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Abstract

This address to language teachers reviewed a number of recent Australian-based research studies. It is suggested that all the studies reviewed lead to the inference that students learning English as a second or foreign language need to be given room to communicate. Further, it is argued that teachers, in providing opportunities for communicative language use, should give due regard to individual student differences, authenticity, cultural congruence and the self-respect of the learner.

Introduction

About 40 years ago when I was being trained as a language teacher, the key to being a success, so we were told, lay in being able to break the language down into its essential structures and to use these often enough with our students until they became automatic. Our method lecturer gave us a range of tricks of the trade which would enable us to fill the class time with activities which were all essentially drills, either overt, or thinly disguised. The class group I was in was composed of recent university graduates, and I still remember the quizzical look on the face of one of my fellow students as he passed his lecture notes to me with multiple question marks and exclamation marks after one of the pieces of advice our lecturer had given us: ‘Meaning doesn’t matter. Language learning is just the formation of habits.’

Counter-intuitive though this is, a generation of language teachers grew up on it and many textbooks were devised to help learners to learn language as mindless habit. In those days it was thought that the accurate descriptions of language coming from linguistics, plus the behaviourist learning theory coming from psychology, would together answer the needs of the language teaching profession.

From the perspective of those, like myself, who had learned languages at school by grammar and translation, this was indeed an exciting new development. But, of course, we were to learn that putting all our faith in it would lead to disappointment. In the course of time, the structural approach made way for its close relations — the situational approach and the audiolingual approach. These in turn gave way to the audio-visual approach and the
structuro-global audiovisual approach. Then came functional notional syllabuses which would lead to the communicative approach, and meanwhile a host of fringe methodologies, labelled ‘humanistic’ would arise, amassing the resources of feelings, music and total physical response in the interests of language learning. Later, as second language acquisition theory developed in certain directions, the natural approach would emerge, while various further developments of the communicative approach, like task-based learning and collaborative learning and interactive approaches, would become common.

If the emphasis 40 years ago was strongly on the language and its analysis, the emphasis today is much more on the learner, or the community of learners, their attitudes, beliefs, cultural assumptions and strategies. Hence the theme of this conference: exploring new learning communities.

So in this talk I would like to leave aside the endless quest for the ultimate methodology, and focus on learners, and on some of the things we are finding out about their needs through research that has been going on quite recently. Rather than talking about research that is generally accessible, I want to relate what I say to a number of studies that you may not have heard about but which I have had access to in the capacity of an examiner or supervisor or collaborator, or as a researcher.

The experience of every language teacher and researcher into language teaching is that language learners behave in a variety of ways, some of which we find easy to adjust to and accept, and some of which bewilder or frustrate us. Why is it that language learners behave the way they do? I think that research is increasingly helping us to answer this question, and that, as language teachers one of the things we need to learn is to give learners the room to learn the way that is best for them. My overall theme, then, is that since the kind of teaching we do is cross-cultural, we need to give learners room, and I would like to explore five different kinds:

1. Room to communicate;
2. Room to communicate in different ways;
3. Room to communicate with real people;
4. Room to communicate while maintaining their cultural identity, and
5. Room to communicate while maintaining their self-respect.

**Giving the learner room to communicate**

If establishing habits was the unquestioned aim of every language teacher 40 years ago, facilitating communication is the unquestioned aim of every language teacher today. Or at least that is what it seems. The orthodoxy is to be communicative. However, when researchers have looked closely at what is done in the name of communicative language teaching, they have often found that people have adopted the name communicative without necessarily adopting its spirit. An example of this came through a study I
was involved in ten years ago which investigated language teaching in all of Australia's universities (Leal, Bettoni and Malcolm 1991). The universities were teaching a generation of language teachers to be communicative and, when all of the language departments were surveyed and invited to choose from a list of ten methodologies the one or ones they used, a clear majority of 75 per cent chose communicative. However, when we surveyed recent graduates they claimed that, as they perceived it, the primary objectives of the courses they had been taught had been literature, writing and reading, although what they had wanted most of all had been oral/aural skills (Malcolm 1991). After all, every use of language can be called communicating, so it has been easy for people to adopt the 'communicative' label and go on doing whatever they had been doing before.

