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Abstract- This study aims at analyzing the language of Pakistani English newspaper editorials (PPEs) over a period of 70 years (1947-2016). It also attempted to draw an internal comparison between the sub-registers of PPEs exploring internal linguistic variations between Eds and Op-eds during these years. A Corpus of Pakistani English Newspaper Editorials (CorPENE) was compiled and analyzed using Biber’s (2006) Multidimensional Analysis (MDA) model. The study investigated the statistically significant linguistic variation between the three selected phases of PPEs and their sub-categories. The study explored four new dimensions of linguistic variation. From the results, it is evident that the language of the editorials became more opinionated over the years but at the same time it showed less argumentative, abstract and explicit discourse. The language of Op-eds became more opinionated, abstract and explicit, while it is less narrative with the passage of time. Overall, newspaper editorials (Eds) have become more opinionated and less narrative, abstract and explicit than Op-eds during the years. Towards the ends of the phases, the informational trend has largely disappeared in the language of Pakistani press editorials and Op-eds.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The language of print media has remained the focus of linguistic studies and a revived interest has been noticed in recent times. Language, culture, and media form a triangle in which each affects the other two and in turn, is affected by them (Rasul et al., 2016). Newspaper has a large public readership. As newspaper language reflects the language of society at large (Westin, 2002), it provides a tool to trace the changes in the particular language as employed by society and, therefore, hints upon the changing social patterns. Thus, it was the large public readership, popularity, and influence of the newspaper that the language of the newspaper was selected for this study.

The language of Pakistani print media has been studied from various perspectives. Some studied newspaper language from a discourse perspective (Hayat & Juliana, 2016; Van Dijk, 2013; Sadaf, 2011; Fairclough, 1992), some applied systemic-functional method to study it (O'Halloran, 2008; Halliday & Webster, 2009) and other studied the language of print media from a gender perspective (Fowler, 1991; Theberge, 1991). In order to communicate with indigenous readership effectively, the language of the newspapers which are published in Pakistan embed a number of linguistic features taken from local language(s) (Uzair et al, 2012).

Pakistani variety of English, with an influence from indigenous languages and local culture(s), is considered distinct from other varieties in the world. English language in Pakistan has adopted different lexical items, syntax, and expressions from the local dialects (Muhabat, et al, 2015; Anwar & Talaat, 2011; Baumgardner, 1993). Pakistani English is considered to be an independent and distinctive variety of English (Mahmood, A., 2009; Mahmood, R, 2009; Rasheed, 2009; Mahboob & Ahmar, 2004; Talaat, 2002; Rahman, 1990) having its own characteristics. However, the concerns of previous studies (Muhabat et al., 2015; Uzair et al., 2012; Anwar & Talaat, 2011; Rasheed, 2009; Mahmood, R., 2009; Mahboob & Ahmar, 2004; Talaat, 2002; Abbas, 1998; Rah man, 1990) have been to identify and study the individual linguistic features.

These approaches and methods of investigation of English used in Pakistan are often criticised for focusing on individual linguistic features. Later, with register coming into prominence as a major predictor of linguistic variation (Bills et al., 1994), various research studies explored several registers to establish English used in Pakistan as a distinctive independent variety. These studies on various registers range
from academic to fiction to internet register. The approaches and methods focusing on individual linguistic features became increasingly unreliable with the introduction of multivariate statistical techniques (like factor analyses or cluster analysis) which focus on the co-occurring linguistic features in the given text(s).

