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ABSTRACT

Pakistani English is considered to be a distinct variety of English on the basis of its comparison with British English and American English. However, this claim is partial as its distinction from other varieties of English particularly used in South Asia has not yet been established. Thus, there is a need to investigate the similarities and differences between Pakistani and South Asian Englishes, and to analyse how far Pakistani English is distinct from other South Asian Englishes. Therefore, the present study aims at analyzing the linguistic features of Pakistani English as a separate variety from other varieties of English used in India and Bangladesh. For this purpose, a corpus of Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi English newspaper reportage was developed and analyzed using Biber’s (1988) multivariate/multidimensional approach. The findings indicated that Pakistani press reportage is different from Indian and Bangladeshi press reportage on all the five dimensions, especially on Dimension 2, in which Pakistani press reportage is narrative, while Bangladeshi press reportage is non-narrative in nature. On Dimension 3, the press reportage of Pakistan is highly explicit as compared to Indian and Bangladeshi press reportage. Further, the sub-categories of Pakistani press reportage also exhibit variation when compared to the sub-categories of Indian and Bangladeshi press reportage. The possible causes of linguistic variation among these countries are their culture...
and geographical origin. It is further suggested that South Asian Englishes are evolving rapidly and linguistic variation among them certainly be a worth researchable area.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The emerging indigenized varieties of English have remained the focus of attention for researchers in the past years (e.g., Ashcroft, 2009; Kachru, 2006; Modiano, 1999; Shehzad, 1992; Quirk, 1990). Recently, researchers have become increasingly interested in studying South Asian Englishes. While a significant body of research has been produced on South Asian English on one side (Tickell, 2016; Giri, 2015; Low & Hashim, 2012; Brians, 2003; Kandiah, 1996; Sridhar, 1996) and Pakistani English on the other (Muhabat, Noor, & Iqbal, 2015; Rahman & Eijaz, 2014; Khan & Safder, 2012; Mahmood, 2009; Mahmood, 2009; Anwar & Talaat, 2011; Uzair, Mahmood, & Mahmood, 2012; Baumgardner, 1993, 1996), the evidence on how distinct Pakistani variety of English is different from South Asian Englishes remains inconclusive. All the previous attempts at establishing English used in Pakistan as Pakistani English were restricted either to finding out individual linguistic features or comparing Pakistani English with British or American English, leaving the identity of Pakistani English out of sight under the umbrella of South Asian English. Therefore, the distinction between Pakistani English and the Englishes of the other South Asian Englishes remains unclear.

For a long time, British English continued to be a yardstick for the standardization of English spoken and written in South Asia. However, with the passage of time, local languages, culture, and socio-political impact started appropriating and indigenizing English language in the region (Kachru, 1996). South Asia occupies a significant place on the map. According to World Bank Group (2016), the population of South Asian countries was 1.7 billion, which is one quarter of the population of the whole world. The speakers of English here have exceeded the ones in the UK and the USA combined (Crystal, 2012). The spread of English in South Asian countries can be attributed to Christian missionaries, British colonization, English
medium of education and spread of English as a global language. These countries, except Nepal and Bhutan, remained the part of the British Empire and significant dominance of English can be attributed to the legacy of British colonialism. In the beginning, English used in this region was labeled as South Asian English or Indian English, but presently, different modern terms like Bangladeshi English, Nepali English, Pakistani English, etc., have evolved.

The Indian Sub-continent witnessed two partitions in the twentieth century resulting in the formation of independent Pakistan and India in 1947 and Bangladesh in 1971. The myth of one great nation debunked with the emergence of three different nations with different economic outlooks, multi-religious beliefs, and diverse ethno-linguistic identities. One English was introduced to this part of the world by the British Raj; however, with the passage of time, it was localized and indigenized (Melchers & Shaw, 2013). Previous studies on Englishes claim that Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi Englishes are different from the British English; however, there is no comparative study available that distinguishes these three varieties. So, in spite of an increasing interest in the study of Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi English (where the geographical boundaries have evolved long ago), little is known about how far these varieties are distinguished from one another. Thus, there is a dire need to study how far these varieties (Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi) are distinguished from one another. So, the present study aims at analyzing that how far Pakistani English is a distinct variety in comparison with Indian and Bangladeshi Englishes across Biber’s (1988, 2006) textual dimensions.

