

Contrastive Discourse Markers in Book Reviews and Editorial Texts

Muayyad Omran Chiad

College of Education /Kerbela University

Abstract

This paper uses a sample of written discourse from Book Reviews and Editorials as a means of exploring the interface in the use of Contrastive Discourse Markers(henceforth CDMs).The written sample yields differences in the use of contrastive linkers.The frequency of CDMs use is higher for Book Reviews for almost every category.The difference reflects a general contrast between the two types of discourse.The study also attempts to relate such a difference to the features of context of situation.Newspaper editorials highly value the economy of space and time which brings it near to automaticity in speech.The striking example is in the use of (but) which suggests a degree of spontaneity.In addition,editorials are constrained by what your interlocutor puts forward.Conversely,book reviewers put their arguments with a certain frame intending to present a line of reasoning in a solid gradual manner,supported by evidence and axioms.The corrections of a particular stance must be made very clear and enhanced by the use of discourse markers.

1. Introduction

Cohesion and register are used in the creation of text. Register is concerned with what a text means. It is defined as the set of semantic configuration that is typically associated with a particular class of context of situation, and defines the substance of the text Halliday and Hasan(1979).

Cohesion is not concerned with what a text means.Rather, it refers to a set of meaning relations that exist within the text.These relations are not structural, that is, not of the kind that link the components of a sentence and they differ from sentential structure.The detection of these meaning relations is important to its interpretation(ibid:6-9).Meaning relations in a text are achieved by the use of discourse markers.Among these is the contrastive discourse markers.Discourse markers,as described in Fraser (1997), are lexical expressions such as those shown in bold typed expressions in the following examples.

(1) a) We were late in leaving home. **Nevertheless**, we arrived on time.

b) It should fly. **After all**, we followed directions. (Fraser, 1997)

They,according to Halliday and Hassan(1976), play an important role in connecting the text as a whole.They are,therefore,considered to have the function of cohesive ties leading to the creation of texture.As semantic relation,they are used to show"the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before"(ibid:227).They are inherently presupposing something that has gone before and something to follow.

So,because of their roles as text forming devices,the study explores some of the differences between two types of texts in written English:Book Reviews texts(henceforth BRT)and Editorials Texts(henceforth ET).Because the newer approaches to language take account of a good number of social, cultural, and situational factors that are

assumed to affect language use and its features. Therefore, the present study also tries to relate the differences in the use of CDMs to situational factors.

The study hypothesizes that there is a significant difference in the use of CDMs between the two genres. BRT uses more contrastive linkers than ET. The difference is related to situational factors such as the opportunity of time planning, degree of interaction, the purpose of the communication, the relationship between participants.

The paper consists of 14 sample texts of book reviews and 21 texts of editorials. Each sample makes a corpus which amounts to 17,504 words. The book review corpus is taken from <http://eh.net/bookreviews/> website. While the latter is taken from some newspapers like Los Angeles Times, Times Online, and the Wall Street Journal. The texts are given in appendix (1) and (2).

The procedure starts with the random choice of the samples, quantitative survey of the links in the material, then tabulating the frequency of their occurrences and relative frequency in terms of types and tokens. Finally, the attention focuses on the links that favored in each corpus like (but) and (however) and the kinds of strategies these are used to convey. On the ground of the results, conclusions and recommendations are given.

Such a kind of research is nearly neglected in linguistic studies because language was looked as a self-contained system independent of the pragmatic environment. So, the study of language meant the study of its parts. However, the present study goes along the new approaches which view language as a synthetic phenomenon, that is, linguistic code in relation to its linguistic and situational context.