Biber (1988) introduced multivariate statistical techniques to investigate register variation in a language. Some researchers studied Englishes used in Pakistan applying multidimensional approach (Shakir & Deuber, 2019; Ali, 2018; Ahmad & Ali, 2017; Hussain et al., 2016; Ahmad & Mahmood, 2015; Ahmad, 2015). Further, a few research studies based their analyses on Biber’s (2006) new factor solution (Ali, 2019; Ahmad, 2015; Shakir, 2013). However, the focus of these studies was different registers including news reportage and news advertisement. It was only Alvi (2017) and Ali (2018) who studied press editorials based on old and new MD. However, Alvi’s study was synchronic in nature. Ali & Sheeraz (2018) conducted diachronic research studying Pakistani English newspaper editorials using Old MD. The present study, however, attempts to explore the corpus specific dimensions based on new factor solution from Pakistani newspaper editorials over a period of 70 years. It attempts to document how Pakistani English was shaped and reshaped over the periods of history. The study attempts to achieve two objectives. First, it investigates how far the language of editorials (Eds) and ‘opposite the editorial’ (Op-eds) varies over a period of time. Second, it also draws an internal comparison between the sub-registers and explores internal linguistic variations between Eds and op-eds of Pakistani English newspapers across Biber’s (2006) textual dimensions.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Showing distinctive features at various levels of language, Pakistani English (PE) has emerged as a distinct, non-native variety of English. It has received an increasing interest in the last two decades. Several studies have focused on phonological, morphological, lexical, and syntactic aspects of Pakistani English (PE) with a special emphasis on deviant, individual linguistic features. (e.g., Muhabat et al., 2015; Rahman, 2014; Khan & Shabir, 2012; Anwar & Talat, 2011; Uzair & Mahmood, 2012; R. Mahmood, 2009; A. Mahmood, 2009; Talaat, 2002; Baumgardener, 1996).

Later, Multidimensional Analysis (MDA), which was developed by Biber (1988) has extensively been used to study linguistic variation in English both diachronically (e.g., Biber & Finegan, 2004; Bills et al., 1994; Westin, 2002) and synchronically (e.g., Biber, 1988, 1994, 1995; Finegan & Biber 1994, Carkin, 2001; Biber, 2006; Egbert, 2015).

An interest in the study of linguistic variation across disciplines has also been observed in Pakistan in recent years. Most of such research studies applied MDA to study linguistic variation in different registers of Pakistani English including Pakistani academic writing (Azher et al., 2017; Rashid et al., 2017; Azher & Mehmood, 2016), fiction (Ahmad & Ali, 2014; Azher et al., 2014; Ahmed, 2009) and newspaper (Ali, 2020; Ali & Shehzad, 2019; Ali et al., 2016; Ahmad & Mahmood, 2015; Shakir, 2013; Ahmad, 2015).


A few of diachronic studies were also conducted in Pakistan. For example, Ramzan et al. (2014) conducted a diachronic study to explore the impact of English language on Urdu language. Latif and Chaudhry (2016) conducted an MD study on the sports category of press. Ali & Sheeraz (2018) conducted a diachronic study focusing on the language of English newspaper editorials, the focus remained the Old MD (the dimensions were borrowed from Biber 1988 model). However, so far, there is no diachronic study conducted on the language of editorials in Pakistani media using new factor analysis. The present study, therefore, attempts
to analyse the linguistic variation that occurred in the language of press editorials over a period of time (1947 – 2016) based on new MDA.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The methods used for this study are largely quantitative as various statistical techniques were used to identify the co-occurring linguistic features, however, a functional or situational interpretation was also provided. The steps followed in this study include the identification of the grammatical features, tagging of all relevant features in the corpus, counting the frequency of each feature in each text, applying factor analysis to compute co-occurrence patterns among features, interpreting the resulting dimensions functionally, and comparing Eds and Op-eds during the three selected periods.

The data was taken from Corpus of Pakistani English newspaper Editorials (1947-2016), CorPENE, for short. As it is a diachronic study which aims at focusing Pakistani English newspaper editorials, a period from 1947 to 2016 was selected. The time sequence was divided into three temporally distanced periods: 1947-1951, 1971-1975, and 2012-2016. Dawn newspaper was selected for the first phase (1947-1951) as it was the only newspaper available at that time. For the second phase (1971-1975), Dawn and Business Recorder were selected as they were the only newspapers available at that time. For the third phase (2012 – 2016), Dawn, Business Recorder, The News, and The Nation were selected.

