



Logical Connectors in Newspapers: A Comparative Study of

Pakistani And British Columns

Behzad Anwar¹, Tabassum Iqbal², Shamshad Rasool³

Abstract

The present study is an attempt to explore and compare the patterns and frequencies of usage of logical connectors in Pakistani and British English newspapers. Logical connectors are important tools that make the written and spoken discourse rationally more connected and cohesive. Non-native speakers of English often confuse spoken mode with written communication and certain expressions that are suitable for spoken are transformed and applied in written discourse. It results in a combination of such propositions that are semantically and logically less related to each other. Present study aims to study whether the same trend exist in the Pakistani English and British newspapers. Pakistani English and British newspapers columns were studied from June to July 2016. Antconc software has been used to compare and contrast the use of logical connectors in both corpora. The results of the present study revealed that there is a significant difference in the use of connectors in both corpora. Pakistani column writers use more logical connectors as compared to the British. This overuse of logical connectors suggests the influence of Urdu, Pakistani writers tend to use certain expressions that the native would simply avoid in columns writing.

Keyword: *Newspapers Discourse, World Englishes, Pakistani English; Logical Connectors*

Introduction

Pakistani English shows a divergence from British English at grammatical, lexical, morphological and phonological. The logical connector is an important element of the grammatical structure of any language and Pakistani writers distinctly use these

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Gujrat

² Lecturer, Department of English, University of Gujrat

³ Lecturer, Department of English, University of Gujrat

connectors in their English writing. Certain groups of words that are used to combine different phrases and clauses are termed 'logical connectors', 'linking adjuncts', 'connective adjuncts' and 'connectives' (Chen, 2006; Lie, 2012). We will use the term 'logical connectors' in this study as it is "generic in nature covering all linking devices including adverbials and conjunctions" (Liu, 2008, p. 492).

Logical connectors are associated with both language and logic (Rahimi & Qannadzadeh, 2010). These connectors are important devices to create coherence in the text and are used to join clauses including dependent and independent clauses along with words including nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, etc. According to Martin & Rose "conjunctions serve as logical connections between figures, adding them together, comparing them, sequencing them in time, or explaining their causes, purposes or conditions" (Martin et.al., 2003, p. 110).

Columns in the newspapers are read by the vast majority of people. These columns reflect the opinion of the columnists on a variety of issues and are written regularly by the intellectuals in the same newspaper. The column writers have to construct the column logically to attract and convince the readers. The arguments of the writers must be woven in a definite way to persuade the target readers and the appropriate use of cohesive devices helps him/her to achieve this target. Logical connectors are considered connectors that create a logical connection not only between the syntactic structure of clauses and words but also between their meanings. These logical connectors express

“semantic and structural relationships between discourse stretches” (Dafouz-Milne, 2008, p. 97).

Two major categories of logical connectors are coordinating logical connectors and subordinating logical connectors. Coordinating logical connectors are further classified into cumulative, alternative, adversative and illative while subordinating logical connectors are classified semantically into reason, result, conditional, concession, comparison and situation, etc. Logical connectors are used to “express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse” (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p. 226) and in meaning building, they show Semantic coherence (Van Dijk, 1977). Although logical connectors are termed as connectors, a slight difference occurs when it is observed that logical connectors have fixed expressions (Greenbaum & Quirk, 1993) but connectors have the ability to show their mobility in the connection process (Chalker, 1996). There is the example of common conjunction i.e. ‘and’ which has a fixed expression and is used only to conjoin clauses and words to add some new information so, it neither can be moved to the initial position of the first clause nor can be written with a preceding full stop (Greenbaum and Quirk, 1993). On the other hand, if ‘and’ is used at the sentence-initial position, such usage is connected mostly to spoken discourse for the change in a topic when media and people start talking about a new topic mentioned before (Collins Cobuild English Dictionary, 1995). But a significant number of examples can be found in the written discourse as well and in this study, we have found that the connector ‘and’ occurs quite frequently at the sentence-initial