2. Contrastive Discourse Markers in English

CDMs are types of connectors used to connect sentences into coherent discourse. As cited by Fraser (1997), several different scholars have labeled them by different terms as "cue phrases" (Hovy, 1994; Knott & Dale, 1994), discourse connectives (Blakemore, 1987, 1992), discourse operators (Redeker, 1991), discourse particles (Schoroup, 1985), discourse signaling devices (Polanyi & Scha, 1983), indicating devices (Katriel & Dascal, 1977), phatic connectives (Bazanella, 1990), pragmatic connectives (Van Dijk, 1985; Stubbs, 1983), pragmatic devices (Vande Koppe, 1985), pragmatic formatives (Fraser, 1987), pragmatic markers (Fraser, 1988; Holker, 1991; Schifffrin, 1987), pragmatic particles (Ostman, 1989), semantic conjuncts (Quirk et al., 1985), and sentence connectives (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Fraser (1997) calls them as discourse markers (DM) that yield a contrastive interpretation of S1. Fraser (1997:2) calls this particular group of DMs, contrastive discourse markers, and points out that:

lexical expression which signals the relationship between the discourse segment of which it is a part, S2, and the foregoing segment, S1. Each DM has a core meaning, but the meaning is not conceptual, such as the case for the noun *boy* which denotes a young, male human, but rather procedural, where the DM signals how S2 is to be interpreted, given S1. For example, in (1a), where the S2 = "We arrived on time" and the S1 = "We were late in leaving home," the DM *nevertheless* signals that we should interpret S2 as being in contrast with an expected implication of S, in this case that we would be late in arriving.

It is obvious from the above definition that the main role of a CDM, according to Fraser (1997), is to establish a contrastive relationship between the two sequences, S1 and S2, which it connects.

Fraser (ibid:3),who coined the term “contrastive” to refer to this particular type of DMs,gives the following examples of (CDMs):

(a)though,all the same,alternately,be that as it may,but,contrary to expectations,conversely,despite(doing)this/that,even so,however, in comparison(with/to this/that),in contrast(with/to this/that),in spite of (doing)this/that,instead(of (doing)that/that),nevertheless, nonetheless,on the contrary,on the other hand, rather than(doing) this/that,still,whereas.

There are specific“meaning distinctions”between each of the above mentioned (CDMs).He argues that these(CDMs)can be grouped together in terms of their co-occurrence and divided into classes and subclasses in terms of placement restrictions.According to Fraser(1997:10-6),the following examples illustrate clearly how CDMs impose restrictions on the sequences they introduce:

- (2) a)Fred is not a gentleman.**On the contrary/*But**, he is a rogue.
 b)A:Harry is quite tall. B:**On the contrary/*But**,he is really quite short.
 c)We didn’t leave late.**But/*On the contrary**,we arrived late.
 d)I don’t like this mess.**But/*On the contrary**,I understand how it occurred.

From these examples,in(a) and(b),only the CDM *on the contrary* can make the two sequences coherent;using *but* instead of *on the contrary* does not seem logical.Similarly,in(c)and(d)*but* cannot be replaced by *on the contrary*.Fraser(1997)further points out that certain CDMs can co-occur, making the relationship between S2 and S1 meaningful.Look at the following examples :

- (3) a)The shipment of candy has arrived.**But/However**,don’t touch it.
 b)It’s alright Sue wasn’t here today.**But/However**,when will she be able to come?
 And,
 (4) a)Take a letter. **But/However**,tell me if I am going too fast.
 b)Don’t smoke tobacco.**Instead/Rather**,chew the stuff.

On this basis, he shows the relationship in the following chart.

But		
However		
On the other hand		Instead
In contrast	Nevertheless	Rather
In comparison		
Conversely		On the contrary

Chart(1) CDMs Placement Restrictions

Fraser(1997:9)explains that CDMs are divided into three different classes,based on their‘core meaning’.These CDMs imposes certain restrictions on the relationship between S2 and S1.

The largest class,headed by *but*,imposes the least restrictions between S2 and S1 with which it is contrasted.The restrictions imposed by *but* are different from those imposed by *instead/rather* and *on the contrary*,such that where one of these classes can occur, the other two cannot.

From the above chart *but, however, and nevertheless*; and *instead* and *rather* can co-occur, while *but* and *instead; nevertheless* and *instead*; and *instead* and *on the contrary* cannot.

Quirk et al. (1972:423) discuss CDMs as "logical connectors" which express logical sequence of actions and process. In (ibid, 1985:632), CDMs are a category of conjuncts which represent a class of adverbials used to express speaker's assessments of how he/she views the connection between two linguistic units. They perform a role of connectives between one unit and another which has already been introduced. They have the role of joining independent linguistic units: text and parts of text. Greenbaum (1969:36-37) and Quirk et al. (ibid :634) show contrastive meanings as a type of relation similar to appositional meaning. Yet, the contrastives present words and matters in contrast with those that have gone before. Appositive seeks another formulation while contrastive gives different explanation. This relation has four sub-meanings.

