An investigation of cultural values and their impact on rhetorical use of pronouns and determiners in EFL essays

iD **Andrew Schenck**

American University of Sharjah, University City, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates.
Email: aschenck@aus.edu

ABSTRACT

Little empirical investigation of cultural influences on rhetoric has been conducted, limiting our understanding of how persuasive discourse may be enhanced in diverse contexts. To broaden our understanding of rhetorical variation and cross-cultural communication, the present study examined a variety of persuasive essays from the International Corpus Network of Asian Learners of English (ICNALE). English texts from college students at the highest proficiency level in the corpus (CEFR B2) were analyzed from mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, Japan, South Korea, Indonesia, the United Arab Emirates, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand. To evaluate the relationship between rhetorical variation and cultural beliefs, the frequency of first-person singular (*I*, *me*, and *my*), first-person plural (*we*, *us*, and *our*), third-person singular (*he*, *him*, *his*, *she*, and *her*), third-person plural (*they*, *them*, *their*), and second-person (*you* and *your*) pronouns and determiners was compared to cultural beliefs about power distance and individualism (vs. collectivism). Comparison using the non-parametric Spearman rho formula revealed that collective societies that accepted hierarchical differences had fewer first-person singular pronouns (rs = -.83; p =.011) and more third-person singular masculine pronouns (rs = .89; p =.003). Individualistic cultural groups had more first-person singular pronouns (rs = .78; p =.023) and less third-person singular masculine pronouns (rs = -.80; p =.017). Findings suggest that rhetorical use of pronouns for persuasion vary predictably in tandem with cultural values. Such information provides insights concerning how English rhetoric and pedagogy may be improved to enhance intercultural communication.

Contribution/ Originality: This study contributes to existing literature by exploring cultural influences that impact written discourse. It offers new insights concerning how cultural values affect rhetorical variation of pronouns and determiners and enhances understanding of intercultural communication.

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, I asked ChatGPT to write a college essay using the following prompt: Smoking should be completely banned at all restaurants in the country. The essay that resulted was cohesive, eloquent, and well-written. Following this, I asked the LLM to write the essay to connect with a reader from China. It produced a number of changes. It added an opening about dining in China, highlighted a Confucian value for respect to others, mentioned local examples of government regulations, and used aspects of national pride to build a sense of belonging. Although information about background conditions in China clearly added appeal for a Chinese reader, it did not connect with the reader

on a personal level. After asking ChatGPT to "connect with the Chinese reader more closely," the LLM then responded with the following reply.

Understood to connect more closely with a Chinese college student, the essay should.

- Begin with a vivid scene from daily Chinese life (e.g., family dining, hotpot, children coughing in smoke).
- Tie arguments to Confucian values (harmony, respect, responsibility).
- Use Chinese examples such as Beijing, Shanghai, restaurant culture, and modernization.
- Appeal to both national pride and personal experience (OpenAI, 2025).

The next revision that followed was very similar to the first, incorporating familiar background variables related to cultural, historical, or political factors. Although the essays produced were truly impressive, they all revealed a clear weakness. The LLM could identify what to put in an essay, but often lacked an understanding of how to address a specific reader on a more personal level. The essays lacked voice, failing to use persuasive expressions designed for a specific cultural or linguistic group. Research suggests people from different cultural contexts use rhetorical techniques in unique ways when writing in English. Among Chinese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, for example, modals of persuasion are often used with the first-person pronoun as in "We should," reflecting Confucian heritage contexts that discourage individuality and stress social harmony (Li, 2016). Other research suggests that meta-discursive nouns (e.g., in adherence to the belief that….) are used much less often in Chinese cultural contexts, as is hedging (Hu, Zhao, & Lu, 2024; Hu & Cao, 2011).