Indeed, ESL and EFL students (unlike the university graduates we surveyed) have repeatedly shown in studies in Australia and overseas that they are less convinced than their teachers of the value of communicative language learning approaches. A recent study of over 150 EFL learners and their teachers in Hong Kong showed that the teachers, but not the students, thought group work helped their language learning (Peacock 1998: 242). As the author of the study, Matthew Peacock, observed this was a reflection of the findings of David Nunan in studies of Australian ESL learners in 1985 and 1988, where the students favoured 'traditional', and the teachers 'communicative', activities.

So, while teachers may be under some pressure from the profession to teach communicatively, they may be under competing pressure from their students not to do so. As Peacock has suggested in a follow-up study (1999: 258), students' lack of faith in the methods adopted by their teachers could lead to a lowering of their performance.

There are many ways of characterising communicative language teaching, but it is not my intention to discuss them here. For our purposes, it is sufficient to consider a communicative approach as one which recognises that purposeful, original, interactive use of the target language by students (in a variety used for contemporary communication) should form an essential part of classroom activity. Communication is, in this sense, a necessary part of language learning, and the more students learn, the more they recognise the need for communication to help them to learn more. A recent study by Melanie Postmus in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Western Australia helped to demonstrate this.

Postmus (1999) was interested in how learners with different language backgrounds approached the language learning experience. To investigate this, she undertook a study in which she enrolled in a beginners' Chinese course and followed her own and her 24 fellow-students' progress over two years, using self-reporting through diaries and interviews as the main source of data. The students in the group included bilinguals and monolinguals. Postmus was interested in how prior language experience, and the kind of
language experience, influenced the way in which the students approached their language learning.

The students in the Chinese language class could be divided into three groups with respect to their prior language knowledge. All had oral and written proficiency in English, but some were speakers of cognate languages to the one they were learning, that is, dialects of Chinese (Cantonese and Hokkien) or Japanese. Others were bilingual in non-cognate languages, such as Bulgarian and Indonesian. The third group consisted of those who were monolingual in English.

Postmus found that the students adopted different strategies according to their language background. The group with cognate language knowledge noticed the ways in which the language they were learning differed in spoken or written form from the ones they already knew. From this, they quickly moved towards intuiting the way the language would be used and sought out interaction opportunities with native speakers both in the class and outside so that they could learn more from their own output. The non-cognate bilingual group started off by comparing Chinese with their own languages on the basis of literal translation, word by word, but quickly abandoned this in favour of developing the procedural knowledge of how to use the language. Like the first group, they saw the need to focus on their output, and to make a deliberate change in their way of thinking (Postmus 1999). The monolingual group spent large amounts of time in extended analysis of input from the written text. Rather than seeking to communicate and learn from their output, they preferred to stay with the written mode and to use rote learning as a conscious strategy. Over time, the monolingual group moved towards more reflection on their output and the development of changes in their way of thinking, but they were less likely to do this if they had no prior experience of immersion learning.

This study is not based on what students say about the teacher’s methodology (indeed, in this case, it was rather teacher-centred) but on what they observe about their own learning experience, and it suggests that, once one has learned in an immersion situation, one is likely to use this as a basis for future learning and to recognise that communication is essential to language learning. Where students do not have such a background, they may need encouragement from the teacher to communicate, because they may find it difficult to break out of their existing learning patterns. As Postmus (1999: 164) noted:

Overall there was low variation (change) in the language learning behaviours of individual participants over the time that this study was conducted. This finding is significant as it implies that the linguistic background of the learner ... has much to do with setting an individual’s approach to foreign language learning within formal instruction contexts.

The teacher, then, needs to give the learner room to communicate, even if they may not at first see the need to do so.
Giving the learner room to communicate in different ways

This leads to the second observation I want to make. The more we get to know about language learners, the more we see that they are all different. Summing up the findings of case studies of six Thai learners of English which were detailed at length in her recent PhD thesis from Newcastle University, Christine Weckert (2000: 380) concluded that they:

support McKay and Wong's (1996) exhortation not to view language learners as homogeneous 'stick figures.' Analysis of the six students' texts revealed as many differences as similarities in the strategies each used to realise socio-culturally and situationally appropriate meanings in English.