1) Reformulatory :

In this relation, the connectives are usually preceded by "or". These are (better, rather, more accurately, more precisely, alternatively, in other words, etc.) In Greenbaum's classification, this relation is referred to as "substitutive" which shows what is being said is a reassessment of what has been said before. The examples below illustrate this relation:

(5) He also provides some of the basic background historiography leading up to the rise of American consumerism. In other words, Hill's book has the polished look of a nice coffee-table book and some of the rhetoric of a serious historical monograph.

(Appendix 1, text 4)

(6) She has applied for a transfer— she is tired of her present job. in other words.

(Quirk et al, 1985, 639).

2) Replacive :

The conjunctive meaning implied in this relation indicates that the items preceding the CDMs are expressed by other items which are more important. Such meanings may be preceded by the conjunction "or" giving combinations of connectors expressing meaning and indicating that what is to come is a replacement of what has gone before. Among these linkers are (again, alternatively, rather, better, worse, on the other hand, etc.) as in the following example :

(7) Strachan's *To Arms* is the first installment in what is promised to be a three-volume history of the conflict. *Financing the First World War* is not a self-contained book as such, written with the intention to get to the bottom of financing arrangements during the Great War. Rather, Oxford University Press is re-issuing parts of *To Arms*, the first volume of Strachan's three-volume book on World War I, as separate paperbacks.

(Appendix 1, text 10)

3) Antithetic :

This relation shows a direct contrast or antithesis or a complete opposition to what has already been introduced. Frequent linkers of this relation are (contrariwise, conversely, instead, oppositely, on the other hand, on the one hand, on the contrary, by contrast, in contrast, by way of contrast, in comparison, by comparison, etc.). The following is an example of this relation:

(8) Since pre-1870 estimates are particularly problematic, Tiberi divides his critiques into two periods: pre-1870, and 1870-1914. On the one hand, this chapter is an objective summary of all of the research; in it, Tiberi summarizes all of the estimates in one table (table 4.1, pp. 158-159), which allows us to compare the various results, making it a very useful table. On the other hand, he finally permits himself to be subjective and tells us which research and which estimates he prefers. It seems that his preference tends toward the capitalization method. (Appendix 1, text 13)

(9) It is said that water flows up hill. On the contrary, it flows downhill.
(Wikipedia)⁽¹⁾

4) Concessive :

It presents unexpected contrast to what has gone before. Contrastive Concessives take the semantic range expressed by the conjunction "but". They include (anyway, anyhow, else, however, nevertheless, nonetheless, notwithstanding, only, still, on the other hand, in spite of it, at the same time, of course, still and all, that said, etc). The example below represents the use of such conjuncts:

(10) It is very cold. I went for my morning walk, however. (ibid)

(11) After initial resistance to professionalization and the adoption of new technologies such as the steam fire engine, firefighters instead sought to shape the new order to their advantage. Yet, even as their departments became increasingly bureaucratized, they were able to carve out a new identity based on occupational specialization. (Appendix 1, text 9)

3. Results of Analysis

Table(1) shows that the overall frequency of CDMs use is found to be higher in the BRT than for ET. The former records 73 frequency of occurrences (4.17) relative frequency out of the total number of words per 1000 words, whereas the latter records 48 frequency (2.74) relative frequency out of the total number of words per 1000 words.

Table(1) Distribution of CDMs in BRT and ET

CDM types in ET	Frequency	Frequency per 1000	%	CDM types in BRT	Frequency	Frequency per 1000 words	%
Reformulatory	0	0	0	Reformulatory	5	0.28	6.84
Replacive	0	0	0	Replacive	5	0.28	6.84
Antithetic	3	0.171	6.25	Antithetic	4	0.22	5.47
Concessive	45	2.57	93.75	Concessive	59	3.37	80.82
Total	48	2.74	100	Total	73	4.17	100

⁽¹⁾ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conjunct>

In comparing the frequencies of different CDMs types, the frequency of CDM use is higher for BRT for almost every category. The difference reflects a general contrast between book review discourse and editorial discourse. Book reviewers tend to vary their means of making contrastive expressions lexically and grammatically.

