

Variation in University Student Writing

A communicative text type approach

Larissa Goulart

Montclair State University

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia

Table of contents

List of figures	XI
List of tables	XV
CHAPTER 1. Introduction	1
1.1 The need for describing the language of university writing	1
1.2 The text categories of university writing	2
1.3 The importance of discipline in the characteristics of university writing	7
1.4 The linguistic characteristics of academic writing and university writing	8
1.4.1 Studies of grammatical complexity in academic writing and university writing	9
1.4.2 MD analyses of published academic writing	10
1.4.3 MD analyses of university writing: Register variation	19
1.4.4 MD analyses of university writing: Disciplinary variation	25
1.5 Trends and gaps in the linguistic profile of university writing	30
1.6 Overview of the study	31
CHAPTER 2. Corpus and data analysis	34
2.1 Introduction	34
2.2 Corpus description	34
2.3 Corpus annotation	37
2.3.1 Tagging and accuracy	38
2.3.2 Identifying complexity features	39
2.3.3 Computing and norming rates of occurrence	41
2.4 Overview: Steps of the study	42
CHAPTER 3. The challenges of classifying university writing into register categories	45
3.1 Introduction	45
3.2 University writing classification: A survey of university writing register	46
3.2.1 In interviews, syllabi, and prompts	46
3.2.2 In university writing corpora	49
3.2.3 Trends and gaps in the types of registers found in university writing	54
3.3 University writing classification: Two case studies of university writing registers	55

3.4	A summary of the challenges of classifying university writing into register categories	59
3.4.1	Challenge 1: Overt markers of register categories	59
3.4.2	Challenge 2: The set of registers that exist in university writing	60
3.4.3	Challenge 3: The description of register categories	61
3.4.4	Challenge 4: Purpose variation within register categories	61
3.5	Implications for the text categorization of university writing	64
CHAPTER 4. The communicative text types of university writing		66
4.1	Introduction	66
4.2	Proposing a framework for the analysis of communicative purposes in university writing	66
4.3	Classifying university writing into communicative text types	67
4.4	The communicative text types of university writing	70
4.4.1	To give a procedural recount	73
4.4.2	To argue	77
4.4.3	To explain	80
4.4.4	To propose	84
4.4.5	To compare	87
4.4.6	Other purposes	89
4.5	Trends in the communicative text types of university writing	91
CHAPTER 5. Textual characteristics of university communicative text types		92
5.1	Introduction	92
5.2	Situational characteristics of university writing	92
5.3	Motivating a textual framework of university communicative text types	93
5.4	The framework of textual characteristics of university communicative text types	95
5.4.1	Text length	95
5.4.2	Textual layout	96
5.4.3	Visual elements	97
5.4.4	Explicitness of purpose	98
5.5	The textual characteristics of each communicative text type	100
5.5.1	To give a procedural recount	100
5.5.2	To argue	103
5.5.3	To explain	105
5.5.4	To propose	107
5.5.5	To compare	109
5.5.6	Other purposes	111
5.6	Trends observed in the textual analysis of university writing	111

CHAPTER 6. A multidimensional analysis of university communicative text types	114
6.1 Introduction	114
6.2 The need for a new MD analysis of university writing	115
6.3 Conducting a new multidimensional analysis of student writing	117
6.3.1 Choosing variables	118
6.3.2 Factor analysis	120
6.4 Dimensions of variation in university writing	124
6.4.1 Dimension 1: Elaborated discourse vs condensed style	124
6.4.2 Dimension 2: Production of possibility vs content-focused description	132
6.4.3 Dimension 3: Informational density vs involved, academic narrative	139
6.5 Cumulative findings of multidimensional analyses of university writing	146
6.6 Trends in the multidimensional analysis of university writing	149
CHAPTER 7. What is an essay? Comparing the communicative text type and the register approach	152
7.1 Introduction	152
7.2 Previous research on the communicative purpose and linguistic characteristics of essays	153
7.3 Corpus of study	156
7.4 Summary of communicative text types in the register of essays	157
7.4.1 Combinations of purposes in the register of essays in arts and humanities	160
7.4.2 Combinations of purposes in the register of essays in social sciences	162
7.4.3 Combinations of purposes in the register of essays in life sciences	163
7.4.4 Combinations of purposes in the register of essays in physical sciences	164
7.5 Summary of textual characteristics in the register of essays	167
7.5.1 Textual characteristics of essays in arts and humanities	169
7.5.2 Textual characteristics of essays in social sciences	169
7.5.3 Textual characteristics of essays in life sciences	170
7.5.4 Textual characteristics of essays in physical sciences	171
7.6 Summary of MD analysis results for the register of essays	172
7.6.1 Dimension 1: Elaborated discourse vs condensed style	175

