



IRAQI
Academic Scientific Journals



العراقية
المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية



ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)

Journal of Language Studies

Contents available at: <http://jls.tu.edu.iq>

Lexical Chunks between Investigation and Application: A Case Study of a BBC Radio 4 Interview

Inst. Ziyad Ahmed Dahaam *
University of Tikrit,
College of Arts,
Department of Translation
E-mail: ziyaddahaam@gmail.com

Keywords: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>lexical chunks</i>- <i>lexical approaches</i>- <i>multi-word-units</i>- <i>structural units</i>- <i>sequences</i>	Abstract <p>This study represents an approach to easily extract lexical chunks which are considered to be the essence of gaining a communicative skill similar to that of any native language speaker. Lexical approaches are very important in this respect; far from grammar rules, they concentrate on learning language in use. Therefore, it aims to investigate this field and its effect on the process of learning a language. It is hypothesized that lexical approaches have their direct effect on raising the students' performance regarding L2 language fluency and production by means of lexical chunks. It is also hypothesized that it is difficult for the students to easily identify and extract lexical chunks in their natural contexts. Therefore, this study adopts Boers and Lindstromberg's (2009) model as a way to facilitate the identification of lexical chunks and to open a way to easily identify them. A transcript of a BBC radio 4 interview (see the appendix) is chosen as the source of the data analysis in this study. The working procedures are thought to be beneficial for L2 learners future identification and extraction of lexical chunks.</p>
Article Info	
Article history: <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Received: 12\8\2019-Accepted: 30\9\2019	
Available online	

* Corresponding Author: Ziyad Ahmed Dahaam , E-Mail: ziyaddahaam@gmail.com ,
Tel: +96407723409935, Affiliation : College of Arts, Department of Translation , Tikrit University –
Iraq

الوحدات المعجمية المتصلة بين التحقيق و التطبيق: دراسة حالة لمقابلة اذاعية على قناة بي

بي سي فور

زياد احمد دحام

جامعة تكريت ، كلية الآداب ، قسم الترجمة

<p>الخلاصة: تمثل الدراسة الحالية احدى طرق استنباط الوحدات المعجمية المتصلة التي تعتبر من اهم عناصر اكتساب المهارات التواصلية لبلوغ درجة مشابهه لتلك التي يملكها أي متحدث للغة المراد تعلمها. الطرق المعجمية تعتبر من اهم الطرق المتبعة في هذا الجانب حيث تركز على تعلم اللغة من خلال التواصل بعيدا عن القواعد اللغوية. لهذا السبب تهدف الدراسة الحالية الى التحقيق في هذه الطرق و تأثيرها على تعلم اللغة وتفترض ان لها تأثير مباشر على اداء الطلبة المتعلق بالتكلم والطلاقة في التكلم من خلال تعلم واستنباط الوحدات المعجمية. وتفترض هذه الدراسة ان الطالب يواجه صعوبة في استنباط و استخراج هذه الوحدات من النصوص الحية لذلك تتبع الدراسة انموذج بويرس وليندسترومبرغ (٢٠٠٩) كطريقة لتسهيل استنباط هذه الوحدات المعجمية. نموذج التحليل عبارة عن نصوص حية في الاصل لمقابلة اذاعية على قناة بي بي سي فور. و يعتقد بان الاجراءات المتبعة سوف تكون ذات اهمية لدى الطالب فهي تمثل طريقة لتسهيل استنباط هذه الوحدات.</p>	<p>الكلمات الدالة: -الوحدات المعجمية المتصلة -الطرق المعجمية - وحدات الكلمات المتعددة - الوحدات البنيوية - المتتاليات</p> <p>معلومات البحث تاريخ البحث: -الاستلام: ٢٠١٩/٨/١٢ - القبول: ٢٠١٩/٩/٣٠ التوفر على الانترنت</p>
--	---

1. Introduction

It is wealth investigating such a subject as lexical chunks since it has a direct effect on the process of learning aspects of language in use. This subject reveals the importance behind using a language for communicative aims and pragmatic intentions. Developing communicators' pragmatic competence starts from lexical approaches to language learning.

