



## The Comparison of Lexical Bundles in Conversation Texts between *Four Corners* and *English Intensive Course* Books

Nurma Aini<sup>1✉</sup>, Abdurrachman Faridi<sup>2</sup>, Sri Wuli Fitriari<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> MA NU Hasyim Asy'ari 3 Kudus, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

### Article Info

#### Article History:

Received 2 August 2018

Accepted 06 October 2018

Published 23

December 2018

#### Keywords:

Lexical Bundle,  
Conversation Text,  
Textbook

### Abstract

Lexical bundle is a word combinations that usually hangs together. By identifying the lexical bundles, we can see what native usually say and or write in certain register. Therefore, the identification the lexical bundles would indicate to what extend the speaker speak native-like. The objectives of the study are (1) to compare the lexical bundles' frequencies in conversation texts between *Four Corners* and *English Intensive Course* books, (2) to compare the lexical bundles' structures in conversation texts between *Four Corners* and *English Intensive Course* books, (3) to compare the lexical bundles' functions in conversation texts books between *Four Corners* and *English Intensive Course* books. This study is a corpus study. The data are the conversation texts which existed in two textbooks; *Four Corners* with native authors and *English Intensive Course* with non-native authors. The result revealed that (1) the frequency of lexical bundles in *Four Corners* are higher than in *English Intensive Course* books, (2) both *Four Corners* and *English Intensive Course* books more frequent in using lexical bundle that incorporate verb phrase fragments, (3) the dominant function of lexical bundles used in two textbooks are special function, most of them consist of simply inquiry. Theoretically, this research contributes to other researchers as a building block for its literature contribution in their review in the case of the similarity and the difference of the lexical bundles' frequencies, structures, and functions.

© 2018 Universitas Negeri Semarang

#### Correspondence Address:

Jl. Kebun Jeruk No.35 Honggosoco, Kudus, Indonesia

E-mail: [nurma90aini@gmail.com](mailto:nurma90aini@gmail.com)

p-ISSN 2087-0108

e-ISSN 2502-4566

## INTRODUCTION

There are many linguists who have been interested in the study of various structures of multi-word units, i.e. lexical bundles (Bal, 2010; Rafiee & Keihaniyan, 2013; Lou, 2012; Hernández, 2013; Allen, 2009). Lexical bundles (LBs) are the sequences of words that most commonly co-occur in a register (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan, 1999). In addition, Allen (2009) said that LBs are empirically derived formulaic units of language which are register-specific and perform a variety of discourse functions. These units of language contribute to the linguistic make up of specific registers, so they can be important indicators for determining the success of language users within these discourse communities.

However, there are so many teaching media used by the teachers or lecturers. One of them is textbook. According to Riazi cited in Gailea & Rasyid (2015) a textbook used in the English Foreign Learning classroom plays crucial role in language teaching and learning process because it can help teacher to provide various learning materials especially for English language learning. Therefore, I conclude that handbook or textbook can helps the teachers or lecturers to guide the students in understanding the materials. Besides, textbook also becomes a model or example in compiling the words. It is included the use of lexical bundles in conversation text. Therefore, the students can imitate or assimilate the use of lexical bundles in their daily practice.

As empirical work with multi-word units has increased, however, it has become impossible to ignore their importance for describing the lexicon of a language (Biber and Conrad, 2005). Mostly, they used corpus data to add the weight to the importance of multi-word units in language. For instance, Conrad & Biber (2004) found that most bundles in conversation are clausal, whereas most bundles in academic prose are phrasal. In the next study, Biber, Conrad, and Cortes (2004) revealed that classroom teaching tends to feature more personal stance bundles than academic prose,

which in contrast features more interpersonal stance bundles.

This present paper adopts the studies above, and applies in different register. I used the conversation texts which exist in the two textbooks. First series-books are *Four Corners* books. They are written by native authors; Jack. C. Richards and David Bohlke (2012). The second series-books are *English Intensive Course* books. They are written by non-native authors, such as Agustien, Mujiyanto, Sofwan, Suprpto, and Wahyanti (2017). The two textbooks are used for first semester students in intensive course subject in different universities. However, teachers should design various teaching activities in class to make students not feel bored to learn (Fakhrudin & Yuliasri in Farista, Bharati, & Fitriati, 2018), including the use of textbooks. Therefore, the aim of this study is to compare the lexical bundles in term of the frequency, structure and function in conversation texts between *Four Corners* and *English Intensive Course* books.