The register of newspaper reportage has been selected to study the variation among the Englishes of the selected countries. Westin (2001) claims that newspaper language reflects the language used in a society at large. Moreover, language, culture and media form a triangle in which each affects the other two and in turn is affected by them (Rasul, 2009). Therefore, the present study focuses on newspaper reportage using Biber’s (1988) multidimensional approach to investigate the similarities and differences among Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi English.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

In South Asia, the process of indigenization or localization of English owes its progress to the influence of native languages, culture, and local English language teachers, etc. These components have added to the advancement of South Asian English as a native variety (Mahboob & Ahmar, 2004). Baumgardner (1993) called this “nativization” of English in the
sub-continent. According to McKenzie (2010), English influences a society through the “continuing influx and nativization of English loanwords into the native tongue” (p. 277). Thus, like other postcolonial countries, English in India interacts with regional languages and is localized in pronunciation, lexicon and syntax. Various researchers worked on English used in India (e.g., Pingali, 2012; Kachru & Smith, 2009; Muthiah, 2009; Chelliah, 2001), and established it as Indian English. Sharma (2011) describes the distinguishing features of Indian English. These distinguishing features are especially concerned with pronunciation, vocabulary, idiomatic distortions and grammar. In the likewise manners, Al-wossabi (2014) reviews different distinctive features of Indian English in terms of phonology, syntax, lexis, pragmatic and sociolinguistic aspects. Further, there are certain studies which distinguish Indian English from British English on the basis of pronunciation (Nandi, 2013; Gargesh, 2008; Baldridge, 1995). There is hardly any attempt at establishing Bangladeshi English as a separate variety of English. The focus of the most of the studies is the attitude of students in learning English language, English language teachers’ education in Bangladesh and teaching English language skills (Islam, 2018; Quayum & Hassan, 2018; Huq, 2018; Hamid & Jahan, 2015; Sultana, 2014).

The concerns of the previous studies (Muhabat et al., 2015; Uzair et al., 2012; Anwar & Talaat, 2011; Rasheed, 2009; Mahmood, 2009; Mahmood, 2009; Mahboob & Ahmar, 2004; Abbas, 1998; Rahman, 1990) have been to establish the identity of Pakistani English as an independent, non-native variety with its own distinct registers. Baumgardner (1993, 1996) and Mahboob and Ahmar (2004) discuss variation between Standard English and Pakistani English on syntactic, morphological, lexical and phonological level. Further, Khan and Safder (2012) claim that Pakistani English is a distinguished variety, and would soon replace Standard English. Previous studies made claims about Pakistani English as a distinct variety on the basis of individual linguistic features. Like Biber (1988), many other linguists have shown their dissatisfaction with the register analysis studies based on individual linguistic features (e.g., Halliday, 1985; Hymes, 1974; Ervin-Tripp, 1972; Bernstein, 1970).

There is a considerable body of research which used multivariate approach to study a range of Pakistani registers from the variationist perspective. For instance, Shakir and Deuber (2018) studied online register, while Asghar, Mahmood, and Asghar (2018) analyzed legal English. Further, such studies range from newspaper editorials (Ali, 2018; Alvi, Mehmood, & Rasool, 2016) to English blogs and newspaper columns (Shakir & Deuber, 2018) and press (Ahmad & Ali, 2017; Ahmad & Mahmood, 2015). Other registers, like Pakistani academic
writing (Azher & Mehmood, 2016), online blurbs (Qasim & Shakir, 2016), and Pakistani fiction in English (Ali & Ahmad, 2016) have also been studied using multidimensional approach. The list of MD analyses further includes spoken and written registers of Pakistani English (Hussain, Mahmood, & Azher, 2016), online brands of Pakistani fashion blogs (Noor & Shakir, 2015), and Pakistani sports columns (Iqbal & Danish, 2014). However, the scope of these studies is limited to Pakistani English and its comparison with British or American English.

