

2022

Pragmatic functions of formulaic expressions in Cebuano

Joseph E. Araneta and Sajed S. Ingilan

Date received: July 20, 2022

Revision accepted: September 24, 2022

Similarity index: 5%

Abstract

Natural conversations contain expressions that can be deciphered through their contextual use. These expressions are often flexible, allowing them to function beyond their literal meaning. Thus, pragmatics is functional in explaining their significance in speakers' utterances, mainly when expressing affirmation and disapproval. This study investigates the pragmatic functions of agreeing and disagreeing formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language, namely *o/oo*, *lagi*, *bitaw*, *mao*, *wala*, and *dili*. The framework of Tanangkingsing (2009) was employed to analyze and describe the functions of agreeing and disagreeing formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language used in a radio conversation. The study revealed that agreeing formulaic expressions are primarily used to convey agreement to the statements of the other participants in the conversation and affirm their own statements. On the other hand, disagreeing formulaic expressions are primarily used to convey contradiction to the perceived wrong information given by the other speakers in a conversation, opposing views or counterarguments to the opinions stated in a conversation, and expressions to serve as negation. Agreeing and disagreeing formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language have various functions depending on the context and the speaker's purpose.

Author Information:

Joseph E. Araneta

josepharaneta.fva@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0002-3106-2736

Instructor,
Senior High School Program,
Davao Doctors College, Inc.
Davao City, Philippines

Sajed S. Ingilan

ingilan.sajed@usep.edu.ph
orcid.org/0000-0002-4466-2028

Associate Professor,
College of Arts and Sciences,
University of Southeastern Philippines,
Davao City, Philippines

Keywords: pragmatics, formulaic expressions, agreeing particles, disagreeing particles, Cebuano

There are utterances or expressions that we automatically use when we convey our response in a communication exchange. Unlike free combinations, these units in language cannot be deconstructed or broken down (Jespersen, 1924; Alwhan, 2019) since they deliver a complete meaning and are easily understood by the hearers or receivers of the message. These utterances are referred to as formulaic expressions; they are a common linguistic phenomenon among languages. Formulaic expressions could be words, phrases, or complete sentences (Jespersen, 1924; Alwhan, 2019) that are conventional in communication, thus, calling them “automatic speech” because of their overly used status (Van-Lanker, 1975; Alwhan, 2019). In the Cebuano language, formulaic expressions are also present but noticeably contain minimal units or just a single word; hence, their pragmatic functions are overlooked.

Moreover, two prevalent features among Cebuano formulaic expressions are the occurrences of agreeing and disagreeing markers. Though Cebuano speakers understand the use of these markers, there is a need to explore their meaning beyond the literal meaning as they convey contextual function. Therefore, pragmatic analysis is necessary to understand the occurrences of these expressions.

In his book *The Philosophy of Grammar*, Jespersen first proposed formulaic expression in 1924. He claimed that these expressions are a whole group of words that cannot be fragmented in the same way as free combinations (Alwhan, 2019). Since then, it has been explored by researchers and scholars, and agreed to the formulaic nature of these utterances (Jespersen, 1924; Bolinger, 1976; Fillmore, 1979; Hickey, 1993; Weinert, 1995; Alwhan, 2019) but differed in some aspects such as its dependence in contextual use and lack of distinctions since the descriptions can be correctly applied to other normalized language utterances such as idiomatic expressions, collocations, etc. (Alwhan, 2019). Taguchi, Li, and Xiao (2013) assert that it has also been explored under various categories such as prefabricated routines (Hakuta, 1974), phrasal chunks (de Cook, 1998), prefabs (Altenberg, 1998), formulaic sequences (Schmitt, 2004), situation-bound utterances (Kecskes, 2003), chunks (Ellis, 2003), and conventional expressions (Bardovi-Harlig, 2009; Bardovi-Harlig, 2009; Bardovi-Harlig et al., 2010). Hence, formulaic expressions attracted researchers and scholars to investigate the existence of this linguistic phenomenon because of its relevance in speech production and language in use.

Van Lancker-Sidtis and Rallon (2004) argue that formulaic expressions differ from non-conventional utterances in various means since they frequently accommodate lexical items with nonliteral or nonstandard meanings. Unlike conventional sentences that can be rigorously neutral in affective substance, formulaic expressions are restrained with attitudinal or emotional implications (Bolinger, 1976; Van Lancker-Sidtis & Rallon, 2004; Alwhan, 2019). Native speakers have a sense of familiarity or recognition of formulaic expressions because of their special condition. They can identify and complete these expressions (when words are eliminated) and exhibit knowledge of their distinctive meanings and proper settings. Taguchi, Li, and Xiao (2013) synthesize the elements of formulaic language based on the studies of several scholars (Coulmas, 1981; Myles et al., 1999; Kecskes, 2000; Wray, 2002; Schmitt & Carter, 2004; Wood, 2006). They state that formulaic expressions are multi-word sequences, deposited in the mind as a complete unit, and fixed syntactic threads that may have positions to allow versatility in use and exist oftentimes; phonologically consistent (i.e., articulated without hesitation), syntactically irregular, community-wide in use, and interrelated to specific contexts and communication events.

As mentioned earlier, the Cebuano language also contains formulaic expressions, most notably when speakers convey agreement and disagreement. Since these expressions have pragmatic functions or contain meanings beyond literal understanding, they are treated as pragmatic or discourse markers (Tanangkingsing, 2009). van Dijk (1977) asserts that pragmatic functions or pragmatic interpretations are

delegated to utterances of natural language that are syntactically well-formed, semantically meaningful, and satisfiable. They are relative to a context, such as the pragmatic contents. Furthermore, Schrifin (1987) in Huddleston and Fairhurst (2013) posits that pragmatic markers perform various purposes in discourse, and one of their main functions is to place characteristics of the context indexically. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg (2009) in Huddleston and Fairhurst (2013) also indicate the pragmatic markers as automatic because they observe the utterance and thus help interpret thereon. Therefore, Cebuano formulaic expressions conveying agreement and disagreement have versatile features but have a complete syntactic element that is functional in discourse and convenient for speakers.

Agreement and disagreement are natural responses and reactions to matters that we affirm or contradict. They are natural phenomena that we express through our language. All the time, we use conventional and automatic methods to express our affirmation and contradiction, especially in spontaneous conversations. Hunyadi (2019) purports that agreeing and disagreeing are not just viewed according to their binary connection. There are several layers, degrees of characteristics, indecision on the perception or belief about an issue, or lack of opinion. However, a successful conversation must acknowledge that understanding agreeing and disagreeing is crucial. Furthermore, failure to recognize or misinterpret it can lead to a total unsuccessful interaction. Being entirely dependent on the linguistic form of agreeing and disagreeing may still be misleading, even though languages commonly have various lexical and syntactic ways to express these phenomena.

Agreement in speech communication is the desired strategy unless the previous exchange contains disapproving or critical matters. Hence, it is an available choice when a speaker conveys his/her perceptions. Agreement is broadly perceived as an expression with various forms of positive position to the premise of the previous speaker's statement (Sacks, 1987; Nor, 2014). On the other hand, disagreement comprises a range of speech acts "at the antipode of agreement" (Angouri & Locher, 2012; Hüttner, 2014) and reveals intersection with related ideas such as argumentation, argument talk, conflict talk, dispute, oppositional talk/exchange, verbal arguing (Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998; Georgakopoulou, 2001; Fujimoto, 2010; Sharma, 2012; Hüttner, 2014). In friendly exchange, the most common conversational contact, participants exhibit unwillingness, and resistance to convey disagreement (Beebe & Takahashi, 1989; Kreutel, 2007) and presume that disagreeable deeds will not be accommodated without logical reasoning (Jacobs & Jackson, 1981; Kreutel, 2007). This inspection of a common preference to agree (Kuo, 1994; Kreutel, 2007) is affirmed in natural data, and agreement exists way greater than disagreement (Pearson, 1986; Kreutel, 2007).

