Writing Culture through Metatext: A Contrastive Analysis of Philippine English and Chinese English in ESL/EFL Research Articles

Mariella D. Abel[1], Maria Luisa S. Saministrado[2]
Graduate School, Xavier University – Ateneo de Cagayan
mariellaabel1@gmail.com[1], msaministrado@xu.edu.ph[2]

ABSTRACT: *The increasing globalization and proliferation of English as a Second or Foreign Language (ESL/EFL) have led to diverse linguistic and cultural manifestations of the language worldwide. Against this backdrop, this study examined the metatext categories utilized by Philippine English and Chinese English authors in writing the results and discussion sections of ESL/EFL research articles, aiming to unveil the underlying writing cultures. Employing a quantitative-qualitative method, the study conducted a contrastive analysis of twenty research articles written in two English varieties, Philippine English and Chinese English, published between 2020 and 2023 in the TESOL International Journal and The Journal of Asia TEFL. The findings revealed that Philippine English writers employed metatext categories such as previews, reviews, and connectors more frequently than Chinese English writers. At the same time, the latter utilized action markers more often. The contrasting utilization of metatext categories from the examined corpora showed that Philippine English authors exhibited a writer-responsible culture, whereas Chinese English authors demonstrated a reader-responsible culture. In light of these findings, it is recommended that ESL/EFL instructors and academic writing instructors acknowledge and incorporate awareness of cultural influences on writing practices into their pedagogical approaches, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of ESL/EFL instruction and academic writing support.*

KEYWORDS: language, metatext categories, Philippine English, Chinese English, writer-responsible culture, reader-responsible culture.

INTRODUCTION

In the global spread of English as a second or foreign language, English has manifested in diverse forms across various linguistic and cultural contexts. English serves as a medium of communication, education, and research worldwide, giving rise to many

English varieties that reflect their speakers' unique cultural and linguistic identities (Schneider, 2018; Tajeddin & Pakzadian, 2020). As English becomes more widespread worldwide, examining its relationship with culture is crucial, especially in English as a Second or Foreign Language. Moreover, English as a second language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) research articles are a significant genre of academic writing, contributing to disseminating research findings, exchanging knowledge, and advancing various fields (Almuhaimeed, 2022). These articles present information and reflect the academic and cultural conventions of the communities in which they are produced. As students navigating the ESL/EFL landscape, understanding how cultural and linguistic factors shape academic discourse is essential for developing proficiency in written communication.

The use of metatext by writers with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds acknowledges the profound impact of language and culture on the construction and interpretation of written texts, with Kobayashi (2003) identifying metatext as a cultural phenomenon. Because metatext is influenced by culture, writers' styles in employing it may vary based on their diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Metatext primarily focuses on coherence and cohesion, essential properties for ensuring text comprehensibility. Mauranen's pioneering study in 1993 narrowly defined metatext as discourse surrounding and commenting on the main text, providing insights into the writer's intentions, organizational strategies, and interpretative cues. Metatext, as an integral part of research articles, provides a lens through which the intertwining of language and culture can be explored. This variability adds complexity to the study of metatext, requiring exploring how writers from different cultural and linguistic contexts approach and integrate metatext categories in their writing. The metatext categories in research articles, as Mauranen (1993) specified, such as preview, review, connectors, and action markers, play a vital role in framing the content and signaling the author's perspective and intentions (Alduwayghiri, 2022).

While research on metatext categories in ESL/EFL contexts exists, more attention should be paid to a detailed contrastive analysis of the Results and Discussion sections in research articles authored by scholars from the Philippines and China. Also, the existing studies that included Philippine English contrasted with other English varieties, such as Taiwanese and Iranian English. To date, most of the current studies of metatext in research articles seem to concentrate on contrasting the native language and the second language. It is important to note that the Philippines and China are two of the countries with a significant presence in ESL/EFL research landscape (Wang et al., 2022; Barrot et al., 2020). English is the second official language in the Philippines and is extensively used in education, government, and the media. English is introduced to Chinese students as a non-native language at a young age, and its significance is increasing due to the demands of international communication and globalization. Despite the shared emphasis on English proficiency, linguistic and cultural differences may influence how scholars from these countries construct their academic discourse

(Thonney, 2016; Alduwayghiri, 2022). Also, language is dynamic and constantly evolving, and cultural influences on academic discourse might also be shifting.

The exploration of metatext categories in research articles offers a nuanced on the interaction between language and culture in academic discourse. While previous studies have primarily focused on comparing the use of metatext between native and second languages, the current research extends this inquiry to the distinct writing cultures of the Philippines and China within the ESL/EFL landscape. With English serving as a vital medium of communication in both nations, albeit with varying degrees of linguistic and cultural influence, understanding how scholars from these contexts construct their academic discourse is paramount. Drawing on insights from scholars such as Mauranen (1993) and Tarrayo (2011), this study aimed to uncover potential disparities in rhetorical styles, particularly within the results and discussions sections of research papers. By delving into these differences, the study not only sheds light on the evolving nature of academic language but also lays the groundwork for the development of culturally responsive teaching methodologies in ESL/EFL settings. Through a contrastive analysis of metatextual features in Philippine English and Chinese English, this research sought to elucidate the intricate relationship between language, culture, and academic writing practices, offering valuable insights for educators and researchers alike. Specifically, it attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What metatext categories are present in the results and discussion section of ESL/EFL research written in Philippine English and Chinese English?
   1.1 action markers
   1.2 previews
   1.3 reviews
   1.4 connectors
2. How do the metatext categories in the two speech communities show differences?
3. What writing cultures are revealed through the utilization of metatext categories in the two English varieties?

This study is built upon the foundational assumption that intercultural differences exist in the rhetorical preferences of writers in Philippine English and Chinese English concerning the use of metatext, despite the perceived universality imposed by the academic paper genre. The conceptual framework draws support from Mauranen' (1993) concept of metatext categories, which underscores the importance of language choices in guiding readers through the text. Additionally, Halliday and Hasan's (1976) classification of conjunction based on cohesive relations provides a linguistic framework for analyzing the structural and semantic aspects of metatext. The classification of conjunctions, as proposed by Halliday and Hasan, is suitable for the present study. Their classification is not based on logic but on textual considerations, representing generalized types of connections observed between sentences.

