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Abstract—Through reviewing studies of military English teaching in the context of Chinese military academies, this paper is aimed at locating both research gaps and weaknesses as well as achievements in an effort to contribute to research and development of military English teaching in Chinese military academies. Seven research topics are identified and the overall situation and problems in topic selection and in research design are then discussed. It is found that over years this field witnesses an increasing number of research projects, indicating a growing recognition of military English teaching in Chinese military academies. However, for topic selection, many topics are too broad and general while students and teachers, technology in teaching, and testing and assessment receive only minimal attention. For research design, plenty of researchers fail to illustrate explicitly their research questions and are thus confusing in terms of their research focuses. While most studies are not empirical and often too subjective, empirical ones usually adopt the quantitative approach and face reliability issue generated from data collection and analysis procedures. Accordingly, the authors tentatively propose some suggestions and future research directions to improve the situation.
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I. INTRODUCTION

With China's military forces opening up more to the world, they are expected to embrace more communications with militaries from other countries and engage in more international military operations other than wars (MOOTWs) (Zhang, 2010). To carry out international exchanges, apart from military specific expertise, foreign language capacity also matters and is thus regarded as both an important quality for new-type military personnel and a combat capability since without military foreign language capacity, it will be hard to perform military specific tasks and missions in a foreign language context (Li & Zhou, 2019). Military English, as one part of military foreign languages should therefore never be underestimated when cultivating future military forces.

Despite its importance, there are confusions over the definition of military English in China. No distinction has been made between military English for special purposes and military English for general purposes; no agreement has been achieved about whether “military” or “English” should be given more importance to or they should be equally valued when discussing military English; and it has been defined differently in different academic fields (Zhang, 2009). In this study, the authors adopt the definition of military English as English for Special Purposes (ESP) because the focus of this review is on language instruction and a definition within the framework of second language instruction and acquisition serves this goal better. Defining it in this way also meets the need of better cultivating future military forces since it in this sense stresses on the actual usage of military English in a professional context. In other words, when teaching military English one should emphasize language skills and hands-on practices in order to enable cadets to utilize military English with more ease in their future military career (Zhang, 2011).

For most cadets, military academies are the only places where they can receive systematic and formal training in military English. The quality of military English teaching in military academies is therefore of paramount importance. That is why the authors narrate the discussion to military academies.

Previously, Zhang (2009) reflected upon military English teaching and pinned down problems and achievements in this field. However, that review centred on experiences drawn from teaching practices instead of scholarly investigations. While Zhang (2010) made some contributions in this respect, she only gave a small section in her review to military English teaching studies. Besides, no other review has been conducted since 2010 so it is unclear how this research field has developed since then. In this article, strengths and weaknesses of relevant studies were looked through and several future research directions were tentatively proposed.

In the second section, how studies are reviewed in this paper is introduced. It is followed by an overall situation of previous studies in this field. Problems in terms of the research topic selection and research design are then discussed.
Suggestions and some future research directions are provided along with the discussion. The last section concludes this article by summarizing problems, suggestions and future research directions.

Through reviewing previous research, the authors aimed to answer the following three questions:

1. What is the overall situation of studies of military English teaching in Chinese military academies?
2. What are the problems in and suggestions for topic selection for studies in military English teaching in Chinese military academies?
3. What are the problems in and suggestions for research design for studies in military English teaching in Chinese military academies?

II. RESEARCH METHODS

To ensure studies reviewed were closely related to the military English teaching in Chinese military academies and comprehensive enough, the authors typed in “military English teaching” and “military English instruction” to conduct key word search and topic” search on CNKI, Google Scholar, Researchgate and EBSCOhost and finally selected 161 studies from Jan. 1st, 2009 to Dec. 31th, 2021. All studies were first categorized and then counted according to year of publication, research topic, acceptance by a core journal and general research method (empirical or not). For empirical ones, they were further grouped based on their research approaches (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed). These steps produced an overall situation of research in this field. Studies were then discussed in detail for their topic selection and research design to present both merits and demerits in these two aspects. Accordingly, suggestions and future research directions were proposed.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Overall Situation

Altogether only 161 studies were found and only nine were accepted by core journals. It shows that there is a dearth of relevant research in this field and the quality of existing ones calls for betterment. As Chart 1 suggested, before 2009 there was barely any research in this field. This was in line with the observation made in Zhang (2009). After 2009, it was clear that the number of relevant research had been gradually climbing, indicating a growing recognition of military English teaching in Chinese military academies. Its number grew most sharply from 2017 to 2018 and peaked in 2020, suggesting that in most recent years, more attention has been paid to research of this field. Although there are some fluctuations, a general upward trend is still clear, indicating that more studies are expected.