Table 1 Details about CorPENE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Dawn</th>
<th>Business Recorder</th>
<th>The News</th>
<th>The Nation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period 1: (1947-1951)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Op-ed Word count Number of Samples</td>
<td>35135 44915 80050 240</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>35135 44915 80050 240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2: (1971-1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Op-ed Word count Number of Samples</td>
<td>30785 38159 68944 120</td>
<td>27963 35437 63400 120</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>58748 73596 132344 240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 3: (2012-2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Op-ed Word count Number of Samples</td>
<td>11509 27222 38731 60</td>
<td>20834 35663 56497 60</td>
<td>14665 31539 46204 60</td>
<td>12559 27959 40518 60</td>
<td>59567 122383 181950 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of samples:</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total word count:</td>
<td>394344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Analysis

This section presents the results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) showing if there is a difference in means of PPEs among the phases being compared on new textual dimensions. The level of significance is 0.05 which means that the phases being compared show statistically significant variation when the significance value shown in the table is less than 0.05.

Table 1 indicates that the linguistic differences among the three phases on D1 have been found highly significant as the p-value is below 0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Phase</th>
<th>(J) Phase</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-0.356*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.474 - -0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-0.785*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.904 - -0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.356*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.237 - 0.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-0.430*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.549 - -0.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.785*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.667 - 0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.430*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.311 - 0.549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on estimated marginal means

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

D1 categorically exhibits a high level of linguistic variation and highlights the fact that there lie statistically significant linguistic differences among the three phases on this dimension. The highly significant values have further been testified by applying post hoc tests on new D1.

Table 2 Post hoc test (Pairwise comparison of phases – New D1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Phase</th>
<th>(J) Phase</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-0.3555*</td>
<td>0.06051</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.1975 - 0.1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-0.7854*</td>
<td>0.06051</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.4434 - 0.4434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.3555*</td>
<td>0.06051</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.1975 - 0.1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-0.4299*</td>
<td>0.06051</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.1975 - 0.1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.7854*</td>
<td>0.06051</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.1975 - 0.1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.4299*</td>
<td>0.06051</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.1975 - 0.1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The post hoc test confirms the results of table 1 that there lie statistically significant differences among the three phases.

Table 3 presents the results of ANOVA showing variation among the three phases on new D2. The results show that phase 1 in comparison with phase 2 and 3 show a statistically significant difference, while, the difference between phase 2 and 3 is statistically non-significant.
Based on estimated marginal means.
* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Post-hoc test was run to confirm the results of ANOVA. The results of post-hoc test confirm the results of ANOVA.

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square (Error) = .696.
* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

So far as D3 is concerned, the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) shows that phase 1 in comparison with phase 3 and phase 2 in comparison with phase 3 showed statistically significant differences. There lie no statistically significant differences between phase 1 and phase 2.
Based on estimated marginal means
* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

These ANOVA results have further been verified by applying post hoc tests which are presented in Table 6.

Table 6 Post hoc test (Pairwise comparison of phases – New D3)

Tukey HSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Phase</th>
<th>(J) Phase</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.0412</td>
<td>0.06539</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>-.1947</td>
<td>-.1123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.2407*</td>
<td>0.06539</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.3942</td>
<td>-.0873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.0412</td>
<td>0.06539</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>-.1123</td>
<td>.1947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.1995*</td>
<td>0.06539</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.3530</td>
<td>-.0461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.2407*</td>
<td>0.06539</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.0873</td>
<td>.3942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.1995*</td>
<td>0.06539</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.0461</td>
<td>.3530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square(Error) = .770.

Post hoc results confirm the ANOVA results of Table 5.

Table 7 highlights that on D4 there lie statistically significant differences among the three phases, as p-value is below .05.

Table 7. Pairwise comparison of phases (New D4)

Dependent Variable: New D4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Phase</th>
<th>(J) Phase</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.315*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.511*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.315*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.511*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.196*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of ANOVA on this dimension have further been testified by running post hoc tests.
Table 8 Post hoc test (Pairwise comparison of phases - New D4)

Dependent Variable: New_D4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Phase</th>
<th>(J) Phase</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.3153*</td>
<td>.06110</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.1719 - .4587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.5109*</td>
<td>.06110</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.3675 - .6543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.3153*</td>
<td>.06110</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.4587 - -.1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.5109*</td>
<td>.06110</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.6543 - -.3675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.1957*</td>
<td>.06110</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.3391 - -.0523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 highlights the post hoc results of the three phases on D4. Post hoc test confirms the ANOVA results that there lies significant variation between the three phases on new D4.

