

Examining the Usage of “actually” and “in fact” in Philippine English through a Corpus-based Analysis

Miren Montoya Morales
De La Salle University, Manila
University of the Philippines, Manila

Abstract

The objective of this study is to give further evidence regarding the meaning and function of *actually* and *in fact* by identifying their usage in Philippine English to extend the deployment of signifying in bilingual/multilingual contexts. The data analyzed in this study are taken from ICE-PHI corpus. This study is helpful for Philippine-ESL teachers and learners in understanding how linguistic markers, such as *actually* and *in fact*, are applied in their own English variety when processing different types of discourses in view of effective communication. All occurrences of *actually* and *in fact* were identified and counted using Wordsmith Tools 5.0. These tokens were further classified according to their position within an utterance. One hundred tokens each of *actually* and *in fact* were randomly selected and analyzed, taking into account the full context in which each token appears, in order to find out consistent patterns concerning the distribution and/or usage of *actually* and *in fact* in discourse. The findings were compared to the American corpora (AmC) analyzed by Oh (2000). The results show that there are both parallelisms and variations between ICE-PHI and AmC.

Keywords: Outer-circle English variety, utterance position, discourse marker, usage, genre

Introduction

According to Schneider (2005), in his study of Philippine English (Phile), “inherent variability is a crucial property of natural language” (p.27), and this has been acknowledged from the sociolinguistic research of Labov. This phenomenon applies to nativized varieties of English where they tend, inevitably, to develop unique and creative linguistic forms distinct from the model of L1

speakers. This process of “structural nativization” may result in an endonormative orientation, that is, the acceptance of the way English is used locally to be the correct usage. Schneider proposed in his study of PhilE that one fundamental aspect of developing indigenous norms is “frequency-based habit formation” (p. 28) since previous researches have attested that “[i]n general, frequency of use has been found to be a decisive factor in shaping language structures” (p.28). An area of research that successfully obtained evidence for determining linguistic forms and patterns in a given region is the study of corpora in applied linguistics (Hunston, 2002; De Beaugrande, 1999; Biber, 1996; Aijmer & Altenberg, 1991;). Corpus Linguistic studies have helped in our understanding of new linguistic patterns in discourse that have become distinct features of particular varieties of English.

Like other Southeast Asean varieties, PhilE is characterized by its own distinct linguistic features (Bautista & Bolton, 2009) as one among several Outer Circle varieties. Halliday (2004) accounts for this inherent variability by foregrounding the role of socialization in language development, which influences an individual’s speech behavior (including writing skills), which, in turn, comes from one’s cultural orientation. Thus, the context of situation determines the actual choices made by the user of the language within a range of possibilities from which systematizable patterns of social behaviour are derived.

It is within this perspective that this paper investigates the varied usage applications of the linguistic items *in fact* and *actually* taken from ICE-PHI, a corpus that consists of a “wide range of linguistic phenomena” (Schneider, 2005, p.29). To be consistent with a descriptive research method, this paper bases its analysis of meaning and function of *actually* and *in fact* on corpus-based studies.

In Inner Circle usages, the linguistic items *in fact* and *actually* are generally held to be “interchangeable”; in addition, they are “frequently found in everyday language use,” and both linguistic items are considered multifunctional (Oh, 2000, p.243). These considerations, together with the desire to understand their more subtle usage differences have led to the comprehensive study on the role of *in fact* and *actually* in varied spoken and written contexts in Inner Circle English varieties (Lewis, 2005; Taglicht, 2001; Clift 2001;

Oh, 2000; Biber & Finegan, 1988; Aijmer, 1986). These previous linguistic studies show that there are disagreements as to their meaning and function.

According to previous analyses, *in fact* and *actually* adopt particular syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic roles depending on how they are embedded within an utterance or discourse. A significant factor that establishes these varied linguistic roles, in turn, is derived from how they are positioned within a clause. *In fact* and *actually* are regarded as conjunctions in their semantic roles as clarifiers (Halliday & Hasan, 1985; Martin, 1992). They are also viewed as evidentials, having pragmatic functions when they serve as expressing the mood, attitude, and judgements of speakers/writers (Aijmer, 1986; Chafe, 1986; and Biber & Finegan, 1988). In addition, they may be designated as discourse markers expressing discrete polyfunctional contributions to discourse meaning (Lewis, 2005; Lenk, 1998; Tognini-Bonelli, 1993; Fraser, 1988; and Watts, 1988). Oh (2000) summarized these various labels given to *actually* and *in fact* "as contrastive conjunctions, elaborative conjunctions, discourse or pragmatic markers, or even stance/evidential markers" (p.245). She claimed that "some of these treatments are compatible with each other, but others are not (e.g. 'contrast' versus 'elaboration' as the basic meaning of *actually* and *in fact*)" (p.245). Oh (2000) concluded from the findings of her study that *actually* and *in fact* do share a common core meaning of 'unexpectedness' such that "the difference between the two lies in the typical association of each with one or the other way of signaling 'unexpectedness' (p. 243). Oh further clarifies that her study "also shows that in real discourse contexts, *actually* and *in fact* develop a number of different uses that are more or less remote from this core meaning" (p. 243). These multiple designations reveal the curious and complex nature of these linguistic items.

The objective of this study is to give further evidence regarding the meaning and function of *actually* and *in fact* by identifying their usage in an Outer Circle application to extend the deployment of signifying in bilingual/multilingual contexts. It is helpful to both English teachers and learners from ESL/EFL environments to find out how linguistic markers, such as *actually* and *in fact*, are applied in their own English variety when processing different types of discourses in view of a more context-sensitive communication within

a multilingual consciousness. This study fills the gap in descriptive research in Phile on managing spoken and written discourses through specific discourse markers by analyzing the usage features of *in fact* and *actually* in ICE-PHI. It aims to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there any difference in the distribution and/or use of *actually* and *in fact* in spoken and written Philippine English?
2. Do *actually* and *in fact* show different patterns of distribution and/or use depending on their position within an utterance (e.g. utterance-initial, medial, or final position)?
3. Which meanings do *actually* and *in fact* have in common?

Method

The data to be analyzed in this study came from the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English (ICE-PHI), compiled by Bautista, Lising and Dayag (1999). The ICE-PHI corpus follows the common design of other ICE corpora, wherein each component corpus contains 500 texts of approximately 2,000 words each. Based on evidence, a reliable source for identifying normative linguistic behavior is the regular usage of educated speakers and writers (Schneider, 2005; Bautista & Bolton, 2009); hence, the spoken and written text samples were taken from adults aged 18 and above and who received formal education through the medium of English up to the postsecondary level. The corpus is divided into two main categories: the spoken and written data. The spoken texts comprise of private and public dialogues and unscripted and scripted monologues. The written texts, on the other hand, included student writing, correspondence, academic writing, popular writing, reportage, administrative writing, press editorials, and literary writing. ICE-PHI does not claim representativeness in terms of proportion of gender, age, and profession in relation to the population as a whole.

The corpus size and frequency of occurrences of *actually* and *in fact* within the corpus were derived using Wordsmith Tools 5.0. The

number of running words in text of the ICE-PHI corpus total to 1,145,029. The present study replicated Oh's (2000) procedure in analyzing *actually* and *in fact*. First, all occurrences of *actually* and *in fact* were identified and counted. There are 673¹ tokens of *actually* and 239 tokens of *in fact*. These tokens were further classified according to their position within an utterance with the exception² of the spoken frequency of *actually*. Since the amount is very large, to make the distribution manageable, only 100 texts representative proportion from the actual 300 spoken texts of *actually* were computed; hence the total 572 spoken tokens of *actually* (refer to Table 6 and Table 7) were reduced to 130 tokens.

The positions within an utterance are the following: initial position refers to either utterance-initial, clause-initial, and it may be preceded by discourse particles, gap-filler words, verbalized pauses (Sioson, 2011, pp. 52-53). Examples of such words are *well, um, yes, or no*; even subordinating/coordinating conjunctions such as *and, but, wh-words* are included as in "...he did not want to be embarrassed, when *actually* it was his fault..." <ICE-PHI:W1A-003#17:1> . Likewise, final position refers to utterance final/clause final. Medial is a heterogeneous position with preverbal, post-copula and postauxiliary being the major subcategories. The distribution of *actually* and *in fact* in three positions was analyzed in both spoken and written corpora in order to make comparative analyses.