An inability to change how discourse is conveyed for a target reader reveals an inherent weakness in modern-day LLMs. They construct essays based upon mainstream training data that do not adequately address the needs of diverse individuals. In order to make English writing more effective in diverse cultural contexts, it is essential that rhetorical variation is examined in further detail. Writers may then be able to tailor their writing to the unique cultural and linguistic needs of diverse readers. More research is needed to examine rhetorical variation in diverse contexts, so that intercultural communication in English can be enhanced (Luo & Chen, 2025).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Early research by Kaplan (1966) identified rhetorical differences in English essays written by learners from different cultural backgrounds. In Asian contexts, he found that learners with Arabic or Hebrew origins often used parallel clauses and syntactic constructions, whereas learners from countries like China and South Korea tended to use indirect, circular discourse that ultimately leads to a central argument. Although the theory provided some unique insights for understanding and composing rhetoric, the study also had some major shortcomings. First, it failed to identify dynamic processes of group membership or cultural change (Cahill, 2003; Huh & Lee, 2019; Severino, 1993). Studies have revealed a degree of variability in cultural values and beliefs, which are impacted by local educational institutions and individual experiences (Kim, 2017). Secondly, it was an oversimplification of cultural values and groups, which limited our understanding of key differences that may impact learning. Subsequent research has helped to compensate for this shortcoming by expanding research to several different cultural contexts, thereby leading to empirical measures of beliefs along a continuum. Hofstede (1984) identified variation of six different cultural values in over 70 countries. Another study called the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) research program identified variation of nine cultural values in 62 countries (House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004; House et al., 1999). More recent research has updated the findings of prior research, examining changes in cultural beliefs that impact different regions of the world (Almutairi, Heller, & Yen, 2021; Minkov et al., 2017).

While conceptions of cultural complexity have been expanded, research examining the impact of cultural beliefs on writing remains relatively unexplored. In an attempt to address the overly simplistic analysis of the Kaplan study, new research on rhetorical variation has focused primarily on localized theoretical conceptions of culture. Intercultural Rhetoric (IR), for example, was devised to examine the impact of local social contexts and genre on

rhetorical variation (Connor, 2004). IR uses a "small culture" approach, which emphasizes the examination of coexisting cultural subgroups (Holliday, 1999).

IR indeed addresses the shortcoming of Kaplan's study by examining cultural variability within local contexts. However, this localized framework for evaluation, along with a singular focus on differences, limits the development of comprehensive pedagogical frameworks for cultural values that are still broadly recognized. In regions of the Middle East and countries with Confucian heritage, research highlights significant cultural forces influencing rhetoric (Hamadouche, 2013; Hamam, 2020; Hammad, 2002; Jiang, 2006). These countries often exhibit high values for power distance, supporting unequal power and status relationships, and collectivism, emphasizing group action and loyalty (Buja, 2019; Zhao & Khan, 2013). The influence of these values is evident in education. For instance, teachers in Chinese contexts frequently speak with authority, demonstrating a high degree of power distance, even within Western educational institutions (Li & Guo, 2012; Zhang & Wang, 2022). Japanese teachers also leverage cultural values related to power distance, while students tend to adopt a collectivist approach to group tasks (Alshahrani, 2017).

Investigations of rhetoric must be multi-faceted, considering both similarities and differences that enhance intercultural communication in writing. Large-scale international studies of cultural characteristics (Hofstede, 1984; House et al., 2002; House et al., 2004; House et al., 1999) may provide a means for such inquiry. They offer empirical evidence of cultural beliefs from various cultural contexts, which can be compared and contrasted to expand our understanding of how rhetoric is employed. The potential of this research is illustrated through the examination of cultural beliefs in Table 1.

Table 1. Cultural values in Asian contexts (The Culture Factor Group, 2025).