As for research topics, apart from two review articles, all together nine research topics were found. Indeed, they have covered all facets of military English teaching. Teaching Content and Textbook were about what to teach; Teaching Method and Teaching Mode dealt with how to teach; Student and Teacher were related to main participants in teaching activities; Technology Application concerned teaching aids; Testing was surely part of testing and assessment and course development talked about the overall course design. The authors thus further categorized these 161 articles in accordance with the aforesaid seven facets in italics in this paragraph in order to make the discussion more logical and easier to follow.

From Chart 2 below, it was obvious that the topic “how to teach” received the most attention by researchers, indicating the major concern in this field. They were followed by studies on “what to teach”. The topic “course development” ranked the third. Together studies on these three topics occupied around 78.3% of all studies. Meanwhile,
other three topics were less talked about, especially the topic “testing and assessment” (1.9%). Researchers seemed to be more interested in or were more aware of the importance of the top ranking topics while somewhat ignored other equally crucial facets. This general trend reminds researchers to do more research in less popular topics for the sake of a balanced development of research of military English teaching.

Researchers without empirical data had long been criticized as being too subjective or even groundless in academic field. But regrettably, most studies reviewed in this paper were not empirical ones (only 13.0% in total). The authors broke down the 21 empirical studies according to their topics and calculated the percentage of empirical research within each topic and the result was presented in Chart 3. It should be noted that the proportion of empirical studies in “course development” and “how to teach” was relatively small (3.0% and 7.5% respectively) although they were hot topics judging from Chart 2. The remaining 87.0% were either a description of a course design, a reflection on achievements, a summary of problems in military English teaching, a summary of teaching practices and experiences, or one's reflection on a particular theory. Although summaries and reflections alike were to some extent useful in offering a bird's eye view of certain topic, providing practical experiences, or introducing new theories into this field, their findings might become less convincing without scientific empirical data. Future research is therefore advised to equip with empirical data set to provide more solid evidence to their conclusions.

When conducting empirical research, there are two most common broad approaches, quantitative and qualitative (Mackey & Gass, 2005). When employing both, it is a mixed-method research design. They are different from each
other in terms of the data type, data elicitation process and data analysis process (Grotjahn, 1987) and each has their own merits and demerits (Mackey & Gass, 2005). As displayed in Chart 4, there was an over-reliance on quantitative research. Although it did not necessarily constitute a problem since the research approach depends on what research aims at and there should be no prejudice against any type of these three research approaches. However, since different research approaches are suitable for different research topics and are aimed at collecting and analysing different types of data, more diverse approaches would help the academia understand a research object from various aspects. Future research is therefore encouraged to adopt a greater variety of suitable research approaches for the purpose of gaining a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of the military English teaching.

To sum up, from the overall situation we can see studies in this field have gradually received more and more attention over years. Yet relevant studies are far from enough and the quality is relatively poor. Researchers who have opted empirical research are rare and quantitative approach is generally preferred. Researchers are encouraged to put more emphasis on less explored topics, conduct empirical investigations more and diversify data collection approaches.

B. Problems and Suggestions in Terms of Selecting a Research Topic

(a). Narrowing Down a Research Topic

The first problem is many research topics are too broad and general. This is especially the case with research on “course development”. Kou and Zheng (2013) for example took the course development as their research subject and identified problems in textbook, teaching outcome, teaching mode and schedule based on teaching experiences. However, other facets such as theories and principles underpinned the course design, content, pedagogy, assessment, and teacher development which are equally important for consideration in course development were left untouched. As a result, a mismatch between what a study claimed to examine and what it examined emerged. The same problem could also be found in more studies like Zhang (2010), Xu (2014), and Yue and Yang (2018). The authors do not suggest that taking course development as a research topic is not applicable. Instead, if one decides to take the course development as the research subject, one should endeavour to take in as many facets as possible to provide a more comprehensive picture of the course development. However, that is likely to make a study less feasible for many scholars unless enough time, financial resources and manpower are available. Alternatively, one can stick to this broad topic and discussing some facets of it but with full justification of choices of some facets over others. A more practical way is to narrow down the research topic to just one facet of course development at a time and conduct an in-depth investigation of it. It will also be easier, the authors believe, for researchers to be better targeted and avoid empty talks by narrowing down the topic.

