



Interactional Voices from Newspaper Editorials: A Filipino-American Contrastive Study

Rodrigo Concepcion Morales ^{1, *} and Mark Ivan Mallare Gomez ²

¹ Curriculum Implementation Division, Schools Division of Paranaque City (DepEd-Paranaque City), Graduate School, University of Perpetual Help System DALTA, the Philippines.

² School of Education-Liberal Arts-Music-Social Work, Centro Escolar University-Manila, the Philippines.

Open Access Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 2024, 07(02), 098–109

Publication history: Received on 16 February 2024; revised on 27 April 2024; accepted on 30 April 2024

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53022/oarjms.2024.7.2.0029>

Abstract

Using categorization of interactive metadiscourse, the present study attempted to contrastively compare editorials of two writing cultures, Filipinos and Americans. The objectives of the study were identifying the cultural features revealed by the Filipino editorialists and Anglo-American editorialists, and determining how the two writing cultures differ in the utilization of interactional metadiscourse resources in their editorials. A total of 180 editorials served as the corpus of the study; 90 from the Philippine Daily Inquirers (PDY) and 90 from the New York Times (NYT). The findings revealed that American editorialists significantly employed metadiscourse resources as compared to Filipino editorialists specifically the employment of code glosses and transitional devices. This can be attributed to their writing confidence in utilizing their native language for Americans, while second language for Filipinos. Cultural, political, and social realities also play a critical role in the utilization of metadiscoursal resources in writing. The pedagogical implications were provided for future research directions.

Keywords: Metadiscourse; Resources; Editorials; Rhetoric; Interactional resources

1. Introduction

Language is a system of functions (Halliday, 1989). People use language for different reasons, some of which are: make relations, build an understanding, and create a rapport of ideas within the speech community that enhances human affairs (Cristal, 2016). The utilization of language either spoken or written has a considerable weight that makes the communication critical since the speaker/writer has the responsibility in making the message clear, coherent, contextual, and effective for the target audience or readers.

In oral communication, spoken language has been extensively studied among scholars and linguists for it is widely utilized or if not, the most conspicuous phenomenon that relates human communication. It is noted that using verbal-non-verbal forms of language have a wide repertoire of resources to effectively deal with their interlocutors. Speech theorists call these resources as Illocutionary Forces Indicating Devices (IFADS) (Searle, 1985). While other linguists call the same as orientational function (Lemke, 1998), and interpersonal functions (Halliday, 1989). Notably, in interactional sociolinguistics, this phenomenon that triggers understanding between interlocutors is called contextualization cues.

On the other hand, as far as writing is concerned writers have the so-called metadiscourse by which they make use of metadiscourse markers for them to effectively convey their point, build a personality, and create communicative relations. As clarified by Vande Kopple (1985) and Crismore et al. (1993) metadiscourse refers to “linguistic material in texts, written or spoken, which does not add anything to the propositional content, but that is intended to help the listener or reader organize, interpret and evaluate the information given” (Crismore et al. 1993: 40).

* Corresponding author: Rodrigo Concepcion Morales

Thus, the use of linguistic markers enables the writer to guide the readers through the text and in the text (Hyland, 2005). In line with this, it serves as a “self-reflective linguistic material referring to the evolving text and the writer and imagined reader of that text.” (Hyland 2012 p. 37).

Writers in general and editorialists in particular expose and propound ideas to their readers and guide them to adopt their position employing metadiscourse markers embedded in the texts such as interactive and interactional markers (Hyland, 2005). In the absence of these markers, the ideas, or organization, credibility and personality of the writer, and the text itself will be jeopardized.

2. Review of related literature

In their 2023 paper, Morales and Gomez looked at how two writing cultures namely Filipino and American differ in terms of utilizing editorial headlines. Using 30 Filipino editorial headlines and 30 Anglo-American headlines as corpora, the study disclosed that Filipino editorialists prefer to use existential presupposition triggers than what Anglo-American editorialists do since the former perceives to be as reader-responsible while the latter as writer-responsible. Additionally, the study found out that American writers are more inclined to using more verbal headlines whereas Filipino writers seldomly employ verbals in their headlines. These findings are concomitant to what Hinds (1983) said that Western writers fall under writer-responsible category while Eastern writers e.g. Filipinos (Morales & Gomez, 2023), Chinese (Dayag, 2009), and Japanese (Hinds, 1987; Kamimura & Oi, 1998) fall under reader-responsible category. Furthermore, cultural attributions do play a critical part. In the said study Filipinos are indirect and implicit in their writings; thus, high-context culture while Anglo-Americans are direct and explicit; thus, low-context culture. However, due to the small or limited number of corpus it shall be necessary to be circumspect before jumping into generalizations.