Asian contexts	Power distance	Individualism
China	80	43
Singapore	74	43
Hong Kong	68	50
South Korea	60	58
Taiwan	58	40
Japan	54	62
Indonesia	78	5
Pakistan	55	5
Philippines	94	17
Thailand	64	19
United Arab Emirates	74	36
United States	40	60

As revealed in Table 1, there tends to be higher cultural values for both power distance and collectivism. Values for power distance are higher than those found in a Western context such as the United States, while those for individualism are lower (with the exception of Japan). These similarities may impact rhetoric in some way. Students with high power distance, for example, may be reluctant to use contentious rhetoric that oversteps authority or causes others to lose face (Nelson, 2000; Yoo, 2014). They may feel compelled to use language that tempers judgments made about others. Learners in a highly stratified and collective society may also utilize discourse that respects different status positions (e.g., using hedging for arguments).

At the same time, subtle cultural differences in Table 1 may have an impact on how rhetoric manifests. While many Asian contexts share high values for power distance and collectivism, their beliefs still differ. Just as it is important to evaluate similarities in rhetoric among learners, it is essential to examine key differences. Joint consideration of similarities and differences may help educators better understand how rhetoric is impacted by cultural factors, leading to new pedagogical techniques for the promotion of intercultural communication. Further

research is needed to help provide insights that may help English writers produce compositions for specific cultural communities.

2.1. Power Distance, Collectivism, and Rhetoric

Values such as power distance and collectivism help define social relationships, behaviors, and communication. The influences of these factors may be exemplified in the classroom, where students in contexts with high power distance maintain decorum through careful regulation of behavior or speech. Influences may also be exemplified in classrooms with collectivist traditions, where students may be compelled to use inclusive language that promotes group cohesion and harmony.

Just as cultural values define relationships between people, they may also serve to define the relationship between a writer and their reader. This view appears to be illustrated by the consistent use of the inclusive first-person plural pronoun for persuasion in EFL essays from the Chinese mainland (e.g., "We should…") (Li, 2016). Collectivism and high-power distance seem to prompt writers to employ a more inclusive and non-judgmental pronoun (as opposed to "You should…"), ensuring that values for collectivism and power distance are maintained. Using the inclusive *we* helps to build a closer relationship with the reader through inclusion in the same group or speech community. By using this pronoun, the writer helps to build a common identity for both the writer and their reader (Petersoo, 2007). The pronoun also connects directly with the reader, as does the utilization of the pronoun *you*. Hyland (2005) explains that these two pronouns are used to "acknowledge and connect to others, recognizing the presence of their readers, pulling them along with their argument, focusing their attention, acknowledging their uncertainties, including them as discourse participants, and guiding them to interpretations" (p. 176).

Using the first-person singular pronoun and determiner (*I, me, or my*) may also be influenced by cultural factors. It is not used to directly address the reader. Instead, it is a means to express individual thoughts or beliefs, making an argument more personal for the reader. Using these devices is a means by which a writer stamps "their personal authority onto their arguments" (Hyland, 2005). In societies where group ideals or behaviors are valued over individualistic freedoms, such rhetorical devices may not be as prevalent.

Finally, third-person singular pronouns (*He, she, him, her, and his*) may be impacted by cultural values. Power distance, a form of social inequality, serves to maintain strict status or power differences that may affect how rhetoric is expressed. In societies with a high degree of power distance, a direct connection with the reader may not be acceptable for persuasion, particularly if the reader is a superior (e.g., a teacher or boss). In contrast to more direct relationships signified when using *I, you*, and *we*, more distant relationships denoting "other" may be established by using pronouns such as *he, she, it*, and *they* (Yule, 1996). Since power differences are often associated with male dominance in prominent social roles, such cultures may also utilize the pronoun *he* more frequently. Conversely, in more individualistic and egalitarian societies, female pronouns and determiners (*She, her*) may be used more often, along with more neutral third-person plural pronouns and determiners (*They, them, their*).

While potential relationships between rhetorical pronouns and cultural beliefs are intriguing, they have not been investigated in detail. Studies of several different contexts may reveal an impact of cultural values on rhetoric, leading to the development of new writing techniques or language pedagogy that fosters effective intercultural communication.

2.2. Research Questions

To examine relationships between rhetorical variation and cultural values, the following questions were posed.

1. Is there a significant relationship between the number of pronouns and determiners used in EFL essays and a writer's cultural values regarding power distance or collectivism?