The ANOVA results provide substantial evidence that there lie statistically significant differences between the three phases. The next section discusses the relevance and importance of the variability keeping in view the objectives of this study.

V. DISCUSSION

This section discusses the results of multidimensional analysis of Pakistani press editorials (PPEs) based on Biber’s 2006 model. Biber (1988) holds the opinion that ‘texts from a single genre might represent several different text types’ (p. 170). Moreover, McEnery and Xiao (2010) find that internal comparisons of genres/registers are important indicators of differences. So, the present study makes a major contribution to the field of register analysis by examining the internal variations within the register of press editorials also. This section also discusses the results of the sub-categories of press editorials, i.e., Eds and Op-eds over a period of time to find out the differences and similarities between them with reference to the dimensions identified in the present study.

Linguistic variation on D1

Figure 1 compares the mean scores of Eds and Op-eds on dimension 1. Linguistic features like infinitives, tt-ratio, to-vb-stance all, pronouns as nominative, pronouns as demonstrative, that as relative pronoun, prepositions and passives-by together perform a function of producing opinionated discourse. The negative end of this dimension contains feature such as noun pre-modifiers produces informational discourse. Based on the functional interpretation of these features, this dimension is labelled as ‘Opinionated vs. Informational discourse’. Pakistani press editorials (PPEs) highlight informational discourse in the first phase. In the second phase, they show mixed purpose discourse (the closeness to the zero score means the discourse is the mixed purpose). However, in the recent period, the language of PPEs has been found generating opinionated discourse which reflects their deviant trend over the years. In phase 1, Op-eds, with the mean score of -0.64, are more informational than Eds (-0.47). Likewise, in phase 2, Op-eds (0.05) are slightly more informational than Eds (0.03). In contrast, in phase three, Eds, with a mean score of 0.54, are more opinionated than Op-eds (0.36).
The following example from *Dawn* highlights the dense presence of opinionated discourse in Pakistani Op-eds. It is pertinent to mention that new dimensions in Pakistani press Op-eds have been explored by applying new factor analysis and the correlation among the linguistic features has proved that more stance building verbs connected with complement clauses are found in abundance in Pakistani press Op-eds on factor 1. That is why PPEs with positive mean values are found generating opinionated discourse. In the following example, the **bold words** are examples of the linguistic features that produce opinionated discourse. The bold words like *to have with* and *why the pre-primary classes* are the examples of infinitives coupled with complement clauses that form a particular pattern in Op-eds and produce opinionated discourse.

*It meant* that the dialogue we have been attempting *to have with* the high-ups of TCF for the last two years has not impressed upon them the significance of language. Their argument in support of their policy – mainly lack of resources – is not convincing. This doesn’t answer the question *why the pre-primary classes, where written text is minimal and there is more emphasis on the spoken language*, should not use Sindhi and also let **this period be treated** as a transitional phase *to introduce* Urdu. (OP, PH.3.DN)

As compared to the first two phases in the history of Pakistan, PPEs, particularly Eds, in the third phase show more inclination towards constructing the opinion of the readers.

**Linguistic variation on D2**

On the positive continuum, linguistic features like *present verbs, predictive adjectives, verbs be, attributive adjectives, sub-conj-cond, modals of necessity, pronoun it, adjectives in the predictive form, adjective of stance, nouns of stance*, and past tense together produce argumentative discourse. The negative continuum of this dimension is characterized by *adverbs of time*. Texts with these features share a functional characteristic of producing narrative discourse. On the basis of the functional interpretation of these features, this dimension is labelled as ‘Argumentative vs. Narrative discourse’. In phase 1, Op-eds with a mean value of -0.43 stand most distinct in producing highly narrative discourse in Pakistani press. This narrative trend has shifted in the next two phases. Phase 2, with a mean value of -0.24, and phase 3, with a mean value of -0.11, reflect a tilt towards argumentative discourse which highlights a shifting pattern of Pakistani press Op-eds over the years. The change of discourse pattern accounts for the cross-cultural variation factors and readership demands over the years in the language of Pakistani press.
During phase 1, EDs with the mean value of 0.39 show narrative concerns, however, with the passage of time they become argumentative. In phase 2, with a mean value of 0.19, and in phase 3, with a mean value of 0.08, they show argumentative concerns. In phase 2 and phase 3, Op-eds show a completely different trend. Eds, with the positive mean values, produce argumentative discourse, while Op-eds with negative mean values are found producing narrative discourse.