Furthermore, Hinds' (1987) distinction between reader-responsible and writer-responsible culture contributes a cultural lens to understanding how writers from the Philippines and China may approach metatext elements. This conceptual framework served as the theoretical underpinning for investigating the nuanced interplay between culture, linguistic choices, and metatextual strategies in academic writing, specifically in research articles, across these two distinct linguistic and cultural contexts.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design
This study employed qualitative-quantitative method, with a focus on contrastive analysis, in examining the metatext in results and discussion sections of ESL and EFL research articles written in Philippine English and Chinese English. According to Angouri (2010), while discourse studies are commonly perceived as inherently qualitative, primarily relying on naturally occurring real-life data, recent research (such as the work by Ozdemir and Longo in 2014) has demonstrated the potential for integrating both quantitative and qualitative paradigms to enhance comprehension of the norms and practices of interactants in discourse. A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in a single study is also known as mixed methods. This is used to collect and analyze data for comprehensive understanding of a phenomenon and to address research questions (Delve, 2022).

Sampling Procedure
Twenty research articles (RAs) were used in the study. Ten of the RAs are written in Philippine English by Filipino researchers and the other ten RAs are written in Chinese English by Chinese researchers. Similar to Tarrayo (2011) and Alduwayghiri (2022), the corpus of the study included the results-and-discussion part only of the RAs since this part is the largest section in nearly all RAs. Aside from that, Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010) found out that the chances for metatext categories to occur, like reviews and previews, are high in the results and discussion sections. In addition, the researcher examined the RA section to be included in the study by considering only section headings, such as Results, Results and Discussion, Findings, Findings and Discussion. Any paragraph in the RA's discussion section that present "conclusion" details was excluded from the study corpus. The RAs were selected using a purposive random sampling method with a careful consideration of inclusion and exclusion criteria for the selection of RAs that were examined in this study.

Data Gathering Procedure
The corpus for this investigation comprised of two sub-corpora of Philippine English and Chinese English research articles in the field of ESL/EFL. The ESL RAs written by Filipino researchers were collected from TESOL International Journal, while EFL RAs authored by Chinese researchers were collected from The Journal of Asia TEFL. All of these journals are considered indexed and refereed and these are accessible online. These RAs are accessible in a public online domain which allows the researcher to download the journals published from 2020 to 2023. Prior to the conduct of the

analysis, the researchers asked for permission from the authors of the RAs by writing an email addressed to them. The researchers only considered the result and discussion sections as described in the sampling procedure.

Data Analysis

This study conducted a contrastive analysis of the two varieties of English, namely Philippine English and Chinese English, focusing on the metatext categories employed by the writers of the two English varieties. The metatext categories proposed by Mauranen's (1993), which serve a textual function, served as a foundational framework for analyzing the articles in the corpus. The analysis involved a quantitative examination to ascertain the frequency of various metatext categories and to draw comparisons between the two datasets. Moreover, the qualitative aspect was emphasized throughout the analysis, especially when analyzing the cultural features as revealed based on the usage of metatext categories by Philippine English and Chinese English writers.

Initially, the researchers read and analyzed the texts to identify instances of metatext structures. The second phase focused on examining the referential characteristics of identified metatext elements and processed quantitative data for the texts. A spreadsheet was created by the researcher to specifically record the metatext categories and to compute for the frequency, percentage, and relative frequency. The third stage involved a parallel comparison of the quantitative findings. Following Mauranen's (1993) framework, both levels of explicitness – high and low – were considered, particularly in identifying review and preview strategies and action markers. Elements such as captions, footnotes, direct quotations, and the like were excluded from the analysis. Only metatext structures within the main section of the results and discussion sections of the research articles were included.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results, analysis, and interpretation of data derived from the examined corpora. Presented in tabular format, these findings align with the specific inquiries outlined in the statement of the problem, offering a comprehensive exploration of the research landscape.

Problem 1. What metatext categories are present in the results and discussion section of ESL/EFL research written in Philippine English and Chinese English?

1.1   Action Markers
Table 1 shows the distribution of frequency, percentage, and relative frequency of action markers used in the results and discussion sections written in Philippine English and Chinese English. The results indicate that EFL research articles written by Chinese English writers use more action markers (55.17%) than the ESL research articles written by Philippine English writers (44.83%) in presenting and discussing the results of their studies. The Philippine English study corpus consists of 24,167 words while Chinese

English study corpus consists of 25,197 words. Considering that the research articles do not have the same number of words, the relative frequency was computed. The relative frequency presents similar trend highlighting on Chinese English (0.13) with slightly higher relative frequency than that of Philippine English (0.11).

Table 1. Distribution of Frequency, Percentage, and Relative Frequency of Action Markers

English Varieties	Action Markers		
	f	*%*	rel. *f*
Philippine English	26	44.83	0.11
Chinese English	32	55.17	0.13
Total	58	100	-

This finding implies notable differences in the use of action markers between research articles written in Philippine English and Chinese English. Specifically, Chinese English writers tend to utilize action markers more frequently in both the results and discussion sections compared to Philippine English writers. As defined by Mauranen (1993), action markers refer to distinct indicators within the text that signify the execution of discourse acts. In other words, these markers demonstrate specific actions that the writers perform in the form of texts. However, the aforementioned finding is contrary to Tarrayo's (2011) findings, which identified Philippine English with a higher frequency compared to Taiwanese English and Iranian English.

The sample actions markers below were extracted from the results and discussions sections of ESL/EFL research articles written in Philippine English and Chinese English. Sentence 1 (S1) and S2 are the sample action markers from the Philippine English corpus, while S3 and S4 are sample action markers from Chinese English corpus.

S1: A framework was developed to best illustrate how Teacher 3 delivers his lessons based on the tabulated and analyzed data (Arlos & Dino-Aparicio, 2021, p. 156).

S2: The statistical tool Kruskal-Wallis H was used to treat the raw data (Ferrer et al., p. 141).

S3: I used AntConc to extract the noun sequences in my specialized corpus in advance, and the exemplars were then used in the workshop (Jin, 2020, p. 6).

S4: Twenty-one valid metaphors were produced, and based on the underlying conceptual metaphorical meaning, they were grouped into four themes (Su & Yang, 2020, p. 7).

1.2 Previews

Table 2 illustrates the distribution of frequency, percentage, and relative frequency of previews used in the results and discussion sections written in Philippine English and

Chinese English. The finding indicates that Philippine English authors (66.42%) utilize previews more frequently than Chinese English authors (33.58%) in writing the ESL/EFL research articles, specifically in the results and discussion sections. This underscores the consistency of this trend even when accounting for differences in article length.

