

Get to know Lexical bundles in TOEIC Listening commercial books

Wichanon Phongjit & Sukanya Thamterasit

1. Why do we need to know lexical bundles in the books?

Learning English as a foreign language, there can be classified in many areas that students may realize a difficulty in a stage of development. One main area is lined on how students begin learning an English language. It is acknowledged that the students require a certain stage in learning that is receptive skills. The receptive skills can be divided into two main skills which are reading and listening. Those skills share the same leaning theoretical concepts for leaning which are micro skills and macro skills. One gap that cannot be denied that listening is more interactive in the interactions. Tsai 2001 mentions that in real situation students need to understand the conversation that the language skills acquired in the classroom and those needed to successfully function in listening in English. Morley (2001: 69) observes that “listening is still regarded as the least important skill”. In order to develop learning skills, there are many parts that can be discussed, one is lexical bundles. Lexical bundles are a key component of both oral and written discourse that is an effective use for processing language (Biber & Barbieri, 2007; Hyland, 2008). Since the lexical bundles can be found in many parts of discourse. This study investigated the lexical bundles that were used in TOEIC listening scripts because this test is essential that is test the general listening ability for communication of students.

2. Lexical bundles

Lexical bundles are a frequent word that are in extract form and repeatedly used in a certain register (Biber et al., 1999). They can extract by the computation program from the corpus which collects all data in the set that represent the enough amount of the language in each register (McEnery & Wilson, 2001). The lexical bundles can be either idiomatic expression or non-idiomatic expression. The lexical bundles is viewed as “discourse building blocks” (Biber, 2009) which can essentially serve communicative purposes for each register (Conrad & Biber, 2005, p.63). To identification lexical bundles, Biber, et al 2004 provides the theoretical framework that lexical bundles need to be analyze in parts of structural and functional categories.

3. Theoretical Framework of Lexical Bundles

In terms of structural categories, Biber, *et al.* (2004). According to this classification, there are three main structural types which include 1) lexical bundles that incorporate verb

phrase fragments like *that's one of the, is based on the*, 2) lexical bundles that incorporate dependent clause fragments like *that this is a, to come up with*, 3) lexical bundles that incorporate noun phrase and prepositional phrase fragments like *at the end of, at the same time*. Each main structural type entails several sub-types as illustrated in Table 1.

Structural types	Sub-types	Sample bundles
1. Lexical bundles that incorporate verb phrase fragments	1.a 1st/2nd person pronoun + VP	<i>I'm not going to</i>
	1.b 3rd person pronoun + VP fragment	<i>and this is a</i>
	1.c discourse marker + VP fragment	<i>I mean I don't</i>
	1.d Verb phrase (with non-passive verb)	<i>have a lot of</i>
	1.e Verb phrase (with passive verb)	<i>is based on</i>
	1.f yes-no question fragments	<i>are you going to</i>
	1.g WH- question fragments	<i>what do you think</i>
2. Lexical bundles that incorporate dependent clause fragments	2.a 1st/2nd person pronoun + dependent	<i>I want you to</i>
	2.b WH-clause fragments	<i>when we get to</i>
	2.c If-clause fragments	<i>if we look at</i>
	2.d to-clause fragment	<i>to be able to</i>
	2.e That-clause fragment	<i>that this is a</i>
3. Lexical bundles that incorporate noun phrase and prepositional phrase fragments	3.a Noun phrase with of-phrase	<i>one of the things</i>
	3.b Noun phrase with other post-	<i>the way in which</i>
	3.c Other noun phrase expressions	<i>a little bit more</i>
	3.d Prepositional phrase expressions	<i>at the end of</i>
	3.e Comparative expressions	<i>as well as the</i>

Another analysis of lexical bundles is functional analysis or discourse functions. This is obtained by Biber, *et al.* (2004) which are 1) stance bundles express attitude or assessment, 2) discourse organisers reflect the relationships between different parts of texts, 3) referential expressions refer to physical or abstract entities, or to other textual parts. These are shown in Table 2.

Categories	Sub-categories	Sample bundles
I. Stance bundles	A. Epistemic stance	<i>the fact that the, and I think that</i>
	B. Attitudinal/	
	B1) Desire	<i>what do you want</i>
	B2) Obligation/ directive	<i>it is important to</i>
	B3) Intention/ Prediction	<i>it's going to be</i>
	B4) Ability	<i>it is possible to</i>
II. Discourse organisers	A. Topic introduction	<i>in this chapter we</i>
	B. Topic elaboration/	<i>on the other hand</i>
III. Referential bundles	A. Identification/ focus	<i>is one of the</i>
	B. Imprecision	<i>or something like that</i>
	C. Specification of	
	C1) Quantity	<i>a lot of people</i>
	C2) Tangible framing	<i>in the form of</i>
	C3) Intangible framing	<i>on the basis of</i>
	D. Time/ Place/ Text	
	D1) Place reference	<i>in the United States</i>
	D2) Time reference	<i>at the same time</i>
	D3) Text-deixis	<i>as shown in figure</i>
	D4) Multi-functional	<i>in the middle of</i>

