The Realization of Lexical Bundle Structures and Functions in English Education Journal

Ferdika Wijaya Kusuma✉, Dwi Rukmini, Abdurrachman Faridi

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info	Abstract
	Discourse is unquestionably constructed with what is presumed as lexical bundle, and in each genre, it idiosyncratically occurs. Thus, the identification of idiosyncrasy of a particular genre would be beneficial for some parties in forming a decent and appropriate discourse. This study aims to explain the construction and function of lexical bundles including bundles which do not fit to theories used in this study. This is corpus-based research. Four-word bundles extracted from 50 chosen articles in EEJ using Antcont 3.5.8 were analyzed accordance with the structure of lexical bundle theory by Biber et. al (1999) and the function of lexical bundle theory by Conrad & Biber (2005). The result showed that (1) the constructions realized in the genre are noun phrase with of-phrase fragment, anticipatory it + verb phrase/adjective phrase, (Verb phrase +) that-clause fragment, copula be + noun phrase/adjective phrase, other prepositional phrase, and prepositional phrase with embedded of-phrase fragment. (2) The functions realized are stance expression, referential expression, and discourse organizer. (3) The excluded structures realized are noun phrase with gerund as modifier and noun phrase with and conjunction in between. (4) The excluded function is to express an entity. This research provides educational department academics variety of expressions for their academic discourse organizations and other researchers new findings concerning other lexical bundles's structures and functions apart from the theorists.

✉Correspondence Address:
Kampus Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Semarang, Jl. Kelud Utara III, Semarang 50237, Indonesia
E-mail: ferdikawijaya@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Discourse is undeniably arranged with multiword expressions which are organized according to syntactic rule and possess each own variety of functions. Having a ton of lexical knowledge and the ability to put the words by the company it keeps is sure important, but one who is working on a discourse is obliged to realize how they are delivered according to its proper function and syntax. Coxhead and Byrd (2007) explained each of discourse types has its own characteristics. Studies show noun phrases and phrasal bundles frequently occur in medical research articles (Jalali & Moini, 2014), while University Lectures of Politics and Chemistry mostly use noun phrase and prepositional phrase (Kashiha & Swee Heng, 2013). Hence, the structural and functional identification of multiword expressions' behavior in each of discourse types must be put into consideration remembering how crucial it is for writing a discourse.

Furthermore, communicative competence is explained as a competence to appropriately apply language structure in appropriate environment, audiences, occasions, subject, and the purpose of communication (Brown, 2000: as cited in Faradilla & Rukmini, 2019; Hymes, 1962). The processes and results of identifying the multiword expressions' behavior of discourses are aimed for guidelines to whomever are strongly trying to acquire the competency as it belongs to communicative competence domain. For that reason, it is safe to say that communicative competence must be achieved by English learners. The competency will be beneficial since discourse is made up with multiword expressions used in an appropriate situation.

Multiword expression, formulaic expression, is one of the communicative competence domains and was introduced by Celce-Murcia (2008) through a proposed revision of the 1995 models. From the terminology itself, it refers to combination of series of words heavily used in the daily interaction. There are several domains in the formulaic competency, and each

is different based on its function and the number of words. Collocation consists of combination of two words, and lexical frame can be three or more words. Meanwhile, idiom refers to series of words and the meaning is different with the literal words.

Lexical frames or lexical bundles can also be considered as multiword expression or recurrent expressions which this study focuses on. It refers to word forms which frequently occur in a discourse. Lexical bundles also can be defined as extended collocation since it is constructed with three or more words and sometimes have idiomatic translation. However, multiword expression can't be claimed as lexical bundle if they don't recur frequently (Biber et al., 1999). Using recurrent expression in a discourse gives the writers or speakers accurate word forms to particular genres since they appear in a great number. Moreover, there are also studies analyzing the function of bundles so that they serve explanation of how to put them in discourse.