Studies conducted about formulaic expressions revealed their contextual functions in various communication settings. In the United States, the study of Rammell, Sidtis, and Pisoni (2017) about the perception of formulaic and novel expressions under acoustic degradation revealed that formulaic expressions are encoded and processed as whole units, supporting a dual-process model of language processing, which assumes that grammatical and formulaic expressions are differentially processed. In Australia, the study of Kashiha and Chan (2015) about the differences in native and non-native speakers' use of formulaic language divulged that the native speakers used more lexical bundles than their non-native counterparts did, and they also used more discourse organizing bundles, while non-native speakers more frequently used lexical bundles as stance expressions. In the Philippines, the study of Pérez-Llantada (2014) about the convergent and divergent usage of formulaic language in L1 and L2 expert academic writing disclosed that formulaic is a key feature of the academic written register across language variables, and that genre determines writers' choice of formulaic sequences in terms of frequency, structural constituency, semantic non-idiomaticity, syntax, and overall discourse style.

Therefore, based on the aforementioned related literature and studies, it is noteworthy to explore the natural and automatic occurrences of formulaic expressions in a conversation focusing on agreeing and disagreeing expressions that contain pragmatic implications based on their contextual functions. Hence, this study deals with the formulaic expressions of agreeing and disagreeing in the Cebuano language, namely *o/oo, lagi, bitaw, mao, wala, and dili*. This study employs qualitative study, specifically discourse analysis, as a method in conducting the study and uses the framework of Tanangkingsing (2009) to analyze the functions of the formulaic expressions of agreeing and disagreeing in the Cebuano language. This study elucidates one of the significant topics in the Cebuano language that discusses the versatility of its pragmatic particles.

Materials and Methods

This study utilizes qualitative research design, specifically discourse analysis, to describe the pragmatic functions of formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language, focusing on agreeing and disagreeing expressions, namely, *o/oo, lagi, bitaw, mao, wala, and dili*. Discourse analysis is functional in this study since it emphasizes language analysis beyond the surface level and the relationship or linguistic and non-linguistic features in the discourse. The study's data is a recorded 2-hour radio conversation of local disc jockeys in Davao City, mainly speaking in Cebuano. The said radio conversation is the radio program DXAB Tambayan 1296. The overall data does not include the advertisements, role plays as part of the program, or songs played during the program. Moreover, the study follows the ethical standard in conducting study by using pseudonyms to hide the identities of the participants in the conversation. The radio conversation is in the public domain since it was recorded on-air; therefore, the researchers do not need permission to record the conversation or the radio program. The framework of the study is the Cebuano reference of Tanangkingsing (2009) about particles and common formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language. The analysis of the study is reviewed and evaluated by teachers in linguistics.

Results and Discussions

Cebuano language contains various particles that frequently appear in natural conversations. According to Trosdal (1992) in Tanangkingsing (2009), these particles are hardly found in a written corpus as they can only be found in conversations since they are used in particular contexts. Hence, these particles have pragmatic interpretations according to their contextual use. Their pragmatic interpretations may vary depending on the speakers who use them in their utterances. In conversations, it is natural to express approval and contradiction. There are expressions that we automatically use to respond to approval or contradiction. In the Cebuano language, formulaic expressions are also considered pragmatic particles; thus, these formulaic expressions contain pragmatic functions. Table 1 presents the agreeing and disagreeing formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language that occurred in the conversation of local disc jockeys in the radio program DXAB Tambayan 1296.

Table 1

Agreeing and Disagreeing Formulaic Expressions in Cebuano Language

Formulaic Expressions	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Agreeing	135	50.75%
<i>o/oo</i>	63	23.68%
<i>mao</i>	56	21.05%
<i>bitaw</i>	13	4.89%
<i>lagi</i>	3	1.13%
Disagreeing	131	49.25%
<i>dili</i>	75	28.20%
<i>wala</i>	56	21.05%
Overall Total	266	100%

The agreeing expressions in the Cebuano language are *o* or *oo*, *mao*, *bitaw*, and *lagi*. These expressions commonly imply affirmation in the prior utterances of the other speakers in the conversation or agreement on the topic or related topics being discussed. Therefore, the speakers infer optimism in their language when they use agreeing formulaic expressions. Tanangkingsing (2009) claims that these pragmatic particles are the common ways to convey positive messages in the Cebuano language. Sometimes, other particles or markers are also attached to these expressions to make a strong emphasis and convey an emotion.

The most frequently used agreeing formulaic expression in the conversation of local disc jockeys is *o* or *oo*, which is used 63 times or 50.74 percent in the overall data. Most of the time, speakers use *o* or *oo* when they affirm the statement or message of the other speakers in a conversation, just like in excerpt 1, wherein speaker 2 responded *oo* to affirm the statement of speaker 1, which is "it's a myth." The particle *oo* in the utterance is the equivalent of 'yes' in the English language. While in excerpt 2, speaker 1 uttered *aw*, a pause filler in Cebuano, before uttering *o* when confirming that the video he/she was referring to was being watched repeatedly.

Excerpt 1

- Speaker 1: It's a myth!
(It's a myth.)
- Speaker 2: **oo** it's a myth *wala man siya kaingon*.
(Yes, it's a myth. [She] never said [yes].)

Excerpt 2

- Speaker 1: **aw o** *gibalik-balik ug tan-aw partner*
(Ah yes. [It was] repeatedly watched, partner.)

The pragmatic particle *o* or *oo* also manifests a positive emotion in the speaker. In excerpt 3, speaker 2 expressed excitement by conveying a positive response to the station manager, who gave them Christmas gifts. This response is conveyed by saying *o* pairing with a particle *diba* to emphasize the positive message. Another case of *o* paired with another Cebuano particle is the combination of *o* and *sige*, a Cebuano particle that also expresses a positive response. In excerpt 4, speaker 1 granted the request of the speaker to greet

on-air. However, in excerpt 5, speaker 1 used the expression *o* to confess a feeling of regret. He/she regretted the pretty face of the subject of their discussion because she had a scandal.

Excerpt 3

- Speaker 2: Speaking of thank you for the love, thank you *kaayo sa atoang* station manager *nga naghatag ug ah* Christmas gift sa atua tanan. ***O diba!***
(Speaking of thank you for the love, thank you very much to our station manager who gave ah Christmas gift to all of us. Alright!)

Excerpt 4

- Speaker 4: *Pwede ko magbati Koy?*
(Can I greet, Koy?)
- Speaker 1: ***O sige Yan dali Yan***
(Yes of course, Yan! You can)

Excerpt 5

- Speaker 2: *O nahimo na siyang* trending before partner and Toro allegedly *na* sex video I mean scandal *nga naga kalat* online. *Pero oo mao na si ****** partner.
(Yes, she was trending before, partner and Toro, because of her alleged scandal. I mean her scandal that spread online. But yes, partner, that is *****)
- Speaker 3: *Nagakalat na* partner.
(It spread [online] partnet)
- Speaker 1: *Gwapa bat-ana o!*
([This] girl is pretty (o)!)

The local disc jockeys also used *o* or *oo* as a discourse marker to express an emphasis on the action made by the speaker or the statement of the speakers themselves. In excerpt 6, speaker 1 uttered *o* to emphasize his/her energetic behavior manifested in the way he/she was speaking. The emphasis in this context affirms the non-linguistic features manifested in the conversation. In discourse analysis, Harris (1952) in Paltridge (2006) claims that it analyzes language beyond the sentence level and the relationship between linguistic and non-linguistic manners.

