humor can be used to transmit “serious” messages hidden in daily relations among people (Dynel, 2017, 2018). Additionally, humor in comedies can be used to echo predominant beliefs and transmit relevant information as shown in relation to the public media discourse (Simpson, 2003; Billig, 2005; Santa Ana, 2009).

According to Kunkel et al. (2002), sexual talk and displays are increasingly frequent and explicit in the media today. Additionally, Yang (1997), noted that there is also growing prevalence of gay talk and portrayals of homosexual behavior in televised media which has a correlation between viewing patterns and the viewers’ sexual activities. However, Raley and Lucas (2006), noted that males who are Gay, Lesbians, and Bisexuals (LGBT) were not portrayed on Televisions until the early 1960s with the exception of highly coded language. This was especially the case because of the influence of the motion picture production code which clearly prohibited LGBTs from being portrayed (Gross & Woods, 1999).

According to McNair (2002), currently, sex and sexuality are portrayed in a variety and ranging ways in popular culture. This exposure has introduced a strong case for the central role in the rejection of tradition and the transformation of society. The media has slowly and intentionally introduced the general audience to lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgendered characters and in the process has helped alter attitudes towards them such as being tolerant, understanding, accommodating, and being indifferent etc.

According to Augustsson (2011), various scholars have also shown that there is evidence of gay language which is often portrayed in gay speech. This type of language among gays is individually managed form of socialization. Indeed, homosexual men for instance, while seeking for identity often learn the language used by homosexuals by reading literature containing such contents as well as watching TV movies series with such contents such as *Queer as Folk*. Therefore, according to Augustsson, (2011), further noted that persons of gay sexual orientations can find friends and lovers and get to know of their unique lexicon as well as how gays operate as a community. However, *gay* language is not exclusively known and spoken by *gay* men since some heterosexuals learn the language sooner or later if interested. For instance, actors Debbie and Hunter and the lesbian couple in a movie *Queer as Folk* learnt and became conversant with the *gay speech* as friends of the in-group. This means that *gay* language can further be exposed to more people and normalized as part of culture.

According to Leap, as cited in Betsch (2008), *gay* men also study how to talk using *gay* language by studying similar others, visiting libraries and viewing television series containing such contents and language such as *Queer as Folk*, *Will & Grace* and *Six Feet Under*. Additionally, Leap, as cited in Betsch (2008) illustrated how a straight male student who understands and talk fluently the “lavender language” (a term coined by linguists, most notably by William Leap to explain LGBTQ unique language). Arising from the above observations, the language spoken by those identifying in such diverse sexual orientations is unique to them and is used to create identities.

Additionally, particular words and expressions used in a language can signal and indicate individual, collection and network identity (Chambers, 2009). As such, men who are *gay* have

used particular terms and languages, as noted in earlier research, for centuries to shield themselves while looking for relationship partners as well as to hide from an unfriendly and disapproving environment (Baker, 2002). For instance, over the years, there are numerous epithets referring to gay men such as *faggots*, *fairie*, *queer*, *queen*, *fag*, and *nelly*. There are other terms commonly used but with a focus on sexual evaluation includes *top*, *versatile*, *bottom*, as well as verbs like *cruise* and *ogle* (Ibid). It is not only important for LGBTs to know such words as well as what they mean, but also for the wider society to know and use the words as appropriate and sensitively. As such, Kunkel, Cope, et al (as cited in Chelang'at & Njoroge, 2012), noted that there is rising presence and of use gay language and depictions of homosexual actions in TV, a tendency with a close association with the youths viewing patterns and their sexual activities. The portrayals are coinciding with more youths coming out openly identifying as LGBTs globally.

In spite of the recent increased exposure however, according to Nyabuga and Booker (2013) numerous stereotypes and labelling of LGBTs such as aliens, obscene, and vulgar, among others have also been reported in the Kenyan media. Additionally, from the 1960s to the present, LGBTs have been stereotypically depicted as hilarious clowns, flaming queers, and flits; villainous criminals, psychiatric patients, underage molesters, and vampires; or violence victims, HIV/AIDS afflicted, and gender/sexual identity disorder (Barton, 2001; Bux, n.d.; Dyer, 1993; Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD), 1991; Gross, 1991,1994, 1996; Gross & Woods, 1999; Hantzis & Lehr, 1994; Huston, 1992; Kielwasser, 1992; Hart, 2000; Moritz, 1994, 1999; Sarten, 1998; Sheldon, 1999; Weiss, 1992). However, some more recent coverage in the 1990s has seen LGBTs characters being portrayed more positively.