Further, there are limited studies that compare Pakistani English newspapers to Indian newspapers. Taimur ul and Seyal (2016) compared news stories, editorials and articles in Dawn (Pakistan), Times of India (India) and People’s Daily (China) in terms of frequency, prominence and direction of development coverage. Saffee (2016) explores that how the newspapers of Pakistan and India discuss the same issues differently.

According to Uzair et al. (2012), the newspapers while making choice of the language items, take into consideration of the cultural and social values of their readers for effective communication. Sajjad (2015) investigates the role of media by evaluating media coverage in India and Pakistan around five major events. The selected newspapers were Dawn, The Nation, The News, The Frontier Post, Daily Times, The Hindu, and The Times of India. In the likewise manner, Hussain (2015) explores the news framing of Indo-Pak conflicts with regard to war and peace journalism by Times of India and The News, Pakistan. Where most of the comparative studies mentioned above focus culture, values, media coverage, etc., there is hardly any study which compares the newspapers of these countries linguistically. Therefore, the current research attempts to study the linguistic features using Biber’s (1988) multivariate approach to find out the similarities and differences among Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi English.

3.0 METHODOLOGY
This section discusses the approach, methods and tools used for the study. The study is basically quantitative in nature. It follows Biber’s (1988, 2006) Multidimensional analysis as the theoretical framework of this study. Multidimensional (MD) analysis is a methodological approach, which applies multivariate statistical techniques, which focuses the co-occurring linguistic features instead of individual linguistic features in the given text(s) to investigate register variation in a language.
The leading newspapers of the three countries – *Dawn, The Nation* and *The News* from Pakistan, *The Times of India, The Telegraph* and *The Hindu* from India and *The Daily Star, The Independence* and *Daily Observer* from Bangladesh, were selected on the basis of wide circulation and readership. A corpus based on the sub-categories of press reportage was developed. The data of press reportage register was taken from the period 1st January, 2017 to 31st December, 2017. Further, 24 texts per sub category of every newspaper were collected to draw conclusive results about the linguistic differences of each category in data analysis. The corpus consists of 864 texts containing around one million (10,92,891) words. The length of the text files vary from 1000 to 1300 words. However, the text files of varying lengths were normalized to text length of 1000 words through the process of normalization (Biber, 1988).

The data was tagged for different linguistic features using Biber’s (1988, 2006) tag count programme. In order to assign grammatical categories to the lexical items, all the text files (864) were run through Biber’s tagger. Then, MD analysis was performed through Biber’s (1988) factor solution. Dimension scores for each text was calculated with reference to Biber’s (1988, 2006) five textual dimensions, viz., involved versus informational production, narrative versus non-narrative, explicit versus situation-dependent, overt expression of argumentation and impersonal versus non-impersonal (for detail, see appendix A) The factor solution was based upon 150+ linguistic features. Biber (1988) identified 67 linguistic features. These 67 linguistic features were categorized in 16 grammatical categories, viz, (A) tense and aspect markers, (B) place and time adverbial, (C) pronouns and pro-verbs, (D) questions, (E) nominal forms, (F) passives, (G) stative forms, (H) subordination features, (I) prepositional phrases, adjectives, and adverbs, (J) lexical specificity, (K) lexical classes, (L) modals, (M) specialized verb classes, (N) reduced forms and dispreferred structures, (O) coordination, and (P) negation (Biber, 1988). (For more detail, see appendix B)