Finally, 100 tokens each of *actually* and *in fact*³ from the ICE-PHI corpus were randomly selected and detailed analyses were conducted, taking into account the full context in which each token appears, in order to find out consistent patterns concerning the distribution and/or usage of *actually* and *in fact* in discourse. The focus of the usage of *actually* and *in fact* were based on earlier works with evidence and/or explanations from authentic utterances (e.g. Biber & Finegan, 1988; Oh, 2000; Traugott, 1995) and those analyses which used contrived/invented examples were ignored (e.g. Taglicht, 2001).

Present usage of *actually*

Biber and Finegan (1988) consider *actually* and *in fact* as stance adverbials. Stance adverbials are defined by Biber and Finegan (1988)

as adverbial expressions that indicate “some aspect of speakers’ (or writers’) attitudes towards their messages, as a frame of reference for the messages, an attitude toward or judgment of their contents, or an indication of the degree of commitment towards their truthfulness” (p. 2) and that the “discourse functions of stance adverbials are often at variance with their literal meanings” (p.17). For instance, in British spoken and written corpora, *actually* indicates solidarity/shared familiarity/emphasis, rather than actuality (Biber & Finegan, 1988, p. 30).

Table 1
Frequencies of Stance Adverbs

	Conversation (AmE & BrE)	Fiction	News (AmE & BrE)	Academic
<i>actually</i>	700	100	100	100
<i>in fact</i>	100	100	100	100

The study concluded that “The frequent occurrence of *actually* adverbials in spontaneous, highly interactive speech suggests their importance to the maintenance of a convincing or engaging dialogue in situations with little motivation and opportunity for careful argumentation” (Biber & Finegan, 1988, p. 18). In a later study by Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan (2000) which used American and British corpora, *actually* and *in fact* were classified as stance adverbials that express epistemic-actuality, that is, they comment on the propositional information of the utterance. The results in that study (Biber, et al., 2000) are shown in Table 1 above where frequency of occurrences is per one million words. Table 1 above shows that, in conversation, *actually* is significantly more frequent than *in fact*. Simon-Vandenberg and Willems (2011) inferred from the results in Biber et al. (2000) that “*actually* is useful in face-to-face negotiation of meanings” (pp. 333-364).

Oh’s study (2000), on the other hand was the first serious attempt to discover potential differences in the distribution/use of *actually* and *in fact*. Table 2 below is a summary version of the results of the distribution of *actually* in terms of their position within a clause.

Table 2

Relative Frequency of the Positions of "actually"

<i>actually</i>	American Corpora	
Position	Brown (written texts) 1,014,312 words	Switchboard (spoken texts) 2,400,355 words
Initial	26%	34%
Medial	74%	58%
Final	0%	8%

Oh's study (2000) refuted Aijmer's earlier claim (1986, p. 129) that *actually* has "a different function and a different stylistic profile" according to its position by asserting that "there is no one-to-one correspondence between position and function. Rather, there exists a restriction such that the propositional use of *actually* can only occur in medial position. Otherwise, the functions of *actually* and *in fact* do not depend much on their position" (p.266). In fact, this restriction is evident in Table 2 above, which is derived from Oh (2000, p.249). Table 2 shows that *actually* occurs much more frequently in medial position in both written and spoken American corpora but very minimally used in final position in spoken texts and no occurrence in written texts. Possibly, the 8% occurrence in spoken texts may be attributed to its use in highly informal contexts. This attribution may be verified by analyzing the register in which *actually* occurred.

In written discourse, Table 2 further shows that *actually* "in initial position occurred in 43 examples (26%)" (p. 250) which is a fairly regular use. Oh (2000) stated that *actually* when positioned initially in written discourse functions primarily "to contradict an expectation" (p. 250). In medial position *actually* has a dual function, that is, one with a local scope, the other with a global scope. The latter is the type of function that is equivalent to the initial position which refers to the function of "contradicting prior expectations" (p. 252). The function in a local scope is also common: "It locally intensifies the meaning of the clause in which it occurs, and, in most of the cases, can be replaced with *really*" (p. 253). Oh (2000) noted a subcategory in medial position which she referred to as parenthetical insertions. She emphasized that under this category both *actually* and *in fact* have a similar function to paraphrase and/or elaborate previous

propositions, at times by providing more detailed information for precision. According to Oh, “[t]hese insertions are usually unexpected from the point of view of the recipient” (p. 254). She states that few parenthetical cases of *in fact* “provides more accurate information by marking the ‘enlargement’ of scope, for example, from ‘the rest of the country’ to ‘the world’ in example (18), and from ‘all the atoms outside’ to ‘the atoms of the entire universe’ in example (19) below. The result is an increase in the strength of a prior assertion, which is the typical use of *in fact* in all (but final) positions.

(18) . . . displays what outlanders call the New York mind, a state that the subject is necessarily unable to perceive in himself. The New York mind is two parts abstraction and one part misinformation about the rest of the country and *in fact* the world. In his fulminating against the literary world, Krim is really struggling with the New Yorker in himself, but it's a losing battle . . . (B-G74)

(19) . . . Harmony, melody, counterpoint, symphonic structure are there; and as this music ebbs and flows, there is an antiphonal chorus from all the atoms outside, *in fact* from the atoms of the entire universe. And so today when we examine the structure of our knowledge of the atom and of the universe, we are forced to conclude that . . . (B-D13)

In fact occurs only rarely in final position (2%) (refer to Table 5), and *actually* does not occur there at all. This position is thus not a typical position in written discourse” (p. 254).

In spoken discourse, *actually* develops a special function in Oh (2000): “it signals that the speaker is engaged in a particular speech act, especially of a face-threatening type, such as contradicting, correcting, or disagreeing with the previous speaker” (p.254). For Oh (2000), expressing disagreement tend to be more frequent in speaking than in writing; thus, using *actually* for this purpose may explain why the occurrence of *actually* in spoken discourse is significantly more frequent than in written discourse as well as why the occurrence of *actually* is also much more frequent than *in fact* in spoken discourse. In addition, *actually* can serve the function of introducing a new topic, or of shifting the focus or perspective on the current topic (Tognini-Bonelli, 1993: 205; Lenk, 1998: 174 - 82) (p.257). Finally, Oh gave an additional function that both *actually* and *in fact* can serve in spoken discourse exclusively, and this refers to the speaker’s intention “to drop the previous verbal attempt in favor of a new utterance,” (p.259)

which appears more relevant to the speaker in light of one's communicative purposes. Oh (2000) calls this speech act "re-start" function (p.259).

When it comes to the medial position, the use of *actually* coincides with the written counterpart where *actually* has the dual functions of a local and global scope as mentioned earlier. With the local scope, *actually* functions as a clause-emphasizer which has a reinforcing effect on the truth value of the clause, and can be rephrased with *really* (p. 260). In the spoken data, whether *actually* occurs in initial or medial position, it can be used to preface disagreement. In summary, *actually* has two possible uses in medial position: (1) as clause-emphasizer having a reinforcing effect on the truth value of (part of) the clause to which it applies; and (2) as a cohesive device.

In Dita's research (2011), *actually* and *in fact* were analyzed as disjunctive adverbs in ICE-PHI. She stated that "it was expected that *actually* emerged as the most popular disjunct in PhilE" (pp. 3-4).

Table 3

Frequency of "actually" as a Disjunctive Adverb in PhilE (Dita, 2011, p. 35)

Single-word disjuncts	Spoken	Written	Total
<i>Actually</i>	467	26	493

Dita (2011) pointed out that "[i]t is also worth mentioning that although the corpus yielded 672 instances of *actually*, only 493 function as disjuncts, the rest serve as subjuncts. She illustrated the difference between the two through these samples from ICE-PHI:

(7) *Actually*, it is more accurate to say that both have a common ancestor, probably some type of rodent! <W2B-003#24>

(8) Rizal outwardly scoffed and *actually* laughed at his own dreams, but in his diaries and letters to close friends he related the dreams which frightened him. <W2B-013#68>

In (7), *actually* functions as a disjunct as it gives a personal evaluation of the proposition in the preceding clause. On the other hand, *actually* in (8) functions as an intensifier, specifically an emphaser (see Quirk et al. (1985, pp. 583-9) for a detailed discussion

of emphasizers) as it provides an evaluation of the verb *laughed*, and not of the whole clause (pp.3-4).