The following excerpt from *Business Recorder* from phase 2 reflects a dense presence of argumentative linguistic features in Pakistani press editorials.

THE smelter **will use** the flash smelting process developed by the Finnish company Outokumpu, and **will have an initial design** output of 20,000 tons of nickel metal in matter per annum when treating 10 per cent nickel concentrates. The capacity **could be doubled** to 40,000 tons of nickel in matter by providing more handling equipment and adding oxygen. The smelter **should be in production** in two years, and **will principally treat** WMCs own ore. Overall, WMCs complete of processing concentrating, smelting and **refining will give** it great flexibility in handling various types of feed. **It will also enable** it to produce a **wide range of end products** a wide range of end products for sale, ranging from **concentrate** (Kambalda) to the **more valuable** matter (Kalgoorlie), and finally the nickel powder and briquettes from the Kwian are finery. (ED, PH.2.BR)

The bold words like **will use, will have an initial design, could be doubled, should be in production, will principally, will also enable**, etc., hint towards the development of stance and argument in Eds. Similarly, the presence of adjectives in the predicative position gives a description and support the argument.

**Linguistic variation on D3**

Factor 3 consists of nine linguistic features. Linguistic features with positive loadings are **word length**, **attributive adjective**, **noun nominalization**, **topic adjectives**, **nun pre-modifiers**, and **abstract nouns**. There are only three features with negative loadings: **second-person pronouns**, **third-person pronouns**, and **first personal pronouns**. Based on the co-occurrence of these linguistic features, this dimension is labelled as "Abstract Information versus Dialogic Reporting". In phase 1, Eds (0.08) have been found producing mixed purpose discourse. In phase 2, Eds (0.32) show a tilt towards abstract informational discourse production. In phase 3, Eds, with mean scores of 0.13, show less abstract discourse than phase 2. Op-eds in phase 1, with a mean score of 0.57, show mixed purpose discourse. In contrast, Op-eds in phase 2 with the highest density of **first-person pronouns, second-person pronouns**, and **third-person pronouns** highlight the categorical dialogic trend of Pakistani press.
In phase 2, Op-ed s have been found producing a dialogic trend and thus imparting informality to the language of Pakistani press. The example given below is replete with first personal pronouns, second personal pronouns, and third personal pronouns which gives a certain colloquial touch to Pakistani Op-ed s. The dialogic trend in other registers of Pakistani English has already been explored by earlier researchers like Ali and Ahmad (2016). According to them, Pakistani English fiction is dialogic and Pakistani English, being a non-native variety, exhibits a certain style of colloquialism and informality by considering the cross-cultural variation factors and the readership demands of these registers.

**SIALI.** never forget the impact upon my conscience of first Summer School that I attended. I had just taken my final examination Greats’ we called them at Oxford University in June, 1914. While they were taking this examination, World War I broke through as they did not know the time the war had ended. When the examination was over, several weeks elapsed before the results were known. Being at a loose end, I decided to go to my first Summer School. I was being run by the Fabian Society at arrow. The standard bearers of the procession were Bernard Shaw, thou economist Web and a little of step H. G. Wells; and the Utopia to which they wore leading you lay just round the corner Shaw and Wells were prominent Fabians and there was just chance that one might meet then at the Summer School. The next morning after my arrival, there was a lecture on Bergson’. (OP, PH.1. DN)

The excerpt from Dawn newspaper given above includes frequent use of first-person pronouns like I attended, I had, we called and third personal pronouns like Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, they were, etc. exhibiting the dialogic trend of Pakistani press editorials at large. In phase 3, again Op-ed s (0.25) show a tilt towards abstract discourse. Op-ed s show a changing trend in press discourse: from abstract informational reporting to dialogic reporting and again abstract informational reporting.