Mohamed and Omer (2000 cited in Dayag 2009) explored the relations between writing and culture. They examined the utilization of rhetorical markers (e.g. furthermore, and, but, additionally) both in English and Arabic narrative texts. The study found out that Arabic writings are context-based, repetition oriented, generalized, and additive. These may be attributed, according to the researchers, that Arabic writings are high-context, high-contact, collectivist, and reader-responsible. Conversely, Anglo-American writings are low-context, low-contact, individualist, text-based, explicit, and writer-responsible. In effect, writers such as editorialists differ in the employment of language as a corollary aspect of culture.

This contention has caught the attention of many linguists. Research studies provide different and conflicting results nonetheless. It is thus submitted that the use of metadiscourse (e.g. code glosses, frame markers, hedges) varies from language and culture to another (Capar & Deniz-Turan, 2019; Hu & Cao, 2011; Moreno, 1997; Mu, Ehrich, & Hong, 2015; and, Zarei & Mansoori, 2010). As such there are two determining factors that are critical in the writings of people who have different backgrounds i.e. culture and language.

On the contrary, this position has been rejected by many applied linguists and sociolinguists. Just for instance Kachru (2009) argues that academic writing is neither pre-determined, inherited, nor given but rather it is “acquired through lengthy formal education.” (p.111). This finding has been corroborated by Yuksel & Kavanoz (2018). They elaborated that academic writing is developed through experience irrespective of writers’ L1 background (Swales, 2004; Habibie, 2019; Hyland, 2015). Additionally, Kafes (2022) examined how novice and experienced academic writers of Research Articles (Ras) differ in the use of metadiscourse. It was found out that there are significant distinctions between novice and experienced writers’ use of number, type, distribution, and use of metadiscourse markers i.e. code glosses. With these arguments we can conclude that regardless of L1 background, culture, and linguistic differences, training and formal education play a pivotal role in determining the usage and efficacy of metadiscourse. At last, Zhao (2017) succinctly put it thus, writers must learn and develop a competence through practice the conventions of academic writing insofar as the metadiscourse is concerned.

As regards the conventions and characteristics of writing across writing cultures, Cai (1993 cited in Connor, 1996 p.37) argued that “Chinese writers are nonlinear and indirect in their writings such as essays, opinions, and argumentative writings.” It was posited that this is due to Chinese rhetoric that follows eight-legged essay pattern derived from Confucian teachings. The pattern is as follows: *poti-chengti*, *qijiang*, *qigu*, *xugu*, *zhonggu*, *houngu*, and *dajie* (opening-up, amplification/intensification, preliminary exposition, first argument, second argument, third argument, final argument, and conclusion (Connor 1996, p. 37 cited in Dayag, 2009).

Another worth-citing work about the features of the texts is conducted by Hinds (1983) which said that Japanese expository writings follow that pattern called *ki-sho`-ten-ket-su* e.g. Morales, 2012. *Ki* introduces the topic; *sho`* develops the topic; *ten* forms an abrupt transition or introduces vaguely related idea or concept; *ketsu* concludes the topic (p.183).

In the same vein, Korean writers have their own writing pattern namely, “*ki-sung-chon-kyul*, which corresponds to the Japanese *ki-sho`-ten-ketsu*. In this regard, only lexicons change but the intrinsic value of the pattern does not change between the two writing cultures. Consequently, “in Korean texts, there is an introduction, the development of the topic, a turning to a somewhat unrelated topic, and a conclusion. Indirectness is caused by the placement of the thesis statement at the end of a text...” (Connor, 1996, p.45).

Equally important is the study regarding editorials. Since the editorialists provide insights, arguments, positions, and ideologies in their writing it is a compelling move to study the same. According to Bell (1991 cited in Morales & Gomez, 2023) newspaper editorials, is a subgenre of the newspaper. Writers persuade, inform, and entertain their readers through the use of rhetorical techniques and linguistic markers. Editorials are said to be a mechanism that emancipates the people and allows them to look at the world in a different perspective which in turn exude power relations embedded in the texts (van Dijk, 1997). In this instance, texts in editorial writings are never *neutral* but always *engaged* because they reinforce the ideas and realize the interests and values of who enact them (Hyland, 2005). In effect, writing is indeed a cultural object (Moreno, 1977, p.5).

Ansary and Babaii (2009) provided that newspaper editorials represent both local cultures and ideological proclivities of the communities where they originated. Editorials not only provide information but also create relations between and among the readers and writers. Hence, discourse in writing has been called ‘metadiscourse’. Schiffrin, Tannen, and Hamilton (cited in Cuevas-Alonso & Miguez-Alvarez, 2022) identified three fundamental usages of [meta]discourse such as: (1) Metadiscourse which extends beyond sentence; (2) Metadiscourse as language use; and (3) Metadiscourse as a social-practice that includes non-linguistic aspects.

Hence, it refers to the process of writing about writing. Metadiscourse is an ‘aspect of a text which explicitly organizes the discourse, engages the audience, and signals the writer’s attitude’ (Hyland, 1998 quoted in Perez-llantada, 2003, p.5). Hyland (2005, p.49) categorizes interpersonal metadiscourse into two namely, (1) Interactive which consists of transitions, framemarkers, endophoric markers, evidentials, and code glosses; and, (2) Interactional which consists of hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions, and engagement-markers.