Further, it is in line with the creation of comedic movies, films and TV programmes to reinforce and create laughter using the stereotype of the gay man (Fejes & Petrich, 1993; Dow, 2001). However, even though these undesirable stereotypes around gay men have been involved TV programs since its inception years (Fejes & Petrich, 1993), noted a departure of this from the two homosexual characters on *Will & Grace* who were considered progressive. However, in comedic movies, homosexuality has been described for years as being in opposition to masculinity where being gay is equivalent to not being masculine (Russo, 1985, Epstein & Friedman, 1996). Relatedly, Padva (2007), noted that harassment and attacks done to gays, lesbians, bisexuals, transgenders and even queers (GLBTQ) and especially adolescents are common themes in commonly used communications tools of the 1990s and 2000s, such as film, television, fiction, children's books, popular music, advertisements, Internet websites, comics and even pornography. Such media depictions reflect varied attitudes towards sexual, homophobic, and heterocentric abuse, harassment, and physical attack of LGBTQ subjectivities ranging from criticizing sexual prejudice to eroticization of victimization scenes; from complex deconstruction of demeaning hegemonic cultural acts to obvious encouragement of violence toward LGBTQ persons.

Further, Carroll and Gilroy, (2002), noted that many common stereotypes used in media shows that gay men and lesbian women possess nonverbal "markers" that differentiate them from straight men and women. Indeed, in their study, they showed that gay men readily recognize and utilize these cues to identify one another. As well, heterosexuals are also able to single out and notice men who are gay and those who are straight from photographs shown to them of the gay men faces (Rule, Ambady, Adams, & Macrae, 2008). However, as to how these nonverbal

behaviors of gay and lesbians are different from those of heterosexuals (and if it is true, in what ways) has not been particularly addressed in research.

Douglas (1975) noted that “a social structure can be organized in the form of a joke or visually as a cartoon. However, the examination of the joke can reveal common assumptions, dominant public values, and general public expectations and in this case humor around sexual minorities. As such, humor is perhaps the most brilliant achievement of the human spirit and a way of saying something serious respectively”. The portrayals of most gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgender in a comical set up has led increased visibility of such acts in television programs. The audiences are most likely pulled to watching such contents through the humor. Therefore, it is possible even for positive sitcoms that feature gay and lesbian actors as leading ones, such as *Ellen* and *Will & Grace*, may emphasize stereotypes by representing these actors as unable to be in stable relationships, oversexualized (or lack of it), and by continuing the perception of gay and lesbian people as comical, one-dimensional figures (Cooper, 2003; Fouts & Inch, 2005; Herman, 2005).

Further, language use in comedic movies use stereotypes as an element and in particular gender reversal. This element explores the frequently held notion that homosexuals are oppositely gendered whereby a gay man is thought of being more feminine than a straight man and a lesbian being considered being more masculine than a straight woman (Sedgewick, 1990). The reflected stereotypical image being that of the “young, white, Caucasian, with a well-muscled, smooth body, handsome face, good education, professional job, and high income” that advertisers push to all gay men as the model they should aim to be (Fejes, 2000). This kind of gay masculinity image is in no way different from the one being sold to heterosexual men. As a character, Will offers a mainstream audience with a pleasant, well-integrated gay character that is very different from the negativity surrounding gay characters in early television programming.

However, Will’s role was critiqued for limiting the depiction of gay men to whites and upper-middleclass, making his character more tolerable to a mainstream heterosexual audience at the expense of isolating a large portion of other gay persons (Gairola, 2000). Also, in spite of some sections praising Will’s gay leading character as being positive and progressive, others however, have criticized the character for “not being gay enough” (Jacobs, 1998). Again, rather than concentrating on measuring how “gay” Will is, something risks essentializing gay distinctiveness, a more fruitful aspect of analysis would be to consider how Will’s “gayness” is contextualized within specified moments of text. For instance, it is important to that whenever *Will & Grace* explicitly deals with Will’s sexuality the plot goes back to the familiar stereotypical perspective of feminizing Will.

Further, heterosexuals use language in speeches which is often likened with gender-appropriate speech, and *gay speech* is frequently seen as gender-inappropriate (Cameron, Deborah & Kulick 2006). According to Augustsson (2011), in the course of a study of LGBTs features and identities, several characters were singled out as indicators of gay male characters like terminologies, high pitch sounds, feminine expressions and code-switching. The same features were also noted among white middleclass gays in America who were the majority of the sampled sexual minorities involved in the research. Further, Rusty and Barret (1998) also did a research on African American *drag queens* and from the findings noted that the LGBTs involved used stereotypical white woman style coincide with sexual references and then shift to stereotypical African-American Vernacular English. This is further indicator that there is a unique language among sexual minorities which is a vital purveyor of the culture.

