



Structure and Function of Lexical Bundles in the Literature Review of Undergraduate Students' Final Projects

Sisilia Agustin Dini Islami[✉], Sri Wuli Fitriati, Januarius Mujiyanto

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:
 Recived 15
 September 2018
 Accepted 12
 December 2018
 Published 15 March
 2019

Keywords:
 Lexical bundle,
 Structure and
 Function of Lexical
 bundle, Literature
 Review, Final
 Projects

Abstract

Lexical bundle is recurrent sequences of words which usually hang together. By identifying and analyzing lexical bundles structurally and functionally, we can see how the texts have been written especially in achieving communicative purpose of the text. The objectives of the research are to analyze lexical bundles in order to explain (1) their structural forms, (2) their functional types, (3) the relation between the structural forms and functional types manifested in the literature review of students' final projects, and (4) the distribution of the relation between the structural forms and functional types to literature review's move structures in achieving its communicative purpose. This research is a corpus study. The data are 20 Chapter II, Literature Review of students' final projects. The results revealed that, firstly the most structural form of LB used in students' texts was Type 1 Noun phrase with *of*-phrase fragment, secondly research-oriented was the most function of LB categorized into procedure, quantification, and description, thirdly there are three relations between structures and functions of LB; (a) Relation I: research-oriented and four structure types, (b) Relation II: text-oriented and three structure types, (c) Relation III: participant-oriented and three structure types, and fourthly, all structures of LB especially which are related functionally into research-oriented has a great contribution to Literature Review's move structures. It means that the use of LBs have contribution in achieving communicative purpose of the text.

© 2019 Universitas Negeri Semarang

[✉]Correspondence Address:
 Kampus Pascasarjana Unnes, Jalan Kelud Utara III Semarang
 50237, Indonesia
 Email: Sisilia.agustin42@gmail.com

p-ISSN 2087-0108
e-ISSN 2502-4566

INTRODUCTION

There were many previous studies conducted which focused on the use of lexical bundle (LB) structurally or functionally in spoken, such as debate, lectures, spoken texts, and conversation or written register such as research articles, argumentative essays, students' theses, and news paper (Bal, 2010; Chen & Baker, 2010; Laane, 2011; Nesi & Basturkmen, 2006; Neely & Cortes, 2009; and Kashiha & Heng, 2013). This research was conducted on focusing only on the use of LB in the students' texts, specifically the Literature Review (LR) of undergraduate students' final projects. Proposed by Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan (1999), lexical bundles are recurrent expressions regardless of their idiomaticity and regardless of their structural status. In creating either spoken or written language, It needs to know how the words arrangement and their functions in order to conveying the communicative purpose of the text. Relating to the words arrangement used in a text, LB was seen as the important aspect that should be mastered in creating a qualified text. In addition, the use of LB was regarded as an important aspect which gave a significant effect in evaluating the quality of text (Kazemi et al, 2014). It means that LB can be used as a tool to see how qualified texts which have been written.

However, there were more LBs identified in academic prose than in conversation (Kim, 2009). There was a difference between the use of LBs in conversation as spoken language and in academic prose as written language in their structures and functions (Biber et al, 2004). In written register, the use of LB presented the factual information while in spoken register they only focused on the personal interaction (Conrad & Biber, 2005). The difference also indicated that LB which appeared in the text played a crucial role in creating meaning based on particular context. Heng, Kashiha & Tan (2014) stated that LBs were considered as building blocks in discourse and have an important role in creating textual consistency. It means that the use of LB contributed a better understanding for the listeners or readers about

the meaning of the context of written language used as well as constructing a flow and rhythm in the written discourse. Besides, they were also used in order to construct a discourse and associated the communicative purposes of the text written (Biber, Conrad, & Cortes, 2004).

Focusing on written register, I used Chapter II, Literature Review of undergraduate students' final projects as the research object. However, I only analyzed four-word LB based on their structures and functions. It was because the number of four-word bundles was more manageable to classify and check the context in which they appear (Chen & Baker, 2010). Therefore, the aim of this research was to analyze the use of four-word LBs appeared in the Literature Review of students' final projects based on their structures and functions, how the relations of their structures and functions, and also their contributions to Literature Review's move structures in achieving communicative purpose of the text.

