



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles

Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, Abbas Monfared, Mohammad Sarfejoo

Abstract

The study of lexical bundles, among types of text analysis, is gaining importance over the others in the last century. This type of study categorically might fit into the field of the ESP. This study takes a frequency-based analysis approach to the use of lexical bundles. Three aspects of structure, form, and function of lexical bundles are investigated in Discussion section of 60 political science articles, with corpora around 253,063 words. This study makes its data pool out of scholarly articles from accredited journals in political science. One part of data pool is made up of 30 articles written by American native speakers. The second half of data comprises the 30 articles written by Iranian scholars in political science. The findings showed that native speaking and Persian speaking writers employed the same forms of lexical bundles, and there are significant differences between the native and functions. Drawing on the findings of this study, syllabus designers would review the possibility of the insertion of lexical bundles into the syllabus design, and the development of materials. It can also be useful for the improvement of the second language writing strategies, for those who want to write in academic contexts in general and political contexts in particular including graduate and post-graduate students developing their Master's theses, doctoral dissertations, or other related types of academic writing.



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

Introduction

Realm of applied linguistic studies over the last 20 years has been replete with pieces of work on discursal attributes of texts which directly or indirectly might feed into the field of ESP (e.g. Grabe & Kaplan, 1999; cited in Biber, Conrad & Cortes, 2004). Those which purposively made use of corpus data provided a relatively tenable ground for the recognition of lexical chunks (Altenberg, 1998; Wray, 2002; cited in Chen & Baker, 2010).

Different approaches and criteria have been adopted to capture the complex nature and stress the importance of these lexical units (Biber. et al, 2004). To briefly mention, Research goals, formal characteristics, text samples and comparatives of register which is Central to discourse analysis can be included. Furthermore, study of lexical units is gaining prominence over other types of discourse analyses (Barber, 1962; Ewer & Huges-Davies, 1971; Dudley-Evans & ST John, 1988). Despite number of studies to demonstrate the importance of multi-word units, surprisingly there is little consensus on the defining characteristics to describe, methodologies to identify, and even justifications to call them (Biber. et. al, 2004). Therefore, no single approach can thoroughly capture the whole.

As mentioned earlier, the results of these studies can categorically or implicationally influence ESP in general and EAP in particular (Byrd & Coxhead, 2010). ESP is mainly focused on language in context, rather than on teaching grammar and language mechanics (Fiorito, 2012). Writing academically in a particular field entails knowledge of the field one is intended to write in, and sensitivity to conventions on which the discourse community is hinged if one is likely to manipulate the available linguistic items to gain any rhetorical effects they favor.



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo
Research Questions

Given the lack of consensus on what should be done to see the behavior of lexical bundles; one should study these units from a different prospective. Moreover, form, structure and function are of much interest to this study. To these ends, this study was to investigate if Persian speaking writers use lexical bundles in the same sequence, frequency, and function as native speakers normally do in one specific section of Discussion section of Political Science (DPS) articles, and provide answers with the following questions:

1. Do Persian speaking writers use lexical bundles in similar sequential patterns (Form) in DPS articles as NSs do?
2. Do Persian speaking writers use lexical bundles as frequently as NSs do in DPS articles?
3. Do Persian speaking writers use lexical bundles in more different parts of speech (structure) as NSs do in DPS articles?
4. Do Persian speaking writers use lexical bundles for similar Functions as NSs do in DPS articles?

Research Hypotheses

Following the research questions mentioned, this study is conducted against following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference between forms of lexical bundles used by Persian speaking writers and NSs in DPS articles.
2. There is no significant difference between frequencies of lexical bundles used by Persian speaking writers and NSs in DPS articles.



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

3. There is no significant difference between structures of lexical bundles used by Persian speaking writers and NSs in DPS articles.

4. There is no significant difference between functions of lexical bundles used by Persian speaking writers and NSs in DPS articles.

Review of Literature

The Study of Word Combinations

The study of fixed expressions - multi-word expressions - has long been of much interest to the researchers. Different researchers seemingly opted for their own rubrics to name these expressions, among which ‘lexical phrases’, ‘formulas’, ‘routines’, ‘fixed expressions’, ‘prefabricated patterns’, and ‘lexical bundles’ are more frequently used (Biber. et al, 2004, p. 372).

These fixed expressions (Moon, 1998) are likely to define a sort of threshold level to distinguish native speakers from non-native ones as Haswell (1991, p. 236; cited in Hyland, 2008a) puts it “the absence of such clusters might reveal the lack of fluency of a novice or newcomers to that community”. The more frequently they are likely to make use of lexical phrases; they are more straightforward to signal competent language use within a register (Cortes, 2004). In fact, expert user’s preferences for certain sequences of words over others entail a kind of sensitivity for a novice or a newcomer to gain control of a new register (Hyland, 2008). Furthermore, most of these expressions can be formulated since as much as 80% of natural language could be patterned in this way (Altenberg, 1998). Or elsewhere it is argued that “most everyday words do not have an independent meaning, or meanings, but are components of a rich repertoire of multi-word patterns that make up a text” (Sinclair, 1991, p. 108; cited in Hyland, 2008a). Pawley and Syder (1983) also stressed the importance of fixed phrases and



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

accounted for the particular discourse functions they perform, which are believed to play an important role in fluent linguistic production, particularly in spoken language. Moreover, it is possibly linked to some degree of maturity in production as writers rely more and more on collocations and the less use of them may be typical behavior of apprentice writers when they are flourishing (Haswell, 1991, p. 236; cited in Cortes, 2004). Interestingly, there are researchers who believe that pragmatic use of a word to contribute to a sense of coherence can also be included in the application of these patterns; therefore, lexical phrases can include one word to many words (Byrd & Coxhead, 2010).