The study involves certain statistical analyses. Factor analysis helped reducing a large number of linguistic features to manageable set of variables. Factor analysis involves grouping linguistic features serving some common function in the selected texts. At this stage, micro-analysis of these linguistic features is crucial as it helps in locating the shared function of the linguistic features. Factor analysis was conducted to bring the large number of observed variables to a small number of underlying constructs. Factor score was computed by calculating the number of occurrences of particular linguistic features. The study used conservative cut off of 0.25 for those features to be included in the computation of factor scores. Finally, in order to find out the difference among the sub-categories of newspaper reportage from all the selected...
newspapers from the three countries, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used. Two-factor ANOVA was applied in two phases. In the first phase, two-factor ANOVA was applied to measure significant statistical differences among the press reportage of the three countries. In the next phase, two factor ANOVA was applied on the corpus with reference to each sub-category of press reportage to measure the significant statistical differences among the Englishes used in the three countries.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Previous researchers such as Ahmad and Mahmood (2015), Muhabat et al. (2015), and Anwar and Talaat (2011), claimed that Pakistani English is a separate variety compared to the British news register. In order to evaluate how distinguished Pakistani English is from other neighbouring varieties of English, the present study compares Pakistani English with Indian and Bangladeshi Englishes.

The results of two-factor ANOVA test show the statistical significant differences among the sub-categories of press reportage (National, Cultural, Financial and Political) as well as among countries (Pakistan, India and Bangladesh). The comparison has been made keeping in view that different categories and countries being compared will only be significant when the p-value is less than 0.05 standard significant value, i.e., (p>0.05).

4.1 Variation Among the Press Reportage of the Countries

Figure 1 compares the mean dimension scores of Pakistani press reportage with Indian and Bangladeshi press reportage register on Biber’s (1988) five textual dimensions.

![Figure 1: Comparison of Pakistani press reportage with Indian and Bangladeshi press reportage](image-url)
As far as dimension one is concerned, positive scores indicate involvedness, while negative scores show informational trend. Figure 1 shows that the scores of Bangladeshi English press reportage, with the highest negative scores of -21.52, are maximum on the negative polarity. The scores of Indian English, in comparison with other two countries, show less informational trend with a score of -15.08. Pakistani English also indicates informational discourse production with a mean score of -20.75. The mean scores of dimension 1 indicate that there is a significant difference in the mean scores of Pakistani and Bangladeshi English in comparison with Indian English.

Pakistani and Indian press reportage have positive scores on dimension two, indicating that their primary concern is narrative, whereas Bangladeshi press reportage with a mean score of -0.05 has been found non-narrative. Being the most typical of narrative, Pakistani press reportage has the highest mean value of 1.55.

On dimension three, all the countries show explicit trend. The comparison of Pakistani press reportage with Indian and Bangladeshi press reportage is especially relevant for determining how far Pakistani press reportage is different from Indian and Bangladeshi press reportage. Figure 1 indicates that Pakistani press reportage represents a highly explicit discourse with a mean value of 6.37. However, Bangladeshi and Indian press reportage show less explicit discourse with the mean values of 4.35 and 4.18 respectively.

Bangladeshi press reportage has the highest negative scores, i.e. -2.07 on D4, indicating that it makes use of covert expression of argumentation. Negative scores of all the three countries indicate that they are mostly non-argumentative in nature. However, at the same time there lies significant difference in their mean scores. As it was also seen in comparison on dimension 1 earlier, on this dimension again Pakistani press reportage in respect of its dimensional mean scores, closely resembles Bangladeshi press reportage.

Dimension five was labelled as ‘Abstract vs. Non-abstract information’ by Biber (1988). The results indicate that Pakistani press reportage is highly abstract in nature with the highest positive mean score i.e., 2.32 on this dimension whereas Bangladeshi press reportage has the lowest positive score on this dimension i.e., 1.56.