Table 2. Distribution of Frequency, Percentage, and Relative Frequency of Previews

English Varieties	Previews		
	f	%	rel. *f*
Philippine English	89	66.42	0.37
Chinese English	45	33.58	0.18
Total	134	100	-

This finding implies that when Philippine English writers present and discuss the results of their study, they provide the readers with explicit indicators that specific ideas will be discussed in the later part of the texts. This aligns with the study by Xue and Meng (2007), emphasizing that English writers feel compelled to elucidate the idea of the paragraph upfront, serving as a summary for the subsequent sentences. When previews are employed in the text, readers gain an initial understanding of the idea that will be thoroughly discussed in the subsequent sentences within the paragraph. This tendency is more evident in the results and discussion sections of ESL research written in Philippine English, which is also corresponds to the findings of studies involving ESL writers, such as Tarrayo (2011) and Alduwayghiri (2022). Previews are more frequently utilized by writers who consider English their second language, as is the case with Philippine English.

Below are some previews extracted from the study corpora. Specifically, sentences S5 and S6 were extracted from the Philippine English corpus, while sentences S7 and S8 were extracted from Chinese English corpus.

S5: Table 1 presents answers to questions number two and three-what language is preferred and what language is spoken by participants (Astrero, 2021, p. 34).

S6: The summary and details of these findings are shown in each of the following tables (Ebron & Mabuan, 2021, p. 166).

S7: The descriptive statistics of and the correlations among the three factors were shown in Table 2 (Gan et al., 2022, p. 41).

S8: Information relating to the pitch ranges and vowel durations of the participants was presented in Table 1 shown below (Wang & Mao, 2022, p. 6).

1.3 Reviews

As shown in Table 3, the English variety that demonstrated more frequent utilization of reviews in writing the results and discussion sections of research articles is the Philippine English. This is presented in the distribution of frequency, percentage, and relative frequency of reviews from the research articles. Specifically, reviews are more frequently used in the ESL research articles written in Philippine English (58.28%) than in EFL research articles written in Chinese English (41.72%). This is also consistent with their relative frequency according to word count of each study corpus.

Table 3. Distribution of Frequency, Percentage, and Relative Frequency of Reviews

English Varieties	Reviews		
	f	*%*	rel. *f*
Philippine English	95	58.28	0.39
Chinese English	68	41.72	0.27
Total	163	100	-

With the findings presented, it is implied that Philippine English texts demonstrate a frequent recapitulation of ideas or concepts presented in the previous parts of the texts. In the contrastive study by Alduwayghiri (2022) on how Saudi and Chinese write research articles in English, Saudi writers use more reviews than Chinese English writers. Considering that Saudi writers use English as a second language, they show similar trend since English is also considered a second language in the Philippines. Aside from that, the findings of the study are congruent with those of Tarrayo (2011), specifically regarding the utilization of reviews in ESL research articles written in Philippine English. Compared to other English varieties, Philippine English exhibits more frequent utilization of reviews in presenting and discussing the results of research articles. Some of the reviews, extracted from the study corpora, are presented below. Sentences 9 and 10 are extracted from Philippine English corpus, while sentences 11 and 12 are extracted from Chinese English corpus.

S9: *The findings discussed above* were subjected to theoretical and practical verification from the three settings (Arlos & Dino-Aparicio, 2021, p. 153).

S10: *It can be gleaned from table 1.1* that the overall online English learning anxiety of the respondents is 3.16 (SD=0.72) interpreted as average level of anxiety (Ferrer et al., 2021, p. 139).

S11: *Together with the above-mentioned results of classroom activities,* this finding indicated that students frequently practiced interactive activities in class and often exchanged ideas in English and expressed their feelings in English (Huang, 2022, p. 11).

S12: These findings clearly indicate that the students had a good knowledge of references and conjunction devices and were able to use them effectively in their argumentative writing, *as found in Dastjerdi and Samian (2011), Liu and Braine (2005) and Zhang (2010)* (Liu, 2021, p. 13).

1.4 Connectors

Table 4 summarizes the key findings regarding the frequency and percentage of connectors used in ESL/EFL research articles written in Philippine English and Chinese English. The two English varieties utilize connectors in adding information to the text (additive), showing contrasting ideas (adversative), discussing the cause-effect relationship (causal), and presenting information according to time (temporal). However, they differ in terms of the number of occurrences in the study corpora.

Table 4. Distribution of Frequency and Percentage of Connectors

English Varieties	Additive		Adversative		Causal		Temporal	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Philippine English	109	57.07	52	42.62	40	51.95	20	57.14
Chinese English	82	42.93	70	57.38	37	48.05	15	42.86
Total	191	100	122	100	77	100	35	100

Of the two English varieties, Philippine English demonstrates more frequent utilization of additive relation as a classification of connectors (57.07%) compared to its number of occurrences in the EFL research articles writing in Chinese English (42.93%). The additive relation that was mostly used in both Philippine English and Chinese English texts is *and*. However, a notable difference on its usage was illustrated on how frequent the writers use this connective in a sentence. Below are sample texts from (a) Philippine English and (b) Chinese English texts from the study corpora.

(a) Teachers then, should understand their students' interests *and* feelings, improve their learners' self-confidence, *and* choose the best teaching method to keep their learners involved in the speaking activity (Julhamid, 2021, p. 185).

(b) Exercises like multiple choice question, true or false, matching *and* blank-filling, instead, emphasize language form *and* knowledge *and* elicit less language output (Huang, 2022, p. 440).