METHODS

This research was a corpus study, which defined as a piece of language text collection in electronic form selected according to external criteria, as far as possible to represent a language or language variety as a source of data for linguistic (Aini, Faridi, & Fitriati, 2018). In answering the research questions, the researcher did some steps, started with the process of collecting data, analyzing data, and reporting the data analysis.

Several steps I did to collect lexical bundles as the main research data manually, such as:

- 1) Collecting 20 Chapter II, Literature Review of undergraduate students' final projects randomly from the library of Language and Art Department of UNNES, and giving a number each of text in order to help the researcher easy in the next process of collecting data.

- 2) Identifying all four-word LBs manually from 20 Chapter II, Literature Review by underlining all bundles found in each text.
- 3) Grouping all the bundles identified in each text by placing them into table based on the number of students' texts. It was to help the researcher easy to analyze the bundles found in order to determine which bundles could be categorized or uncategorized into LB.
- 4) Collecting bundles which categorized into LBs (appeared at least 5 times in 3-5 texts) and placing them into a table in order to help the researcher easy to categorize them based on their structural and functional type.

After the process of collecting data, I did four steps to analyze the data, they were:

- 1) Categorizing four-word LBs based on their structural forms proposed by Biber et al (1999).
- 2) Categorizing four-word LBs based on their functional category proposed by Hyland (2008).
- 3) Categorizing how the structural forms related to functional types of LBs. These relations were based on how the LBs manifested structurally and functionally in the literature review of students' final projects.
- 4) Analyzing how the relations of structural forms and functional types of LBs contributed to literature review's move structures proposed by Kwan (2006) (See Table 1) in order to achieve its communicative purpose.

Table 1. Literature Review's Move Structure by Kwan (2006)

Move 1	Establishing a part of the territory of one's own research by:
Strategy A	Surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims
Strategy B	Claiming centrality
Strategy C	Surveying the research-related phenomena
Move 2	Creating a research niche (in response to Move 1) by:
Strategy A	Counter-claiming
Strategy B	Gap-indicating
Strategy C	Asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed
Strategy D	Asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to one's own research
Strategy E	Abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework
Move 3	(optional) Occupying the research niche by announcing:
Strategy A	Research aims, focuses, research questions or hypotheses
Strategy B	Theoretical positions/theoretical frameworks
Strategy C	Research design/processes
Strategy D	Interpretations of terminology used in the thesis

The Literature Review's move structures showed in Table 1 above was used to analyze how LBs distributed in the students' texts. From knowing and identifying the distributions of LBs, the researcher also analyzed how those distributions contributed to achieve communicative purpose of the Literature Review. After analyzing process, the researcher

reported the results into four main parts based on four research questions.

related to functions, and their distributions to Literature Review's move structures.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

As result of analysis, I found 26 LBs collected from total 99008 words in 20 Literature Review of students' final projects which presented as follows:

Table 2. Lexical Bundles in the Literature Review of Students' Final Projects

Lexical Bundles
The result of the
The meaning of the
The purpose of the
The average score of
The objectives of the
The aim of the
The goal of the
To be able to
To find out the
Should be able to
Can be used to
Can be seen as
Can be defined as
Can be used in
Is based on the
Can be divided into
It can be concluded
It is important to
It can be said
On the other hand
Based on the explanation
In the form of
Is one of the
Is a kind of
As well as the
There are so many
Total LB: 26

Showed in Table 2, those 26 LBs found in students' texts were collected manually from 20 Chapter II, Literature Review of students' final projects. Those LBs were the main data in this research which would be analyzed based on their structures and functions, how the structures

Structural Forms of Lexical Bundles in the Literature Review of Students' Final Projects

Using theory proposed by Biber et al (1999), I found that there were nine structural forms identified from LBs appeared in the literature review of students' final projects, as showed in the following table:

Table 3. Structure Types of LB in students' texts

Structure of LB	Lexical Bundles
Type 1; Noun phrase with <i>of</i> -phrase fragment	The result of the The meaning of the The purpose of the The average score of The objectives of the The aim of the The goal of the
Type 9; (verb/adjective +) <i>to</i> -clause fragment	To be able to To find out the Can be used to Should be able to
Type 5; Anticipatory <i>it</i> + verb phrase/ adjective phrase	It can be concluded It is important to It can be said
Type 6; Passive verb + prepositional phrase fragment	Can be seen as Can be defined as Can be used in Is based on the Can be divided into
Type 4; Other prepositional phrase (fragment)	On the other hand Based on the explanation
Type 3; Prepositional phrase with embedded <i>of</i> -phrase fragment	In the form of
Type 7; Copula <i>be</i> + noun phrase/adjective phrase	Is one of the Is a kind of
Type 12; Other expressions	As well as the
Type 11; Pronoun/noun phrase + <i>be</i> (+..)	There are so many

As shown in Table 3, from all of the LBs found, the most structural forms appeared was structure type 1 noun phrase with *of*-phrase fragment, consisted of bundles “*the result of the, the meaning of the, the purpose of the, the average score of, the objectives of the, the aim of the, and the goal of the*”. Those LBs were frequently used in the literature review of students’ final project for a variety of abstract qualities (Biber et al, 1999:1016).

For the second structure used was type 9 (verb/adjective +) *to*-clause fragment, consisted of bundles “*to be able to, to find out the, can be used to, and should be able to*”. In addition, the bundle “*should be able to*” can be identified by predicative adjective + *to*- clause which was used to indicate possibility or ability (Biber et al, 1999:1022-1023).

For the next structures of LBs appeared were type 5 anticipatory *it* + verb/adjective phrase which consists of bundles “*it can be concluded, it is important to, and it can be said*”; type 6 passive verb + prepositional phrase fragment, consisted of “*can be seen as, can be defined as, can be used in, is based on the, and can be divided into*”; type 4 other prepositional phrase (fragment), consisted of bundles “*on the other hand and based on the explanation*”; type 3 prepositional phrase with embedded *of*-phrase fragment consisted of only a bundle “*in the form of*”; type 7 copula *be* + noun/adjective phrase consisted of bundles “*is one of the and is a kind of*”; and the two last structure types of LB appeared were type 12 other expressions consisted of bundle “*as well as the*” and type 11 pronoun/noun phrase + *be* (+ ...) consisted only of bundle “*there are so many*”.

From the findings mentioned above, it could be concluded that there were nine structure types of LB used frequently in students’ text; type 1 noun phrase with *of*-phrase fragment consisted of 7 LB, followed by structure type 9 (verb/adjective +) *to*-clause fragment consisted of 4 LB, structure type 5 anticipatory *it* + verb/adjective phrase consisted of 3 LB, structure type 6 passive verb + prepositional phrase fragment consisted of 5 LB, structure type 4 other prepositional phrase (fragment)

consisted of 2 LB, structure type 3 prepositional phrase with embedded *of*-phrase fragment consisted of 1 LB, structure type 7 copula *be* + noun/adjective phrase consisted of 2 LB, and the last were type 12 other expressions, and structure type 11 pronoun/noun phrase + *be* (+ ...) which consisted of 1 LB for each.

Functional Types of Lexical Bundles in the Review of Related Literature of Students’ Final Projects

In analyzing the functional types of LBs, I used theory proposed by Hyland (2008). It was found that from the total 26 LBs, 11 bundles identified as research-oriented followed 9 bundles as participant-oriented and 6 bundles as text-oriented as showed in the following table:

Table 4. Functional Types of LB appeared in students’ texts

Functional Type	Total of LB
Research-oriented	11
Text-oriented	6
Participant-oriented	9
	26

1) LBs functioning as Research-oriented

There were 11 LBs which categorized into research-oriented function, they are “*the result of the*” as procedure research-oriented, “*there are so many and the average score of*” as quantification research-oriented, “*the meaning of the, the purpose of the, the objectives of the, the aim of the, the goal of the, is one of the, is a kind of, and in the form of*” as description research-oriented.

2) LBs functioning as Participant-oriented

From the total 26 LBs found, there were 9 bundles categorized into participant-oriented. They were “*it is important to, to be able to, should be able to, and to find out the*” as stance participant-oriented, and “*can be seen as, can be used to, can be used in, can be defined as, and can be divided into*” as engagement participant-oriented.