Consequently, a number of studies on metadiscourse have paid attention on research articles (e.g. Morales, 2012; Hyland, 1996a, 1996b, 2001; Valro-Garces, 1996; and Cao & Hu, 2021), book reviews (e.g. Birhan, 2021; and Jalilifar, Hayati & Don, 2018), advertisements (e.g. Fuertes-Olivera, Sacristan & Fernandez, 2001; Al-Subhi, 2022; and Gustafsson, 2017), textbooks and dissertations (e.g. Hyland, 1994, 1999, 2001; Kuhl & Behnam, 2010; Bunton, 1999; and Hyland & Tse , 2004), online entertainment articles (e.g. Rahmati & Khamsah, 2020), and research abstracts (Alzareini, Zainudin, Awal, & Sulaiman, 2019). However, less attention has been paid to the contrastive study of metadiscourse specifically interactional markers of two writing cultures; Filipino and American in particular. The current study focuses on contrastively comparing the production of interactional markers found in editorials of two leading newspapers in the Philippines and in the United States of America. Moreover, this study sought to achieve the following research objectives:

- To identify what cultural features are revealed by the Filipino editorialists and Anglo-American Editorialists; and,
- To determine how two writing cultures differ in the use of interactional metadiscourse resources in their editorials

3. Methodology

A total of 180 editorials were examined in this study: 90 editorials written by Filipino editorialists from Philippine Daily Inquirer (PDI) and 90 editorials written by American editorialists from New York Times (NYT). The duration within which the editorials were written was from August 1 to October 28, 2023. The PDI corpus has 74, 871 total number of words and NYT has 103, 860 total number of words 103, 860. Both newspaper genres have 178, 731 total of words. As a limitation of the study, the researchers decided to focus on the interactive resources of metadiscourse corroborated by Hyland & Tse (2004).

Moreover, as part of the contrastive analyses of the editorial corpus, two doctorate students from reputable universities served as intercoders with interceding agreement of 90%. After giving them ample time for contrastive analyses of the corpus, the researchers and the intercoders met to finalize the interceding agreement. After some disagreement, the researchers and intercoders reached 95% of interceding agreement.

4. Results and discussion

Table 1 Number of interactional metadiscourse markers employed by Philippine Daily

PDI	NYT	PDI	NYT	PDI	NYT	PDI	NYT	PDI	NYT
Transitions		Frame Markers		Endophoric Markers		Code Glosses		Evidentials	
3720	4963	0	0	0	0	212	300	217	312

Inquirer (PDI) and New York Times (NYT)

As can be seen American Editorialists preponderantly employed metadiscourse resources than Filipino editorialists did. In terms of total numbers of words in editorials, Americans had a total of 103, 860, whereas Filipino had a total of 74, 871 number of words with a difference of 28, 991. It implies that, American editorialists explicate more than their counterparts.

4.1. Transition Markers

Table 2 Number of occurrences of transitional devices in PDY and NYT

PDI	<i>f</i>	NYT	<i>f</i>	TOTAL
for	873	for	972	1845
and	2089	and	2664	4753
nor	10	nor	14	24
but	267	but	605	872
or	265	or	357	622
yet	28	yet	60	88
so	105	so	259	364
in addition	4	in addition	0	4
thus	34	thus	7	41
therefore	8	therefore	6	14
however	36	however	19	55
conversely	1	conversely	0	1
TOTAL	3720		4963	8683

Table 2 provides the top three transitional devices frequently occurred both in the texts of Americans and Filipinos namely; for, and, and but. In particular, American editorialists seem to prefer for which garnered the highest number of occurrences (972) and percentage (52.68%) followed by and which appeared 2664 times and has a percentage of 56.05%, and but which occurred 267 times which has a percentage of 30.62%. In contrast, Filipino editorialists just like Americans do employed for in their writings frequently which in turn occurred 873 times and garnered a percentage of 47.32 % followed by and which occurred 2089 times and has a percentage of 43.95%, and finally the use of but by Filipino writers which occurred 605 times in texts and has a percentage of 69.38%.

Based on the number of occurrences and percentage of the top three transitional devices used by the two writers, it seems that Filipino editorialists dominate their writings with the use of *but* to make claims or assert counterarguments in the texts for the benefits of the readers as regards to the issues or ideas propounded in the texts. American

editorialists, on the other hand, prefer the usage of *for* and *and to* to make more their writings filled with more information as may be deemed necessary by the writers themselves.

4.1.1. *Extract 1*

“Despite such massive scale of problems hounding Pasig River, the only project of note from the government was the launch in December 2019 of the Pasig River ferry, but even that has failed to attract a critical mass because the service was intermittent, and people had to contend with the offensive odor from the river.”

-PDI 8/3/23

4.1.2. *Extract 2*

“...as we’ve seen, our roads get flooded easily, our airports get bogged down regularly by technical problems, and much of our sea transport systems are unsafe.”