Lexical bundle studies have become concern for linguists for the past years and are conducted through various approaches. Some previous studies identified the multiword unit in various subject of discourse (Aini et al., 2018; Allan, 2017; Csomay, 2013; Inaroh et al., 2020; Jalali & Moini, 2014; Maribel & Lee, 2018; Beng & Yuen, 2015; Ruan, 2017; Wright, 2019) . Those studies reveal word pattern or its function, or both can go simultaneously in a study. Meanwhile, some research compares two or more subjects (Ädel & Erman, 2012; Fitriati & Wahyuni, 2019; Gungor & Uysal, 2016; Hong Ang & Hua Tan, 2018; Karabacak & Qin, 2013; Kashiha & Heng, 2013; Kwary et al., 2017; Kwon & Lee, 2014; Maswana et al., 2013; Ucar, 2017). Some compare non-native with native discourse, and other compare between disciplines. Different from previously mentioned studies, there are studies investigating integration of lexical bundles in L1 and L2 writers (Shin et al., 2019), comparing expository and argumentative essay through its lexical bundle to identify the discourse features (Chen & Baker, 2014), discovering transfer effect through lexical bundles in French

EFL (Paquot, 2013), analyzing the use of definite article using lexical bundle (Shin et al., 2018), and measuring the awareness of Lexical Bundles (Mhedhbi, 2014).

This research aims to investigate lexical bundles' patterns and its functions, and how the writers apply the bundles excluded from available structure and function in Universitas Negeri Semarang EEJ. Little is known how non-native academic writers use lexical bundle patterns and functions, and wether or not they use expressions which are unfit to common systems in educational research articles.

In the end, the result of this study is expected to reveal the behavior of EEJ authors in using lexical bundles in their academic works for the sake of discourse research. The variety of expressions can be beneficial to educational department students as they acquire alternative choices for their works. Moreover, it works the same for teachers or lecturers as the findings can be taught in classroom.

METHOD

This research is corpus-based research investigating lexical bundles' structure, function, and the bundles which are exclusively different than the available categorization in Universitas Negeri Semarang English Educational Journal. This study analyzed four-word sequences with minimum co-occurrence 30 times distributed in 10 articles. The data were analyzed according to structural categorization of academic prose by Biber et al., (1999), and functional categorization by Conrad and Biber (2005).

The data were extracted from 50 chosen articles in EEJ, and the authors are entirely non-native writers who are English learners of Universitas Negeri Semarang. The articles which were published from 2019 to 2021 were chosen randomly. The data extraction process used corpus analysis software called Antcont 3.5.8 due to the large amounts of word in the articles. Once all the data were successfully extracted, they were automatically arranged based on its frequency. Before the data retrieval, the articles were transformed into .txt format, eliminating

unnecessary elements such as tables and figures because Antcont can only read text-only files.

The findings were gathered through the following stages: (1) identifying the construction of lexical bundles, (2) identifying the construction of lexical bundles excluded from Biber et. al (1999) categorization, (3) identifying the function of lexical bundles, and (4) identifying the excluded function of lexical bundles from Conrad and Biber (2005).

To make sure that the research was credible, and the findings and interpretations are accurate, the researcher applied triangulation. This is a process of corroborating evidence from different individuals, types of data, or methods of data collection (Creswell, 2012). From one of those options, this study sought evidence from different individual, especially a person who is expert in lexical bundles. The findings were submitted to an expert and examined to see wether or not the researcher misinterpret the analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Before it gets into the findings and discussions, let us take a look at the bundles, their frequency and availability as it acts as objects analysis. Corpus analysis toolkit called Antcont 3.5.8 is used to discover those elements required for analysis. To be considered as lexical bundles, the combination of four-words must occur 30 times in at least 10 articles.

Table 1. Lexical Bundles, Frequency, and Availability

No.	Lexical Bundle	Frequency	Availability
1	Teaching and learning process	83	15 Articles
2	The result of the	56	23 Articles
3	It can be concluded	53	21 Articles

4	Can be concluded that	49	21 Articles
5	Is in line with	48	21 Articles
6	In line with the	46	21 Articles
7	It can be seen	44	19 Articles
8	The meaning of the	42	19 Articles
9	In the form of	38	21 Articles
10	The teaching and learning	35	12 Articles
11	Be concluded that the	32	16 Articles
12	To find out the	31	16 Articles
13	The result showed that	30	15 Articles

In line with the	Other prepositional phrase (fragment)
It can be seen	Anticipatory it + verb phrase/adjective phrase
The meaning of the	Noun phrase with of-phrase fragment
In the form of	Prepositional phrase with embedded of-phrase fragment
The teaching and learning	Other Expression
Be concluded that the	(Verb phrase +) that-clause fragment
To find out the	Other prepositional phrase (fragment)
The result showed that	(Verb phrase +) that-clause fragment

The Realization of Lexical Bundles Structure in EEJ

The process of categorization reflects on Biber's (1999) theory of lexical bundles in academic prose. It provides 12 classifications described syntactically. The Table 2 below shows what structure the bundles in Table 1 belong to.

