

令和 4 年 5 月 29 日現在

機関番号：32689
 研究種目：若手研究
 研究期間：2020～2021
 課題番号：20K13143
 研究課題名(和文) Formulaic Sequences in Academic English Writing: A Resource for Students and Teachers
 研究課題名(英文) Formulaic Sequences in Academic English Writing: A Resource for Students and Teachers
 研究代表者
 APPEL RANDY (Appel, Randy)
 早稲田大学・グローバルエデュケーションセンター・講師(任期付)
 研究者番号：10802043
 交付決定額(研究期間全体)：(直接経費) 2,000,000円

研究成果の概要(和文)：低レベル・コーパス(LLC)と高レベル・コーパス(HLC)では、67種類と85種類の語彙バンドル(LB)、2,595トークンと3,072トークンが検出された。HLCの作者はすべての長さ(種類とトークン)のLBをより頻繁に使用していた。トークン数で評価した場合、これらの差は統計的に有意であった。また、LLCは課題文と重複するLBをより多く使用し、課題文への依存度が高いことが示された。機能別分類では、HLCの作者はすべての主要な機能カテゴリーを統計的に多く使用していることが示された。また、LLC作者は談話構成の割合が高く、HLC作者の方がスタンスバンドルの割合が若干高かった。

研究成果の学術的意義や社会的意義

Results add to our growing understanding of the ways in which L2 English writers make use of multi-word structures in their writing. Given the limited amount of research in this area, these findings give important insights that indicate how multi-word structures relate to perceptions of proficiency.

研究成果の概要(英文)：67 and 85 lexical bundle (LB) types, as well as 2,595 and 3,072 tokens, were found in the Lower-Level Corpus (LLC) and Higher-Level Corpus (HLC). HLC writers were more frequent users of all LB lengths (types and tokens). When evaluated in terms of token counts, these differences were statistically significant. LLC writers used more LBs that overlapped with the provided prompt, indicating a greater dependence on the prompt for language used in their essays. Functional classifications indicated that HLC writers made statistically greater use of all major functional categories. Furthermore, LLC writers had a greater percentage of discourse-organizing structures, with HLC writers holding a slightly higher percentage of stance bundles. These results have been submitted for publication and are also being shared with teachers to help students better understand which structures to avoid/make greater use of in their academic English writing.

研究分野：Applied Linguistics

キーワード：Lexical Bundles L2 English Academic Writing Proficiency differences

1 . 研究開始当初の背景

This research began with a desire to help L2 English writers improve their writing proficiency. With a growing recognition in the linguistic community regarding the importance of multi-word structures, a project looking at the relationship between the use of lexical bundles (i.e., one kind of corpus-driven multi-word structure) and perceptions of academic writing proficiency seemed a valuable endeavor. Furthermore, with this aspect of language increasingly highlighted as crucial to writing proficiency, I thought it was important to evaluate how well L1 Japanese students were able to make use of this linguistic feature. With no existing research of this kind targeting L1 Japanese learners of English, I wanted to use this research to better understand my students' writing and help them quickly improve their writing skills by using the results of this work in future teaching interventions.

2 . 研究の目的

The purpose of this research was to discover any potential links between the use of lexical bundles (LBs) and perceptions of academic English writing proficiency. The discovery of links between the use of LBs and writing proficiency could then be used as a basis for further instruction on this aspect of language. In other words, by identifying LBs associated with higher-level writing, these LBs could then be taught to students to increase perceptions of academic English writing proficiency. On the other hand, LBs more frequently associated with lower-level writing could be highlighted as items to avoid.

A further goal of this research was to set up a large corpus of academic English writing by L1 Japanese users so that other forms of analysis could take place. With my first research project now complete and submitted for publication, I have begun working on a second project with this data and hope to explore several other forms of analysis using this data in the coming years.

3 . 研究の方法

Research methods involved the collection, cleaning, and evaluation of two corpora of L2 English academic writing from L1 Japanese students. First essays were collected from a large academic English writing program at my university. Next, these essays were evaluated by a team of experienced language teachers. To ensure consistency in these evaluations, at least two experienced teachers rated each essay. Following these evaluations, the essays were divided into a lower-level group and a higher-level group. Once these two corpora had been created, lexical bundles of varying lengths (minimum 3-words) were extracted from each corpus using WordSmith Tools 8.0 and compared. To effectively deal with the common problem of substantial overlap among extracted LBs, these lists were manually sorted in order to remove shorter bundles contained within longer sequences (e.g., ~~at the end /end of the~~ → at the end of the). This pattern of sequence deletion and sorting was adapted from my previous research (e.g., Appel & Murray, 2020). In order to provide a detailed analysis, extracted sequences were examined using inferential statistics to discover general production differences (types and tokens), the extent of overlap with the prompt, functional category distinctions, and individual item production tendencies that could be related to the level of each group of writers (i.e., High/Low).

4 . 研究成果

A total of 67 and 85 LB types, as well as 2,595 and 3,072 tokens, were found in the Lower-Level Corpus (LLC) and Higher-Level Corpus (HLC), respectively. HLC writers were more frequent users of all LB lengths (types and tokens). When evaluated in terms of token counts, these differences were statistically significant.

LLC writers were also found to use a greater number of LBs that overlapped with the provided prompt ($p < .01$). Looking specifically at the LBs used by each group indicated that LLC writers were more generally dependent on the prompt for their language rather than displaying a specific tendency toward any particular set of items. In other words, these writers seemed to use a substantial portion of the prompt language in their own writing and did not confine their textual 'borrowing' to the frequent use of a small number of structures. This was an important finding since it overlapped with some of my previous research (Appel & Wood, 2016; Appel et al., in review).

Functional classifications (referential, discourse-organizing, stance) were also used to better understand writer tendencies. HLC writers made statistically greater use of all major functional categories. Furthermore, while both groups favored research-oriented LBs, LLC writers had a greater percentage of discourse-organizing structures, with HLC writers holding a slightly higher percentage of stance bundles.

Another major result from this research was a list of commonly used multi-word structures by both low and high-level writers. The results of this study have been submitted for publication and are also being shared with current teachers in the program in order to help students better understand which structures to avoid/make greater use of in their academic English writing.

5. 主な発表論文等

〔雑誌論文〕 計0件

〔学会発表〕 計0件

〔図書〕 計0件

〔産業財産権〕

〔その他〕

-

6. 研究組織

	氏名 (ローマ字氏名) (研究者番号)	所属研究機関・部局・職 (機関番号)	備考
--	---------------------------	-----------------------	----

7. 科研費を使用して開催した国際研究集会

〔国際研究集会〕 計0件

8. 本研究に関連して実施した国際共同研究の実施状況

共同研究相手国	相手方研究機関
---------	---------