-PDI 10/4/23

4.1.3. *Extract 3*

...the sixth Ombudsman of the Philippines pushed for tough penalties, including five years in jail, **for** anyone who commented on the SALN of government employees, saying that this necessary document had been “weaponized” and were being used to destroy reputations.”

-PDI 9/14/2

4.1.4. *Extract 4*

“...we should pay communities for the energy generated by their solar panels or pay them to conserve energy by doing small things, like turning off their hot water heaters for a few hours.”

-NYT 8/13/2

4.1.5. *Extract 5*

“It’s the third criminal indictment of Mr. Trump, and it demonstrates, yet again, that the rule of law in America applies to everyone, even when the defendant was the country’s highest-ranking official. The crimes alleged in this indictment are, by far, the most serious because they undermine the country’s basic principles.”

-NYT 8/1/23

4.1.6. *Extract 6*

“That appears to be the first fruit of his campaign reboot, but there are good reasons he doesn’t like to stray from his rigid agenda, as demonstrated by his occasionally.”

-NYT 8/1/23

The above examples show how writer-editorialists use coordinating conjunctions or transitional devices to guide the readers through the texts. Those metadiscourse resources i.e. transitional devices provide relation between main clauses (Hyland, 2005).

These findings reveal that American writers are more confident in expounding their positions, ideas, and personalities in their writings since they belong to the Inner Circle of Concentric Circles of English (Kachru, 1995) These findings are in congruence with the study of Morales and Gomez (2023 citing Hinds 1970) saying that American editorialists are writer-responsible whereas Filipino editorialists are reader-responsible. American writers write articles by not considering so much of their readers. However, Filipino writers take more considerations on their readers in general and readers’ background, status, level of instructions, and especially the contexts in particular i.e. the texts must be understood by looking at the surrounding contexts.

Making arguments and counterarguments, insofar as the Filipino editorials are concerned, enables the readers to have a wider perspective regarding the issues being tackled by the writer. This finding supports Kuzborks and Soden (2018)

that Asian writers tend to use more frequently adversative conjunctions such as *however*, *yet*, and *but* in their texts. While Americans filled their editorials with *and* and *for* conjunctive connectors to make an impression of authority with regard to the topic and issues which the writer sees fit for the reader to adopt. (Hyland, 1997). This is within the idea of linearity in writing by which Americans provide rich information that must be understood within and in the texts (Hind 1987; Xing, Wang, & Spencer, 2008; Morales & Gomez, 2023). Additionally, this seems in conflict with the study of Madaini (2002) corroborated by Safari and Mahdavidrad (2021) that Asian writers i.e. Iranian use much additive conjunction such as *and* to enrich the facts of the texts which in effect projects the 'cultural model' distinct in the writings of many Asians.

Based on the summary of numbers of transitional devices used by American and Filipino writers, the former employed more conjunctions compare to the latter. In total NYT embedded 4963 and PDI 3720 transitional devices that give a discrepancy of 1243 gap between the two corpora. This is contrary to what Field and Oi (1992), Milton and Tsang (1993), Chen (2006), and Ishikawa (2010) said that non-native English speakers; that is, those whose L1 is not English, tend to overuse conjunctions in their writings whereas those native English writers use less conjunctions in their writings. The present study provides a clear indication that L1 or mother tongue has nothing to do nor has a strong correlation with the editorial writings as far as the metadiscourse is concerned. It may be said that that people in a speech community communicate via language that is understandable and thus conforms to the conventions of the contexts and the social realities therein. With this the L1 is not 'the' factor but may be said to be 'a' factor in the production of texts such as editorials. Therefore, experience and degree of education override the seemingly unequal use of metadiscourse markers by different writers who belong to different geographical locations and writing cultures (Zhao, 2017).

Regarding the employment of other two interactive metadiscourse markers namely; frame markers and endophoric markers, it was surprising but nonetheless justifiable that American and Filipino editorialists did not include those metadiscourse markers in their texts. Frame markers are the resources use to lead the readers in the texts by providing sequences, acts, or stages while endophoric markers are said to be resources that are used to indicate information other than the text itself (Hyland, 2005).

4.2. Frame Markers and Endophoric Markers

The absence of frame markers does not and cannot be equated to lack of coherence and cohesion of the texts. It may be said that writers purposively did not employ frame markers so as to enable the readers to look at the texts and the surrounding facts of the editorial as a whole e.g. social events and issues. On the other hand, with regard to endophoric markers, it may seem that writers both Filipinos and Americans deliberately omitted the use endophoric markers so as to make the texts smooth once the readers read the same. Also, it may be implied that endophoric markers, once utilized, will consume much space in the broadsheet which will in turn make the editorial section of the newspaper less appealing and might discombobulate the readers by giving them other information other than the texts presented.

Since editorial writings' potent objective is to persuade (Baff, 2020), employment of endophoric markers may be said to be a hindrance for the writer to effectively make the readers adopt their position and ideas in so far as their intentions as writers are concerned. The rarity of endophoric markers in editorial writings is therefore justifiable.