However, Baker (2002) noted that some of the labels or epithets used to refer to sexual minorities are positive whereas some are still in the negative or stereotypical form. The use of the labels and epithets also in many ways depend on whether the speaker is gay or straight. In a research involving Polari, the findings showed that homosexual men in different geographic locations gave conflicting meanings to words such as *faggots*, *fairie*, *queer*, *queen*, *fag*, and *nelly*. Baker further noted that these words can also be used to hide their sexuality as well as a way of relating with other *gay* men, work as an identity sign to a group of people who are from diverse backgrounds, and also refer to in-group insults (Baker Ibid). Therefore, language use in comedic movies with reference to LGBT's talk, conversations, speech, as well as the non-verbal language like kissing, touching, implicitly or impliedly engaging in romance or sex etc. was analyzed in this study.

1.1 Problem statement

Over the years, comedic movies such as situation comedies use sexual orientations as a plot and comedic device, Fouts & Inch (2005). Indeed, in a study of programming from 2001–2002 and 2002–2003, sexual content associated with sexual minorities occurred in 15% of programs overall (Fisher, Hill, Grube, & Gruber, 2007). Most of these portrayals were in movies or in sitcoms. Seif (2017), also argues that there has been an increase in the portrayal of gay characters in several television series during the last decades. Also, Fisher, Hill & Gruber, (2007), observed that since 1997 when *Ellen* became the first television show to have a gay leading character, portrayals of gay and lesbian individuals on television has become more common. Many other comedic shows such as *Spin City*, and *Dawson's Creek* followed. Other comedic shows such as *Will and Grace*, *Queer as Folk*, *Six*, and *Oz* that depict gay characters in more complex plot lines and with more explicit sexual behaviors have also been produced. However, in comedies, portrayals of homosexuality tend to be one-dimensional, and homosexual characters and homophobia are often exploited for comic effect (Cooper, 2003; Fouts & Inch, 2005). Therefore, the constant exposure, prominence, visibility of diverse sexual orientations content was investigated as to whether it may have an effect on students' attitudes towards sexual orientations.

1.2 Objective of the Study

To establish the influence of language use in the comedic movies on attitudes towards sexual orientations of University students in Kenya.

1.3 Research Hypotheses

Ho2: There is no significant influence of language use in the comedic movies on attitudes towards sexual orientations of University students in Kenya.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Social learning theory (SLT)

The theory was proposed by Albert Bandura who argued that most learning takes place through observing the behavior of others (Anaeto et al, 2008). The social learning (SLT) theory proposed that learning occurs through a cognitive process involving a social context and as well as purely through observation or direct instruction even if imitation or direct reinforcement is not present (Bandura, 1971). Further, the theory explains how people adopt and maintain recommended behaviors through observation.

The main idea under the SLT theory is that individuals are driven to adopt the recommended behavior to the extent that they perceive the latter will bring about positive outcomes. First-hand experience is not a necessary condition for the behavior changes to happen. In the context of comedic movies containing sexual orientations/LGBTs, it means that if the youths are exposed to a positive language and scenes that portrays successful LGBTs actors who are also rich and famous, have happy relationships as gays, lesbians, bisexuals or even also transgenders, they may be cognitively or psychologically influenced or reinforced to think that such sexual orientations are to be admired, aspired and even modeled. This theory was therefore, used to describe the influence of language in the comedic movies on attitudes towards sexual orientations of Kenyan university students.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study used mixed methods research design that further involved a convergent parallel mixed method model involving combining or integration of qualitative and quantitative research and data. The study population was students in Universities within Nairobi County sampled from 7 main chartered public and private Universities. In total, a sample size involving 467 male and female students was sampled through probability sampling techniques involving stratified sampling and simple random sampling. Also, non-probability sampling techniques involving purposive and snowball sampling was used to select 30 FGDs participants. The research instruments used were questionnaires, content analysis and focus groups discussions interviews.

