



Contextual Constraints on Placement of Conjunctives within a Sentence: Pedagogical Implications for EFL Learners

قيود سياقية على أماكن إدراج أدوات ربط الجُمْل: دلائل تعليمية لمتعلمي اللغة
الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

Ahmed Mohammed al-Bakri

*Researcher, Department of English,
Faculty of Arts-Sana'a University -Yemen*

أحمد محمد البكري

*باحث - قسم اللغة الإنجليزية
كلية الآداب- جامعة صنعاء- اليمن*

الملخص:

يُنظر إلى أدوات ربط الجُمْل (conjunctives) في اللغة الإنجليزية على أنها أدوات سبك يمكن وضعها في أماكن مختلفة في الجملة (مثلاً هاليدي وماتيسن 2004، تومبيسن 2004)؛ إلا أن هذا القول مبني على ملاحظات عامة حول كل هذه الأدوات دون استثناء، ولا توجد دراسة تتناول هذه الأدوات أو بعضها وتدرسها دراسة مستفيضة مبنية على أمثلة مأخوذة من نصوص حقيقية لمعرفة المدى الممكن لنقل هذه الأدوات في الجملة والأماكن المناسبة لها، وكذلك معرفة ما هي القيود – إن وجدت – التي قد تمنع نقل أداة الربط أو تحدد مكانها المناسب ضمن الجملة. ومن هنا تستمد هذه الدراسة أهميتها، حيث تظهر النتائج أن إمكانية نقل أدوات الربط ليست مطلقة، بل أن هناك قيود سياقية تركيبية (syntactic) وبراجماتيكية (pragmatic) تحدد تلك الإمكانية من عدمها، وكذلك المكان المناسب لوضع الأدوات. وترى الدراسة أن تلك القيود هي التي ينبغي لمتعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية إدراكها إذا ما أرادوا استخدام أدوات ربط الجمل استخداماً صحيحاً مثلما يستخدمها أهل اللغة الأصليين بشكل عام ومجتمع الأكاديميين بشكل خاص.

الكلمات المفتاحية: أدوات ربط الجمل (conjunctives)، أماكنها، القيود السياقية.

Abstract:

Conjunctives are usually assumed to be cohesive devices that are readily moveable to different places within a sentence (for example, Halliday and Matthiessen 2004; Thompson 2004). However, this assumption is based on observations about frequent profiles of all conjunctives across all types of sentences. No study has attempted a systematic analysis of the occurrences of particular conjunctives in particular types of sentences to examine the extent to which the moveability of those conjunctives to their frequent places in a sentence is possible; nor, to the best of my knowledge, has any study attempted to exactly identify the types of contextual factors that may dictate the appropriate placements of a conjunctive. The present study attempts to accomplish a systematic analysis of the occurrences of particular conjunctives in particular types of sentences to examine the extent to which the moveability of those conjunctives to their frequent places in a sentence is possible. It aims to identify the types of contextual factors that may dictate the appropriate placements of a conjunctive. It also aims to find out the pedagogical implications for EFL learners on the basis of the results, the present paper argues that the moveability and the placement of a conjunctive within a sentence appear to be more often than not restricted and determined by certain syntactic and/or pragmatic constraints. The paper also argues that it is such constraints that ESL/EFL learners need to be aware of should they wish to choose the appropriate placement of a conjunctive within a sentence in a manner that is felicitous and conforms to the expectations of the academic community.

Keywords: conjunctives, placement, syntactic, pragmatic/rhetorical, constraints

Introduction:**Background and Research Questions**

The initial idea behind this paper crossed my mind while teaching academic writing – or rather English for Academic Purposes (EAP) – to freshmen and sophomores at both public and private universities in Yemen. The writing

textbooks assigned at the English departments at those universities offer inadequate instruction on lexicogrammatical devices required to produce academically appropriate written discourses in

English. Among these devices are conjunctions.⁽¹⁾ Although their appropriate usage (including placement within sentences) is of primary importance to the production of coherently written texts (Halliday and Hasan 1976; Hoey 1983 and 2001), conjunctions are just glossed over, if not neglected altogether, in the assigned writing textbooks in the departments of English language at Sana'a University.

Apart from the patchy instruction on the diversified logico-semantic relations expressed by conjunctions, the potential places of conjunctions within sentences are not sufficiently addressed. Indeed, it is more often than not suggested that conjunctions are always moveable and can occur in the initial, medial, and final positions in a sentence. It is no surprise that the students of English departments at Sana'a University end up misplacing them when writing in English, not only when doing their writing assignments and graduation writing projects at the undergraduate level but also when doing their MA theses and doctoral dissertations.

Motivated by the desire to find a remedy for this problem, the researcher embarked on compiling teaching material on conjunctions based on research works and reference grammars. It turned out that previous descriptive linguistic analyses – though providing some insightful findings and information on conjunctions and their multifunctionality – do not offer adequate explanations of the moveability and appropriate placements of conjunctions within a sentence; that is, no work has provided a systematic, descriptive analysis of conjunctions in terms of their moveability and appropriate placements (see, for example, Halliday and Hasan 1976, Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, Hoey 2001, and Hyland 2005).

Halliday and Hasan (1976), for example, provide a detailed account and extensive taxonomy of conjunctions and the logico-semantic relations expressed by these cohesive devices. They do not, however, address the potential positions of conjunctions within a

sentence. Martin (1992) offers an elaboration on Halliday and Hasan's seminal work *Cohesion in English*, in ways influenced by the stratificational approach to discourse structure. He provides a comprehensive account of conjunction relations between textual segments as well as lexicogrammatical resources employed to signal such relations. While developing his framework of these resources, Martin discusses in detail the distinction between **external** and **internal** relations established by conjunctions. Like Halliday and Hasan, he does not touch on potential positions which can be occupied by conjunctions.

In his model of metadiscourse resources, Hyland (2005) subsumes conjunctions under the category of interactive resources and discusses their role in organizing textual elements. He demonstrates the crucial role of these devices in helping writers to "supply additional information, by rephrasing, explaining or elaborating what has been said" (p. 52) as well as readers to "interpret pragmatic connections between steps in an argument" (p. 50).

There are of course some other studies which touch on the placement and ordering of thematic elements, but they offer more a little than general tendencies. Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999), for example, present a brief discussion of the multifunctionality of conjunctions, pointing to the confusion ESL/EFL students often make when using some semantically similar conjunctions. They also pointed to the fact that "most of these conjunction adverbials are capable of appearing in different places in a clause; they may be found at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end of independent clauses" (p. 522). But the examples given by the authors are concocted texts composed of very short simple sentences, that is, sentences each of which is made up of one independent clause which, if the conjunction in question was excluded, would have 'Simple Theme' (in Halliday's, 1994, terms).

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) point to potential positions which conjunctions can

¹ Different scholars use different terms (e.g. Discourse Adjuncts, Conjunction Adjuncts, Metadiscourse Adjuncts, Conjunction Adverbials) to refer to these (and sometimes in addition to other) devices of textual cohesion. In the present study, the term

'conjunction' is used to refer to sentence-connecting expressions such as *for example*, *however*, *on the other hand*, *in other words*, etc.

occupy in a clause, claiming that conjunctives are “**characteristically** thematic: they are very frequently found in a thematic position (i.e., before the topical Theme), but they also occur in other locations in the clause” (p. 83, emphasis in original). The authors give plenty of authentic examples to illustrate potential positions which conjunctives often occupy in clauses with Multiple Themes. They claimed that, when functioning as Textual Themes in such clauses, conjunctives occur after Circumstantial and Interpersonal Themes. They also observed that conjunctives “cannot occur as predicated theme” (p. 133). Similarly, while discussing the notion of Multiple Theme, Bloor and Bloor (2004) state that conjunctives “are often, but not always, selected as textual Theme” (p. 77), that is, they are placed before Topical Theme.

