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The Philippine ESL Journal has received many submissions last year, which is why we have nine articles divided in two sections for this issue. We thank Dr. Maria Cequena and Mr. Jessie Barrot from De la Salle University, Manila; and Dr. Teresita Tajoloso from Palawan State University for their willingness and time to review the articles extensively.

The previous issues of PESL have one or two submissions representing countries from Asia other than the Philippines. In this issue, only the works of Filipino scholars and researchers were included. This may not be a coincidence but a circumstantial indication to highlight some of the areas of research that are of importance to the language learning/teaching in the Philippines, the Mecca for English language learning (Robertson, 2008; Magno, 2009), as more Asian students coming from Iran, China, Korea, and other neighbouring Asian countries come to the Philippines to learn English and get their undergraduate and graduate courses in language education.

The first section presents four sociolinguistic-discourse analytic researches touching different sectors in the Philippines. Applying Goffman’s (1999) framework on the concept of Face, Pamela Skouhus’s study provides an ingenious analysis of business workplace interaction and face management on employer-employee discourse that involved face threatening speech acts: avoidance process and corrective process. Using Gumperz’s (1982) framework for conversational functions of code-switching, Gocheco’s paper appropriately addressed a gap in Philippine research. The study analyzed a unique corpus of political discourse: television-mediated political campaign advertisement (TPCA) during the campaign period for Philippine senatorial elections. My ethnographic study with Mikhail Go utilized triangulation techniques to analyze the preferred medium of communication and patterns of code
alternations of Filipino factory labor workers. Morales’ study represents a discourse of the educated sector of the Philippine society: adults who were 18 years old and above and who were educated in the Philippines through English as a medium of instruction. The study analyzed the meaning and function of actually and in fact in Philippine English from ICE-Phi corpus.

These studies remind us of the thriving area in Philippine research which was strengthened by the voluminous works of Danilo Dayag, an intelligent scholar who gave Discourse Analysis a significant role in the tradition of Philippine research, and his students (e.g. on classroom discourse, Dayag, 2012; on media discourse, Dayag, 2008a, 2008b; Dayag, 2010; on metadiscourse and argumentation, Dayag, 2009; on political discourse, Gocheco, 2010; on academic discourse, Gustilo, 2010; on media discourse, Pullido, 2010, to name a few). May all those who come behind us (our students and young researchers) find these works inspiring as we too have been inspired by the legendary works of Bro. Andrew Gonzales and Dr. Ma. Lourdes (Tish) Bautista—two prominent pillars in Philippine Linguistics.

The second part of the issue includes research touching psycholinguistics, bilingualism, and ESL research. It reports on researches delving on variables that play important role in language learning in a bilingual and ESL context. First, Cequena’s study involving 66 freshman college students investigated how weblogging can facilitate the development of writing skills. Students did their writing tasks using a web facility where they could read and post comments on their written outputs. Cequena found that weblogging indeed helped students develop their writing performance. Second, Gomari and Lucas focused their research lenses on the language learning motivation and language anxiety of Iranian EFL students in the Philippines. Their top finding indicated that these students were not amotivated. But further study needs to be done to confirm their findings as their study did not find strong evidence to the claim that the students are extrinsically motivated rather than intrinsically motivated to learn the English language. Third, using Mokhtari and Reichard’s (2002) Metacognitive Awareness Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSII), Mante-Estacio examined the metacognitive awareness and perceived use of reading strategies of 30 ESL students. She found that her participants used the three major types of
metacognitive reading strategies. However, her findings need confirmation as her study did not specify which strategy affects reading comprehension because the regression analysis indicated that there was no significant predictor of the reading tests scores. Fourth, **Alice Mae A. Mamhot, Maria Hannah V. Martin and Elaine M. Masangya** contributed to the literature of language anxiety by comparing two groups of respondents: 20 ESL and 20 EFL learners in two Philippine-based learning institutions using the 33-item Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) survey developed by Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) and the 2-item questionnaire adapted from Williams and Andrade (2008). Again, I sound a trumpet call to replicate their study to confirm their findings especially the finding that the EFL group have “no level of language anxiety,” while the ESL students have a slight anxiety on the Fear of Negative Evaluation and General Feeling of Anxiety. Lastly, **Parina and De Leon’s** paper focused on three interesting variables: writing apprehension, writing self-efficacy, and language exposure. Utilizing a language exposure questionnaire, Daly-Miller’s writing apprehension test or WAT (Erkan and Saban, 2011), and YaVuz-Erkan’s (2004, cited in Erkan & Saban, 2011) self-efficacy in writing scale questionnaire (SWS), they found an inverse relationship between writing apprehension and writing efficacy, no correlation between writing apprehension and language exposure, but significant relationship between language exposure and efficacy.

One common denominator of the studies introduced here, which is a limitation that can be improved on in future research, is the small size of the sample, making the conclusions and generalizations tentative. Nevertheless, the studies have made significant contributions in the field of linguistics, as these studies have identified and occupied important gaps in research and have contributed in the validation of theories and findings that underpin and inform successful language learning and teaching. More importantly, these studies are informed by methodologies and perspectives from multiple disciplines, which are integrated into an innovative research. I am specifically amazed at how language teachers now have employed quantitative methods (In the past, many of our studies have been largely qualitative in nature) and concepts from other related disciplines in doing research.
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