3) LBs functioning as Text-oriented

There were 6 bundles of the total 26 bundles found that categorized into text-oriented. They were “*on the other hand*” as transition text-oriented, “*it can be concluded and it can be said*” as structuring text-oriented, and “*is based on the, based on the explanation, and as well as the*” as framing text-oriented.

From those findings, it could be said that research-oriented was used frequently in Chapter II, Review of Related Literature of students’ final projects. The frequent use of LBs categorized into research-oriented have some functions. They were; describing the final step of a process (*the result of the*), describing a quantity of something (*there are so many*), aiming to mention, describing or explaining the quantity of something, e.g. students’ score test (*the average score of*), showed the description of something (*the meaning of the*), describing reason (s) why a research being conducted (*the purpose of the, the objective of the, the aim of the, and the goal of the*), aiming to describe something related to the topic of research (*is one of the, is a kind of*), and describing something related to research topic, including related theory, research design, etc. (*in the form of*).

The Relations between Structural Forms and Functional Types of Lexical Bundles

Based on the results of analysis, there were relations between structures and functions of 26 LBs appeared in students’ texts. The researcher divided this part into three points;

1. **Relation I**; research-oriented and structure types of LB consists of:

- 1) The relation of description research-oriented and structure type 1 (i.e. *the meaning of the, the purpose of the, the objectives of the, the aim of the, and the goal of the*), structure type 7 (i.e. *is one of the, is a kind of*), and structure type 3 (i.e. *in the form of*)

2) The relation of procedure research-oriented and structure type 1 (i.e. *the result of the*)

3) The relation of quantification research-oriented and structure type 1 (i.e. *the average score of*), and structure type 11 (i.e. *there are so many*).

2. **Relation II**; participant-oriented and structure types of LB consists of:

1) The relation of stance participant-oriented and structure type 9 (i.e. *to be able to, should be able to, to find out the*), and structure type 5 (i.e. *It is important to*)

2) The relation of engagement participant-oriented and structure type 6 (i.e. *can be seen as, can be used to, can be used in, can be defined as, and can be divided into*).

3. **Relation III**; text-oriented and structure types of LB which consists of:

1) The relation of transition text-oriented and structure type 4 (i.e. *on the other hand*)

2) The relation of framing text-oriented and structure type 4 (i.e. *based on the explanation*), type 6 (i.e. *is based on the*), and type 12 (i.e. *as well as the*)

3) The relation of structuring text-oriented and structure type 6 (i.e. *it can be concluded, it can be said*).

The Distribution of the Relations of Structural Forms and Functional Types of Lexical Bundles

This part consists of three points as results of analysis, they are; (See Table 6 for further information)

1) **Relation I**; the relations of research-oriented structures of LB had distributed to 11 Literature Review’s move structures. This relation consisted of some LBs categorized

into 4 structures; type 1 noun phrase with *of*-phrase fragment, type 11; pronoun/noun phrase + *be* (+ ...), type 7 copula *be* + noun/adjective phrase, and type 3 prepositional phrase with embedded *of*-phrase fragment which were related to research-oriented function (description, procedure, and quantification). The detail information were:

a. Move 1 (Establishing one of the territory of one's own research by:)

- Strategy A (surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims). There was only a LB's distribution to this strategy. It was only the bundle "*is one of the*".
- Strategy B (claiming centrality). Some LBs' distribution to this strategy were "*the meaning of the, the result of the, and there are so many*".
- Strategy C (surveying the research-related phenomena). Some LBs' distribution to this strategy were "*the purpose of the, the objectives of the, the aim of the, the result of the, the average score of, is one of the, and in the form of*".

b. Move 2 (Creating a research niche (in response of move 1) by:)

- Strategy A (creating claiming) which has been distributed by some LBs. They were "*the goal of the, is one of the, is a kind of*".
- Strategy B (gap-indicating) which has been distributed by some LBs. They were "*the meaning of the, the purpose of the, the objectives of the, the result of the, there are so many, is a kind of, and in the form of*".
- Strategy C (asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices

surveyed) which has been distributed by some LBs. They were "*the meaning of the, the aim of the, the goal of the, is one of the, is a kind of, and in the form of*".