From the foregoing discussion, it is clear that there are significant differences between Pakistani English and Indian English on D1, D2 and D3 and between Pakistani and Bangladesh press reportage on D2 and D3. However, on D1 and D4, there are no significant differences between Pakistani and Bangladeshi English. Table 1 provides mean scores of subcategories of press reportage of the selected countries.
Table 1: 1988 MD analysis of the subcategories of press reportage of Pakistan, India and Bangladesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Reportage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-21.27</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-15.38</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-22.98</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-2.68</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cultural Reportage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-17.47</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-9.58</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-19.04</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Financial Reportage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-23.62</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-17.54</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-22.39</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Political Reportage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-20.66</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-17.84</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-21.68</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Variation Among the Subcategories of Press Reportage

This section discusses linguistic variation among the sub-categories of press reportage form Pakistan, India and Bangladesh. The sub-categories selected for analysis are national, cultural, financial and political press reportage.

4.2.1 National Press Reportage (NPR)

Figure 2 shows the relationship among Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi NPR. There are some differences among NPR of all the three countries.
Figure 2: Comparison of Pakistani NPR with Indian and Bangladeshi NPR

Pakistani NPR (-21.27) and Bangladeshi NPR (-22.98) are more informational as compared to Indian NPR (-15.98) on D1. On D2, Pakistani NPR (2.44) shows the highest narrative concerns as compared to Indian (0.80) and Bangladeshi (0.65) NPR. On D3, Pakistani NPR (6.80) has been found the most explicit in nature. Pakistani NPR appears to be different from Indian (3.58) and Bangladeshi NPR (4). On dimension 4, Pakistani national press reportage shows least covert in argumentation as compared to Indian (-1.47) and Bangladeshi (-2.68) national press reportage. Bangladeshi NPR (-2.68) has been found the most covert. On D5, Indian NPR (2.25) has been found the most abstract in nature. Pakistani NPR, with a mean score of (2.21), also shows impersonal style. Bangladeshi NPR, however, shows the least abstract style with a mean value of (1.24).

4.2.2 Cultural Press Reportage (CPR)

Figure 3 presents mean dimension scores of Pakistani cultural press reportage along with Indian and Bangladeshi cultural press reportage.
On D1, Bangladeshi CPR has been found the most informational with mean score (-19.04). Indian CPR (-9.58) shows the least informational trend as compared to Pakistani CPR (-17.47) and Bangladeshi CPR. In the likewise manner, on D2, Bangladeshi CPR (-0.91) has the highest negative score as compared to Indian CPR (-0.49) and Pakistani CPR (-0.12). On D3, Pakistani CPR, with mean score (6.01) has been found the most explicit. Bangladeshi CPR (4.05) is also found producing explicit discourse. However, with mean score of (2.71), Indian CPR is the least explicit in nature. D4 has no positive features. Pakistani CPR (-2.58) shows the most non-argumentation discourse among the three countries. Indian CPR (-1.58) however, produces the least non-argumentation discourse. Positive mean scores on D5 show the tendency of CPR of all the three countries towards the non-impersonal style. Pakistani CPR, with a mean score of (1.59), has been found the least non-impersonal as compared to Bangladeshi CPR (2.39) and Indian CPR (2.06).

4.2.3 Financial Press Reportage (FPR)

Figure 4 suggests that Pakistani FPR (-23.62) is the most informational in nature on D1 as compared to Bangladeshi FPR (-22.39) and Indian FPR (-17.54).
4.2.4 Political Press Reportage (PPR)