Weckert's important study, which I shall come back to in more detail later, was based on the observation of her students' behaviour in an EFL setting, where English language input was limited. It showed how students, all in their different ways, make use of the target language resources that are to hand, to help them to learn to communicate in the written mode. Everything that happens in their experience, every advertising sign they read, every letter they receive or write, every scribbled comment of the teacher on a piece of work, every assessment procedure they are put through, every native or non-native speaker with whom they interact becomes a learning resource which may be drawn upon. At the same time, as we have seen, the students' prior language knowledge and learning experience are also resources that are drawn upon. But close study of the behaviour and output of the learners made it clear to Weckert that it is not possible to predict how they will make use of the various inputs in their communication. Neither the Contrastive Analysis hypothesis, which highlights the role of the L1, nor the Interlanguage hypothesis, which stresses the development of an approximative system, nor the Creative Construction hypothesis, which emphasises the need for comprehensible input, could account alone for the performance of any of the learners. Different learners select differently from the communicative resources with which they are surrounded in order to develop competence in a new language, and any one learner employs different learning strategies in different situations and at different stages of learning.

Second or foreign language learners are engaged in the exploration of culturally new territory. Within a community of learners, many of the explorers will take different routes. Much of what is going on may be hard to discern because it goes on in the privacy of the learner's own mind. When Jim Lantolf from the State University of Pennsylvania visited Australia in 2000, he emphasised the importance in language learning of what Vygotsky called 'appropriation', that is, the 'private manipulation and experimentation with the morphosyntactic, phonological, and lexical patterns of the language' (Lantolf 2000, ALAA conference abstract). One way in which this takes place is in inner speech, where the learner is seeking to gain control of what he or she has internalised from the input from communicative settings. In their writing in English, the students Weckert studied sometimes based their production on models that they had had presented to them in
class, and which they had, to a greater or lesser extent, memorised. This was especially the case with texts which had a fairly predictable form such as letters of application or invitation. Weckert saw this communicative behaviour as a risk minimisation strategy, and found that the students used it particularly in exam or test situations. Where there were no models on which they could draw, students were more likely to depend on the strategy of direct translation from their first language. The matter of risk minimisation was an important factor in determining the communicative strategies the students would use. It showed up, for example, in their preference for simple sentences when writing in exams, although they might have been capable of writing in complex or compound sentences. Sometimes students would adopt the speech patterns of second-language speaking teachers as models, resulting in the use of patterns which sound odd to the native speaker, such as saying ‘from their thinking’, meaning ‘creatively’ or ‘How about...?’ to mean ‘What do you think about...?’ Misappropriation of models could also occur with native-speaker speech. Weckert’s students were given a task which required them to give directions to somebody involving the use of the imperative, for example: ‘Walk around the corner and take the first turn to the right...’, but, in discussing the possibilities with the students, she expressed them using the ‘you’ subject, for example, ‘You can go this way or you can go that way...’. Later, she found that in an assessable piece of work the students had used the ‘You can’ form instead of the simple imperative.

Students are, then, actively monitoring the situation in which they find themselves and employing strategies in their communication that may be based on a cost–benefit analysis. If the chance of error, especially public error, is high, many students will not put the full extent of their competence to the test. They will stay in the safe ground, and perhaps stagnate in their learning. Further evidence of this came from research which Alastair McGregor and a number of colleagues at Edith Cowan University and the Guangzhou Foreign Language University conducted a few years ago (McGregor and Malcolm 1995). This compared the effectiveness of more and less intensive modes of instruction on learners of English (in China) and Chinese (in Australia). We found that some students achieved much better on intensive instruction, but others lost all confidence and virtually gave up.

Another consideration, which was emphasised by some of the teachers we interviewed in the 1990 review of language teaching in Australia’s universities, was the fact that some students may be typically ‘turned on’ to certain learning approaches because, outside of the time they are in the English class, they are using their minds in different ways. For example, it has been anecdotally observed that engineering students may prefer rote memorisation whereas social work students like to engage in role play.