Be that as it may, one should be careful in jumping into generalizations that this phenomenon; that is, absence of frame markers and endophoric markers in the editorial texts, does not necessarily mean that there is no interaction between the readers and texts and the writer/s. Writers employed different linguistic techniques and rhetorical devices so as to present social relations in their editorials. Thus, the diffusion of the use of other metadiscourse markers compensates for the absence of endophic and frame markers.

4.3. Code Glosses

As can be seen in the table there were a total of 553 instances where the PDI and NYT editorial writers employed code glosses in their texts. In particular PDI used 167 code glosses on the hand and the NYT 386 code glosses on the hand. The highest frequency of code glosses as metadiscourse markers was obtained by *like*, which accounted for 262 of the total number of code glosses in the corpus (or 47.38%), followed by *called* 13.74, *such as* 7.96%, for example 5.06%, generally 2.89%, known as 2.71, specifically 2.17, in particular 1.99%, in general 0.90%, much like 0.36%, namely 0.18%, and referred to as 0.18%.

Table 3 Number of occurrences of Code Glosses in PDI and NYT

PDI	f	NYT	f	TOTAL
namely	1	namely	0	1
such as	27	such as	17	44
known as	4	known as	11	15
called	21	called	55	76
referred to us	1	referred to us	0	1
that is	33	that is	47	80
specifically	3	specifically	9	12
in particular	4	in particular	7	11
in general	3	in general	2	5
generally	1	generally	15	16
much like	1	much like	1	2
like	65	like	197	262
for example	3	for example	25	28
TOTAL	167		386	553

Table 3 indicates that among the 13 classes of code glosses, both Filipino and American editorialists seem to prefer *like*. It is also interesting to note that although *like* garnered the highest frequency, this feature is not so much utilized equally by the Filipinos and Americans in their editorials. As can be seen in table 3, Americans utilized *like* 262 times in their texts while Filipinos employed the same for only 65 times giving us the difference of 132. It is therefore safe to conclude that Americans are more fond of making additional information to ensure that the “writer’s predictions of the readers’ knowledge-base” and writer’s intended meaning are achieved (Hyland, 2005a, p.52). While Filipinos, on the other hand, seem to restrain themselves from using elaborative linguistic resources i.e. code glosses. This cannot be equated to lack of linguistic competence in delivering their points since each writing community shows different cultural and linguistic realities. One explanation regarding this event is that the Philippines belongs to the Outer Circle while the USA belongs to the Inner Circle (Kachru, 1980). As such the former delivers their points and reflects social realities in their editorials that must be understood by the contexts surrounding such a text compare to the latter. The wide discrepancies in the employment of code glosses may seem in conjunction to the issues and events that transpired in the two different countries i.e. the Philippines and the USA, under study. One way to justify this by looking at the facts and contexts when and how the code glosses are used by the American and Filipino editorialists.

4.3.1. Extract 1

“Cities like New York, which has more than 100,000 people living in shelters, cannot be expected to welcome asylum seekers on their own. More than 90,000 migrants have arrived in New York City over the past year, many as part of a political stunt by Texas, Florida and Arizona.”

-NYT 8/3/23

4.3.2. Extract 2

“Haley seems to have her feet still planted on the ground — able to face what Saul Bellow once called “the reality situation.””

-NYT 8/24/23

“One prominent economist declared that underlying inflation was and that “all the hoped-for saviors” — that is, forces that might bring inflation down painlessly...”

-NYT 9/11/23

4.3.3. Extract 3

“Given the government’s inability to bring down rice prices and secure more supply, the suggestion by Trade Secretary Alfredo Pascual for Filipinos to shift their diet to alternatives like sweet potato (camote) or white corn sounded like an insensitive, tone-deaf comment. Well, every little bit helps.”

-PDI 8/25/23

4.3.4. Extract 4

“Some of the world’s most unique structures were literally built on the past such as Antwerp’s port authority headquarters that used to be a derelict fire station; Singapore’s Space Asia that was built within and around two former homes; and L’École de Musique et de Théâtre in Louviers, France, that was built over the ruins of a monastery, just to cite a few examples.”

-PDI 10/1/23

4.3.5. Extract 6

“But beyond this, it is obvious that the country’s fiscal system—that is, the collection side and the spending side—need to be overhauled to make government more efficient at levying what is due to it, while spending wisely these precious resources where they are absolutely needed.”

-PDI 8/2/23

The examples presented above were culled from the editorials produced by Filipino and Americans. They present different issue-areas. Thus, it is prudent to conclude that they (Filipinos and Americans) utilized code glosses as may be deemed necessary in relations to their trainings and expertise as writers, and experience. This is in support to what Habibie (2019) and Hyland (2019) which posited that irrespective of L1 the use of metadiscourse resources in general and code glosses in particular depend upon the experience and familiarity with the rhetorical conventions in the field of the writers concerned. Making generalizations on the basis of numerical differences in the use of code glosses is not so much significant since editorial writings tackle different issues in a particular speech community. The socio-linguistic realities also make a contribution on how and when to employ code glosses.