Table 2. Discourse functions of lexical bundles (based on Biber, *et al.*, 2004, pp.384-388)

4. Listening Comprehension and Lexical Bundles

Bottom-up processing is used when listeners build the meaning from the sound that he/she hears. Sound is converted to words and from words to sentence which can create the meaning (Vandergrift, 1997:387). Richards (2008:4-5) indicates that this process plays important roles in understanding utterances from speakers, one process of the bottom – up processing mentally breakdown the language into its components which refers to chunking. He also points out that the core meaning of message can be understood by using chunking. Besides, Yeldham and Gruba (2014:35) argue that bottom-up processing relates to the way to solely develop students micro listening skills. It is noted that students come across problem when they listen to longer and complex sentences and they are not able to use this information processing to help their comprehension. On the other hand, Batova (2013:187) argue that this process also can help foreign language learners to listen to unfamiliar language patterns.

Top-down processing refers to the listener prior knowledge of the topic, their general knowledge of the world and of how message generally interact with their linguistic knowledge to create an interpretation of the message. This could be the knowledge about the topic, learners try to use the knowledge that they already have on listening topics to create expectation on the

topic what they expect to hear and interpret their understandings (Helgesen, 2003:26). According to Rahimi (2012:550) and Buck (2001:18), they claim that when the listeners try to use prior knowledge on the topics to interpret the listening text, sometime they may make an incorrect interpretation. This relates to the concept ‘schemata’, A schema represents our knowledge about concepts; that is, “those underlying objects, situations, events, sequences of events, actions and sequences of actions” (Fang, 2008:23) and is defined as a mental representation of a typical instance (Cook, 1997:86). It is found that the learners tend to use their schema concerning the topic to construct and guide an incoming language input (bottom – up processing) for making interpretation.

Bottom up knowledge can refer to the micro marker such as well, ok and now Chaudron and Richards (1986). Top down knowledge is a macro markers such as *I’am going to, in the end of*. It is possible to say that a macro markers relate to lexical bundles from its form and function. Chaudron and Richards (1986) studied how these two types of marker contribute to the listening comprehension of students. They believed that the micro and makers can contribute one another in order to help listening comprehension. it was found that the macro markers, defined as lexical bundles found it more useful in listening comprehension than the micro marker.

5. How did we observe lexical bundles?

5.1 Sample

There are two corpora used in this study. The data were obtained from the listening scripts in TOEIC Longman Preparation book. The books were selected by their levels which are beginners and advance levels. The 5 sets of TOEIC tests from each book were compiled in Notepad. Then, the notepad files were loaded into *AntConc*. The beginner’s corpus size is 23,113 and the advance’s corpus size is 26,423 words.

Type of Corpus	Word Count
Beginner’s TOEIC	23,113
Advance’s TOEIC	26,423
Total	49,536

5.2 Data collection

The data were selected in the two corpora. The cluster analysis in Antconc were used to classified the data. The program was set to search for 4 word bundles in the lexical bundles. Then, the top one hundred ranks of lexical bundles in each corpus were used in the part of data analysis.

5.3 Data Analysis

In part of the analysis, the analysis were used the frameworks of (Biber 2004) which comprised of structural and functional features as mentioned in parts of literature review. 100 lexical bundles in each corpus were analyzed. Then, the structural and functional categories obtained from the analysis were count its frequency of each-sub categories and were calculated to be percentage.

6.1 What are those lexical bundles?

From the research questions, what are the structural and functional features of lexical bundles in TOEIC preparation listening scripts?

The frequency and percentage of the functional features were shown in the table 3

Functional category	Beginner's Level		Advance's Level		Examples
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent	
A. Referential expressions	21	29.57	19	30.15	
1. Identification/focus	5	7.04	4	6.34	<i>Refer to the following</i>
2. Imprecision					
3. Specification of attributes		da			
- Quantity specification	1	1.04	1	1.57	<i>The rest of the</i>
- Tangible Framing	0	0	0	0	
- Intangible Framing	0	0	0	0	
4. Time/place/Text reference	15	21.12	19	22.22	<i>The end of the , the front of the</i>
B. Stance Expression	49	69.01	42	(77.77)	
1. Epistemic stance	9	12.67	10	15.87	<i>I'm sure he is, and I'll have</i>
2. Attitudinal /modality stance	15	21.12	8	12.69	<i>May I have your, I would like to</i> <i>Have to wait until</i> <i>Is going to be</i> <i>Will be able to</i>
- Desire	12	16.90	10	15.87	
- Obligation/directive	7	9.85	7	11.11	
- Intention/Prediction	5	7.04	7	11.11	
- Ability					
C. Discourse Organizer					
1. Topic introduction	1	1.04	0		<i>Let's go to the</i>