(b). Suggestions for Future Research Directions for Less Explored Topics

The second problem, as having been pointed out in the overall situation, is that too little attention has been paid to topics “participants” (10.6%), “technology application” (8.1%), and “testing and assessment” (1.9%). In the following the authors report what have been done under each of the three less investigated topic and provides more possible research directions.

For starters, participants in teaching, scilicet students and teachers.

There is no doubt that students are pivotal for conducting teaching practices since they are what teaching practices designed and carried out for. He and Tian (2017) introduced a cognitive framework of learning strategies and advocated the building of a cognitive framework of military English learning strategy. However, their emphasis is more on the
introduction of a theory and it is not clear how that theory can be applied to military English learning and teaching. While Zhou and Wang (2015) and Huang (2018) mainly introduced the concept of need analysis, others advocated that to better satisfy students’ demands, more attention should be paid to military vocabulary (Liu & Cai, 2017) and to solving students’ problems in learning (Zhang & Ren, 2012). Meanwhile, Liu and Cai (2017) also noticed different types of needs between high-level learners and low-level learners and thus campaigned for more attention to various needs of learners of different language proficiency. These studies merit in the notice of individual differences in learning and in advocating taking these differences into consideration in teaching practices. However, most of them fail to provide any concrete data to support their claims. Apart from students’ needs and their learning strategies, there are many more topics around learners worthy of exploration. What types of errors do students commonly make? What kind of classroom interaction serves the teaching and learning needs best? What about learner's motivation, beliefs and learning styles? What does the developmental pattern in military English acquisition look like? Answering to these questions will surely help scholars and teachers acquire a better understanding of the acquisition process of students and ultimately improve teaching outcomes.

Researches on teachers are far less. Although teacher development has been repeatedly emphasized by many studies such as Xu and Zhang (2013) and Yue and Yang (2018), only four studies paid special attention to it. These studies either focused on the development of specific skills or a broader institutional framework. They concluded that currently teachers responsible for military English teaching generally lacked specified knowledge and therefore called for more training and learning of relevant knowledge so that they would be better qualified in teaching military English (Cai & Liu, 2014; Zhang & Wang, 2016; Cheng, 2019). Wang et al. (2020b) also proposed the building of a better faculty team. However, relevant studies are insufficient and are usually summaries based on personal experiences. Besides, little has been discussed on causes of or solutions to problems identified. As a vibrant research field, teacher development involves far more issues and concerns. Future studies can explore teachers’ beliefs and their influences on teaching or the relationship between beliefs and practices. Different anticipations between teachers and students for teaching, teachers questioning in military English class and teacher's self-esteem in teaching military English all deserve attention.

As for “technology application”, researchers simply introduced military English corpuses (Huang et al., 2012; Zhang 2019), speech laboratories (Sun & Zhang, 2013), MOOC (Wang & Li, 2019) and other multimedia tools (Lv, 2021; Wang et al., 2020a) to military English teaching. Only Zhang et al. (2020a, 2020b) went further to examine the effectiveness of online platforms like WeChat. All of them agreed that these tools indeed facilitated their teaching. However, relevant studies are far from enough considering the increasing popularity of high-tech teaching aids like corpuses, smart classrooms, computer assisted language learning (CALL), and mobile assisted language learning (MALL), to name a few. Will these technologies enhance the effectiveness of teaching? How to better integrate these technologies into military English teaching? Which technology is more useful in teaching military English vocabulary? Which technology better facilitates students' military English oral competence and which, their writing performance? What can be obtained in terms of technology application by investigating the attitude of students and teachers toward using smart classrooms? Researchers are advised to diversify their research focuses so as to better understand and utilize the technology in military English teaching.