2. How does the pragmatic use of pronouns or determiners differ in essays from different cultural contexts? How can these differences be used to enhance our understanding of intercultural rhetoric and inform the design of EFL instruction?

Through examining these questions, the results could lead to new pedagogical techniques for promoting intercultural communication.

3. METHOD

The present study was designed to investigate potential influences of two cultural values on rhetoric in English essays: power distance and individualism (collectivism). To provide a comprehensive view of the impact of these cultural variables, writers from a large number of different countries needed to be evaluated. In addition, these writers needed to have a similar English level to ensure that compositional differences were not related to language proficiency. Finally, essays produced by these writers needed to be of the same genre to help ensure that differences in topic were not the cause of rhetorical variation. By choosing essays of the same genre, written by EFL learners at the same English proficiency level, extraneous influences on rhetorical variation could be better controlled.

To select essays of the same genre written by EFL learners at similar proficiency levels, the International Corpus Network of Asian Learners of English (ICNALE) was utilized. This corpus prompted participants to compose essays on two specific topics: the importance of having a part-time job and whether smoking in restaurants should be permitted. Participants were allocated 20 to 40 minutes for each essay, without access to dictionaries or digital devices (Ishikawa, 2013; Ishikawa, 2023). The uniform administration of essay prompts and procedures aimed to ensure that rhetorical differences primarily reflected the students' unique cultural and linguistic backgrounds. In total, 11 different cultural contexts were analyzed: mainland China (13 essays, 3360 tokens), Singapore (132 essays, 33485 tokens), Hong Kong (17 essays, 3990 tokens), South Korea (152 essays, 36194 tokens), Taiwan (23 essays, 5856 tokens), Japan (36 essays, 8532 tokens), Indonesia (6 essays, 1541 tokens), Pakistan (6 essays, 1519 tokens), the Philippines (22 essays, 6032 tokens), Thailand (4 essays, 1016 tokens), and the United Arab Emirates (122 essays, 28351 tokens).

To evaluate the relationships between cultural values and rhetoric, first-person, second-person, and third-person pronouns and determiners were tallied from each set of essays using the corpus analysis tool called AntConc. Pronouns and determiners were grouped into the following categories for analysis: first-person singular (*I, me, my*), first-person plural (*we, us, our*), second-person (*You, your*), third-person singular (*he, him, his / she, her*), and third-person plural (*they, them, their*). After total instances of each category were tallied, they were statistically compared to empirical values for each cultural belief defined by The Culture Factor Group (2025) using the Spearman rank correlation (see Table 1). The Culture Factor Group has empirical scores based on the work of Hofstede (1984), yet also incorporates the latest research to ensure that empirical values are current (Almutairi et al., 2021; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010; Minkov et al., 2017). Due to rigorous efforts to keep empirical values up to date through modern research, this tool was considered ideal for the present study.

Smaller datasets from Indonesia (6 essays), Pakistan (6 essays), and Thailand (4 essays) had very few instances of any pronoun, with some pronouns missing any representation altogether (see Appendix for more information on frequencies of pronouns and determiners). Due to the potential of these very small samples to skew results, they were eliminated from empirical evaluation. Only contexts with at least 10 essays were deemed worthy of evaluation. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used to analyze the remaining empirical values from the 8 remaining countries. A non-parametric measure was used since a normal distribution of values could not be assumed.