This study collected both qualitative and quantitative data. Mixed method data collection was employed for data collection. Questionnaires and interview guide for focus group discussions (FGDs) was used. According to Creswell (2009), collecting both quantitative and qualitative data assists in the triangulation of the result to ensure validity and reliability. From Campbell et al (1999), while the survey is useful for measuring the incidence of a specified behavior, it is often unsatisfactory for full investigation of motivations, beliefs and values that may have a major influence on behavior. Therefore, qualitative research methods such as FGDs interviews complemented and neutralized the biases of quantitative research. Therefore, data was collected primarily using a questionnaire and an interview guide for focus group discussions respectively. The study adopted the triangulation technique of data collection. This technique involves collecting data from different sources and checking the collected information from different sources for consistency of evidence (Asthana & Bhushan, 2007).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Quantitative data was obtained through questionnaires which were collected in 7 chartered main public and private Universities in Nairobi county. Sampling was however, adjusted to fit these respondents within the other sampled Universities. The researcher obtained 467 questionnaires which were complete and sufficiently filled in all the sections and were thus used in the data analysis. The response rate was 93.4%, which is sufficient and acceptable. Qualitative data was also obtained from focus group discussions and content analysis of the *Modern Family* comedic movie that has sexual orientations/LGBTs contents.

4.1 Language Use in Comedic Movies and Attitudes towards Sexual Orientations/LGBTs

The findings on the use of language referring to sexual orientations/LGBTs in comedic movies, a majority of 65.1% of the sampled University students agreed. This means that comedic movies use descriptive/verbal Language to refer to sexual orientations/LGBTs. About 19.1% were neutral and 15.8% disagreed. These findings agree with those made by Augustsson

(2011), that there is gay language which is often portrayed in gay speech by LGBTs. Such language is a self-managed socialization and is largely used positively for identity and belonging.

Table 1. Language Use in Comedic Movies and attitudes towards sexual orientations

Sexual orientations/ LGBTs language use in Comedic movies....	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %
1. I am aware of the use of descriptive/verbal language on sexual orientations/LGBTs in comedic movies.	65.1	19.1	15.8
2. There is more positive descriptive/verbal language describing sexual orientations /LGBTs in comedic movies.	64.9	16.7	18.4
3. Stereotypical and humorous language is constantly used in comedic movies to make sexual orientations/LGBTs more acceptable.	60.2	22.3	24.0
4. The stereotypical and humorous language normalizes sexual orientations/ LGBTs.	60.1	24.0	15.9
5. None-verbal language and symbols help communicate sensitive messages on diverse sexual orientations/ LGBTs	66.2	18.2	15.6

Findings on the presence of more positive descriptive/verbal language describing sexual orientations/LGBTs in comedic movies showed that 64.9% of the sampled University students agreed that there is more positive use of descriptive/verbal language referring to sexual orientations /LGBTs in the comedic movies. About 16.7% were neutral while 18.4% disagreed with this view. These findings are similar to those made by Yang (1997), that there is also growing prevalence of gay talk and portrayals of homosexual behavior in televised media which has a correlation between viewing patterns and the viewers' sexual activities.

In addition, results from the FGDs of the LGBTs University students indicated that respondents recognized the use of language in the comedic movie in reference to sexual orientations/LGBTs. This has contributed to the more positive LGBTs portrayals in comedic movies and media in general like in soap operas and music. For instance, the following LGBT respondents indicated that:

Q: How can you describe the language used to refer to sexual orientations/LGBTs in comedic movies?

R1: *They language used is gender sensitive and inclusive, unlike the stereotypes used before that portrayed LGBTs like people who are mad, cursed, and inhuman. However, in the movies, the language used is gender sensitive and inclusive. Today, the language describes LGBTs living in a world full of love, where everyone is comfortable despite their gender identity, they use educative language for people to stop thinking we are mentally disturbed, people to understand us.*

R2: *The biased language used to describe us in the comedic movies and magazines especially in Africa, wording in magazines, are kind of abusive in a way..*

R3: *Today, the language describes LGBTs living in a world full of love, where everyone is comfortable despite their gender identity, they use educative language for people to stop thinking we are mentally disturbed, people to understand us.*

R5: *The biased language used to describe us in the comedic movies and magazines especially in Africa, wording in magazines, are kind of abusive in a way..*

R7: *The language used in the comedic movies is just full of hate, pretends LGBTs do not exist. The media also twist their messages to suit their sales and do not encourage LGBTs to come out....yet the media should be the voice of the LGBTs community...*

R10: *The language used in the comedic movies follows heavily on the hardline that the church has taken that describes LGBTs as evil and barbaric...*

R11: *There are actually some media contents in some media houses with correct information and contents describing LGBTs. They have accepted LGBTs although the editors sometimes manipulate the contents in order to use LGBTs to sell more...*

R12: *The language used in the comedic movies is mostly sensational in order to make headlines from LGBTs.*

From the FGDs results therefore, the respondents identified the presence and positive use of LGBTs language in the comedic movies. Therefore, results from the FGDs of the LGBTs University students indicated that respondents recognized the use of language in the *Modern Family* comedic movie in reference to sexual orientations/LGBTs. It was noted to have contributed to the more positive LGBTs portrayals in comedic movies and even further in other media genres like in soap operas and music.

