World Journal of Educational Research
ISSN 2375-9771 (Print) ISSN 2333-5998 (Online)
Vol. 2, No. 1, 2015
www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/wjer

Metadiscourse Analysis of the Extraverted-Introverted L2 Learners' Oral Production

Behzad Ghonsooly[1], Seyyedeh Maryam Hamedi[2], & Seyyedeh Mina Hamedi[1*]

[1] Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

[2] Imamreza University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

[*] Seyyedeh Mina Hamedi, E-mail: sm3_hamedi@yahoo.com

Abstract

The study at hand aims at analyzing the relationship between the extraversion level and the employment of metadiscourse markers in the Second Language (L2) learners' oral production on the one hand, and investigating the differences between various levels of extraversion and the types of metadiscourse they use, on the other hand. To this end, 60 advanced EFL learners comprising 12 males and 48 females took part in the study and their extraversion level was assessed with the aid of Myer-Briggs Type Indicator questionnaire. The highly extraverted (N=7) accounted for 11.7%, moderately extraverted (N=22) comprising 36.7%, moderately introverted (N=9) including 15%, and quite introverted (N=22) involving 36.7% of the population. Indeed, the findings revealed a strong positive correlation between the extraversion level and the employment of metadiscourse markers in speech. Besides, there were statistically significant differences across highly extraverted, moderately extraverted, moderately introverted, and quite introverted learners regarding the application of met discourse markers in their speech.

Keywords

extraversion, metadiscourse markers, oral production

1. Introduction

Human beings differ from each other in numerous ways; however, some of these ways are of more importance to psychology than the others to be probed extensively, among which personality is of wider significance (Eysenck, 1994). Campbell, Davalos, McCabe, and Troup (2011) pointed out that exploring facets of personality and individual differences can be even conducive to gaining a better insight into cognitive system.

Accordingly, Extraversion-Introversion (E-I) is one of the major personality differences that has grabbed the attention of the psycholinguists, in particular (Dornyei, 2005). Therefore, it would be worthwhile to clarify the underlying characteristics of this construct to gain a more comprehensive view of this personality type indicator, respectively. Eysenck and Eyenck (1975), and Myers (1962) claim that extraverts tend to be open to the strangers and get socially mixed whereas introverts are

likely to keep aloof and tend not to keep a high profile. “Extraverts have found to be more talkative in triads or groups (Bem & Allen, 1974; Shaw, 1976 as cited in Thorne, 1987, p. 718) but not necessarily in dyads where findings are inconsistent” (Campbell & Rushton, 1987 as cited in Thorne, 1987, p. 718).

Based on Yungian personality typology (1976) extraverts are generally outgoing, direct, energetic, and sociable and introverts tend to be more reticent, bashful, thoughtful, sensitive, and inscrutable. Besides, he believes that extraverts prefer creating a more all embracing, common space whereas introverts tend to take a more private and individual space. In fact, Gale (1969) defines extraverts as the ones who are more restless and energetic in restricted environments. Furnham (1990) highlighted the existence of numerous distinct commonsense relationships between (E-I) and language use to the point that with the relative ease, a reliable measure of this trait can be produced. For instance, regarding the oral production, extraverts are characterized by their talkativeness and fewer pauses, whereas introverts are marked by tending to utilize more formal speech with more careful grammatical constructions (Dornyei, 2005). Although numerous studies have been focused on the distinction between the extraverts-introverts natural speech, less has been conducted to identify metadiscourse markers in their speech.

In fact, metadiscourse is a prevalent dimension of everyday language, and a prominent feature of the ways we interact within a range of genres and settings (Hyland, 1997). In essence, inspections have revealed the significance of metadiscourse in casual conversation (Schiffrin, 1980) as a prominent means of promoting communication (Hyland, 1997) and a fundamental factor of persuasive and argumentative discourse (Crismore & Farnworth, 1990; Hyland, 1997).

