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In this paper we explore the provision of applied linguistics within Australian universities. We focus on how the ‘what’ of applied linguistics, as captured in scholarly definitions of the discipline, accords with the ‘where’, as captured in potential contexts of application as these are manifested in provision. In doing so, we examine the extent of any congruence or divergence between how applied linguistics is understood in the abstract and how it is realised in degree programs. Our findings, based an analysis of data collected via a survey of university websites, suggest that while the rhetoric around course offerings may suggest a wider view of the discipline, the content of applied linguistics programs generally reflects a narrower interpretation which aligns closely with observations often made as caveats to scholarly definitions and sees English language teaching as predominant.

DEFINITIONAL ISSUES IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Like definitions more generally, definitions of applied linguistics have sought not only to describe but are inevitably normative, reflecting how the writer thinks the world ought to be. In this sense, definitions have been players in an ongoing debate about the nature of applied linguistics, a discipline that is consistently reported in the literature to be struggling to define its identity (Chen and Cruickshank, 2009; Davies and Elder, 2006; Harris, 2001–2). That debate has, in large part, focused on the relationship between theory and practice and the legitimate scope of the field. A central question here has been whether applied linguistics should be viewed as serving the particular theoretical interests of linguistics, or those practical, real-world applications for which it has relevance and on which insights from the discipline can be brought to bear? Allied to this question is that of the dependence on or independence of applied linguistics from linguistics; in other words, whether applied linguistics is a discipline in its own right.

For those who identify themselves as or aspire to be applied linguists, these questions are crucial to their understanding of the nature of the discipline and its professional community. In this paper, we begin by briefly identifying three definitional issues that, we argue, have shaped understandings of applied linguistics. The first concerns historically
sourced uncertainty about its relationship with linguistics; the second has to do with its identification with English language teaching; and the third with debates over the need for an understanding of the discipline that expands its contexts of application and its intellectual and methodological bases.

Davies and Elder (2006) trace the uncertainty that has arisen from the relationship between applied linguistics and linguistics to two different traditions. The first has focused on addressing practical problems involving language and became more sharply defined in the 1950’s in response to a narrowing of the field of linguistics; the second has foregrounded the application of linguistic theory. Since the broadening of the scope of linguistics over the last 20 years, the two traditions may appear to have become harder to distinguish but they nevertheless remain divergent currents in applied linguistics. Further complicating the task of defining the discipline is the broadening of those source disciplines upon which it draws. As Davies and Elder observe, while this may widen the contexts of application and range of language-related issues that can be addressed, it raises the question of the place of ‘linguistics’ in ‘applied linguistics’.

Given these divergent orientations within the discipline, it is perhaps unsurprising that ‘what constitutes legitimate activity in applied linguistics is a highly contested issue’ (Chen and Cruickshank, 2009, p. 2), one which ‘continues to generate doubt and misgiving [over applied linguistics] as an academic inquiry’ (Harris, 2001–2, p. 100).

Compounding these issues, and acknowledged across the literature is the fact that, while ‘applied linguistics’ potentially refers to a wide range of tasks or activities to which a knowledge of linguistics is relevant, in practice it is often seen as synonymous with language teaching, and in particular English language teaching. Corder, for example, observes that ‘because of the greater public interest in language teaching and the considerable official support there has been in recent years for research and teaching in the application of linguistics to language teaching, this term has effectively come to be restricted in this way in common usage’ (Corder, 1973, p. 7). Cook and Seidlhofer (1995, p. 7) similarly note that despite the potentially wide scope of the field, ‘it is with language teaching and learning, and particularly English language teaching and learning, that many works on applied linguistics are primarily concerned’. Wilkins (1999) attempts to identify the scope of the discipline in a ‘pragmatic way’ by considering publications including journals that incorporate the label ‘applied linguistics’ in their title or subtitle and books defining or surveying the field of applied linguistics. In every case, he concludes, applied linguistics is overwhelmingly concerned with educational applications and, in the case of journals, language education in particular.
It was the need to clarify the relationship between linguistics, applied linguistics and English language teaching which prompted Widdowson (1980, 2000) to coin the phrase ‘linguistics applied’ to capture inquiry which defines its foci in linguistics terms, and to distinguish this from ‘applied linguistics’ as a discipline which mediates between linguistics and contexts in which it finds practical application. While this characterisation has been disputed, it has nevertheless been influential in shaping the debate.