2. Lexical Approaches

lexical approaches are the recent concern of many scholars who search for methods to raise the communicative value of the second language learners. Richards and Rodgers (2001, p.12) emphasize that lexical approaches are the “building blocks of language learning and communication”; grammar, or any other “unit of planning and teaching” are not as important as “lexis”. Lexical approaches provide a key role to language structure, language use, and “in particular to multi-word lexical units or chunks”. This role has been emphasized both within the first language and the second language learning systems. Richards and Rodgers add that:

“lexical approaches in language teaching seek to develop proposals for syllabus design and language teaching founded on a view of language in which lexis plays the central role”

(ibid, p.13)

Richards and Rodgers pay great attention to the notions of form and meaning. They concentrate on those lexical items which have no “direct translational equivalence” between the target and the source languages; i.e., those units which have regular occurrences and can be described as “memorized patterns”, “free forms” such as ‘lexical chunks’.

Penamaria et al. (2008, p. 14) admit the fact that lexical approaches are best described as “natural approaches” to language teaching where lexical chunks are the “central element” in raising the receptive skills and awareness of the learners. Penamaria et al. claim is supported by the following evidences:

1. Language is for making meaning, for accomplishing purposes.
2. What is true for language in general is true for written language.
3. Phonology, orthography, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics are always simultaneously present and interacting in every instance of language.
4. Language use always occurs in a situation.
5. Situations are critical to meaning-making.
6. Language acquisition occurs through actual use.

That is why Timmis (2015, p. 31) argues that lexical approaches reveal the role of lexical chunks (chunking language) in achieving fluency and building a communicative base for language learners.

3. Lexical Chunks

Biber and Randi (2015, p. 34) admit that lexical chunks have been the interest of linguistics over the last three decades because a big deal of the language we use every day contain multi-word expressions such as: *in a nut shell, if you see what I mean, to start with*, etc. Such expressions have been investigated under different labels: “lexical phrases”; “formulas”; “routines”; “n-games”; “prefabricated patterns”; “formulaic sequences”, etc. Such a lexical phenomenon requires that we understand its nature and description.

3.1 Nature and Description

Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992, pp. 1-3) assert that lexical chunks are phrases of different length which occur in a language as one unit to fulfill a communicative purpose; they are “multi-word lexical phenomena...conventionalized form/function composites” which occur frequently in a language to serve a communicative meaning such as ‘*as it were*’, ‘*on the other hand*’, ‘*as X would have us believe*’. These chunks can be represented by relatively short fixed phrases such as ‘*a _____ ago*’; or longer phrases/clauses such as ‘*if I X, then I Y*’, ‘*the _____ er X, the _____ er Y*’, or any other chunk that fulfills the communicator needs. Each chunk is fixed and each “slot” in these chunks can be filled differently, though the chunk has a “basic frame”, thus: (*a year ago, a month ago*), (*the higher X, the higher Y, the longer you wait, the sleepier you get*). In these examples, each chunk represents a function in discourse as to express time or to show relationship among ideas. For this reason, Nattinger and DeCarrico view lexical chunks as related to a theory of competence, performance and pragmatics. In this regard, Kasper et al. (2010, p. 141) write that lexical chunks are “conventional expressions” which are used “predictably” by native speakers and are “undertaken” by L2 learners.

Trillo (2013, pp. 106-7) prefers to call lexical chunks as “multi-word sequences”. For him, those sequences are stored mentally as one unit that can be “retrieved holistically” whenever needed instead of building the chunk word by word as it is done with normal utterances. Therefore it is easy for native language users to recall

them at the time of use. Biber and Randi (2015, p.65) assert that they are “bundles” like: ‘*it is necessary to...*’, ‘*it should be noted that...*’, ‘*the fact that the...*’ which are the patterns of “phraseology”.

Petrovska (2012, p. 228) reveals that they can be used to express various communicative functions and intentions. They can (for example) express requests, welcomings, greetings, etc. An utterance which is used to express any communicative function and intention can be expanded to other different utterances; such as the expansion of the politeness request ‘Can I help you?’ to the followings:

1. *How can I help you, Madam/Sir?*
2. *Do you mind if I can help you, Sir?*
3. *Would you like me to help you, Madam?*

Petrovska asserts that all the above expansions are chunks which serve to reflect one unified communicative intention: to express a politeness request. The different forms used to express this intention are stored in the communicator’s mind and it is easy for him/her to recall them.

Miller (2017, pp. 102-103) shows the importance of lexical chunks to language learning in the following points:

1. Lexical chunks are highly motivating by developing fluency at the very early stages and thus promote a sense of achievement.
2. Lexical chunks are not dead ends. Some are analyzable by the rules of grammar. Therefore, they are dual in nature.
3. Lexical chunks may be used to maintain a conversation, change the topic, make a request, greet etc.
4. The functional features of lexical chunks provide learners with the possibility of expressing the same function in increasingly more difficult ways by expanding an initial formula.
5. Lexical chunks let speakers overcome memory and processing constraints since they are stored as wholes and are readily accessible.