Excerpt 6

- Speaker 1: *Nacarried away ko oo salamat diay kay sa hisgutan nato karong mga kapamilya no. Kauban nato ang kastambay mataghapon kini ang inyong Tambayan Dose Nobentay Sais! O hyper gihapon mga kapamilya no. Dapat man gud good vibes dapat sugdan man gud ang prugrama karon mga kapamilya nga malipayon.*
(I was carried away. Yes, Thank you for our talk today. We are accompanied by [our] *ka-stambay* every afternoon, your *Tambayan Dose Nobentay Sais!* Yes, we're still hyper *kapamilyas*. We have to manifest with good vibes, *kapamilyas*, because we need to start the program with happiness.)

In excerpt 7, speaker 2 made an emphasis on his/her own statement by saying *oo* at the end of his/her utterance. The speaker emphasized the trending news about the bad weather because of Typhoon Nona. This context shows the flexibility of *o* or *oo* as a discourse marker in terms of its syntactic position. This observation attests that discourse markers are syntactically flexible in their position in the utterance, which, most of the time, are uttered in the initial position of the utterance (Archakis, 2001; Fung & Carter, 2007; Yang, 2011; Araneta & Ingilan, 2019). This feature of *o* or *oo* as a discourse marker is similar to

the Cebuano kuan as a discourse marker that can be found in any syntactic position in utterances that emphasize and solicit the hearers' attention (Araneta & Ingilan, 2019). Another similar observation is in the study of Tanangkingsing (2022) about the flexibility of Cebuano *unsa* as a discourse marker in the Cebuano language to evoke attention to the hearers by making a questioning tone.

Excerpt 7

Speaker 2: Trending *karon* partner *ang lakat sa panahon tungod kay ginabantayan sa pag-asa kaning si Bagyong Nona oo.*
(Yes. The weather today is trending because PAG-ASA is monitoring the movement of Bayang Nona)

Another interesting case of *o* is that the local disc jockeys also used the expression as a reference. In excerpt 8, speaker 1 used *o* as a marker to indicate or refer to the subject he/she was talking about and solicit information. This case is similar to Cebuano *kuan*, which functions as a reference in which the particle implies an expression that extracts information through question form or confirmation in a yes-or-no question (Tanangkingsing, 2009). Araneta and Ingilan (2019) also affirm this analysis that by using the referent *kuan*, the speaker seeks attention and leads the hearer to which desired referent he/she is referring.

Excerpt 8

Speaker 1: *Na-unsa naman ning isa o?*
(What's happening to this one (o)?)

The pragmatic particle *oo* is also observed in the reduplication process. In excerpt 9, Speaker 2 already said yes, but after, he/she supplemented it with an utterance of *oo*. In the excerpt, Speaker 2 enumerated the places of the contestants in a television variety show as the results of the final performances. Though the reduplicated words are in different languages, English and Cebuano, they are each other's equivalent words. Though the speaker code-switched, the base of the syntactic structure of the utterance is in Cebuano. According to Rubino (2005), Austronesian languages, where the Cebuano language belongs, are prominent in many forms of reduplication processes. Further, Filipinos tend code-switch since the Philippines is a linguistically diverse country, and the English language is considered a second language in the Philippines. This form of code-switching is intrasentential, in which the code-switching happens inside one sentence (Bullock & Toribio, 2009).

Excerpt 9

Speaker 2: *Unya si Kz Tandingan 4th iyahang gi-impersonate si Lady Gaga ug 5th si Keanne Cipriano nga gi-impersonate si Ricky Martin. Yes oo.*
(And KZ Tandingan was the 4th [placer]. She impersonated Lady Gaga. And the 5th [placer] is Keanne Cipriano who impersonated Ricky Martin. Yes, yes)

The second most frequently used agreeing formulaic expression in the conversation of local disc jockeys is *mao*, which is used 56 times or 21.05 percent in the overall data. When speakers use *mao* in utterances, they function as a discourse marker, demonstrative marker, interrogative expression, affirmation, conjunction, and interjection. In excerpt 10, Speaker 1 used *mao* as a discourse marker to emphasize a statement and supplement more information about the topic they are talking about. The speaker emphasizes Denise Laurel's statement that she is dedicating her win to her son Alejandro because that was the first time she won and never in the weekly competition. This case of *mao* is similar to *o* or *oo*, which functions as a discourse marker wherein the speaker stresses further information in the conversation.

Excerpt 10

Speaker 2: ...*Siya ang nahimong champion yes oo tungod kay matud pa kay Denise partner never daw siya sa ilaha ganing mga... mga weekly performances never siya nadaug and every time daw mapildi siya nagahilak iyang anak. Mao nag-ingon si Denise partner na gina-dedicate ang iyang kadaugan sa iyahang 5 years old na anak nga si Alejandro...*

(...She became the champion. And yes, yes, it's true according to Denise, partner, she never won on their weekly performances. Every time she lost, her son cried. That's why she dedicated her win to her 5-year-old son, Alejandro...)

The local disc jockeys also used mao as a discourse marker to provide a conclusion about the topic the speakers are discussing, shift or transition to another topic, and end a topic. In excerpt 11, speaker 1 concluded drunkards are yummier based on their reasoning. In excerpt 12, speaker 3 used mao to shift to another topic from mentioning one trending topic to another, which is the death anniversary of FPJ or Fernando Poe Jr. This notion means that mao is also treated as a transition device. In excerpt 13, speaker 3 employed mao to end the discussion of the featured heated news in their program. In conversation analysis, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) emphasized the prominence of transition devices in turn-taking, turn allocations, and topic transition in conversations explained in transition-relevance place (TRP).

Excerpt 11

Speaker 1: ...*ug mao to mga kapamilya no ahh mas lamion daw tong sa mga laok ang mga taong palahubog*

(...and that's it, kapamilyas, (no ahh) drunkards are yummier [according to people].)

Excerpt 12

Speaker 3: *Diritso siya partner unya namatay siya sa pangidaron kapamilya nga sienta'y sinko anyos. So mao na ang atong trending karon FPJ ahh death anniversary niya karon. Another pa na trending.*

(It was a sudden [death] and he died at the age of 75, kapamilya. So, that's our trending today about FPJ's death anniversary. And another trending.)

Excerpt 13

Speaker 3: *Mao nato partner ang atoang balitang nag aso-aso.*

(So, that's our heated news for today, partner.)

Another pragmatic function of mao in the conversation of local disc jockeys is a demonstrative marker. The speakers used mao to refer to a previously mentioned topic in the conversation or a proceeding subject or topic. Moreover, the expression mao may refer to a person or an idea. In excerpt 14, speaker 2 employed mao to indicate the word "boomerang" as a word being associated with Mar Roxas because of bashing Davao City, but that hit him back. In excerpt 15, speaker 2 used mao to refer to "Andrea Brillantes" as the younger sister of Daniel Padilla in the tv series Pangako Sa'yo. In excerpt 16, speaker 3 employed mao to direct "Denise Laurel" as the champion of the tv contest Your Face Sounds Familiar. Both contexts used mao to refer to persons; however, in excerpt 15, the referent was already mentioned before the utterance of mao, while the referent in excerpt 16 was only mentioned after the utterance of mao. This case of mao as a demonstrative marker is similar to the case of a pragmatic particle in Makhuwa, a Bantu language. The locative demonstratives *va* and *vo* also function as pragmatic particles in the left and right locations. They solicit the receiver's attention, heighten the illocutionary force, and demonstrate the relationship between

the speaker and the hearer (Van der Wal, 2013).

Excerpt 14

Speaker 1: *Unsay naa sa word na boomerang?*

(What's with the word boomerang?)

Speaker 3: Partner *mao ni siya ang gi-associate karon kay Roxas gihapon. Ang iyahang pagsaway sa Davao ni boomerang sa iyaha.*

(Partner, this is also the word being associated right now to Mar Roxas. His bashing to Davao City boomeranged to him.)

Excerpt 15

Speaker 2: *Si Andrea Brillantes mao na siya tong manghud ni Daniel Padilla sa Pangako Sa'yo.*

(Andrea Brillantes is the younger sister of Daniel Padilla in Pangako Sa'yo.)