7.6.2	Dimension 2: Production of possibility vs content-focused description	178
7.6.3	Dimension 3: Informational density vs involved, academic narrative	181
7.7	Trends in the communicative purposes and linguistic characteristics of essays	184
CHAPTER 8. Conclusion and implications		186
8.1	Overview	186
8.2	Perspectives on communicative text types	187
8.2.1	The communicative text types of university writing across disciplines	190
8.2.2	The textual characteristics of university communicative text types across disciplines	191
8.2.3	The linguistic characteristics of university communicative text types across disciplines	192
8.2.4	Comparing the register and the communicative text type approach	198
8.3	Methodological contributions of this study	201
8.3.1	Classifying texts by communicative text types	201
8.3.2	Examining variation across both communicative text types and disciplines	202
8.3.3	Describing the textual characteristics of texts	203
8.4	Implications of the current study	204
8.4.1	Implications for the teaching of university writing	204
8.4.2	Implications for research on university writing	205
8.4.3	Implications for register studies	205
8.5	Future research	206
References		209
Appendixes		
APPENDIX A. Reliability of automatic tags given by the Biber Tagger on texts written by L1-English and L2-English students		216
APPENDIX B. Tag-fixing script		219
APPENDIX C. All combinations of purposes in the corpus		220
APPENDIX D. Overall features selected for factor analysis		221
APPENDIX E. Full factorial structure matrix for the three-factor solution		224

APPENDIX F. Correlation and scree plot	226
APPENDIX G. Mean and standard deviation for each factor	228
APPENDIX H. Simple effects Dimensions 1–3	229
Index	239

List of figures

FIGURE 1.1	Example assignment 1	4
FIGURE 1.2	Example assignment 2	5
FIGURE 2.1	Example of text tagged with the Biber Tagger	38
FIGURE 2.2	Overview of the components of the analysis	44
FIGURE 3.1	Text excerpt from physical sciences	59
FIGURE 3.2	Visual representation of Goulart et al.'s (2022) results for essays, explanations and methodology recounts	64
FIGURE 4.1	Most frequent combinations of minor purposes with the communicative text type of <i>to give a procedural recount</i> across disciplinary groups	73
FIGURE 4.2	Most frequent combinations of minor purposes with the communicative text type of <i>to give a procedural recount</i>	75
FIGURE 4.3	Most frequent combinations of minor purposes with the communicative type of <i>to give a procedural recount</i> across disciplinary groups	76
FIGURE 4.4	Most frequent combinations of minor purposes with the communicative type of <i>to argue</i>	78
FIGURE 4.5	Most frequent combinations of minor purposes with the communicative type of <i>to argue</i> across disciplinary groups	80
FIGURE 4.6	Most frequent combinations of minor purposes with the communicative text type of <i>to explain</i>	82
FIGURE 4.7	Most frequent combinations of minor purposes with the communicative type of <i>to explain</i> across disciplinary groups	83

FIGURE 4.8	Most frequent combinations of minor purposes with the communicative type of <i>to propose</i>	85
FIGURE 4.9	Most frequent combinations of minor purposes with the communicative type of <i>to propose</i> across disciplinary groups	86
FIGURE 4.10	Most frequent combinations of minor purposes with the communicative type of <i>to compare</i>	88
FIGURE 4.11	Most frequent combinations of minor purposes with the communicative text types of <i>to describe</i> , <i>to give personal advice</i> , and <i>to narrate a personal event</i>	90
FIGURE 6.1	Distribution of disciplines and registers/communicative text types along Biber's (1988) Dimension 1: Involved versus informational production	116
FIGURE 6.2	Distribution of discipline and communicative text types along Dimension 1: Elaborated Discourse vs condensed style	128
FIGURE 6.3	Interaction Plot for Dimension 1: Elaborated discourse vs condensed style	129
FIGURE 6.4	Distribution of discipline and communicative text types along Dimension 2: Production of possibility vs content-focused description	135
FIGURE 6.5	Interaction plot for Dimension 2: Production of possibility vs content-focused description	136
FIGURE 6.6	Distribution of discipline and communicative text types along Dimension 3: Informational density vs involved, academic narrative	141
FIGURE 6.7	Interaction plot for Dimension 3: Informational density vs involved, academic narrative	142
FIGURE 7.1	Distribution of <i>to argue</i> , <i>to explain</i> and other purposes within essays across disciplines	158
FIGURE 7.2	Most frequent combination of major + minor purpose in essays	159

FIGURE 7.3	Most frequent combination of major + minor purpose in arts and humanities essays	161
FIGURE 7.4	Most frequent combination of major + minor purpose in social sciences essays	162
FIGURE 7.5	Most frequent combination of major + minor purpose in life sciences essays	164
FIGURE 7.6	Most frequent combination of major + minor purpose in physical sciences	165
FIGURE 7.7	Most frequent combinations of communicative purposes across disciplines	166
FIGURE 7.8	Mean dimension scores for dimensions 1–3 for the register of essays	174
FIGURE 7.9	Distribution of discipline and communicative text types within essays along Dimension 1: Elaborated discourse vs condensed style	176
FIGURE 7.10	Distribution of discipline and communicative text types within essays along Dimension 2: Production of possibility vs content-focused description	179
FIGURE 7.11	Distribution of discipline and communicative text types within essays along Dimension 3: Informational density vs involved, academic narrative	182
FIGURE 8.1	Distribution of discipline, communicative text types and language background along Dimension 1: Elaborated discourse vs condensed style	207