Form and Structure

Although some scholars like to opt for their own coined terms when talking about the morphological aspects of lexical bundles, one is more and more likely to observe the use of form and structure rubrics more than others. However, diversity in the use of alternative terms for lexical bundles might demonstrate some degree of terminological confusion. Clusters, recurrent word combinations, lexical phrases, phrasicon, n-grams, bundles, and recurrent word strings are interchangeably used by researchers in this line of study (Chen & Baker, 2008).

Drawing on the work of Biber and colleagues (1999), most studies on the recurrent word combinations use the structural classification of lexical bundles in the Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English (Biber et al., 1999). They proposed fourteen categories of lexical bundles for conversation, and twelve categories for academic prose; however, overlaps exist across categories. Chen and Baker (2010) distinguished three broad structural categories of “NP-based,” “PP-based,” and “VP-based,” the NP-based being any noun phrases with post-modifier fragments such as the purpose of, the PP-based being those starting with preposition plus a noun-phrase fragment such as within the scope of, and VP-based being any combinations with a verb component such as have/ has to do with. Biber et al (2004) stressed that most lexical bundles do



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

not appear as a complete structural unit; instead they bridge two structural units although the way they bridge among discourse contexts, genres, and registers is different; Pervasiveness of use of lexical bundles admittedly documented in different studies (Biber & Barbieri, 2007; Wray, 2000; Wray & Perkins, 2000). Most bundles in academic writing are parts of noun or prepositional phrases (Hyland, 2008a). He also pointed out the noun phrase with of-phrase fragment is the most common structure in academic genres as Byrd and Coxhead (2010) noticed also that academic prose is considered to be 'noun-centric'. They; moreover, admitted the coincidence of findings with Hyland (2008b) in that passive bundles are characteristic feature of science discipline. Besides, Chen and Baker (2010) made notice of the different structural property of lexical bundles between conversations and the academic prose, the former being clausal and the latter being phrasal.

Biber et al (2004) identified three major structural types of lexical bundles. Type 1 includes bundles incorporating verb phrase fragments (e.g., it's going to be).

Table 1: partial adaptation from Structural types of lexical bundles (Biber et al., 2004)

Lexical bundles that incorporate verb phrase fragments

1a. (connector +) 1st/2nd person pronoun + VP fragment:

e.g., you don't have to, I'm not going to, and well I don't know

1b. (connector +) 3rd person pronoun + VP fragment:

e.g., it's going to be, that's one of the, and this is a

1c. discourse marker + VP fragment:

e.g., I mean you know, you know it was, I mean I don't

1d. verb phrase with active verb:

e.g., is going to be, is one of the, have a lot of, take a look at

1e. Verb phrase with passive verb:



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

e.g., is based on the, can be used to, shown in figure N

1f. yes-no question fragments:

e.g., are you going to, do you want to, does that make sense

1g. WH-question fragments:

e.g., what do you think, how many of you, what does that mean

Type 2 includes bundles which make use of dependent clause fragments in addition to simple verb fragments (e.g., I want you to).

Table 2: partial adaptation from Structural types of lexical bundles (Biber et al., 2004)

Lexical bundles that incorporate dependent clause fragments

2a. 1st/2nd person pronoun + dependent clause fragment:

e.g., I want you to; I don't know if, you might want to

2b. WH-clause fragments:

e.g., what I want to, what's going to happen, when we get to

2c. If-clause fragments:

e.g., if you want to, if you have a, if we look at

2d. (verb/adjective+) to-clause fragment:

e.g., to be able to, to come up with, and want to do is

2e. That-clause fragments:

E.g. that there is a, that I want to, that this is a

Type 3 includes bundles which are phrasal in structure like prepositional phrases (e.g., the end of the).



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

Table 3: partial adaptation from Structural types of lexical bundles (Biber et al., 2004)

Lexical bundles that incorporate noun phrase and prepositional phrase fragments

3a. (connector +) Noun phrase with of-phrase fragment:

e.g., one of the things, the end of the, a little bit of

3b. Noun phrase with other post-modifier fragment:

e.g., a little bit about, those of you who, the way in which

3c. other noun phrase expressions:

e.g., a little bit more or something like that

3d. Prepositional phrase expressions:

e.g., of the things that, at the end of, at the same time

3e. Comparative expressions:

e.g., as far as the, greater than or equal, as well as the

Under the rubric of form, researchers attempt to define bundles in terms of the length of bundle unit. How many words should be set as one bundle unit when in most cases bundles with a shorter length are subsumed under the longer ones? In order for a corpora to be manageable, for a researcher to avoid idiosyncrasies, and for a concordance tool to have precise checks, most researchers (Biber et al., 1999a; Biber et al., 2004; Cortes, 2004; Hyland, 2008a; and Chen & Baker, 2010) acquiesced on the form of one lexical bundle unit to be a four-word unit.