- Strategy D (asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to the one's own research) which has been distributed by some LBs. They were "*there are so many and is one of the*".
- Strategy E (abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework) which has been distributed by some LBs. They were "*the purpose of the, the aim of the, the goal of the, is one of the and in the form of*".

c. Move 3 (occupying the research niche by announcing:)

- Strategy A (research aims, focuses, research questions or hypothesis) which has been distributed by only one LB. it was "*there are so many*".
- Strategy B (theoretical positions /theoretical framework) which has been distributed by only one LB. it was the same LB with in Strategy A, "*there are so many*".
- Strategy C (research design or processes) which has been distributed by some LBs. They were "*in the form of, the result of the, and the objectives of the*".

2) **Relation II**; the relations participant-oriented of structure types of LB had distributed to 10 LR's move structures. This relation consisted of some LBs categorized into 3 structures; type 4 other prepositional phrase (fragment), type 6 passive verb + prepositional phrase fragment, and type 12 other expressions,

which related functionally to text-oriented function (structuring and framing). The details were:

- a. Move 1 (Establishing one of the territory of one's own research by:)
 - Strategy A (surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims). In this strategy, it was only a distribution of LB, "*on the other hand*".
 - Strategy B (claiming centrality) which has been distributed by two LBs, "*it can be concluded and based on the explanation*".
 - Strategy C (surveying the research-related phenomena). It was only a distribution of LB same with in strategy A, "*on the other hand*".
- b. Move 2 (Creating a research niche (in response of move 1) by:)
 - Strategy B (gap-indicating) which only has been distributed by one LB, "*on the other hand*".
 - Strategy C (asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed) which has been distributed by some LBs. They were "*on the other hand, it can be concluded, it can be said, is based on the, based on the explanation, and as well as the*".
 - Strategy D (asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to the one's own research) which has been distributed by two LBs, they were "*as well as the and it can be concluded*".
 - Strategy E (abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework) which has been distributed by

also two LBs, they were "*as well as the and based on the explanation*".

- c. Move 3 (occupying the research niche by announcing:)
 - Strategy B (theoretical positions /theoretical framework) which has been distributed by two LBs, they were "*as well as the and is based on the*".
 - Strategy C (research design or processes) which has been distributed by only a LB, it was "*is based on the*".
- 3) **Relation III**; the relations of text-oriented structure types of LB had distributed to 9 LR's move structures. His relation consists of some LBs categorized into 3 structures; type 9 (verb/adjective +) *to*-clause fragment type 5 anticipatory *it* + verb/adjective phrase, and type 6 passive verb + prepositional phrase fragment which related functionally into participant-oriented function (stance and engagement). The detail information were:
 - a. Move 1 (Establishing one of the territory of one's own research by:)
 - Strategy A (surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims). This strategy has been only distributed by a LB, "*can be seen as*".
 - Strategy B (claiming centrality). This strategy also has been distributed by a LB, "*should be able to*".
 - Strategy C (surveying the research-related phenomena) which has been distributed by two LBs, "*to be able to and to find out the*".
 - b. Move 2 (Creating a research niche (in response of move 1) by:)

- Strategy A (creating claiming) has been distributed by some LBs, such as "to be able to, can be used to, and can be used in".
 - Strategy B (gap-indicating) has been distributed by some LBs, such as "to be able to, should be able to, can be divided into, can be defined as, to find out the, it is important to, can be seen as, can be used to, and can be used in".
 - Strategy C (asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed) has been distributed by some LBs, such as "to be able to, should be able to, it is important to, can be seen as, can be used to, can be divided into, and can be defined as".
 - Strategy D (asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to the one's own research) has been distributed by some LBs, such as "to be able to, should be able to, and can be used in".
 - Strategy E (abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework) has been distributed by some LBs, such as "to be able to, should be able to, it is important to, and can be divided into".
- c. Move 3 (occupying the research niche by announcing:)
- Strategy A (research aims, focuses, research questions/hypothesis) has been distributed by two LBs, "to find out the and can be used in".
 - Strategy B (theoretical positions /theoretical framework) has been distributed by also two LBs, "should be able to and can be used in".