Miller provides the following example which is full of lexical chunks:

4. *"Right again. The truth is that the whole thing struck me as a bit odd and I wanted time to think about it. I've thought, and you're welcome to the story. You can believe it or not, as you like. It's all the same to me."*

Miller admits the fact that lexical chunks are considered to be the central issue in raising the awareness of the students and to develop "their ability to chunk language successfully".

3.2 Features of Lexical Chunks

Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992, pp. 10-11) assert that lexical chunks are conventionalized lexical strings which, in addition to their different syntactic shapes, they "are capable as well of performing pragmatic acts". They pay great attention to the pragmatic aspect of lexical chunks despite the many syntactic features they said to have. They view a lexical chunk as a pragmatic component which represents the essence of what they call the "pragmatic competence" and developing it at the same time.

However, Castro et al. (2018, pp. 11-12) stress that lexical chunks are phrases which are constituted from two or more words; they are found in different ways such as smallest structural units, to bigger structural units, and are said to exhibit the following features:

1. They are combinations of fixed or semi-fixed multi-word units which occur recurrently.
2. They are sequences of words or other meaning element stored and retrieved as a whole without creation or invention according to grammatical rules.
3. They should at least contain two morphemes and coherent in phonology.

Petrovska (2012, p. 229) admits that lexical chunks are easy to acquire because they are frequent and can be described as memorized forms. They are "situational meaning associated". Frequent occurrence and situation association give lexical chunks the feature of being: highly memorable, stored as units, easy to be picked up, highly accessible, easily acquired as wholes, easily retrievable, no need for the learner to know their internal constituents and no need for analysis by the rules of syntax.

3.3 Classification of Lexical Chunks

Hattingen and Decarrico's (2010, p. 97) maintain that lexical chunks can be of four main types, as follows:

1. **Poly-words**: According to Hattingen and Decarrico's, they are short phrases but are used as one unit, and can be both canonical and not canonical. Furthermore, the constituents of this type are "invariables; they do not accept "variability", and can be viewed as "continuous" (uninterrupted), such as: *hold your horse, not on your life, as it were, I'll say, and what on earth?*. Castro et al. (2018, p. 13) write that they are one fixed combination of words. Each part of this combination cannot be replaced by others. For example, '*out of the question*'; this poly-word consists of words that cannot be changed by any other words without changing its meaning. Part of this type are idioms (*hold your horse*), topic shifters (*turning to the point*), summarizers (*to put it together*).
2. **Institutionalized Utterances**: Hattingen and Decarrico (2010, p. 97) mention that they are usually functioning as separate utterances and they are usually canonical and invariable. Castro et al. stress that they can be kinds of "proverbs, aphorisms, and formulas for social interaction which are used for quotation, allusion, or direct use. For example: *give me a break, there you go, be that as it may, long time no see*. Castro et al. admit that they mainly refer to the utterances that have pragmatic functions. For example, '*I'm afraid of...*', '*I'm sorry but...*'. (2018, p. 13).
3. **Phrasal Constraints**: Hattingen and Decarrico (2010, p. 97) write that they are phrases that can be short to medium in length, and can be both canonical and non-canonical. They accept variation in regard to their constituents (NP, VP, Adj. P, Adv. P, N,V Adj., etc.), and they are continuous (uninterrupted) such as: *good* __ (*greeting*) *good morning, good afternoon, good evening*; *dear* __ (*greeting*) *dear* First name, *dear* Title + Last name; *the* __ *er the* __ *er* (comparator) *the sooner the better; the busier the happier*.
4. **Sentence Builders**: Hattingen and Decarrico's (2010, p. 97) assert that they are used to present a framework for the whole sentences and are formulas for social interaction when used in an utterance. They are both continuous (uninterrupted) and discontinuous (interrupted), such as: *not only ... but also, I think (that) X* (assertion); *not only was her mother injured in the accident, but also her father; the sooner all this work is finished, the sooner we will all be able to go home*. Castro et al. (2018, 13) admit that 'sentence frames and heads' can also be given

as a name for this type where they are used to organize a text such as ‘*on the one hand...on the other hand*’.

This classification can also be used as a working procedure to exactly determine and extract lexical chunks from utterances together with the model of the study presented in the data analysis.