The results from the first dimension show that Bangladeshi PPR (-21.68) contains more informational density than Pakistani PPR (-20.66) and Indian PPR (-17.84). On D2, Pakistani PPR (3.42) has been found the most narrative in nature among all the selected countries. Bangladeshi PPR (0.45), however, is the least narrative. On D3, political press reportages of all the countries show explicit trend. Pakistani PPR (6.97) is the most explicit in nature.
Indian PPR (5.53) and Bangladeshi PPR (5.1) appear to be almost similar indicating the explicit nature. On D4, all the countries show non-argumentative style. Bangladeshi PPR (-1.68) is the most non-argumentative as compared to Pakistani PPR (-1.51) and Indian PPR (-1.29). Positive mean scores of all the countries on D5 indicate non-impersonal style of political press reportage. Pakistani PPR with dimension scores (2.54) is the most impersonal/ non-abstract among the selected countries. Bangladeshi PPR (1.36) has the least mean score on this dimension. The data reveals that Pakistani political press reportage is different from Indian and Bangladesh political press reportage on all of the five dimensions.

5.0 CONCLUSION

As far as the mean scores of Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi press reportage are concerned, Pakistani press reportage has been found different from Indian and Bangladeshi press reportage on all the five dimensions. Especially, on D2, there is a stark difference between the mean scores of Pakistani and Bangladeshi press reportage. Pakistani press reportage is narrative while Bangladeshi press reportage is non-narrative in nature. On D3, the press reportage of Pakistan is significantly different from that of other two countries. It is highly explicit as compared to Indian and Bangladeshi press reportage.

So far as sub-categories of press reportage are concerned, Pakistani national reportage is statistically different from Indian national reportage on D1, D2 and D3. It is more informational, involved and explicit than Indian press reportage. Moreover, it differs from Bangladeshi national category on D2, D3, D4 and D5. It is more narrative, more explicit, less covert and more abstract as compared to Bangladeshi national press reportage. Therefore, the national press reportage of the three countries are different from one another.
There are also variations in the mean scores of Pakistani cultural press reportage in comparison with Indian and Bangladeshi cultural press reportage on D1, D2 and D3 out of the five dimensions. Pakistani cultural press reportage has been found the most explicit and the least non-narrative than the other two countries.

The most significant difference can be observed between Pakistani and Indian financial press reportage on D1, D2 and D3. Pakistani financial press reportage is more informational, narrative and explicit than Indian financial press reportage. On D2, where Pakistani FPR is narrative, Bangladeshi FPR is non-narrative in nature. On D4 and D5 Pakistani FPR has been found more covert and more abstract than Bangladeshi FPR. Pakistani political press reportage is different from Indian political press reportage on D1, D2 and D3 as it is more informational, narrative and explicit than Indian PPR. Further, it is different from Bangladeshi PPR on D2, D3 and D5 as it is more narrative, less covert and more abstract than Bangladeshi political press reportage.

The comparison highlights that Pakistani press reportage, with its sub-categories, is different from Indian and Bangladeshi press reportage. The findings thus provide substantial evidence that Pakistani English is a distinct variety in comparison with Indian and Bangladeshi Englishes also. It is hoped that this corpus-based study, although relatively small-scale and limited in scope, has contributed valuable insights into the variation in Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi Englishes and pave a way to dig deeper into linguistic analysis of these distinct varieties.
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Appendix A

Co-occurring Linguistic Features on Five Textual Dimensions of 1988 MD analysis of Press Reportage

**Dimension 1: Involved vs. Informational Discourse**

**Positive Feature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominalization,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘That’ deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb (uninflected present, imperative &amp; third Person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Person pronoun/Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb ‘Do’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb/Qualifier-Emphatic (e.g., just, really)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First person pronoun/possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun ‘it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb ‘Be’ (uninflected present tense, verb, and auxiliary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Negative Feature**

| Nouns (excluding gerund |
| Preposition |
| Attributive Adjective |

**Dimension 2: Narrative vs. Non narrative Concerns**
Positive Feature | Negative Features
--- | ---
Past Tense Verb | (No negative Features)
Third person pronoun (except ‘it’) | Verb-perfect Aspect
Public Verbs

