

## Appendix 8: Findings from Corpus Analysis

(Pertains to chapter 5, by Laura Aull)

In Table A below, the most significant distinctions ( $p < .001$ ) are shaded and noted by \*\*\*; in these categories, so great is the distinction in discourse across two corpora that the likelihood it occurred by chance is 1 in 1,000. Those distinctions that are not significant are noted as n.s. Table A also shows the “direction” of the distinction, or which corpus contains more of each discourse category; for example, MICUSP (C2) contains fewer generalization markers than FY writing (C1), so the final column notes  $C1 > C2$ . But COCAA (C3) contains still fewer, so the second column notes  $C3 > C2$ .

	C1: UM Incoming FY			C2: MICUSP (Advanced Student)			C3: COCAA (Published Academic)			
Corpus comparison	C1 v C2			C2 v C3			C1 v C3			
Feature	LL	Sig	(C1–C2)	LL	Sig	(C2–C3)	LL	Sig	(C1–C3)	Overall Gradient
Generality markers	16,121.61	***	$C1 > C2$	33.33	***	$C2 > C3$	200,980	***	$C1 > C3$	$C1 > C2 > C3$
Qualified generalizations	846.37	***	$C1 > C2$	104.7145	***	$C2 > C3$	17,266.2	***	$C1 > C3$	$C1 > C2 > C3$
Hedges	51,358.73	***	$C2 > C1$	125.103	***	$C2 > C3$	176,612.5	***	$C1 < C3$	$C2 > C3 > C1$
Boosters	108,723	***	$C2 > C1$	170,173.8	***	$C2 > C3$	0	n.s.	Equal	0

*Table A. Stance feature use across UM DSP, MICUSP, and COCAA*

In Table B below, Corpus 1 (C1) refers to the minor DSP essays, Corpus 2 (C2) refers to the selected minor students’ essay genre, and Corpus 3 (C3) refers to the selected minor students’ discipline-specific writing. As in Table A, the most significant distinctions ( $p < .001$ ) are shaded and noted by \*\*\*, and those distinctions that are not significant are noted as n.s. Here, other acceptable but less significant statistical distinctions are also noted and lightly shaded (\* denotes  $p < .01$ ; \* denotes  $p < .05$ ).

	C1: Minor DSP (Incoming FY)			C2: Minor Essay			C3: Minor Discipline–Specific			
Corpus comparison	C1 v C2			C2 v C3			C1 v C3			
Feature	LL	Sig	(C1–C2)	LL	Sig	(C2–C3)	LL	Sig	(C1–C3)	Overall Gradient
Generality markers	58.11	***	$C1 > C2$	29.86	***	$C2 > C3$	119.736	***	$C1 > C3$	$C1 > C2 > C3$
Qualified generalizations	1.89	n.s.	$C1 > C2$	3.78	n.s.	$C2 > C3$	6.45	*	$C1 > C3$	$C1 > C2 > C3$
Hedges	0.09	n.s.	$C2 > C1$	3.04	n.s.	$C2 > C3$	0.41	n.s.	$C1 > C3$	$C2 > C1 > C3$
Boosters	4.35	*	$C1 > C2$	1.54	n.s.	$C2 > C3$	7.71	**	$C1 > C3$	$C1 > C2 > C3$

*Table B. Stance feature use across UM DSP essays, minor undergraduate essays, and minor discipline–specific writing*

Table C shows epistemic stance feature use across these three, the minor discipline-specific writing (C1), minor general essay writing (C2), and minor personalized/ reflective writing (C3).

	Minor Discipline-Specific			Minor Essay			Minor Personalized			
Corpus comparison	C1 v C2			C2 v C3			C1 v C3			
Feature	LL	Sig	(C1–C2)	LL	Sig	(C2–C3)	LL	Sig	(C1–C3)	Overall Gradient
Generality markers	29.86	***	C2 > C1	2.50	n.s.	C3 > C2	29.16	***	C1 < C3	C3 > C2 > C1
Qualified generalizations	3.78	n.s.	C2 > C1	1.52	n.s.	C3 > C2	6.92	**	C1 < C3	C3 > C2 > C1
Hedges	3.04	n.s.	C2 > C1	2.43	n.s.	C2 > C3	0.16	n.s.	C1 > C3	C2 > C1 > C3
Boosters	1.54	n.s.	C2 > C1	6.48	*	C3 > C2	11.60	***	C1 < C3	C3 > C2 > C1

Table C. Stance feature use across minor discipline-specific writing, minor general essay writing, and minor personalized/reflective writing

Table D shows epistemic stance feature use across the minor discipline-specific writing, according to three common discipline groups: humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.

	C1: Minor Humanities			C2: Minor Social Sciences			C3: Minor Natural Sciences			
Corpus comparison	C1 v C2			C2 v C3			C1 v C3			
Feature	LL	Sig	(C1–C2)	LL	Sig	(C2–C3)	LL	Sig	(C1–C3)	Overall Gradient
Generality markers	6.05	*	C1 > C2	22.39	***	C2 > C3	43.78	***	C1 > C3	C1 > C2 > C3
Qualified generalizations	3.24	n.s.	C2 > C1	14.00	***	C2 > C3	3.58	n.s.	C1 > C3	C2 > C1 > C3
Hedges	0.01	n.s.	C1 > C2	8.17	**	C2 > C3	6.97	**	C1 > C3	C1 > C2 > C3
Boosters	6.19	*	C1 > C2	6.79	**	C2 > C3	22.48	***	C1 > C3	C1 > C2 > C3

Table D. Stance feature use across minor discipline-specific writing in humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences

Table E below shows stance marker use in the minor discipline-specific writing compared to MICUSP, as a reference corpus for advanced student writing, and COCAA, as a reference corpus for expert writing.

	C1: Minor Discipline-Specific			C2: MICUSP (Advanced Student)			C3: COCAA (Published Academic)			
Corpus comparison	C1 v C2			C2 v C3			C1 v C3			
Feature	LL	Sig	(C1–C2)	LL	Sig	(C2–C3)	LL	Sig	(C1–C3)	Overall Gradient
Generality markers	2.83	n.s.	C2 > C1	33.33385	***	C2 > C3	0.810028	n.s.	C1 < C3	C2 > C3 > C1
Qualified generalizations	0.26	n.s.	C1 > C2	104.7145	***	C2 > C3	3.972537	*	C1 > C3	C1 > C2 > C3
Hedges	15.55	***	C2 > C1	125.103	***	C2 > C3	6.141529	*	C1 < C3	C2 > C3 > C1
Boosters	13.0	***	C1 > C2	170.173.8	***	C2 > C3	7,891.594	***	C1 > C3	C1 > C2 > C3

Table E. Stance feature use in minor discipline-specific writing versus MICUSP and COCAA