Consequently, since speech is one of the most natural and common ways of exchanging information and it is widely considered as one of the prominent skills in foreign language learning classes contributing to the opening of numerous L2 discussions, maintenance of pair works and group works, and promoting higher chances of self-expression, the present study aims at examining the relationship between the students’ extent of extraversion and the employment of metadiscourse markers in their oral production on the one hand, and investigating the differences between various levels of extraversion and the type of meta discourse they use, on the other hand.

1.2 Significance of the Study

In as much as, awareness of these personality differences as useful predictors for L2 achievement, can make a big contribution to Second/Foreign language teachers’ performance for adopting wiser and due strategies in dealing with individual differences, psycholinguists have mostly addressed the impact of these personality dimensions on the learners’ natural communicative oral performance (e.g., Socan & Bucik, 1998; Dewaele & Furnham, 1999, 2000).

Yet, conducting a research on the relationship between this personality trait and the use of metadiscourse markers has been relatively neglected. In other words, although the application and role of metadiscourse markers has been investigated in various contexts, including textbooks (Crismore,

1984; Hyland, 1999), science popularizations (Crismore & Farnsworth, 1990), advertisements (Fuertes-Olivera et al., 2001 as cited in Dafouz-Milne, 2008) little has been done to explore the utilization of metadiscourse markers across various personality types particularly the extraverted and introverted EFL learners.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

In sum, the aim of the present study is twofold. Firstly, it attempts at investigating the relationship between the extraversion level and the employment of metadiscourse markers in the L2 learners oral production. Secondly it aims at examining the differences between various levels of extraversion and the types of metadiscourse they use in their natural speech communication. Therefore, the present study attempts at addressing the following questions:

1) Is there any significant relationship between the students' extent of extraversion and the use of metadiscourse markers in their speech?

2) Is there any significant difference in terms of the use of metadiscourse markers across?

highly extraverted, moderately extraverted, moderately introverted, and quite introverted individuals?

3) What types of metadiscourses are mostly used by the extraverts?

4) What types of metadiscourses are mostly used by the introverts?

2. Literature Review

Metadiscourse is considered as a primary means of boosting interaction, supporting an interlocutor's stance and establishing a relationship with an audience (Hyland, 1997).

In fact, metadiscourse characterizes a range of lexical items (words and expressions) whose primary role is to improve communicative competence in at least one of two ways: by reorganizing the inference process involved in detecting the relation between parts of a text and the context (including the co-text) and by building and maintaining the rapport between interlocutor and audience (Zegarac, in press).

According to Hyland (2005) the term metadiscourse was first used by Zellig Harris in 1959 to propose a way of understanding language in use, highlighting a writer's or speaker's attempts to direct a receiver's perception of a text. Hyland (1998) asserts that metadiscourse attracts our attention on the ways writers project themselves into their work to represent their communicative intentions since it enables us to see how writers seek to affect readers' comprehension of both the text and their approach towards its content and the audience.

In sum, utilizing metadiscourse helps readers perceive discourse structure and intertextuality, share pragmatic assumptions, determine intended meanings, and unveil the institutional and ideological ties underlying the text (Pérez-Llantada, 2003).

Hyland (2005) categorizes metadiscourse markers into two groups of interactive metadiscourse markers (which reflects the writer's consideration of the audience's background knowledge, interests, and abilities) and interactional metadiscourse markers (which draws the reader's attention to the

author's stance towards the predominant expressive content of the text and towards the reader). Based on Hyland (2005) interactive metadiscourse includes code glosses, endophoric markers, evidentials, frame markers, and transition markers.

Depending on Hyland (2005) classification, code glosses provide further information by rephrasing, clarifying or unfolding what has been said to make sure the reader is able to perceive the writer's intended meaning; Endophoric markers are the expressions which refer to other parts of the text; Evidentials signifies that an idea emanates from another source; Frame markers represent text boundaries or delineate elements of text structure; Transition markers help the reader perceive the relevant relations between parts of the text.