Following the calculation of inferential statistics, results were followed by further examination of descriptive statistics that explained significant relationships between pronouns and cultural values. A qualitative examination of statistically significant relationships was also conducted to further triangulate the findings. Such examination helped

to provide a more concrete understanding of statistically significant relationships, leading to additional insights about rhetorical variation and potential pedagogical applications.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Research Question 1: Relationships Between Rhetoric and Cultural Values

Correlation with cultural beliefs yielded some significant relationships regarding first-person singular and third-person singular (Masculine) grammatical categories. First-person singular pronouns and determiners were significantly correlated with empirical values for both power distance and individualism (Table 2). Regarding power distance, the correlation was negative ($r_s = -0.83$; $p = 0.011$). As acceptance of status and power differences increased, the number of first-person pronouns decreased. Learners from contexts with high power distance may be reluctant to express individual opinions or assertions, feeling that such rhetoric may be perceived as an act of defiance against authority. Concerning individualism, the correlation was positive ($r_s = 0.78$; $p = 0.023$). Learners tended to infuse more personal rhetoric into essays as cultural values for individualism increased. Conversely, learners from collective cultures tended to use these pronouns less, perhaps reflecting the perceived importance of expressing shared values over individualistic ones.

Table 2. Correlations of cultural beliefs with pronouns and determiners.

Correlations						
	I*	**We**	**She**	**He**	**You**	**They**
Power distance	-0.826*	-0.012	-0.060	0.886*	0.228	-0.371
	0.011	0.978	0.888	0.003	0.588	0.365
	8	8	8	8	8	8
Individualism	0.778*	0.192	-0.216	-0.802*	-0.671	0.204
	0.023	0.649	0.608	0.017	0.069	0.629
	8	8	8	8	8	8

Note: *Empirical values represent both pronouns and determiners for each category.

As for the first-person plural pronoun and determiners, there were no significant relationships to any of the cultural values included in this study. Although using the collective "We" could be a means of maintaining social harmony and promoting collective beliefs, it does not clearly link with these cultural values in the essays examined.

Third-person singular pronouns and determiners did have some notable correlations to the cultural values examined. Collective societies that accept hierarchical differences (denoted by high power distance and collectivism) used masculine pronouns and determiners more often. The relationship between masculine rhetorical devices and differences in power distance and individualism was both significant, yielding correlations of $r_s = 0.89$ ($p = 0.003$) and $r_s = -0.80$ ($p = 0.017$), respectively. As power distance increased, so did the use of these pronouns. These pronouns are less personal and do not directly link to either the reader or the writer (as opposed to first-person or second-person pronouns like *I, we, or you*). Third-person pronouns may be used to maintain a distance from the reader. They may also be used to reduce potential controversy by removing the argument's link to either the writer or their reader. Finally, they may be a less personal means of presenting an argument, which could be perceived as more desirable in collective societies that discourage independent action. Due to the prevalence of patriarchal status hierarchies in collective societies, the masculine pronoun may be more prevalent than its matriarchal counterpart.

While the third-person plural had the potential to reveal influences due to cultural values, no significant relationship was detected. Second-person pronouns and determiners also had no significant relationships according to calculations of the Spearman rho formula.

4.2. Research Question 2: Differences in Pragmatic Use of Pronouns

Evaluation with inferential statistics revealed clear cultural links to first-person singular and third-person singular pronouns or determiners. Refer to Table 3.

Table 3. Percentage of pronouns and determiners by cultural context (First-person singular and third-person singular).

Cultural context	Power distance	Individualism	I - % of corpus*	He - % of corpus
Philippines	94	17	0.66	0.76
China	80	43	0.90	0.37
United Arab Emirates	74	36	0.72	0.30
Singapore	74	43	0.95	0.45
Hong Kong	68	50	0.79	0.26
South Korea	60	58	1.70	0.24
Taiwan	58	40	1.61	0.27
Japan	54	62	2.56	0.08

Note: *Empirical values represent both pronouns and determiners for each category.

Through analysis of corpus percentages, a pattern for determiners and pronouns becomes evident for the first-person and third-person singular. First-person pronouns and determiners tend to increase as power distance decreases. Philippine learners, from a cultural background with the highest power distance, used these grammatical features the least, whereas learners from Japan, who come from a tradition with the lowest power distance, used them the most. Concerning third-person singular masculine pronouns and determiners, they tended to increase as power distance increased. Japanese learners used these grammatical features the least, whereas learners from the Philippines used them the most.