The last one is “testing and assessment”. For any kind of teaching, testing and assessment should never be underestimated since they evaluate teaching practices and provide feedback throughout the teaching process. Nevertheless, there have been a paucity of relevant studies in this field although the necessity of scientific and objective means of assessment and testing has been repeatedly mentioned in articles like L. Zhang (2010), Zhou et al. (2012) and Dai et al. (2018). Portfolio assessment was examined in Hou and Wu (2016) exclusively and proved to improve teaching outcomes. This conclusion agreed with findings in Wan et al. (2020). However, both are simply summaries of their practices. It is therefore unclear whether every procedure of the portfolio assessment examined is objective and reliable enough or whether it is more useful and effective compared with traditional ways of assessment. Kou (2015) took exam papers as the research object and concluded that exam papers were too difficult and there should be more ways to evaluate spoken military English. However, nothing has been mentioned about the validity of the test paper and the content of it seems irrelevant to military English, thus undermining the result of that study. The reliability and validity of a test were investigated in Gao and Huang (2020). By inviting some teachers to participate in the study as raters, factors influencing the reliability and validity were analysed and solutions were put forward. However, it is unclear whether a strong agreement has been reached among raters and if not, whether there have been any steps taken to solve the inconsistency. Therefore, it can be concluded that although these four articles have contributed to certain extent, there are some severe problems in their research design. In addition, there are more fascinating directions for exploration in this respect. One can investigate constructs, namely, traits of a test plans to measure (Davies et al., 1999) so as to avoid threats of construct irrelevance and construct under-representation (Messick, 1989). More studies can also be carried out on the development of a rating scale by exploring selections and weighting of various criteria, descriptors, format, length and usability so that students’ performance can be judged on a more objective and scientific basis. Another area of interest is the washback of a test, which refers to influences of a large-scale high-risk test on teaching and learning and acts as an important component of measuring the quality of a test (Qi, 2011). With the advent of English Language Proficiency Test for the Military in China, research on this topic is both inevitable and urgent.
For hot research topics, despite the sheer number of research projects, there can be more possible research directions. Taking the topic “what to teach” as an example. For specific teaching content, some have explored important contents in teaching and agreed that teaching should give special emphasis on military vocabulary (Zhang & Miao, 2011; Wu et al., 2013). It is understandable since military English as ESP necessarily contains a large amount of unique vocabulary (Yan et al., 2010) and they are extremely hard for students to memorize (Yang et al., 2018). But what about other specific teaching contents? Another subtopic of “what to teach” concerns the textbook. Developing a suitable textbook is rather complex since it concerns objectives of a course, needs of both teachers and students, requirements of the society on language usage, and assistance and support for learning (Cunningsworth, 1995). Currently, most studies under this subtopic focused on the language used (Wang et al., 2016), overarching framework (Yin et al., 2019), and topics covered (Wei, 2015; Wang, 2018; Zhang et al., 2019). Few instead took another perspective like the textbook user for exploration. Wang (2011) for instance compared the textbooks at home and abroad and found that currently military English textbooks failed to satisfy students while Liu et al. (2016) recommended introducing cultural knowledge into the textbook. However, another textbook user, the teacher, is overlooked. What are teachers’ needs and suggestions for a textbook?

To sum up, researchers are advised to narrow down their research topics while diversify their research focuses so as to generate more understandings of military English teaching.

C. Problems and Suggestions in Terms of Research Design

(a). Lack of Research Questions

At the initial stage, there must be at least one research question in second language research. They are what a study aims to answer and are necessary for any research. However, many previous studies in military English teaching did not have any research questions and some expressed their research questions implicitly or vaguely.

Take Wang and Zhou (2017) as an instance. In that article, no research question was raised or at least reported. From the article’s title, they seemed to centre on the course development. However, readers might find their research topic seemed to be changing all the time, from course development to the outcomes of a mixed teaching mode, and to students’ satisfaction toward the course as a whole. Without specific and well-targeted research questions, it is difficult for readers to figure out what an article is truly about and for authors to concentrate on what he or she aims to expound. Of course, there are several studies such as Wang (2011), Li and Chen (2019) and Zhang et al. (2020a, 2020b) that have outperformed others in this respect. Future studies are thus advised to dig out specific research questions either from teaching practices or from reading previous research before designing and conducting a research.