Thus teachers need to vary the communicative opportunities and demands of the situations they create for their learners, recognising that, at any given time the same kind of opportunity may not be exploited in the same way by all learners.
Giving the learner room to communicate with real people

A third factor which seems to have an important bearing on the effectiveness with which people learn to communicate is the extent to which their communication is authentic as opposed to contrived. To illustrate this I would like to return to the work of Weckert (2000). She was interested in finding out to what extent autonomy and authenticity in student communication enhanced their language learning as shown in their production of written texts. Autonomy was essentially seen in terms of the degree to which the student was in control of the situation, and the language and the information to be conveyed. Authenticity was seen in terms of the degree to which the student was actually communicating with a real person. Over the twelve-week period of her study, Weckert collected text samples of a variety of types from her six subjects. They ranged from texts where autonomy and authenticity were nil (as in cloze tests where the student had to fill in word gaps in an examination text) to where they were partial, as where students negotiated the nature of their communication with the teacher. After the study period had concluded and she had left the school and returned home to Australia, an unexpected windfall occurred. A number of her students wrote unsolicited letters to her on subjects of their own initiation. Weckert was able to include an analysis of these texts in her study, representing the extreme end of the autonomy/authenticity range. She made an interesting finding. These texts were far from perfect, but in every case, they were longer and more complex than any of the other texts the students had produced, revealing a level of command over the language which had not been shown in work produced purely for pedagogical purposes.

An example of one of these texts is shown below:

Dear Ajarn Chris     how are you?
I’m sorry don’t send letter to you. Because I don’t free. I study 6 Subject in ______ University English, Economics, government Society, Thai and Culture and Psychology. English is very difficult and teacher he come from U.S.A. he speak English very fast and I have problem listening and vocabulary, grammar too. You can advice me.
Now in ______ is rainny. I thing in Australia is rainny too. Now Ajarn Chris teaching in University?
How about your family. I thing your family very happy.
Ajarn Chris take care your himself.
See you
Somchai
Sorry I write is not true Grammar.

Weckert (2000:227) notes of this piece of writing: ‘while, on the one hand, he appears to have lost some confidence in his English proficiencies, he was prepared to risk exposing these in order to communicate.’ As she
points out, the grammar is, indeed, not perfect. Yet, for all the risks Somchai had taken in his language, he had not made any more inappropriate lexico-grammatical choices than in his earlier writing samples. Part of his risk-taking was in attempting compound as well as simple sentences. There are three of each in the first paragraph. For the most part, he is not relying on the easy path of direct translation from his own language. An exception, as Weckert points out, is perhaps the use of ‘now’ to mark the present tense in the question ‘Now Ajarn Chris teaching in University?’ This seems to be following the Thai pattern of using temporal adverbs to mark tense. Significantly, Somchai is showing a sensitivity to the interpersonal tenor of his communication. He is using elliptical forms ‘I’ll’ and ‘don’t’, allowing for the attachment of an afterthought in his sentence: ‘... I have problem listening and vocabulary, grammar too,’ and signing off with the informal ‘See you.’ Perhaps the final P.S., ‘Sorry I write is not true Grammar,’ is an admission by Somchai that he has abandoned his classroom expectations of his communication, but ironically in so doing he has shown a competency which the classroom never revealed.

An important inference that Weckert draws from her work is that we need to think twice about teaching approaches which depend heavily upon inauthentic communicative activities such as simulations and the imitation of genres. This is, of course, not to say that the teacher should never expect students to suspend disbelief and participate in activities which are ‘staged’ for the purpose of language practice. It is, however, important to recognise that students can distinguish between the pedagogical artifact and the ‘real thing’ and that it may take the latter to enable the extent of their communicative competence to be demonstrated.

Giving the learners room to communicate while maintaining their cultural identity

A lot of my time is spent with Aboriginal people, interacting with them and looking together with them at the way they use English. Many people doubt whether such a thing as Aboriginal English exists. Education systems have, for the most part, implicitly denied its existence by assuming that if Aboriginal children speak English they speak the same English as non-Aboriginal people, and should be subjected to literacy instruction and testing based on standard Australian English. When they fail to achieve comparable literacy levels in standard Australian English to those of other Australians, what is questioned is never the rightness of denying their cultural identity by ignoring their unique English heritage, but rather the students’ ability, or their home situation, or their social disadvantage, or their lack of motivation.