4. Data Analysis

This study follows Boers and Lindstromberg’s (2009) model which is fully described below. The data of this study is a transcript of a BBC Radio 4 interview (in 8 pages) originally recorded on-air on 2/4/2015 with Nigel Farage (a British politician). The full citation of this interview is pinned in the appendix.

4.1 The Model Adopted

This study adopts Boers and Lindstromberg’s (2009) model which is based on the form and function of lexical chunks identification. For Boers and Lindstromberg (2009, pp. 1-4), the mastery of lexical chunks is the only factor that distinguishes native speakers from highly proficient language learners to less proficient language learners; it is a fact that even highly proficient language learners who learned many words and grammar rules may fail to use lexical chunks as native speakers do.

Boers and Lindstromberg view lexical chunks as “words or other elements” that can be: a. a sequence; b. continuous; c. discontinuous; d. appears to be prefabricated; e. stored and retrieved whole from memory; and f. are not subject to analysis by language or grammar. These characteristics apply to all word strings which are used by a language user as “holistic units”, they resemble an “idiosyncratic” role. However, Boers and Lindstromberg (ibid, pp. 6-13) assert that the identification of lexical chunks within discourse involves the following four main premises:

1. Function based identification: several lexical chunks can be determined based on the function they serve in discourse; their function can be: a. social routine formulae such as: *excuse me, have a nice day, how are you doing?*; b. conversational fillers such as: *sort of, you know what I mean, you see and so on*; c. sentence heads, such as: *shall we + infinitival phrase and would you mind + gerundial phrase*; e. situation evaluators such as: *You must be kidding!, Small world!, When the cat’s away*; f. discourse organizers, such as: *by the way, on*

the other hand, having said that, last but not least, let's move on to; and i. referential (or message oriented function), such as: *stomach ache, commit a crime, break up, put on weight.*

2. Formal features based identification: understanding the features exhibited by lexical chunks is a good way to identify them. Lexical chunks are described as being a continuum of two or more words. This continuum may: a. at least contain one word which is fully fixed, such as: *commit suicide*; b. allows for restricted substitution, such as: *conduct / do / carry out an experiment*; c. containing open slot frames, such as: *the –er, the –er (the sooner, the better), as _ as_ (I did it as fast as I could)* and *it takes/took/will take (someone)[time] to [infinitival phrase] (It took me two hours to get there).*
3. Transparent/opaque meaning based identification: Boers and Lindstromberg admit that lexical chunks can be found as a continuum of a semantically transparent meaning, and as a continuum of a semantically opaque meaning. The difference between the two lies in that a chunk which is easily understood and has a plain meaning is a transparent one, such as: *make a presentation* and *tell a lie*. While, those with an opaque meaning are fixed and do not accept separate words composition; they can be found in any dictionary of idioms, such as: *spill the beans* and *hit it off with [s'one]*. It is so because, for example, *spill + beans* does not equal the meaning of revealing a secret; while *make + presentation* has a clear meaning, taking into account that both constituents are not fixed and do accept substitution (mostly restricted). The criterion of compositionality is a good way to discover that.
4. Frequency of occurrence based identification: those are the chunks which occur frequently in everyday conversations. There are many chunks that occur frequently, such as: discourse organizers (*and so on* and *for example*), and conversational fillers (*sort of* and *you know [what I mean]*). Frequency of occurrence accounts only for those combinations which serve a discourse communicative intention, such as those presented in (1), (2), and (3) above.

For Boers and Lindstromberg, lexical chunks are very diverse. In addition to the aforementioned lexical chunks identification, it can also be viewed as: discourse markers (*added to that*); compounds (*peer pressure*); standardized similes (*clear as crystal*); proverbs (*when the cat's away*); genre typical clichés (*publish or perish*);

exclamations (*you must be kidding!*). These chunks appear in the native English language corpus he was investigating.

4.2 Analysis of the Data

In this analysis, the researcher concentrated on the speech of Nigel Farage being the interviewee, with the fact that he is a British native speaker. ‘NF’ is the original abbreviation appears in the transcript, taking into account that his speeches are mentioned here exactly as they appear in the transcript except that the researcher follows the ‘underline’ procedure to point to (as thought to be) lexical chunks and that only five of his speeches are selected for analysis (presented as extracts). The interviewer is Mishal Husain, and his speech is not submitted for analysis.

Extract (1):

NF: What I said was, I want us to live, and in fact, if you watch tonight’s party political broadcast, I say this line very clearly, ‘I want us to live in a society that is integrated’.