Qualitative review of the statistically significant relationships between rhetoric and cultural values appears to reveal a reciprocal relationship between the use of first-person and third-person singular grammatical features. While all learners used first-person singular grammatical features to assert opinions (e.g., *I think that..*, *I disagree that…*, *I strongly believe that…*), frame an argument (*I have two reasons why…*), or describe personal experience (e.g., *I saw a person…*), learners from environments with less power distance used these features to a larger degree. Learners from backgrounds with higher power distance and collectivism also appeared to use these features differently from their more egalitarian and individualistic peers. This perspective is illustrated through examination of the following essay written by a Philippine college student.

> In *my* opinion, having a part-time job in college is not a priority. Focusing on studies instead is. Unless absolutely necessary, for example if the student is on *his* own having to earn money for *his* needs, *I* believe that having a part-time job is a great distraction from education and will slowly but surely take a toll on the student's health. First of all, having a part-time job takes away *one's* time for study and rest. How would a day in the life of a college student with a part-time job be like? I'm quite sure it is similar to a varsity player's. The student would go to school, eat, go to work, finish requirements, and before **he** knows it, the day's up. *He'll* go to school again with only a few hours of sleep and not be able to concentrate in the discussions. Even while working, *he* will.

The above example reveals that the Philippine learner is using first-person pronouns and determiners to express personal opinions and make assertions (*In my opinion, I believe that…*). However, support for the learner's proposition tends to utilize third-person singular masculine pronouns. Learners from the Philippines tend to avoid personalizing the evidence with individual experiences by using third-person singular or plural pronouns. Framing the argument in this way appears to separate the writer from their argument. This technique may reduce the strength of an assertion, ensuring that opinions presented do not violate authority or group norms.

In essays written by learners from contexts with less power distance and collectivism, first-person singular pronouns were used to personalize the argument to a greater degree, as in the following example from a Japanese learner.

> *I* agree with this because smoking is really bad for health; it's *my* main reason. *I* heard that it's poisonous to smoke somebody's smoke. *I* mean if someone smokes in front of a non-smoker, the non-smoker could be affected sometimes more than the smoker. Some restaurants separate seats for non-smokers, but the smoke could reach the non-smoker. In the restaurant, we should enjoy the dishes without smoke. In many countries, smoking in the restaurant is not allowed. Japan is too unconscious about the smoking problem. There's no good point to smoking. We have to think about this more seriously. I don't smoke and I really hate smoking. But I actually *I* have many friends who smoke. *I* can't tell them to stop smoking, though *I* worry about their health, as *I* also know how hard it is to stop, and they want to stop if they can. One of my friends who often smokes said that she doesn't know how to stop smoking, so she wants something changeable without being poisonous. *I* don't think smoking should be banned completely everywhere, because it would be so hard for smokers, but *I* hope that something changeable will be made, as she said. What *I* want to say is that smoking should be banned at least in restaurants, but not everywhere. We should think about not only non-smokers but also smokers.

Here we can see a marked difference in the degree to which the first-person singular pronoun is utilized. It is used to express opinions (*I agree…, I don't think…, I hope…*), frame an argument (*my main reason, what I want to say is…*), and express personal experiences (*I have many friends…, I worried about their health*). The writer appears more confident concerning an ability to personalize their argument. This confidence may reflect cultural influences. Learners from a background of lower power distance and high individuality may use these rhetorical features more often.

Overall, findings suggest that the rhetorical use of pronouns and determiners is affected by cultural factors such as power distance and individualism. Through understanding these differences, inter-cultural communication may be enhanced in diverse contexts.

5. CONCLUSION

Results of the present study suggest that cultural factors influence how rhetoric is used in English essays written by diverse learners. First-person and third-person singular pronouns/determiners were significantly correlated with empirical values for power distance and individualism (collectivism). Qualitative follow-up also reveals that first-person singular pronouns and determiners tend to be used more often in contexts with low power distance and high individualism. Using these rhetorical devices appears to personalize an argument. In contrast, third-person singular pronouns and determiners tend to be used more often in contexts with higher power distance and high collectivism (low individualism). Using third-person pronouns appears to add distance between the writer and their argument, making it less controversial. Such a technique may help to ensure that the argument does not violate norms for adherence to authority or collective action.