position in both corpora. As far as the connectors are concerned, being adverbials and conjunct, they can be moved according to demand because they do not have fixed expressions and depict the speaker's intention and listener's assessment in connection process of various utterances (Chalker, 1996). Logical connectors join the meanings of different syntactic units, so are also justified having considerable status in discourse as discourse markers (Leech & Svartvik, 1994). It has been observed that being discourse markers, logical connectors can play the role of connectors both syntactically and semantically as writing coordinating conjunction 'and' at the initial position of the first clause is a common practice today and still, the clause possesses meaningful coordination with the previous sentence. It happens with logical connectors when they are used as connectors and discourse markers in contexts because discourse markers are utterance initial elements (Fraser, 1990). The context indicates the meanings of so-called logical connectors in the guise of connectors. It seems a pragmatic approach towards the functions of logical connectors as discourse markers.

Research Questions

The aim of the present study is to examine whether there is any significant difference in the use of logical connectors between English newspaper columns written by Pakistani British writers or not. For this purpose, following questions are set:

RQ 1. How do Pakistani and British column writers display similar/different patterns of logical connectors regarding their semantic categories?

RQ 2. What kind of variations can be observed in the use of logical connectors in Pakistani columns with reference to British English?

Literature Review

In a linguistic process, variation is unavoidable when there is strong language contact. English is used as a second language in the Pakistani context, whereas Urdu is a national language. The variation in the English language is the result of the interference of LI. The grammar of English language exhibits the borrowing and other features of LI. The sociolinguistic reality and variation in Pakistani English depend on the factors including the linguistic economy, simplification of language, cultural environment, language contact, interference of LI etc. Variation in Pakistani English is obvious as it is used in Pakistani multilingual context. Less knowledge and low proficiency in the English language also cause variation and insertion of culturally fixed expressions from LI to L2. English, being the target language in Pakistan, accommodates these variations as deviated features.

These are certain reasons which cause variation in the use of logical connectors. Fixed British rules of logical connectors are not fully observed in Pakistani English rather these logical connectors are used according to the communicative need of the speakers. In Pakistani English, difference between logical connectors and connectors is not clear and both have the same role in grammatical constructions. In Pakistani context, English is used as the translation of Urdu so; interference of constructions of Urdu grammar creates difficulties. When various kinds of relations among utterances are defined by logical connectors (Caron, 1994), variations occur and the use of English logical connectors in

Pakistani context shows pragmatic aspects and features with varying grammatical constructions.

Pakistani English includes numerous logical connectors which act like connectors when used in certain discourse. In spoken/written discourse, the use of logical connectors as connectors is different because the fixed expressions of logical connectors are changed when used as connectors and discourse markers. The use of logical connectors in Pakistani text is actually the reflection of informal use of logical connectors in spoken discourse.

Asassfeh (2005) explored the use of connectors in the writing of native and non-native English students and found that they differ significantly in the usage. According to the finding, non-native learners of English find it difficult to memorize, recall and use the connectors appropriately.

As far as the research on Pakistani English is concerned, the researchers have contributed their due share in finding out the variant features of this variety. Among various features, grammatical features have been explored by different researchers (Baumgardner, 1993; Rahman, 1990; Anwar & Talaat 2011), but there is still a gap for analyzing further grammatical features especially logical connectors.

Jameel et al. (2014) analyzed the use of linking adverbial in native and non-native English. By taking the data from three native and three non-native varieties of English, the differences in frequency and patterns of linking adverbials were identified. They found that Pakistani speakers differ in the use of adverbials

not only from the speakers of native but also from the non-native varieties of English.

Classification of Connectors

The researchers followed Biber et al.'s (1999, p.765) classifying connectors semantically and defining adverbials, and further identified and added other connectors that were encountered during data processing. So, a list of 48 logical connectors was prepared to check their occurrences in both corpora. The frequency and occurrences of the connectors were extracted separately from each corpus.