Unlike Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) and Bloor (2004), Thompson (2004) points out that conjunctives “frequently occur in second position in the clause, at the Theme-Rheme boundary immediately after the subject . . .; and they may appear even later in the Rheme” (p. 158). When discussing the ordering of thematic elements in clauses with Multiple Themes, Thompson points out that conjunctives can occur as Theme (i.e., sentence-initially), and that “it is normally possible to identify factors in the context which have led to their being chosen as Theme” (p. 146). Although he provides some interesting examples illustrating how contextual pressures may determine the placement of a conjunctive, his discussion does not account for many instances of conjunctives in general and the conjunctives selected for the present study in particular.

Downing and Locke (2006) point to the fact that “most of [conjunctives] can function in other positions in the clause, and so represent a real choice when used thematically” (p. 235). The authors do not, however, specify those ‘other positions’ which can be occupied by conjunctives; neither do they point to cases where conjunctives are moveable and where they are not.

Clearly, what one gets from these previous works is some observations about the general tendencies of **all** conjunctives across **all** types of sentences. Moreover, most of the observations appear to have been based on frequency profiles of occurrences of conjunctives and not on a detailed descriptive account of **each** conjunctive and its potential placements in sentences of more or less the **same** type and structure; nor are they based on an analysis of a collection of texts belonging to a specific genre, the factor which is crucial for any investigation of linguistic phenomena. Furthermore, such generalized observations, as will be shown by the analysis of the study data, do not hold true for all the occurrences of a conjunctive in different contextual environments.

Since one of the essential requirements of corpus research is “a set of good questions that can be answered by study of a corpus” (Nation, 2001, p. 31), this study attempts to address the following questions: (a) As has been asserted by previous literature, conjunctives can be moved from the initial position to immediately after the Topical Theme (TT), immediately after a Circumstantial Theme (CT), and sentence-final position; but, is it *always* a matter of *optionality* to place a conjunctive in one rather than another of its frequent placements within a sentence?; (b) Arguably (and as is suggested by Thompson, 2004), the answer to this question is: No, there are contextual factors that appear to play a key role in determining the appropriate placement of a conjunctive within a sentence⁽²⁾; but, what *exactly* are those potential factors?

It is the answers to these questions that can be of pedagogical significance for the development of writing materials designed for the purpose of teaching academic writing to EFL learners.

Sources and Method

The study adopts a descriptive-analytic approach to the analysis of the data collected for the purposes of this study. In addition to this approach, a quantitative investigation of the

² It is worth noting that the term ‘contextual’ is used in the present study to refer to both co-textual (i.e. at the sentence level) and rhetorical/pragmatic (i.e. at the discourse level) factors.

selected conjunctions is marginally included. The inclusion of this method is due to the researcher's conviction that quantification "should be treated as a starting point of investigation" (Hunston 2007, p. 46). And since one of the aims of the study is to come up with results that can be of a pedagogical value to EFL learners in their effort to acquire knowledge of the appropriate usage of conjunctions in academic prose, the researcher found it more useful to investigate the occurrences of the target conjunctions in linguistic research articles. Toward this end, a corpus of **121** articles was compiled from research articles published in seven edited books.⁽³⁾

It is of course practically impossible to attempt an exhaustive listing of **all** occurrences of a particular conjunction – let alone of **all** conjunctions – in **all** types of sentences. Therefore, the conjunctions *for example*⁽⁴⁾ and *on the other hand* were selected and searched for manually in **three sets** of sentences selected and sorted out according to the types of their thematic structure. These sets include sentences that, *when the target conjunction is ignored*, start with a **Topical Theme (TT)**, **Circumstantial Theme (CT)**, and **Predicator Theme (PT)**.⁽⁵⁾ The model of thematic structure as developed by systemic-functional linguists was used as an analytic tool. The reason for employing this framework as an analytic tool is twofold: **(a)** It helps us to easily sort out the data sentences into different sets according to their Theme types, and then select those sets we wish to include in our investigation of the target conjunctions; **(b)** It provides us with terminologies that can help to accurately

identify and describe the placements of the target conjunctions in the sentences of each set.⁽⁶⁾

To ensure as accurate and delicate a descriptive analysis of the collected data as possible, all occurrences of the target conjunctions in each set of the sentences were examined and compared to each other separately from those occurrences in the other two sets. The comparison was based on the following criteria:

1. In the sentences starting with a Topical Theme (TT): The comparison was based on whether a sentence has: **(a) a New Single TT**: this Theme introduces a new discourse entity into the unfolding discourse and provides a discourse entity that is intended, in the case of *for example*, to give a specific instance of a more general entity, and, in the case of *on the other hand*, to stand in contrast to another entity in the preceding sentence(s); **(b) a Repeated TT**: this Theme is a **repetition**⁽⁷⁾ of an entity introduced in the preceding discourse; **(c) Multiple TTs**⁽⁸⁾: a sentence is treated as having these Themes when it has two or more Topical Themes, all of which have the same discourse function but each of which occurs in its own clause in the sentence; **(d) 'You/We/One' TT**: this type of Theme is realized by the reader-oriented pronoun *you*, the author-oriented *we* (both exclusive and inclusive) or the generic pronoun *one*.

In this set of sentences, the placement of a conjunction is expected to be in one of the following positions: **Initial Position, Immediately after the Topical Theme, after the Auxiliary/Main Verb, and Final Position.**

³ These books include the following: *Advances in written text analysis* (2001) edited by M. Coulthard; *Cohesive in spoken and written discourse* (1999) edited by W. Bublitz, U. Lenk and E. Ventola; *Coherence and cohesion in spoken and written discourse* (2009) edited by O. Dontcheva-Navratilova and R. Povolná; *Functional approaches to written text: Classroom applications* (1997) edited by T. Miller; *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2003) edited by D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. E. Hamilton; *Pragmatics, discourse and text: Some systematically-inspired approaches* (1988) edited by E. H. Steiner and R. Veltman; *Text and context in functional linguistics* (1999) edited by M. Ghadessy.

⁴ The occurrences of the variant *for instance* were also included.

⁵ See Halliday (1994) and Thompson (2004) for a detailed treatment of Theme types.

⁶ It should be noted here that, when describing thematic structure in English, the systemic-functional linguists, including Halliday,

use the terms 'clause' and 'clause complex' to refer, respectively, to a one-clause sentence and a more-than-one-clause sentence. In the present study, the traditional term 'sentence' is used to refer to any orthographically separate sentence. The reason for this is that our analysis, as will be clear later, requires that the component clauses making up a sentence be taken into account should we wish to give a more delicate analysis of the study data. It is thus practically more convenient to use the term 'clause' when referring to clauses within an orthographical sentence.

⁷ Following Hoey (1983;1991), the third person pronouns are treated as repetitions.

⁸ In the SFG linguistics, the term 'Multiple' is used to refer to the case where the clause has one or more than one thematic constituent occurring along with the Topical Theme. In the present study, it refers to the case where two or more TTs occur in different clauses in the sentence.