Function

Studies have already been done viewed and analyzed bundles by taking two criteria primarily including structure and function (i.e., Biber et al., 1999; Biber et al., 2004, Cortes, 2004; Hyland, 2004; Hyland, 2008; Biber & Barbieri, 2007; Eisenmann, Wagner & Cortes, 2008; Chen & Baker, 2010). Some key features are attributed to the occurrence of lexical bundles functionally including that they usually have identifiable discourse functions, relating to



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

stance, discourse organization, or referential framing; and they are considerably more common in spoken discourse than written discourse since interlocutors are supposed to meet the requirements of one discourse situation through performing different kinds of functions; not necessarily in simultaneity (Biber et al. 1999).

Functions of lexical bundles

Classic Model:

Having been covered larger corpora including casual conversation, textbooks, course packs, service encounters, institutional texts, and so on, Biber's taxonomy (2004) is the model most researchers are likely to hinge to. In his taxonomy, he distinguished three major categories: stance expressions, discourse organizers, and referential expressions.

1. Stance expressions

Stance expressions provide a frame for the writer to interpret following proposition in order to translate two kinds of meaning including epistemic and attitude/ modality. It also should be noted that stance bundles can be either personal or impersonal (e.g., and I don't know, are more likely to).

2. Discourse organizers

Speakers and writers to introduce a topic or focus on a topic, and to elaborate or clarify make use of discourse organizing bundles.

3. Referential bundles

This category involves identification of entities or single-out of some attributes of an entity to have importance comparing the other entities or other attributes of an entity (e.g., is one of the,



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

a lot of the). This category shares into four subcategories of identification/ focus, imprecision indicators, specification of attributes, and time/ place/ text reference.

II. Alternative models

Taking an inductive approach, Hyland (2008) modified the classic taxonomy to group bundles, the one conforming to post-modern criteria introduced by Kumaravadivelu (2001) in that it is less precise and welcomes varieties. He defined three broad categories of research-oriented, text-oriented, and participant-oriented.

Byrd and Coxhead (2010) made attempts to cool off the seemingly terminological confusion by defining bundles in three broad categories of presentation of content, organization of discourse/ text, and expressions of attitudes. They did not arrive at a thorough analysis of bundles and they made a case for it in that limiting the analysis is an attempt to provide a system that teachers might find more directly applicable to teaching EAP.

Structural and functional categories relationship

No matter what structure involves in the formation of one bundle unit, numbers of functions are to be carried out within one unit (Biber & Conrad, 2006). Along with the claim that most academic functions are to be performed in the form of bundles with nouns and prepositional phrases (Hyland, 2008a), he noticed the variety of use of bundles in electrical engineering other disciplines with 213 4-word strings occurring 20 times per million words whereas biology had the smallest range of use. Also, specialized readership, i.e., speaking to narrow members of discourse community makes it peculiar for writers to use bundles unlikely of other disciplines.

Stance bundles are mostly made of dependent clause fragments, and referential bundles are composed of noun phrase or prepositional phrase fragments; interestingly, discourse organizing bundles can almost make use of all three structural categories (Biber et al., 2004).



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

The above examples demonstrate the direct relationship between structural categories and discourse functions. Some discourse functions are characteristic attributes of a special discipline, but expressed in different structures overlapping across disciplines (Cortes, 2004).

Operationalization of Lexical Bundles

To operationalize any variables, one should be attentive to the response of two basic questions of how a variable is defined, and How a variable is measured (Brown, 2003). To operationalize generation of lexical bundles, first researchers defined lexical bundles, admittedly, richly (e.g., Biber et al. 1999; Hyland, 2008; Cortes, 2004). To define one unit of lexical bundle, characteristic attributes should be taken into account.

The first criterion to heed is cut-off frequency, which specifies how many bundle units should be included for the further analysis (Chen & Baker, 2010). The normally confirmed frequency threshold for large written corpora goes from 20 to 40 per million words (e.g., Biber et al. 2004; Cortes, 2004) although some believe that setting frequency threshold to 20 times per million words is to be conservative (Hyland, 2008a). Chen and Baker (2010) set the frequency and distribution threshold to 4-word bundles occurring 25 times per million words across at least three texts. She believes that standardized frequency should be translated into raw frequency since standardized frequency loses 'expected impartiality'. The second criterion to heed is recognition of a bundle unit cross-textually. One unit of lexical bundle has to occur in different texts in at least 3-5 texts (Biber et al., 1999; Biber et al., 2004; Cortes, 2004; Chen & Baker, 2010) or at least in 10% of texts to avoid idiosyncrasies from individual writers/ speakers (Hyland, 2008a). Final criterion backs to length of the recurrent word strings ranging from 2 to 6 word units (e.g., Barber & Barbieri, 2007). Taking into account these criteria, one should define one unit of lexical bundle as a unit of word strings approximately from 2 to 6 word units which is to occur 20 times per million words across at least 3 contexts or 10% of texts.



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo
Method

Corpus of the study

This study makes its data pool out of scholarly articles from accredited journals in political science. One part of data pool is made up of 30 articles written by American native speakers, most articles come from American Journal of Political Science and American Political Science Review. The second half of data comprising the 30 articles written by Iranian scholars in political science mostly came from International Studies Quarterly and Middle East studies. In table 4, distribution of articles across the source journals is displayed.