**Dimension 3: Explicit Vs. Situation Dependent Discourse**

Positive Feature | Negative Features
--- | ---
Wh-pronoun-relative clause-object position | Adverb of time
Wh-pronoun-relative clause-subject-position | Adverb of Place
Wh-pronoun-relative clause-object position | Adverb Other
With prepositional fronting (pied-piping) | Coordinating Conjunction –phrasal connector
Singular noun-nominalization

**Dimension 4: Overt Expression of Argumentation /Persuasion**

Positive Features | Negative Features
--- | ---
Infinitive Verb | (no negative features)
Modal of Prediction | Persuasive Verb
Subordinating conjunction-conditional | Modal of Necessity
Adverb within auxiliary

**Dimension 5: Impersonal (Abstract) VS. Non impersonal (Non-Abstract Style)**

Positive Features | Negative Features
--- | ---
Adverbial-conjuncts | (no negative features)
Agentless Passive verb
Passive verb + by
Passive Post nominal modifier
Subordinating conjunction-Other
Appendix B

Linguistic Features Relevant to the 1988 MD analysis of Press Reportage

Private verb (e.g., believe, feel, think)
‘That’ deletion (e.g., I think [that] he did it)
Present tense verb (uninflected present, imperative and third person)
Pro-verb ‘do’
Demonstrative pronoun (that, this, those, these)
Adverb/Qualifier-Emphatic (e.g., just, really, so)
First person pronoun (e.g., we, our)
 Pronoun it/its
Verb ‘Be’ (Uninflected present tense, verb and auxiliary
Subordinating Conjunction- Causative (e.g., because)
Discourse particles (sentence initial, well, now)
Nominal pronoun (e.g., someone, everything)
Adverbial-Hedge (e.g., almost, may be)
Adverb/Qualifier, Amplifier (e.g., absolutely, entirely)
Wh-question
Modals of possibility (can, may, could, might)
Coordinating conjunction-clausal connector
Wh-clause (e.g., he believed what I told him)
Stranded Preposition (appearing at sentence end)
Noun (excluding nominalization and gerund)
Preposition
Attributive adjective (e.g., national interest, annual return)
Past tense verbs
Third person pronoun (except ‘it’)
Verb-perfect aspect
Public verb (e.g., assert, complain)
Wh-pronoun- relative clause-object position (the person who he likes)
Wh-relative clause-subject position (e.g., the participants who like to join…)
Wh-relative clause-object position with prepositional fronting (‘pied piping’)
Co-ordinating conjunction-phrasal connector
Nominalization (e.g., organization, development)
Adverb-Time (e.g., instantly, soon)
Adverb-place (e.g., above, beside)
Adverb other (excluding adverb/Qualifier, Hedge, Emphatic, Time, place, Amplifier
Infinitive Verb
Modals of prediction (will, would.)
Suasive Verb (e.g., ask, command)
Subordinating Conjunction- conditional (if, unless)
Modal of necessity (Ought, should, must)
Adverb within auxiliarly (splitting aux-verb) (e.g., the product is specifically meant)
Adverbial-conjuncts (however, therefore, thus)
Agentless passive verb (e.g., however, therefore, thus)
Agentless passive verb (e.g., the scheme was introduced)
Passive verb+ by (e.g., the plan was introduced by principal)
Passive post nominal modifier (e.g., the message conveyed by)
Subordinating conjunction-Other (e.g., as, excepts, until)
Present Tense Verbs (Uninflected present, imperative and third person)
2nd person Pronoun
1st Person Pronoun
Verb “Be”
Noun (excluding nominalization and Gerund)
Preposition
Verb Perfect Aspect
Predictive adjectives
Passives all
That-complement clause controlled by stance verb
To-complement clause controlled by stance verb
To-complement clause controlled by stance adjective
Process nouns, (isolation et.)
Other abstract nouns (e.g., idea)
Activity Verb (e.g., give, take)
Mental verb (e.g., believe, enjoy)
Seem
Contractions
Split infinitives
NOT neg.
P-AND
O_AND
FINAL PREP.