Excerpt 16

Speaker 2: *Ug nagpadungagay sa ilang negative reactions sa nahimong resulta sa Your Face Sounds Familiar kay matud pa partner ang nahimong mananaug sa o nahimong champion mao si Denise Laurel.*

(And they were expressing their negative reactions to the result of Your Face Sounds Familiar because Denise Laurel became the champion.)

The local disc jockeys also used *mao* as an interrogative marker to ask for information from the hearer or the receiver of the question. In excerpt 17, speaker 1 used his/her partners in the radio program if that was the only news about the weather. Diesel (2003) claims that interrogatives express questions that direct the receiver of the message to explore for answers or information from his/her knowledge repertoire. This case of pragmatic particle *mao* as interrogative is similar to the case of Mandarin Chinese particle *ba*, which also functions as interrogative, demonstrating the hearer's weak commitment toward the argument conveyed in the conversation (Ljungqvist, 2010).

Excerpt 17

Speaker 1: *Nona nona nona the explorer! Una bay lagay... mao rato partner lagay sa panahon nato?*

(Nona nona nona the explorer! What's the... Is that all about the weather condition?)

Another pragmatic function of *mao* in the conversation of the local disc jockeys is an expression of affirmation. The speakers used *mao* to affirm the information being discussed in the conversation. In excerpt 18, speaker 3 confirmed the information being asked by Speaker 1 about the contextual meaning of the word "myth." Speaker 3 used *mao* to answer the question of speaker 1, which is the word associated with Mar Roxas's statement concerning Davao's security. Another interesting feature of *mao* as affirmation is the presence of the pragmatic particle *lagi*, which denotes a strong emotion or emphasis on the speaker's expression. In excerpt 19, speaker 3 stated that he/she is right with strong emotion in his/her utterance by using *lagi* twice to emphasize his/her point. This pragmatic function *mao* is comparable to the case of the Indonesian marker *ya*, which conveys agreement or acceptance to the prior statement, and is similar to English markers such as *yes*, *yeah*, *uh-huh*, and other markers that convey the same meaning (Wouk, 2001).

Excerpt 18

Speaker 1: *Unsa diay ang nasa word na myth?*

(What's with the word myth?)

Speaker 3: Partner *mao mana ang pahayag ni Mar Roxas partner mahitungod sa Davao nga safe daw ang Davao. Ingon siya* it's a myth.

(Partner, that's the word stated by Mar Roxas regarding the security of Davao. He said that it's just a myth.)

Excerpt 19

Speaker 3: *Mao lagi tama lagi ko*

(I am right. I told you that I'm right.)

The local disc jockeys also used the formulaic expression *mao* as a conjunction that conveys either a reason why an event happened or a result of a condition. In excerpt 20, Speaker 3 narrated the sequence of events that happened prior to the comatose of the subject. He/she ended his/her statement by saying *mao na siya*, indicating the events that led to the current condition. In excerpt 21, speaker 2 indicated an action caused by the current situation of the subject of the discussion. Speaker 2 said that people listen to the radio while breaking cacao fruits to fight their dizziness. This case of pragmatic particle *mao* as a conjunction can be substantiated by Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (1998, as cited in Hauge, 1999; Fielder, 2008) that there is a correlation between conjunctions that are located in the middle of an utterance and discourse markers located at the initial part since conjunctions link clauses while discourse markers link larger units. This case is also similar to a Bulgarian pragmatic particle *amá* which is referred to as both a conjunction and a particle (Fielder, 2008).

Excerpt 20

Speaker 3: *...Gidala siya didto sa St. Luke's Medical Center Quezon City kapamilya niadtong gabhiona* December 11 *ug didto na wala na siya kamata* partner. He suffered stroke *tapos nahimong* coma partner *ug nagkabrain* clot *mao na siya*.

(...he was rushed to St. Luke's Medical Center in Quezon City, kapamilya, on the eve of December 11. And there he wasn't able to wake up. He was in comatose and there was a clot in his brain that's why.)

Excerpt 21

Speaker 2: *Ni-share lang sila bisan naa silay gipangbuhat* partner still *nakalansang ilang radyo sa... kay para pud* partner *dili pud sila bation ug duka kay sa kadugayan man gud sa sigeg lingkod dira sigeg buak sa cacao dukaon sila mao ng naminaw sila sa DXAB.*

(They just shared though they are busy. They spared time to listen to radio so that they won't feel dizziness while sitting and breaking cacao fruits. That's why they are listening to DXAB.)

The last pragmatic function of formulaic expression *mao* is an interjection. This function conveys a noticeable emotion behind the utterance. The particle *mao* in this context implies that the speaker is surprised upon knowing the information he/she received from the other participant in the conversation. In excerpt 22, speaker 1 said *ah mao ba!* which denotes an exclamation. The expression was also intensified or emphasized because of the occurrence of another particle *ah* prior to the utterance of *mao*. Sadock and Zwicky (1985, as cited in Tanangkingsing, 2009) purport that in an exclamation, the speaker stresses a strong emotional reaction to what he/she believes to be a fact. In a declarative, the speaker highlights his/her intellectual assessment that the motion is factual. Interjections do not just serve as expressions of emotion. The utterance has various functions: back channels, discourse markers, attention getters, placeholders,

transitions, and self-repair. Interjections can also indicate disapproval and index objects or social relations (Kockelman, 2003; Norrick, 2009).

Excerpt 22

Speaker 1: Ah mao ba?
(Oh, really?)

The second least used agreeing formulaic expression is *bitaw*, used 13 times or 4.89 percent in the overall data. The pragmatic particle *bitaw* is an expression of confirmation, affirmation, transition device, and discourse marker. When the speakers used *bitaw* as an expression of confirmation and affirmation, they reinforced or supported the other speakers' statement, asked for a guarantee of the truthfulness of their knowledge or belief, and upheld their own statement. Tanangkingsing (2009) states that *bitaw* is a clause-initial particle that functions as a discourse connector. In excerpt 23, speaker 2 confirmed the statement of the other speaker that there was a day that a guest never showed up, according to the executive producer of MBM. In excerpt 24, speaker 1 asks for affirmation from the other participants in the conversation if his/her knowledge is true about caroling. In excerpt 25, speaker 2 used mao to affirm his/her own statement in the conversation about the importance of living a healthy life. Further, *bitaw* in excerpt 25 is paired with another Cebuano particle *oy* to intensify the affirmation of the speaker.

Excerpt 23

Speaker 2: Guest *silá sa MOR unyá sa MBM wala. Bitaw naay isa ka adlaw nga wala nisipot ang* guest *ingon pa sa atong ah kuan atong ah* executive producer *sa MBM.*
(They were a guest in MOR and they never showed up in MBM. Yes, there was a day that they never showed up according to our ah (kuan) ah executive producer.)

Excerpt 24

Speaker 1: Caroling, *bitaw* partner *no?*
(Caroling. Yes, right partner?)

Excerpt 25

Speaker 2: *Bitaw oy sige* Mario Penduko *mag* healthy living *na me ha ayaw nag...* thou shall not talk *ana ba para amigo ta.*
(Yes, (oy) okay, Mario Penduko, we'll have a healthy living... do not talk anymore about that so that we'll stay friends.)

Another pragmatic function of the formulaic expression *bitaw* is a transition device and the equivalent of an English adverb anyway. When speakers use it as a transition device, they signal to the other participants in the conversation to shift or move to another topic. Tanangkingsing (2009) argues that it is similar to anyway that is connected to the previous statement or topic. This case is also the same with mao when speakers use it as a transition device when they prompt to shift to another topic in the conversation. In excerpt 26, speaker 2 signaled to other participants in the conversation to move to the next question.