More generally, despite consistently featuring qualifying statements that acknowledge its close association with language teaching, the definitions of applied linguistics in the literature provide a clear indication of the broader range of activities or domains of application that the discipline potentially encompasses. Wilkins (1999), for example, states that “the nature of that human “endowment” that is language, and the knowledge and capacities it spawns, are the subject matter of “theoretical linguistics”. The study of the uses that man makes of the endowment and of the problems that he encounters in doing so is the subject matter of “applied linguistics”, a discipline which, he goes on to say, is concerned with

... increasing understanding of the role of language in human affairs and thereby with providing the knowledge necessary for those who are responsible for taking language-related decisions whether the need for these arises in the classroom, the workplace, the law court, or the laboratory...Given the pervasiveness of language, it follows that applied linguistics is potentially a highly diversified field (Wilkins, 1999, p. 6).

The goal of applied linguistics, Wilkins argues, is to provide its various fields or domains of application with ‘a coherent “conceptual basis” for the analysis and understanding of those aspects of their work which are language related’ (Wilkins, 1999, p. 7).

This potential for an expanded view of applied linguistics as a discipline which develops insights into language use in diverse contexts of application finds voice in Candlin’s observation with respect to language teaching, a domain of activity that he cites as an example of how applied linguistics ‘begins with local and quite practical problems’ the investigation of which requires attention to ‘major issues in research, both of its practical management and intellectual bases’ (Candlin, 1988, p. vii). The former points to the need to confront methodology issues raised by applied linguistics understood in this way (Sarangi and Candlin, 2003, 2004), the latter to its relationship to theoretical orientations that may be relevant in addition to those associated with linguistics (Candlin and Sarangi,
2004; Sarangi and Candlin, 2001). Adding to this expanded view of the discipline are calls for increased social involvement and accountability, exemplified by Candlin’s call for a ‘critical’ focus on ameliorating social problems and issues in which language is implicated (Candlin 1990).

Moves to open applied linguistics to a greater range of applications and theoretical orientations have been seen more recently across the discipline. For example, Shohamy (2006) has argued that applied linguistics needs to embrace an ‘expanded’ view of language which would acknowledge and encompass not only linguistic insights but include the broader diversity of ways in which language matters in people’s lives. Other examples include Rampton (2002) who, while also advocating a socially committed stance, has argued that applied linguistics is best conceived of as a ‘pluri-centred field’; Blommaert (2005) who has advocated the incorporation of semiotic approaches; Kramsch’s emphasis on ‘ecological’ understandings of language use (Kramsch, 2008; Kramsch and Whiteside, 2008); Fairclough’s ‘critical’ focus on power and ideology (Fairclough, 1985; Fairclough, 1992); and Pennycook’s argument for a more generally politically interested and informed ‘Critical Applied Linguistics’ (Pennycook, 2001).

THE STUDY

These definitional issues and the diverse perspectives they reflect raise interesting questions concerning how applied linguistics is represented in degree programs that seek to prepare students to enter the field and become members of its academic and professional community, and what such representation tells us about how the discipline and professional community are understood within those programs. It was with the purpose of exploring this question within the Australian context that the current study was conducted. Specifically, we sought to establish the extent of any congruence or divergence between how applied linguistics is understood in the literature, and how it is realised in degree programs.

The study involved a survey of websites encompassing 39 Australian universities. In taking websites as our source of data, we were aware that the presentation of courses on university websites exemplifies the discourse of advertising (Cook, 2001), and is a primary means by which universities promote their program offerings. The importance of these websites in representing the discipline to potential students aligned well with our motivation for conducting the study.

The study comprised two stages. First, searches were conducted of all university websites for undergraduate and postgraduate courses and programs labelled ‘Applied Linguistics’. Where these were identified, they were analysed in respect of:
1. their overt definitions/descriptions of the discipline of applied linguistics – often couched in terms of program focus;
2. their identification of the contexts of application of applied linguistics as articulated in terms of career pathways; and
3. their models of provision.

