Studies in Corpus Linguistics
117

Table of contents

https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.117.toc



Pages v–x of
Variation in University Student Writing: A communicative text type approach
Larissa Goulart
[**Studies in Corpus Linguistics**, 117] 2024. xviii, 239 pp.

© John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way. For any reuse of this material written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

For further information, please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website at benjamins.com/rights

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 matric 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**