Table 4: Corpora with respect to journal selection

Corpus	Journal	No. of articles
Native speaking writers	American Journal of Political Science	24
	American Political Science Review	4
	The Journal of Politics	2
Persian speaking writers	Middle East Studies	17
	International Studies Quarterly	6
	Third World Quarterly	2
	Asian Survey	3
	Political Research Quarterly	2
Total		60

Since this study used discussion section of papers, the accessibility of modifiable texts was a concern. Most articles officially published do not permit manipulation of texts; therefore, it was necessary to make use of Google OCR in order to recognize texts and render them modifiable. In Table 5, the number of articles, considering the nativity variable in Corpora is displayed.

Table 5: Corpora with respect to nativity



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

Corpus	No. of texts	No. of words
Native speaking writers	30	128,452
Persian speaking writers	30	124,611
<hr/>		
Total	60	253.063

Identification of Lexical Bundles

To identify lexical bundles as other rubrics of “recurrent word units”, the recurrent instances of a unit should be taken into account in order to arrive at the certainty to call one unit as lexical bundle (Biber et al, 2004). To identify the lexical clusters and to arrive at the frequency of each unit, each corpus was submitted to the corpus software AntConc in order to generate the lexical bundles. AntConc is a software application, which has been gone under regular revisions, and its latest version of this software is available for free for any OSs if one is going to use it. The new edition of the software offers new features which make it responsive to the variety of corpus-based analyses.

Results and Discussion

The purposes of this study included a description of lexical bundles in terms of form, structure, and function, identification of these factors, and comparison of the use of lexical bundles in one specific section of a particular genre taking a frequency-based approach. Lexical units were identified, and lists of lexical bundles were generated following the factors mentioned.



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo
Generating lexical bundles

After the corpus has been processed, the software yielded lexical bundle units from the most frequent to the least frequent. Native speaking writers' corpus submitted 178 lexical clusters out of 128,452 words, and Persian speaking writers' corpus submitted 132 lexical clusters out of 124,611 words. Table 6 shows the distribution of lexical bundles in native speaking writers' corpus.



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

Table 6: Distribution of lexical bundles native speaking writers' corpus

N	Freq	Lexical Bundles	N	Freq	Lexical Bundles	N	Freq	Lexical Bundles
---	------	-----------------	---	------	-----------------	---	------	-----------------



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

13	the nature of the	61	4	annual meeting of the	120	3	extent to which a	
2	12	at the same time	62	4	are likely to be	121	3	for a number of
3	12	in the case of	63	4	as in the case	122	3	for a variety of
4	11	in the united states	64	4	at one point in	123	3	for many of the
5	11	on the basis of	65	4	be thought of as	124	3	for their helpful comments
6	10	as well as the	66	4	but it is not	125	3	has no effect on
7	10	in terms of the	67	4	by far the most	126	3	i am grateful to
8	10	in the context of	68	4	can be used to	127	3	in any of the
9	10	the extent to which	69	4	each of the three	128	3	in each of the
10	9	a large number of	70	4	for the most part	129	3	in order to win
11	9	on the other hand	71	4	important to note that	130	3	in the area of
12	8	are more likely to	72	4	in a series of	131	3	in the house of
13	8	as a function of	73	4	in addition to the	132	3	in the last column
14	8	fit of the model	74	4	in the face of	133	3	in the next section
15	8	it is important to	75	4	in the first row	134	3	in the previous section
16	8	the size of the	76	4	in the number of	135	3	in the second column
17	7	a special case of	77	4	in the set of	136	3	in the u s
18	7	department of political science	78	4	in this case the	137	3	in this paper we
19	7	for a discussion of	79	4	is assumed to be	138	3	is equal to the
20	7	it is useful to	80	4	it is difficult to	139	3	is important to note
21	7	one of the most	81	4	levels of political information	140	3	is not the case
22	7	the degree to which	82	4	may be interpreted as	141	3	is proportional to the
23	7	the magnitude of the	83	4	more likely to be	142	3	it is also possible
24	7	to the extent that	84	4	of political science vol	143	3	it is possible that
25	6	in the presence of	85	4	of the impact of	144	3	last column of table
26	6	of the dependent variable	86	4	of the relationship between	145	3	of a set of
27	6	the assumption that the	87	4	one point in time	146	3	of the house of
28	6	the effect of a	88	4	our discussion of the	147	3	of the independent variables
29	6	the end of the	89	4	political science vol no	148	3	of the most important
30	6	the impact of the	90	4	that the effects of	149	3	of the national election



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

31 6 the study of political	91 4 the core of the	150 3 of the paper is
32 6 to the study of	92 4 the effect of the	151 3 of the public s
33 6 we would like to	93 4 the importance of the	152 3 of the university of
34 5 a great deal of	94 4 the increase in the	153 3 of this paper is
35 5 american journal of political	95 4 the results for the	154 3 on the one hand
36 5 are presented in table	96 4 the ways in which	155 3 one of the best
37 5 can be thought of	97 4 to the problem of	156 3 or to put it
38 5 for each of the	98 4 to the use of	157 3 ordinary least squares of
39 5 in the form of	99 4 we do not have	158 3 political science university
40 5 in the sense that	100 4 with a discussion of	of
41 5 in this section we	101 3 a large proportion of	159 3 presented at the annual
42 5 is one of the	102 3 a number of reasons	160 3 should come as no
43 5 journal of political science	103 3 a time varying covariate	161 3 since there is no
44 5 of california los angeles	104 3 also more likely to	162 3 state university of new
45 5 of the number of	105 3 and there is no	163 3 statistically significant at
46 5 professor of political	106 3 are based on the	the
science	107 3 as a consequence of	164 3 take into account the
47 5 the baseline hazard function	108 3 as a result of	165 3 that it can be
48 5 the case of the	109 3 as a set of	166 3 that the number of
49 5 the discussion of the	110 3 as can be seen	167 3 the annual meeting of
50 5 the effects of the	111 3 as the number of	168 3 the basis of this
51 5 the fit of the	112 3 as well as to	169 3 the coefficient for the
52 5 the house of representatives	113 3 at the annual meeting	170 3 the context of a
53 5 the strength of the	114 3 at the end of	171 3 the distribution of the
54 5 through the use of	115 3 be interpreted as the	172 3 the fact that the
55 5 university of california los	116 3 but there is no	173 3 the first is that
56 5 we find that the	117 3 by the university of	174 3 the goal is to
57 4 a change in the	118 3 can be expressed as	175 3 the last column of
58 4 a discussion of the	119 3 estimates are presented in	176 3 the limiting case of
59 4 a function of the		177 3 the presence of a
		178 3 the problem is that