2. In the sentences starting with a Circumstantial Theme (CT): The comparison here was based on whether or not the CT (or an entity within it) is intended to stand in a **Matching relation**⁽⁹⁾ to a Circumstantial (which is often but need not be a CT) in the prior or subsequent discourse. This relation may be that of **Compatibility** or **Contrast** (to follow Hoey's (1983) terminology⁽¹⁰⁾). In this set of sentences, the potential places where a conjunctive can occur are: **Initial Position, after the Circumstantial Theme, Immediately after the Topical Theme, after the Auxiliary/Main Verb, and Final Position.**
3. In the sentences starting with Predicator Theme (PT): Since these sentences have a Predicator functioning as Theme, the comparison between the occurrences of the conjunctive is based on the structure of the sentence element functioning as a Direct Object (DO). Thus, the Predicator-Theme sentences are sub-divided into sentences with a **Simple Object** and those with a **Complex Object**. The latter includes any sentence where the DO is realized by: (a) a series of three or more coordinated NPs; (b) an NP that is postmodified by two or more Preposition Phrases; c) an NP postmodified by a relative clause (restrictive or nonrestrictive); or d) a noun clause. The former type of the Predicator-Theme sentences includes any sentence where the DO is realized by an NP without postmodification altogether or postmodification other than the types mentioned above under Complex Object.

The collected data comprise not only the occurrences of the target conjunctives connecting orthographically separate sentences, but also those occurrences linking two structurally-independent parts of the same

sentence that are separated by a colon, semicolon, or dash. The reason for the inclusion of the latter type of occurrences is that these punctuation marks "can be taken as sentential terminal signals . . . [and] are capable of marking major discourse patterns" (Tadros, 2001, p. 70).

Data Analysis and Discussion

Before embarking on a discussion of the results of the study analysis, it should be reiterated that frequency profiles of the occurrences of the target conjunctives are not the goal of the present study, but rather its starting point; that is, the main aim of this study is to attempt a descriptive analysis of the placements of the target conjunctives. Thus, Table 1 below shows the total number of attestations of the target conjunctives found in the whole corpus, the total numbers of the conjunctives in each set of the data sentences, and the potential positions that each conjunctive tends to occupy across the three sets of the data sentences.

As is evident from the statistical data displayed in Table 1 below, it can be concluded that the conjunctives under scrutiny differ in terms of the numbers as well as frequencies of their potential sentence positions across the three sets of data sentences. In the set of the sentences starting with a TT, for instance, the conjunctive *for example* occurs in four positions (initially, after the TT, after the auxiliary, or after the main verb), whereas *on the other hand* occurs in only two positions (initially and after the TT); and a very high proportion (105/158) of the occurrences of *for example* in these sentences is placed in initial position, but most of the instances (51/84) of *on the other hand* occur immediately after the TT. In the set of the sentences starting with a CT, a higher proportion (44/74) of the instances of *for example* occurs sentence-initially, whereas almost all the occurrences (11/12) of *on the other hand* are placed after the CT.

⁹ The notion of Matching relation is inspired by Winter's (1977, 2001) classification of clause relations.

¹⁰ See Hoey (1983) for a detailed discussion of these rhetorical relations.

Table 1: a more detailed quantitative analysis of the selected conjunctives according to their placements in each of the set of data sentences

Conjunctive	Theme Type	Position						FP	Total
		IP	Medial						
			After CT	After TT	After PT	After Aux.	After MV		
For example	TT	105	—	39	—	10	4	0	158
	CT	44	30	0	—	0	0	0	74
	PT	9	—	—	43	—	—	5	57
On the other hand	TT	34	—	51	—	0	0	0	85
	CT	1	11	0	—	0	0	0	12
	PT	0	—	—	0	—	0	0	0
Total:		193	41	90	43	10	4	5	386

— : the dash indicates that the position is not available, given the Theme type in the respective set of the data sentences; **TT**=Topical Theme; **CT**=Circumstantial Theme; **PT**=Predicator Theme; **IP**=Initial Position; **FP**=Final Position; **Aux**=Auxiliary; **MV**=Main Verb

Indeed, the potential positions of one and the same conjunctive appear to vary in terms of their number and frequency across the three sets of the data sentences. Let us consider the occurrences of *for example*. In the sentences starting with a TT, there are four positions available for the conjunctives; in the sentences with a CT, only two places; and in the sentences with a PT, three places. The conjunctive tends to occur more frequently in initial position than in any of its other potential places in the sentences with a TT; in the sentences with a PT, by contrast, it prefers by far the immediately-after-the-PT position, with a much higher proportion (43/57) of its attestations being placed after the Predicator and much less (9/57) in initial position and still less (5/57) in final position.

All this suggests that the frequent positions of a conjunctive as well as their number appear to vary from certain sentences to others according to the thematic structure of the sentences. Accordingly, it would be misleading to hazard such across-the-board claims as that conjunctives are characteristically thematic, that conjunctives occur more frequently after the Topical Theme, or that conjunctives can be placed in sentence-final position. Such sweeping claims are based on generalizations and intuition which seem to hold true for some conjunctives in sentences having the same thematic structure but not for other sentences having a different thematic structure. This also supports Bhatia's (1993) argument that

empirical evidence is necessary to "confirm or disprove some of the intuitive and impressionistic statements that we all tend to make about high or low incidence of certain lexico-grammatical features" (qtd in Vincent B Y Ooi, 2001, p. 180).

Although the sketchy statistical account given above has thrown up some interesting results, such results cannot help us answer the research questions and are indeed of little, if any, pedagogic value to ESL/EFL learners. That is, the findings of the quantitative analysis of the selected conjunctives cannot tell us whether the placement of these conjunctives in one sentence position rather than the other potential positions is a question of optionality open to writers or is determined by contextual factors; and if the latter alternative holds true, the statistical results fail to exactly pinpoint those factors. To address this problem, the present study has attempted descriptive-analytic examination of the placements of the target conjunctives in the data sentences, a detailed discussion of which we can now turn to.

To ensure a more accurate analysis of the data, I find it useful to present a discussion of each set of data sentences separately, as follows.

In the sentences starting with a Topical Theme (TT):

Table 2 below displays the results of a descriptive analysis of the occurrences of the two conjunctives under scrutiny in the set of data sentences starting with a TT. A cursory

look at the table can give us a preliminary idea of the key role played by the type, number, and discourse function of theme in determining the

appropriate placement of a conjunctive within a sentence.

Table 2: a descriptive analysis of the target conjunctives based on the type and number of the TT in the sentences starting with a Topical Theme

	Type of TT	Type of the MR	Position				Total	
			IP	MP				FP
				After TT	After Aux.	After MV		
For example	New Single		49	39	0	0	0	88
	New Multiple		38	0	0	0	0	38
	Repeated		13	0	6	4	0	23
	You/We/One		5	0	4	0	0	9
Total			105	39	10	4	0	158
On the other hand		Contrast	8	51	0	0	0	59
	New Single	Compatibility	8	0	0	0	0	8
	New Multiple		4	0	0	0	0	4
	Repeated		13	0	0	0	0	13
	You/We/One		1	0	0	0	0	1
Total			34	51	0	0	0	85

TT: Topical Theme; MR: Matching Relation; IP: Initial Position; MP: Medial Position; FP: Final Position; Aux.: Auxiliary; MV: Main Verb

Obviously, in the sentences having a single TT that is intended to introduce a new entity into the unfolding discourse, the conjunctives tend to occur either in initial position (*for example*: 49/88; *on the other hand*: 8/59) or immediately after the TT (*for example* 39/88; *on the other hand* 51/59); nowhere else were the target conjunctives attested to occur in this set of the data sentences, at least in the sentences found in the corpus of the present study. To illustrate this point, the following extracts⁽¹¹⁾ are selected from the study corpus:

1-a.[1] Pragmatic markers have the additional bonus that they "buy the speaker planning time, a convenience vis-à-vis the constraints of real-time processing". [2] *Well for example* provides a solution to problems of speech management (such as the difficulty to find the appropriate word) and can be used for processes such as self-correction or reformulation which are part of speech articulation.