Besides and Hyland (2005) categorizes interactional metadiscourse into attitude markers which reflect the communicator's affective attitude towards the descriptive content of the text; Boosters indicating that the communicator is holding one of numerous possible views relating to a certain point; Self mention items including the personal pronoun "I" or phrases such as "the author"; Engagement markers which directly address readers, focusing their attention or asking them to see themselves as participants in the discourse, and hedges representing the communicator's doubtfulness to the truth of the proposition expressed by a distinct part of the text. Henceforth, metadiscourse is the author's or the speaker's rhetorical manifestation to "bracket the discourse organization and the expressive implications of what is being said" (Schiffrin, 1980, p. 231).

Indeed, extraverts have proved to outperform introverts in faster doing of more complex tasks which calls for more response competition; however, the easiness of the task or the task which involves little response competition would deprive them of the favored advantage (Eysenck, 1974, 1976). Dewaele and Furnham (1999) explained that introverts are more susceptible to higher pressure conditions, which hampers the automaticity of their oral production; therefore, they slide back to controlled serial processing which would result in slower speech production, hesitation, and more errors. Despite the bountiful studies on the detection of metadiscourse markers in various texts and genres, none has been extensively focused on the distribution of these markers in various personality types such as introverts and extraverts. Consequently, the researcher aims at examining the use of metadiscourse markers across various levels of extraversion.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

A community sample of 60 advanced English learners, studying at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, with the average age of 19.22, ranging from 18 to 25, comprising 12 males and 48 females, participated in this study with no expectation of rewards in the end.The highly extraverted (N=7) accounted for 11.7%, moderately extraverted (N=22) comprising 36.7%, moderately introverted (N=9) including 15%, and quite introverted (N=22) involving 36.7% of the total population. Besides, to analyze their speech in view of the application of metadiscourse markers their speeches were audio recorded. Furthermore,

they didn't have any familiarity with the concept of metadiscourse markers and their functions.

3.2 Instruments

To assess the extraversion trait, Myer-Briggs scale containing items related to their level of extraversion and to detect the use of metadiscourse markers Hyland's (2005) classification of metadiscourse markers were administered.

3.2.1 Myer-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) Test

The standardized Myer-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) test was utilized in this study consisting of 15 multiple choice questions with two choices of a, b devoted specifically for assessing the overall level of extraversion-introversion in the individuals. This scale produces a possible range of scores from zero to fifteen based on which the learners were categorized into four main dichotomies of 1) Quite introverted (if gained six and below), 2) Moderately introverted (seven or eight), 3) Moderately extraverted (between nine to twelve), 4) Quite extroverted (thirteen and above that) depending on the MBTI guidelines. Cronbach's alpha was computed with the score exhibiting the reliability coefficient of .79 for the extraversion-introversion trait.

3.2.2 Haylor's Metadiscourse Markers Classification

Interactive metadiscourse includes code glosses, endophoric markers, evidentials, frame markers, transition markers, and interactional metadiscourse involves attitude markers, boosters, hedges, self-mention, and engagement.

3.3 Procedure

The survey was conducted in the first semester of the 2013-2014 academic year. To find out the relationship between extraversion and the use of metadiscourse markers, MBTI questionnaire was administered to 60 university students at the beginnings of their normal English classes. In addition, in an attempt to study the differences between extraverts and introverts regarding the employment of metadiscourse markers in their oral production in the EFL classroom context, their speeches were audio recorded during their panel discussion classes in five successive sessions each lasting for 90 minutes.

Depending on the university curriculum the students had to pass these four-credit panel discussion classes for two successive semesters as a compulsory course to gain the chance of making their way to the higher levels. To this end, the learners were provided with opportunities for having free interpersonal natural English discussions on agreed various everyday topics based on which they were meticulously scored on both their accuracy and fluency by their professor. In all ten hours of speech was recorded. Individuals had the overall opportunity of speaking around 10 minutes all during these sessions.