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

Table 7 shows the distribution of lexical bundles in Persian speaking writers' corpus.

Table 7: Distribution of lexical bundles in Persian speaking writers' corpus

N	Freq	Lexical Bundles	N	Freq	Lexical Bundles	N	Freq	Lexical Bundles
1	24	in the middle east	45	5	as one of the	90	4	one of the most
2	16	on the other hand	46	5	as well as a	91	4	parts of the world
3	15	the council of guardians	47	5	at the end of	92	4	paved the way for
4	15	the end of the	48	5	in post revolutionary iran	93	4	the collapse of the
5	14	as well as the	49	5	is no doubt that	94	4	the idea of a
6	14	at the same time	50	5	of the armed forces	95	4	the one hand it
7	10	as a result of	52	5	of the armed forces	96	4	the power of the
8	10	of the constitutional revolution	53	5	of the islamic republic	97	4	the private sector in
9	10	the constitutional revolution of	54	5	of the middle east	98	4	the relationship between the
10	10	the fact that the	55	5	of the post revolutionary	99	4	the rest of the
11	9	in the price of	56	5	on the part of	100	4	the same way as
12	9	islamic republic of iran	57	5	the aim of this	101	4	the time of the
13	8	at the time of	58	5	the destruction of the	102	4	to percent of the
14	8	of the private sector	59	5	the outcome of the	103	4	united states and the
15	8	of the regime s	60	5	the political economy of	104	4	vis a vis the
16	8	on the one hand	61	5	the shah and the	105	4	year war with iraq
17	8	the role of the	62	5	the study of the	105	4	year war with iraq
18	7	in the third world	63	5	the united states has	106	3	about the nature of
19	7	of the country side	64	5	was one of the	107	3	an increasing number of
20	7	per cent of the	65	5	would have to be	108	3	as far as the
21	7	the impact of the	66	5	a great deal of	109	3	at the expense of
22	7	the iran iraq war	67	5	a result of the	110	3	be described as the
23	7	the islamic republic of	68	5	and on the other	111	3	been one of the
24	7	the middle east and	69	4	and the private sector	112	3	between iran and the
25	7	the united states and	70	4	and the united states	113	3	between the united states
26	6	in the case of	71	4	as a result the	114	3	for the first time
27	6	no more than a	72	4	as well as in	115	3	from the perspective of
28	6	percent of the total	73	4	be attributed to the	116	3	half of the twentieth
29	6	the price of oil	74	4	by a group of	117	3	in favour of the



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

30 6	to the extent that	75 4	by the council of	118 3	in opposition to the
31 5	bear in mind that	76 4	be described as	119 3	in terms of the
32 5	in a number of	77 4	eight year war with	120 3	in the aftermath of
33 5	in the absence of	78 4	first half of the	121 3	in the annals of
34 5	in the course of	79 4	in addition to the	122 3	in the face of
35 5	in the midst of	80 4	the bazaar and	123 3	in the name of
36 5	of the state in	81 4	in the country s	124 3	in the nature of
37 5	one of the main	82 4	in the form of	125 3	in the pages of
38 5	the case of iran	83 4	in the islamic republic	126 3	in the works of
39 5	the course of the	84 4	iran iraq war and	127 3	iran and the united
40 5	the emergence of a	85 4	is based on the	128 3	it was in the
41 5	the fall of the	86 4	it is clear that	129 3	more than a few
42 5	the ranks of the	87 4	of the nineteenth century	130 3	of religion and state
43 5	the state and the	88 4	of the twentieth century	131 3	of the iranian revolution
44 5	there is no doubt	89 4	on the basis of	132 3	of the revolution the



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo
Results for the Use of Lexical Bundles (Frequency)

After lists of bundles were generated, Chi-square analysis was run, the cells were identified, the frequency of use for each was calculated, the expected values were set, and the residual of these bundles were presented. Table 8 shows the frequency of use in lexical bundles as the observed number, the expected number and the standard frequency which is realized as residual.

Table 8: Frequencies, Expected values and Residuals for Lexical Bundles as Frequency

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Native	178	155.0	22.0
Iranian	132	155.0	-22.0
Total	310		

Table 9 shows the results of Chi-square analysis indicating no significant difference between the two groups' use of lexical bundles in terms of frequency (Chi-square = 3.22, $P = .073 > .05$). Therefore, the first null-hypothesis as Iranian EFL learners do not use lexical bundles as frequently as NSs do in DPS articles is supported.