## METHOD

This study utilizes corpus study. It is a collection of pieces of language text in electronic form, selected according to external criteria to represent, as far as possible, a language or language variety as a source of data for linguistic. In collecting the data, I do some procedures as follows;

### 1) Preparing the two textbooks

There are two series of textbook which becomes the data source in this study. They are *Four Corners* books and *English Intensive Course* books. Each tittle of book consists of four books, such as book 1, book 2, book 3 and book 4. Each book consists of some units as chapter and there are conversation texts in each unit. Furthermore, I use the conversation texts as a selected text for each textbook.

- 2) Typing the conversation texts which exist on two textbooks  
 For inserting the data into software, I must type the texts. It available to use. In the first typing, I use *Microsoft program*, it was more common and easy in typing the texts, but then I convert the data into *txt* form. It caused by the need of the Antconc program.
- 3) Identifying Lexical Bundles through software  
 To identify the lexical bundles in two series of textbooks, I use Antconc 3.5.2 (Siricharoen and Wijitsopon, 2017). It is a software program which is specially designed to identify lexical bundles automatically. For identifying the lexical bundles, I do some steps as follows:
- a) Inserting the data  
 The saved data in *txt* form was utilized in this step. The ways to insert the data, such as open the bar *file*, *ray open file(s)*, then choose the data which to be extracted. It was done automatically.
- b) Choosing *Cluster/N-Grams* function  
 Actually, there are some functions in the Antconc program, but in this study I only use *Cluster/N-Grams* which function to yield a list of lexical bundles. In addition, three and four-word sequences will be the criteria of this study. It is based on statement of Biber et. al (2002), they said that three and four-word sequences are the common sequences while two-word are too short and five or six-word sequences are less common (p. 444). Therefore, tick *N-Gram* in *search term*, then choose min. 3 and max. 4 in *N-gram size* to fulfill the criteria above.
- c) Finding the result  
 To find the result, I click *start* for ending this program. The list of lexical bundles automatically display in the monitor in sequences words based on the rank and frequency for each bundle. To be grounded in using this program I do preliminary study. I used six conversation texts in *English Intensive Course* books.  
 After that, several steps I do to analyze the data manually, such as;
- a) Displaying the top 50 of lexical bundles for each textbooks  
 I use the top 50 of lexical bundles which represent the result for each textbook. The top 50 of lexical bundles appeared in the monitor automatically. It is based on the rank and the frequency found.
- b) Categorizing the structure of lexical bundles  
 The categorization of the lexical bundles' structure adopts from Biber et. al. in 2004. They identified the structural type of lexical bundle into three categories, such as a) type 1, bundles incorporate verb phrase fragment, b) type 2, bundles incorporate dependent clause fragment in addition to simple verb phrase fragment, and c) type 3, bundles incorporate noun phrase and prepositional phrase fragment.
- c) Categorizing the function of lexical bundles  
 After categorizing the structural type of lexical bundles, the last step is analyzing the function of each bundle. I adopt the study of Biber et. al (2004) and Biber (2006) for categorizing the function of lexical bundle. There four kinds of lexical bundles' functions such as: stance expression, discourse organizer, referential

expression, and special conversation function.

d) Comparing the result for each textbooks

Percentage was used to compare the top 50 bundles for each textbook. Based on the result, I explain the similarities and the differences of two textbooks.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

This part gives the explanation and the interpretation of the findings related to the theory and other supported researches. The findings include three points, they are;

**Lexical Bundles’ Frequencies in Two Textbooks**

The most notably the diversity of two register—this study is related to the textbooks with native and non-native authors, can be seen by the frequency of lexical bundles. Chen & Baker (2010) showed that native writers more frequent in use of lexical bundles than non-native writers. It is corresponding with the finding of the present study which found that native authors (*Four Corners*) used more number of lexical bundles than non-native authors (*English Intensive course*). Totally, 164 lexical bundles were found in *Four Corners* books, while 106 lexical bundles were found in *English Intensive Course* books. The gap between native and non-native authors is significantly seen by the difference of lexical bundles’ number. The native authors seem likely common in using the word combination, while non-native authors usually used different word especially certain word combination in production their feeling, it seem like that they still try to learn how to say something.