Excerpt 26

Speaker 2: *Bitaw kapamilya* next question please!
(Yes, kapamilya, anyway, let's move to the next question please)

The local disc jockeys also used the formulaic expression *bitaw* as a discourse marker in the conversation. The speakers used it to accentuate their claims in the discussion, explain their stance about an issue, or give more details about the subject of their conversation. When used as a discourse marker, this

case is the same with *o* or *oo* and *mao*. In excerpt 27, speaker 1 agreed to the result of the tv contest they were talking about and explained further the reasonable outcome of the result since all of the contestants deserve to win because they worked hard, gave all their best, and sacrificed a lot.

Excerpt 27

Speaker 1: Congratulations Denise Laurel! Wohoo MoRight. *Bitaw mga kapamilya ahh tanan sila deserving nga madaug kay gibuhat nila ang ilang best nila. Nag-sacrifice sila kapamilya, hardwork ug already been paid off mga higala kay ahh nabuhat nila ilang performance nga* in a full potential.

The least used agreeing formulaic expression in the Cebuano language is *lagi*. The local disc jockeys only used it as an expression of affirmation. They used it to agree with the statement of the other speakers in the conversation. This case is the same as other agreeing formulaic expressions in Cebuano, which generally imply the affirmation of their statements. In excerpt 28, speaker 2 affirmed the statement of speaker 1 about the mysterious incident that happened backstage. The word *lagi* was even intensified by the word *grabe*.

Excerpt 28

Speaker 1: *Hala giunsa man diay to nako pagka-kuan ah ay damgo tingali. Unya na-interveiw nako sila unya nakaingon ko nga nindut inyung pagkakanta ha unya mao to pagka-kuan backstage giingnan nako nga...*

(What, how did that happen? Maybe it's just a dream. But when I interviewed them, I said to myself that they sang it beautifully. Then after that at the back stage, they told me that...)

Speaker 2: Partner *grabe lagi* partner.
(Yes, partner. It was unbelievable.)

Speaker 1: *Basin na-ungo ko.*
(Maybe it was done by a ghost.)

The agreeing formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language generally manifest positive implications in their utterances. They agree to the statements of the other participants or speakers in the conversation and affirm their own statements. Further, they used the expressions in various ways, making them function differently in various contexts. Sacks (1987, as cited in Nor, 2014) affirms that agreement is broadly perceived as an expression with various forms of positive position to the premise of the previous speaker's statement. The multifunctionality of agreeing formulaic expression is evidence of Tanangkingsing (2009) claim regarding the versatility of these expressions; thus, they are regarded as pragmatic particles that serve many purposes in a conversation and can be deciphered only through their contextual use.

On the other hand, the disagreeing formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language that occurred in the conversation are *dili* and *wala*. These expressions generally convey contradiction to the other participants or speakers' statements or indicate different perceptions, knowledge, or beliefs about the topic being discussed in the conversation. Thus, disagreeing formulaic expressions commonly imply a negative response to the hearer or receiver of the utterance. According to Tanangkingsing (2009), primarily, these are two ways to express disagreement in the Cebuano language using formulaic expressions. These are accompanied by other particles in Cebuano to mitigate the negative message or impoliteness in the utterance.

The most frequently used disagreeing formulaic expression is *dili*, which is used 75 times or 28.20 percent in the overall data. When the speakers use *dili* in conversation, it functions as an expression to relay contradiction and correction, challenge the truthfulness of a statement, dismiss wrong information, clarify

a situation, affirm a statement of disapproval, serve as a negation, imply exclusion, convey an appeal, avoid an event to happen, and express a dislike. In excerpt 29, speaker 3 contradicted the statement of Speaker 1 if he was referring to Mang Kanor, the sabongero or cockfighter. In excerpt 30, speaker 3 contradicted and corrected his/her partner in the radio program that the person they were referring to was not wearing a panty but rather a panty-short. It can also be observed that speaker 3 used *di*, a shortened version of *dili*. Therefore, deletion of sounds happens in the process of utterance. It is also intensified by another formulaic expression in Cebuano, which is *lagi*.

Excerpt 29

- Speaker 3: *Gi-ilisan partner kay negatibo man gud ng Kanor gud mao mana si Mang Kanor. Mang Kanor, kaila kang Mang kanor partner?*
(It was replaced because Kanor has a negative connotation. That is Mang Kanor. Do you know Mang Kanor, partner?)
- Speaker 1: *Si Mang kanor katong Mang Sabongero.*
(Mang Kanor the cockfighter.)
- Speaker 3: *Dili* partner.
(No, partner.)

Excerpt 30

- Speaker 3: *Di lagi partner naka-panty short dili naka-panty. Nakapanty short, short siya kapamilya na muraḡ panty.*
(No, partner, it's not. [She's] wearing a panty-short not a panty. It's panty-short. It's a short that looks like a panty, kapamilya.)

Another case of *dili* as an expression to contradict is when a speaker challenges the truthfulness of the statement of the other speaker in the conversation and disagrees with the reaction of people against someone, and dislikes something that he/she disapproves of. In excerpt 31, speaker 3 refuted the claims of the other speaker that the person in the video is Andrea. However, when he/she zoomed in on the face, she found out that it was a different celebrity. In excerpt 32, speaker 3 stated that he/she does not like a binignit that has a watery soup and is almost water-like. This case of *dili* is utilized as an expression to convey strong disapproval.

Excerpt 31

- Speaker 3: *Mao to gi-full nako partner ang dagway unya dili man to si kuan*
(That's why, partner, I zoomed in the face, it wasn't (kuan).)
- Speaker 1: *Nawala ko sa focus*
(I lost focus.)
- Speaker 3: *Dili man to si Andrea lahi man to na artista.*
(It wasn't Andrea. It's a different celebrity.)

Excerpt 32

- Speaker 3: *Kato dyung binignit partner na halos tubig nalang*
(That binignit, partner, that its soup is almost water.)
- Speaker 2: *Oo, halos mura lang siya ug lugaw partner butangan lang ug kanang kuan kamote, balanghoy ug saging.*
(Yes. It's almost like a porridge, partner. [They] just put [kanang kuan] it with sweet potato, cassava, and banana.)

- Speaker 3: *Ahh tinoud jud diy na binignit kapamilya kanang lapot dili ng sabaw.*
(Ahh it's true, kapamilya, that [kanang] sticky soup not the watery soup.)

The local disc jockeys also used the formulaic expression *dili* to clarify wrong information and refute a question. In excerpt 33, speaker 3 clarified that the dance performance of the subject of their conversation was not that daring. In excerpt 34, speaker 2 refuted the speaker's question about the restaurant they went to eat with Mads Melanie. It can also be observed the emphasis on the contradiction of speaker 2 through the reduplication of *dili*. Moreover, another case of *dili* to clarify or dismiss wrong information is through a question form. In excerpt 35, speaker 2 asked the other speaker if he/she was not referring to POEKwang. This type of question solicits a confirmation, but the one who asked the question is not certain if he/she is right.

Excerpt 33

- Speaker 3: *...Dali ra ang sayaw niya dili kaayo dili siya kuan kanang daring nga sayaw jud no pero.*
(The dance was easy and not that daring but...)

Excerpt 34

- Speaker 1: *Katong gikan-an ninyo ni kuan ni Mads Melanie?*
(The one you went in to eat with Mads Melanie?)
Speaker 2: *Dili dili*
(No, no.)

Excerpt 35

- Speaker 2: *Dili pud si POEKwang?*
(Isn't it POEKwang?)

Another function of formulaic expression *dili* is to affirm a statement of disapproval conveyed by the other speaker in the conversation. In excerpt 36, speaker 3 mentioned that there are versions of binignit, a Filipino food delicacy, not cooked properly. Speaker 1 agreed by saying those are not a real binignit. It was reinforced by Speaker 3 that they are not real binignit. The utterance of *dili* in this context conveyed affirmation to the claim made by one speaker. According to Krifka (2013) and Roelofsen and Farkas (2015) in Repp, Meijer, and Scherf (2019), claim that affirmations of negative assertions are best expressed by no, a negation in English and one of the equivalent particles of *dili*. Kramer and Rawlins (2011) in Repp, Meijer, and Scherf (2019) argue that the function of yes and no gets neutralized in replies to negative antecedents. The two particles necessarily have the same meaning in the context. Therefore, they are correspondingly sustainable both in affirming and rejecting responses.