Dita, also noted that the corpus showed “the fact that only *actually* (of all the *-ly* disjuncts) is used in code-switches. Apparently, this item can freely co-occur with Tagalog lexicon but not any other disjunct. Consider the following examples:

(72) *Actually* kasya nga ang eyeglass e <S1A-004#244>

(73) *Actually* sa T V mukhang hindi ganun kalaki 'no pero pag katabi ninyo silang nag-aantay

kayo ng bus diyang sa labas mukha kaming mga dwende kahit sa women's side ano <S2A-019#53>

(74) *Actually* pareho tayo 'no swack tayo dun nagagalingan tayo sa mga setters ditto <S2A019#213>

(75) Yeah *actually* kasi Jullie ang orientation natin nagsimula tayo sa opposition na 'yon <S1B-030#94>” (p.12)

Lewis (2005) analyzed *actually* and *in fact* as discourse markers (DMs) within a pragmatic framework, specifically, she used the rhetorical structure theory (RST) (Mann & Thompson 1987) as a framework. Her study focused on rhetorical relations. Lewis (2005) explained that any relation is founded upon “some common ground or congruence between two ideas” for it to stand (p. 7) and so in considering rhetorical relations, “this level is the status -- the validity, accuracy or strength -- of the related arguments. Rhetorical relations are essentially persuasive and include sequences” (p. 7). The constituents of rhetorical relations consist of two arguments: “a claim followed by a narrower claim in the same field” (p.6). The sequence of the arguments may appear as: “claim + elaboration, claim + justification and claim + retreat” (p.7). The function of the DMs is to identify the relationship between these two related arguments to establish coherence within a semantic space. In the case of the discourse marker (DM) *actually*, the relation is called “epistemic-retreat” or “reformulation” (p. 6). On the other hand, *in fact* falls under “elaboration”. The difference between the functions of the two DMs has to do with how they “describe either a similarity or dissimilarity between the arguments, i.e. to be either consonant or dissonant” (pp.8-9). The function of “retreat” is a dissonant relation which “point to some incompatibility between ideas (p.9). On the other hand, “elaboration” is considered a consonant relation, thus,

“reinforce the status of the related segment based on the presupposition of consonance, or close compatibility of ideas” (pp.8-9). Lewis used corpus-based samples to explain her evaluation of these DMs.

Example 1 (*in fact*)

Example (1) shows a claim that something was successful, followed by a measure of its success.

(1) The Joint Research Equipment Initiative (JREI) ... has proved to be an outstanding success. | *In fact*, the JREI has been so successful that [...] it is to be an annual event (ELABORATION)
(Speech by John Battle, British Minister for Science, Energy and Industry, 17 March 1998)

The discourse marker *in fact* indicates that what follows is an elaboration of the previous idea. (Lewis, 2005, p.4)

In Lewis (2005), the first argument is called “claim” and the second argument “retreat”. For Lewis, the second argument does provide evidence, but the discourse markers indicate that the evidence is not conclusive.

Example 2 (*actually*)

You may never have heard of the "postmodernist" challenge to history; [...] | but you will surely delight in this exhibition of a superb professional historian seeing it off. | *Actually*, it is slightly unfair to say that Professor Evans "sees off" postmodernism, .. (*Electronic Telegraph*, 27 September 1997)
(Lewis, 2005, p.6)

Present Usage of *in fact*

Traugott (1995) made a diachronic analysis of *in fact* and concluded that its clausal role is found to be “as an adjunct and is primarily elaborative in function, at the beginning of the nineteenth century” (p. 10). These examples below used by Traugott were extracted from written data.⁴

Example 1

“I should not have used the expression. In fact, it does not concern you--- it concerns only myself. (1815 Austen, *Emma*, Vol. 3, Chap. 10, p. 393)” (p.10)

Example 2

"[Of Request-Response pairs] Between the request and the response a special type of cohesive relation (Schiffrin 87) exists, similar to that which binds question-answer pairs. In fact, we claim that at the level of discourse interpretation, the request and response form a discontinuous predicate argument structure. (1989 Ball, Analyzing discourses, p. 268)" (p.10)

Continuing with Traugott's study (1995), contemporary usage examples of *in fact* show that it has two distinct applications:

- (1) *in fact* was used to assert "the truth of what follows, despite contrary expectations" (p.7)

Example 3

"In terms of discourse structure, we might expect there to be radical differences between messages and dialogue, but in fact there are interesting similarities. (1989 Ball et al., Answers and Questions, p. 60) (p.7)

- (2) *in fact* was used to confirm "a preceding formulation (i.e. is anaphoric) and promises to elaborate (i.e. is cataphoric); more particularly, it introduces an explanation of not ... the oldest in the preceding clause: (p.7)

Example 4

"Polling isn't The World's Oldest Profession, although around election time it might seem like it. In fact, once upon a time, way back in the first third of this benighted century, modern polling wasn't yet even a gleam in the eye of a small-town Iowa kid named George Gallup. (Oct. 8 1990, United Press International)" (p.7)

Lewis (2005) is consistent with Traugott's analysis of *in fact* as demonstrated by the utterance she cited in the previous section where *in fact* plays a consonant relation with a function of elaboration. Dita (2011), on the other hand, pointed out the disjunctive function of the phrasal form *in fact*. She noted that there is a relatively high frequency of occurrence as shown in the table below:

Table 4

Frequency of Phrasal Disjunct "in fact" in PhilE (Dita, 2011, p. 37)

Phrasal disjuncts	Spoken	Written	Total
<i>In fact</i>	169	70	239

Dita concluded that *in fact* is one of the two most popular prepositional disjuncts in ICE-PHI. Dita added that according to her observation, this popular disjunctive usage “still maintain that status until the present day” (p. 37). The following examples illustrate how phrasal disjuncts are used in PhilE.

Example 5

And then James says I don't care anymore I don't care who knows *in fact* I want the whole world to know <S1A-015#27> (Dita, 2011, p. 37)

Lastly, Dita claims that the phrasal disjunct *in fact* also expresses actuality of reality:

(56) Well I was *in fact* the life of the party <S1A-088#51>

As mentioned previously, Oh (2000) concluded that in written discourse “*actually* has a contrastive meaning, as pointed out by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 253), denying a proposition that is asserted or implied previously” (p. 251). However, the phrasal form “*in fact* is characteristically used to signal an increase in the strength of an assertion that has been made in the previous utterance. As a result, it functions to reinforce, and not contradict, expectation” (p.251). According to Oh (2000), this particular type of use has been verified by Martin (1992, p. 208) who described this reinforcing function “as marking internal similarity between clauses” (p. 251).

Table 5

Relative Frequency of the Positions “in fact” (Oh, 2000, p. 249)

<i>in fact</i>	American Corpora	
	Brown (written texts)	Switchboard (spoken texts)
Initial	43%	86%
Medial	55%	6%
Final	2%	8%

This reinforcing function applies to the use of *in fact* in both initial and medial position. It was also noted earlier that like the classifications of Traugott and Lewis on the elaborative function of *in fact*, Oh (2000) also verified this elaborative function, labeled as parenthetical insertion which applies only in medial position for both

in fact as well as *actually*. As stated earlier, the uses of *in fact* in the final position are for exceptional cases only (2%).

In spoken discourse, “[i]nterestingly, the function of *in fact* in initial position remains very similar in written and spoken discourse” (Oh, 2000, p.257). However, in medial position, the use of *in fact* is rare (6%); although the function is still very similar with the initial position. Lastly, for Oh (2000), *in fact* also functions as a cohesive device to “indicate the relationship between the following utterance and the preceding context” (p. 254).

Results and Discussion

Overall Distribution of *actually* and *in fact* in PhilE

Table 6

Frequency of “*actually*” and “*in fact*” in Spoken versus Written Data

Verbal Mode	Spoken		Written		
Data	ICE-PHI Philippine English	Switchboard Corpus American English (Oh, 2000, p.247)	ICE-PHI Philippine English	Brown Corpus American English (Oh, 2000, p. 247)	Total ICE- PHI
Total number of words	683,910 words (300 texts)	2,400,355 words	461,119 words (200 texts)	1,014,312 words	
<i>Actually</i>	572 *(0.08%)	1,293(0.054%)	101 (0.02 %)	166 (0.016)	673
<i>in fact</i>	167 (0.024%)	345 (0.14%)	69 (0.015%)	151 (0.015)	236

*lexical density (= the percentage of the token in one hundred words)

The total number of tokens of *actually* and *in fact* in the two corpora is shown in Table 6, with the corresponding lexical densities given in parentheses. As can be seen in Table 6, *actually* is 4 times more frequent in spoken than in written PhilE (0.08% versus 0.02%). Although there is a difference in the frequency of *in fact* in spoken and written discourse (0.024% versus 0.015%), nevertheless it is not a staggering one. In both cases, *actually* and *in fact* are more used in spoken discourse but *actually* is still more associated with spoken discourse.