Finally, for further analyses the researchers transcribed and coded the recordings at the word level based on the employment of both interactive metadiscourse markers including code glosses, endophoric markers, evidentials, frame markers, transition markers, and interactional metadiscourse comprising attitude markers, boosters, hedges, self- mention , and engagement. After collecting the data, they were entered into and processed with SPSS program.

Considering the aim of this study is mainly two-fold, firstly it aims at investigating the relationship between extraversion and the use of metadiscourse markers and secondly, it attempts at examining the significant differences across the four dichotomies of extraversion scale regarding the predominant type of discourse markers, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for the first and Multivariate analysis of variance for the second was computed.

4. Results and Discussion

The relationship between extraversion (as measured by the MBTI) and employment of metadiscourse markers in their L2 speech was examined using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Subsequently, preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. As a result, there was a strong, positive correlation between the two variables, r=.82, n=60, p<.0005, with high levels of extraversion associated with higher application of metadiscourse markers in their speech. Besides, the coefficient of determination of 67.24 per cent was calculated to determine the extent of the shared variance between the two variables which is a respectable amount of variance.

The learners were categorized into four main dichotomies of 1) Quite introverted (if gained six and below), 2) Moderately introverted (seven or eight), 3) Moderately extraverted (between nine to twelve), 4) Quite extroverted (thirteen and above that) based on the MBTI guidelines.

In order to detect the differences across the four dichotomies of highly extraverted (N=7) accounted for 11.7%, moderately extraverted (N=22) comprising 36.7%, moderately introverted (N=9) including 15%, and quite introverted (N=22) involving 36.7% of the total population, regarding the employment of metadiscourse markers Multivariate analysis of variance was performed.

Table A (see appendix A) reveals the descriptive statistics of all types of metadiscourse markers for quite introverted (Group: 1), moderately introverted (Group: 2), moderately extraverted (Group: 3), and highly extraverted (Group: 4) learners is presented. The findings reveal a higher mean for higher extents of extraversions across the code glosses, endophoric, transitions, attitude markers, boosters, self-mention, and engagement. Besides, a higher mean for higher levels of introversion can be seen in the use of evidentials and hedges.

Table 1. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices[a]

Box's M	89.711
F	1.212
df1	55
df2	5696.504
df3	.136

As Table 1 demonstrates, the data are not violating the assumption of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices since Sig. value is *larger* than .001, no violation of the assumption can be detected. To explore the statistical significance of the test across all the four groups of extraversion multivariate tests was conducted (Table 2).

Table 2. Multivariate Tests[c]

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.998	2441.429[a]	10.000	47.000	47.000	.998
	Wilks' Lambda	.002	2441.429[a]	10.000	47.000	47.000	.998
	Hotelling's Trace	519.453	2441.429[a]	10.000	47.000	47.000	.998
	Roy's Largest Root	519.453	2441.429[a]	10.000	47.000	47.000	.998
Group	Pillai's Trace	1.563	5.333	30.000	147.000	147.000	.521
	Wilks' Lambda	.013	15.534	30.000	138.630	138.630	.763
	Hotelling's Trace	34.779	52.941	30.000	137.000	137.000	.921
	Roy's Largest Root	33.721	165.234[b]	10.000	49.000	49.000	.971

The findings unfold a statistical significance across various extent of extraversion with Wilk's Lambda .01 and partial eta squared of .76.

Table 3. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Codegloss	1.041	3	56	.382
Endophoricmarkers	1.403	3	56	.251
transitions	1.707	3	56	.176
framemarkers	2.260	3	56	.091
evidentials	1.301	3	56	.283
Hedges	2.516	3	56	.067
attitudemarkers	2.583	3	56	.062
Boosters	.251	3	56	.860
selfmention	.870	3	56	.462
engagement	1.133	3	56	.344

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances indicate that there is no violation of the assumption of

equality of variance since in the Sig. column, no values are *less* than .05.