From the extracted sample texts, it can be inferred that Chinese English writers frequently use 'and' to connect the ideas within the sentence. At some point, this can make the whole idea to be presented indirectly. According to how Kaplan (1966) puts it, as cited by Liu (2009), Chinese writing can be characterized as indirect, with paragraph development resembling a continuous spiral, expanding outward. In paragraph case, the texts revolve around the subject, offering diverse tangential

perspectives, yet never directly addressing it. Aside from the connector 'and,' Chinese English research articles used common additives such as *in addition, moreover, furthermore,* and *also*. As for Philippine English research articles, they use additive relations that are less common such as *in another sense, in addition to the above findings, another thing,* and *more so.*

As for the other classification of connectors, based on the data presented in Table 4, the Chinese English authors use adversative relations more frequently than the Philippine English authors when writing the results and discussion sections of the research articles, having 57.38% and 42.62% respectively. Adversative relations signify a contradiction to what is anticipated, based on the content of the communication (Siasi, 2018). The above findings corroborate with those of Tarrayo (2011) which study proved that EFL writers, like Taiwanese, utilize adversative connectors more often than ESL writers. This is also consistent with the relative frequency (see Table 5) of Chinese English texts (0.28) which is considered higher than that of Philippine English (0.22). This means that Chinese English writers explicitly present opposing ideas or concepts when discussing and analyzing the results of their study. Some of the adversative relations utilized by these writers are *on the contrary, differently, against this backdrop, reversely,* and *in contrast.* On the other hand, Philippine English writers utilized the following adversative relations in writing the results and discussion sections of their study: *whereas, although, despite this, however, on the other hand,* and *in contrast.*

Table 5. Relative Frequency of Connectors in Percentage

English Varieties	Word Count	Additive	Adversative	Causal	Temporal
Philippine English	24,167	0.45	0.22	0.17	0.08
Chinese English	25,197	0.33	0.28	0.15	0.06

Moreover, causal relation is another classification of conjunction according to Halliday and Hasan (1976). Causal relation establishes a connection of cause and effect between ideas or concepts presented within the texts. As elaborated in Table 4, Philippine English exhibits a more frequent utilization of causal relations (51.95%) compared to Chinese English (48.05%). The relative frequency, as presented in Table 4.5, also shows consistent results, identifying Philippine English with a higher number of causal relations (0.17), albeit with only a slight difference compared to Chinese English (0.15). This is opposite to the findings of Tarrayo (2011) in his contrastive analysis of the three English varieties: Philippine English, Taiwanese English, and Iranian English. The latter study found out that EFL writers, specifically the Iranian English writers, use causal relations more frequently than the other English varieties, with a slight difference in frequency from Philippine English. Based from the findings presented in Table 4, it can be inferred that Philippine English explicitly discuss reason and effect of ideas within the text. Writers of this English varieties used the following sample causal relations in their texts: *as a result, consequently, therefore, but,* and *thus.* On the other

hand, Chinese English writers also use causal relations in writing the results and discussion sections of their research articles such *as hence, thus, therefore, due to space constraints,* and *in turn.*

The last classification of conjunctions is the temporal relation. When incorporating temporal relations into written texts, they encompass the time aspect inherent in the communication process (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, as cited in Cabrejas, 2022). As presented in table 4, Philippine English writers tend to utilize temporal relations more frequently (57.14%) than Chinese English writers (42.86%) when writing the results and discussion sections of their research articles. Table 4.5 also shows the same trend with its relative frequency with Philippine English having 0.08 percent and Chinese English 0.06 percent of the total word count. This is aligned with the findings of Tarrayo (2011) identifying ESL writers who use temporal relations more frequently than EFL writers. Philippine English frequently use temporal conjunctions such as *first, second, then, at this juncture, meanwhile,* and *finally*. These conjunctions help establish temporal connections between events, findings, and discussions, providing a coherent and structured presentation of research results over time. As for Chinese English writers, they also use temporal relations but less frequent than Philippine English writers. The following temporal relations were utilized by Chinese English writers: *first, second, meanwhile, after doing this, first of all,* and *at the end.*

Problem 2. How do the metatext categories in the two speech communities show differences?

2.1 The Pronoun Use in Action Markers
Aside from stating that action markers are utilized more frequently in Chinese English texts than in Philippine English texts, both of these texts also differ in the preferred pronouns usage by the writers of these two English varieties. When writing action markers in their texts, the writers present their point of view: first person and third person. This difference is evident in the extracted texts from Chinese English study corpus.

> Before EFA, *we* conducted Bartlett's test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954), and the result suggested that the data was suitable for a factor analysis with X2 (253) = 2285.52, p < .001 (Gan, Yan, An, 2022, p. 40).

> While almost all the participants reflect on these types of challenges, *we* quoted only from a few due to space constraints (Qi, Liao, & Zhao, 2021, p. 4).

> *I* used AntConc to extract the noun sequences in my specialized corpus in advance, and the exemplars were then used in the workshop (Jin, 2020, p. 6).

From the sample texts, some Chinese English writers utilize first-person point of view pronouns such as "we" and "I" in writing the results and discussion sections of their research articles, thereby making the presence of the author within the text more

pronounced. In contrast, none of the Philippine English texts employ first-person pronouns; they use the third-person pronouns. This finding correlates with Ren and Wang's (2015) research, highlighting the prevalent use of pronouns as sentence subjects in Chinese. Consequently, pronouns such as "I" and "we" are commonly found in Chinese writing. Conversely, English writing tends to prioritize facts and figures, leading to a more impersonal style where speakers avoid direct references to themselves or their readers, thus minimizing the use of first-person pronouns. Philippine English authors have observed this writing practice in their written texts.

2.2 The Use of Previews and Reviews

In terms of writing previews and reviews, both of these metatext categories appear more frequently in Philippine English texts than in Chinese English texts. Philippine English writers explicitly indicate the previews and reviews of ideas mostly included in the sentence construction. On the other hand, Chinese English writers may use fewer previews and reviews in their sentences because they sometimes use parentheses to instruct the readers to see and refer to the tables or figures. To elaborate on this, two sample texts from the study corpora, (a) Chinese English and (b) Philippine English, are presented below.

(a) To analyze the relationship between PWMC and vocabulary retention tests (form recognition tests and passive recall tests), descriptive analysis *(see Figure 5, 8)* and correlation analysis *(see Appendix E, F)* were adopted. As the forward digit span test entails only participants' PWMC *(see Table 2),* the current study mainly used the result of the forward digit span test as the indicator of PWMC (Jiang et al., 2023, p. 11).

(b) The result of the analysis which is *shown in Table 3.2.3.1* indicates that the differences in the means of the parents' educational attainment among grade 12 public senior high school students as English language learners during the school year 2018-2019 is obtained by lower group mean minus higher group mean (Julhamid, 2021, p. 184).