Generally, these results are consistent with those of the Inner Circle Englishes (Brown Corpus, Switchboard Corpus, and London-Lund Corpus). Specifically, the lexical densities are consistent with American corpora with ICE-PHI yielding a slightly higher density except in the use of *in fact* which has an identical score (0.015%). In the written data *actually* have a particularly close density (0.02% in

PhilE versus 0.16% in AmE); while in the spoken data, both *actually* and *in fact* have a higher density but almost equal in proportion of relative frequency between the two linguistic items: *actually* (0.08% in PhilE versus 0.054% in AmE); *in fact* (0.024% in PhilE versus 0.014% in AmE). These results show that in writing, PhilE and AmE have similar lexical density of *actually* and *in fact* but in speaking, both lexical items are more frequent in PhilE.

Distribution Across Positions

The results of the analysis of the distribution of *actually* and *in fact* across positions within the utterance are summarized in Table 7 below. The results in Table 7 are compared with the American data in Table 2 (*actually*) and Table 5 (*in fact*).

Actually and *in fact* are distinguishable in terms of the position that each favors in written versus spoken discourse. *Actually* favors medial position, whether it occurs in written (81.2%) or spoken discourse (50.8%), although the tendency is stronger in the written variety. This result is consistent with the American corpora (Oh, 2000) which yielded these figures: (74%) written discourse/(58%) spoken discourse. Distinctly, *in fact* shows a very strong preference for the initial position in both spoken (77%) and written (72.4%) discourse. Clearly, both relative frequencies have a very close result with the spoken discourse slightly higher than the written discourse. These tendencies are in contrast to the American written discourse (Brown Corpus) analyzed by Oh (2000) where “the preference [of *in fact*] is for medial position (55%), rather than initial position (43%)” (p.250). However, regarding spoken discourse, the American data (Switchboard Corpus) shows a parallel relative frequency with ICE-PHI wherein the “initial is the position where it occurs most frequently (86%)” (Oh, 2000, p.250).

There is also a notable difference with the medial and final position between Philippine spoken discourse (PhilSD) and American spoken discourse (AmSD). With the use of *in fact*, PhilSD shows a 17% tendency which is significantly higher than AmSD of “6%” (Oh, 2000, p. 250). Conversely, the final position of *in fact* in PhilSD yielded a very rare 4% tendency while in the AmSD, the medial has the

lowest tendency (6%) although this occurrence is close to that of the final position (8%) in AmSD.

Table 7
Distributions Across Positions in ICE-PHI

Position	Spoken Texts (300 texts)		Written Texts (200 texts)	
	<i>actually</i> *	<i>in fact</i>	<i>actually</i>	<i>in fact</i>
Initial				
Utterance-initial	24	76	14	41
Word + ^ + Utterance initial/Clause-initial	14	33	3	5
Clause-initial	6	20	2	4
Re-start	5	0	0	0
Rectify	4	1	0	0
Repeat	1	0	0	0
<i>Sub-total</i>	54(41.5%)	130 (77%)	19 (18.8)	50(72.4%)
Medial				
(S) + (Aux) + ^ + V [post-Aux/midVP]	22	4	21	4
(S) + Copula + ^ + C [post-LV]	17	15	27	5
(S) + ^ + Copula/Aux [pre-LV/pre-Aux]	4	1	2	3
(S) + ^ + V + C [preverbal (without aux)]	10	2	27	2
(S) + VP + ^ + C [postverbal]	7	0	1	0
Others	6	7	4	3
<i>Sub-total</i>	66 (50.8%)	29 (17%)	82 (81.2%)	17(24.6%)
Final				
Utterance-final	0	0	0	0
Clause-final	4	5	0	0
<i>Sub-total</i>	2	2	0	2
	6 (4.6%)	7(4%)	0 (0%)	2(3%)
Exceptions				
full response to mean yes/no <i>or</i> ^ +yes/ no	4 (3.0%)	1 (0.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Excluded from the data				
The same news item stated twice in text ⁵ (S2B-015)	0	1	0	0
In + fact (2 words – not a phrasal marker)	0	1	0	1
Total number of tokens (concord result)	130	169	101	70
Actual Total (data analysis)	130 (100%)	167(100%)	101 (100%)	69 (100%)

(^ = token; S = Subject; Aux = Modal auxiliaries (can, may, will, etc.), aspectual auxiliary verbs (be, have) or emphatic verb (do); V = main verb; C = complement (including verbal phrases, and what traditional grammar refers to as objects))

*Only 100 texts representative proportion from the actual 300 texts were computed; hence the original 572 tokens were reduced to 130 tokens.

Lastly, it is worth noting that in the final position, American Data (AmD) and Philippine Data (PhilD) coincide wherein the final position is much more frequent in spoken than in written discourse for both *actually* (PhilD = 4.6% versus 0%; AmD 8% versus 0%) and *in fact* (PhilD = 4% versus 3%; AmD 8% versus 2%). This indicates that the use of *actually* and *in fact* in the final position is closely associated with spoken discourse in both English varieties. Although the 1% difference in the use of *in fact* in PhilD appears insignificant, this is

because of the relative frequency distribution; but if you consider the actual frequency of occurrence (7 tokens over 2 tokens), these results further support that, indeed, the final position uses are more of a feature of spoken discourse.

Use of *actually* and *in fact* in Written Discourse

Actually and *in fact*, as discourse and pragmatic markers in written discourse have similar “core” functions with those concluded in earlier studies; particularly, that (1) of guiding the reader to the intended propositional commitment made by the writer; as well as (2) to indicate the relationship between a prior assertion to a subsequent one. Through them, their role of establishing coherence in written discourse is accomplished.

Focusing on the initial position, *actually* is less favored, to be certain, *in fact* (72.4%) has far exceeded the frequency of *actually* (18.8%). *Actually* when used in initial position have a dual role and these uses are also found in medial position. On one hand, it reinforces the strength of the prior assertion and establishes compatibility, on the other hand, *actually* may also function to subvert the reader’s expected outcome. Example (1) demonstrates expectedness and example (2) shows unexpectedness.

- (1) <p> <ICE-PHI:W1A-010#56:1>
When a mother leaves her child in the care of a babysitter, this means that the mother trusts the babysitter.
<ICE-PHI:W1A-010#57:1>
Actually, in a human-human relationship, every person must have to trust another person if he or she leaves something valuable to him or her.
<ICE-PHI:W1A-010#58:1>
This trust may arise from the thought that the other person knows how to take care of something valuable meaning that the caretaker should have enough knowledge about it and should be able to efficiently apply this knowledge in his or her work.
- (2) <p> <ICE-PHI:W2D-019#130:2>
Advertising is really where the money is, according to her.
<ICE-PHI:W2D-019#131:2>
But she doesn't want the money as much as bringing out a good product.
<p> <ICE-PHI:W2D-019#132:2>
<quote> “ *Actually*, I 'm just new in the business.
<ICE-PHI:W2D-019#133:2>

My studio is only a little bit more than a year old.

<ICE-PHI:W2D-019#134:2>

I would like to establish my name first before thinking about money.

The function of *in fact* in written discourse, largely does not depend on its position within a clause or utterance. The universal function of *in fact* in PhilE is to reinforce the earlier proposition or clause for emphasis, to give proof, to achieve a rhetorical purpose, or to crystallize the expected meaning. The relationship between the earlier proposition or clause with the subsequent one containing the phrasal marker *in fact* is one of internal similarity for the purpose of increasing the strength of an assertion from the previous utterance and not to contradict it. These different ways of supporting the earlier clause may overlap with each other but all of them signal a positive and parallel meaning in relation to the previous utterance. In addition, these functions are consistent with the results in Oh (2000) with AmD. The following examples demonstrate these varied uses.

Examples in initial position:

(3) <ICE-PHI:W2F-017#5:1>

You heard right: until last week I had never been on a plane.

<ICE-PHI:W2F-017#6:1>

I had never seen the inside of a plane except in the movies.

<ICE-PHI:W2F-017#7:1>

In fact, I had never been higher than the top story of the Naga PNB building.

<ICE-PHI:W2F-017#8:1>

Even that experience made me airsick for a week.

(4) <ICE-PHI:W2A-002#72:1>

When other female characters speak, it is in the form of traditional 'woman's talk,' a form of non-speech and background static of background noises and gossip which do nothing to articulate women's concerns.

<ICE-PHI:W2A-002#73:1>

In fact, the neighboring women in 'Karagatan' are gossips who, while providing background information on Elpidio, are judgmental of other women: 'quotation in Tagalog' </O>

(5) <ICE-PHI:W1B-019#49:3>

In the briefing sessions, it was also stressed that the sub-categories were to be used only to determine individual pay increases so as to ensure Bank-

wide consistency in the allocation of increases to staff with similar performance rating and salary quartile.

<ICE-PHI:W1B-019#50:3>

There would be no labeling and recording of the sub-categories of staff in their personnel files.