**Linguistic variation on D4**

This dimension includes positive linguistic features: communicative verbs, other communicative verbs, adverbs of time, and th-vb-stance. These linguistic features together perform a function of producing “Context-Oriented Reporting”. Among the three phases, only in phase 1 Eds (0.54) have been found producing context-oriented discourse. In phase 2, with a mean value of -0.14, and in phase 3, with a mean value of -0.10, they have been found producing explicit discourse. A shift from context-oriented towards explicit discourse production has been observed in Eds during the years. Op-ed s in phase 1, with a mean score of 0.26, produce context-oriented discourse and in phase 2, with a mean value of 0.05, produce mixed purpose discourse. However, in recent phase the mean scores of Op-ed s, i.e., -0.27, show that they are producing explicit discourse. In phase 1, both Eds and Op-ed s produce context-oriented discourse, while Eds are more context-oriented than op-ed s. In phase 2, Eds are explicit and Op-ed s produce mixed purpose discourse. In the recent phase, both Eds and Op-ed s are producing explicit discourse with Op-ed s comparatively more explicit than Eds. Pakistani press Eds exhibit a tilt towards the context-based reporting.
The presence of adverbs in the example given below expresses context-oriented reporting in Pakistani press Op-ed's. In Biber’s (2006) opinion, adverbs are always a key source of context-oriented and situation-dependent discourse. Adverbs lead the discourse to a certain context where the presence of place and temporal adverbs help the readers to understand the context more appropriately.

**LETHARGY is what weighs down us** Karachi and we are only too thankful to the winding up of what has been one of the hottest junes in decades out of the 75 calendars. Three heat strokes; 4 dehydration 2 food-poisoning is **how the days' health count reads. Never exactly a health resort**, Karachi has sounded moribund this week! And the Karachi traffic police have no heart left for those motions of sinuous grace reminiscent of the finer forms of classical dance; instead they flap their arms as disconsolate water-deprived fish would their fins. **Ambiguity of meaning** remains a constant factor, however. (OP, PH.2.DN)

In the excerpt given above, the bold words like **down, only too, never exactly, this week** are the examples of the words that produce context-oriented discourse.

**VI. CONCLUSION**

This paper has explored linguistic variations between different phases of PPE's and their sub-categories – Eds and Op-ed's, over a period of time. The results indicate a considerable difference between three phases of PPE's and their sub-categories on four textual dimensions. On D1, PPE's highlight informational discourse in the first phase. In the second phase, they show mixed purpose discourse and in the third phase language of PPE's has been found generating opinionated discourse. In phase 1, Op-ed's are more informational than Eds. Likewise, in phase 2, Op-ed's are slightly more informational than Eds. In contrast, in phase three, Eds are more opinionated than Op-ed's.

On D2, the tendency of Pakistani Eds in the last two phases shows that they are narrative whereas phase 1 started with an argumentative trend and this trend deviates towards narrative discourse production over the years. Op-ed's show an argumentative trend over a period of time.

On D3, Op-ed's showed the inception of an abstract trend in Pakistani press in the first phase. It changed into a dialogic informational trend in the second phase. In the third phase, they again showed abstract discourse production. In all the three phases, Eds showed abstract information reporting. Nominalization is the primary marker for producing abstract discourse. It can also be used for ideological purposes. This grammatical device is used in the newspaper to manipulate the readers by expressing the central action in nominal form and omitting the actor. This changes the relative prominence of the participants obscuring 'who did what to whom' (Mey, 2009, p.585). The mean scores of Op-ed's on dimension 3 also endorse the fact that Pakistani press Op-ed's are inclined towards producing abstract discourse production.

On D4, Op-ed's produced context-oriented discourse in the beginning. This trend gradually shifted towards an explicit discourse. Similarly, this context-oriented trend was noticeable in the Eds category in phase one. But in phase two, Eds showed explicit discourse as opposed to Op-ed's. In phase three, Op-ed's were more
explicit than Eds. The results show the unique linguistic characteristics of Pakistani Eds and Op-eds on four new textual dimensions.
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