Discussion:

No doubt that the underlined multi-words have a discourse function other than that revealed by the semantic representation of the constituents they contain. For example, the composite multi-word chunk ‘*what I said was*’ has a function of ‘formulating a social interaction’ between the interviewer and the interviewee. It is recognized as ‘a sentence builder’ because of the function it serves (to build social interactions); it does provide a framework for the following main idea of ‘NF’, which is ‘to live in an integrated society’. Furthermore, it is continuous and accepts no interruption. Grammatically speaking, we cannot end a sentence by a ‘be’ auxiliary followed by a comma. The existence of the comma itself between this chunk and the following one indicates that it is put to serve an intention; though this utterance is only a transcript, but even the professional who converted this interview into a transcript realized this fact. The chunk ‘*what I said was*’ has a transparent semantic meaning in case that its meaning is clear and the constituents accept some variations, such as those appear in the same interview: ‘*what I’m arguing for is*’; ‘*what I’m saying is*’, with the fixation of ‘what’.

The multi-word chunk '*I want us to live*' is repeated for two times in this utterance. Based on Boers and Lindstromberg's fourth identification procedure, this immediate frequency is intentional by 'NF'. It can be viewed as having a discourse function of an emphasis to 'live in an integrated society'.

Uttering the chunk '*and in fact*' is semantically empty, but rather it seems to be 'a poly-word' which reveals an intention to change the topic (a topic shifter) of the speaker to get to the main point after he indulged his speech with '*what I said was*' and '*I want us to live*' which do not seem to carry any information other than revealing a discourse function. This is clear when considering the rest of the utterance.

The multi-word chunk '*I say this line very clearly*' seems to be an institutionalized sentence which serves a pragmatic function aimed, by considering its position, to draw the attention of the interviewer to the idea of 'living in an integrated society' and that he will be convinced with it 'if he watched that night's party political broadcast'.

Extract (2):

NF: You know, I've spent time in places like Belfast, and I've seen what divided communities are like, you know, I went earlier on, in the last decade, I went to Oldham and I saw, you know, communities living completely separately . .

Discussion:

The most recognized frequent lexical chunk in the whole interview is '*you know*'. Its recurrence draws the attention as to why it does occur many times by 'NF'?; despite the fact that it is fixed 'you + know'. This chunk is recognized to be 'a conversational filler'. It is filled by 'NF' every time he presents facts, he did himself, in his utterance: spending time in places like Belfast, seeing what divided communities are like, and seeing communities living completely separately; facts 'NF' supposes the interviewer to 'know', while he believes that the interviewer does not 'know'. This is a clear-cut confirmation that this chunk exists for nothing than a pragmatic intention.

'*What...are like*' is recognized here as a lexical chunk. Based on Boers and Lindstromberg's 'feature based identification procedure', this chunk is an 'open slot

frame' one. The 'slot' between 'what' and 'are like' is filled with 'divided communities': an adjective + a noun, so that this chunk does accept all kinds of this structure; with the fact that it does also accept 'nouns' alone, taking into account that we can make examples like: 'what mountains/villages/ etc. are like'. This chunk does accept 'a restricted variation' in that we can only change 'are' (a plural indicator) to 'is' (a singular indicator) in case the noun present in the slot is singular. Still, 'what' and 'like' are fixed and do not seem to accept any substitution or variation in this utterance.

Extract (3):

NF: what I'm saying is this: that if you go right back to 1950, I mean, let's take the 1990s, let's look at 1990-1997 until Labour got in, through that period of time net migration to Britain ran between 30,000 and 50,000 people a year.

Discussion:

Again, the chunk 'what I'm saying is' is repeated, and at the same position as it occurred in Extract (1), serving the same function with a slight variance in the 'verb' slot being used in the progressive form, together with the 'is' slot. The only difference here is that it does present a framework for another idea: the refusal of 'unskilled Labour to migrate to Britain'.

The lexical chunk 'I mean', is also noticed to be used frequently by 'NF' all over his speeches along the interview. Every time it appears it keeps the same syntactic form 'I + Mean', which means that this chunk is fixed and does not accept variants. It is not acceptable, for example, to use 'he/she/they mean(s)'. This chunk is nothing than a 'discourse marker' for many reasons, it is fixed in all times of use; it carries a pragmatic intention because the semantic meaning does not account for its occurrence; 'NF' does not 'mean' an exact point in his utterance, but rather it is used to mark two different sentences which are remarkably different: 'that if you go right back to 1950, I mean, let's take the 1990s' (a big move time 1950-1990s) 'means' something else.