<ICE-PHI:W1B-019#51:3>

In fact, the overlaps in the salary matrix were introduced to ensure that staff would not be categorized. </p>

Examples in medial position:

(6) <ICE-PHI:W2D-011#125:3>

<quote> “ Brides must be queens and not mannequins, ”</quote> Reyes says.

<ICE-PHI:W2D-011#126:3>

<quote> “ Putting too much blusher will make them look like Raggedy Anns.

<ICE-PHI:W2D-011#127:3>

Brides with soft supple skin can *in fact* do away with blusher for that more natural look. ”</quote> </p>

(7) <ICE-PHI:W2C-008#6:1>

Aglipay said <indig> jeepney </indig> drivers and motorists will be reluctant to bribe female traffic enforcers.

<ICE-PHI:W2C-008#7:1>

The women enforcers, meanwhile would be hesitant to accept bribes because <quote> “ they would be exposed to probing eyes, ”</quote> Aglipay said. </p>

<ICE-PHI:W2C-008#8:1>

He said he would still consult Metro Manila Development Authority (MMDA) Chairman Jejomar Binay on his plan to get his approval. </p>

<ICE-PHI:W2C-008#9:1>

MMDA Executive Director for Traffic Ernesto Camarillo *in fact* welcomes the idea of having more female traffic enforcers.

<ICE-PHI:W2C-008#10:1>

<quote> “ It appears that lady enforcers are more strict in traffic enforcement than their counterparts and motorists are less tempted to bribe them, maybe because they are ashamed to do it to a woman, ”</quote> Camarillo said. </p>

The extract below is a sample of clause-final use of *in fact* in PhilD which was used to emphasize the impact of Admi's shortcoming. Again, it reiterates the universal function of *in fact* which is to reinforce the strength of the prior assertion.

(8) <ICE-PHI:W1A-002#25:1>

Subsequent research by one of our faculty has revealed that the first curriculum proposal presented to us cannot even begin to compare with that of Harvard, but by linking it with a trend sweeping the globe, Admi has taken the first step towards the NGEC 's fetishization.

<ICE-PHI:W1A-002#26:1>

In this country, the word <mention> “ global ” </mention> has morphed into an alternative signifier for success and material progress, so anything linked to it is expected to find instant acceptability (who doesn't want success and progress, after all?).

<ICE-PHI:W1A-002#27:1>

Acceptability is the cornerstone of any object 's fetishization - without it, no object can work its magic. </p>

<ICE-PHI:W1A-002#28:1>

But Admi 's first attempt has been less than successful - has elicited hostility, *in fact*, so now it is sending forth new verbal representations, among them one of Admi top brass being <quote> “ upset ” </quote> at having been so misrepresented and misunderstood.

Medial Position

In AmD (Oh, 2000), “medial position is favored by both *actually* (74%) and *in fact* (55%) in written discourse” (p. 252). However, the results in ICE-PHI show the huge disparity between *actually* (81.2%) and *in fact* (24.6%). In PhilD, *actually* in medial position received the highest relative frequency which is about 3.3 times more frequent than *in fact*. *Actually* takes the stage when it is investigated in medial position since this is the most favored category in PhilE.

It has three main uses in medial position. One function is having the same purpose as *in fact* which is to strengthen the previous assertion which is consistent with AmD (Oh, 2000) wherein these conjunctions serve to “make internal similarity relations explicit” (p. 244). Likewise, Lewis (2005) further verifies this type of use by pointing out that *actually* and *in fact* signals the compatibility in sequence of arguments using a formula of claim+elaboration. These three examples demonstrate this function:

(9) <ICE-PHI:W1A-007#19:2>

It is evident here that the Chinese are highly unreceptive to foreign influences that they *actually* reached the point that they burned these

foreign (to be more specific European) artifacts just to openly show their disgust.

(10) <ICE-PHI:W1B-015#99:6>

By the way we had the national <indig> barangay </indig> and SK elections last Monday.

<ICE-PHI:W1B-015#100:6>

I have classmates who were candidates and two of them won.

<ICE-PHI:W1B-015#101:6>

I 'm *actually* starting to believe that our class is composed of born leaders.
</p><p>

<ICE-PHI:W1B-015#102:6>

I have to cut this short.

<ICE-PHI:W1B-015#103:6>

I have something coming up.

(11) <ICE-PHI:W2B-017#45:1>

Effort must be vigorous and consistent.

<ICE-PHI:W2B-017#46:1>

The absence of collection effort gives a “ hint ” to the borrower that the bank is not interested in running after the account.

<ICE-PHI:W2B-017#47:1>

It *actually* encourages payment default. </p><p>

<ICE-PHI:W2B-017#48:1>

One cannot wait another month without action, otherwise, one is inducing the very nonpayment one is trying to avoid.

The term argument used by Lewis (2005) is fitting since many sequential clauses and utterances may appear in one discourse which when taken in isolation may appear senseless; however, when considered within the entire discourse becomes evidently sensible. For instance, the reference marker *actually* and *infact* may not signal a relation to the immediate utterance but to several utterances or clauses apart. The important aspect to consider is the sequential relationship of ideas/propositional content not the superficial utterance sequence. As this example of compatibility makes clear:

(12) <ICE-PHI:W2E-010#28:1>

The National Economic and Development Authority lies all the time, the state university is full of crap, and forget the businessmen.

<ICE-PHI:W2E-010#29:1>

They lie every morning to their wives.

<ICE-PHI:W2E-010#30:1>

Why would they hold back with their country? </p><p>

<ICE-PHI:W2E-010#31:1>

We need, not to sing, but to understand the situation as it really is and not as pet theories depict it.

<ICE-PHI:W2E-010#32:1>

Nobody predicted the crisis, except perhaps this newspaper, which stoutly dismissed economic trends over the past five years as a smoke-and-mirrors act.

<ICE-PHI:W2E-010#33:1>

The UP School of Economics *actually* clamored for massive devaluation on the peculiar theory that a cheaper peso will mean a richer country.

<ICE-PHI:W2E-010#34:1>

The difficulty of finding solutions is compounded in a country that defies orthodox economics about cheapening currencies to boost exports.

<ICE-PHI:W2E-010#35:1>

You couldn't give away the crap we produce here except, of course, children to pedophiles. </p>

The second use of *actually* which is the most common and versatile function of *actually* in medial position is to contradict an expectation or what Lewis (2005) refers to as dissonance where the DM or conjunction (*actually*) signals that two sequential arguments are not compatible which appears structurally as claim+retreat.

(13) <ICE-PHI:W2F-001#3:1>

Whenever he could get away, the young man would go sailing or fishing.

<ICE-PHI:W2F-001#4:1>

He had never learned to swim and was *actually* afraid of the sea.

<ICE-PHI:W2F-001#5:1>

But something drew him to its icy blue depths and wayward breezes.

</p> <p>

<ICE-PHI:W2F-001#6:1>

This obsession puzzled the young man 's family.

(14) <ICE-PHI:W2B-003#84:2>

It had been done before and the poor hostess was dumped with white elephants which even their owners refused to claim. </p> <p>

<ICE-PHI:W2B-003#85:2>

The height, I think of the situation 's absurdity was when a gift I once gave *actually* came back to me!

<ICE-PHI:W2B-003#86:2>

I know because the route was very traceable. </p>

(15) <ICE-PHI:W2D-020#67:1>

Decanting, says De Guzman, is not wise because it leaves impurities in the extract which could hinder its effectiveness. </p><p>

<ICE-PHI:W2D-020#68:1>

<indig> <it> Sukang Iloko </it> </indig> is customarily added to the solution and the yarns are soaked in it for 15 days.

<ICE-PHI:W2D-020#69:1>

<indig> Mang </indig> Luis is not aware that soaking the yarns *actually* weakens them.

<ICE-PHI:W2D-020#70:1>

After two weeks, the dyed yarns are squeezed, wrung and sundried, rinsed once, squeezed and wrung once again, and allowed to dry in the sun for the last time.

Some written texts use DM to signal the presence of a contrary position from the previous assertion. In example (16) the DM used is “however” which lessens the unexpectedness of the signal “retreat” word *actually*. Yet the use of *actually* is not superfluous but necessary for emphasis. For example (17), the DM used is “while”.

(16) <ICE-PHI:W2A-020#77:1>

Of these countries, Japan offers the highest wages in all occupational categories except transport operators.

<ICE-PHI:W2A-020#78:1>

However, because these figures do not take into account cost of living in the host country, the differentials may *actually* be lower.

<ICE-PHI:W2A-020#79:1>

Within occupations, entertainers show the highest wage levels; domestic helpers, some of the lowest.