Excerpt 36

- Speaker 3: *Naay partner nay mga ang binignit kani jung tininood na binignit*
(There is a binignit that is not cooked properly)
Speaker 1: *Naa diy dili tininood partner*
(Yes, partner. There is)
Speaker 3: *Naa partner nay dili tininood.*
(Yes, partner. There is.)

In some contexts, the formulaic expression *dili* is just a simple negation but does not necessarily

contradict any statement of the other speakers or participants. In excerpt 36, speaker 2 stated that every week when Denise was not announced as the winner, her son always cried. In the context, speaker 2 was stating information without making any claim or argument that implies a contradiction to the statements of the other speakers or participants in the conversation.

Excerpt 37

Speaker 2: *Matud pa ni Denise kapamilya nga everytime daw every week no mag-perform sila unya i-announce nga dili iyang mama ang top oo wala nadaug ana siya nga maghilak daw iyang anak kay wala daw siya nadaug*

(According to Denise, Kapamilya, every time, every week they performed and announced as not a winner or being on top, her son always cried because she didn't win.)

Another case of *dili* as negation is the positivity of the message that it implies. Some cases of *dili* in other contexts function as a negation but express a positive message. In excerpt 38, speaker 2 said that Denise Laurel showed a fighting spirit, a common trait among Filipinos that will not deplete no matter how many times she lost. Though *dili* is usually treated as a negative word, this context implies its multifunctionality by conveying a positive tone. Tian and Breheny (2016) assert that participants in conversation initially constitute their positive argument when processing a negative statement. Further, Kaup, Yaxley, et al. (2007) in Tian and Breheny (2016) propound that negation is comprised of a two-step simulation: (1) positive argument simulation; and (2) the first simulation is refused and changed by an argument that is consistent with the sentence meaning whenever possible. Lüdtke and Kaup (2006) in Tian and Breheny (2016) insist that if a negative statement is comprised of a direct positive context, the first simulation is quicker and deleted. Therefore, the processing of negation is significantly enabled by context.

Excerpt 38

Speaker 2: *...kani ganing fighting spirit ba sa pinoy nga dili mawala bisan paman pila ka beses siya.. pila ka semana gud siya napildi partner. Wala gyud nagexpect na siya ang..*

(That fighting spirit of a Filipino that will never deplete despite how many times... how many weeks she lost, part. [She] never expected that she will [win].)

The local disc jockeys also used the formulaic expression *dili* to express an appeal to stop doing something wrong. In excerpt 39, speaker 2 explained to the people that if they are not satisfied with the result in Your Face Sounds Familiar, maybe they should not bash Denise because she never forced the people to vote for her. It can be observed that *dili* is used in the phrase *dili pud siguro* to indicate the speaker's stance or opinion about the viewers' criticism. Pérez Carballo (2020) claims that in the expressivist perspective, "to accept a moral sentence is to accept a system of norms corresponding to that sentence. The system of norms corresponding to a sentence is incompatible with the system of norms corresponding to its negation. Nevertheless, it is inconsistent to accept incompatible systems of norms. So, it is inconsistent to accept a moral sentence and its negation." When a speaker expresses a strong disagreement, it conveys his/her stance or position about an issue.

Excerpt 39

Speaker 2: *Pero pud sa mga tao partner kung wala man sila na-satisfy sa maong resulta sa Your Face Sounds Familiar dili lang... dili pud siguro si Denise ang ilahang i-bash kay wala man gisugo ni Denise ang mga tao*

(But for the people, partner, if they're not satisfied to the result of Your Face Sounds Familiar, maybe they shouldn't... shouldn't bash Denise because she did not force

them to vote for her.)

Another function of formulaic expression *dili* in conversation is to express avoidance so that an event will not happen. In excerpt 40, speaker 2 stated that a group of listeners to their radio program are listening to them while breaking cacao fruits in order to fight dizziness. In this context, the expression *dili* conveys an action against something they are trying to avoid. Elliot (2006) in Marrero, Yagual, Gámez, et al. (2020) argues that people generally avoid a stimulus if they regard it as negative. They tend to push away a stimulus that is associated with any negativity. Therefore, approach and avoidance intentions comprise a semantic concept or classification encoded for action understanding (Peeters, 1995; Marrero, Urrutia, Beltrán, et al., 2017; Marrero, Yagual, Gámez, et al., 2020).

Excerpt 40

Speaker 2: *Ni-share lang sila bisan naa silay gipangbuhat partner still nakalansang ilang radyo sa... kay para pud partner dili pud sila bation ug duka kay sa kadugayan man gud sa sigeg lingkod dira sigeg buak sa cacao dukaon sila mao ng naminaw sila sa DXAB.*
(They just shared though they are busy. They spared time to listen to radio so that they won't feel dizziness while sitting and breaking cacao fruits. That's why they are listening to DXAB.)

The local disc jockeys also used the formulaic expression *wala* when they expressed disagreement in the conversation. It is used 56 times or 21.05 percent in the overall data. When speakers use *wala* in conversation, it functions to ask for clarification; it serves as negation, conveys contradiction, expresses confirmation, demonstrates a negative effect, and serves as an indefinite pronoun, no one. In excerpt 41, speaker 2 asks for clarification why he did not receive a Christmas gift from their station manager if all of them were given. The utterance of *wala* in this context manifests a negative implication of the message.

Excerpt 41

Speaker 2: Speaking of thank you for the love thank you *kaayo sa atoang* station manager *nga naghatag ug ah* Christmas gift *sa atua tanan. O diba!*
(Speaking of thank you for the love, thank you very much to our station manager who gave ah Christmas gift to all of us. Alright!)

Speaker 1: *Oy!* Thank you *kaa wala lage naabot sa akoo?*
((Oy!) Thank you very much. Why I didn't receive?)

Usually, the formulaic expression *wala* functions as negation in the utterance but conveys various usages depending on the context. In excerpt 42, speaker 1 mentioned *wala* to indicate the current situation of the typhoon that it did not move yet. In excerpt 43, speaker 1 conveyed an unfortunate or unfavorable event he/she was experiencing. In excerpt 44, speaker 1 used *wala* to emphasize that we cannot reach our dreams and aspirations in life without faith and action. In excerpt 45, speaker 1 described a crab he/she was referring to as the one without a mouth. However, in excerpt 46, *wala* implies a positive impression in the utterance. Speaker 1 mentioned *walay* lain thrice, which means no other than in English. This expression implies that the persons the speaker referred to are unique, distinguished, and different from the rest.

Excerpt 42

Speaker 1: *Naa pa siya sa lok... lokasyon kapamilya wala pa siya ka ka kuan kalihok.*
(It's still in the location, kapamilya, it still didn't move)

Excerpt 43

Speaker 1: *Ahh Nakit-an man gud nako ang ngalan ni Cariñosa, ni Yaya Ozawa pero wala gyuy akoa.*

(Ahh because I saw the name of Cariñosa, of Yaya Ozawa, but I never saw mine.)

Excerpt 44

Speaker 1: *Mao nay ginaingon kapamilya ang pangandoy kung walay ginatawag nga pangadyi ug paglihok kapamilya di gyud ninyo maangkon ug makab-ot mao ng hanggang pangarap ka nalang. Mga kapamilya pwede namo motext sa atong text line 0927-618-5880.*

(That's what we call, *kapamilya*, that our dreams, if we have no faith and action, we cannot reach our dreams and aspirations in life. It's will just stay as a dream. *Kapamilyas*, you can now text to our text line 0927-618-5880.)