**Table 1: Semantic Classification of Linking verbials/Connectors
(Biber et al.1999)**

Sr.	Category	Examples
1	Enumeration and addition	First, second, finally, lastly, furthermore, moreover
2	Summation	In sum, to conclude, overall, to summarize
3	Apposition	In other words, that is, for example, for instance
4	Result/Inference	Therefore, consequently, thus, so, then
5	Contrast/Concession	On the other hand, in contrast, though, however, alternatively
6	Transition	Incidentally, by the by, by the way

The area of logical connectors in grammar is very important for analysis but logical connectors with their various kinds have not been observed yet properly. Even the pragmatic aspects of grammatical constructions through logical connectors have not been touched from a research point of view. So this study aims to fill the gap and the variation in the use of logical connectors in Pakistani English has been explored with reference to conventional rules of British English.

Methodology

This study is based on the corpus linguistics approach for the identification of connectors in the English newspapers. According to Flowerdew (2004, p. 12), analyses through corpus techniques “provide attested examples of recurring language patterns, which are based on empirical data rather than introspection or gathered through elicitation techniques”. A corpus of Pakistani and British columns writings from English newspapers has been compiled. A Newspaper is one of the important genres of research because it has different topics to study. The language of newspaper is enriched with different types of text such as sports, business, editorials, local and international affairs, stories, politics and entertainment. The different features of Pakistani English have been investigated by using different genres and newspaper is one of the important genres of research (Baumgardner, 1993; Anwar & Talaat 2011; Anwar, 2012).

The data for analysis was extracted through Antconc software. By using the concordance, the researchers identified all connectors and categorized them manually as sometimes the same forms of adverbials can have different functions. Two months' written corpus of the columns of PE newspapers and BE newspapers for the period from 01 June 2016 to 31 July 2016 has been compiled and used for this study.

- | | |
|-------------------|----------|
| 1. Dawn (D) | Pakistan |
| 2. Daily Times DT | Pakistan |
| 3. Guardian (G) | British |
| 4. I News (IN) | British |

Table 2: Newspaper Corpus

Newspapers	Token	Types	Logical Connectors	Frequency per 100000
Dawn (D) Daily Times (DT) Guardian (G) I News (IN)	527531	24610	6645	1260
	480947	24903	5477	1139

As there was a slight difference in the size of both corpora in terms of the total number of words; the frequency of logical connectors was adjusted to occurrence per 100000 words. The above table shows that the Pakistani columns writer use more logical connectors than those of British English.

Data Analysis and Discussion

This section deals with data analysis and frequencies of the logical connectors in the newspapers based on Biber et al. (1999) semantic classification of connectors. Grammatical constructions and semantic references of these categories have been discussed in this section to explore pragmatic aspects. It also answers the first question whether there are similarities or differences in the pattern of use by columns writers according to their semantics. It was noticed that a different pattern was used by the column writers of both the newspapers. Brown (1994) argues that second language learners seek the properties of the target language and their inter-language competence becomes the reflection of linguistic variation. All the six categories of Biber et al. (1999) semantic classification have been discussed one by one in the following sections.

Table 3: Enumeration and Addition

Category	Connectors	Occurrences Pak English	Connectors	Occurrences Br English
Enumeration and addition	Moreover	70	Moreover	6
	In addition	41	In addition	7
	Furthermore	25	Furthermore	6
	Lastly	6	Lastly	2
	Finally	59	Finally	82
	First of all	5	First of all	6
	Secondly	38	secondly	2
	Also	1010	Also	557
	Besides	47	Besides	8
	And (sentence initial)	487	And(sentence initial)	763
	Total	1788	Total	1439

The above data suggests that there is a significant difference in the use of connectors by the writers of both countries. Ishikawa (2009) also found that non-native speakers of Asia use additive connector more frequently with reference to native speakers. Only three connectors out of ten 'and', 'first of all', and 'finally' are more frequent in British corpus while seven connectors are overused by Pakistani columns writers. The frequent use of 'first of all' and 'finally' in British corpus suggests that the writers organize their columns with a logical division of arguments and ideas. The use of 'and' at sentence-initial position is frequently used In both corpora. According to modern English, coordinating conjunctions not only create coordination between utterances but also are used at sentence initial position. When used at sentence initial position following a full stop, only syntactic coordination breaks while semantic coordination remains the same, so, they are termed as connectives or discourse

markers because of their mobility. According to old notion, coordinating conjunctions have fixed expressions and it is improper to change their position in sentences but these conjunctions are used with their changed position at the start of the sentences since the Anglo-Saxon period (Burchfield, 1996).