[1] The relation between the two approaches is problematic. [2] Reductionists try to eliminate one notion in favor of the other. [3] *Grosz and Sidner, for instance*, state that "a discourse can be understood at a basic level

even if [the reader] never does or can construct [...] such rhetorical relationships". [1] Some researchers even modify the former distinction between written and spoken communication as based on the medium of communication and the typical linguistic features bound up with it, instead preferring to see the essential difference in how much emphasis the communicator puts on the interpersonal involvement between the speaker/writer and the audience or on the content of the message. [2] **For example**, *Tannen* shows how oral strategies are characterized by focusing on the relationship, relying on social context and shared interpersonal context for meaning, whereas literate strategies emphasize content.

[1] Second, even where Themes and N-Rhemes contain similar information, that information is being used in different ways. [2] **For example**, *temporal adverbials* appear both Thematically and N-Rhematically. However, these adverbials have quite different effects in the two positions.

2-a[1] Textual differences in narrative structure, in syntax, and in vocabulary help define two contrasting views of science.

¹¹ These examples and the subsequent ones are all taken from the study corpus.

[2] The professional articles create what I call a *narrative of science*; they follow the argument of the scientist, arrange time into a parallel series of simultaneous events all supporting their claim, and emphasize in their syntax and vocabulary the conceptual structure of the discipline. [3] The popularizing articles, **on the other hand**, present a sequential *narrative of nature* in which the plant or animal, not the scientific activity, is the subject, the narrative is chronological, and the syntax and vocabulary emphasize the externality of nature to scientific practices.

b-[1] System-sentences are "the well-formed strings that [are] generated by the grammar" . . . , i.e. they "are abstract theoretical constructs, correlates of which are generated by the linguist's model of the language-system" [2] Text-sentences, **on the other hand**, are "context-dependent utterance signals (or parts of utterance-signals), tokens of which may occur in particular texts".

It is clear that the underlined elements in (1) and (2) above are Topical Themes (TTs) in their respective sentences, and also have the same discourse function. Put differently, the TTs *Well* in S2 of (1a) and *Grosz and Sidner* in S3 of (1b) are new entities introduced into the unfolding discourse as specific instances of, respectively, the pragmatic markers referred to in S1 of (1a) and the reductionists mentioned in S2 of (1b); similarly, the TTs *Tannen* in (1c) and *temporal adverbials* in (1d) are intended to, respectively, introduce particulars of the researchers mentioned in S1 of (1c) and the information referred to in S1 of (1d).

In (2), the underlined TTs *The popularizing articles* and *text-sentences* are introducing entities intended to stand in a Matching Contrast (MC) with *The professional articles* in S2 of (2a) and *system-sentences* in S1 of (2b), respectively. The placement of the TT before the conjunctive in these sentences brings into focus an entity in contrast to another entity in the prior text. It is this pragmatic factor that appears to require the TTs be placed in a more

thematically prominent position and the conjunctive be 'demoted' to a less thematically prominent place.

However, as can be concluded from the data displayed in Table 2 above, there are certain cases where the conjunctive should not be placed immediately after the TT, with its appropriate placement appearing to be highly restricted to the initial position of the sentence. The first case is when the TT of the sentence is NOT intended to introduce a new entity intended to be a particular instance of or to stand in a Matching Contrast to another entity in the preceding discourse. In this case, the TT is: (a) a repetition⁽¹²⁾ of another discourse entity that is often (but need not be) a "topical entity in current focus" (in terms of McCarthy, 2001, p. 77); (b) the reader-oriented pronoun *you*, the author-oriented *we*, or the generic pronoun *one*.

Examples:

3-a.[1] Firbas (1966), Reinhart (1982), and Simon-Vandenberg (1987) present evidence that indefinite NPs with specific reference may also serve as marked themes.

[2] **For example**, Simon-Vandenberg discusses *Now, a friend of mine, he had the same problem*. [3] Simon-Vandenberg explains this apparent discrepancy by citing Langendonck's study of indefinites.

b.[1] The analyst faces certain difficulties in the study of inferences. [2] **For example**, inferences are elusive because once they have been drawn they do not appear to be inference any more.

c.[1] We noted briefly that basic clause relations interact with basic text structures. [2] **For instance**, we noted that the demonstration of our consensus about the basic structure of Situation and Evaluation in example 11 depend upon our awareness of the 'weak' logical sequence of its three imperative clauses.

4-a.[1] The differences in frequency are striking. *Well* was frequent in conversation (face-to-face and especially telephone conversation). It was also frequent in broadcast discussion and interviews. [2] **On**

¹² Following Hoey (1983; 1991), the third person pronouns will be treated as repetitions.

the other hand, *well* was much less frequent in prespecified speech where there is less adaptation to the recipient.

b.[1] As regards the influence of speakers' rights on the structure of the family conversations, it can be claimed that the points of entry of the children in the Yoruba-English family conversations were marked by Prefatory I and II, and sometimes by Regulatory Negative and Positive I exchanges. [2] **On the other hand**, such markers were not found with the parents' contributions.

c.[1] A token can be described as the actual word in the text. [2] If one had the following in a span of text: *come, coming, comes, come, come*, one would have five different tokens for the type *come*. [3] **On the other hand**, one might have two tokens for two different types: He *heads* for home as fast as he can/Tonight, *heads* will roll.

Clearly, the underlined TTs are repetitions that are NOT intended to bring into attention new entities that are particulars of or stand in a Contrast to other entities in the preceding text; rather, their discourse function is to maintain the continuity of referents and topics (Halliday & Hasan, 1989; Hoey, 1991). Given this discourse function of such TTs, it would be an at-the-discourse-level error (i.e. pragmatic error) to place them before the conjunctive (i.e. sentence-initially), a sentence position that is more thematically prominent and is often reserved for entities intended to be brought into focus.

In the case of *on the other hand*, Table 2 above shows that the TT may not be a repetition but a new entity that is intended to stand in a Matching Compatibility (as opposed to Matching Contrast) with another entity in the prior discourse. Examples:

5.a.[1] Political speeches, the purpose of which is "primarily persuasion rather than information or entertainment" . . . , bear features of both written and spoken discourse, i.e. they are an instance of what Crystal and Davy (1969) term "complex discourse medium". [2] On the one hand, the text of speeches is typically scripted in

advance and at the moment of performance cannot be easily adapted to the audience's response, i.e. similarly to written discourse, the context is "split" . . . and "there is no reciprocal management of the discourse" . . .

[3] **On the other hand**, the oral performance in front of an audience involves visual contact and overt interpersonal and interactive aspects, i.e. similarly to spoken discourse, for the audience the moment of delivery coincides with the moment of perception.

b.[1] The starting point of a discourse analytical approach to the complex phenomenon of racism is to realize that racism, as both social practice and ideology, manifests itself discursively. [2] On the one hand, racist opinions and beliefs are produced and reproduced by means of discourse; discriminatory exclusionary practices are prepared, promulgated, and legitimated through discourse. [3] **On the other hand**, discourse serves to criticize, delegitimize, and argue against racist opinions and practices, that is, to pursue antiracist strategies.

In (5a), the underlined TTs – and hence the propositions of their respective sentences – are intended to stand in a Compatibility in the sense that they are not introducing discourse entities (i.e. *the text of speeches* and *the oral performance in front of an audience*) whose differences are meant to be highlighted; rather, they are introducing entities whose differences are meant to prove the same point stated in S1, that is, the author's argument that political speeches have a mixture of written and spoken features. Similarly, in (5b) the underlined TTs *racist opinions* and *discourse* stand in a Compatibility to each other in that they (and hence the propositions of their respective sentences) are intended to prove the author's argument stated in S1. Note, that Compatibility (as opposed to Contrast) is the relation intended to be established between the respective TTs in extracts (5a) and (5b) – hence between the propositions of the pertinent sentences – is reinforced by the presence of *on the one hand* initiating the second sentences.