Excerpt 45

Speaker 1: *Lahi pud nang kuan kasag lahi pud nang lambay? Ang katang daw kay kanang nga dili mamaak. Basig kagang na walay baba.*

(Is (kuan) swimming crab is different from blue crab? Maybe the crab that do not bite is the one that do not have a mouth.)

Excerpt 46

Speaker 1: *Malipayon o nasuko? Kauban mga higala ang inyong prinsipe uso walay laing parekoy El toro! Thank you so much partner sa imong presensya ug kauban sad nato ang walay lain mga kapamilya ang nainusarang the rose among the thorns walay lain kapamilya ang Holly Holmes Azotame-A.*

([Are you] happy or angry? Friends, we have with us our prince no other than El Toro. Thank you very much, partner, for your presence being with us. And, *kapamilya*, we also have... no other than the rose among the thorns... no other than, *kapamilya*, Holly Holmes, Azotame-A.)

Another function of formulaic expression *wala* is to contradict and counter the statement or opinion made by the other speaker in the conversation. In excerpt 47, speaker 2 contradicted the statement of Speaker 1 that the guess was not able to show up in the program. In excerpt 48, speaker 3 countered the interpretation of Mar Roxas that he does not understand the difference between crime volume, index crime, and non-index crime.

Excerpt 47

Speaker 1: *Nakasipot sila oy!*
(They showed up (oy!))

Speaker 2: *Wala partner ang mao to akong bet gane is Sasa ug Maa*
(No, partner. The ones who showed up are my favorite, from Sasa and Maa.)

Excerpt 48

Speaker 3: *Murag wala nasabtan pag-ayo ni Mar Roxas ang mahitungod aning crime volume ug index crime ug non-index crime.*
(Seems like Mar Roxas didn't understand very well between crime volume, index crime, and non-index crime.)

The local disc jockeys also used the formulaic expression *wala* to affirm a negative statement made by the other speaker or participant in the conversation. In excerpt 49, speaker 2 affirmed the negative statement of Speaker 1 about the untruthful statement of the subject of their conversation. In excerpt 50, speaker 3 affirmed the negative statement of Speaker 1 that it did not work. It can also be observed that Speaker 1 and speaker 3 used *wala*, a shortened version of *wala*. This case means that there was a deletion of sounds in the utterance. This case of *wala* is similar to *dili* when it functions as an affirmation to a statement of disapproval conveyed by the other speaker in the conversation.

Excerpt 49

- Speaker 1: It's a myth!
(It's a myth.)
- Speaker 2: *Oo* it's a myth *wala man siya kaingon*
(Yes, it's a myth. [She] never said [yes].)

Excerpt 50

- Speaker 1: *Wa na gamit!*
(It was useless.)
- Speaker 3: *Wa nagsilbi* partner.
(It didn't work, partner.)

Another pragmatic function of formulaic expression *wala* is conveying a negative effect resulting from an action. In excerpt 51, speaker 1 stated that it was already too late to stop the negative effect of the sexy photo posted by Andrea, who is minor, since it had already gone viral. According to several claims, negations and modalities are sentiment-relevant (Wiegand et al., 2010; Benamara, Chardon, Mathieu, et al., 2012). Kennedy and Inkpen (2006) in Benamara, Chardon, Mathieu, et al. (2012) emphasize that negations are more sentiment-relevant than diminishers.

Excerpt 51

- Speaker 3: *Bata pa kaayo. Unsa may dautan sa* two-piece partner?
([She's] very young. What's bad with wearing two-piece, partner?)
- Speaker 1: *Dautan partner siya kay syempre kay imoha ng ibutang sa... sa* social media.
(It was bad because of course if you post it in social media...)
- Speaker 2: *Daghan siya ug* followers.
(She has a lot of follow of followers.)
- Speaker 1: *I-share share na unya tan-awon mabastos man gud.*
(You share it and you will be disrespected.)
- Speaker 2: Plus, *ang mga bata karon* partner mosoun *kay Andrea hala gisout mani ni Andrea dapat naa pud koy ingon-ani.*
(Plus, children nowadays tend to imitate Andrea that they should be like her.)
- Speaker 1: *Mao jud! Pero wala na.* Bad influence
(Exactly! But it's too late. [It's] already a bad influence.)

The last pragmatic function of formulaic expression *wala* is to serve as an indefinite pronoun, no one or nobody. In excerpt 52, speaker 2 said that Golden State thinks no one can beat them since they are a very strong team and their win-loss record is 24-0. They are also the defending champion. In excerpt 53, speaker 1 expressed dismay because nobody laughed at his/her joke and that his/her partners in the program were not supportive. Kahrel (1996) in Miestamo (2007) explores how languages convey the negation of indefinite

pronouns about persons and things equivalents to English terms nobody and nothing. Miestamo (2007) claims that the interplay between negative indefinite pronouns and standard negation presents fascinating cross-linguistic differences regarding whether the latter co-exists with the indefinite and is intrinsically negative.

Excerpt 52

Speaker 2: *...Pero sayang lang pud ilahang record diba nga kuan na unta 24-0 daghan ang-expect nga muabot pa'g 25-0 kay siyempre feeling nila wala nay makapildi sa Golden State eh kay kuan gud sila kanang kanang unsa tawag gane ana Tor sila ang champion last year.* (But it was so sad their record is (kuan) already 24-0. Many (people) expected that they would reach 25-0 because of course they feel like no one can beat the Golden State (eh) because (kuan) they are (kanang kanang) what do you call that Tor? They are the champion last year.)

Excerpt 53

Speaker 1: *Grabe wala man lang mo mukatawa partner grabe katawa sad mo oy i-support sad ninyo akong kuan ba.* (Wow! Nobody laughed (at my joke), partner. Wow! You should suppose to laugh (oy). You support my (kuan) (joke).)

The disagreeing formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language primarily convey contradiction to the perceived wrong information given by the other speakers in a conversation, opposing views or counterarguments to the opinions stated in a conversation, and expressions to serve as negation. Disagreement also conveys the illocutionary force behind the utterance of the speakers. Thus, there is a tendency for speakers to mitigate the effect of their negative impression or impoliteness. Disagreement includes a range of speech acts “at the antipode of agreement” (Angouri & Locher, 2012; Hüttner, 2014) and unveils convergence with related concepts such as argumentation, argument talk, conflict talk, dispute, oppositional talk/exchange, verbal arguing (Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998; Georgakopoulou, 2001; Fujimoto, 2010; Sharma, 2012; Hüttner, 2014). The use of supplementary particles is also prominent in disagreements to mitigate the negative effect of the utterance or message. The particles are also considered as modal verbs (Locher, 2004; Kreutel, 2007), hedges (LoCastro, 1986; Locher, 2004; Kreutel, 2007), uncertainty markers (Pearson, 1986; Kreutel, 2007), reluctance markers (Kotthoff, 1993; Kreutel, 2007), disclaimers (Hayashi, 1996; Kreutel, 2007), prefaces (Kuo, 1994; Kreutel, 2007) or modality markers (García, 1989; Kreutel, 2007). Aijmer (1986, as cited in Tannen, 1993; Kreutel, 2007) explains that hedges liberate the speaker from the accountability for using negative statements and save him the trouble of groping for alternative words or phrases to soften the effect of negative statements. This analysis can also be explained by Brown and Levinson (1987, as cited in Torres, 2020). They claim that politeness is “a regressive action” that neutralizes the negative effect or face damage caused by the face-threatening acts implied in the utterance.

It is also important to highlight that there are more agreeing formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language than disagreeing formulaic expressions. The result also revealed that more agreeing expressions occurred in the conversation, which is used 135 times or 50.75 percent in the overall data, than disagreeing, which is used 131 times or 49.25 percent in the overall data. The claims can explain this finding that in friendly conversation, which is the most occurred form of communication situation, participants display unwillingness and resistance to conduct disagreement (Beebe & Takahashi, 1989; Kreutel, 2007), and presume that disagreeable actions will not be catered without logical reasoning (Jacobs & Jackson, 1981; Kreutel, 2007). This observation of a common response to agree (Kuo, 1994; Kreutel, 2007) is confirmed in

natural data, and agreement occurs way greater than disagreement (Pearson, 1986; Kreutel, 2007).