Table 9: Chi-square Lexical Bundles as Frequency

	Frequency
Chi-Square	3.224a*
D.F.	1
*Asymp. Sig.	.073



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 201.0.

*Asymp stands for asymptotic, i.e. non-exact or approximate significance.

Results for the use of lexical bundles (Form)

Some prior studies showed that the most dependable form for lexical chunks to be recognized as one lexical unit is made of four words, and longer stretches or shorter stretches of any lexical bundle neither contribute to a novel stretch, nor capture the core constituents of one lexical unit, removing necessary parts (Hyland, 2008; Chen & Baker, 2010). In other words, if one unit of lexical bundle is shorter than its standard form, it might have some missing parts, which are normally the core constituents. For example, “as can be seen” altering into “can be seen”, which does not have “as”, cannot be a bundle and instead is called a verb phrase. Besides, longer bundles exceeding its standard form, predictably would permit for the insertion of other word classes which might not be the actual part, for instance, “as can be seen” altering into “as can be seen a” an article which is not the core part of this bundle since it can be replaced by another article depending on the word follows.

Capitulating prior findings, an analysis of Chi-square was run to probe whether Persian and native speaking writers use lexical bundles in similar sequential patterns in DPS articles. Table 10 displays the frequencies, percentages and standardized residuals of the lexical bundles in terms of their form in the articles written by Persian and native speaking writers. Since none of the standardized residuals are beyond the range of +/- 1.96, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between Persian and native speaking writers’ use of lexical bundles in terms of their sequential patterns in DPS articles.



Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

Table 10: Lexical Bundles Frequencies, Percentages and Residuals (Form)

	Form	
NATIVE	Count	178
PERSIAN	Count	132
Total	Count	310

The Chi-square value of zero – after correcting for a two-by-two Chi-square table – further indicates that the minor differences between Persian and native speakers' use of lexical bundles in terms of their sequential patterns in DPS articles are not statistically significant (Chi-Square (1) = 0, $P = 1 > .05$). Based on these results, it can be concluded that the second null-hypothesis as Persian speaking writers do not use lexical bundles in similar sequential patterns in DPS articles as NSs do is supported. Table 11 shows the cells for the Chi-square analysis.

Table 11: Chi-square Cells for the Recognition of Lexical Bundles With Respect to Form

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Continuity Correction	.000	1	1.000
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.76.			
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table			



Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo
Results for the use of lexical bundles (Structure)

Following three major structural categories proposed by Biber et al. (2004), the generated lexical units were analyzed to see if they fit into either category. The first type of structure in lexical bundle includes fragments incorporating verbs such as “you don’t have to”. The second type includes fragments incorporating dependent clauses such as “I want you to”, and the last category includes fragments incorporating noun phrases and prepositional phrases such as “a little bit about”.

To observe statistical significance, Chi-square was run to probe whether Persian speaking writers use lexical bundles in different parts of speech (structures) in DPS articles more than native speaking writers do. Table 12 displays the frequencies, percentages and standardized residuals of the lexical bundles in terms of their structure by native and Persian speakers. The native speakers used the first (Std. Residual = 1.9) and second (Std. Residual = 1.6) categories more than what was expected. The positive values of Std. Residuals help us to arrive at that conclusion. On the other hand, the Persian speaking writers used the third category (Std. Residual = 1.5) more than what was expected. Reverse patterns can be seen on the negative Std. Residuals. The native speakers used the third category less than expectation and Persian speaking writers used the first and second categories less than expectation.

Table 12: Frequencies, Percentages and Std. Residuals Lexical Bundles (Structure)

		Structure			Total
		First Category	Second Category	Third Category	
Count		39	17	122	178



Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

NATIVE	% within NATIVENONNATIVE	21.4%	9.9%	68.8%	100%
	Std. Residual	1.9	1.6	-1.3	
PERSIAN	Count	12	4	116	132
	% within NATIVENONNATIVE	9.4%	3.1%	87.4%	100%
	Std. Residual	-2.1	-1.8	1.5	
Total	Count	51	21	238	310
	% within NATIVENONNATIVE	16.0%	6.8%	77.2%	100%

The Chi-square value of 17.47 ($P = .000 < .05$) indicates that there are significant differences between the native and Persian speaking writers in the use of lexical bundles in terms of their structure. That is to say that the Persian speaking writers' use of the first category is significantly below what was expected. Based on these results it can be concluded that the third null-hypothesis as Persian speaking writers do not use lexical bundles in different parts of speech (structure) as NSs do in DPS articles is rejected (Table 13).

Table 13: Chi-square Cells for the Recognition of Lexical Bundles In Terms of Structure

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.471a	2	.000
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.87.			



Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo
Results for the use of lexical bundles (Function)

The last question to answer in this study was concerned with the functions of lexical bundles. To reach this end, another analysis of Chi-square was run to probe whether Persian speaking writers used lexical bundles in different functions in DPS articles more than NS writers did. NS writers used the first category more than what was expected with the Residual of 2.2 while Persian speaking writers used the second category with the Residual of 0.6, and the third category with the Residual of 1.4, which was more than what was expected. Reverse patterns can be seen on the negative Residuals. The NS writers used the second and the third categories less than expectation. Table 14 shows the frequencies, percentages and standardized residuals of the lexical bundles in terms of their function by NS writers and Persian speaking writers.