Before moving to the second case where the conjunctive tends to occur sentence-initially, it should be noted that, if there is any possible movement of the conjunctive to another place in a sentence starting with a TT that is realized by a repetition (lexical or pronominal), the reader-oriented pronoun *you*, the authorial *we*, or the generic pronoun *one*, the movement is to a place after or within the verb phrase,⁽¹³⁾ but never immediately after the TT (see Table 2 above). Examples:

6.a.[1] It was also pointed out above that there is a tendency for the selection of a label to be associated with common collocations. [2] Many labels are built into a fixed phrase or 'idiom' (in the widest sense of the word), representing a single choice. [3] Frequent collocations include, **for example**, 'the move follows . . .!', '. . . rejected/denied the allegations', '. . . to solve this problem', and '. . . to reverse this trend', where the retrospective label is found in predictable company.

b.[1] So the question to ask, then, is not whether or not a text like (7) is coherent but whether or not its hearer or reader is willing to assume that it is coherent, i.e. whether or not he is willing to *make* it coherent. [2a] This is entirely his choice (as well as in accordance with the hearer-knows-best principle of describing coherence), and is independent of the *cause* of the speaker's failure to secure coherence; [2b] she may, **for example**, be schizophrenic or aphasic, too young or too old, drunk or drugged.

c.[1] The genre-register-language analysis actually copes very well with the switches of this kind. [2] One does not, **for example**, have to consider the slide show as some kind of an embedded genre on its own.

The second case where the placement of a conjunctive appears to be highly restricted to the initial position of the sentence is when the sentence has **Multiple Topical Themes**

(MTTs).⁽¹⁴⁾ As can be seen from the data exhibited in Table 2 above, all the occurrences of *for example* and *on the other hand* in the data sentences having MTTs are in initial position; no single instance was attested of both conjunctives being placed anywhere else in such sentences. Examples:

7.a.[1] Genres are then plotted, on the basis of the factor scores, within the two poles of each dimension. [2] **For example**, face-to-face conversation is at the pole of Interactive and press is at the pole of Edited Text with professional letters somewhere in the middle.

b.[1] Teachers and curriculum developers need to fit the best options for text presentations with what the text itself offer. [2] **For example**, a problem-solution table does not fit with a narrative text, and a procedural time line or flow chart may not easily fit with a cause-and-effect text.

c.[1] It is clear that, although these are imperative in form, they are not primarily to be interpreted as commands in the usual sense. [2] The prototypical imperative – e.g. "be quiet!" – can be paraphrased as "you must be quiet". [3] **On the other hand**, the first example above is closely related to conditional promises ("If you take a closer look, you will be rewarded . . ."), while it seems more appropriate to paraphrase the second example not as "you must tour Cawdor Castle" but as "you can tour Cawdor Castle".

In examples (7a) and (7b), the underlined elements are discourse entities functioning as TTs for independent clauses in their respective sentences as well as introducing specific instances of more general entities (i.e. genres and options for text representation). The same holds for example (7c), where *the first example* and *the second example* refer to sentences that should be viewed as imperative sentences that are in contrast to the prototypical imperative mentioned in S2. It is true that *the second*

¹³ It is worth noting that the incidence of the conjunctive *for example* being placed in this position is very low, at least in the data sentences of the present study. This rarity should not be taken as an indication that the placement of conjunctives within or after the verb phrase are of little pedagogical significance and can be ignored in teaching materials. On the contrary, it seems suggestive of the existence of a communicative purpose that

requires a conjunctive be placed in this position. But, given the fact that only very few instances were found of *for example* being placed after the auxiliary or the main verb in the data sentences, further research is needed to find out that purpose.

¹⁴ See the Sources-Method section to recall what is meant by this term.

example is not a TT in its respective clause, but it is treated as a TT for two reasons. First, it has the same discourse function of the TT the first example; secondly, its clause can readily be paraphrased into a clause where *the second example* can be a TT (e.g. *while the second example could more appropriately be paraphrased not as [...] but as [...]*).

It is worth noting that the MTTs may be distributed across different sentences, as is illustrated in the following extracts.

8.a.[1] There are restrictions on the type of relation a connective can express. [2] **For example**, and can express additive and causal relations but not concessive relations. [3] And however can express contrastive and concessive relations, but not causal relations.

b.[1] Official documents are the best example of the genre Formal Exposition. [2] **On the other hand**, Romances are the best example of the genre Imaginative Narrative. [3] Biography is on its own; although the present findings indicate that it is nearer the second cluster than the first.

Obviously, each pair of the underlined entities in (8) has the same syntactic and pragmatic function; they are TTs in their respective sentences and, in (8a) they are intended to provide particular instances of conjunctives having limitations in terms of the relation they can express, and in (8b) they are meant to stand in Contrast to *official documents* mentioned in S1. Note that the second and third sentences in each extract can readily be combined into a compound sentence.

Before wrapping up the discussion of the occurrences of the target conjunctives in sentences starting with TTs, it is worth noting that a closer examination of the in-the-initial-position occurrences of the target conjunctives in the data sentences having a New Single TT has revealed that the placement of many of these occurrences in initial position rather than immediately after the TT is not a question of optionality; rather, it appears highly restricted to the initial position of the sentence, and this restriction is created when the TT of the sentence is realized by a syntactically complex

structure. By ‘a syntactically complex structure’ is meant the realization of the TT by a noun phrase that is followed by a relatively lengthy postmodification; the postmodifier can be a relative clause (restrictive or nonrestrictive), a relatively lengthy parenthetical expression (e.g. an appositive), or a combination of these structures.⁽¹⁵⁾ Examples:

9.a.[1] The greater tendency of Swiss ads to project interaction and negotiation is reflected in other choices as well. [2] **For example**, questions, which are inherently interactive, occur in only 12% of the English ads as opposed to 13% of the Swiss ads.

b.[1] Some of these items are fairly transparent in their function – e.g. *in, on, across*, etc., as indicators of spatial location – , and therefore do not really need corroboration as to their function. [2] Others, however, are less transparent and do need corroboration by the concordancer. [3] **For example**, the discourse markers used to check or indicate topic change – *okay, right, now, well* – all have other possible functions.

10.a.[1] Leech . . . claims that rules define mappings which are conventional in that they are not predictable or deducible from non-linguistic entities. [2] **On the other hand**, principles, characterizing the pragmatics, are non-conventional, being motivated by, and predicable from, the goals and motives of participants in the interaction.

b.[1] In expository writing, use of *this/these* presupposes that the reader has access to the referent; its use signals that the topic will persist or that the topic is something the writer wants to highlight or identify with. [2] **On the other hand**, the use of that/those, which also presupposes reader access to the referent, can signal the end of a topic/discussion (*That's that!*), scrupulous objectivity, a temporarily past reference, etc.

Obviously, the underlined NPs in these extracts are intended to highlight entities that are (in the case of Examples (9)) particulars of and (in the case of Examples (10)) in a Matching Contrast to another entity in the prior text, a discourse

¹⁵ For practical reasons, the results are not displaced in Table 2.

function which more often than not requires that the conjunctive be placed immediately after the TT. However, this requirement seems to have been overridden by the presence of a fairly lengthy postmodification.

In the sentences starting with a Circumstantial Theme (CT):

As is evident from the data shown in Table 3 below, in the sentences starting with a CT the conjunctives are placed either sentence-initially or immediately after the CT. No single instance was attested of the conjunctives being placed in another position in this set of data sentences.