The chunks 'let's take the' and 'let's look at' are notable in this utterance. It is like 'NF' is giving us a structure that can be used with some variants: 'let's + V + article/preposition'. It can be considered as a frequent chunk here, and many examples can be derived from it, for example: 'let's take a/an...'; 'let's look

on/above/over etc....’; ‘*let’s walk around*’, etc. However, what counts most is that the occurrence of this chunk is a pragmatic one; it is like an intention to consider those years as examples for comparing migrations to Britain up to the speaking moment of ‘NF’.

Another chunk that draws the researcher’s attention is ‘*run between + Number + and + Number*’. It is recognized as a continuum with fixed words ‘*run*’ (with tense variant), ‘*between*’ and ‘*and*’. This continuum contains open slot frames that can be filled by different numbers. It is said to be variable for this reason.

Extract (4):

NF: let me give you an example: last year, 27,000 people, skilled people, came to Britain from outside the European Union to take jobs in this country which were high-value jobs where they would not be a drain on our public services. That gives you an idea of, you know, roughly what the numbers are. What we’re talking about, and I think, you know, maybe we’re putting the cart before the horse here, in talking details of the Australian style points system,

Discussion:

The underlined lexical chunk ‘*let me give you an example*’ is introduced by the speaker to elaborate his following speech, this chunk is used as an institutionalized utterance which is functioning as a formula for social interaction and is used for allusion as a separate chunk. ‘NF’ does not really support a direct example as the semantic representation of this chunk reveals, but rather he implies that the following utterances are to be an answer to the question of the interviewer and therefore ‘NF’ is just interacting with him. In this regard, this chunk is canonical and invariable with a pragmatic function; we cannot say, for example, ‘*let me give you a pen*’ or ‘*let somebody gives you an example*’ in this utterance.

The next chunk, as thought to be, is ‘*skilled people*’. This chunk is uttered by the speaker as an emphasis to the kind of people he is talking about because the word ‘*people*’ is repeated in his utterance with an adjective, separated by commas. This repetition indicates that it is used as a conversational filler, with an idea that ‘no other kind of people’ migrated to Britain at that time except those ‘27,000 skilled people!’

The chunk ‘*be a drain on*’ can be realized as a fixed lexical item, and is considered as having an opaque meaning that does not accept any change in the constituent slots, the construction can appear like this: ‘*N + be a drain on + N*’. It seems that the

speaker uses this chunk somehow idiomatically to welcome the idea of accepting 'skilled people' to migrate to Britain.

The other recognized chunk is '*that gives you an idea of*'. It may be seen as follows: '*that + V (present simple) + pronoun + an idea of + something*', so that it appears as a continuum which has open slot frames with a restricted substitution. 'NF' uses this chunk as a discourse marker in a try to relate his previous utterance with the following one, and at the same time drawing the interviewer's attention to do so.

The chunk '*you know*' appears again with the same function of its occurrence in Extract (2). Similarly, the chunk '*roughly what the numbers are*' seems to correspond to the chunk '*what divided communities are like*' in the same Extract. The difference here is that '*roughly*' is added and '*like*' is eliminated, and 'a noun' alone is accepted; i.e., this chunk is seen like this: '*roughly what the Adj. + N/N are*', taking into account that it reflects the same function of '*what + Adj. are like*' in Extract (2).

The chunk '*what we're talking about*' seems to be a tool to give importance to the following idea of the speaker. It corresponds to the function of the chunks '*what I'm arguing for is*' and '*what I'm saying is*' mentioned in Extract (1). The chunks '*and I think*' and '*you know*' seem to exhibit the same function, and they are also conversational fillers here (cf. Extract 2).

The chunk '*putting the cart before the horse*' is semantically opaque with a fixed form, it is realized as a poly-word with an idiomatic meaning. It is nothing than an idiom 'NF' uses to describe his speech about 'talking details of the Australian style points system'; '*in talking details of*' is another realized chunk which seems to be invariable, it is fixed, and its function is intentional which may be seen as a referential (or message oriented function) in that the speech of 'NF' turned from 'that of migration to Britain' to 'Australian style points system' as a kind of a reference for difference.

Extract (5):

NF: we've been tied up with caps for five years, it has devalued the debate, what we're not actually addressing is the fact that 624,000 people settled in Britain last year and that we have no control over the numbers that settle this year or next year, I mean, let's be honest, we cannot have any debate about immigration about numbers, all the while we're members of the European Union and that, I hope, is what's going to get discussed tonight.

