

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

When writing a journal article, the writers need to pay attention to vocabulary. Wilkins (1972) stated that “without grammar, very little can be conveyed, but without vocabulary, nothing can be conveyed.” In conveying opinions, a good selection of vocabulary is required. In addition, vocabulary builds the text as blocks of language. Therefore, a good selection and use of vocabulary is necessary for writing good academic texts. A good writing academic text can be useful and insightful for increasing the literacy of the reader who wants to comprehend something, and they can also analyze their research data based on the source of their reading.

In the Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary (1995, p.1331), vocabulary is defined as “all the words that a person knows or uses, or a list of words with their meanings, especially in a book for learning a foreign language”. The vocabulary may include single words and multiwords. For multiwords, we have the terms that be considered as lexical bundles. Biber et al (1999, p.899) defined that a lexical bundle is a group of words that appears across texts in the same register and help shape distinctiveness of the register, but not idiomatic. In a further publication, Biber (2006) simply defines lexical bundles as the most frequent recurring sequences of words in a given register. It also can be an important consideration to determine the successful

language user in specific discourse community and very crucial for language construction in all university register.

According to Biber (2006), he also discovered that lexical bundles appear in academic writing. It is important to determine whether lexical bundles create a difference in judging writing proficiency in college students, if the types of lexical bundles used by student writers considered proficient are the same lexical bundles that are arranged in composition textbooks, and if the bundles in these textbooks well represent the academic register. From those explanation, it can be concluded that proficiency can be seen from the selection of vocabulary in writing. Furthermore, examining lexical bundles may be useful for the reader and also writer as their reference when preparing their academic writing.

Actually, lexical bundles have two kinds of types, such as structural types and functional types, but the writer only focus on the structural types of lexical bundles because structural types tend to be more specific and certain enough in grammatical situation rather than functional types. The structural-based of lexical bundles can be more understandable and fixed, because it related with the word class in every particular word. The structural types are based on the grammatical structure of lexical bundles. Biber et al (1999) categorized the structural types depending on whether lexical bundles incorporate nouns, prepositional phrases, verbs, or clause fragments. Structural types were developed by Biber et al (1999) and it was used to study Longman grammar of spoken and written English. This theory indicates the reference material to determines the lexical bundles which is

frequently used in sections. As applied to this study, the independent variable (lexical bundles) is expected to explain the dependent variable, (in this case is part of sections, which is abstract, introduction, methods, results and discussion and conclusion) because as the practical contribution, it could be useful to comprehending many types of lexical bundles and its structures, then producing into texts, particularly in academic writing.

There are several studies in examining lexical bundles in one academic discipline. The studies conducted by Hyland (2008), Salazar (2013), also Jalali and Moini (2014), Grabowski (2015), Ucar (2017), Nevia et al. (2018), Ulfa & Muthalib (2020) and Budiwiyanto & Suhardijanto (2020) focused on the lexical bundles in one specific discipline such as in linguistics as social science area, medicines and pharmacy as health science area, biology as life sciences area and so on. Actually, Ucar (2017), Nevia et al. (2018) and Ulfa & Muthalib (2020) examine English lexical bundles and Budiwiyanto & Suhardijanto (2020) examines Indonesian lexical bundles. It is related with the linguistics study as social science area.

Other studies have compared the lexical bundles from two or more specific disciplines, such as Cortes (2004), Kwary, Ratri, and Artha (2017) and Gil & Caro (2019). Cortes (2004) compared about lexical bundles in history as the social science area and biology as the life science area. Kwary, Ratri, and Artha (2017) described about the use of lexical bundles in journal articles of four academic disciplines: Health Sciences, Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences, which is this previous study inspired this recent study a lot. Gil & Caro (2019)

compares the use of lexical bundles in linguistics as Social Science area and medicine as Health Science area.

Based on the explanation above, there have been quite a number of studies that have analyzed these lexical bundles, including two research disciplines that compare Social Science and Health Science. However, there is still a lack of research in lexical bundles for two specific disciplines analyze different sections of journal articles. On average, several research focus on lexical bundles in one section only, such as in abstract. Meanwhile, in this study, the lexical bundles will be analyzed in five sections: abstract, introduction, methods, result and discussion, and conclusion. In journal articles, there are several sections or parts, it divided into six sections as well, such as abstract, introduction, literature review, methods, results and discussion and conclusion. According to the explanation above, the literature review was the one of sections that not included for the data analysis of this study. The reason is because no literature review has found in the *Pediatrics Neurology* journal.