Table 3: A descriptive analysis of the occurrences of the target conjunctives in the sentences starting with a CT

Conj.	Type of Relation		Position					Total	
			IP	After CT	After TT	After Aux./MV	FP		
For example	Non-matching		35	0	0	0	0	35	
	Matching	Preceding	Compatibility	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Contrast	0	25	0	0	0	25
		Succeeding	Compatibility	3	0	0	0	0	3
			Contrast	6	5	0	0	0	11
Total			44	30	0	0	0	74	
On the other hand	Non-matching		0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Matching	Preceding	Compatibility	1	0	0	0	0	1
			Contrast	0	11	0	0	0	11
		Succeeding	Compatibility	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Contrast	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total			1	11	0	0	0	12	

IP=Initial Position; CT=Circumstantial Theme; TT=Topical Theme; Aux.= Auxiliary; MV: Main Verb; FP=Final Position

It is also clear that the placement of these conjunctives in either place is not a question of optionality but rather appears to be determined by the type of rhetorical function which the CT is intended to perform in the unfolding discourse. As is shown in Table 3 above, all the occurrences of the conjunctives (*for example* 35/35; *on the other hand* 11/11) are placed invariably after the CT when that CT is intended to stand in a Matching Contrast with another Circumstantial in the preceding discourse. That circumstantial is often (but need not be) a CT in its sentence, and may be stated explicitly in the prior text (as in 11a, 12a, and 12b) or is kept implicit but can readily be inferred from the whole context (as in 11b). The following examples can illustrate the point:

11.a.[1] To appreciate how the students reworked the meaning of the original text in their summaries, one has to look at the amount of text the narrator devotes to which part of the story. [2] In the original story, for example, roughly 1/6 is devoted to Ted's life in Vietnam, his fight against the North Vietnamese and his emigration to the US.

b.[1] However, depending upon certain constraints in the context, the second-order field may or may not be open to variation. [2] In a televised discussion of capital punishment, for instance, the subject matter is predetermined and speakers are not at liberty to discuss their personal relationships, their views on Marxism, or the spring flowers, unless they can connect them in some way to the topic of capital punishment.

12.a.[1] In sentence one the writer has chosen an indeterminate voice rather than deictically anchoring the text in the here and now. [2] In sentence two, on the other hand, the writer not only identifies this voice as belonging to "a group of 28 scientist from 17 nations" but also signals his/her reporting role.

b.[1] One key factor is whether the ellipsis occurs in the initiating move of an exchange or in the responding move. [2] In a responding move, ellipsis is normally chosen where it is possible to do so, and its co-operative character, though still present, is not particularly strong [3] In an initiating move, on the other hand, ellipsis is more of a marked choice.

Obviously, the underlined CTs in (11a) and (12) stand in a Matching Contrast to other Circumstantials stated explicitly in the preceding sentences of their respective extracts. In other words, the CTs *In the original story*, *In sentence two*, and *In an initiating move* are intended to be in Contrast, respectively, with *in their (i.e. students') summaries* in S1 of (11a), *In sentence one* in S1 of (12a), and *In a responding move* in S2 of (12b).

Similarly, though less obvious, the underlined CT in S2 of (11b) should be understood as standing in contrast to some other Circumstantial, but that Circumstantial is not stated explicitly in, but should be inferred from, the unfolding discourse. Put differently, we can say that the CT *In a televised discussion of capital punishment* is intended to provide an instance of a context where the subject matter of discussion is predetermined and speakers cannot talk about just any issues, as opposed to another context (e.g. a family conversation or an online chat) where such contextual constraints are not workable. Although there is no mention of such contexts in the prior text, the author assumes that readers can infer them from the whole context, and “information that . . . is inferable based on the prior discourse is **discourse-old**” (Prince 1992, qtd in Ward and Birner, 2003, p. 129; my highlighting). By ‘discourse-old’ is meant ‘given in the prior discourse’, and inferable information should be treated as such. Thus, we can treat the CT *In a televised discussion of capital punishment* in (11b) as a CT that is intended to be opposed to other CTs such as *in an online chat room* and *during a family dinner conversation* as if these CTs were stated explicitly in the preceding sentence. It is this pragmatic interpretation that requires the conjunctive *for instance* in S2 of (13b) be placed after the CT.

This order of the thematic elements (i.e., conjunctives occurring after the CT) seems to be reversed as a result of some pragmatic factors. In the case of *for example*, it can be observed (from the data in Table 4 above) that it tends to occur invariably in initial position when there is a Non-matching relation between

the CT and another Circumstantial in the prior discourse; in other words, the CT is intended to specify a circumstance for exemplification to come. A case in point is the following extracts.

13.a.[1] In conversations between male friends, she finds, men take turns giving monologues – some quite extensive – about subjects in which they are expert [2] **For example, in one conversation**, the men talk about "home-made beer-making; hi-fi equipment; film projectors and the logistics of switching from one to the other" (1997a: 120).

b.[1] In each case, students can be asked to identify the audience in some detail. [2] **For example, in a sermon**, the audience and the writer know each other quite well, since they are likely to be together on a weekly basis, but they know each other only in one very specific content – that in which a minister and his/her congregation interact.

Clearly, the CT *in one conversation* in S2 of (13a) stands in a Non-matching relation to the CT *In conversations between male friends* in S1. Similarly, in (13b), the underlined CT in S2 does not stand in a Matching relation to *In each case* in S1 or any other (explicitly stated or readily inferable) Circumstantial in the preceding discourse. Rather, it is just intended to provide a specific instance for the exemplification to come; that is, we cannot say that the author means ‘in a sermon’ as opposed to, say, ‘in a political speech’. Thus, the placing of the conjunctive after the CTs in these examples would be infelicitous and even mis-signaling,⁽¹⁶⁾ as it would trigger expectations on the part of the reader that are not met; that is, placing the CT in initial position would render it more thematically marked, which would give rise to the rhetorical purpose of highlighting a contrast, a purpose which is not intended in these examples.

Another case where *for example* appears to occupy the initial position of the sentence is when the CT is intended to be in a Matching Compatibility to another CT in the succeeding discourse. The same holds for *on the other*

¹⁶ The phenomena of mis-signaling is a common fault in learner writing (Hoey, 2001).

hand, but the Compatibility relation is with a CT in the prior discourse. Examples:

14.a.[1] In cohesive harmony, we are asking how strings and chains interact as far as experiential grammar is concerned (Hasan 1984, 1985). [2] **For example, at group rank**, the "nice" string and the "house" string are related through nominal group structure as Epithet to Thing: *nice house, nice garden, nice car, nice garage*. [3] Similarly, **at clause rank**, the "calling" string is related to the "time of day" string as Process to Circumstance: called every morning, called every morning, called every evening, called every evening.

b.[1] The sequencing function has been related to alternations in word order, voice, and verb form. [2] For example, Schiffrin (1981) shows that the English historical present is associated with temporally sequenced clauses, while Hopper (1979) shows that temporal sequencing is associated with the use of the verbal forms with a di-prefix in Malay. [3] Myhill (1992) argues that, **in languages with a relatively high frequency of VS order**, sequencing is particularly associated with VS word order, while SV order is associated with unsequenced clauses. [4] **On the other hand, in languages with a lower frequency of VS order**, this correlation is not found.

In example (14a), the CTs *at group rank* in S2 and *at clause rank* in S3 stand in a Matching Compatibility. That these CTs, and hence the propositions of their respective sentences, are intended to stand in Compatibility, rather than Contrast, is explicitly signaled by 'similarly' at the very beginning of S3, the conjunctive which "self-evidently [shows] that the sentence it belongs to has the same function as the one before it" (Hoey, 1983, p. 135). It is interesting to note that S3 could be dispensed with without affecting the coherence of the extract, given the fact that it is meant to provide further exemplification. Again, this fact reinforces our claim that the two CTs in question are meant to be in a Compatibility relation with each other.

By the same token, the underlined CTs in (14b) are intended to be in a Matching Compatibility. It is true that these CTs seem to be in a Contrast to each other, but, given the context in which they occur, it is Compatibility that readers should interpret as the relation intended by the author to be established between the CTs (and hence the propositions of their sentences). The reason for giving precedence to this relation is twofold. First, the CTs are occurring in sentences whose propositions should not be attributed to the author; the author only cites them in support of his argument stated in the first sentence.