The first extracted text (a) was written by Chinese English authors. Though this is not considered a preview, the frequent usage of references enclosed in parentheses, such as "see Table 2," is notable. In academic or technical writing, it serves to direct the reader to relevant tables, figures or other sources of information that support or provide context for the text. This helps readers locate specific data or details mentioned in the text and reinforces the author's points. The first text (a) was placed in the part prior to the presentation of the table and figure that were mentioned. This could be considered as a preview; however, this study only considers the metatext categories constructed in phrases or sentences. Unlike to first text (a), the second extracted text (b) inscribed the phrase "shown in Table 3.2.31" to refer to the table that is presented after the paragraph. This text is considered a preview because it explicitly informs the readers about what is to be presented in the next part of the text, such as informing the readers ahead of time about the content of the table which will be shown in the next part. Since Chinese English texts often use phrases in paratheses to refer to the specific tables or figures,

this may result in a fewer number of previews and reviews. Conversely, Philippine English writers include previews and reviews in their sentence construction as a way of giving reference to the table or figure. Hence, while Chinese English texts tend to rely on parenthetical references for directing readers to supporting information, Philippine English writers incorporate previews and reviews within their sentences, providing clearer references to tables and figures.

2.3 The Explicit and Implicit Usage of Connectors

Connectors are used more frequently in Philippine English texts compared to Chinese English texts. However, based on the classification of connectors by Halliday and Hasan (1976), Philippine English writers frequently use additive, causal, and temporal, whereas Chinese English writers use adversative relations more often. Aside from the numerical data, the way the authors of these English varieties exhibit differences in terms of how they establish cohesion in writing the results and discussion sections of their research articles.

To start with, Philippine English writers establish cohesion of ideas in their texts by explicitly using connectors such as *however, thus, moreover, finally*, and others. This writing practice of Philippine English writers resembles the writing practice of native speakers of English, wherein "they mark all logical development at the super-sentential level with a large variety of devices of logical conjunction" (Xue & Meng, 2007, p. 95). These devices, referred to as "logical conjunctions," which are related to the idea of connectors as a metatext category, help organize and structure the text in a coherent manner, ensuring that the reader can follow the logical progression of ideas throughout the entire piece of writing. It can be seen in the sample texts (a and b) extracted from Philippine English study corpus the explicit usage of connectors to connect the ideas from one sentence to the other.

  (a) *However*, it was perceived that majority of the assessments, though creative, were more focused on content rather than performance, *thus* not enough to gauge students' understanding and application of learning (Arlos & Dino-Aparicio, 2021, p. 151).

  (b) *Furthermore*, as aforementioned, students claimed that through consultations, the connection between them and their teacher deepened; *hence*, the teacher had the chance to know them better (Ebron & Mabuan, 2021, p. 169).

On the other hand, Chinese English writers have a different way of establishing coherence in writing. When Chinese authors write in English, they utilize punctuation like commas, colon, and semi-colon to join together two or more complete sentences without the use of conjunctions. This corroborates with the studies of Yang (2001) and Liu (2009). The following two extracted texts from Chinese English study corpus provide evidence to the analysis made by the researcher.

(c) In short, the overall picture of teachers' understanding of listening teaching was not satisfying: the theory-practice transfer problem was still pervasive; teachers were negative towards the materials and procedures (Su & Yang, 2020, p. 7).

(d) Namely, the higher the writing score of the whole sample, the more comparative references were used in the writing; the higher the writing score of a low-quality essay, the fewer reflexive references yet the more indefinite references were used in the writing, or vice versa (Liu, 2021, p. 10).

It is evident from the two extracted texts that Chinese English writers tend to use punctuations like comma, colon, and semi-colon to connect the ideas from one sentence to another, instead of using cohesive devices such as the connectors, which are most frequently used by the Philippine English writers. This finding implies that Chinese English writers tend to implicitly connect ideas within their texts, leaving readers to understand the connection of the ideas in the text. Conversely, Philippine English writers explicitly mark the connectedness of the ideas within their texts through the use of different classifications of connectors.

Problem 3. What writing cultures are revealed through the utilization of metatext categories in the two English varieties?

3.1 Philippine English Authors Demonstrate Writer-Responsible Culture
The utilization of metatext categories in writing the results and discussion sections of research articles reveals the writing cultures of the Philippine English and Chinese English writers. Based on the aforementioned findings, Philippine English writers utilize metatext categories with more frequently compared to Chinese English writers. Specifically, the prevailing metatext categories they use include previews, reviews, and connectors. These metatext categories are known for their text-organizing role in writing texts, achieving coherence and cohesion, which guide the readers in understanding how the ideas in the texts are organized (Mauranen, 1993 as cited by Mahmood & Yasmin, 2016). The explicit and frequent utilization of these metatext categories by Philippine English authors in writing the results and discussion sections of research articles exhibits a writer-responsible writing culture. This is further elaborated in the succeeding paragraphs.
When writing the results and discussion sections of ESL research articles, Philippine English writers provide readers with explicit information about what the succeeding texts will focus on. Clearly, writers of this English variety tend to guide readers on what to expect in the text they are about to read. This practice is exhibited in the sample except from ESL research articles written by Philippine English writers.

The summary and details of the five most preferred activities by the students are shown in the following table…(Ebron & Mabuan, 2021, p. 162).

In the context in which this sentence was constructed, the writer was about to present a table and stated the main contents to ensure that readers would have the same understanding. Moreover, Philippine English writers usually provide ample information prior to listing or enumerating key points in their texts, rather than doing so without prior introduction. A sample preview extracted from ESL research article by Philippine English writers is presented below.

> The lesson plan and design, content delivery and assessment of learning by Teacher 1 have evidently showed the following:…(Arlos & Dino-Aparicio, 2021, p. 151).

Additionally, when introducing the main idea of a visual, particularly a table, Philippine English writers directly refer to the table as stated in the first few words of the sentence, whereas Chinese English writers tend to mention the table being referred to in the last few words of the sentence. This applies not only to previews but is also evident when they use reviews in their texts. A comparison of these instances is demonstrated in Table 6. Note that previews used by Philippine English and Chinese English writers are similarly placed at the end of the paragraphs from which they are extracted.

Table 6 Comparison Between the Two English Varieties When Using Previews and Reviews

Metatext Categories	Philippine English	Chinese English
Previews	"Table 2.b reveals the respondents' frequency of using SNSs in a day" (Caliboso, 2021, p. 224).	"Then ANOVA (Duncan) analyses were run to examine the differences in the use of references and conjunctions in essays of varying quality, *the results of which are reported in Table 4*" (Liu, 2021, p. 9).
Reviews	"As can be seen from the table, the most preferred activity by the students is writing an essay using the Process Approach (Nunan, 1991) with an average of 3.59" (Ebron & Mabuan, 2021, p. 162).	"Even so, statistically significant difference occurred only in the use of comparative references between low and high-quality essays, *as evidenced by post-hoc ANOVA analyses reported in Table 4*" (Liu, 2021, p. 10).