These findings were further compared with the results from content and thematic analysis of the *Modern Family*. The findings indicates that Mitchel and Cameron (a gay couple) are two leading characters in the comedic movie. The two characters were used in the leading roles and constantly talked and interacted with other characters debunking most of the stereotypes associated with sexual minorities/LGBTs. The identified and selected themes in the *Modern family* Comedic movie also indicates a more positive use of language in reference to sexual orientations/LGBTs. For instance, the language used to refer to the gay couple, family, gay parenting etc. is especially sensitive. This is shown in the excerpt below when the gay couple- Mitchel and Cameron as married couple live, work and bring up their adopted daughter-Lily:

Mitchell: (to Lily) Who's a good girl? Who's that? Who's that?

Granny: Oh, she's adorable!

Mitchell: Oh, thank you.

Granny: Hi, precious! (puckers up; blows lips in attempt to make Lily smile)

Mitchell: (in small voice) Hello. Hi, hi! We just- we just adopted her from Vietnam and... we're bringing her home for the first time, huh.

Man: Oh, she's an angel. You and your wife must be so thrilled.

Cameron: (enters) Sorry, sorry, sorry. Daddy needed snacks. Hi. (fumbles his way to his seat; granny and man look away uncomfortably) So, what are we talking about?

Further, in a Commentary, more descriptive and verbal language referring to sexual orientations is given as:

Mitchell: Uh, we have been together for, guh, five- five years now? And, uh, we just, we decided we really wanted to have a baby, so we had initially asked one of our lesbian friends to be a surrogate, but-

Cameron: Then we figured they're already mean enough; can you imagine one of them pregnant?

Mitchell: Don't think so.

Cameron: No, thank you.

(Cut back to scene)

Mitchell: You saw that, right? Everybody fawning over Lily, and then you walk on and suddenly it's all "Oooh, SkyMall, I gotta buy a motorised tie rack." Alright, you know, I'm- I'm gonna give a speech.

Cameron: You are not giving a speech.

Mitchell: Why?

Cameron: You're gonna be stuck with these people for the next five hours.

Mitchell: You're right, you're right. Okay, I'm sorry.

Lady: Honey, honey, look at those babies with those cream puffs.

Mitchell: Okay, excuse me. (stands up) Excuse me, but this baby would've grown up in a crowded orphanage if it wasn't for us cream puffs. And you know what? No, to all of you who judge-

Cameron: Mitchell...

Mitchell: -hear this: love knows no race, creed-

Cameron: Mitchell...

Mitchell: -or gender. And shame on you, you small-minded, ignorant few-

Cameron: Mitchell!

Mitchell: What?!

Cameron: (motions to cream puffs in Lily's hands) She's got the cream puffs.

Mitchell: Oh.

Cameron: ...We would like to pay for everyone's headsets.

The findings from the content and thematic analysis shows that comedic movies are increasingly using more positive, sensitive language while referring to sexual minorities/LGBTs so as to portray them as good people, humane, normal successful in their lives. The tone is set to portray the two gay parents positively throughout the comedic movie-Modern Family.

4.2 Correlation Analysis for Language Use and Sexual Orientations/LGBTs

The researcher conducted a correlation analysis in order to determine the relationship between language use and attitudes towards sexual orientations.

Table 2. Correlation Analysis for Language Use and Sexual Orientations/LGBTs

		Language Use_Log	Sexual Orientation
Language Use_Log	Pearson Correlation	1	.145**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002
	N	467	467
Sexual Orientation	Pearson Correlation	.145**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	
	N	467	467

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Findings shows Pearson correlation coefficient (r) is 0.145 with p-value of 0.002 which means that there is a significant relationship between language use and attitudes towards sexual orientations/LGBTs since the correlation coefficient is 0.145 ($r=0.145$, $p=0.002<0.05$). Since $p=0.002<0.05$, there is a correlation because the value of $r=0.145$. This means that there is a relationship between language use and the attitudes towards sexual orientations, the relationship is significant among the sampled University students in Kenya. These findings are similar to those made by Yang (1997), that there is growing prevalence of gay talk and portrayals of homosexual behavior in televised media which has a correlation between viewing patterns and the viewers' sexual activities.