According to the Table B (see appendix B), there were statistically significant differences across all levels of extraversions in the use of different types of metadiscourse markers except for the frame markers.

To summarize, a one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to scrutinize extraversion-introversion differences in the application of metadiscourse markers in their speech. Ten dependent variables were used: code glosses, endophoric markers, evidentials, frame markers, transition markers, attitude markers, boosters, hedges, self-mention, and engagement. The independent variable was extraversion. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to verify the normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, with no serious violations noted.

There were statistically significant differences across highly extraverted, moderately extraverted, moderately introverted, and quite introverted learners on the combined dependent variables, F (30, 138.63)=15.53, p=.000; Wilks' Lambda=.01; partial eta squared=.76. When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, the differences to reach statistical significance, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .01, were for all as reported. code glosses, F (3, 56)=39.33, p=.000, partial eta squared=.67; endophoric markers, F (3, 56)=21.19, p=.000, partial eta squared=.53; evidentials, F (3, 56)=26.23, p=.000, partial eta squared=.58; transitions, F (3, 56)=11.24, p=.000, partial eta squared=.37; hedges, F (3, 56)=39.22, p .000, partial eta squared=.67; attitude markers, F (3, 56)=126.77, p=.000, partial eta squared=.87; boosters, F (3, 56)=146.55, p=.000, partial eta squared =.88; self-mention, F (3, 56)=36.62, p=.000, partial eta squared=.66, and engagement, F (3, 56)=90.91, p=.000, partial eta squared=.83. There were no statistically significant differences in the use of frame markers across the four groups. An inspection of the mean scores revealed that higher extraverted reported higher use of metadiscourse markers.

In all, depending on the findings of this study the more introverted individuals only outperformed the high extraverted learners in the application of hedges and evidentials. Henceforth, regarding the hedge employment in the introverts' speech, the present study findings would corroborate Dewaele and Furnham (1999) investigation in which they attributed the introverts' speech with more hesitations and hedges. In addition, introverts utilized more evidentials such as X claimed, according to Y, etc. in their speech to ensure the credibility of their speech and sometimes to avoid self-mention and self-expression of their own beliefs as they did not want to keep a high profile which is in line with Eysenck and Eyenck (1975), and Myers (1962) observations. On the contrary, the extraverts exceled introverts in the frequent use of transitions such as therefore, besides, in addition, and endophoric markers like as mentioned earlier, as I said earlier, etc. as they are characterized with talkativeness and fewer pauses in speech which is consistent with Furnham (1990) investigations. In fact, the more frequent use of attitude markers, boosters, self-mention, and engagements in the extraverts may be justified in the light of Yungian personality typology (1976) who characterizes extraverts as more open,

direct, and more inclusive individuals who tend to build a more social common space. As a result, to maintain their interaction by making further explanations and to build a rapport they resort to more use of code glosses to rephrase their speech such as for example, in other words, etc.

5. Conclusion

The study demonstrates a strong positive correlation between the extent of extraversion and the metadiscourse employment in speech. In other words, the more extraverted, the higher use of metadiscourse markers is noted. Moreover, the study reveals that there were significant differences regarding the application of metadiscourse markers across of highly extraverted, moderately extraverted, moderately introverted, and quite introverted learners. Indeed, those with higher levels of extraversion outperformed the more introverted ones in the use of code glosses, endophoric markers, transitions, attitude markers, boosters, self-mention, and engagement, whereas the more introverted ones proved to be better in the frequent use of hedges and evidentials. Finally, there were no significant differences with regard to the frame markers employment in their speech.

Refrences

Campbell, A. M., Davalos, D. B., McCabe, D., & Troup, L. (2011). *Executive functions and extraversion Personality and Individual Differences*, *51*, 720-725.

Crismore, A. (1984). The rhetoric of social studies textbooks: Metadiscourse. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *16*(3), 279-296.