During the data collection process, it quickly became evident that while the design of some websites made navigation easy and meant that the task of locating the required information was a relatively straightforward process, others were far less transparent, often fragmenting program information and/or burying it in ways that rendered the accessing of it far more challenging. As such, while we are confident of the integrity of our data and the accuracy of the overall picture of provision that it presents, we feel it is incumbent on us to make the qualification that, in a small minority of instances, our understanding and recording of provision based on our searches may not have reflected precisely actual provision.

FINDINGS

OVERVIEW

Of the 39 Australian universities included in the survey, 19 do not run programs in applied linguistics either at undergraduate or postgraduate level. Of these, a small minority offer TESOL postgraduate programs that make no explicit reference to ‘applied linguistics’. 4 universities run programs in applied linguistics at undergraduate and postgraduate level, 4 refer to ‘applied linguistics’ within a generalist BA (where it features as one or more modules), and 1 runs an applied linguistics program at undergraduate level only. Of the 18 universities that run applied linguistics programs at postgraduate level, 9 appear to interpret applied linguistics narrowly as TESOL, 1 offers a range of applied linguistics programs all with a language education focus, and 1 has a core applied linguistics program from which other programs focusing on TESOL as well as other contexts of application draw.

1. DESCRIPTIONS OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS

A minority of universities preface their outlines of study programs and ‘applied linguistics careers’ with descriptions of the discipline that indicate a breadth of interest beyond TESOL. One, for example, sees applied linguistics as ‘concerned with the practical issues of language: acquisition of second or foreign languages, language teaching, language
policy, multilingualism, cross-cultural communication, maintenance of languages, and assessment and treatment of language difficulties. Its major, it claims, 'provides critical, practical and theoretical knowledge relevant to careers in foreign language education, the teaching of English as a Foreign Language or Second Language, and in social communication and the pathology of speech'. Other descriptions present applied linguistics Masters degrees as being 'for professionals in fields as diverse as education, language teaching, language planning, TESOL, government, health and the law', and for 'students who are teachers of English or of other languages as second languages, language professionals (translators, interpreters etc.) and graduates who wish to pursue careers in areas which emphasize knowledge of languages'.

Four universities describe the focus of their applied linguistics offerings unambiguously in language teaching terms, making no reference to the meaning of ‘applied linguistics’ per se or to the potentially broader range of contexts of application of the discipline foreshadowed in the literature. This was typified by one institution which describes its Masters program as 'designed for professionals already in the field of language teaching'. It continues: 'The course, which concentrates on teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL), considers issues connected with TESOL teaching in Australia and the region and the teaching of Asian languages within Australia'.

Even where institutions do not focus exclusively on language teaching, they tend to employ descriptions that are ‘hedged’ and which, to varying degrees, rely on the reader to infer the ‘stuff’ of applied linguistics while encouraging a narrow interpretation:

Applied Linguistics includes a focus on the process of teaching and learning a second language and is suitable for those involved in teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL), second language teaching (SLT) and teaching of modern languages. Both traditional face-to-face and computer assisted methodologies are featured.

In this example, ‘includes a focus on’ implicitly acknowledges, in non-specific terms, the fact that applied linguistics comprises other areas of focus and as such would be suitable for those working in other professional contexts. In this respect it performs the same function as ‘concentrating on’, featured in our previous quotation (‘concentrates on teaching English to speakers of other languages’). This tendency to highlight language teaching as a context of application, while implying other possible such contexts, is a common feature of course descriptions and is further illustrated in the following paragraph the purpose of which is to provide an ‘overview’ of the Applied Linguistics degree on
This program provides students with the opportunity to study the nature of language, with a focus on applications such as the teaching and learning of first and second languages or the use of language in human interaction. This program of study would benefit students who have a background as language teaching professionals but are seeking more specialised knowledge related to their work.

It is intriguing to juxtapose this overview with the picture presented in the same institution’s definition of applied linguistics (‘What is Applied Linguistics?’), which suggests a more expansive range of contexts of application and reads:

In Applied Linguistics people investigate how an understanding of language can be put to use in a variety of fields including first and second language acquisition, second language teaching, literacy, language and classroom education across the curriculum, the use of language in university academic contexts, language and the law, forensic speaker identification, speech pathology, translation and advertising. In other words, it uses knowledge of how languages work within different applied settings.