The implication of this finding suggests a difference in writing style between Philippine English and Chinese English writers when it comes to introducing visual elements,

particularly tables, in research articles. Philippine English writers provide direct and immediate reference to the table at the beginning of the sentence. In contrast, Chinese English writers tend to mention the table at the end of the sentence. This difference in writing style may reflect cultural or linguistic preferences in how information is structured and presented. For instance, the preference of Philippine English writers to directly refer to the table at the beginning of the sentence could indicate a desire for clarity and straightforwardness in communication.

On the other hand, the tendency of Chinese English writers to mention the table at the end of the sentence might suggest a different approach to organizing information, perhaps emphasizing context or setting up the reader for the information that follows. This corroborates with the studies of Yang (2001) and Xue and Meng (2007), which highlight the indirect nature of Chinese discourse development compared to the more direct and linear nature of English discourse. This suggests that Chinese writers, when composing in English, might unconsciously or consciously draw upon their writing practices rooted in Chinese writing culture.

Furthermore, the use of connectors is also evident in the Philippine English study corpus. Based on the frequency count and its relative frequency, authors of this English variety use different types of connectors in writing the results and discussion sections of ESL research articles. Among the connectors classified by Halliday and Hasan (1976), the present study reveals that additive, causal, and temporal relations appear more frequently in the Philippine English study corpus, while adversative relations appear less frequently.

The findings imply that authors of Philippine English tend to structure their writing in a way that guides readers through the logical flow of ideas with a focus on coherence and clarity. By using connectors that emphasize additive, causal, and temporal relations more frequently, writers in this English variety demonstrate a commitment to facilitating understanding and engagement with their research articles. Table 7 presents the sample connectors repetitively used by Philippine English writers which are extracted from the study corpus.

Table 7. Extracted Connectors Utilized by Philippine English Writers in ESL Research

Connectors			
Additive	**Adversative**	**Causal**	**Temporal**
And	Although	As a result	Finally
Also	However	In turn	Meanwhile
In addition	Yet	Thus	First
In other sense	Whereas	Therefore	Second
Moreover	On the other hand	Consequently	Then
Furthermore	In contrast	Hence	At this juncture
Another thing	Even though	But	The first, the second…the tenth
More so	Despite this	Because	
	But		

In a writer-responsible culture, authors take on the responsibility of ensuring that their readers can easily follow their arguments and interpretations (Hinds, 1987, as cited in MacKenzie, 2015). By employing connectors that establish connections between ideas, authors of Philippine English contribute to the readability and accessibility of their texts. This approach suggests an intention to actively engage readers and to make the content more comprehensible, which aligns with the principles of a writer-responsible culture.

3.2 Chinese English Authors Exhibit Reader-Responsible Culture
Chinese English authors utilized metatexts in writing the results and discussion sections in EFL research articles. In contrast with Philippine English writers, Chinese English writers employed fewer metatexts based on the computed frequency count and relative frequency. However, these findings reveal the writing culture of Chinese English authors, which is considered to have a reader-responsible culture. The next paragraphs will elaborate on how Chinese English authors display reader-responsible writing culture as evidenced in terms of the authors' utilization of metatext categories.

Based on the quantitative data, Chinese English writers have used different metatext categories in the study corpus. However, it is evident that the number of these metatexts is fewer compared to the number of metatexts used by Philippine English writers. Tarrayo (2011) and Alduwayghiri (2022) consider this phenomenon as an indicator that authors of a particular English variety adhere to a reader-responsible writing culture. In terms of using previews and reviews, Chinese English writers tend to indicate what they are referring to in the last part of the sentence, as shown in Table 6. Their practice of indicating what they are referring to towards the end of the sentence when using previews and reviews could indicate an effort to provide context or clarification for readers after presenting the main idea, enhancing reader comprehension and engagement. This finding corroborates the study of Xue and Meng (2007) indicating that Chinese writers tend to write inductively, where the main point is often delayed or implied, whereas English native speakers typically adopt a deductive style, clearly stating the thesis or points they intend to explain or argue. This contrast is also evident in texts written in Philippine English.In addition, Chinese English writers utilize connectors in writing the EFL research articles; however, these connectors are fewer in frequency than those in Philippine English. Aside from their difference in number, Chinese English writers establish cohesion in writing differently. This is illustrated by the sample text below, which was extracted from the Chinese English study corpus.

> Based on the underlying conceptual metaphorical meanings, there were further identified and grouped into three themes (1) teachers' guidance, (2) status and features, (3) students' agentive role, as shown in Table 3 (Su & Yang, 2020, p. 862).

Based on the sample text, connectors are minimally used even when different ideas are presented in the sentence. Xue and Meng (2007) have explained this writing

phenomenon of Chinese authors, pointing out that the sentences they write often need more cohesive ties formed through conjunctions. This explains why Chinese English texts have fewer frequency counts of connectors than Philippine English texts, as shown in Table 4. Also, Chinese English writers use other symbols or punctuation to connect the ideas in a sentence, such as in the above excerpt. Table 8 enumerates the connectors found in Chinese English EFL research articles.

Table 8. Extracted Connectors Utilized by Chinese English Writers in EFL Research

Connectors			
Additive	**Adversative**	**Causal**	**Temporal**
And	Whereas	Thus	At the end
Moreover	On the contrary	Hence	Finally
In addition	Although	Due to space	Meanwhile
Furthermore	However	constraints	First
In other words	On the one hand	As a result	Second
Also	Even though	Therefore	Lastly
	Apart from that	In turn	First of all
	Alternatively		After doing this
	Even so		
	But		
	Differently		
	Against this		
	backdrop		
	Although		

Among the four classified connectors, Chinese English texts have higher frequency of using adversative relations. Chinese English writers explicitly present contrasting ideas or events when writing the results and discussion sections of EFL research articles. The adversative connectors they used are less common compared to the ones used buy Philippine English writers. Chinese English authors tend to descriptively emphasize the opposition or contradiction of ideas in the text, resulting in more uniquely phrased connectors. The following sample text, which highlights the use of adversative relation, is extracted from the Chinese English study corpus.

> *Against this backdrop*, the acquisition of a native-like accent is no longer the ultimate objective of the majority of global English learners (Wang & Mao, 2022, p. 134).