Crismore, A., & Fransworth, R. (1990). Metadiscourse in popular and professional science discourse. In W. Nash (Ed.), *The writing scholor: Scholors in academic discourse*, (pp. 118-136). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Dafouz-Milne, M. (2008). The pragmatic role of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers construction and attainment of persuasion: A cross linguistic study of newspaper discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *40*, 95-113.

Dewaele, J. M., & Furnham, A. (1999). Extraversion: The unloved variable in applied linguistics research. *Language Learning*, *19*(3), 509-544.

Dewaele, J. M., & Furnham, A. (2000). Personality and speech production: A pilot study of second language learners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *28*, 355-365.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eysenck, M. W. (1974). Age differences in incidental learning. *Developmental Psychology*, *10*, 936-941.

Eysenck, H. J. (1976). *The measurement of personality*. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Eysenck, H. J. (1994). Personality: Biological foundations. In P. A. Vernon (Ed.), *The neuropsychology of individual differences*. London: Academic Press.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck personality questionnaire* (adult and junior). London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Furnham, A. (1990). Language and personality. In H. Giles, & W. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology* (pp. 73-95). Chichester: Wiley.

Gale, A. (1969). Stimulus hunger: Individual differences in operant strategy in a button-pressing task. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, *7*, 265-274.

Hyland, K. (1997). Scientific claims and community values: Articulating an academic culture. *Language and Communication*, *16*(1), 19-32.

Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *30*, 437.

Hyland, K. K. (1999). Talking to students: Metadiscourse in introductory course books. *English for Specific Purposes*, *18*(1), 3-26.

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.

Jung, C. G. (1976). *Psychological types*. Bollingen Series XX Princton, NJ: Princton University Press.

Myers, L. B. (1962). *Manual: The Myers-Briggs type indicator*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services.

Pérez-Llantada, C. (2003). Communication skills in academic monologic discourse. Empirical and applied perspectives. *Circulo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, *3*, 15.

Schiffrin, D. (1980). Metatalk: Organisational and evaluative brackets in discourse. *Sociological Inquiry*, *50*, 199- 236.

Socan, G., & Bucik, V. (1998). Relationship between speed of information-processing and two major personality dimensions-extraversion and neuroticism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *25*, 35-48.

Thorne, A. (1987). The press of personality: A study of conversations between introverts and extraverts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *53*, 718-726.

žegarac, V. (In press). Metadiscourse markers in IELTS texts and in textbooks for undergraduate students. In *IELTS Research Reports 9*. British Council /IDP Australia.

Appendix A

Table A. Descriptive Statistics

	Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Codegloss	1	5.4091	1.29685	22
	2	6.0000	1.73205	9
	3	7.5000	1.01183	22
	4	11.2857	1.49603	7
	Total	6.9500	2.22790	60

Endophoricmarkers	1	5.8636	1.45718	22
	2	6.1111	1.05409	9
	3	7.6364	.95346	22
	4	9.8571	1.67616	7
	Total	7.0167	1.79917	60
Transitions	1	5.7727	1.19251	22
	2	6.4444	1.50923	9
	3	7.5909	1.53248	22
	4	9.5714	2.93582	7
	Total	6.9833	2.01260	60
Framemarkers	1	7.7273	1.85631	22
	2	7.8889	2.57121	9
	3	7.8636	1.35560	22
	4	9.7143	2.21467	7
	Total	8.0333	1.91308	60
Evidentials	1	11.0455	1.88925	22
	2	10.2222	1.39443	9
	3	8.0909	1.41115	22
	4	5.7143	1.11270	7
	Total	9.2167	2.38705	60
Hedges	1	16.0000	2.42997	22
	2	12.7778	2.38630	9
	3	10.3636	1.36436	22
	4	9.0000	1.15470	7
	Total	12.6333	3.37471	60
attitudemarkers	1	8.1818	.90692	22
	2	9.1111	.92796	9
	3	12.0909	1.60087	22
	4	18.1429	1.21499	7
	Total	10.9167	3.38637	60
Boosters	1	7.6818	1.28680	22
	2	10.6667	1.22474	9
	3	14.2727	1.51757	22
	4	18.1429	1.06904	7
	Total	11.7667	3.91159	60
Selfmention	1	5.0000	1.85164	22