Other universities similarly emphasise language teaching explicitly while also recognising other areas of application, as illustrated in the following gloss of applied linguistics:

Applied linguistics is concerned with practical issues involving language in the life of the community. The most important of these is the learning of second or foreign languages. Others include language policy, multilingualism, language education, the preservation and revival of endangered languages, and the assessment and treatment of language difficulties. Other areas of interest include professional communication, for example, between doctors and their patients, between lawyers and their clients and in courtrooms, as well as other areas of institutional and cross-cultural communication ranging from the boardroom to the routines on an answer phone.
This particular university’s emphasis on language teaching is also evident in the streams available within their Masters programs: namely, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Language Testing and Language Program Evaluation, Technology in Language Learning, English Language.

One program overview we found especially noteworthy with respect to the articulation of contexts of application and what these suggested about how applied linguistics was being understood was the following:

This program is designed to introduce students from a range of backgrounds to disciplines within Applied Linguistics, as they engage with second language speakers and their communities. It allows students to experience issues associated with understanding language use and second language learners in diverse and international contexts... The course offers students a critical understanding of the theoretical and practical issues relating to applied linguistics, including second/foreign language acquisition, language teaching, language contact and intercultural communication.

Here, ‘as they engage with second language speakers and their communities’ and ‘second/foreign language acquisition, language teaching, language contact and intercultural communication’ serve to foreground language teaching while implying other possible contexts of application through the use of the phrase ‘and their communities’ (Who/what are these communities?). This is paralleled by ‘understanding language use and second language learners in diverse and international contexts’: once again we have second language learners – and, by implication, language teaching – highlighted, and other contexts of application implied in ‘language use...in diverse...contexts’. Also of interest is the reference made to ‘disciplines within applied linguistics’. What exactly is being referred to here and are they really disciplines or sub-disciplines?

In relation to descriptions of applied linguistics, then, the tendency is to foreground language teaching – and, in particular, English language teaching – and minimize or exclude other potential contexts of application. This tendency, however, is in certain cases mitigated by descriptions of career pathways for those who opt to study applied linguistics. It is to these that we turn next.
2. CAREER PATHWAYS

A large proportion of universities offering a Masters degree in Applied Linguistics clearly identify for would-be students some of the professional contexts to which the degree would have relevance; these generally appear under headings such as ‘Career Pathways’, ‘Career Opportunities’ or ‘Career Outcomes’. The following four statements, from four different universities, are typical:

Applied linguistics is intended for students who are teachers of English or of other languages as second languages, language professionals (translators, interpreters, etc.) and graduates who wish to pursue careers in areas which emphasize knowledge of languages.

Graduates may work as specialist teachers, educational administrators, and other language professionals.

The Masters program allows graduates access to more senior positions in language teaching institutions such as TAFE colleges and private language schools.

Second language teaching, program administration, educational leadership, curriculum design, public service, research training, research on language learning and tertiary sector teaching.

Once again, the tendency to emphasise the language teaching profession is easy to discern and any suggestion of alternative career applications often feels little more than tokenistic. There are, however, notable exceptions, such as this description which describes a far more diverse range of applications:

Applied linguistics is a useful complement for a range of professions. These include speech therapy and pathology, allied health, psychology and training in a variety of industrial jobs that require skills in communication management and cross-cultural interaction. There is demand also among administrators and teachers in classrooms, in indigenous communities and international schools, and other government and community organisations for skills to meet diverse cultural and language learning needs.

During the course of our study, we also noted instances of tension or disparity within the same institution between statements of discipline or program focus and those
of career pathways – something we revisit later, in our discussion. Where this occurs, it is typically the case that the former are articulated predominantly, if not wholly, in terms of language teaching – and typically TESOL, while the latter suggest a broader sphere of interest by specifying a range of potential applications beyond TESOL. This is illustrated by the following two statements (featured on the same university’s website and the first of which we highlighted earlier):

Applied Linguistics focuses on the process of teaching and learning of a second language and is suitable for those involved in teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL), second language teaching (SLT), teaching modern languages and other kinds of language education.

The program in Applied Linguistics is also designed for those who are interested in applying linguistics in other professional areas including translation, journalism and media, language policy and planning, website design, and socio-educational development work.