(b). Specific Problems in Research Methods

1. Lack of Empirical Data

There was a rather similar writing pattern in most studies reviewed: problems were presented first and suggestions were given afterwards while nearly all problems and suggestions were generated from researchers’ personal practices. It was very common to come across expressions such as “according to our teaching practices”, “based on my experiences over these years”, “I’ll discuss my feelings and thoughts about”, or “our practices are very successful and we are certain they will improve the teaching outcomes”. For example, Wang et al. (2020a) introduced activities including mini-lectures, game and Model United Nations when discussing pedagogy while He and Fan (2019) tentatively advised starting the military English course right from the first year in college. They all claimed their proposals were or would be effective and beneficial while no empirical data were provided to support their conclusions. This is rather subjective and dubious since anyone can claim his or her conclusion is correct without any evidence. Future research should therefore try to avoid simply summarizing teaching practices or sharing personal thoughts without empirical data.

2. The Problem of Reliability

The major problem of reviewed empirical studies is reliability.

For research that employ a survey or a questionnaire, none except Zhang et al. (2020a, 2020b) examined the reliability of the survey itself by Cronbach’s α, thus casting doubts on the instrument used and findings produced. Further studies should at least provide certain evidence, perhaps a statistical one, to persuade readers of the reliability of research tools.

For researches that employ pre-tests and post-tests, researchers need to ensure both tests are comparable in terms of the difficulty. Otherwise, students’ performance is highly likely to be biased. Therefore, results in Li and Chen (2019) were somewhat dubious because it was hard to determine whether progresses observed resulted from the teaching method adopted or from an easier post-test. Other scholars like Yan et al. (2010) did not explain whether there was any significant difference among subjects in pre-tests so it was hard to tell whether the significant difference came from new materials used or from differences already shown in the pre-test. Likewise, further studies should at least provide certain statistical evidence to consolidate their results.

In experimental research, if the control group and the experiment group are taught by different teachers, certain measures should be taken to handle possible influences brought by them. Be that as it may, Yan et al. (2010) and Li and Chen (2019) ignored possible influences or at least did not mention any detail in this respect.
In studies that require subjective ratings, rater reliability should be calculated to ensure the consistency of rating results. If there is no strong reliability among raters, scores delivered should be subject to suspicion. However, studies like Gao and Huang (2020) took no measure or did not report any detail in this respect although in their case, inter-rater reliability should be measured. What's more, if there is only one rater, intra-rater reliability should then be measured by rating the data at certain time interval.

Taken overall, empirical studies in this field lacked a pilot testing or did not report it. It is a very important step in data collection process. With a pilot study undertaken, researchers are able to find out any potential problems which may waste huge amount of time, energy, and financial resources (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Scholars are therefore recommended to conduct a pilot study and report it in their future projects.

3. Suggestions for Data Elicitation Measures

Empirical studies in this field have usually gathered data through surveys, interviews, experiments, tests, and corpuses. However, there are more and sometimes more suitable data collection measures to examine the military English teaching. This is because collection measures are decided by the type of data one tries to collect which in turn, is determined by what one resolves to explore. Even for the same research topic, data elicitation measures vary in accordance with one's research perspective. In the following text, the authors tentatively propose another four data collection methods.

First, surveys with close-ended questions have been frequently used to investigate problems in learning military English and in teacher development. Although relevant studies possibly managed to reveal the most common problems, they could not find out some potential problems since questionnaire takers were offered with limited choices with close-ended questions. If interviews or surveys with open-ended questions are chosen otherwise or added as additional research tools, more surprising and perhaps comprehensive findings might be obtained.

Second, when asking students to verbalise their problems in comprehending military English materials, they may sometimes not realize their problems or even falsely report their problems to satisfy researchers. It is therefore more desirable to directly observe their problems and eye-tracking technique can serve this need. It can be used to find out difficulties in processing a reading material. This is because it directly records where a learner's eyes gaze at longer or when a learner rereads certain part of a material, which, according to Reichle et al. (2006, 2012), indicates some difficulties.