Furthermore, Chinese English authors tend to elucidate the actions made within the text by utilizing action markers. In fact, these authors use this category of metatext more frequently than the Philippine English authors, as presented in Table 1. Interestingly, some Chinese English authors use first-person pronouns, such as "I" and "we," when utilizing action markers, whereas Philippine English authors mainly use third-person

pronouns. The following text shows an extracted sentence from the Chinese English study corpus emphasizing the use of first-person pronouns by Chinese English authors.

> *I* used AntConc to extract the noun sequences in my specialized corpus in advance, and the exemplars were then used in the workshop (Jin, 2020, p. 6).

This observation corresponds with the findings of Ren and Wang (2015), suggesting that English compositions written by Chinese authors retain certain characteristics of Chinese writing culture. This is evident in how these writers employ pronouns. Pronouns are commonly employed as sentence subjects in Chinese, leading to a frequent occurrence of first-person pronouns in their writing. This tendency primarily stems from the perspective that the Chinese take in viewing things. Specifically, it reflects the influence of Confucian human-centered philosophy, wherein the objective world is understood and evaluated with man as the focal point (Ren & Wang, 2015). This insight underscores how Chinese authors' cultural background influences their language use, particularly in the frequent use of first-person pronouns, reflecting the enduring impact of Confucian philosophy on their writing culture.

In conclusion, the analysis of metatext utilization in the results and discussion sections of EFL research articles by Chinese English authors compared to their counterparts in Philippine English revealed intriguing insights into the cultural and linguistic nuances shaping academic discourse. Despite employing fewer metatexts, Chinese English writers exhibit a reader-responsible writing culture, evident through their strategic use of previews, reviews, connectors, and action markers. The preference for delayed or implied main points, the descriptive emphasis on contrasting ideas using adversative connectors, and the frequent utilization of first-person pronouns in action markers all reflect the influence of Chinese writing culture, deeply rooted in Confucian philosophy. These findings contribute to one's understanding of cross-cultural communication in academic writing and highlight the enduring impact of cultural backgrounds on language use and expression.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The examination of metatext category usage among writers of Philippine English and Chinese English has been undertaken. The interaction between language and culture is evident in the authors' rhetorical choices concerning metatext, despite the general adherence to academic paper conventions imposed by genre. The observed variations in metatext category usage among writers of Philippine English and Chinese English underscore the nuanced interplay between language, culture, and rhetorical strategies, aligning with the foundational principles of Contrastive Rhetoric theory proposed by Robert Kaplan (1966). Based on the quantitative and qualitative results of the study, it can be concluded that Philippine English and Chinese English utilize metatexts in writing the results and discussion sections of their research articles. The varying results

gained from the study point to the diverse writing cultures of the authors of two English varieties.

First, Philippine English and Chinese English writers differ in number of using action markers in their texts. The frequent usage of action markers by Chinese English writers implies that they provide detailed descriptions of their actions in the text. They tend to describe their actions to arrive at such findings, considering that they are writing the results and discussion sections of research articles. By doing so, Chinese English authors tend to use first-person pronouns, making the text more personal. This reflects the Confucian philosophy in their writing culture, exemplifying how EFL writers consciously or unconsciously adhere to their native language writing culture in foreign language writing. On the other hand, when Philippine English writers employ action markers in their texts, they tend to be impersonal due to their practice of using third-person pronouns, especially in writing academic texts.

Second, Philippine English writers are more direct and straightforward when guiding readers on reviewing and previewing ideas in their texts. This provides clear ideas to the readers, leaving no room for confusion. This explicitly portrays characteristics of adhering to writer-responsible culture. Conversely, Chinese English writers tend to indicate what is being referred to in the later part of the paragraph. This implies that these writers organize the structure of the ideas in their texts in an indirect and implicit manner. This shows a reader-responsible culture considering that the writers think that readers have the same understanding of the text with them. Hence, the differing approaches to guiding readers between Philippine English and Chinese English writing reflect distinct cultural orientations towards responsibility in communication.

Third, Philippine English and Chinese English authors utilize connectors in different ways. Of the two, Philippine English authors employ connectors more frequently than Chinese English authors. Philippine English has similarities with American English which emphasizes the usage of logical conjunctions. This allows the readers to understand the connectedness of ideas in the text, as connectors are explicitly used. In contrast, Chinese English authors have a tendency to write sentences with minimal conjunctions, as they aim to construct sentences that can stand alone. This reflects how implicit they are in organizing the ideas in the text, which aligns with their adherence to reader-responsible culture.

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed to address the identified gaps and enhance future research in this field. Educators should integrate cultural awareness into teaching methods to enrich students' language learning experiences and proficiency in English, fostering effective cross-cultural communication skills. Linguists are encouraged to delve into the study's findings, offering opportunities to explore the intricate relationship between language and culture through metatext analysis, potentially leading to interdisciplinary collaborations and further research. Translators and interpreters stand to benefit from incorporating these insights into their training programs, enhancing their ability to bridge language gaps

and ensure accurate academic discourse transmission, thus promoting inclusivity. For future researchers, the study provides valuable reference material and insights into the relationship between language and culture, particularly within English varieties, offering a comparative baseline for further investigation. Future research directions could include exploring interpersonal functions of metatext across different English varieties within the same journal, contributing to a deeper understanding of language and culture dynamics.

REFERENCES

Alduwayghiri, R. K. (2022). The Contrastive Rhetoric: The Distinction in the Use of the Metatext, Preview and Review, in the Result and the Discussion Section by Saudi and Chinese Researchers. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies,* 12(9), 1873-1879.

Almuhaimeed, S. A. (2022). Research Trends in ESL/ EFL: A systematic investigation of studies in ELT Journal and TESOL Quarterly. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. http://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/4010

Angouri, J. (2010). Quantitative, qualitative or both? Combining methods in linguistic research. Research methods in linguistics, 1, 29-45.

Barrot, J. S., Acomular, D. R., Alamodin, E. A., & Argonza, R. C. R. (2020). Scientific Mapping of English Language teaching research in the Philippines: A bibliometric review of doctoral and master's theses (2010–2018). *RELC Journal*, 53(1), 180–193. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220936764

Cabrejas, M. M. (2022). Cohesive Devices on the Abstracts of Select Research Articles Presented in the International Academic Forum (AIFOR): A Discourse Analysis. British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies, 3(1), 22-41.