Reformulatory and replacive relations are absent in ET corpus while they are much less frequent than the concessive linking in BRT, 5 frequency of occurrences and (0.28) relative frequency out of the total number of words per 1000 words. Concessive linking predominates greatly in the material as a whole.

Moreover, table (2) shows that concessive (however) predominates in BRT, with 22 frequency and (%30.31). It is more than three times as common as its occurrence in ET, with 6 occurrences (%12.5) in ET. See example (12) below.

CDMs tokens	Frequency in BRT	%	Frequency in ET	%
However	22	30.31	6	12.5
But	11	15.06	30	62.5
Yet	11	15.06	3	6.25
Of course	7	9.58	3	6.25
On the other hand	3	4.10	0	0
In other words	3	4.10	0	0
Only	2	2.73	1	2.08
Nevertheless	2	2.73	0	0
On the one hand	2	2.73	0	0
Nonetheless	2	2.73	0	0
Rather	2	2.73	0	0
Or	1	1.36	0	0
Alternatively	1	1.36	0	0
To put all this in perspective	1	1.36	0	0
Again	1	1.36	0	0
On the contrary	1	1.36	0	0
Even so	1	1.36	1	2.08
In contrast	0	0	2	14.16
Instead	0	0	1	2.08
Still	0	0	1	2.08
Total	73	100	48	100

Table(2) Frequency and Relative Frequency of CDMs Tokens in the Material

Another striking example in table (2) is the heavy use of (but) as a contrastive marker. In fact, (but) is used to link 30 examples (%62.5) of all contrastive relations in the ET corpus, but has only 11 occurrences (%15.06) in the BRT corpus. It seems that (but) carries a higher functional load in ET corpus by taking over the other contrastive links in BRT corpus. (But) is a straightforward contrastive discourse marker, always a confirmative in character and seems to act as a cooperative "sharing device" (Quirk, 1955:178). Another factor may be related to short time planning where it rises from the sudden shifts in the presentation as if there is a degree of automaticity similar to

speech. That is, editorial texts favour stereotypes that can be retrieved automatically. This can be explained in the greater use of a group of contrastive markers represented by (but). The observation confirms the idea that loose CDMs is a feature of ET than of BRT. See examples (13) and (14) below.

12) Abandonment of the gold standard? Outright nationalization? Higgs quotes Elliot Brownlee (1996) to the effect that it was tax policy that most concerned business. Higgs, **however**, seems to be neutral on what if any policies contributed the most to the low level of investment. Indeed, his argument seems to be that it was all of these things together that contributed to the new regime, and that trying to parse out the effect of particular New Deal policies would be counterproductive. Before giving up on the Depression era as a source of information about how policies affect the economy, **however**, it makes sense to me to probe further. (Appendix 1, text 7)

13- Schwarzenegger came into office echoing the assertion of government skeptics everywhere that there is enough money to be saved from rooting out waste, fraud and abuse to permit the abundance to continue, without the investment. **But** that's a lazy canard, and Schwarzenegger now acknowledges that the state cannot cut its way to prosperity. (Appendix 2, text 1)

14) To stretch the aid money further, Congress should buck the labor unions and lift the requirement that American food aid be shipped on U.S.-flagged vessels. **But** short-term emergency aid won't be enough. (Appendix 2, text 2)

Table(3) Positions of CDMs in BRT and ET

Positions of CDMs	BRT		ET	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Initial	58	79.45	46	95.83
Medial	8	19.95	2	4.16
Final	7	9.58	0	0
Total	73	100	48	100

One interesting result in this study, indicated in table (3), is the CDMs in RRT appear in all positions with higher frequency than they do in the ET texts.

One question may be raised concerning the difference in frequency of CDMs between the two sample texts. The divergence can be explained, as put by Halliday (1978:62), by considering the situational factors that are assumed to affect language use.