In fact, Aboriginal people have never, as a speech community, spoken the same English as other Australians. From the beginning, two forms of English evolved on Australian soil: one among the immigrants and one among the Aboriginal people. Admittedly, it was cross-cultural encounters
that occasioned the use of English by Aboriginal people, but it was in Aboriginal contexts that first New South Wales Pidgin English, and then the creoles and Aboriginal English varieties derived from it, developed and flourished. Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal Australians have, right until the present day, kept one another at a distance, and the Englishes they have developed reflect their distinct histories and cultures. As we work together — native English-speaking Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians — in my research group at Edith Cowan University, we are constantly surprising one another by how we have been talking past one another when we have assumed common meanings in the English words and expressions we have used.

This experience has taught us to advocate an education for Aboriginal people where they will no more be taught as deficient speakers of somebody else’s English. What we advocate, and are trying to develop, is an education which recognises ‘two-way English’ — in which different cultural patterns and traditions can coexist (Malcolm, Haig, Königsberg, Rochecouste, Collard, Hill and Cahill 1999).

What we are doing has something in common with much more widespread trends, where many groups who have come to English through accidents of history rather than through direct inheritance are claiming a right to call it their own, and where the right of native speakers of the standard dialect to impose it, with all their cultural baggage, onto others, is being disputed.

Ming Sheng Li (1999), in his PhD thesis written at La Trobe University, explored some of the implications of this for the teaching of English overseas, in particular in China, by teachers from such countries as Australia. He noted how often offence has been caused by overseas teachers who transgress local conventions in the ways in which they carry out their teaching. This extends to the subjects they focus on, the activities they expect the students to carry out, and even their own dress and posture. He argued that cultural awareness is a more important part of the training of such teachers than is methodology, and he considered that, in view of the cultural bias of some methodologies, teachers in these situations should practise what he called ‘border pedagogy’.

Such situations also exist in Australia. Farzad Sharifian (1999) has described a situation in an Australian independent school where what he called the ‘macro-culture’ associated with a belief system which crosses many national boundaries, meant that offence could be caused to students by such matters as teacher–student and student–student eye contact and proximity, talking about students’ family members and the use of mass media, music and certain kinds of posters as teaching aids. Even to present food such as rice in a poster might be considered inappropriate.

Of course, it is possible to overestimate the magnitude of the differences which separate cultures and to attribute to culture certain behaviours which are more matters of personality. For example, the reported behaviour of expatriate English teachers in China who sit down and put their feet up on
the students’ desks while teaching could hardly be interpreted as representative of acceptable teacher behaviour in ‘western’ culture.

Xudong Deng (1999) in his PhD at Edith Cowan University sought to discover the cultural differences which separate Chinese conversationalists from English conversationalists by looking separately at conversations between Chinese friends in China, and between matched pairs of Australian friends in Australia. He looked particularly at what happens when people’s turns overlap — that is, where we might say that they interrupt one another. Perhaps surprisingly, he found that people’s behaviour when speech overlaps is governed by the same principles in the Chinese and the Australian contexts and that differences, where they occurred, were usually matters of degree. At a higher level of abstraction, he did find, however, that Australians are comfortable with a situation where individuals’ rights and obligations are clear-cut and explicitly stated, whereas the Chinese operate on the basis of a more ‘porous’ view of rights and obligations, with it being understood that the strongest rights and obligations exist within the family. Australians in conversations are, accordingly, more likely than Chinese to respect the right of the interlocutor to continue until a possible completion point before interrupting, whereas Chinese speakers might interrupt at any point but drop out more readily if necessary to resolve the overlap.

The more we know about cultural differences affecting communication, the more we can see that many of them (perhaps like those Deng studied) are likely to be imperceptible to most people attempting to communicate across cultures. I am not, then, counselling that teachers should understand all the cultural reasons why people may misunderstand one another, but that they should be humble about their own culture and not be too quick to dictate the cultural terms for interaction.

**Giving the learners room to communicate while maintaining their self-respect**

Finally, I would like to refer to some research which has helped to highlight the fact that cross-cultural communication, and communication in classrooms, pose ongoing threats to the self-esteem of those that are involved.