4.3 Regression Analysis for Sexual Orientations/LGBT and Language Use

In order to determine the regression model for language use and attitudes towards sexual orientations/LGBTs, a regression analysis was conducted. The model was also tested to determine whether language use in the comedic movies significantly predicts attitudes towards sexual orientations of the University students.

Table 3. Regression Analysis for Sexual Orientations/LGBT and Language Use

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.145 ^a	.021	.019	.12561

a. Predictors: (Constant), Language Use

The findings indicate that the adjusted R^2 is 0.019. This means that 1.9% of attitudes formed towards sexual orientation of University students is explained by language use in the comedic movies while the remaining 98.1% would be due to other factors that were not included in the model.

Table 4. Regression Analysis Coefficients for Language Use

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.836	.032		25.916	.000
Language Use	.119	.038	.145	3.156	.002

a. Dependent Variable: Sexual Orientation

Further, the findings on regression analysis coefficients, shows that the regression model is statistically significant since $p=0.002<0.05$. This means that language use in comedic movies significantly predict attitudes towards sexual orientations. Therefore, the model can be defined as $Y=0.836+0.119X_2$ where Y = sexual orientations attitudes and X_2 =language use. However, this regression model should be tested further using ANOVA in order to determine whether it is adequately fit to predict the dependent variable.

4.4 ANOVA for Language Use

The researcher also conducted analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the second independent variable language use. ANOVA analysis are conducted so as to determine how influential and useful the independent variable-language use in comedic movies was in predicting the dependent variable-attitudes formed towards sexual orientations, (Sawyer, 2009; Field, 2013).

Table 5 ANOVA analysis for Language Use

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	.157	1	.157	9.960	.002 ^a
Residual	7.337	465	.016		
Total	7.494	466			

- a. Dependent Variable: Sexual Orientation
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Language Use

The results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for regression coefficients as shown were; $F_{1, 465, 0.05}=3.84<9.96$ with $p=0.002>0.05$. This indicates that the model is significant since $P<0.05$. The regression model is significantly fit/adequate to predict attitudes towards sexual orientations, hence it can be argued that language use in comedic movies had a significant influence on attitudes of University students towards sexual orientations among those sampled in Kenya. Therefore, the null hypothesis that language use in comedic movies has no influence on attitudes of University students towards sexual orientations in Kenya was rejected. It is true thus, to conclude that comedic movies containing sexual orientations/LGBTs content has influence on Kenyan University students.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that comedic movies consumed by audiences like the Kenyan youths often use language to create humor using the diverse sexual orientations/LGBTs. Language use is an influential tool in media and can lead to positive, negative or neutral attitudes formed towards sexual orientations/LGBTs. Comedies, both local and foreign are popular among Kenyan University youths who watch them for entertainment, information and education. The youths however, watch the predominantly American comedies produced in Hollywood. Majority of the University students irrespective of their gender, age, religion enjoyed watching comedic movies mostly downloaded from the internet which is a largely uncontrolled and unregulated source of media contents. Increasingly, the comedic movies were noted to be not only showing diverse sexual orientations/LGBTs, but also using a more positive language while describing them. Therefore, comedic movies contents through language use had a significant influence on the attitudes of the University students such as becoming more tolerant, accepting, and understanding of the diverse sexual orientations like LGBTs.

5.1 Recommendation

This study recommends that the policies and laws in place criminalizing sexual orientations such as LGBTs be reviewed. The policies in place need to be updated and brought to the reality of the times. In spite of criminalizing sexual orientations like LGBTs, the contents featuring them as well as the numbers of those identifying themselves as such seems to be becoming more visible and prominent. As well, attitudes towards them are changing albeit slowly. These changing trends are evident across the globe as well.

5.2 Suggestion for further research

Today, sexual orientations/LGBTs are visible in the diverse media platforms and genres such as soap operas, music, fiction movies etc. Therefore, the influence of other genres of media contents should be analyzed. Further research can also be done using experimental research design so as to establish the causal-effects analysis.