4.4. Evidentials

Table 4 Number of occurrences of evidentials in PDI and NYT

PDI	f	NYT	f	TOTAL
according to	50	according to	0	50
states	21	states	99	120
state	23	state	120	143
provides	4	provides	7	11
provide	19	provide	17	36
based on	49	based on	0	49
admittedly	1	admittedly	1	2
argue	2	argue	5	7
maintain	9	maintain	3	12
clearly	13	clearly	18	31
probably	6	probably	24	30
possibly	4	possibly	6	10
certainly	17	certainly	12	29

as noted	2	as noted	0	2
shows that	1	shows that	0	1
TOTAL	221		312	533

As reflected in Table 4, differences may be seen in the use of evidential resources between American editorials and Filipino editorials. The total number of evidentials is 533. Specifically, NYT employed more evidentials in their texts amounting to 312 whereas PDI employed only 221 with a difference of 91. This may imply that American editorialists try to persuade and connect with the readers using rational approach whereas Filipino editorialists are more inclined in using emotional approach.

Also, the utilization of more evidentials as metadiscourse resources may be said to be a reflection of objectivity and functionality while less evidentials metadiscourse resources adhere to subjectivity and value-expressiveness. These findings are in support to what Kamimura and Oi (1998 cited in Dayag, 2009) that Americans tend to use rational appeal; that is, information based on facts that are not subject to objection while Asians especially Orientals i.e. Japanese, tend to use the emotional or affective appeal in their [argumentative] writings.

4.4.1. Extract 1

"It may also be used to buy or rent supplies, materials, and equipment for confidential operations; pay rewards to informers, and uncover or prevent illegal activities that pose a clear and present danger to agency personnel and property. Such wide-ranging guidelines, in effect, provide the legal basis for any state agency to ask for CIF."

-PDI 9/18/23

4.4.2. Extract 2

*"The reclamation projects in Manila Bay are at various stages of development, **according to** data from the Philippine Reclamation Authority, which former president Rodrigo Duterte had transferred from the DENR to the Office of the President in 2019 through Executive Order No. 74..."*

-PDI 8/18/23

4.4.3. Extract 3

*"The National Mapping and Resource Information Authority on Tuesday noted that sea levels in Manila are rising at thrice the global average: 8.4 millimeters a year compared to 3.4 mm/year global average **based on** data from 1902 to 2022."*

-PDI 8/18/23

4.4.4. Extract 4

"According to the standard model, which is the basis for essentially all research in the field, there is a fixed and precise sequence of events that followed the Big Bang: First, the force of gravity pulled together denser regions in the cooling cosmic gas, which grew to become stars and black holes; then, the force of gravity pulled together the stars into galaxies."

-NYT 9/02/23

The above cited examples give us how the two editorialists namely; Americans and Filipinos, used evidentials in their editorials in order to create an authorial command of the subject. In general the utilization of evidential markers are indications that the metalinguistic representations of idea from the another source are observed (Thomas & Hawes, 1994 cited in Yang, 2014) making the whole structures of the texts coherent and persuasive. Through the employment of evidential metadiscourse markers will enable the writer to effectively guide the readers regarding the ideas that are being tackled in the editorial section of the newspaper. These markers help the writers persuade the readers to be active participants engaged in the written discourse.

5. Conclusion

The study revealed that American editorialists preponderantly employed metadiscourse resources in writing their editorials, while Filipino editorialist less employed metadiscourse resources in writing their editorialists. Specifically,

this was evidenced in the total number of words each writing culture has produced. Additionally, top three transitional devices frequently employed were *for*, *and*, and *but*. Additionally, based on the number of occurrences and percentage of the top three transitional devices used by the two writers, it seems that Filipino editorialists dominate their writings with the use of *but* to make claims or assert counterarguments in the texts. Conversely, American editorialists prefer the usage of *for* and *and* to make more their writings filled with more information to substantiate their editorials. As far as code glosses are concerned, the results indicate that among the 13 classes of code glosses, both Filipino and American editorialists seem to prefer like. It is also interesting to note that although like garnered the highest frequency, this feature is not so much utilized equally by the Filipinos and Americans in their editorials. In addition, Americans utilized *like* 262 times in their texts while Filipinos employed the same for only 65 times giving us the difference of 132. Seemingly, It could be concluded that Americans are more fond of making additional information to ensure that the “writer’s predictions of the readers’ knowledge-base” and writer’s intended meaning are achieved. While Filipinos, on the other hand seem to moderate themselves from using elaborative linguistic resources i.e. code glosses, this result cannot be equated to lack of linguistic competence in delivering their points. One explanation regarding this event is that the Philippines belongs to the Outer Circle while the USA belongs to the Inner Circle. As such the former delivers their points and reflects social realities in their editorials that must be construed by the contexts surrounding such a text as compared to the latter. The wide discrepancies in the employment of code glosses may seem in conjunction to the issues and events that transpired in the two different countries under study. One way to justify this by looking at the facts and contexts when and how the code glosses are used by the American and Filipino editorialists.