Table 14: Frequencies, Percentages and Std. Residuals Lexical Bundles (Functions)

		Function			Total
		First Category	Second Category	Third Category	
NATIVE	Count	67	13	98	178
	% within NATIVENONNATIVE	37.0%	7.3%	55.7%	100%
	Std. Residual	2.2	-.6	-1.3	
PERSIAN	Count	24	13	95	132
	% within NATIVENONNATIVE	18.1%	10.0%	71.9%	100%
	Std. Residual	-2.4	.6	1.4	
Count		91	26	193	310



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

Total	% within NATIVE NONNATIVE	28.4%	8.5%	63.1%	100 %
-------	---------------------------------	-------	------	-------	----------

The Chi-square value of 15.27 ($P = .000 < .05$) indicates that there are significant differences between the native and Persian speakers' use of lexical bundles in terms of their functions. It can be seen that the significant Residuals belong to the first category where the two values are beyond the ranges of ± 1.96 . That is to say the NS writers' use of the first category is significantly above expectation while Persian speaking writers' use of the first category is significantly below what was expected. Based on these results, the fourth null-hypothesis as Persian speaking writers do not use lexical bundles for similar Functions as NSs do in DPS articles is rejected. Table 15 displays how the functions were used after the analysis.

Table 15: Chi-square Cells for the Recognition of Lexical Bundles In Terms of Function

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.279a	2	.000
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.64.			



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo
Discussion

Hyland (2008) accentuated the nature of science and its contribution to the behavior of lexical units. That is, those sciences purely enjoy empirical framework such as engineering or the like is called hard science; however, inferably those which make use of interpretive mode of investigations are called soft science. If we put political science under the heading of the second category, and if we draw on the result of this study, it would possibly be safe to claim that such sharp dichotomization on the nature of the science seems to be artificial in that within political context we can think of another dichotomy of those which make use of experimental framework bearing some resemblance to the first category, and of those which adopt hermeneutic approach bearing some similarities to the second category. Therefore, there is a kind of relative tendency in each type of science including the hard one and the soft one to swing against their entitled type by having bundles characteristic of their opposite dichotomy.

The boundary among the functional subcategories cannot be soundly set all the time as Biber et al (2004) and Cortes (2004) stressed the relative intuitive mode of placing of one particular lexical unit under one functional subcategory. By sensitive nature of political field of science, particularly for those contexts with some degree of political exigencies, we mean the tendency of the writers to use words with neutral characteristics to keep the conservative mode of rhetoric, to avoid dramatizations, and to downplay the effect of authorship. It is possible for the writers of this field of science to use certain lexical units with a particular function in mind to get across ironically.

However, when analyzing the text, the lexical bundle comes to belong to the functional category irrelevant to what the writer primarily intended to make use of so as to communicate with the intended audience. Particularly, this boundary can even be more artificial when the discourse readily yields itself to open interpretations. That is, unlike experimental framework where some



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

lexical bundles are specifically used to convey particular discourse functions such as “as can be seen”, interpretive framework makes use of possible coincidences, hermeneutic reasoning to justify some unexplainable events rather than to provide statistical indices to open new window for further research. Although papers from NS writers showed that these writers treat the concept of politics as other writers do in any other fields, political unrest, social exigencies, and channelized method of interpretation in the Iranian local context would possibly account for the lack of empirical work in the field, and more dormant ground for open interpretations, predictive studies or the like.

Conclusions

Regarding the use of lexical bundles across corpora of NS and Persian speaking writers’ DPS articles, the following perspectives came up:

1. Due to nativity, NS writers use a regular pattern of use in that they purposefully make use of lexical bundles to get across, whereas Persian speaking writers follow a habitual style of use in that they use bundles haphazardly and in a predictable fashion, not tuned to the functions they intend to develop the discourse upon since the amount of exposure to the variety of lexical bundles is subject to accidental occurrences.
2. Four-word lexical bundles are still the most trustable form of bundles, and the particular genre of DPS articles does not offer any novel form of lexical bundles.
3. Nominal phrases and prepositional phrases are perhaps the best categories to capture the abstract nature of academic content, and this also holds right for the political discipline.
4. Methodological frameworks, empirical and interpretive, influence the use of certain categories over the others in terms of form and function particularly; Persian speaking writers are



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

more likely to make claims with higher degrees of certainty, whereas NS writers are likely to hedge when making claims even with statistical logic to overshadow authorship.

References

- Altenberg, B. (1998). On the phraseology of spoken English: the evidence of recurrent word-combinations. In A. P. Cowie (Ed.), *Phraseology: theory, analysis and applications* (pp. 101–122). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anthony, L. (2004). *AntConc: A Learner and Classroom Friendly, Multi-Platform Corpus Analysis Toolkit*. Center for English Language Education in Science and Engineering School of Science and Engineering, Waseda University, 3-4-1 Okubo, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan
- Ari, O. (2006). Review of three software programs designed to identify lexical bundles. *Language Learning and Technology*, 30- 37, Georgia State University, USA
- Baradaran, A & Sarfarazi, B. (2011). The impact of scaffolding on the Iranian EFL learners' English academic writing. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(12), 2265-2273.
- Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- 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., F. Barbieri. (2007). Lexical bundles in university spoken and written registers. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(3), 263-286.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., and Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman
- Brown, C. L. (2007). Strategies for making social studies texts more comprehensible for English-language learners. *The Social Studies*, (September-October), 185-188.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents
- Byrd, P & Coxhead, A. (2010). On the other hand: lexical bundles in academic writing and in the teaching of EAP. *Papers in TESOL*, University of Sydney, Australia



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

Chaudron, C. and Richards, J. (1986). The effect of discourse markers on the comprehension of lectures. *Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 113-127.