Table 2. The Structure of Bundles

Lexical Bundle	Structure
Teaching and learning process	Other Expression
The result of the	Noun Phrase with of-phrase Fragment
It can be concluded	Anticipatory it + verb phrase/adjective phrase
Can be concluded that	(Verb phrase +) that-clause fragment
Is in line with	Copula be + noun phrase/adjective phrase

The "teaching and learning process" is a noun phrase. The "Process" as the head of noun and "teaching and learning" as the pre-noun modifiers. There is also a conjunction, "and", to indicate the addition of more noun modifiers.

The "the result of the" is a noun phrase. The "result" is the head of noun and "of the" is as post-modifier. The post-modifiers are preposition "of" and article "the". The head of noun is accompanied by noun.

The "it can be concluded" is considered as clause. It begins with anticipatory, "it", followed by verb phrase, "can be concluded".

The "can be concluded that" is considered as verb phrase. "Can be" plays as modal and "concluded" plays as the verb. There is also that-fragment accompanying the verb phrase.

The "is in line with" is a copula followed by noun phrase. The "is" plays as the copula, "in line" plays as the prepositional phrase, and "with" plays as preposition. The prepositional phrase consists of a preposition, "in", and object of preposition, "line".

Two prepositional phrases construct "in line with the". The first is "in line" and the second is "with the". The prior prepositional phrase consists of a preposition, "in", and object of preposition, "line". There is no object to

preposition in the later prepositional phrase but only pre-modifier noun "with the".

The "it can be seen" is considered as clause. It begins with anticipatory, "it", and "can be seen" plays as verb phrase. The verb phrase is constructed with a modal verb, "can be", and the main verb itself, "seen".

The "the meaning of the" consists of two noun phrases with a preposition in between. Both are nouns with same pre-modifier. The head of prior noun phrase is "meaning" and the head of later noun phrase is missing. The pre-modifiers are "the". The preposition in between is "of" to indicate that first noun is a part of another noun.

The "in the form of" consists of two prepositions and a noun phrase. The prepositions are "in" and "of", and the noun phrase is "the form". The "form" is head noun and "the" is pre-modifier.

The "the teaching and learning" is a noun phrase with same pre-modifier. There are two words which plays as head noun. The first is "teaching" and the second is "learning". The "the" plays as pre-modifier for both. There is also a conjunction, "and", in between the head nouns to indicate the addition of head noun.

The "be concluded that the" consists of a verb phrase, that-fragment, and an article as pre-modifier. The verb phrase is arranged by copula, "be", and past participle, "concluded".

The "to find out the" begins with a preposition, followed by phrasal verb, and ends with an article. The preposition is "to". The phrasal verb consists of "find" as main verb, and "out" as preposition.

The "the result showed that" is arranged with noun, verb phrase and that-fragment. The noun is "the result", "the" as pre-modifier and "result" as head noun. The verb phrase is "showed".

s mostly used noun phrase without any phrase fragment.

How the construction of these bundles is excluded from Biber et. al. (1999)

The meaning of deviation in this study means that the structure occurred in the register doesn't represent or fit to the Biber et. al. (1999) theory of lexical bundle structure. As you can see

in the Table 4.2, there is a type of lexical bundle form in academic prose, called other expression. It is the category which the bundle doesn't represent all the other categories. Based on this definition, consequently, the deviation of lexical bundle can be seen to find the other expression in the register.

According to elaboration of lexical bundle form in UNNES EEJ above, there are two bundles classified as other expression, and they are standing in the highest rank in term of frequency. The first deviation done by the journal writers is "teaching and learning process", and the bundles appear 83 times in 15 articles. The syntactic system was formed by Process as the head of noun and teaching and learning as the pre-noun modifiers. There is also a conjunction, and, to indicate the addition of more noun modifiers. The second deviation is actually a same phrase with the previous one. The rule which researcher set in determining the combination of words isn't enough because a complete noun phrase of the bundle consists of five words. The bundle is "the teaching and learning", it appears 35 times in 12 articles. The syntactic system was formed by a noun phrase with same pre-modifier. There are two words which plays as head noun. The first is "teaching" and the second is "learning". "The" plays as pre-modifier for both. There is also a conjunction, and, in between the head nouns to indicate the addition of head noun. On the other side, the bundle actually is same with the first deviation.