Third, there is still no student-specific corpus in which learners have to establish one when conducting corpus-based research. Researchers are therefore recommended devoting efforts into building up more well-accepted and accessible military English corpuses and conducting researches based on them. Other studies instead focus on the necessity of a corpus to research (Li et al., 2014), on the compilation (Shen et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2019), military English self-learning (Huang et al., 2012), and military English vocabulary teaching (Zhang, 2019; Zheng et al., 2020). They are not only tools for researchers to analyse for instance patterns of military texts or systematic errors in learning military English, but also materials available for teaching and learning. However, no researchers except the aforementioned five studies have incorporated them into military English teaching research. Other studies instead focus on the necessity of a corpus to research (Li et al., 2014), on the building of a corpus (Ma et al., 2018), on translation (Yang, 2011) and on the text analysis (Xing, 2020). What's more, currently there are scarcely any well-recognized or accessible military English corpuses so that most researchers could not find out some potential problems since questionnaire takers were offered with limited choices with close-ended questions. If interviews or surveys with open-ended questions are chosen otherwise or added as additional research tools, more surprising and perhaps comprehensive findings might be obtained.

Fourth, corpuses provide an alternative to explore military English teaching as they have assisted in textbook compilation (Shen et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2019), military English self-learning (Huang et al., 2012), and military English vocabulary teaching (Zhang, 2019; Zheng et al., 2020). They are not only tools for researchers to analyse for instance patterns of military texts or systematic errors in learning military English, but also materials available for teaching and learning. However, no researchers except the aforementioned five studies have incorporated them into military English teaching research. Other studies instead focus on the necessity of a corpus to research (Li et al., 2014), on the building of a corpus (Ma et al., 2018), on translation (Yang, 2011) and on the text analysis (Xing, 2020). What's more, currently there are scarcely any well-recognized or accessible military English corpuses so that most researchers have to establish one when conducting corpus-based research. Researchers are therefore recommended devoting efforts into building up more well-accepted and accessible military English corpuses and conducting researches based on them. In particular, there is still no student-specific corpus in which learners’ performances in producing military English (either as a form of speaking or writing) are documented. With such a corpus, it saves time and energy for scholars who are interested into, for example, probing into systematic patterns of students' performances and with such knowledge, a better understanding of both teaching and learning outcomes can be gained.

IV. Conclusion

In this paper, previous studies in the field of military English teaching in Chinese academies are reviewed in terms of the overall situation, problems in topic selection, and problems in research design. Suggestions and future research directions are given accordingly. Major findings are presented as follows:

The general trend shows that (1) although generally there are more and more studies centering on this research field, both quality and amount of relevant studies need further boost; (2) researchers have taken all facets necessary for military English teaching into consideration although far less attention has been paid to equally essential topics including technology application in teaching, students and teachers as well as testing and assessment; (3) most studies
are non-empirical and lack substantial evidence to support their analysis and discussion; (4) among empirical ones, more adopt the quantitative approach and thus cannot investigate data that cannot be gained from quantitative approach, leaving many interesting topics untouched. Therefore, different empirical approaches are encouraged to meet the demands of different research topics and researchers are recommended to carry out more researches on less explored topics.

Problems in topic selection fall into two types:

(1) The topic is too broad and general and therefore can be formidable to manipulate. Discussion on such a topic is also highly probable to be incomplete unless enough time, money and energy are allowed. Scholars are therefore expected to narrow down their topics or provide sufficient evidence to support their choices of some facets over others of one broad topic.

(2) Some equally important topics are less examined. More possible directions for research in students and teachers, testing and assessment and technology in teaching are then provided respectively. Some new research directions are also provided for hot research topics.

Apart from the general research approach mentioned in the overall situation, there are two other major problems in research design:

(1) Lack of research questions. Many studies lack research questions thus making their research less focused and difficult to follow. Researchers are then suggested to pin down their research questions from daily teaching practices or from reading before carrying out a study and make them explicit when reporting it.

(2) Reliability issue. Very few studies have provided any evidence to ensure the reliability during data gathering and analysis processes, thus greatly undermining the persuasiveness and credibility of their conclusions. It is therefore advised to take and present measures such as statistical ones to address this issue.

Lastly, four additional data collection measures, namely, interview or survey with open-ended questions, eye-tracking technique, classroom observation, and corpus, are introduced to elicit more interesting information about military English teaching via a more appropriate approach.

Research in military English teaching in Chinese military academies still has a long way to go. With more proper and wider range of topics selected and more appropriate research methods applied, this field is sure to produce fruitful results which in turn will improve the quality of military English teaching and ultimately, will benefit the cultivation of new military personnel for the PLA.
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