This study relied on two Elsevier journals for the data. *Lingua* and *Pediatrics Neurology* are the two journals that have been choosen. *Lingua* is a Social Science journal dedicated to the study of linguistics, both pure and applied linguistics. Then there is *Pediatrics Neurology*, which is one of the Health Science journals that looks at neuro, brain, and child development. The two journals are related because there is a branch of science in linguistics that discusses psycholinguistics in relation to Pediatric Neurology in Health Science area.

Moreover, from the pure linguistics as morphology for example, it can be related to the neurology as branch of health science in specific.

According to Wikipedia, Elsevier Journal is a Netherlands-based publishing company specializing in scientific, technical, and medical content. It is a part of the RELX Group, known until 2015 as Reed Elsevier. Its products include journals such as *The Lancet* and *Cell*, the ScienceDirect collection of electronic journals, the Trends and Current Opinion series of journals, the online citation database Scopus, the SciVal tool for measuring research performance, the ClinicalKey search engine for clinicians, and the ClinicalPath evidence-based cancer care service. Elsevier's products and services also include digital tools for data management, instruction, research analytics and assessment. In 2018, Elsevier publishes more than 500,000 articles annually in 2,500 journals. Its archives contain over 17 million documents and 40,000 e-books. Total yearly downloads amount to more than 1 billion, it also can be the profit business for the authors who want to publish their articles because it can afford to all readers over the worlds wide and mostly can be open-access to make it easier for readers to collect the data. Several reasons mentioned above also support the reasons why using Elsevier as data that is considered qualified.

This study is going to analyzes the lexical bundles in the abstract, introduction, methods, results and discussion and also conclusion sections of two specific disciplines of journal articles published at Elsevier, which are *Lingua* for linguistics and *Pediatrics Neurology*. The previous studies on lexical bundles mostly focus on lexical bundles across two or more specific disciplines but only analyse in one section. This study seeks to fill in the gap of the research of lexical

bundles by focusing on the structural types of lexical bundles from five sections of linguistic and pediatric journal articles published at *Lingua* and *Pediatrics Neurology* based on Biber et al (1999) theories.

1.2. Statement of Problems

Based on the background of the study, this study intends to answer the following problems:

1. How frequency and phraseology in the structural types of lexical bundles influence the writing proficiency in linguistic journal articles by *Lingua* and pediatrics journal articles by *Pediatrics Neurology* in every section?
2. How the implications of the most significant similarities and differences found in all sections for academic writing?

1.3. Objective of the Study

Based on the statement of the problems, the objectives of the study are formulated as follows:

1. Analyzing and exploring the structural types of lexical bundles which are frequently used in linguistic journal articles by *Lingua* Elsevier and pediatrics journal articles by *Pediatrics Neurology* Elsevier in five sections.
2. Illustrating the implication for academic writing from similarities and differences of structural types lexical bundles found in all sections.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study is expected to deliver theoretical contribution on the corpus linguistics as it develops a model of academic writing, particularly to analyze the

structural types of the lexical bundles in linguistics and pediatrics journal articles published at *Lingua* and by *Pediatrics Neurology* by Elsevier. This study is also expected as a reference material since it determines the lexical bundles, identifies the structural types of lexical bundles, and investigates the similarities and differences of the structural types of lexical bundles by using Antconc concordance with N-grams. The Antconc concordance version that have been used is Antconc 3.5.8 for Windows that released in 2019. The reason why the writer choose this version rather than the newest one because the newest one separating the clusters in 3-words, 4-words and 5-words bundles.

In this case, those separation are great if it is used to more specific function in bundles in large size, but if it refers to more vary data and specialized, the older version is better. However, if you want to focus only in 3-words bundles and not 3-5 words bundles as well as this study, the newest version will be helpful. While for practical contribution, this study is expected to expand the research studies in the field of the linguistics and *Pediatrics Neurology*, particularly for linguists, practitioners and researcher in social science and health science who want to use the reference data and also assist the readers how to write a good journal article for publication, because Elsevier provides mega journal and indexed by Scopus.

1.5. Definition of Keyterms

1. Academic Writing : a product of many considerations, such as: audience, purpose, organization, style, flow and presentation which has formal tone and style

2. Elsevier: a leader in information and analytics for customers across the global research and health ecosystem.
3. Frequency: The rate at which something occurs or is repeated over a particular period of time or in a given sample
4. Journal article: a collection of scientific articles which contain specific and related topic
5. Lexical bundle: the combination of words that in fact reoccur most commonly in a given register, a recurring sequence of three or more words
6. Phraseology: a mode of expression, especially one characteristic of a particular speaker or writer
7. Section: any of the more or less distinct parts into which something is or may be divided or from which it is made up