Chen, Y & Baker, P. (2010). Lexical bundles in L1 and L2 academic writing. Special Issue on Technology and Learning Vocabulary, University of Lancaster, England

Cheng, W. (2007). Concgramming: A Corpus-Driven Approach to Learning the Phraseology of Discipline-Specific Texts. *CORELL: Computer Resources for Language Learning*, 1, 22-35.

Cortes, V. (2004). Lexical bundles in published and student disciplinary writing: examples from history and biology. *English for Specific Purposes*, Department of English, Iowa State Univeristy, 203 Ross Hall, Ames, IA 50014, USA

Cortes, V. (2006). Teaching lexical bundles in the disciplines: An example from a writing intensive history class. *Linguistics and Education*, (17), 391-406.

Erman, B. (2007). Cognitive processes as evidence of the idiom principle. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 12(1), 25-53.

Firth, J. R. (1951). Modes of meaning. *Essays and Studies (The English Association)*, 118-149.

Flowerdew, L. (2005). An integration of corpus-based and genre-based approaches to text analysis in EAP/ESP: countering criticisms against corpus-based methodologies. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24, 321-332.

Gibbons, M. T. (2006). Hermeneutics, political inquiry, and practical reason: an evolving challenge to political science. *American Political Science Review*, 100(4), 563-571.

Giles, M. W & Garand, J. C. (2007). Ranking political science journals: reputational and citational approaches. *Political Science & Politics*, 40(4), 741-751.

Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. New York: Longman.

Haswell, R. (1991). *Gaining ground in college writing: Tales of development and interpretation*. Dallas: Southern, Methodist University Press

Hix, S. (2004). A global ranking of political science departments. *Political Studies Review*, 2(3), 293-313.

Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of lexis in text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. England



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

Hoey, M. (2005). *Lexical priming: A new theory of words and language*. London: Routledge

Hyland, K. (2008). *As can be seen: lexical bundles and disciplinary variation*. Center of Academic and Professional Literacies, Institute of Education, University of London, 20 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL, United Kingdom

Hyland, K. (2008). *Academic clusters: text patterning in published and postgraduate writing*. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 41-62.

Jalali, H., Eslami Raskh, A., & Tavangar Rizi, M. (2008). *Lexical bundles and intradisciplinary variation: the case of applied linguistics*. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies*, 2(4), 447- 484, Iran

Jalali, H., Eslami Raskh, A., & Tavangar Rizi, M. (2009). *Anticipatory 'it' lexical bundles: A comparative study of student and Published writing in applied linguistics*. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies*, 177- 194, Iran

Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2004). *Toward critical contrastive rhetoric*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 7-27.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). *Toward a postmethod pedagogy*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4), 537-560.

Jespersen, O. (1924). *The philosophy of grammar*. Allen & Unwin, London

Juknevičien, R. (2009). *Lexical Bundles in learner language: Lithuanian learners vs. native speakers*. *KALBOTYRA*, 61(3)

Laane, M. (2011). *Lexical bundles in engineering research articles*. 10th International Symposium „Topical Problems in the Field of Electrical and Power Engineering “Pärnu, Estonia, January 10-15, Tallinn University of Technology

Moon, R. (1998). *Fixed expressions and idioms in English: A corpus-based approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London

Nattinger, J., & DeCarrico, J. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.

Neely, E & Cortes, V. (2009). *A little bit about: analyzing and teaching lexical bundles in academic lectures*. *Language Value*, Georgia State University, USA

Nekrasova, T., M. (2009). *English L1 and L2 Speakers' Knowledge of Lexical Bundles*. *Language Learning Journal*, 59(3), 647-686.



MJAL 6:2 Summer 2014

ISSN 0974-8741

Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers Use of Lexical Bundles in the Discussion Section of Political Science Articles by 1.Mohammad Meisam Safarzadeh, 2.Abbas Monfared, and 3. Mohammad Sarfejoo

Pang, W. (2010). Lexical bundles and the construction of an academic voice: a pedagogical perspective. *British Columbia Institute of Technology, Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles*, 47

Pawley, A., & Syder, F. H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Native like selection and native like fluency. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds), *Language and Communication* (pp. 191-230). London: Longman

Ping, P. (2009). A study on the use of four-word lexical bundles in argumentative essays by Chinese English majors: A comparative study based on WECCL and LOCNESS. *CELEA Journal (Bimonthly)*, 32(3)

Rafiee, M & Tavakoli, M. (2011). Structural Analysis of Lexical Bundles Across Two Types of English News Papers Edited by Native and Non-native speakers. *MJAL*, 3(2)

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation: describing English language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. M. (1999) The lexical item, in E. Weigand (ed.) *Contrastive Lexical Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vahid Dastjerdi, H. & Rafiee, M. (2010). Corpus study of lexical bundles: journalistic discourse in focus. *The Asian ESP Journal*, Autumn Edition

Van Manen, M. (1997). *Researching lived experience: human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. London, ON: The Althouse Press.

Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.