2. Topic Elaboration/Clarification	0	0	1	1.57	<i>This has been a</i>
---	---	---	---	------	------------------------

Table 3: Functional Features

From the Table 3, the percentage of advance’s level indicates this level used more referential expression than beginner’s level. In contrary, the stance expression were used more in advance’s level. However, there is no different of the use of discourse organizers between the two levels. It is suggested that the high’s level students need to know more lexical bundles in order to increase more range of lexical bundles.

The frequency and percentage of the structural features were shown in the table 3

Structural category	Beginner Level		Advance Level	
	Freq. 71	Percent	Freq.63	Percent
A. Lexical Bundles that incorporate verb phrase fragment	54	76 %	45	76%
- 1.a 1 st /2 nd person pronoun + VP fragment	27	38.02	17	26.98
- 3 rd person pronoun + VP fragment	1	1.40	1	1.53
- discourse marker + VP fragment	5	7.04	5	7.93
- Verb phrase (with non-passive verb)	20	28.16	18	28.57
- Verb phrase (with passive verb)	1	1.40	1	1.53
- yes-no question fragments	0	0	2	3.17
- WH- question fragments	0	0	1	1.53
2. Lexical bundles that incorporate dependent clause fragments	2	2.81	3	4.76
- a 1 st /2 nd person pronoun + dependent clause fragment	0		1	1.53
- WH-clause fragments	0		1	1.53
- If-clause fragments	2	2.81	1	1.53
- to-clause fragment	0		0	0
- That-clause fragment	0		0	0
3. Lexical bundles that incorporate noun phrase and prepositional	15	21.12	15	23.80
- Noun phrase with of-phrase fragment	1	1.40	1	1.53
- Noun phrase with other post-modifier fragment	2	2.81	1	1.53
-Other noun phrase expressions	2	2.81	5	7.93
- Prepositional phrase expressions	9	12.67	8	12.69
- Comparative expressions	1	1.40	0	0

Table: 4 Structural Features

According to the table 4, there is an only slim difference between the uses of structural categories. The advance's level tends to use more variety of structural choices than the beginner's level.

REFERENCES

- Batova, N. 2013. Academic listening: Is there a place for bottom-up processing? *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(4):1-10.
- Buck, G. 2001. *Assessing listening*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004). If you look at ...: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(3), 371-405.
- Biber, D. and Barbieri, F. 2007. "Lexical bundles in university spoken and written registers". *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 263-286.
- Biber, D. (2009). A corpus-driven approach to formulaic language in English: Multi-word patterns in speech and writing. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 14(3), 275- 311.
doi:10.1075/ijcl.14.3.08bib
- Cook, G. 1997. Key concepts in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 51(1):86.
- Conrad, S., & Biber, D. (2005). The frequency and use of lexical bundles in conversation and academic prose.
- Kwon, Y.-E & Lee, E.-J. (2014). Lexical bundles in the Korean EFL teacher talk corpus: A comparison between non-native and native English teachers. *Journal of Asia TEFL*. 11. 73-103.
- McEnery, A. M., & Wilson, A. (2001). *Corpus linguistics: an introduction*: Edinburgh University Press.
- Morley, J. 2001. "Aural comprehension instruction: Principles and practices." In CelceMurcia, M. (Ed.) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 69-85.
- Nadig, A. (2013). Listening Comprehension. *Encyclopedia of Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 1743.

Neely, Elizabeth & Cortes, Viviana. (2009). A little bit about: Analyzing and teaching lexical bundles in academic lectures. *Language Value*. 1.

Nesi, H. and Basturkmen, H. (2006) Lexical bundles and discourse signaling in academic lecturers.. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, volume 11 (3): 283-304.

Richards, JC. 2008. *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsai, M. 2001. "Learning is a lifelong process." In Belcher, D. and U. Connor (Eds.) *Reflections on Multiliterate Lives*. Tonawanda: Cromwell Press Ltd., 135-140.

Helgesen, M. 2003. Teaching listening. In: Nunan, D. (Ed.). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rahimi, AH. 2012. On the role of strategy use and strategy instruction in listening comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(3):550-559.

Vandergrift, L. 1997. The strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(3):387-409.

Yeldham, M & Gruba, P. 2014. Toward an instructional approach to developing interactive second language listening. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(1): 33–53.