3. MODELS OF PROVISION

When we turn from the descriptions of applied linguistics and career pathways open to graduates to the composition of programs, we find a core disciplinary interest that is invoked primarily to teach TESOL but includes much that is more generic. By the same token, there are very few courses in programs that are overtly TESOL-focused that could be regarded as TESOL specific. These include courses focusing on syllabus design, language teaching methodology, materials development and pedagogical grammar. While we acknowledge that course headings do not necessarily fully reflect course content, they are nevertheless indicative of the content of those courses that tend to form the core of provision. Within the majority of Masters programs in Applied Linguistics, these tend to include the following:

- Grammar (or other courses focusing on linguistic form)
- Discourse/discourse analysis
- Language assessment
- Sociolinguistics/language in society
- Second language acquisition
- Phonetics and phonology
- Introduction to language/linguistics
Of the universities surveyed and offering applied linguistics programs, 15 offered all or most of these elements in the form of discrete courses. The fact that the most common ‘base’ model of provision offers these foci within a single Masters program leads us to ask whether this fact tells us anything about how applied linguistics is understood by those who design provision – a point to which we shall return later. Within this model students are often offered additional courses that give them the opportunity to pursue particular interests.

The second, much less common model offers a generalist MA in Applied Linguistics with specialised language education-related versions. One university, for example, offers a generalist MA along with versions that enable specialisation within the area of language education in fields such as ‘language testing and language program evaluation’ and ‘computer assisted language learning’.

The third model sees MAs in Applied Linguistics and related areas drawing on a range of courses which are combined to create language education related versions, as well as a number that reflect other contexts of application. These include ‘TESOL’, ‘Language Program Management’, ‘Translation and Interpreting’, ‘Communication in Professions and Organisations’, ‘Clinical Audiology’ and ‘Editing and Publishing’.

**DISCUSSION**

In approaching this study we found ourselves facing a methodological dilemma. Given our observation that the literature highlights the fact that applied linguistics has come to be associated primarily with TESOL, we were mindful that any search for programs named ‘Applied Linguistics’ would likely result in a foregrounding of TESOL at the expense of programs which might be concerned with applied linguistics but without being explicitly labelled as such. On the other hand, we realised that if we opted to search for all programs that might qualify as ‘concerned with applied linguistics’, there was a danger that in establishing the basis for such a search and thus delimiting the scope of the discipline, we would be imposing our own preconceptions of applied linguistics rather than discovering an emergent picture of the discipline based on the presentation and configuration of program offerings.

We ultimately chose to focus attention only on those programs where explicit reference was made to ‘applied linguistics’. Our rationale for doing so was that we could otherwise neither make valid assumptions about whether there was any awareness of the discipline as a discipline, nor, therefore, about how applied linguistics was understood.
Having adopted this approach and conducted our survey accordingly, we were interested in discovering the extent of any congruence between what our findings told us about applied linguistics as it is represented in provision, and the nature of the discipline as revealed in debates around its definition – specifically issues concerning its relationship to linguistics and to English language teaching, as well as its potential relevance to a far broader range of contexts of application.

With respect to where applied linguistics appears to sit in relation to English language teaching, perhaps not surprisingly we found that the majority of applied linguistics offerings are in fact TESOL programs, and there is thus effectively a conflation of the two. Moreover, there is no obvious correlation between program and its host department, exemplified by the case of applied linguistics as TESOL which is offered, for example, in both linguistics and education departments. This lack of a default disciplinary location underscores the interdisciplinary relevance of applied linguistics. As the literature makes clear, this is a strength of applied linguistics, and points to its value for the disciplines more generally. On the other hand, the lack of a disciplinary home risks subordinating applied linguistics to other disciplines, leaving it without an identity of its own.

Where applied linguistics programs recognise the discipline as having relevance to contexts of application other than English language teaching, they nevertheless give greater prominence to TESOL in the majority of cases. It is intriguing to surmise why this might be the case. A factor of particular relevance to the Australian context is the history of applied linguistics in respect of migrant education and its connections to the multi-cultural movement and related government policies (McNamara and Lo Bianco, 2001). In addition, some of the key graduate programs in applied linguistics targeted the emerging EFL market which had been established on the British model, often by people with experience of equivalent MA programs in the UK. As well, the earliest formal applied linguistics in Australia emerged from the needs of university modern language teachers. The prominence of TESOL also doubtless reflects trends that are found internationally. For example, as explained in the methodology section, there is inevitably a strong marketing dimension: TESOL is arguably the context of application with the best developed career pathway and this has implications for enrolment numbers and the viability of ‘applied linguistics’ programs. Furthermore, TESOL typically attracts large numbers of overseas students who wish to develop their own facility with the language while also acquiring language teaching expertise and a qualification they can take back with them to their countries of origin.