Rose Senior (1999a) in her PhD for Edith Cowan University, *The good language class: teacher perceptions*, reported on a study of teaching by 36 teachers in intensive English language classes in five institutions in Perth. She was interested in exploring the matter of class cohesion, which is almost universally reported on by teachers as a (or the) desirable characteristic of a good language class. The teachers Senior studied judged the cohesion of their classes by observing the behaviours of their students, especially the ‘body language, facial expressions, responsiveness, willingness to engage in interactive tasks with a range of other students, and spontaneous whole-class behaviour (especially in the form of laughter)’ (Senior 1999a: 370). In a presentation based on the study (Senior 1999b), she highlighted the fact
that humour had an important role in developing class cohesion. Teachers, she found, would use humour to set the tone of the class in the early stages. As one teacher commented: ‘I don’t mind if I have to make a bit of a fool of myself ... [and then] they think, “If the teacher can be silly and make us laugh, we can do the same.”’ (Senior 1999b: 5). Humour sometimes developed with individual students as focal points. Sometimes students were given humorous nicknames or teased. Often humour was initiated by students, but occasionally it upset them.

It was interesting that the teachers studied by Senior tended to depend on evidence of class cohesion, rather than regular linguistic assessment, as evidence of the success of their teaching. The students, however, had other ideas. Senior found that students who exhibited the behaviours identified by teachers as evidencing class cohesion were sometimes dissatisfied with their learning. Senior discussed this apparent contradiction in the following terms:

Why did the teachers assume that students valued cohesive classes to the same extent as themselves and were satisfied with the progress that they were making? The animated way in which they talked about classes which they considered cohesive indicates that that the teachers’ own emotions were bound up with the notion of class cohesion. If they felt excited and exhilarated by teaching classes which they believed to be cohesive it is perhaps not surprising that they found themselves teaching more energetically and putting that extra bit of effort into preparing lessons. This may have been one of the reasons why the teachers considered that students were satisfied with the experience of being members of cohesive classes. Their assumption that students who were members of cohesive classes were satisfied customers may also be linked to what might be termed the snowball effect. If teachers have a general feeling of well-being as a result of what they consider to be a positive communal group experience, they are likely to consider that others who undergo the same experience will have similar feelings to their own. They may consider that what is good for themselves as teachers must, ipso facto, be good for their students as learners, thus confounding the two beliefs. (Senior 1999a: 378).

There is some evidence from Senior’s work that teachers may sometimes fail to gauge the strongly felt views of their students who will play along with the fun which the teacher seeks to provoke for the sake of class cohesion, but who are concerned to see the cumulative effect of their classroom learning in terms of linguistic competence. Teachers may be motivated by what Senior has called the ‘feel-good factor’ (Senior 1999a: 375), which gives them a sense of affirmation after a lesson, but sometimes fail to see what it takes to give the student an equivalent sense of affirmation.

This bears comparison with the work of Kaye Malcolm (1994), who found that, in cross-cultural communication in the workplace, one of the main motivating forces of the non-native English speakers in their communications with native speakers was the maintenance of their own self-esteem, even if it meant conveying messages of comprehension back to their interlocutor when they did not understand.
To take another case from a completely different context, after some ten years of study seeking to understand the factors underlying the communication failure between Aboriginal students and their teachers, I found that the crux of the matter, from the Aboriginal students’ point of view, came down to the answers to three key questions:

Who is this person that wants to interact with me?
Who is listening in?
Do I want to say anything, and if not, are my rights to non-involvement being recognised? (Malcolm 1982: 131).

In effect, the Aboriginal students who from the teachers’ point of view were resisting communication, were simply wanting to be treated the way in which, as they saw it, normal human beings are treated.

Perhaps the most basic need of all of us in cross-cultural and pedagogical situations is to have the sense that we are respected as we are, and if this need is met, much of the rest will follow.

**Conclusion**

I began by looking at the past and seeing the way in which the language teaching profession had been dominated, for a time, by a preoccupation with language and how it is structured. Times have changed, and I think for the better. The preoccupation I find in much current research, as I have tried to present it here, is with the amazingly complex and infinitely varied people who learn and use language. One of the things that this research suggests to me is that we need to learn to trust these people and the manifold resources they bring to the task of learning and using language.

I am reminded of the fable told of the farmer who was impatient to see his rice grow faster and went to the fields one day and pulled each plant up just a little higher. He went home exhausted but proud to tell his family what he had achieved. His son, next day, went out to check and found all the rice plants drooping (Chia 1996).

Teachers are essential to enable classrooms to become effective learning environments, but part of their role is to recognise what students can do without them, and to have the patience and faith to see this happen.
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