An editorial is defined as a statement or an article by a news organization, newspaper or magazine that expresses the opinion of the editor, editorial board, or publisher. It is anything other than advertising or promotional material (The Free Dictionary, 2008:online). The department within a publishing house is responsible for the content of its titles, both by commissioning and acquiring but also subsequently ensuring accuracy and completeness of the finished publication.⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ www.publishers.org.uk/paweb/paweb.nsf/0/AB6267C37C470E1480256AD80057F556!opendocument

The purpose of editorials is to inform the reader about a certain issue and giving a part for the personal involvement of the writer with the intention of affecting the reader's final decision(Cappon,1982:58).Some interpretation is inseparable by selecting what to include,what to leave out,and with a particular arrangement,the writer expresses his perspective in the subject reported.Editorials may be written and published in a short time,there is no time to tackle any topic in detailed analysis.This is due to limitations of time and space on the length of editorial texts.Therefore,information must be presented in a format and at a rate which makes it easily digestible to the readers.Hyde(1956:118)makes this clear when he indicates that journalists look for the shortest way in reporting things without giving a chance for repetition and useless words and phrases.On this ground,writers may avoid connectives:"sometimes unity can be achieved by linking words.But sometimes these connections may not be necessary ... so they are left out " (Metz , 1977:75).

On the other hand,book review calls for the reviewer to identify, summarize and,most importantly,evaluate the ideas and information the author has presented.There is a tendency of evaluate the strengths of the book,weaknesses and validity through explanation,interpretation,and analysis.Book reviews can be positive or negative,based on the assessment of the book.Also they vary in length,scope,intended audience,and complexity(University of Alberta:2005:online).

Two types of knowledge is needed when making a book review.

- 1)Knowledge of the work being reviewed which requires an understanding of the author's purpose is and how the work contributes to that purpose, and also some knowledge of the author--his/her nationality,time period,other works etc.
- 2)Knowledge of the genre means understanding the art form and how it functions.Without such understanding,the reviewer has no historical or literary standard upon which to base his/her evaluation.

By this,there is a kind of description,exposition,and judgement.The reviewer's understanding of the author's purpose,how well the reviewer feels the author's purpose has been achieved and evidence to support the reviewer's judgement of the author' achievement is significant.

The book review should be logically developed and organized.Changes in the outline may need to be made and transitional paragraphs introduced, but the aim should be toward logical development of the central idea(Colford:2000:online).Therefore,the reviewers need to protect their arguments with a certain frame by presenting their line of reasoning in a solid gradual manner,supported by evidence and axioms to expert audience in the field.The criticism of a particular point must be made very clear enhanced by the use of discourse markers in general and CDMs in particular.They are indicators of certain kind of relationships between preceding and following texts.

Therefore, the greater demand for explicitness of a particular line of reasoning, based on thorough analysis and directed to a special type of audience leads to more use of CDMs on the part of BRT.

4. Conclusion

The study has shown that the ways in which book review discourse expresses contrast in English differently from newspaper editorial discourse. Although editors generally use contrastive linkers, they rely much on (but) as their favorite contrastive discourse marker. On the other hand, book reviewers vary in their means more and make greater use of (however).

Some of the differences are related to situational factors. The public nature of newspapers, and the automaticity they seem to be connected with, leaving little scope for variation. Economy of words and space is another factor affecting what and how to include in editorial columns where space is seriously counted. By the same token, book reviewers have much space to write and time for planning ahead. They write with expository and argument prose putting in mind the purpose of evaluation of the book's strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, certain frame is needed for presenting their line of reasoning in a solid gradual manner, supported by evidence. Their ideas must be made very clear and enhanced by the use of discourse markers.

The study is intended to correct the lack of literature for one type of connectives—CDMs in two genres—Book Review from book review website and Editorials from newspapers. It has provided a normative pattern of CDMs usage in these two genres which has an implication to ESP. McCarthy (1993:170) states that written discourse analysis is not a new method for teaching languages. It offers us "a fundamentally different way of looking at language compared with sentence-dominated models". Students can be trained to recognize CDMs along text lines, making writing easy for both them and the teacher.

