



Editorial

Cite this article: Moody A (2024). New look, same *English Today*. *English Today* **40**, 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078424000063>

The editorial policy of *English Today* is to provide a focus or forum for all sorts of news and opinion from around the world. The points of view of individual writers are as a consequence their own, and do not reflect the opinion of the editorial board. In addition, wherever feasible, *ET* generally leaves unchanged the orthography (normally British or American) and the usage of individual contributors, although the editorial style of the journal itself is that of Cambridge University Press.

The overwhelming majority of readers won't understand the title of this editorial, and that is because most of this journal's readership interact with the electronic version of the journal. But readers who are accustomed to reading the print version of *English Today* will immediately recognise that volume 40 is now printed in a larger paper format.

It was not easy for the editorial team or the editorial board to approve this change in format, which was first proposed by Cambridge University Press (CUP) near the end of 2022. For the last 40 years *English Today* has strived to bring readers the best thinking about the forms, functions and status of the English language internationally. As one of the oldest journals devoted to the study of English in all its international contexts, the format change was not one the editorial team or the editorial board were eager to implement, and nearly every member of these two bodies expressed fond appreciation for the previous format and what it has come to represent over the years. But the reality of producing an academic journal in 2024 is that most readers will interact with the journal in electronic formats, not in print formats, and CUP proposed the format change to improve the journal's electronic accessibility. The new format of the print version accompanies a new format for individual articles, which was implemented in early 2023 in anticipation of the change to the new print format. Long-time *English Today* readers will notice the new format and how author biographies and photos (when included) have been moved to the end of articles.

While the print format of *English Today* has changed, I am grateful to acknowledge that the print version of the journal, no matter how few copies are printed annually, still exists and is available to readers who want to read a physical copy of the journal. A primary advantage of having the electronic platform in addition to the print version of the journal is that CUP's FirstView platform allows us to publish articles online before they are assigned to an individual issue.

One of the questions that I'm frequently asked about *English Today* is how the online version of an article differs from the version that appears in the print edition. I'm very happy to take a little bit of space within this editorial to respond to that frequently asked question: there is *no* difference between the version of an article that is published online and the version that is finally assigned to a print issue. Authors can make corrections or revisions before the article is published, but once it is published, changes cannot be made to the content, regardless of whether it is first published online or directly to a print issue. Our usual practice at *English Today* is to publish articles continuously throughout the year, even though the four issues of the journal are printed on a regular schedule (March, June, September and December). Once published, most articles reside on the FirstView platform until they are added into a specific issue. Once an article is published it cannot be altered or changed, and this ensures that the online and print versions do not differ. These principles for publication have been codified by the Committee on Publishing Ethics (COPE) to ensure that the quality of articles – whether they first appear online or not – is consistent for a journal and that there is no difference between *English Today's* print and electronic versions.

This is all to say that the various editorial teams at *English Today* over the past 20 years have been watching the landscape of academic publication change, from print-only versions of the journal to electronic copies and distribution. And, as these changes have developed within academic publishing, *English Today* has adapted to the changes to ensure the integrity and academic quality of the journal. The format change that print readers will see in volume 40 is simply the latest in a long list of changes that have been implemented since academic publishing began to transition from print-only to dual print and electronic platforms.

In this first issue of volume 40 *English Today* is pleased to bring readers six research articles. Starting with attention on sub-Saharan Africa, Abisola Aleyeola explores changing pattern of stress in the English of Yoruba teenagers in Nigeria and Alfred Buregaya presents evidence that the definite article functions as a possessive determiner in Kenya. Iman Sheydaei shifts the focus of language change to American immigrants from the Middle East and Northern Africa (MENA) in a description of Low-Back Merger. Two research articles explore the use of English in China. David C. S. Li adds his own perspective on the China English/Chinese English debate (which was explored in an *English Today* special feature in issue 3 of volume 39). Ying Qi Wu

and Qi Sun examine the use of *emo* as a popular lexeme among Chinese youth. Finally, Olha Bohuslavská and Elena Čiprianová describe English within Slovakia's linguistic landscape.

Rounding out the first issue of volume 40 are three short articles and two book reviews. Guangxiang Liu and Chaojun Ma continue the description of linguistic landscapes with their account of English in rural China. Hongsung Choe and Seongyong Lee return to a frequently discussed topic of choosing a target model of teaching, and discuss the issue within the Korean context. Book reviews from Wen Li and Ang Chen, Irham Irham, and Caroline Wiltshire conclude the issue.