Based on the findings, it could be concluded that the relation of structural forms

and research-oriented (Relation I) had contributed mostly, to 11 LR's move structures, followed by the relation of structures and participant-oriented (Relation II), distributed to 10 LR's move structures and the relation of structures and text-oriented (Relation III) to 9 LR's move structures.

In terms of structures of LB in academic students' texts, this research findings were in line with some findings of previous studies; Rafiee, Tavakoli & Amirin (2011), Farvadin (2012), Xixiang (2012), Jalali & Moini (2014), and Beng and Keong (2014). They found that noun phrase and prepositional phrase were the most structures of LB used in students' texts. In this research, it also found that the most structures of LBs used in the LR of students final projects were noun phrase, prepositional phrase and verb/adjective phrase. Noun phrase structures consisted of structure type 1 noun phrase with *of*-phrase fragment and structure type 11 pronoun/noun phrase + *be* (+ ...), while prepositional phrase consisted of type 6 passive verb + prepositional phrase fragment, structure type 4 other prepositional phrase (fragment), and structure type 3 prepositional phrase with embedded *of*-phrase fragment. In addition, verb/adjective phrase consisted of structure type 9 (verb/adjective +) *to*-clause fragment and structure type 5 anticipatory *it* + verb/adjective phrase.

The most functional type of LB appeared in the LR of students' final project was research-oriented. This research finding was similar with Dontcheva-Navratilova (2012), Rafiee & Keihaniyan (2013), Alquraishi (2014), Beng & Keong (2015), Jalali (2015), Esfendiari & Moein (2016), and Jalali (2016) who found that referential expressions was used more frequently in students' texts. In those previous studies, the referential expressions corresponded to research-oriented in Hyland's taxonomy (Gungor & Uysal, 2016). Therefore, the finding of this research supported those previous studies' findings. From all the findings of this research related to some previous studies, it was indicated that the use of LB structurally and functionally in students' academic texts was almost similar.

They used noun phrase and prepositional phrase as the most structures and research-oriented or referential expressions as function of LB to develop their texts to be more qualified.

Different way with some previous studies, this research investigated the relations of structures and functions of LB appeared in students' texts. There were 3 relations identified from LB appeared in students' texts. The analysis of those 3 relations was expected to help students' or all of academic participants to identify and classify the structures of LBs and their functions. By knowing the structures of LBs, hopefully students could easily know the functions. For example, the LB "*it is important to*" structurally was categorized into structure type 5 anticipatory *it* + verb phrase or adjective phrase, was related functionally to stance participant-oriented. It means that the bundle "*it is important to*" was used to convey the writers' attitudes and evaluations (Hyland, 2008b). In addition, in another previous research, it was found that the bundle "*it is important to*" also has a variety functions; hedges, attitude markers, emphatic and attribution which were used to develop the quality of texts written (Jalali, 2015).

In addition, this research also investigated the distribution of LB in the Literature Review (LR)'s move structures. It was needed to know how the use of LB supported in achieving communicative purpose of text. According to this research's finding, all of the LBs structurally related to functional types have great distribution to almost all of literature review's move structures. In order to know how the distribution of LBs supported to achieve communicative purpose of text, the researcher also identified each of LB distributed to functions and format of LR, as follows:

- 1) bundles *the meaning of the, the purpose of the, the objectives of the, the aim of the, the goal of the* which distributed in some LR's move structures to indicate that LR's function was essentially a description,
- 2) bundle *to find out the* indicated what topic the research focused on,

- 3) bundles *there are so many, the average score of, the result of the, it can be concluded, it can be said, based on the explanation, can be used in, can be used to, can be defined as, can be seen as*, and *on the other hand* mostly indicated the main part of all of what related to the topic of research,
- 4) bundles *is based on the, can be divided into, in the form of, is a kind of, and is one of the* were used to show the current sources of everything related to the topic, such as issues constructing the research topic, theories underlying the research topic, etc.

Besides, the distributions were also for LR's format which consisted of bundles *to be able to, should be able to, it is important to, and as well as the*. Those bundles were used to show that literature review's format was in terms of justification. By using those bundles, the writer tried to argue that what he or she will do in form of a research has a justification.

According to the analysis results, it could be concluded that the distribution of the relation of structural and functional type of LB to LR's move structures have a great distribution in achieving communicative purpose of LR which can be seen from the analyzing LBs' distributions to LR's move structures and to the LR's functions and format in undergraduate students' final projects.