Results of the study provide insights about rhetoric, which may help to promote better intercultural communication. English writers may learn techniques for framing arguments that are culturally appropriate for the context in which they write. Such insights may also lead to more effective pedagogical strategies for promoting communication among diverse learners. While the potential application of results is clear, the present study is not without limitations. The rhetoric examined in this study was limited to pronouns and determiners.

A more comprehensive examination of different rhetorical techniques and cultural values is needed to facilitate better cross-cultural communication. In addition, values such as power distance and collectivism may be interconnected with other cultural beliefs. For example, some groups with highly stratified power structures may also be dominated by male figures. It will be important to further investigate interrelationships between different

cultural factors that impact rhetoric. More in-depth qualitative inquiry may help make these interrelationships clear. While more study is still needed, existing support for the impact of cultural influences on rhetoric presents an opportunity to transform both cross-cultural communication and English pedagogy.

REFERENCES

Almutairi, S., Heller, M., & Yen, D. (2021). Reclaiming the heterogeneity of the Arab states. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management, 28*(1), 158-176. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-09-2019-0170

Alshahrani, A. (2017). Power distance and individualism-collectivism in EFL learning environment. *Arab World English Journal, 8*(2), 145–159. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no2.10

Buja, E. (2019). Power distance in the Korean culture as it emerges from a K-drama. *Redefining Community in Intercultural Context, 8*(1), 137-147.

Cahill, D. (2003). The myth of the "turn" in contrastive rhetoric. *Written Communication, 20*(2), 170-194. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088303020002003

Connor, U. (2004). Intercultural rhetoric research: Beyond texts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 3*(4), 291-304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2004.07.003

Hamadouche, M. (2013). Intercultural studies in the Arab world from a contrastive rhetoric perspective. *Arab World English Journal*(2), 181–188.

Hamam, D. (2020). A study of the rhetorical features and the argument structure of EAP essays by L1 and L2 students in the UAE. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 17*(2), 699–706. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2020.17.2.28.699

Hammad, H. M. (2002). A contrastive examination of the rhetorical patterns of Arab speakers' Arabic and ESL writing. Master's Thesis, University of Calgary.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Holliday, A. (1999). Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(2), 237-264. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.2.237

House, R., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., & Dorfman, P. (2002). Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: An introduction to project GLOBE. *Journal of World Business, 37*(1), 3-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516(01)00069-4

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies.* New York: Sage Publications.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., & Gupta, V. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. *Advances in Global Leadership, 1*(2), 171-233.

Hu, C., Zhao, Z., & Lu, C. (2024). Metadiscursive nouns in corporate communication: A cross-cultural study of CEO letters in the US and Chinese corporate social responsibility reports. *English for Specific Purposes, 76*, 28-40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2024.06.001

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

Huh, M.-H., & Lee, I. (2019). A search for EFL college students' culture-related rhetorical templates of argumentative writing. *English Teaching, 74*(3), 55-77.

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(2), 173-192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365

Ishikawa, S. (2013). The ICNALE and sophisticated contrastive interlanguage analysis of Asian learners of English. In S. Ishikawa (Ed.), Learner corpus studies in Asia and the world. In (pp. 91–118). Kobe: Kobe University Press.

Ishikawa, S. I. (2023). *The ICNALE guide: An introduction to a learner corpus study on Asian learners' L2 English* (1st ed.). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Jiang, X. (2006). Cross-cultural pragmatic differences in US and Chinese press conferences: The case of the North Korea nuclear crisis. *Discourse & Society*, *17*(2), 237-257. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060249

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, *16*(1–2), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00804.x

Kim, E.-Y. J. (2017). Academic writing in Korea: Its dynamic landscape and implications for intercultural rhetoric. *Teaching English as a Second Language—Electronic Journal*, *21*(3), 1–15.