	2	6.2222	1.56347	9
	3	8.5455	1.37069	22
	4	11.4286	1.39728	7
	Total	7.2333	2.67675	60
Engagement	1	6.0455	1.09010	22
	2	7.7778	.83333	9
	3	8.8636	1.08213	22
	4	14.1429	1.77281	7
	Total	8.2833	2.71275	60

Appebdix B

Table B. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	codegloss	198.603[a]	3	66.201	39.336	.000.678
	endophoricmarkers	101.555[b]	3	33.852	21.198	.000.532
	transitions	89.865[c]	3	29.955	11.249	.000.376
	framemarkers	22.661[d]	3	7.554	2.189	.099.105
	evidentials	196.426[e]	3	65.475	26.236	.000.584
	hedges	455.287[f]	3	151.762	39.228	.000.678
	Attitudemarkers	589.746[g]	3	196.582	126.773	.000.872
	boosters	800.740[h]	3	266.913	146.550	.000.887
	selfmention	280.009[i]	3	93.336	36.622	.000.662
	engagement	360.225[j]	3	120.075	90.919	.000.830
Intercept	codegloss	2643.625	1	2643.625	1570.802	.000.966
	endophoricmarkers	2517.933	1	2517.933	1576.737	.000.966
	transitions	2502.790	1	2502.790	939.900	.000.944
	framemarkers	3194.896	1	3194.896	925.712	.000.943
	Evidentials	3566.794	1	3566.794	1429.200	.000.962
	Hedges	6720.058	1	6720.058	1737.038	.000.969
	Attitudemarkers	6549.537	1	6549.537	4223.710	.000.987
	Boosters	7472.195	1	7472.195	4102.643	.000.987
	selfmention	2821.890	1	2821.890	1107.210	.000.952
	engagement	3933.076	1	3933.076	2978.066	.000.982
Group	Codegloss	198.603	3	66.201	39.336	.000.678
	Endophoricmarkers	101.555	3	33.852	21.198	.000.532
	Transitions	89.865	3	29.955	11.249	.000.376
	framemarkers	22.661	3	7.554	2.189	.099.105

	Evidentials	196.426	3	65.475	26.236	.000.584
	Hedges	455.287	3	151.762	39.228	.000.678
	Attitudemarkers	589.746	3	196.582	126.773	.000.872
	Boosters	800.740	3	266.913	146.550	.000.887
	selfmention	280.009	3	93.336	36.622	.000.662
	engagement	360.225	3	120.075	90.919	.000.830
Error	Codegloss	94.247	56	1.683		
	Endophoricmarkers	89.428	56	1.597		
	Transitions	149.118	56	2.663		
	framemarkers	193.272	56	3.451		
	Evidentials	139.757	56	2.496		
	Hedges	216.646	56	3.869		
	Attitudemarkers	86.837	56	1.551		
	Boosters	101.994	56	1.821		
	selfmention	142.724	56	2.549		
	engagement	73.958	56	1.321		
Total	Codegloss	3191.000	60			
	Endophoricmarkers	3145.000	60			
	Transitions	3165.000	60			
	framemarkers	4088.000	60			
	Evidentials	5433.000	60			
	Hedges	10248.000	60			
	Attitudemarkers	7827.000	60			
	Boosters	9210.000	60			
	selfmention	3562.000	60			
	engagement	4551.000	60			
Corrected Total	Codegloss	292.850	59			
	Endophoricmarkers	190.983	59			
	Transitions	238.983	59			
	framemarkers	215.933	59			
	Evidentials	336.183	59			
	Hedges	671.933	59			
	Attitudemarkers	676.583	59			
	Boosters	902.733	59			
	selfmention	422.733	59			
	engagement	434.183	59			