In additive category, logical connectors give the sense of addition i.e. the addition of one proposition into the other and the Pakistani column writers frequently use these connectors. The overuse of 'in addition', 'furthermore' and 'moreover' in Pakistani newspapers indicates this tendency which is quite high in comparison with British column writings. Cumulative conjunctions report the level of addition in the form of correlatives as well.

Besides, Pakistani writers have the tendency to use two connectors together because of the influence of L1 as the following examples show:

1. **Moreover, because** such murders are categorized as honor killings, there is a sense that the tragedy is somehow different, explicable and thus palatable. (18 July 2016, D)
2. **Moreover, besides** the key plotter, ostensibly Turkey former air force chief, over 100 generals and admirals will face treason charges for conspiring against the state. (24 July 2016, D)
3. That point **besides, if** the Turkish government continues to tread the present dangerous path, it would be helping the US. (25 July 2016, DT)

4. **Finally, since** the government appears to be moving in the right policy direction as far as property market is concerned, there is need for another drastic action. (23 July 2016, D)
5. To simplify the argument, the war on terrorism has not been successful **because although** the al-Qaeda has suffered irretrievable losses IS has simultaneously managed to metamorphose into a new rapidly growing terrorist threat. (10 July 2016, DT).

Table 4: Result/Inference

Category	Connectors	Occurrences Pak English	Connectors	Occurrences Br English
Result/ Inference	Therefore	121	Therefore	45
	Consequently	27	Consequently	5
	Accordingly	17	Accordingly	1
	Then	450	Then	477
	Thus	145	Thus	52
	As A Result	59	As A Result	32
	Hence	84	Hence	6
	In Short	11	In Short	13
	So That	63	So That	37
	Because	445	Because	606
Total	1422	Total	1274	

In table 4, the result/inference category, 'then', 'because' and 'in short' are more frequently used by the British columns writers, while 'hence', 'accordingly', 'as a result', 'thus', 'consequent', 'so that' and 'therefore' are overused in Pakistani corpus. This is also because of the influence of L1 when literal translation of Urdu equivalents is used in English by the Pakistani writers.

The connector 'so that' has an explicit sentence construction with specific verbs of possibility i.e. 'may' and 'could' in British English. But in Pakistani English, the use of 'so that' is different and there is a slight variant specific construction containing specific verbs in Pakistani English. For example,

1. The army wants to change the terms of that deal so that the politicians continue to give in to military demands but stop making the money. (2 June 2016, D)
2. Children must be sensitized at a young age, so that they grow into altruistic and responsible beings. (28 June 2016, DT)

Table 5: Summation

Category	Connectors	Occurrences Pak English	Connectors	Occurrences Br English
Summation	To sum up	3	To sum up	1
	To conclude	3	To conclude	2
	Overall	33	Overall	26
	To summarise	2	To summarise	1
	Concluding	3	Concluding	2
	Total	44	Total	32

From table 5, we can see that Pakistani writers use the summing connectors almost with the same pattern as the natives do. It implies that the writers of both countries construct the text with similar flows of argumentation and a congruent organization of discourses whose semantic weaving is quite alike and end with the same pattern.