ESL teachers have an important role in shaping the writing skills of their students. In this regard, they may provide writing activities on combining simple sentences using conjunctions specifically the coordinating conjunctions *for*, *and*, *nor*, *but*, *or*, *yet*, and *so*, (FANBOYS). Furthermore, after reading editorials in the class, ESL teachers, may ask students to produce compound complex sentences anchoring these on the highlighted topic in the editorial read, thereby developing the thinking skills of the students. Also, highlighting the employment of FANBOYS and the appropriate punctuation marks of compound complex sentences. Another pedagogical implication is that the ESL teachers may ask the students to write an editorial of the current events using different sentences according to structures (simple, compound, complex, and compound-complex sentences).

In addition, collaborative activities where students are grouped by the ESL teachers asking them to examine the cohesion employed by the editorialists in their writings. Furthermore, ESL teachers may ask the students to write personal essays in dyads using different cohesive devices. They may also ask the students to identify the lexicogrammatical features and structures of the editorials written by American and Filipino editorialists.

For research directions, researchers may use other writing cultures to contrastively compare them. For instance, comparing countries from the inner and outer circles employing interactional and interactive resources of metadiscourse. The results in this study may be considered less conclusive due to small corpora. Thus, overgeneralizations should be avoided, thereby more studies on interactive resources of metadiscourse should be conducted.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

References

- [1] Alzarieni, M. M., Zainudin, I. S., Awal, N. M., & Sulaiman, M. N. (2019). Interactional metadiscourse markers in the abstract sections of Arabic patents. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(2), 379–393. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.29>
- [2] Al-Subhi, A. S. (2022). Metadiscourse in online advertising: Exploring linguistic and visual metadiscourse in social media advertisements. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 187, 24–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.10.027>
- [3] Ansary, H., & Babaii, E. (2009). A cross-cultural analysis of English newspaper editorials. *RELC Journal*, 40(2), 211–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688209105867>
- [4] Baff, R. E., Wachsmuth, H., Khatib, K. A., & Stein, B. (2020). Analyzing the Persuasive Effect of Style in News Editorial Argumentation. *Association for Computational Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.287>
- [5] Bell, A. (1991). *The language of news media*. CiNii Research. <https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1130282271249833984>

- [6] Birhan, A. T. (2021). An exploration of metadiscourse usage in book review articles across three academic disciplines: a contrastive analysis of corpus-based research approach. *Scientometrics*, 126(4), 2885–2902. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03822-w>
- [7] Bunton, D. (1999). The use of higher level metatext in Ph.D theses. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, S41–S56. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906\(98\)00022-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906(98)00022-2)
- [8] Çapar, M., & Turan, Ü. D. (2020). Interactional metadiscourse in research articles written by Turkish and Native speakers. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 10(1), 324–358. <https://doi.org/10.18039/ajesi.682042>
- [9] Chen, C. W. (2006). The use of conjunctive adverbials in the academic papers of advanced Taiwanese EFL learners. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 11(1), 113–130. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.11.1.05che>
- [10] Connor, U. (1996). Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-Cultural aspects of Second-Language writing. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED401754>
- [11] Crystal, D. (2016). 3. English as a Global Language. In *Multilingual Matters eBooks* (pp. 34–62). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783095681-004>
- [12] Crismore, A. et al. (1993) 'Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: A study of texts written by American and Finnish university students', *Written Communication*
- [13] Cai, G. (n.d.). Beyond Bad Writing: Teaching English composition to Chinese ESL students. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED364104>
- [14] Dayag, D. (2009). *Metadiscourse, Argumentation, and Asian Englishes: A Contrastive Rhetoric Approach*. UST Publishing House.
- [15] Field, Y., & Oi, Y. L. M. (1992). A comparison of internal conjunctive cohesion in the English essay writing of Cantonese speakers and native speakers of English. *RELC Journal*, 23(1), 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829202300102>
- [16] Garcés, C. V. (1996). Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Spanish-English economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 15(4), 279–294. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906\(96\)00013-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906(96)00013-0)
- [17] Gustafsson, M. (2018). Metadiscourse in advertising: Persuasion in online advertisements of makeup brands. N/A. <http://lnu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:1191292>
- [18] Halliday, M. (1989). Introduction to functional grammar. *Language*, 65(4), 862. <https://doi.org/10.2307/414947>
- [19] Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*, 3, 183-195.
- [20] Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsible: a new typology. In U Connor and R.B. Kaplan (eds). *Writing across languages: analysis of L2 text*.
- [21] Hu, G., & Cao, F. (2011). Hedging and boosting in abstracts of applied linguistics articles: A comparative study of English- and Chinese-medium journals. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(11), 2795–2809. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.007>
- [22] Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: A Reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156–177. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.156>
- [23] Hyland, K. (1994). Hedging in academic writing and EAF textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(3), 239–256. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(94\)90004-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(94)90004-3)
- [24] Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(3), 341–367. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.3.341>
- [25] Hyland, K. (2001). Disciplinary Discourses: Social interactions in Academic writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(2), 344. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587657>
- [26] Hyland, K. (2012). *Disciplinary identities*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009406512>
- [27] Hyland, K. (2015). Teaching and researching writing. In *Routledge eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717203>
- [28] Jalilifar, A., Hayati, S., & Don, A. (2018). Investigating metadiscourse markers in book reviews and blurbs: A study of interested and disinterested genres. *Studies about Languages*, 33, 90-107.
- [29] Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). The Handbook of World Englishes. In *Blackwell Publishing Ltd eBooks* (pp. 289–312). <https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9781405111850.2006.00021.x>