List of tables

TABLE 1.1	Summary of studies investigating academic discourse using Biber's (1988) Dimensions	14
TABLE 1.2	Summary of studies investigating academic Discourse through new multidimensional analyses	17
TABLE 1.3	Mean Dimension scores for essays across studies	22
TABLE 1.4	Summary of MD studies investigating university writing across university registers	23
TABLE 1.5	Summary of MD studies investigating university writing across disciplines	28
TABLE 2.1	Corpus of study	35
TABLE 2.2	Internal composition of the ETS corpus	36
TABLE 2.3	Internal composition of the British Academic Written English Corpus	37
TABLE 2.4	Internal composition of the corpus used in this study	37
TABLE 3.1	Characteristics of registers identified in MICUSP (Römer & O'Donnell, 2011, p.170)	50
TABLE 3.2	Characteristics of registers identified in BAWE (Nesi & Gardner, 2012, pp.36-42)	51
TABLE 3.3	Characteristics of registers identified in the ETS corpus	52
TABLE 3.4	Characteristics of registers identified in the BrAWE corpus (Goulart, 2021, p.5)	53
TABLE 3.5	Shared registers in previous studies of university writing	56
TABLE 4.1	The framework of communicative purposes of university writing	68
TABLE 4.2	Distribution of communicative purposes in the corpus	71

TABLE 4.3	Minor purposes associated with each communicative text type	72
TABLE 4.4	Registers within the communicative text type of <i>to give a procedural recount</i>	74
TABLE 4.5	Registers within the Communicative text type of <i>to Argue</i>	77
TABLE 4.6	Registers within the communicative text type of <i>to explain</i>	81
TABLE 4.7	Registers within the communicative text type of <i>to propose</i>	84
TABLE 4.8	Registers within the communicative text type of <i>to compare</i>	87
TABLE 4.9	Registers within less frequent communicative text types	90
TABLE 5.1	Shared situational characteristics of university student writing	94
TABLE 5.2	Textual characteristics of communicative text types of university student writing	96
TABLE 5.3	The textual characteristics of communicative text types	99
TABLE 5.4	The textual characteristics of <i>to give a procedural recount</i> texts across disciplines	102
TABLE 5.5	The textual characteristics of <i>to argue</i> texts across disciplines	105
TABLE 5.6	The textual characteristics of <i>to explain</i> texts across disciplines	106
TABLE 5.7	The textual characteristics of <i>to propose</i> texts across disciplines	109
TABLE 5.8	The textual characteristics of <i>to compare</i> texts across disciplines	110
TABLE 5.9	Summary of textual and linguistic characteristics of university communicative text types	112
TABLE 6.1	Mean Dimension scores for Biber's (1988) Dimensions	117

TABLE 6.2	Summary of linguistic features included in the final factor analysis	121
TABLE 6.3	Structure of three-factor solution	123
TABLE 6.4	Distribution of communicative text types across disciplines in Dimension 1	130
TABLE 6.5	Distribution of communicative text types across disciplines in Dimension 3	143
TABLE 6.6	Comparison of Dimensions identified in studies of university and academic writing	147
TABLE 6.7	Summary of the three identified dimensions of university writing	150
TABLE 7.1	Summary of results of previous studies that described the linguistic characteristics of essays	154
TABLE 7.2	The subcorpus of essays	156
TABLE 7.3	Communicative text types within essays across disciplines	157
TABLE 7.4	Summary of most common combinations of communicative purposes across disciplines	166
TABLE 7.5	The textual characteristics of essays across disciplines	167
TABLE 7.6	Number of texts in each communicative text type	173
TABLE 7.7	Most frequent combinations of purposes across disciplines	175
TABLE 7.8	Dimension 1 score means and standard deviations for essay communicative purposes	178
TABLE 7.9	Dimension 2 score means and standard deviations for essay communicative purposes	180
TABLE 7.10	Dimension 3 score means and standard deviations for essay communicative purposes	183
TABLE 7.11	Summary of MD analysis results for the register of essays across disciplines	183

TABLE 8.1	Summary of textual and linguistic characteristics of university communicative text types	188
TABLE 8.2	Combinations of communicative purposes across disciplines	191
TABLE 8.3	Textual characteristics of university writing across disciplines	193
TABLE 8.4	Co-occurrence of linguistic features in the MD analysis	195
TABLE 8.5	Summary of MD analysis results across communicative text types and disciplines	196
TABLE 8.6	Summary of the analysis of variation within essays	200
TABLE 8.7	Mean Dimension scores across disciplines	202
TABLE 8.8	Mean Dimension scores across text types	203