Secondly, S3 and S4 combined have the same rhetorical function as that of S2. In other words, S2 on one hand and S3 and S4 on the other provide exemplification to prove the author's claim that the sequencing of clauses is determined by alternations in word order, voice, and verb form. Therefore, S3 and S4 are not intended to highlight differences between certain languages, but rather to give another example of alternations affecting clause sequencing. It is this global rhetorical purpose that appears to have suppressed the interpretation of Contrast in favor of that of Compatibility, a relation which requires that the CT in S4 be placed in a thematically less marked position in the sentence, that is, after the conjunctive.⁽¹⁷⁾

As for the conjunctive *for example*, and drawing on the data exhibited in Table 3 above, we can also conclude that, if the CT in question stands in a Matching Contrast with a Circumstantial in the succeeding rather than preceding discourse, there seems to be an optionality to place *for example* either in initial position or immediately after the CT. Examples:

15.a.[1] One change that often occurs in the narrative between the research article and the popularization is that the researchers become actors and the claim becomes a discovery event. [2] **For instance, in his *Scientific American* article**, Chambon gives his group's response to the results as they developed: "To

¹⁷ It is true that there is only one instance of *on the other hand* found in the study corpus to connect between the propositions of two sentences intended to be in Compatibility with each other,

and thus further research is required to confirm or refute my argument. However, the argument for the interpretation of Compatibility rather than Contrast sounds reasonable.

our great surprise we saw several bands on the film' (*Scientific American*). [3] In the *New York Times* article, in contrast, the discovery is stressed at the outset. The discoverers are mentioned only a third of the way through.

b.[1] Briefly: the term "discourse" at present has a variety of uses. [2] In contemporary cultural of criticism, **for example**, one can speak of the "discourse of modernity" or "the discourses of power" or "feminist discourse"; indeed, I was tempted to begin the present sentence by referring to "the discourse of contemporary cultural criticism." [3] In a more technical usage current among linguists, "discourse" is . . . "simply a broad term that includes interactional talk, but also includes written essays, advertisements, sermons, folktales, etc.

Obviously, the underlined CTs in each of these extracts are intended to stand in a Matching Contrast to each other. In the case of (15a), this relation is explicitly signaled by the discourse adjunct *in contrast* occurring after the marked Theme (i.e., the underlined CT) in S3; in (15b), it is kept implicit and is highlighted through the placement of the CT in the initial position. Given the same syntactic and pragmatic factors in these two extracts, the occurrence of the conjunctive in different positions shows that it is a matter of optionality to place it either before or after the CT in such a contextual environment.

However, a closer examination has revealed that this optionality seems to be unavailable in two cases.⁽¹⁸⁾ The first case is when the CTs intended to be in a Matching Contrast to each other occur in the **same** sentence; in this case, the placement of the conjunctive appears to be highly restricted to the initial position. Examples:

16.a.[1] When these words occur in the same utterance, one of them will typically receive more prominence than the other, depending on such things as information focus or surprisingness of content [2] **For example**, in response to "What happened today?" the reply might be "The *elephants*

escaped," with the greater prominence on *elephants*, whereas in response to "Did you feed the elephants today?" the response might be "The *elephants escaped*."

b.[1] However, the content of the N-Rheme should be more obviously connected with the goals of each text portion. [2] **For example**, in the section which describes the problem, the N-Rheme should have an obvious connection with what is wrong, while in the section which describes the solution, the N-Rheme should have an obvious connection with what was done to solve the problem.

Clearly, the two underlined Circumstantials of each pair are in a Contrast with each other. This rhetorical relation is explicitly indicated by the subordinators *whereas* in (16a) and *while* in (16b).

The second case is when the CT in question is intended to be in a Matching Contrast with a Circumstantial occurring in a subsequent sentence, and that Circumstantial is placed in the Rheme rather than the Theme of its sentence. Examples:

17.a.[1] There are other syntactic patterns that might be related to the narrative of nature. [2] **For instance**, in my earlier study, I noted the tendency for the popularizations to use question and answer patterns (a traditional technique in pedagogical literature). [3] But there were few of them here.

b.[1] The terminology plays a role in narrative because many of the terms are unpacked in the form of narratives of laboratory techniques. [2] **For instance**, near the end of the BMC article, the authors mention some possible implications for the use of bacterial systems in biotechnology, and say that they may require the use of bacterial regulatory elements with 'ds cDNA'. [3] The equivalent of this abbreviation is given by a whole sentence in Chambon's *Scientific American* article:
Clearly, each of the underlined elements in the third sentence of each of (17a&b) is a

¹⁸ The results of this examination are not incorporated into the data shown in Table 4, because that would render the display of the data unmanageable and cumbersome.

Circumstantial occurring in the Rheme of its respective sentence; it is also intended to be in a Contrast with the underlined CT in the second sentence of its respective extract. Placing the CT before the conjunctive would give it much more prominence and give rise to the expectation that another Circumstantial of the same status (i.e. CT) is to come in a subsequent sentence, an expectation that is not met. It is such syntactic and pragmatic factors that seem to play a key role in determining the appropriate placement of a conjunctive within a sentence.

In the sentences starting with a Predicator Theme (PT):

Before embarking on the discussion of the occurrences of the conjunctives in this set of the data sentences, it should be noted that no single instance was attested of *on the other hand* being used in the Predicator-Theme sentences found in the study corpus. And since these sentences have a Predicator functioning as a Theme and a Direct Object functioning as a Rheme, the sentence-position labels used to identify the various placements of *for example* in the data sentences are a little bit different from those used in the case of the other two sets discussed earlier. Table 4 below shows the potential positions of a conjunctive in the Predicator-Theme sentences are categorized into: **Initial**, **Immediately after the Predicator Theme** and **Final**.

Type of Object	Position			Total
	IP	Immediately after the PT	FP	
Simple	3	14	5	22
Complex	6	29	0	35
Total	9	43	5	57

IP=Initial Position; PT=Predicator Theme; FP=Final Position

As is evident from this table, *for example* occurs sentence-initially, immediately after the Predicator, and sentence-finally, with a much higher proportion of its occurrences (43/57) being in the immediately-after-the-PT position, and much less proportions (9/57) and (5/57) in initial and final positions, respectively.

Pedagogical instruction based on such quantitative information would lead ESL/EFL learners to assume that it is appropriate to place this conjunctive in any of these positions in sentences having a PT. However, a closer investigation has revealed that such an assumption would be wrong, and that pedagogical instruction based on such quantitative findings would be insufficient, if not misleading.

As can be seen from the data in Table 4 above, *for example* can be placed in the initial position, immediately after the PT, or sentence-finally in the Predicator-Theme sentences having a Simple Direct Object⁽¹⁹⁾. In the sentences having a Complex Direct Object, however, the placement of *for example* appears to be restricted to the initial position and the immediately-after-the-PT position; it would be inappropriate to place the conjunctive sentence-finally. Extracts (18) and (19) below show examples of Predicator-Theme sentences with a Simple DO and with a Complex DO, respectively.

18.a.[1] We generally assume that all the forms of a lemma share the same meanings, but we are now beginning to discover that in some cases, if they did not share similar spelling, we might not wish to regard them as being instances of the same lemma. [2] **For example**, take the lemma *move*. [3] The forms *moving* and *moved* share some meanings with *move*, but each form has a very distinctive pattern of meaning.

b.[1] Another way of representing Situation is by picture. [2] Take the art of cartooning, **for instance**. [3] In just one drawing, the artist can do as much as words by presenting a frame of life.

c.[1] It is not an accident that vending machines or super markets can be used for selling certain categories of goods. The speaking relevant to material action is typically minimal and routinised; consider, **for example**, Wittgenstein's bricklayer.