- [30] Kafes, H. (2022). Akademik söylemde kod belirleyicileri. Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 48, 53–72. <https://doi.org/10.21497/sefad.1218358>
- [31] Kamimura, T., & Oi, K. (1998). Argumentative strategies in American and Japanese English. *World Englishes*, 17(3), 307–323. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971x.00106>
- [32] Kuhi, D., & Behnam, B. (2010). Generic Variations and Metadiscourse Use in the writing of Applied Linguists: A Comparative Study and Preliminary framework. *Written Communication*, 28(1), 97–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088310387259>
- [33] Kuzborska, I., & Soden, B. (2018). The construction of opposition relations in high-, middle-, and low-rated postgraduate ESL Chinese students' essays. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 34, 68–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.03.013>
- [34] Lemke, J.L. (1998). Multiplying meaning, visual and verbal semiotics in scientific text. In J.R. Martin & R. Veel (eds.), *Reading science* (pp. 87–113). London: Routledge.
- [35] Míguez-Álvarez, C., Alonso, M. C., & Cruz, M. (2021). The Relationship between Metacomprehension and Reading Comprehension in Spanish as a Second Language. *Psicología Educativa: Revista De Los Psicólogos De La Educación*, 28(1), 23–29. <https://doi.org/10.5093/psed2021a26>
- [36] Milton, J. C., & Tsang, E. S. (1993). A corpus-based study of logical connectors in EFL students' writing : directions for future research. HKUST SPD | the Institutional Repository. <https://hdl.handle.net/1783.1/1083>
- [37] Mohamed, A., & Omer, M. R. (2000). Texture and Culture: Cohesion as a marker of rhetorical organisation in Arabic and English narrative texts. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Texture-and-Culture%3A-Cohesion-as-a-Marker-of-in-and-Mohamed-Omer/8829c88ffa41d036c8bb63ef3077e88ded765a77>
- [38] Morales, R. C. (2012) Conclusions in research articles: A Filipino-Japanese contrastive rhetoric study. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 8, February: 83–95.
- [39] Morales, R., & Gómez, M. S. (2023). A Filipino-American Contrastive study on newspaper Genre: A response to post Pandemic period. *Open Access Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 6(2), 038–048. <https://doi.org/10.53022/oarjms.2023.6.2.0046>
- [40] Moreno, A. I. (1997). Genre constraints across languages: Causal metatext in Spanish and English RAs. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(3), 161–179. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906\(96\)00023-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906(96)00023-3)
- [41] Mu, C., Zhang, L. J., Ehrich, J., & Hong, H. (2015). The use of metadiscourse for knowledge construction in Chinese and English research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 20, 135–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.09.003>
- [42] Pérez-Llantada, C. (2003). Communication skills in academic monologic discourse: Empirical and applied perspectives. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 3(15), 1–14.
- [43] Searle, J. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1–24
- [44] Swales, J. M. (2004). Research genres. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139524827>
- [45] Safari, M., & Mahdavidad, F. (2021). Native vs. Novice Nonnative Writers' Use of Conjunctions in Conference Abstracts of Soft vs. Hard Sciences. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Translation Studies*, 6(2), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.22034/efl.2021.285118.1098>
- [46] Vanda Kopple, w. (1988). Metadiscourse and the recall of modality markers. *Visible language*, 22 (2), 233–272.
- [47] Xing, M., Wang, J., & Spencer, K. A. (2008). Raising students' awareness of Cross-Cultural contrastive rhetoric in English writing via an E-Learning course. *Language Learning & Technology*, 12(2), 71–93. <http://elc.msu.edu/llt/vol12num2/xingetal.pdf>
- [48] Yüksel, H. G., & Kavanoz, S. (n.d.). Dimension of experience: Metadiscourse in the texts of Novice Non-Native, Novice Native and Expert Native Speaker. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1185916>
- [49] Zarei, G. R., & Mansoori, S. (2011). A Contrastive Study on Metadiscourse Elements Used in Humanities vs. Non Humanities across Persian and English. *English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 42. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n1p42>
- [50] Zhao, C. G., & Llosa, L. (2008). Voice in high-stakes L1 academic writing assessment: Implications for L2 writing instruction. *Assessing Writing*, 13(3), 153–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2008.10.003>