Li, D., & Guo, X. (2012). A comparison of power distance of Chinese English teachers and Chinese non-English teachers in classroom communication. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, *21*(1), 221–239.

Li, W. (2016). The cultural ID in the modal system: A contrastive study of English abstracts written by Chinese and native speakers: Can modality differences be an important indicator of the China English variety? *English Today*, *32*(4), 6-11. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078415000577

Luo, Q., & Chen, F. (2025). Scientific mapping of GenAI in English as a foreign language (EFL) context: Trends, gaps, and implications. *International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction*, *21*(1), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJTHI.384377

Minkov, M., Dutt, P., Schachner, M., Morales, O., Sanchez, C., Jandosova, J., . . . Mudd, B. (2017). A revision of Hofstede's individualism-collectivism dimension: A new national index from a 56-country study. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, *24*(3), 386-404. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-11-2016-0197

Nelson, G. (2000). Individualism-collectivism and power distance: Applications for the English as a second language classroom. *The CATESOL Journal*, *12*(1), 73-91. https://doi.org/10.5070/B5.36463

OpenAI. (2025). ChatGPT (GPT-5 version) (Large language model).

Petersoo, P. (2007). What does 'we' mean?: National deixis in the media. *Journal of Language and Politics*, *6*(3), 419–436. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.6.3.08pet

Severino, C. (1993). The "doodles" in context: Qualifying claims about contrastive rhetoric. *The Writing Center Journal*, *14*(1), 44-62. https://doi.org/10.7771/2832-9414.1282

The Culture Factor Group. (2025). *Country comparison tool*. Retrieved from https://www.theculturefactor.com/country-comparison-tool

Yoo, A. J. (2014). The effect Hofstede's cultural dimensions have on student-teacher relationships in the Korean context. *Journal of International Education Research*, *10*(2), 171–178. https://doi.org/10.19030/jier.v10i2.8519

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zhang, W., & Wang, Y. (2022). An analysis on Sino-UK cultural differences in education from the perspective of Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory (A case study of are our kids tough enough?). *Journal on Education*, *4*(2), 373–384. https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v4i2.438

Zhao, F., & Khan, M. S. (2013). An empirical study of e-government service adoption: Culture and behavioral intention. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *36*(10), 710-722. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2013.791314

APPENDIX

Table A1. Frequency of pronouns and determiners per cultural context (First and Second Person).

Cultural context	I	Me	My	We	Us	Our	You	Your
Philippines	28	3	9	17	9	17	38	22
China	36	8	15	61	21	39	22	6
Indonesia	3	0	2	12	6	13	10	1
Singapore	252	18	48	57	11	32	33	18
Hong Kong	46	6	11	24	3	13	29	15
Thailand	5	0	2	8	0	3	18	16
South Korea	493	37	84	175	13	49	162	53
Taiwan	122	16	39	49	10	17	74	29
Pakistan	4	0	2	5	1	12	4	0
Japan	181	12	25	103	19	19	31	5
Emirates	147	4	52	23	9	23	209	95

Table A1 presents the frequency of pronouns and determiners per cultural context (First and Second Person).

Table A2. Frequency of pronouns and determiners per cultural context (Third-Person).

Cultural context	She	Her	He	His	Him	They	Them	Their
Philippines	2	4	15	23	8	47	16	57
China	2	6	7	15	2	59	21	46
Indonesia	0	0	0	0	0	15	6	12
Singapore	16	36	52	80	19	217	100	311
Hong Kong	1	2	13	8	0	74	26	79
Thailand	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	1
South Korea	26	20	47	34	5	486	130	354
Taiwan	12	7	14	10	6	104	41	72
Pakistan	0	0	3	8	1	16	11	21
Japan	4	3	3	2	2	138	28	73
Emirates	14	17	38	32	15	384	196	333

Table A2 presents the frequency of pronouns and determiners per cultural context (Third-Person).