(17) <ICE-PHI:W2B-012#7:1>

For the adjective <mention> “traditional” </mention> in the Philippine context is typically employed in a positive light, as in <mention> “traditional values.” </mention>

<ICE-PHI:W2B-012#8:1>

And the word <mention> “politician,” </mention> while loaded with more negative than positive connotations, can *actually* be made to look good when paired with an affirmative word, like <mention> “progressive” </mention> or <mention> “new.” </mention> </p><p>

<ICE-PHI:W2B-012#9:1>

In political theory, the term <mention> “traditional leadership” </mention> is a purely analytical category.

Lastly, the third main use of *actually* in medial position is to act as clause-emphasizer which reinforces the effect of the truth-value of the prior assertion or proposition. This function has several

subcategories: (a) explain/clarify a point further; (b) to verify the validity of the prior assertion; and (c) to point towards the “actuality” of reality.

(18) (To explain)

<ICE-PHI:W2A-001#57:1>

On the other hand, the special type of teacher training included the conduct of vacation assemblies, division normal institutes, model or demonstration classes, supervision, and teachers' meetings. </p>

<p> The <it> <foreign> pensionado </foreign> </it> system, which was officially established by the General Superintendent of Education through a circular he issued on March 3, 1904, may be added to the list of regular forms of teacher training.

<ICE-PHI:W2A-001#58:1>

This *actually* consisted of sending a few qualified teachers to the United States or to the Philippine Normal School for further training along special lines.

<ICE-PHI:W2A-001#59:1>

The <it> <foreign> pensionados </foreign> </it> were to work either for a certificate, a bachelor's degree, or a graduate degree. </p>

(19) (Verify the validity of the prior claim)

<ICE-PHI:W2B-037#53:1>

While FoxPro had market share, Access had a newer relational DBMS architecture.

<ICE-PHI:W2B-037#54:1>

Microsoft built up ACCESS market share by making it a part of Microsoft Office Pro. </p>

<p>

<ICE-PHI:W2B-037#55:1>

<mention> Access </mention> is *actually* a multi - purpose product.

<ICE-PHI:W2B-037#56:1>

It is now the best PC and LAN database management system because it combines ease of use and relational DBMS functionality.

(20) (Actuality of reality)

<p> <ICE-PHI:W2D-004#32:1>

The monthly pension of a member who retires after age 60 and has paid the required 120 monthly contributions, will be the higher of either:

<ICE-PHI:W2D-004#33:1>

1. the monthly pension computed at the earliest time he could have retired had he been separated from employment plus all adjustments;

<ICE-PHI:W2D-004#34:1>

2. the monthly pension computed at the time when he *actually* retires.

</p> <p>

<ICE-PHI:W2D-004#35:1>

A member who retires more than once shall be entitled to the higher of:

<ICE-PHI:W2D-004#36:1>

1. the monthly pension computed for the first retirement claim; or

<ICE-PHI:W2D-004#37:1>

2. the recomputed monthly pension for the new claim. </p>

As shown in the previous section, the main function of *in fact* in medial position is similar to that of the initial utterance, that is, to reinforce the strength of an argument. Aside from this, there is also an occasional use of *in fact* in the medial position which is to signal an ironic claim. This use also occurs in initial position although less prevalent than in medial. This function differs from the initial and medial use of *actually* since it does not outwardly contradict prior expectation; instead, it buffers the irony by use of discourse markers or meaningful utterances to indicate the coming opposition. In number (21), the word “*though*” indicates “despiteness of the stated proposition” to the derogatory remark: “quibble at the .. banality of the act”. This prepares the reader for an expected opposing idea which is a positive claim, that is, “accepted norm”.

(21) <ICE-PHI:W2B-008#3:1>

<mention> <indig> <it> Larawan III </it> </indig> </mention> marks Benedicto Cabrera 's return to the theme that first made him a buzzword among collectors and the art public: painted retakes of antique photographs, particularly those taken at the turn of the century.

<ICE-PHI:W2B-008#4:1>

Though some may quibble at the seeming banality of the act, such a painterly practice is, *in fact*, quite an accepted norm in the artworld mainstream.

<ICE-PHI:W2B-008#5:1>

Artists have been consciously reproducing photographs as paintings since the 1950s, when Irish artist Francis Bacon took Edward Muybridge 's multiple-exposure shots, taken in the 1870s, and transformed them into brutalized images that conveyed the <foreign> angst </foreign> - ridden sensibilities of contemporary European existence. </p>

Utterance (22) shows another facet of the function of *in fact* which is also a fairly regular use where the contrary claim is made obvious

by a direct statement with the use of signal words that are contradictory to the prior proposition; here, this function appears in both medial and initial position within a discourse. In the first occurrence, the word “opposite” is the signal word; while in the second occurrence, the word “distort” is used.

(22) <ICE-PHI:W2A-019#105:1>

The key is for governments to <quote> “ use their immense <it> leverage </it> to structure the market." </quote>

<ICE-PHI:W2A-019#106:1>

Osborne and Gaebler clarify this <it> <quote> “ has nothing to do with conservative calls to 'leave it to the market,' </it> however. <X>

<ICE-PHI:W2A-019#X107:1>

<it> Structuring the market to achieve a public purpose is *in fact* the opposite of leaving matters to the 'free market' </it> (italics mine)--it is a form of <it> intervention </it> in the market. ” </X> </quote> </p><p>

<ICE-PHI:W2A-019#108:1>

In a word then, even if the current Philippine version of reengineering the bureaucracy adopts in words the progressive principle of steering, it does not give justice to the substance of the principle.

<ICE-PHI:W2A-019#109:1>

In fact, it distorts the meaning of the principle. </p> </I>

Finally, in consonance with the AmD, *in fact* occurs only rarely in final position (2%), and *actually* does not occur there at all. This position is thus not a typical position in written discourse in PhilE as well.

Use of *actually* and *in fact* in Spoken Discourse

Both *actually* and *in fact* can be used utterance- (or clause-) initially, mostly preceded by discourse markers (well, yeah) or discourse particles (uhm, ah, na), conjunctions, and even gap-filler words from Tagalog lexicon (ano, 'no, 'ya). Based from the corpus, in general, both *actually* and *in fact* are more a feature of speech than of writing (*actually*: 41.5% versus 18.8%; *in fact*: 77% versus 72%). Although in PhilD, the relative frequency of *in fact* in both speech and writing are quite close which is not the case in AmD (Oh, 2000).

Unlike in AmD where the main function of both linguistic items in speaking is to contribute to the coherence of the discourse,

this function appears only as secondary in PhilD specially with regard to *in fact*. Although the use of *actually* in spoken discourse includes all the corresponding functions in the written discourse. This structural cleanness is particularly applicable for particular registers in public speaking such as legalese, broadcast talks, and classroom discussions where great emphasis is put on the substance or meat of the discourse and a certain amount of intelligibility and logic is required in a transaction; thus, the necessity for coherence markers. For instance, these extracts illustrate the function of establishing “actuality of reality”. Both examples use the most common position which is medial position (post-copula).

(Legalese)

(23) <ICE-PHI:S1B-065#14:1:D>

Number six that Fontainebleau transferred its assets which were *actually* acquired from <indig> jueteng </indig> collections and waived its right to operate a casino in favor of Fontana through the owner R N Development Corporation

(24) <ICE-PHI:S2A-064#2:1:A>

Mr Chief Justice I 'll be very very brief

<ICE-PHI:S2A-064#3:1:A>

I uh feel when I 'm standing in this chamber this evening that uh I 'm *actually* facing the bar of history and the bar of public opinion

(Classroom Interaction)

(25) <ICE-PHI:S1B-006#97:1:A>

Okay it gave descriptions of characteristics and behaviors of witches

<ICE-PHI:S1B-006#98:1:A>

And if these descriptions were read by psychologists today or by you you 'd recognize that many of them were *actually* traits of mentally ill people

<ICE-PHI:S1B-006#99:1:A>

Like symptoms of depression hallucination paranoia schizophrenia

The following are special functions of *actually* in spoken discourse which does not occur (0%) in written discourse. Only (27) single independent response and (28) rectify uses were excluded in AmSD (Oh, 2000) which make them a feature of PhilE. The label “rectify” is used for the purpose of this study. This function refers to

the signaling of the adjustment made or of making right the information that was inaccurately stated in the initial utterance as seen in example (28):

(26) Parenthetical Insertion

<ICE-PHI:S1B-001#81:1:A>

Uhm I sometimes think that people who are experts in a field could not be as dependent on language <indig> 'no </indig>