Table 6: Contrast/Concession

Category	Connectors	Occurrences Pak English	Connectors	Occurrences Br English
Contrast/ Concession	On the other hand	74	On the other hand	8
	In contrast	11	In contrast	12
	Although	128	Although	76
	However	522	However	154
	Alternatively	5	Alternatively	3
	Yet	243	Yet	321
	In reality	20	In reality	9
	On the contrary	11	On the contrary	4
	After all	40	After all	72
	Nevertheless	48	Nevertheless	18
	Even so	8	Even so	5
	Instead	168	Instead	146
	Anyway	13	Anyway	34
	In fact	83	In fact	79
	Or	1864	Or	1552
	Total	3238	Total	2493

The category of contrast/concession in table 6 is the most frequently used category in both corpora. The connectors ‘in contrast’, ‘yet’, ‘anyway’ and ‘after all’ are exceedingly used by the British writers. The contrast connector ‘yet’ describing contrast and contradiction at sentence initial position has a higher frequency in British corpus. It is placed at the start of the sentence but gives clear meaning. The first utterance is a simple proposition but the second utterance opposes previous proposition and includes a contrastive aspect.

The connector 'in fact' is used in British English when the second statement is contradicted with the previous statement. But the Pakistani writers use this connector when it is not required as the following examples show:

1. There are still students that exist with this drive, with this passion. **In fact**, I would say the majority of those that I have personally encountered want to succeed on the basis that they want to contribute their utmost capability to the world. (11 July 2016, DT)
2. Several other reports suggested that Mateen was a regular visitor to the club and had been escorted out in a drunken state many times. **In fact**, he had reportedly exchanged messages on a gay dating app that led to some speculation about his own sexual leanings. (16 July 2016, D)

In British English, two connectors 'although' and 'but' are not used in a sequence but in Pakistani corpus, we can find such examples because of the influence of Urdu when the literal translation of logical connectors 'agerche' and 'lekin' is used in complex sentences. For example,

1. **Although** Media plays a dedicated role of a watchdog **but** the governments, federal or provincial, are not fearful enough to derail from their governing techniques. (16 July 2016, DT)
2. **Although** we see that most people succumb to the power of situational forces, but not all do. (10 July 2016, DT)

In Pakistani English, certain connective pairs, for example, 'because-so, are also used which is not observed in British English.

3. Moreover, **because** such murders are categorized as honor killings, so there is a sense that the tragedy is somehow different, explicable and thus palatable. (18 July 2016, D)

In British English, the connector 'on the contrary' is used to strengthen the statement by suggesting that the opposite is the case. However, a variation could be observed in the use of 'on the contrary' in Pakistani English as the following examples show; rather the use of this connector is redundant is the second example.

1. Even with the best of intentions, each case could take up to years to solve, requiring a panel of experts, and perhaps some amendments in the international law. **On the contrary**, the Taliban issue consists of precise goals, its targets identified, locations marked. (2 June 2016, DT)
2. **On the contrary**, if PEMRA initiates amendment in its Act & Rules, it would be a nerve-wrecking process and may cause an inordinately long delay. (11 June 2016, DT)

Table 7: Transition

Category	Connectors	Occurrences Pak English	Connectors	Occurrences Br English
Transition	By the way	6	By the way	9
	Incidentally	10	Incidentally	7
	Now,	44	Now,	120
	Total	60	Total	136

The transition category in table 7 is overused in British newspapers, with 'by the way', and 'now' while the Pakistani writers use the connector 'incidentally' more in their writings.

Table 8: Apposition

Category	Connectors	Occurrences Pak English	Connectors	Occurrences Br English
Apposition	In other words	31	In other words	17
	That is,	9	That is,	13
	For example	48	For example	43
	Namely	3	Namely	8
	For instance	2	For instance	22
	Total	93	Total	103

Table 8 of ‘Apposition’ is the second category wherein the British column writers exceed in the use of logical connectors. The connectors ‘that is’, ‘namely’ and ‘for instance’ are over used in British corpus. Pakistani writers often fail to differentiate between ‘for example’ and ‘for instance’. That is why the use of ‘for instance’ is very rare in Pakistani English corpus.