The Realization of Lexical Bundle Function in

The analysis involved examining the bundle reflected to Conrad Biber (2005) functions of lexical bundles. Each of bundles have its own function and each frequency has its own realization, therefore, the researcher explained them one by one. As you can see in the explanation below, it explains how the bundles belong to particular function, its occurrences, and its availability. Before we go further to the realization, let us take a look at the categorization in the table below:

Table 3. The Function of Lexical Bundles in

	Function	Lexical Bundles
I	Stance Expression	
I-A	Epistemic Stance	
	Impersonal	is in line with
		in line with the
I-B	Attitudinal/Modality Ability	
	Impersonal	it can be concluded
		can be concluded that
		it can be seen
		be concluded that the
II	Discourse Organizer	
II-B	Topic Clarification/Elaboration	to find out the
		the result showed that
III	Referential Expression	
III-C	Specification of Attributes	the meaning
	Intangible Framing Attributes	of the
		the teaching and learning
	Tangible Framing Attribute	the result of the
		in the form of
IV	Special Conversational Function	-

The "is in line with" occurs 48 times across 21 chosen articles and used to give status that something is accordance with another. The explanation suits well with Epistemic Stance of Stance Expression function, and the bundle does not provide an individual attribute, hence, it was presented impersonally. The realization in Article 1 shows the finding of research in Article 1, team

teaching strategy was more effective teach the students with introvert and extrovert personality, is accordance with Lestari, Sada, and Suhartono's (2013).

The "in line with the" occurs 46 times across 21 articles and has the same purpose to express a certainty that something is accordance with another. There is no individual attribution, so it is conveyed impersonally. The elimination of copula be and the additional "the" word in the bundles doesn't change the fact that majority of these bundles are the continuation of "is in line with". The bundle in text of "is in line with" and "in line with the" can be seen below:

"…team teaching strategy was more effective teach the students with introvert and extrovert personality. This findings is in line with the other studies…"

The "it can be concluded", occurs 53 times across 21 chosen articles, and makes direct reference to something. The bundle belongs to Attitudinal/Modality stance bundle, which is sub-category of Stance Expression, as it signals for interpretation of prior discourse, and is delivered impersonally. The realization of "it can be concluded" bundle in Article 4 signals writer's attitude that significant value in normality test distributed to experimental classes in an article can be concluded that the scores were distributed normally. The bundle in text can be seen below:

"…auditory learning style was 0.15. From this result it can be concluded that the pre-test scores in both of experimental class I and experimental class II were distributed normally."

The "can be concluded that" bundle occurs 49 times across 21 chosen articles and makes direct reference to something. The bundle belongs to Attitudinal/Modality stance bundle, which is sub-category of Stance Expression, as it signals for interpretation of prior discourse, and is delivered impersonally. The elimination of "it" in the previous bundle and the additional "that" word form new recurrent patterns, and they actually are still on a same phrase/clause. As a result, majority of the analysis possess the same realization as they signal for interpretation as well. One of the bundles in Article 4, it signals writer's attitude that significant value in

homogeneity test distributed to experimental classes in the article can be concluded that the pre-test and post-test were homogeneous. The bundle in text can be seen below:

"…the data was also homogeny because 0.20 > 0.05. Looking at these results, it can be concluded that the significant values…"

The "it can be seen" expression occurs 44 times across 19 articles. There is a "can" modality followed by passive form consisting of copula be and past participle of see. It shows that there is an ability to witness visually something. The involvement of modality word "can" in the "it can be seen" bundle still doesn't change that it possesses similar role as the previous bundle involving the "can" modality bundle. Realization in Article 1, "it" within the bundle means the result of significant difference after treatment implementation, and the result can be seen in table 4.34 of the article. The bundle in text can be seen below:

"…team teaching and blended learning to students with introvert personality. It can be seen from the significant value (0.696)…"

Majority of "be concluded that the" expressions are the continuity of "it can be concluded" and "can be concluded that" bundles. The full expression from beginning to last would be "it can be concluded that the". The copula "be" might indicate that the prior word is a modality. Therefore, it is safe to state that "be concluded that the" enable the writers to express attitude which is included in Stance Expression Bundle. The exclusion of speaker/writer makes it expressed impersonally. It occurs 32 times across 16 articles. The manifestation of the bundle in Article 1 shows significant value of experimental group scores in determining the normality of the pre-test data can be concluded that the data were normally distributed. The bundle in text can be seen below:

"…both experimental classes was more than 0.05, it could be concluded that the data of pre-test of both groups had normal distribution. …"

The "to find out the" bundle occurs 31 times across 16 articles, and it tries to signal an elaboration of prior discourse as the "find out"

means to discover something. For that reason, the expression plays role as Discourse Organizer. Realization of the recurrent expression in Article 1 shows that it signals the elaboration of objective of the study, and it is to find out the effectiveness of Team teaching on academic achievement of 9th graders in science. The bundle in text can be seen below:

"…the objective of his research is to find out the effectiveness of Team teaching on academic achievement of 9th graders in Science. …"

The last recurrent bundle in the analysis belongs to "the result showed", occurs 30 times across 15 articles, and it belongs to Discourse Organizer as a topic clarification. The "the result showed that" recurs several times in Article 1, and one of them signals an elaboration of the result of data analyzed by using ANOVA, and it showed that extrovert and introvert students are effective if treated using team-teaching. The bundle in text can be seen below:

"…sing ANOVA to prove the hypotheses. The result showed that Team-teaching was more effective…"

The "the meaning of the" expression occurs 42 times across 19 articles, plays as a Referential Expression. There is one occurrence in the analysis that possess different purpose with other occurrences. Entities are directed by the expression into a nature that can not be grasp or touch due to the using of "meaning". The "the meaning of the" which makes direct reference to "word" occurs in Article 5, Article 28, Article 39, and Article 46. The "the meaning of the" which makes direct reference to "text" occurs in Article 31, Article 35, and Article 41. In Article 31, the "text" refers to a text consisting of infringement and the implicit meaning. The bundle in text can be seen below:

Article 5 : "…adding the suffix -istic to the base character. The meaning of the word becomes…"

Article 31 : "…implicit meaning helping the readers to know better understanding about the meaning of the text. …"

The "the teaching and learning" bundle occurs 35 times across 12 articles making it the

tenth most frequently recur expression and plays role as Referential Expression. The "teaching and learning" brings attributes to entity making it invisible to eyes and can not be touched or grasped. The "the teaching and learning" bring attribute to "process" in majority of articles. In Article 1, the "process" refers to problem-solving activity in which the extrovert students actively participate. The "the teaching and learning" bundles bring attribute to "activity" several times in the analysis. In Article 13, the "activity" refers to an activity in which the students respond to teacher's code-switching. The bundle in text can be seen below:

Article 1 : "…extroverted students will look more active in the teaching and learning processes than the introverted…"

Article 13 : "…code-switching in the teaching and learning activities. The responses were…"

The "the result of the" bundle occurs 56 times across 23 chosen articles and makes direct reference to something. Furthermore, "result" can not be grasped or touched, thus, it is considered as intangible. The "the result of the study" bundle exists in Article 1, 16, 18, 21, 23, 26, 32, and 46. "the result of the" expression makes direct reference to "study". According to context, each of "study" represents its own entity. For example, the "study" in Article 1 discusses that research method affects the result of study. The "the result of the analysis" bundles occur repeatedly in Article 22 and once in Article 29. The referential expression makes direct reference to "analysis". According to context, each of "analysis" represents its own entity. For example, one of the "analysis" in Article 22 discusses result of analysis by Molina and Albir. The bundle in text can be seen below:

Article 1 : "…the research method will influence the result of the study…"

Article 22 : "…linguistic compression, and calque. The result of the analysis in the translation quality…"

The "in the form of" expression occurs 38 times across 21 articles making it the ninth bundles most frequently recurred and plays role as Referential Expression. Different with other Referential Expression, this expression makes the entities should be able to be grasped, touched, or visible to eyes which means it belongs to tangible framing attribute bundle. The "in the form of" makes direct reference to "request" in Article 2 which refers to indirect directives command by teacher. In Article 5, the bundle makes direct reference to "quote" which refers to data of qualitative research.

Article 2 : "…the teachers' commands were in the form of request. This study…"

Article 5 : "… design in this study is qualitative research. Data in the form of quotes from documents"

How the function of these bundles is excluded from Conrad and Biber (2005)

The number of bundles occurred 589 times in UNNES EEJ and the majority of them have been identified its function. The occurrence of unidentified bundle is 85 times, and it is the highest co-occurrence in the register.