Appendix (1) Book Review Texts

- 1- Martin C. Spechler, "Review of Jari Eloranta and Jari Ojala (editors), *East-West Trade and the Cold War*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Nov 4 2005. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/1006>
- 2- Mark Aldrich, "Review of John Witt, *The Accidental Republic: Crippled Workingmen, Destitute Widows, and the Remaking of American Law*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Jun 11 2004. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/0794>
- 3- Paul Miranti, "Review of Margaret Levenstein, *Accounting for Growth: Information Systems and the Creation of the Large Corporation*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Sep 28 1999. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/0192>
- 4- Bryan Wuthrich, "Review of Daniel Delis Hill, *Advertising to the American Woman, 1900-1999*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Aug 8 2002. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/0521>
- 5- Leonidas Montes, "Review of Gloria Vivenza, *Adam Smith and the Classics: The Classical Heritage in Adam Smith's Thought*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Mar 19 2004. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/0751>

- 6- Jonathan Silva, "Review of Pamela Walker Laird, *Advertising Progress: American Business and the Rise of Consumer Marketing*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Dec 3 1998. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/0129>
- 7- Hugh Rockoff, "Review of Robert Higgs, *Depression, War, and Cold War: Studies in Political Economy*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Jul 1 2007. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/1235>
- 8- Barbara Straus Reed, "Review of Gerald J. Baldasty, *E.W. Scripps and the Business of Newspapers*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Aug 25 1999. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/0184>
- 9- Dalit Baranoff, "Review of Mark Tebeau, *Eating Smoke: Fire in Urban America, 1800-1950*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Jun 17 2004. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/0797>
- 10- Hans-Joachim Voth, "Review of Hew Strachan, *Financing the First World War*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Jan 23 2007. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/1180>
- 11- Gordon Boyce, "Review of Andrew Gibson and Arthur Donovan, *The Abandoned Ocean: A History of United States Maritime Policy*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Sep 11 2000. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/0290>
- 12- John Howard Brown, "Review of Gary Hull (editor), *The Abolition of Antitrust*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Oct 17 2005. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/0997>
- 13- Elise S. Brezis, "Review of Mario Tiberi, *The Accounts of the British Empire: Capital Flows from 1799 to 1914*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Sep 6 2005. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/0978>
- 14- Roger Ransom, "Review of Mark R. Wilson, *The Business of Civil War: Military Mobilization and the State, 1861-1865*." EH.Net Economic History Services, Oct 1 2007. URL: <http://eh.net/bookreviews/library/1262>

Appendix (2) Editorial Texts

- 1- Changing California's tax system". Los Angeles Times. April 15, 2008. <http://www.latimes.com/>
- 2- "The food price threat. Los Angeles Times April 15, 2008. <http://www.latimes.com/>
- 3- Penner, Ethan . "Our Financial Bailout Culture". The Wall Street Journal . April 11, 2008; Page A17
- 4- Jaffe Chuck "Piece of the Treasury for \$100". The Wall Street Journal . April 11, 2008; Page A17
- 5- Kim, Jane J."Sallie Mae Won't Offer Consolidation Loans". The Wall Street Journal. April 12, 2008; Page B2
- 6- Dugan, Ianthe Jeanne "Wall Street's Insecurity" ". The Wall Street Journal. April 12, 2008; Page B1.
- 7- "GE's Disappointing Results Rattle Nervous Stock Markets". The Wall Street Journal April 11, 2008 .
- 8- "10% of GDP". The Wall Street Journal . April 17, 2008; Page A18.
- 9- Casselman, Ben "Born to Renovate". The Wall Street Journal April 11, 2008; Page W1.
- 10- Kopel, David "The Democrats and Gun Control". The Wall Street Journal April 17, 2008; Page A19