Conclusion

To conclude, we can say that Pakistani writers overuse the logical connectors in their columns and these connectors are overused for two pragmatic aspects i.e. turn taking and to manage the conversation in context-based spoken discourse. So, it is the effect of spoken discourse which causes to vary written English in Pakistan and in this case, English involves a lot of variation in Pakistan. Logical connectors are used in a variety of ways which are different from those of British English. The excessive use of logical connectors in Pakistani English shows that the column writers of both countries are different in the structure involving organizing the ideas, providing background information, addressing the issue, deploying arguments, and articulating a

position. The overuse and underuse of some connectors are because of the difference in the context in which English is used by native and non-native writers. The data suggest that Pakistani English is an indigenized variety of English with its own norms of the use of logical connectors. However, there is a need for a large-scale study to analyze the logical connectors in other genres at a broader canvas to make the result more convincing and authentic and to claim Pakistani English as a distinct variety of English.

References

- Asassfeh, S. M. (2005). Perception and actual use in expository academic writing of logical connectors by graduate nonnative speakers of English and comparable native speaker controls. Unpublished PhD Thesis. The University of Alabama. Tuscaloosa.
- Anwar, B. (2012). A Sociolinguistic Study of Urdu-English Code-Switching in Pakistan. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan.
- Anwar, B. & Talaat, M. (2011). English in non-native context: Distinctive features of Pakistani journalistic English. *ELF Annual Research Journal*. Vol 13, 11-20.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (1999). Longman grammar of spoken and written English. London: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. NewJersv: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Burchfield, R. W. (1996). The New Fowler's Modern English Usage. (Ed.), Clare Press: Oxford, England.
- Baumgardner, R. J. (1993). Utilizing Pakistani English Newspapers to teach Grammar. In Robert J. Baumgardner (Ed.). The English

Journal of Media Studies 35(1)

Language in Pakistan. Karachi: Oxford University Press. pp. 255-273.

Collins Cobuild English Dictionary (1995). London: HarperCollins.

Caron J. (1994). Connectives. In Asher R.E. and Simpson J.M.Y. (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 2, Pergamon, Oxford, pp. 706-707.

Chalker, S. (1996). Collins Cobuild English Guides 9: Linking Words. London: HarperCollins.

Chen, C. (2006). The use of conjunctive adverbials in the academic papers of advanced Taiwanese EFL learners. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*. Vol. 11(1), 113-130.

Dafouz-Milne, E. (2008). The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in the construction and attainment of persuasion: Across-linguistic study of Newspaper discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 40 (4), pp. 95-113.

Fraser, B. (1990). An Approach to Discourse Markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 14, pp. 383-395.

Flowerdew, L. (2004). The argument for using English specialized corpora to understand academic and professional language. In U. Connor, T. Upton (Eds.), *Discourse in the professions: Perspectives from corpus linguistics*, pp. 11-36. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Greenbaum, S. & Quirk, R. (1993). *A student's Grammar of the English Language*. Essex: Longman.

Granger, S. & Tyson, S. (1996). Connector usage in the English essay writing of native and non-native *EFL speakers of English*. *World, Englishes*, Vol. 15 (1), pp. 17-27.

Halliday, M.A. K. & Hassan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

- Ishikawa, S. (2009). Phraseology Overused and Underused by Japanese Learners of English: A Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis. In K. Yagi & T. Kanzaki (Eds.), *Phraseology, Corpus Linguistics and exicography: Papers from Phraseology 2009 in Japan* (pp.87-100). Nishinomiya, Japan: Kwansai Gakuin University Press.
- Jameel, A., Mahmood, A., Hussain, Z. & Shakir, A. (2014). A Corpus-Based Analysis of Linking Adverbials in Pakistani English. *International Journal of Linguistics*. Vol. 6 (3). pp. 133-140.
- Liu, D. (2008). Linking adverbials: An across-register corpus study and its implications. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*. Vol. 13(4), pp. 491-518.
- Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1994). *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- Lie, L. (2012). Linking adverbials in academic writing on applied linguistics by Chinese doctoral students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. Vol. 11, pp. 267-275.
- Martin, J.R., & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. London: Continuum.
- Rahimi, A. & Qannadzadeh, J. (2010). Quantitative usage of logical connectors in Iranians' EFL essay writing and logical and linguistic intelligences. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 2012-2019.
- Rahman, T. (1990). *Pakistani English: The Linguistic Description of a Non-narrative Variety of English*. Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and Context*. London: Longman