Delve. (2022, September 1). What is mixed methods research? https://delvetool.com/blog/mixedmethods

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hinds, J., Connor, U., & Kaplan, R. B. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. Landmark essays on ESL writing, 63-74.

Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. Language learning, 16(1-2), 1-20.

Kobayashi, K. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Japanese research articles in the field of applied linguistics: A contrastive study (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya).

Liu, Y. (2009). The impact of cultural factors on Chinese and American college students' rhetorical choices in argumentative discourse: A contrastive study. Intercultural Communication Studies, 18(1), 128.

MacKenzie, I. (2015). Rethinking reader and writer responsibility in academic English. Applied Linguistics Review, 6(1), 1-21.

Mahmood, M. A., & Yasmin, T. (2016). Metatextual Devices in Pakistani Research Theses: English-Economics Comparative Analysis. Science International, 28(4).

Mauranen, A. (1993). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English economics texts. *English for specific Purposes,* 12(1), 3-22.

Ozdemir, N. O., & Longo, B. (2014). Metadiscourse use in thesis abstracts: A cross-cultural study. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 141, 59-63.

Rashidi, N., & Souzandehfar, M. (2010). Text-Organizing Metatext in Research Articles: An English-Persian Contrastive Analysis. *TESL-EJ*, *13*(4).

Ren, J., & Wang, N. (2015). A Survey on College English Writing in China: A Cultural Perspective. English Language Teaching, 8(1), 21-30.

Schneider, E. (2018). World Englishes. Oxford University Press. https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-270;jsessionid=B0A52B2CAECFB770D825875B05D65EFA

Siasi, E. (2018). Discourse analysis of cohesive devices in student's writing. Journal of English Education, Literature and Linguistics, 1(2), 87-94.

Tajeddin, Z., & Pakzadian, M. (2020). Representation of inner, outer and expanding circle varieties and cultures in global ELT textbooks. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00089-9

Tarrayo, V. N. (2011). Metatext in Results-and-Discussion Sections of ESL/EFL Research: A Contrastive Analysis of Philippine English, Taiwanese English, and Iranian English. *Journal on English Language Teaching*, *1*(3), 39-52.

Thonney, T. (2016). " In This Article, I Argue": An Analysis of Metatext in Research Article Introductions. Teaching English in the Two Year College, 43(4), 411.

Wang, J., Abdullah, R., & Leong, L. (2022). Studies of Teaching and Learning English-Speaking Skills: A Review and Bibliometric analysis. *Frontiers in Education*, *7.* https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.880990

Xue, L., & Meng, M. (2007). A cross-cultural characterization of Chinese and English written discourse. Intercultural Communication Studies, 16(3), 90.

Yang, Y. (2001). Chinese Interference in English Writing: Cultural and Linguistic Differences.

APPENDIX A
Study Corpora

ESL Research Articles
Philippine English

Arlos, A. & Dino-Aparicio, C. (2021). Emergence of New Protocols from the Teaching of Oral Communication in Three Senior High School Settings. *TESOL International Journal, 16*(8), 146-161.

Astrero, E. (2021). Real talk: The status of Code-Switching in philippine classsrooms. *TESOL International Journal, 16*(8), 29-39.

Caliboso, J. (2021). Social Networking sites and ESL Students Writing Proficiency in English. *TESOL International Journal, 16*(4.4), 220-233.

Ebron, G. & Mabuan, R. (2021). Flipped Learning Approach in Teaching Writing in a University Setting: Students' Experiences, Preferences, and Perspectives. *TESOL International Journal, 16*(4.4), 157-179.

Ferrer, V., Marcos, C., & Morandarte, R. (2021). ESL High School Learners' Online Language Learning Anxiety: Investigating the Influence of Gender and Socio-Economic Status. *TESOL International Journal, 16*(8), 132-145.

Hajan, B. & Pagadas, R. (2021). Blended Learning in A Research Writing Class: Perceptions and Experiences from ESL Secondary Learners. *TESOL International Journal, 16*(4.4), 99-117.

Julhamid, N. (2021). Speaking Ability of Grade 12 Public Senior High School Students. *TESOL International Journal, 16*(8), 175-190.

Orlanda-Ventayen, C. (2021). Technology Integration in Teaching Language Subjects by Primary Education Teachers. *TESOL International Journal, 16*(8), 91-102.

Orlanda-Ventayen, C. & Ventayen, R. (2021). Language Proficiency and Plagiarism Practices among Graduate Students. *TESOL International Journal, 16*(4.4), 55-66.

Vidal, C. (2021). Vocabulary learning attitudes and strategies of college freshmen: Inputs to a proposed vocabulary development program. *TESOL International Journal, 16*(8), 72-90.

EFL Research Articles
Chinese English

Gan, Z., Yan, Z., & An, Z. (2022). Development and Validation of an EFL Speaking Self-Efficacy Scale in the Self-Regulated Learning Context. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. 19*(1), 35-49.

Huang, Q. (2022). Classroom Activities, Classroom Anxiety and Teacher Roles: Three Dimensions Revealing Class Reality of a University English Course. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. 19*(2), 431-449.

Jiang, M., Zou, D., Lee, L., Wang, F., Wu, N. (2023). The Cognitive Process with Intensive and Rapid Vocabulary Acquisition Tasks Using Multimedia Glosses. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. 20(1). 64-88.*

Jin, B. (2020). Using Genre- and Corpus-based Findings to Inform the Writing of the Discussion Section of a Research Article. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. 17*(3), 1111-1123.

Liu, M. (2021). References and Conjunctions as Cohesive Devices in Chinese Undergraduate EFL Students' Argumentative Essays. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. 18*(3), 1144-1160.

Liu, W. & Wang, Q. (2021). English Teachers' Use of Resources in Chinese Public Schools. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. 18*(3), 967-975.

Qi, Q., Liao, L., & Zhao, C. (2021). "I Didn't Even Know if My Students Were in Class": Challenges of Teaching English Speaking Online. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. 18*(4), 1455-1462.

Su, F. & Yang, L. (2020). Exploring the Change of Chinese EFL Teacher Beliefs in Listening Teaching: A Metaphor Analysis. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. 17*(3), 858-372.

Tan, X. (2020). Multilingual and Multimodal Literacy Beyond School: A Case Study of an Adult Vlogger in China. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. 17*(4), 1252-1265.

Wang, Z. & Mao, Y. (2022). No Prosody, No Emotion: Affective Prosody by Chinese EFL Learners. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. 19*(1), 125-139.