REFERENCES

- Anaeto, S. G., Onabajo. O. S., Osifeso, J. B. (2008). *Theories And Models of Communication*. Maryland, USA. African Renaissance Books Inc; 57-136
- Asthana, H.S., & Bhushan, B. (2007). *Statistics for Social Sciences with SPSS Application*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Private Ltd. 2007. Print.
- Augustsson, E. M, (2011). *Queer as Folk, Representation of Gay Vocabulary in Popular Culture*. University of Gothenburg.
- Bandura, A. (1971). *Social Learning Theory*. New York: General Learning Press.
- Baker, P. (2002). *Polari – The Lost Language of Gay Men*. New York: Routledge.
- Barton, D. (2001, April 15). Sitcoms embrace Gays, but characters still stereotypes. *Sacramento.com Television*. Retrieved from http://entertainment.sacramento.com/television/20010416_Gays.html.
- Betsch, M. L. (2008). University Conference Focuses On ‘Gay Language’. Retrieved from <http://www.cnsnews.com/node/5425>
- Billig, M., (2005). *Laughter and Ridicule: toward a Social Critique of Humour*. Sage, London
- Bux, R. A. (n.d.). Sexual orientation and television. Retrieved from <http://www.mbcnet.org/ETV/S/htmlS/sexualorient/sexualorient.htm>
- Cameron, Deborah & Kulick. (2006). *The Language and Sexuality Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Campbell, O., Cleland, J., Collumbien, M., & Southwick K. (1999). *Social Sciences Methods For Research On Reproductive Health*. World Health organization, Geneva Switzerland.
- Carroll, L., & Gilroy, P. J. (2002). Role of appearance and nonverbal behaviors in the perception of sexual orientation among lesbians and gay men. *Psychological Reports*, 91, 115–122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2002.91.1.115>.
- Chambers, S. (2009). *The Queer Politics of Television*. London and New York: I.B. Taurus.

- Chelang'at, S., & Njoroge, C. (2012), *An investigation into the impact of television portrayals urban youth*, unpublished Masters thesis submitted at the University of Nairobi.
- Cooper, E. (2003). *Decoding Will and Grace: Mass audience reception of a popular network situation comedy. Sociological Perspectives*, 46(4), 513–533.
- Cresswell J.W. (2009a). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and mixed Methods Approaches*. 3rd edition. London: sage Publications
- Dirks, T. (2010). *Main Film Genres*. Retrieved from <http://www.filmsite.org/genres.html>
- Douglas (1975). *Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation*. Maynard, Guest Editor, University of Wisconsin, Madison Pp. 105-29.
- Dow, B. (2001). *Ellen, Television, and the Politics of Gay and Lesbian Visibility: Critical Studies in Media Communication*, vol.10 (Issue.2) 123-140.
- Dyer, R. (1993b). *The Role of Stereotypes. The Matter of Images. Essays on Representation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Dynel, M., (2017). *But seriously: on conversational humour and (un)truthfulness. Lingua* 197, 83–102.
- Dynel, M., (2018). *Irony, deception and humour: seeking the truth about overt and covert untruthfulness. In: Mouton Series in Pragmatics. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin*.
- Epstein, R., & Friedman, J. (Producers/Writers). (1996). [Videocassette]. Tri-Star Home Video.
- Fejes, F. (2000). *Making a gay masculinity. Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 17, 113116.
- Fejes, F, Petrich, K. (1993). *Invisibility, homophobia, and heterosexism: Lesbians, gays, and the media. Critical Studies in Mass Communication*. 10:396–422.
- Field, A. P. (2013). *Discovering statistics using SPSS: and sex and drug and rock 'n'* (4th ed.) London: Sage.
- Fisher, A, D., Hill, J, D., Joel., W, G., Gruber., L, E., (2007). *Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Content on Television: A Quantitative Analysis Across Two*; 52(3-4): 167–188.
- Fouts, G., & Inch, R. (2005). *Homosexuality in TV situation comedies: Characters and verbal comments. Journal of Homosexuality*, 49(1), 35–45.
- Gairola, R. (2000). *Will & Grace: Watching with ambivalence. PopMatters.com*. Retrieved August 8, 2001 from <http://www.popmatters.com/tv/reviews/w/will-and-grace.html>.
- Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation. (1991, May 17). *Images of Lesbians in television and motion pictures: Report to the Commission on the Status of Women of the city of Los Angeles*. Los Angeles: Sylvia Rhue.
- Gross, L. (1991), *Out of the mainstream: Sexual minorities and the mass media. Journal of Homosexuality*;21:19–46. [PubMed: 1856468]