Another gap was showed by the use of lexical bundles between native and non-native authors. Non-native authors used different types of lexical bundles, for example *I wish I had*, where native authors rarely used that kind of lexical bundles. This fact showed that non-native authors tried to translate their feeling into

word production word by word or the lexical of Indonesian to English directly.

Therefore, we can assume that there is significant difference between native and non-native authors in using of lexical bundles’ frequencies.

**Lexical Bundles’ Structures in Two Textbooks**

As the pioneer study, Biber et. al (1999) found that most lexical bundles were not complete structural units. They found that the most structural type in academic prose were lexical bundles that incorporate noun phrase and prepositional phrase while, the most structural type in conversation was lexical bundles that incorporate verb phrase fragment. It was supported by the study of Hernandez (2013) where in the three oral corpora found that verb phrase is the most structure occurred. Although conversation text is in the written form, but the content of the conversation text must be regarded to the real conversation which are characterized by high interaction. Therefore, the finding of the study is in line to the finding of conversation where the dominant structure of lexical bundles used both native and non-native authors were lexical bundles that incorporate verb phrase fragments. They consist of several sub categorizes, such as: (connector)+1st/2nd person pronoun+VP fragments, 3rd person pronoun+VP fragments, yes-no question fragments, WH-question fragments.

1st/2nd/3rd person pronoun+VP fragments are used to begin an utterance, and it ends with the beginning of a complemet clause; for example, *I’m trying to, as I was saying*. Besides, there were lexical bundles which report negative personal stance; for example, *I don’t know, I have no idea*.

Yes-no questions with verb *want*, asking about the needs of the interlocutor/ the addressee; for example, *do you want to*. In addition, the common interrogative lexical bundles are formed with *can, would*, they used as indirect requests; for example, *can I help you, would you like to*.

WH-question fragments with *do* as a main verb, asking about present actions. The lexical

bundles which include as WH-questions are *what do you think, what are you doing, how do you spell*.

In conclusion, both native and non-native authors are the same in using the lexical bundles' structures. They are mostly used lexical bundles that incorporate verb phrase fragments,

**Lexical Bundles' Functions in Two Textbooks**

Functional taxonomy of lexical bundle is used to classify the lexical bundles based on the function. There are 4 categories; stance expression, referential expression, discourse organizer, and special function. The dominant function used by the authors of *Four Corner* and *English Intensive Course* was special functions. This functional group of lexical bundles have been found particularly frequently in Conrad and Biber's (2005) study of conversational discourse, when compared with academic discourse. By identifying this function, it indicated that the conversation texts in both textbooks presented the question to maintenance the communication between the speakers. Therefore, the communication between the speakers would run smoothly. However, the lexical bundles which are included as special function consist of several sub-categories, such as politeness, expectation, request, reporting, offer, and simply inquiry.

Based on the finding, there were only 4 sub-categories of lexical bundles which are appeared in two textbooks, they are politeness, expectation, request, reporting, offer/request, and simply inquiry. A full list of this type of lexical bundles is given in the Table 3.1 below.

**Table 1.** Special functions in *Four Corners* and *English Intensive Course* books

Sub-category	Four Corners	English Intensive Course
Politeness	Thank you very much	Fine thank and yourself
Reporting	As I was saying	-
Offer/	Can I help you	-
Request	Do you want to I help you yes Would you like to	

Simply inquiry	What do you mean Do you have any Have you ever been How do you spell What are you doing What do you think Are they from the Are you I'm Are you oh hi Are you oh hi Are you ok oh But can I ask Do you have a Do you spell your Do you think that	Sure what is it What are you doing What would you like Would you like a And would you like? Are you doing here Are you planning to Can I use your Can you tell me Did you use to Do you have a Honey why are you How far is it How long have you Is it from here Is there anything else Isn't it? it Do you know what
Hybrid function		
Expectation		I look forward to

In short, both native and non-native authors wider used in special function than the other functions. They mostly used simply inquiry to maintain their communication. By asking many questions, they get the respond from the interlocutor and the interlocutor also would have no any hesitation to ask another questions, so there will be two way communication.

**CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION**

There are three conclusions that can be drawn after describing, and interpreting the data. Those conclusions are made in accordance with the objectives of this study.

Both in *Four Corners* and *English Intensive Course* books, it has been found that the minimum frequency of lexical bundle occurred was in two different texts. In contrast, we can see that the native authors used more frequent the lexical bundles than the non-native used.

Beside that, the finding also revealed that there were no types of lexical bundles which were used by the native authors, were used by the non-native authors. Therefore, it is concluded that non-native authors tend to translate the lexical of Indonesian to English directly, they didn't want to follow what the native say did.

The comparison of lexical bundles' structures in conversation texts between *Four Corners* and *English Intensive Course* books could be seen by detecting the similarities and the differences of them. Both, *Four Corners* and *English Intensive Course* books had similarity in term of the dominant structural type which is used by the native and non-native authors. Both of them mostly used the lexical bundles that incorporate with verb phrase fragments. More detail, they used a lot of 1st/2nd person pronoun + VP fragments and yes-no question fragments. From the result above, it is concluded that the native and non-native authors inclined to speak about their personal experiences and they presented many questions to get the responses. In contrast, the finding didn't show any differences of two textbooks in term of structural types.

The last conclusion is about the comparison of lexical bundles' function in two textbooks. Both in *Four Corners* and *English Intensive Course* books, the most functional type of lexical bundle was special function which is the biggest part used by the authors was simply inquiry. Besides, the result showed that there were no lexical bundles that were categorized as discourse organizers. It indicated that the authors tend to present the question to maintenance the communication between the speakers. However, the difference is showed by the second and the third dominant of lexical bundles found in two textbooks. In *Four Corners*, the second and the third were stance bundles and referential expressions, while in *English Intensive Course* books was vice versa. Therefore, the conversation text in *Four Corners* book seems like the direct conversation which contain spontaneously while the conversation texts in *English Intensive Course* books closer to identify something as clarifying.

Based on the findings, I suggest further researchers to take an advance study by identifying the lexical bundles in those two textbooks or another textbook by using different software.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, D. (2009). Lexical bundles in learner writing: an analysis of formulaic language in the ALESS learners corpus. *Komaba Journal of English Education*
- Bal, B. (2010). Analysis of four-word lexical bundles in published research articles written by Turkish scholars. *Analysis*, 11, 30–201. Retrieved from [http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/alesl\\_theses](http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/alesl_theses)
- Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus –based study of spoken and written registres (Vol.23)* John Benjamin Publishing
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004). If you look at ...: Lexical bundles in university teaching nad textbooks. *Applied Linguistic*, 25 (3), 371-405
- Biber, D., Leech, G., & Conrad, S. (2002). *Longman student grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Longman
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, C. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Chen, Y. & Baker, P. (2010). Lexical bundles in L1 andL12 academic writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14 I 30-49. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol14num2/chenbaker.pdf>
- Conrad, S. M. & Biber, B. (2005). The frequency and use of lexical bundles in converstaion and academic prose. *Lexicographica* 20. Retrieved from [http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/ling\\_fac](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/ling_fac)
- Farista, N., Bharati, D. & Fitriati, S. W. (2018). The Effectiveness of Roundtable and One Stay Two Strays Techniques to Teach

- Speaking Skill to Students with High and Low Self-Confidence. *EEJ* 8 (2)
- Gailea, N. & Rasyid, Y. (2015). A study of the English textbooks for senior high school in four English skills on gender quality in Serang city-Banten. *IJLECR* 1(1), 97-104. Retrieved from <http://pps.unj.ac.id/journal/ijlecr>
- Hernandez, P. (2013). Lexical bundles in three oral corpora of university students. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 13 (1), 187-209
- Lou, X. (2012). Structural analysis of lexical bundles in EFL English majors' theses of an ordinary normal university in China. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 1 (6). doi:10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.6p.142
- Rafiee, M. & Keihaniyan, M. (2013). A comparative analysis of lexical bundles in journalistic writing in English and Persian: A constrative linguistic perspective.
- Siricharoen, A., & Wijitsopon, R. (2017). Lexical bundles in authentic and business textbook emails: a case study of informal business emails. *Selected Proceedings of the International Conference: DRAL 3/19th ESEA*