Discussion:

Several lexical chunks are also realized in this Extract. To start with, *'tied up with caps for'* is realized as an idiom with an opaque semantic meaning. It seems to be a fixed idiom which is invented by 'NF' at the moment of his speech to indicate an intention as a matter of dissatisfaction with reference to the persons (may be politicians) who wear 'caps', as it appears, this dissatisfaction lasted for a long time. However, though the researcher admits that this is a fixed lexical chunk with no variants, but this may only applies to 'NF' at that moment. It is thought that this lexical chunk can be used in another utterance in a different situation with a restricted variance, i.e., it can be viewed to have this structure: *'tied up with + NP + for + Time'*.

The chunk *'what we're not actually addressing is'* appears to have the same function as that correspondent chunk in Extract (1), with some variants in the slots and the fixation of 'what'. The chunk *'and that'* recorded a frequency of two times use in this utterance. This chunk is used at the first time as a discourse marker which is clearly used with an intention to join the preceded idea of 'NF' with the following one. The second occurrence of *'and that'* in the same utterance can be regarded as a poly-word with a function of shifting the topic 'NF' was talking about before he used this chunk.

Another identified chunk is *'control over'* which seems to be canonical with a transparent semantic meaning. Following Boers and Lindstromberg's 'function based identification' procedure, we can resume that this chunk is a continuum which allows for restricted substitution with 'over' being fixed and the substitution goes with 'control', for example, *'speaking over'*.

The next chunk is *'I mean'* which allows us to record another frequency of occurrence that corresponds to the same chunk in Extract (3) with the same function and form without any variables.

The chunk *'let's be honest'* is noticed to function as a discourse organizer where 'NF' reorganizes his utterance from giving evidences for his immigration refusal to the fact that he 'cannot have any debate about immigration about numbers' because he is a 'members of the European Union'.

The chunk *'all the while'* is realized as an institutional utterance since it seems to be used as a formula for social interaction. It is canonical and fixed in terms of its

specific occurrence in this utterance. 'NF' prefers to use this form to express the time of his engagement with the immigration issue, other than using, for example, 'most of the time'.

The last chunk appears in this utterance is '*is what's going to get*'. This chunk corresponds to the 'what' chunks appear in the previous Extracts, with the 'is' forwarded to the beginning. What is obvious here is that '*going to get*' itself represents a chunk with a transparent semantic meaning. It is used here as an allusion, where 'NF' concentrates on that 'night discussion'. He could, for example, use 'what will be discussed...', but it seems to be less effective to point to the importance of that discussion that night.

5. Findings and Discussions

Based on the previous discussion of the Extracts, many findings can be drawn. It is found that the speaker uses lexical chunks nearly along the whole utterance he produces as a response to the questions submitted by the interviewer Mishal Husain. Utterances of 'NF' in the whole transcript appear to contain at least two lexical chunks for each response. This is an indication that the normal occurrence of lexical chunks is within natural situations.

The previous analysis of the Extracts reveals that 'NF' style of using his native language affects the construction of the chunks identified. For example, his style in using the 'what' chunks along the five Extracts analyzed evokes a premise that lexical chunks are self-invented: '*what I said was*'; '*what I'm arguing for is*'; '*what I'm saying is*'; '*what I said was*'; '*what...are like*'; '*roughly what the Adj.+ N/N are*'; '*what we're talking about*'; '*what we're not actually addressing is*'; and '*is what's going to get*'. Other chunks of this self-invented type are those which are used idiomatically by 'NF' such as: '*putting the cart before the horse*' and '*tied up with caps for*'. This type is very useful in obtaining lexical chunks for learning processes because what appear in 'NF' speeches absolutely appear differently in other speeches of other speakers, and hence we can get a great amount of lexical chunks.

It is also found that all lexical chunks in the data analyzed are used with an intention on the part of the speaker. The existence of those chunks indicates that they are used for communicative purposes; they are all existed to fulfill 'NF' needs in a try

to convey his intention to the interviewer. This result indicates that lexical chunks are pragmatic components in nature.

Lexical chunks can be described as having a general characteristic that they are vague outside the utterances where they exist. Their occurrence cannot be counted without looking backwards and forwards to see what utterances are surrounding them, and hence concluding some remarks regarding their meaning and the purpose why they are there. This is not to be followed as a procedure for their identification. Their identification really requires an approach.

Below is a table for all the chunks used in the whole Extracts analyzed (given that they are determined frequent, variable and interrupted in terms of their occurrence in ‘NF’ speech):

Frequent: those which occur more than one time with restricted and non-restricted substitution.

Variable: those which allow for restricted and non-restricted substitution.