- Gross, L. (1994), *What is wrong with this picture? Lesbian women and gay men on television*. In: Ringer, R.J., editor. *Queer words, queer images: Communication and construction of homosexuality*. New York, NY: New York University Press; P. 143-156.
- Gross, L. (1996). Don't ask don't tell: Lesbian and Gay people in the media. In P. M. Lester (Ed.), *Images that injure: Pictorial stereotypes in the media*. (pp. 149-159). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Gross, L. (2001). *Up from invisibility: Lesbians, gay men, and the media in America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gross, L. & Woods, J. D. (1999). Introduction: Being Gay in American media and society. In *The Columbia reader: On Lesbians and Gay men in media, society, and politics*. (pp. 297-301). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hantzis, D. M. & Lehr, V. (1994). Whose desire? Lesbian (non)sexuality and television's perception of hetero/sexism. In R. J. Ringer (Ed.), *Queer words, queer images: Communication and the construction of homosexuality*. (pp. 107-121). New York: New York University Press.
- Hart, K. R. (2000). Representing Gay men on American television. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 9(1) 59-79.
- Herman, D. (2005). "I'm gay": Declarations, desire, and coming out on prime-time television. *Sexualities*, 8(1): 7-29.
- Huston, A. C., Donnerstein, E., Fairchild, H., Feshbach, N. D., Katz, P. A., Murrany, J. P., et al. (1992). Summary and conclusion. *Big world, small screen: The role of television in American society* (pp. 130-146). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Jacobs, A. (1998, October 23). When gay men happen to straight women. *Entertainment Weekly*. Retrieved from <http://www.ew.com>.
- Kielwasser, A. P. & Wolf, M. A. (1992). Mainstream television, adolescent homosexuality, and significant silence. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 9, 350-373.
- Kunkel, D., Farinola, W.J., Cope-Farrar, K.M., Donnerstein, E., Biely, E., & Zwarun, L. (2002) *Deciphering the V-Chip: An examination of the television industry's program rating judgment: Journal of Communication*, 52 (1), 112-138.
- McNair, Brian (2002) *Striptease Culture: Sex, Media and the democratization of desire*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Moritz, M. J. (1994). Old strategies for new texts: How American television is creating and treating Lesbian characters. In R. J. Ringer (Ed.), *Queer words, queer images: Communication and the construction of homosexuality*. (pp. 122-141). New York: New York University Press.
- Moritz, M. J. (1999). Old strategies for new texts: How American television is creating and treating Lesbian characters. In L. Gross and J. D. Woods (Eds.), *The Columbia reader: On Lesbians and Gay men in media, society, and politics*. (pp. 301-306). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Nyabuga, G, Booker, N. (2013). *Mapping digital Media: Kenya, a report by the open society foundations*. London, Milbank.

- Padva, G. (2007). Media and Popular Culture Representations of LGBT Bullying, *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 19:3-4, 105-118, DOI: 10.1080/10538720802161615
- Raley, A.B., & Lucas, J.L. (2006). Stereotype or success? Prime-time television's portrayals of gay male, lesbian, and bisexual characters. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51(2), 19-38.
- Rovella, M., Geringer, S. D., & Sanchez, R. (2015). Viewer Perception of Product Placement in Comedic Movies. *American Journal of Management*, 15(1), 36-43.
- Rule, N. O., Ambady, N., Adams, R. B., Jr., & Macrae, C. N. (2008). Accuracy and awareness in the perception and categorization of male sexual orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1019–1028.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013194>
- Santa Ana, O., (2009). Did you call in Mexican? The racial politics of Jay Leno immigrant jokes. *Lang. Soc.* 38, 23–45.
- Sarten, L. (1998, October 1). “Will and Grace” sitcom features two Gay characters. *GLWeb: The Rainbow Screen*. Retrieved September 5, 2001, from [http://www.Glweb.com/rainbow screen/archive/10-1-98.html](http://www.Glweb.com/rainbow%20screen/archive/10-1-98.html).
- Sawyer, S. F. (2009). Analysis of Variance: The Fundamental Concepts. *Journal of Manual & Manipulative Therapy*, 17(2), 27E-38E.
- Sedgwick, E. K. (1990). *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sheldon, C. (1999). Lesbians and film: Some thoughts. In L. Gross and J. D. Woods (Eds.), *The Columbia reader: On Lesbians and Gay men in media, society, and politics*.(pp. 301-306). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Simpson, P., (2003). *On the Discourse of Satire: towards a Stylistic Model of Satirical Humor*. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Udo-Akang, D, (2012), *Theoretical Constructs, Concepts, and Applications*, American international journal of contemporary research, Vol. 2(9) www.ajjcrnet.com
- Weiss, A. (1992c). Post-war Hollywood Lesbians: Whose happy ending? In *Vampires & violets: Lesbians in film*. (pp. 51-83). New York: Penguin Books.
- Yang, Alan S. (1997). *Attitudes toward homosexuality*. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. (Autumn, 1997), pp. 477-507: Oxford University Press on behalf of the American Association for Public Opinion Research Stable URL:
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2749583>