This bundle, "teaching and learning process", doesn't represent all the functions presented by Biber et. al. (1999). Literally and contextually, it doesn't fit with the explanation of Stance Expression which express attitude or assessment, it doesn't reflect between prior and coming discourse as of explained in Discourse Organizer, it doesn't make any reference to entities or even Special Conversation Function. The closest category related to the bundle is the Referential Expression. If the Referential Expression makes or signals that something is referred, and the entity isn't involved in the bundle, the deviation bundle in the register is one complete expression of the signal and the entity. Most of "teaching and learning process" bundles are derived from "the teaching and learning" bundle. As we can see "the teaching and learning" bundle is Referential Expression. With the addition of "process" it becomes full Referential Expression with the entity. The remaining bundles which are excluded from the theories are "the result of the", "is in line with", "in line with the", "the meaning of the", "the teaching and learning". To understand how these bundles doesn't fit to the theories, try to read carefully the previous sentence. It shows how the

bundles are used in the articles. They, as well as "teaching and learning process", play as entity in the text. I assume entity is like noun in traditional grammar. It can be as subject, object for verb, and object for preposition.

In conclusion, it can be concluded that the "learning and teaching process", "the result of the", "is in line with", "in line with the", "the meaning of the", "the teaching and learning". bundle can be functioned to express a complete abstract or physical entity.EEJs.

CONCLUSION

The result of this study contradicts studies analyzing academic prose of different subject. In other words, this research serves academics different formation and function, or there might be a particular bias that confronts authors to behave differently. Further research is needed to address this issue and to see whether or not EEJ authors behave differently by comparing to educational research articles by native speaker.

REFERENCES

AAELAEEIRWhatsApp conversation between native and non-native speakers of English. Proceedings of the UNNES International Conference on English Language Teaching, Literature, and Translation (ELTLT 2018).

Gungor, F., & Uysal, H. H. (2016). A comparative analysis of lexical bundles used by native and non-native scholars. English Language Teaching, 9(6), 176.

Hong Ang, L., & Hua Tan, K. (2018). Specificity in english for academic purposes (eap): A corpus analysis of lexical bundles in academic writing. 3L The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 24(2), 82–94. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2402-07

Hymes, D. H. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In In Reading in the Sociology of Language (pp. 99–138). Mouton Publisher.

Inaroh, I., Faridi, A., & Wuli Fitriati, S. (2020). The use of structures and functions of lexical bundles in conversation texts in Bahasa Inggris textbook published by Kemendikbud. English Education Journal, 11(1), 105–113.

Jalali, Z. S., & Moini, M. R. (2014). Structure of lexical bundles in introduction section of medical research articles. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98, 719–726.

Karabacak, E., & Qin, J. (2013). Comparison of lexical bundles used by Turkish, Chinese, and American university students. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70, 622–628.

Kashiha, H., & Swee Heng, C. (2013a). Structural analysis of lexical bundles in university lectures of politics and chemistry. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 3(1), 224–230.

Kashiha, H., & Swee Heng, C. (2013b). Structural analysis of lexical bundles in university lectures of politics and chemistry. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 3(1), 224–230.

Kwary, D. A., Ratri, D., & Artha, A. F. (2017). Lexical bundles in journal articles across academic disciplines. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7(1), 131.

Kwon, Y.-E., & Lee, E.-J. (2014). Lexical bundles in the Korean EFL teacher talk corpus: A comparison between non-native and native English teachers. In THE JOURNAL OF ASIA TEFL (Vol. 11, Issue 3).

Maribel, N. Z., & Lee, K. R. (2018). Korean English learners'use of lexical bundles in speaking. The Journal of AsiaTEFL, 15(2), 276–291.

Maswana, S., Kanamaru, T., & Tajino, A. (2013). Analyzing the journal corpus data on English expressions across

disciplines. In THE JOURNAL OF ASIA TEFL, 10 (4).

Mhedhbi, M. (2014). Lexical bundles and the construction of an academic voice in business writing. Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 5(6).

Ong Sook Beng, C., & Yuen, C. K. (2015). Functional types of lexical bundles in reading texts of MalaysianEnglishAEnglishEnglish English and Turkish non-native writers. English Language Teaching, 10(12), 28.

Wright, H. R. (2019). Lexical bundles in stand-alone literature reviews: Sections, frequencies, and functions. English for Specific Purposes, 54, 1–14.