<ICE-PHI:S1B-001#82:1:A>

They if if they know the subject matter very well they would not be as constrained when it comes to talking about these things <indig> 'no </indig>

<ICE-PHI:S1B-001#83:1:A>

So that 's one layer of studies that you can do

<ICE-PHI:S1B-001#84:1:A>

Just looking at whether it makes a difference to use English or Filipino when it comes to these very specific aspects <,,> *actually* focus on language skills <indig> 'no </indig>

<ICE-PHI:S1B-001#85:1:A>

But if you look at how they do uh my work is in mathematics so I look at how these things affect mathematical tasks

<ICE-PHI:S1B-001#86:1:A>

You can look at how they appreciate history

<ICE-PHI:S1B-001#87:1:A>

You can look at how they appreciate uh their studies in religion <indig> 'no </indig>

<ICE-PHI:S1B-001#88:1:A>

This can apply to any of our uh subject matter <,,>

(27) As an independent affirmative/negative response

<ICE-PHI:S1B-026#111:1:D>

There are some bad sides here that you become extra-emotional when you make decisions

<ICE-PHI:S1B-026#112:1:B>

Uh uhm

<ICE-PHI:S1B-026#113:1:D>

But then again like you said I think earlier when you 're more of a powerful corporation you can easily buy or hire a professional manager

<ICE-PHI:S1B-026#114:1:A>

<{}> But don't

<ICE-PHI:S1B-026#115:1:B>

Uh

<ICE-PHI:S1B-026#116:1:A>

But don't you find that that uhm there 's also a limited range of of ideas and and and you know <{> <[> when you feel the idea </[> needs to evolve
 <ICE-PHI:S1B-026#117:1:C>
 <[> *Actually* </[> </[>
 <ICE-PHI:S1B-026#118:1:B>
 When it 's with the family
 <ICE-PHI:S1B-026#119:1:C>
 There is always a clash of ideas

(28) Rectify

<ICE-PHI:S2A-006#124:1:A>
 Two rookies or *actually* three rookies in the first five of coach Luigi Trillo in Tagupa Rolan and Abadia so only Yong and Mangulabnan we don't even have a Mamaclay in the first five of Adamson

(29) Restart a

<ICE-PHI:S2A-054#116:3:A>
 A teaspoon of chili garlic sauce one teaspoon of chili garlic sauce
 <ICE-PHI:S2A-054#117:3:A>
 And then we have some cooking oil for frying
 <ICE-PHI:S2A-054#118:3:A>
 Okay what we will do is we will just mix our cornstarch with our wine and our *actually* it 's just a <.> ma </.> matter of mixing all these ingredients together well
 <ICE-PHI:S2A-054#119:3:A>
 Okay

Restart b

<ICE-PHI:S1B-026#221:1:F>
 Actually uh we 've gotten close to that already
 <ICE-PHI:S1B-026#222:1:B>
 Uh <{> <[> yeah </[>
 <ICE-PHI:S1B-026#223:1:F>
 <[> A </[> </[> very good friend uh uh *actually* the first option that we had was uh not fire but uh lie low
 <ICE-PHI:S1B-026#224:1:B>
 Uh uhm
 <ICE-PHI:S1B-026#225:1:F>
 Uhm save the friendship

(30) Utterance-final

<ICE-PHI:S1B-026#103:1:B>

Uh well that does it mean it 's better to start your business with with family so that you end up being a big corporation like that I mean really successful like that

<ICE-PHI:S1B-026#104:1:D>

It 's easy to keep the secret inside <{> <[> *actually* </[>

<ICE-PHI:S1B-026#105:1:B>

<[> Yeah </[> </[> uh okay

<ICE-PHI:S1B-026#216:1:F>

Uh skill and the people we needed their skill *actually* who were we used to climb with

The use of *in fact* in PhilD spoken discourse is mainly to give support to whatever proposition or assertion was discussed previously. This support comes in the form of a positive or parallel idea to clarify the point further regarding the topic being discussed or to give more weight or truth on what is being said. Not unlike the function in written discourse, *in fact* in spoken discourse also serves to strengthen the claim of the previous assertion but in a less compelling way such as in a form of an anecdote or a side comment. It is also used as an expression for being excused from the conversation or to express a point in a more polite manner.

(31) Medial (postauxiliary)

<ICE-PHI:S1A-050#154:1:A>

And uh you you can also notice our economy our economic situation right now is not in at its best

<ICE-PHI:S1A-050#155:1:A>

You can see that the Philippine peso has gone down to

<ICE-PHI:S1A-050#156:1:C>

Yes

<ICE-PHI:S1A-050#157:1:A>

Forty-four to one again

<ICE-PHI:S1A-050#158:1:A>

One U S dollar is *in fact* uh some of them are projecting that this will go up up to forty-six pesos

<ICE-PHI:S1A-050#159:1:B>

And this will affect the cost of fuel <indig> 'no </indig>

<ICE-PHI:S1A-050#160:1:C>

Yeah

(32) Medial (post-complement)

<ICE-PHI:S1A-090#194:1:A>

Is there a priest in the family

<ICE-PHI:S1A-090#195:1:B>

With us in among the distant relatives there are priests *in fact* parish priests
and I don't know if we have a bishop already among the the uh

(33) Utterance-initial

<ICE-PHI:S1A-088#190:1:C>

Let 's have another cup of coffee

<ICE-PHI:S1A-088#191:1:B>

You go ahead

<ICE-PHI:S1A-088#192:1:A>

Yes Jimmy will buy the next round so

<ICE-PHI:S1A-088#193:1:C>

Thanks Jim

<ICE-PHI:S1A-088#194:1:B>

In fact order a piece of cake too <O> Speaker C laughs </O>

<ICE-PHI:S1A-088#195:1:A>

Uh waitress

<ICE-PHI:S1A-088#196:1:B>

Uh Vic she 's not a waitress <,> actually

<ICE-PHI:S1A-088#197:1:C>

This guy is the waitress <O> laughs </O>

<ICE-PHI:S1A-088#198:1:B>

In fact he 's a waiter or so we think <O> laughs </O>

(34) Medial (before an obligatory element)

<ICE-PHI:S2A-038#55:1:A>

I 'm glad that I 'm very happy that Tish talked about the classroom because
I 've said many times I said it *in fact* about last month I think January four
when I spoke at the Philippine Normal College

These functions appear in whatever position *in fact* is placed in the discourse. There is no correspondence between its position in the clause or utterance and its function/meaning; its varied functions may be applied in the same way in whatever position it is placed in spoken discourse. This is true even of this last function: "rectify".

(35) Rectify (initial-position)

<ICE-PHI:S1B-045#43:1:E>

There 's this notion <indig> na </indig> kids <indig> lang 'eh </indig>

<ICE-PHI:S1B-045#44:1:D>

No no even adults *in fact* a lot of adults uh have dengue

<ICE-PHI:S1B-045#45:1:E>

Uhm

<ICE-PHI:S1B-045#46:1:D>

The only reason is that they don't normally uh adults don't normally go to the doctor right away

(36) Rectify (medial-position)

<ICE-PHI:S1B-028#43:1:F>

But uh understand that uh as candidates find out that they are losing and have no more chances of catching up then they uh just fold up and they go home bringing with them the the poll watchers assigned to those precincts or to those uh uh municipal uh tally areas

<ICE-PHI:S1B-028#44:1:F>

So uh I would then recommend uh *in fact* appeal to uh the citizenry to maintain the watch because there are still many more days of this

<ICE-PHI:S1B-028#45:1:F>

Media also should be commended for uh for maintaining this sort of reportage because uh the people should be informed

Conclusion

The summary of the findings of this study is discussed in the context of the research questions stated in the introduction. ICE-PHI yielded a difference in distribution and/or use of *actually* and *in fact* in spoken and written Philippine English. There is a stark contrast of position and function between *actually* and *in fact* in written discourse. *Actually* is favored in medial position (81.2%) which occurred in 82 examples whereas *in fact* is favored in initial position (72.4%) and occurred in 50 examples. Congruently, with regard to spoken discourse, a parallel trend exists: *actually* is also favored in medial position (50.8%) and *in fact* is favored in initial position (77%). The difference of the preference for *actually/in fact* in Philippine Data depends on its position regardless of the verbal mode (spoken/written). This means that the preference has the same position in both spoken or written discourse. Whereas, in American Data, the difference of the preference is influenced by the verbal mode; that is, the preferred position of *actually/in fact* may differ in the spoken and written discourse. This implies that in the Philippine context, there is a close usage association between spoken and written registers of *actually* and *in fact*. It should be pointed out, however, that comparability of data may influence these results; specifically, the

ICE-PHI spoken data comprises of both private and public discourses whereas the AmD (Switchboard Corpus) consists solely of informal telephone conversations across major areas in the United States. This difference of genre/registers between American and Philippine Data may account, on one hand, for the parallelism of preferred position of *actually* and *in fact* between spoken and written discourses in ICE-PHI and, on the other hand, the pronounced usage preference disparity of spoken from written discourses between the Brown Corpus (consists of both informative and imaginative prose which apply academic and professional usage) and the Switchboard Corpus (consists of informal conversation).