- 11- Spitzerism Lives. The Wall Street Journal April 17, 2008; Page A18
- 12- Kemp, Jack "Obama and Economic Opportunity". The Wall Street Journal April 17, 2008; Page A19
- 13- Baltimore, David and Ahmed Zewail "We Need a Science White House". The Wall Street Journal April 17, 2008; Page A18.
- 14- Kim, Jane J. "The Best and Worst College-Savings Plans". The Wall Street Journal April 16, 2008; Page D1.
- 15- "What's in a Merger? For Fliers, Not Much". The Wall Street Journal April 16, 2008; Page D1
- 16- Simon, Ruth and James R. Hagerty "Why Lenders Are Leery Of Short Sales". April 17, 2008; Page D1.
- 17- James R. Hagerty "Freddie Mac to Unveil Lenders' Pact" April 17, 2008; Page D4
- 18- Macartney, Jane "You Want to Go where Everybody Knows your Name". Times Online . May 12, 2007. <http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news>
- 19- Thomas , Zoe "Keeping Ahead of Climate Change". Times Online . December 2, 2007. <http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/>
- 20- Ried, Melanie "Lapsed liberal who Disowned auld Alliance with Labour". Times Online . June 1, 2007. <http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/>
- 21- Jenkins, Simon "Blair was Hounded too little by the Feral Beasts, not too much" Times Online . June 17, 2007. <http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/>

References

- Blakemore, D. 1987. Semantic constraints on relevance. Oxford: Blackwell.
 -----(1992) Understanding utterances. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bazanella, C. (1990) Phatic Connectives as Intonational Cues in Contemporary Spoken Italian. Journal of Pragmatics, 14(4):629-47.
- Cappon, R. (1982) The Associated Press Guide to Good Writing. Reading :MA: Addition Wesley.
- Colford, Ian (2000) "How to Write a Book Review". Retrieved on 15/4/2008 from the website: <http://www.library.dal.ca/>
- Fraser, B. (1988) "Types of English Discourse Markers". Acta Linguistica Hungarica, 38(14):19-33.
(1997) Contrastive discourse markers in English. Boston University Manuscript.
- The Free Dictionary (2008) "Editorial". Retrieved on 20/4/2008 from the website: <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/>
- Greenbaum, S and Quirk, R. (1990) A Student's Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman .
- Greenbaum, S. (1969) Studies in English Adverbial Usage. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. and R. Hasan (1976) Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978) Exploration in the Foundations of Language. London: Longman.
- Holker, K. (1991) Französisch: Partikelforschung. Lexikon der Romanistik Linguistik, Vol V(1):77-88. Niemeyer.

- Hovy,E.(1994)Parsimonious and Profligate Approaches to the Question of Discourse Structure Relations. London: Longman.
- Hyde,Grant(1956)News Writing:Newspaper Reporting.New York:Holt , Rintlege &Winston,Inc.
- Knott,A.and R.Dale.(1994)"Using linguistic Phenomena to Motivate a Set of Coherence Relations".Discourse Processes, 18(1):35-62.
- Katriel,T. and Dascal M.(1977) "Between semantics and pragmatics: the two types of but" - Hebrew "aval" and "ela"". Theoretical Linguistics, 4:143-72.
- McCarthy,M.(1993)Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.Cambridge University Press.
- Metz,William(1977)News Writing from Lead to "30" .New Jersey
- Ostman, J-O.(1989)"On the Language-Interval Interaction of Prosody and Pragmatic Particles". Levels of Linguistic Adaptation, ed. by J.Verschueren. Philadelphia.
- Polanyi,L. and P.Scha(1983)"The Syntax of Discourse".Text 3:261-70.
- Quirk,R.,Greenbaum,S.,Leech,G. and Svartvik,J.(1985)A comprehensive grammar of the English Language.London: Longman.
- (1972)Contemporary English Grammar.London:Longman.
- Redeker,Gisela(1991)"Review Article:Linguistic Markers of Discourse Structure".Linguistics,29(6):1139-72.
- Schoroup(1985)Common Discourse Particle in English Conversation: like, well, y'know.Garland.
- Schiffrin,D.(1987)Discourse Markers.Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Stubbs, M.(1983)Discourse analysis.University of Chicago Press.
- University of Alberta(2005)"A Concise Guide to Writing a Critical Book Review".Retrieved on 15/4/2008 from the website: <http://www.library.ualberta.ca/index.cfm>
- Vande Kopple,W(1985)"Some Exploratory Discourse on Meta-Discourse. College Composition and Communication.36.
- Van Dijk,Teun .ed.(1985)Handbook of Discourse Analysis.Vol.2,London: Longman
- Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (2006)" Conjunct" <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conjunct>