Interrupted: those which are not continuous.

Extract No.	Lexical Chunks Used	Frequent	Variable	Interrupted
1	<i>what I said was</i>	+	+	-
	<i>I want us to live</i>	+	-	-
	<i>and in fact</i>	+	-	-
	<i>I say this line very clearly</i>	-	+	-
	<i>I want us to live</i>	+	-	-
2	<i>you know</i>	+	-	-
	<i>what divided ... are like</i>	+	+	+
	<i>you know</i>	+	-	-
	<i>you know</i>	+	-	-
3	<i>what I'm saying is</i>	+	+	-
	<i>I mean</i>	+	-	-
	<i>let's take the...</i>	+	+	-
	<i>let's look at...</i>	+	+	-
	<i>ran between ... and ...</i>	-	+	+
4	<i>let me give you an example</i>	+	-	-
	<i>skilled people</i>	-	+	-
	<i>be a drain on</i>	-	-	-
	<i>That gives you an idea of</i>	-	+	-
	<i>you know</i>	+	-	-
	<i>roughly what the numbers are</i>	+	+	-
	<i>What we're talking about</i>	+	+	-
	<i>and I think</i>	+	-	-
	<i>you know</i>	+	-	-

	<i>putting the cart before the horse here in talking details of</i>	- -	- -	- -
5	<i>tied up with caps for what we're not actually addressing is and that control over I mean let's be honest all the while and that is what's going to get</i>	- + + + + - + +	- + - + - - - +	- - - - - - - -

6. General Conclusions

The researcher comes up with the following important conclusions based on both the theoretical and the practical parts:

1. Lexical chunks are proved to be continuums of multi-words composed together in a way to give (or invent) a chunk of a pragmatic function. Solo-words do not maintain this function, and anyone can resort to the dictionary to select the meaning of a single word he/she needs.
2. Identifying lexical chunks is not that easy job, to do so one should follow a working procedure such as that followed in this study. In most cases, lexical chunks appear to be tied with the utterances where they exist. Their form and function are usually difficult to be recognized, but (for example) knowing that there are 'open slot frame' chunks would let you decide the chunk on the basis that there are in-between words which are not part of the chunk.
3. Normal situations (such as the online interview analyzed) is the best environment for the creation of lexical chunks. The transcription of them is very useful and time saver. Therefore L2 learners can (in most of the cases) resort to them to identify lexical chunks beneficial for their proficiency to reach a level of production similar to that of L1 native speakers.
4. In the identification of lexical chunks, there will appear many different structures (fixed, variable and interrupted). Fixed chunks are to be memorized, and chunks with a variable characteristic can be used later with different words that satisfy the interaction needs, for example, instead of using 'to be honest' by 'NF', a

speaker can use 'to be clear' in a similar situation; and interrupted chunks provide a strategy to control a good range of sentences.

References

- Biber, Douglas, and Reppen, Randi. (2015). *The Cambridge handbook of English corpus linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boers, Frank, and Lindstromberg, Seth. (2009). *Optimizing a lexical approach to instructed second language acquisition*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Castro, S., Chiluisa, M., Tandalla, E., & Gonzalez, L. (2018). *Lexical Chunks for Promoting Explicit Learning Vocabulary*. 3Ciencias.
- Kasper, G., Nguyen, H., & Yoshimi, D. R. (2010). *Pragmatics and Language Learning*: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Miller, J. (2017). "Teaching Vocabulary Chunk by Chunk". Retrieved 7 June 2019, <http://www.efltasks.org/file/lexical>, pp. 102-104.
- Nattinger, James R. and DeCarrico, Jeanette S. (1992). *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*. Oxford England; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Peñamaría, S. S. R., and Martínez, R. D. (2008). *Didactic Approaches for Teachers of English in an International Context*: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Petrovska, Irina (2012): "Teaching Lexical Patterns in English and Macedonian Tourism Discourse". *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 44, pp. 228-235.
- Richards, Jack C. and Rodgers, Theodore S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Timmis, Ivor (2015). *Corpus Linguistics for ELT: Research and Practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Romero-Trillo, J. (2013). *Yearbook of Corpus Linguistics and Pragmatics 2013: New Empirical and Theoretical Paradigms*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Appendix

Transcript of BBC Radio 4, Today, 2nd April 2015, Interview with Nigel Farage, 8.10 am (available at: <http://news-watch.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/040215-Radio-4-Today-2nd-April-Interview-with-Nigel-Farage-8.10am1.pdf>)