¹⁹ See the Sources-Method section for the distinction between Simple and Complex Objects.

19.a.[1] It should be apparent that the paraphrase tests used throughout this book to establish relations are in some sense simulations of the process that a reader goes through in assessing how a current sentence relates to its predecessor(s). [2] Consider, **for example**, a pair of sentences discussed briefly in Section 7, Chapter 2.

b.[1] The writer has also chosen to depict the officials in favorable terms and the protesters in unfavorable ones. [2] Notice, **for example**, how Energy Department estimates are given priority over those from the protesting group, and how the DOE (Department of Energy) spokesman's comments are presented before those of the demonstrators.

c. The single-point potential approach works best when each of the potentials is very different from the others. When the interaction allows for states with only minor differences in behaviour potential, a problem can arise involving *the proliferation of single-point potentials*. **For instance**, take Mitchell's Cyrenacian auction procedure, where attendees at an auction are allowed to inspect the item being sold at any point from the opening of the item's sale to the completion of the sale.

Examples (19) show that the placement of the conjunctive is either in the initial position or immediately after the PT in the Predicator-Theme sentences whose DO is postmodified by a relative clause (restrictive as in (19a) or nonrestrictive as in (19c)) or a noun clause (as in (19b)). Never was the conjunctive found to occur in the final position in the Predicator-Theme sentences with a Complex DO. If this total non-occurrence suggests anything, it strongly suggests that the placement of a conjunctive within a sentence is not always left to the writer's preference and discretion; rather, it may be dictated by structural constraints like the ones illustrated in the above extracts.

Pedagogical Implications

This has two key implications for teaching the usage of conjunctions to EFL learners. The first implication relates to the placement of a conjunctive within a sentence. As has been

shown through the above discussion, the placement of the same conjunctive in initial position, immediately after the Topical Theme, immediately after the Circumstantial Theme, and sentence-finally is not always a matter of optionality and preference; rather, it is very often determined by syntactic and pragmatic factors. EFL learners then need to be aware of those factors; so that, they can make informed decisions about the appropriate placements of a conjunctive within a particular set of sentences. This can greatly help them use conjunctions in a manner that is felicitous and conforms to the expectations of the academic community.

The second implication concerns the type of limited instruction that teaching materials often offer on conjunctions. As can be concluded from the descriptive analysis of the occurrences of the target conjunctions, there are some cases where, as a result of certain syntactic and/or pragmatic requirements, the same conjunctive may be prevented from occupying one or another of its frequent sentence positions. Therefore, it is inadequate, even misleading, for writing materials to point out to the fact that a conjunctive can be placed in different sentence positions and, to illustrate that, offer some made-up sentences where it is possible for the conjunctive to move from the initial position to another place. Writing materials designed for ESL/EFL learners must also point to the fact that a conjunctive may well be prevented from occurring in one of its frequent positions; they need to offer explicit instruction as to where and why that conjunctive should not be placed in that position.

To meet these learning needs, many contextualized examples (taken or adapted from authentic discourses) must be included in teaching materials in order to provide learners with the necessary exposure to and practice with the appropriate placements of a conjunctive across sentences having the same and different thematic structures. In fact, the provision of such "authentic, representative language to learners is a basic responsibility of classroom instruction" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001, p. 30).

Conclusion

In summary, the researcher wants to make three claims. Firstly, the sentence positions which the same conjunctive, let alone different conjunctives, frequently occupies vary across sentences having different thematic structures; that is, the same conjunctive may be placed in any of its frequent positions in a particular set of sentences but is restricted to certain places in another set of sentences. It would be wrong therefore to hazard such across-the-board claims as that conjunctives are characteristically thematic, that conjunctives occur more frequently after the Topical Theme, or that conjunctives can be placed in sentence-final position.

Secondly, and as can be concluded from the above paragraph, it is insufficient, if not misleading, to prepare teaching materials on the usage of some conjunctives in English based on the frequency profiles of those conjunctives. Such materials would lead ESL/EFL learners to wrongly assume that it is a question of optionality to place a conjunctive in one or another of its frequent positions.

Thirdly and more importantly, there are more often than not certain syntactic and/or pragmatic factors determining the appropriate placement of a conjunctive within a sentence; those factors may prevent a conjunctive from occupying one of its frequent sentence positions. It is such syntactic and pragmatic determinants that ESL/EFL learners need to be aware of should they want to use conjunctives in a manner that is felicitous and conforms to the expectations of the academic community. Teaching materials that provide frequent profiles of conjunctives and their sentence positions while ignoring syntactic and pragmatic restrictions on the moveability and the placement of a conjunctive would be of little, if any, pedagogical value to EFL learners.

References

- [1] Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics?. In K. R. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds), *Pragmatics in language teaching*, pp. 13-32. USA: Cambridge University Press .
- [2] Bloor, T. & Bloor, M. (2004). *The functional analysis of English* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.
- [3] Bublitz, W., Lenk, U., & Ventola, E. (Eds.). (1999). *Coherence in spoken and written discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins .
- [4] Celce-Murcia, M. & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: an ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed). USA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- [5] Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Advances in written text analysis*. London: Routledge.
- [6] Dontcheva-Navratilora, O. & Povolná, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Coherence and cohesion in spoken and written discourse*. UK: Cambridge Scholars.
- [7] Downing, A. & Locke, P. (2006). *English grammar: A university course* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- [8] Ghadessy, M. (Ed.). (1999). *Text and context in functional linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- [9] Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *Introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Arnold.
- [10] Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- [11] Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.
- [12] Hoey, M. (1983). *On the surface of discourse*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- [13] Hoey, M. (2001). *Textual interaction: An introduction to written discourse analysis* (reprint). London: Routledge.
- [14] Hunston, S. (2007). Using corpus to investigate stance quantitatively and qualitatively. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse*, pp. 27-48. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- [15] Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.
- [16] Jordon, M. (1984). *Rhetoric of everyday English texts*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- [17] McCarthy, M. (2001). It, this and that. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in written text analysis*, pp. 266-275. New York: Routledge.
- [18] Miller, T. (Ed.). (1997). *Functional approaches to written text: Classroom applications*. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/FunctionalApproaches/>
- [19] Nation, P. (2001). Using small corpora to investigate learner needs: Two vocabulary research tools. In M. Ghadessy, A. Henry &

- R. L. Roseberry (Eds.), *Small corpus studies and ELT: Theory and practice*, pp. 31-45. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- [20] Ooi, V. B. Y. (2001). Investigating and teaching genres using the World Wide Web. In M. Ghadessy, A. Henry & R. L. Roseberry (Eds.), *Small corpus studies and ELT: Theory and practice*, pp. 175-203. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [21] Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. E. (Eds.). (2003). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. USA: Blackwell.
- [22] Steiner, E. H. & Veltman, R. (Eds.). (1988). *Pragmatics, discourse and text: Some systematically-inspired approaches*. New Jersey: Ablex .
- [23] Tadros, A. (2001). Predictive categories in expository text. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in written text analysis*, pp. 69-82. New York: Routledge.
- [24] Thompson, G. (2004). *Introducing functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Hodder Education .
- [25] Ward G. & Birner. B. J. (2003). Discourse and information structure. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*, pp. 119-37. USA: Blackwell.
- [26] Winter, E. O. (1977). Clause relational approach to English texts: a study of some predictive lexical items in written discourse. *Instructional Science*, vol. 6 (1), pp. 1-92.
- [27] Winter, E. O. (2001). Clause relations as information structure: two basic text structures in English. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in written text analysis*, pp. 46-68. New York: Routledge .