Based on the results of this study, there are pragmatic functions that are not found in the framework of Tanangkingsing (2009). Therefore, this study presents various pragmatic functions of agreeing and disagreeing formulaic expressions aside from those stipulated in his framework. This finding is due to the vast research data that this study gathered from the sources. Hence, this study generated new findings that increased the list of pragmatic functions that can be used as references for future studies concerning agreeing and disagreeing formulaic expressions in different conversation or communication contexts.

Conclusion

The pragmatic functions of agreeing formulaic expressions in Cebuano language are affirmation, confirmation, positive emotion, discourse marker, reference, demonstrative marker, interrogative expression, conjunction, interjection, and transition device. In contrast, the pragmatic functions of disagreeing formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language are contradiction, correction, expression to challenge the truthfulness of a statement, expression to dismiss wrong information, clarification, affirmation to a statement of disapproval, negation, expression of exclusion, appeal, expression to avoid an event to happen, expression of dislike, demonstration of a negative effect, and an indefinite pronoun. The local disc jockeys of DXAB Tambayan 1296 primarily used the agreeing expressions to convey agreement to the statements of the other participants in the conversation and affirm their statements. They used these expressions in various ways, making them function differently in various contexts. On the other hand, the local disc jockeys primarily used disagreeing formulaic expressions to convey contradiction to the perceived wrong information given by the other speakers in a conversation, opposing views or counterarguments to the opinions stated in a conversation, and expressions to serve as negation. Agreeing formulaic expressions are more frequently used in the conversation; therefore, speakers are most likely to agree with the statements made by the other participants in the conversation. Agreeing and disagreeing formulaic expressions in the Cebuano language have various functions depending on the context and purpose of the speakers. Hence, it is essential to understand their meanings according to their contextual use to communicate successfully. Since there are various pragmatic particles in the Cebuano language, further studies about pragmatic functions are valuable in the field of Cebuano linguistics in order to design a substantial pragmatic functions framework as a reference for scholarly purposes.

References

- Alwhan, S. H. (2019). An overall study of formulaic expressions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 8(3), 24-30. <http://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v8n.3p.24>
- Araneta, J. & Ingilan, S. (2019). Exploring the pragmatic functions of Cebuano kuan in conversations. *International Journal of Education Research for Higher Learning*, 25(2), 63-84.
- Benamara, F., Chardon, B., Mathieu, Y., Popescu, V., & Asher, N. (2012). How do negation and modality impact on opinions? In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Extra-Propositional Aspects of Meaning in Computational Linguistics*, 10-18.
- Bolinger, D. (1976). Meaning and memory. *Forum Linguisticum*, 1, 1-14.
- Bullock, B. E., & Toribio, A. J. E. (2009). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Carballo, A. (2020). Negation, expressivism, and intentionality. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 70(279), 246-267.
- Diessel, H. (2003). The relationship between demonstratives and interrogatives. *Studies in Language. International Journal sponsored by the Foundation "Foundations of Language"*, 27(3), 635-655.
- Fielder, G. E. (2008). Bulgarian adversative connectives: Conjunctions or discourse markers. *Crosslinguistic studies of clause combining*, 79-98.
- Fillmore, C. L. (1979). On fluency. In C. J. Fillmore, D. Kempler, and W.S. Wang (Ed.). *Individual differences in language ability and language behaviour*, 85-101. New York: Academic Press.
- Hickey, T. (1993). Identifying formulas in first language acquisition. *Journal of Child Language*, 20, 27-41.
- Huddleston, K. & Fairhurst, M. (2013). The pragmatic markers anyway, okay and shame: A South African English corpus study. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, 42, 93-110. <https://doi.org/10.5842/42-0-170>
- Hunyadi, L. (2019). Agreeing/disagreeing in a dialogue: multimodal patterns of its expression. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1373. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01373>
- Hüttner, J. (2014). Agreeing to disagree: 'doing disagreement' in assessed oral L2 interactions. *Classroom Discourse*, 5(2), 194-215.
- Jespersen, O. (1924). *The philosophy of grammar*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Kashiha, H. & Chan, S. H. (2015). A little bit about: Differences in native and non-native speakers' use of formulaic language. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 35(4), 297-310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2015.1067132>

- Kreutel, K. (2007). "I'm not agree with you." ESL learners' expressions of disagreement. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 11(3), n3.
- Ljungqvist, M. (2010). A relevance-theoretic analysis of the pragmatic marker *ba* in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 261-287.
- Marrero, H., Yagual, S. N., Gámez, E., Urrutia, M., Díaz, J. M., & Beltrán, D. (2020). Negation interacts with motivational direction in understanding action sentences. *Plos One*, 15(6).
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234304>
- Miestamo, M. (2007). Negation – an overview of typological research. *Language and linguistics compass*, 1(5), 552-570.
- Nor, S. N. M. (2014). Discourse strategies of expressions of opinions in radio talks. *International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research*, 77, 34.
<https://doi.org/10.7763/IPEDR.2014.V77.8>
- Norrick, N. R. (2009). Interjections as pragmatic markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(5), 866-891.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.08.005>
- Paltridge, B. (2006). Discourse analysis: An introduction. *Continuum*.
- Pérez-Carballo, A. (2020). Negation, expressivism, and intentionality. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 70(279), 246-267.
- Pérez-Llantada, C. (2014). Formulaic language in L1 and L2 expert academic writing: Convergent and divergent usage. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 14, 84-94.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2014.01.002>
- Rammell, C. S., Sidtis, D. V. L., & Pisoni, D. B. (2017). Perception of formulaic and novel expressions under acoustic degradation. *The Mental Lexicon*, 12(2), 234-262.
- Repp, S., Meijer, A. M., & Scherf, N. (2019). Responding to negative assertions in Germanic: On yes and no in English, Dutch and Swedish. *In Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, 23(2), 267-286.
- Rubino, C. (2005). Reduplication: Form, function and distribution. *Studies on Reduplication*, 28, 11-29.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *In Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 7-55). Academic Press.
- Taguchi, N., Li, S., & Xiao, F. (2013). Production of formulaic expressions in L2 Chinese: A developmental investigation in a study abroad context. *Chinese as a Second Language Research*, 2(1), 23-58.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/caslar-2013-0021>
- Tanangkingsing, M. (2009). *A functional reference grammar of Cebuano* [Dissertation, National Taipei University of Technology, Taiwan].

- Tanangkingsing, M. (2022). Pragmatic functions of versatile unsa 'what' in Cebuano: From interrogative pronoun to placeholder to stance marker. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 193, 59-75.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.03.008>
- Tian, Y. & Breheny, R. (2016). Dynamic pragmatic view of negation processing. In *Negation and polarity: Experimental perspectives*. Springer, Cham.
- Torres, J. (2020). Politeness Strategies vis-à-vis genders and exposures to western culture: The case of 'The Voice of the Philippines' coaches. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 1(3), 100-117. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v1i3.1>
- Van der Wal, J. (2013). (Inter) subjectification in Makhuwa: From demonstrative to pragmatic particle. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 14(1), 1-44. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.14.1.01van>
- van Dijk, T. (1977). *The semantics and pragmatics of functional coherence in discourse*. University of Amsterdam.
- Van Lancker-Sidtis, D., & Rallon, G. (2004). Tracking the incidence of formulaic expressions in everyday speech: Methods for classification and verification. *Language & Communication*, 24(3), 207-240.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2004.02.003>
- Weinert, R. (1995). The role of formulaic language in second language acquisition: A review. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 180-205.
- Wouk, F. (2001). Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: The discourse marker ya. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(2), 171-191.