

## ***From the Editor-in Chief, June 2015***

Dear Readers and Colleagues,

In the first article Richard Day examines ways in which graduate students of TEFL could be encouraged to participate actively in discussions following student presentations. In particular, the study investigated whether identifying specific students as primary responders or secondary responders would facilitate discussions. Five research questions were raised and addressed and the author concludes that 'it is encouraging to find an activity that encourages students to engage in classroom discourse safely and without fear of rejection by their classmates'.

The second article by Kim and Kim investigated, in a Korean context, how and in what ways students of English whose parents were not Korean used their multicultural backgrounds in the learning of English. The study was conducted in two *Damunwha* welfare centres which provide academic support to students from multicultural backgrounds. Interestingly, the study found that family relationships and socio-economic status were key variables.

The three authors of the third article, Oh, Lee and Moon, investigated the relative importance of planning, L2 linguistic knowledge and individual differences in the writing of argumentative essays. The study, which involved 72 Korean university students enrolled in English composition classes, concluded that teachers need to balance instruction in L2 linguistic knowledge along with content knowledge and, at the same time, found that individual differences were also

significant. The authors therefore urge that ‘teachers must find ways to foster individual differences in and out of the classroom.’

The fourth article ‘The effects of task modality and type on Korean EFL learners’ interactions’ by Lim and Lee explored ways in which the use of ‘mobile chatting’ could provide a viable method of interaction in EFL classrooms. The authors wanted to know how task type – some students were engaged in convergent decision making tasks and others in divergent decision making tasks – and modality – some students were involved in face-to-face interaction and some in text-based interaction using mobile software – influenced the ways in which students interacted. One important finding was that, even though the students found face-to-face interaction more demanding, they also enjoyed this more.

In the fifth article, Setiono Sugiharto examined how multilingual Indonesians used translanguaging and made use of their linguistic resources when writing ‘translanguaged texts’. By analysing a range of such texts, the researcher concludes that the translanguaged texts indicate the identity of their authors and that the authors deliberately use different linguistic codes to produce hybrid texts in which their own cultural values are represented.

In closing, I would like to remind readers and colleagues that the next Asia TEFL conference is on the approaching horizon (November 6-8 in Nanjing) and we look forward to seeing many of you there.

*London, June 2015*  
*Andy Kirkpatrick*  
*Editor-in-Chief*