The second significant finding of the study is that although both linguistic items have been shown to be favored in specific positions where the pattern of distribution may be traced, nevertheless how they function in the discourse in terms of syntactic, semantic, or pragmatic relation is not influenced by their position, this means, there is no correspondence between its position in the clause or utterance and its function/meaning; its varied functions may be applied in the same way in whatever position it is placed in spoken discourse. That being said, there are functions that occur more commonly in a specific position. For instance in written discourse, *actually* has a three-fold predominant function when used in medial position: namely, to express either the consonance or dissonance between sequential arguments, and to verify the “actuality of reality” of the preceding assertion or proposition. In addition, the use of *in fact* in initial position in written discourse predominantly function as clause-intensifier to establish the credibility of the prior utterance or prior assertion using parallel and positive evidence to support it. On the other hand, there are certain functions of *actually* that are a feature solely of spoken discourses: namely, repeat, restart and rectify functions; as well as the single independent retort. In addition, both *actually* and *in fact* may co-occur with Tagalog lexicon in spoken PhilE discourse.

Finally both linguistic items contribute primarily to the meaning and structure of the discourse; and also to bring out the rhetorical purpose of the writer (e.g. acting as stance adverbials) by (1) guiding the reader to the intended propositional commitment made by the writer; as well as (2) indicating the relationship between

a prior assertion to a subsequent one. Through them, their role of establishing coherence in written/spoken discourse is accomplished.

References

- Aijmer, K. (1986). Why is actually so popular in spoken English? In G. Tottie, & I. Backlund (Eds.), *English in speech and writing: A symposium* (pp. 119-129). Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Aijmer, K., & Altenberg, B. (1996). *English corpus linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English discourse particles: Evidence from a corpus*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bautista, L., & Bolton, K. (Eds.). (2009). *Philippine English: linguistic and literary perspectives*. Manila: Anvil.
- Biber, D. (1996). Investigating language use through corpus based analyses of association patterns. *International journal of corpus linguistics*, 1, 171-197.
- Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1988). Adverbial stance types in English. *Discourse Processes* 11, 1-34.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (2000). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Chafe, W. (1986). Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In W. Chafe, & J. Nichols (Eds.), *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology* (pp. 261-72). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Clift, R. (2001). Meaning in interaction: the case of actually. *Language*, 77(2), 245-91.
- De Beaugrande, R. (1999). Reconnecting real language with real texts: text linguistics and corpus linguistics. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 4, 243-259.
- Dita, S. N. (2011). The semantics and grammar of disjuncts in Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Studies in Philippine English: Exploring the ICE-Philippines* (pp. 33-50). Manila: Vibal Publishing.
- Fraser, B. (1988). Types of English discourse markers. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 38, 19-33.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.

- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *International Corpus of English*. [on-line site] <http://icecorpora.net/>
- Lenk, U. (1998). *Marking discourse coherence: Functions of discourse markers in spoken English*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Lewis, D. M. (2005). *Discourse markers in English: a discourse-pragmatic view*. Unpublished manuscript. Département d'Études du Monde Anglophone, Université Lumière Lyon-2, Faculté des Langues, 74 rue Pasteur, 69365 Lyon Cedex 07. [on-line site] <http://people.bu.edu/bfraser/>.
- Lo, J., & Hyland, F. (2007). Enhancing students' engagements and motivation in writing: The case of primary students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 219-237.
- Mann, W. C., & Thompson, S. A. (1987). Rhetorical structure theory: A theory of text organization. *ISI Report RS - 87 - 190*. Marina del Rey, CA: Information Sciences Institute, University of Southern California.
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text: system and structure*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text: System and structure*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Oh, S.-Y. (2000). *Actually and in fact in American English: a data-based analysis*. *English Language and Linguistics* 4, 243-68. [on-line site] <http://www.hku.hk/linguist/cou/adv/ling6013>
- Schneider, E. (2005). The subjunctive in Philippine English. In D. T. Dayag & J. S. Quakenbush (Eds.), *Linguistics and language education in the Philippines and beyond* (pp. 27-40). Manila, Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Sioson, I. (2011). Ano ba talaga ang "ano"?: Exploring the meanings of "ano" in conversations. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 6(2), 46-65.
- Taglicht, J. (2001). Actually, there's more to it than meets the eye. *English Language and Linguistics*, 5(1), 1-16. doi: 10.1017/S1360674301000119
- Taglicht, J. (2011). *Actually, it's not so simple*. Unpublished manuscript. Department of English, The Hebrew University.

- Tognini-Bonelli, E. (1993). Interpretative nodes in discourse: actual and actually. In M. Baker, G. Francis, & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and technology: in honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 193-212). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, E. C. (1995). The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. In D. Denison (Chair), *12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics* (pp. 21-36). Manchester, Oxford, U.K.
- Vandenberg, A. M. S., & Willems, D. (2011). Cross-Linguistic data as evidence in the grammaticalization debate: The case of discourse markers. *Linguistics*, 49(2), 333-364. doi: 10.1515/ling.2011.010
- Verdonik, D. (2008). The impact of context on discourse marker use in two conversational genres. *Discourse Studies* 10, 759. doi: 10.1177/ 1461445608096572
- Watts, R. (1988). A relevance theoretic approach to commentary pragmatic markers: The case of actually, really, and basically. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 38, 235-260.

Endnotes

¹ Dita's (2011) count yielded 672 tokens of *actually*, whereas in this study, the concordance count yielded 673 tokens of *actually*.

² This reduction of distribution proportion is an original modification which was not applied in Oh's (2000) study. This reduction was done because the distribution processing of a large amount of tokens was time consuming.

³ One requirement of the present study is to investigate the full discourse context in which each token occurs meticulously. The aim of the study is to explore possible existing usage tendencies and in no way does it intend to make general claims. Because of the high number of yielded tokens (673 tokens of *actually* and 239 tokens of *in fact*), it is not feasible to include all occurrences. Instead, the present study randomly selected 100 tokens each of *actually* and *in fact*, and then applied a detailed analysis of them "on the basis of the assumption that they are representative for the whole sample" (Oh, 2000, p.246, endnote #6).

⁴ A third application was pointed out by Traugott (1995) where *in fact* was used as two separate words as seen in the example below: "Many of my friends have urged me to issue a point-by-point denial of the book's many outrages. To do so would, I feel, provide legitimacy to a book that has no basis in fact and serves no decent purpose," the former president said. I have an abiding faith that the American people will judge this book for what it really is: sensationalism whose sole purpose is enriching its author and its publisher," said Reagan. (8 April 1991, United Press International)" (p.10) This type of use in American corpora was also documented in Oh (2000, p. 246, endnote no.5). This use of

in fact was excluded from the data analysis. In ICE-PHI, the usage included “in truth” as in: “<ICE-PHI:W2C-015#38:2> Gunigundo also said the banner headline of the October 1 issue of a newspaper <mention> “ Marcos Gold Deal--Swiss Witness Tags FVR, Then Retracts, ” </mention> was <quote> “ misleading and erroneous. ” </quote> </p> <p> <ICE-PHI:W2C-015#39:2> He informed the President that <quote> “ retraction presupposes that the real Dr. P. Ritter-Jurus executed or issued the internal memorandum (on the Marcos gold), when ***in truth and in fact***, said memo was executed by a fake Dr. Ritter. ” </quote> </p> </l>

⁵ An identical broadcast news item was uttered twice in subtexts: <ICE-PHI:S2B-015#66:3:A> and <ICE-PHI:S2B-015#18:1:A>; thus, even if the concordancer recorded two tokens of *in fact*, it is counted as one token in Table 7 for utterance initial position.

⁶ This paper authored by D. M. Lewis was published a year later in 2006 in K. Fischer (Ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles. Studies in pragmatics, 1*, 43-60.

About the Author

Miren M. Morales is a full-time faculty of the University of the Philippines, Manila and is presently pursuing a Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics at De La Salle University, Manila. She received both her B. S. E. and M. A. English Studies: Language degrees from the University of the Philippines, Diliman. Her research interests include pragmatics, dramaturgy, World Englishes, and Bilingual Education.