CONCLUSION

From the findings, it can be concluded that the most structural forms of LBs used in students' texts is Type 1 Noun phrase with *of*-phrase fragment which consisted of the bundles "*the result of the, the meaning of the, the purpose of the, the average score of, the objectives of the, the aim of the, and the goal of the*". Those bundles have been used frequently in almost all of the LR of students' final project for a variety of abstract qualities. It was also identified that the most functional type of LBs used in students' texts is research-oriented, consists of "*the result of the*" as procedure research-oriented, "*there are so many*

and the average score of" as quantification research-oriented, "the meaning of the, the purpose of the, the objectives of the, the aim of the, the goal of the, is one of the, is a kind of, and in the form of" as description research-oriented. Each LB categorized into research-oriented have different functions based their utilization in the sentences related to the research conducted. In addition, there were three relations between structures and functions of LBs; (1) Relation I; 4 structures and research-oriented, (2) Relation II; 3 structures and participant-oriented, and (3) Relation III; 3 structures and text-oriented. Each relation was based on the LBs used and how they were manifested in the Literature Review of students' final projects. The findings also showed that the relation of structural forms and research-oriented had contributed mostly to LR's move structures. In addition, as a part of results analysis, the researcher also identified that the use of all of the LBs whether structurally and functionally have distributed to shape the format and functions of LR as genre. It can be said that the utilization of LBs structurally and functionally have great distribution to LR's move structures in achieving its communicative purpose of the text.

For the next researchers who interested in the use of LBs, it was suggested to conduct a research focusing on other part of undergraduate students' final projects. Because of the use of LBs can be a tool to evaluate text's quality, for English teacher, it was suggested to teach LBs as one of formulaic expressions as a reference in teaching word constructions in order to help students, for example to avoid error in using words arrangement in writing a text.

REFERENCES

- Aini, N., Faridi, A., & Fitriati, S.W. (2018). The Comparison of Lexical Bundles in Conversation Texts between Four Corners and English Intensive Course Books. *English Education Journal*, 8 (4), 445-451.
- Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S., & Finegan E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written english*. London: Longman.
- Beng, C.O.S. & Keong, Y.C. (2015). Functional types of lexical bundles in reading texts of Malaysian university english test: A corpus study. *Journal of Language Studies*, 15 (1), 77-90. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.17576/GEMA-2015-1501-05>.
- Chen, Yu-Hua. & Baker, P. (2010). Lexical bundles in L1 and L2 academic writing. *Language Learning and Technology*, 14 (2), 30-49. Retrieved from http://ilt.msu.edu/vol14num2/c_henbaker.pdf.
- Heng, C.S., Kashiha, H., & Tan, H. (2014). Lexical bundles: Facilitating university "talk" in group discussions. *English Language Teaching: Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 7 (4), 1-10.
- Hyland, K. (2008a). As can be seen: lexical bundles and disciplinary variation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27, 4-21. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2007.06.001.
- Hyland, K. (2008b). Academic clusters: Text patterning in published and postgraduate writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18 (1), 41-62. doi:org/10.1111/j.14734192.2008.001.
- Jalali, Z.S. & Moini, M.R. (2014). Structure of Lexical Bundles in Introduction Section of Medical Research Articles. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 719-726. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.473.
- Kashiha, H. & Heng, C.S. (2013). An exploration of lexical bundles in academic lectures: Examples from hard and soft sciences. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL*, 10 (4), 133-161.
- Kazemi, M., Kohandani, M., & Farzaneh, N. (2014). The impact of lexical bundles on how applied linguistics articles are evaluated. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 2014, 870-875. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.494.
- Kim, Y. (2009). Korean lexical bundles in conversation and academic texts. *Corpora*, 4 (2), 135-165.

- Kwan, B.S.C. (2006). The Schematic Structure of Literature Reviews in Doctoral Theses of Applied Linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 30-35.
- Neely, E. & Cortes, V. (2009). A little bit about: analyzing and teaching lexical bundles in academic lectures. *Language Value*, 1 (1), 17-38. Retrieved from <http://www.e-revistas.uji.es/languagevalue>.