It is also noteworthy that while TESOL is frequently given greatest prominence in applied linguistics programs, these will, nonetheless, typically make reference to the wider
range of contexts of application to which a degree in applied linguistics can be relevant. In other words, they effectively promote a view of applied linguistics as TESOL but, in their descriptions of career pathways, also give a (normally minimalistic) nod to its potentially wider contexts of application. Again, we are left wondering whether, in some cases, there are marketing considerations at work here.

Then there is the fact that the more applied linguistics is presented as virtually synonymous with TESOL, the greater the risk of reinforcing this restricted understanding of the discipline among program providers (who typically scope other institutions’/competitors’ programs when creating curricula), academics and professionals (particularly with language teaching backgrounds), and students. In other words, there is, perhaps, something of a vicious circle in operation.

Despite this predominance of TESOL in applied linguistics provision, the evidence we found of a ‘core’ of courses that features in all applied linguistics programs – including those without a TESOL focus – while perhaps not definitive, nevertheless places the question of the relationship between linguistics and applied linguistics in an interesting light. Although there may be some uncertainty and dispute around whether assessment and second language acquisition can rightly be regarded as linguistics proper, there is, we would argue, some evidence in support of the idea that, however one chooses to define applied linguistics and its potential scope of interest, there is a widespread perception that at its heart lies the notion of a base discipline that informs its activities.

Finally, there are those definitional issues that bear on the notion of a more expansive view of the discipline of applied linguistics, as realised in its contexts of application and its intellectual and methodological bases. Despite applied linguistics scholars universally bearing witness to the discipline’s relevance beyond language education – and TESOL in particular, we have observed also how only a handful of universities offer a generalist MA in applied linguistics, with a number of different streams and/or shared courses with programs that recognise and focus on alternative contexts of application. These programs are indeed exceptional and do little to allay the overall impression that, consistent with the literature, applied linguistics is usually interpreted far more narrowly in a way that does not do justice to its potential to bear on a much broader range of professional interests.

**CONCLUSION**

Applied linguistics has always suffered from a sense of insecurity about its identity. Whether or not they are justified, questions have been raised over its academic credentials,
its coherence as a discipline, and its relationship to linguistics on the one hand, and its contexts of application on the other. While this may be symptomatic of a dynamic young discipline that is simply finding its feet and establishing its academic niche, the fact remains that applied linguistics and TESOL have it seems, for many, become one and the same thing. The fact of this close association means that when the discipline of applied linguistics is looked at through the lens of provision it becomes impoverished, its potential stunted by a frequent reduction of its focus to a single domain of application. This very much confirms observations in the literature but is at odds with the near-universal acknowledgement that applied linguistics refers to a far broader range of tasks or activities than suggested by the majority of programs identified in our study. Despite its undoubted importance to the history of applied linguistics, TESOL is but one of many contexts of language use where applied linguistics offers the prospect of greater understanding for both researchers and participants alike.

Again, viewed through the lens of provision, there are examples of applied linguistics programs notable by virtue of their paucity but which reflect and are defined in terms of a greater diversity of contexts of application. Given that such diversity stands in sharp contrast to the tendency to understand applied linguistics far more narrowly, it might, in Corder’s words, ‘be better that the label should always be specified further so that the field of application and, in consequence, the nature of the applied linguistics involved are better understood’ (Corder, 1973, pp. 7–8).

Looking to the future, the question the current state of provision raises for the discipline is how applied linguistics is to identify itself more confidently and securely as independent of TESOL given their close historical association and current pressures to conflate them. Any prising apart of the two will present a significant challenge and require a realisation, at program level, of the opportunities and possibilities that an expanded view of applied linguistics, as reflected in the literature, presents for students, educators and researchers alike.
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