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Abstract

English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) teachers often find it challenging to use only English when they are teaching reading classes. One factor may be that they believe that their students do not want them to. This quantitative action research investigated how students in a one-semester university English reading class felt about their teacher and themselves using the target language only. A twenty-item questionnaire was administered at the beginning and end of the semester, to compare students’ initial and final attitudes. Significant T-test results from thirteen items showed that students came to feel very positive about their teacher’s English-only approach, and toward their own use of the target language in class.

1. Introduction

1.1. Teaching Reading by Using English

"Teaching English in English" seems to be a significant proposition for English teachers teaching any type of classes. Yet opinions seem to be split on the issue. Some argue that the target-language-only environment will create "unnatural communication" or "loss of the learner's primary identity" (Allwright & Bailey, 1994). Others suggest that learners would rely too much on the information given in their first language (Wong-Fillmore, 1985), and that learning would not occur if their first language were used beyond what is absolutely necessary. In communication classes, it seems to be natural and expected that both the teacher and students use the target language. This can produce both great satisfaction
and achievement (Burden & Stribling, 2003). However, in many EFL reading classes in the Japanese classroom settings, the students’ first language is often the common medium of instruction and, very often, “translation” becomes one of the central tasks of the class. It is also the case that reading classes are often designed to teach discrete grammar items and vocabulary, but not to let the students experience real reading.

While not denying the utility of first language use in teaching EFL reading, the writer would like to point out some of the possible limitations of yakudoku, a Japanese-only approach:

* Students may rely on Japanese translation in order to understand the meaning.
* Students often use Japanese translation in order to explain what they understood. (Ushiro, 2004)
* Originally rich and multi-dimensional meaning of English is possibly narrowed.
* Japanese translation is often placed in the central part of class tasks.
* Well-written Japanese translation is often the goal and part of assessment.
* Students’ memory may be stored in Japanese.
* Students may rely on Japanese vocabulary when they produce.

If the target language, English, is used as a medium of instruction, the students will presumably benefit from the following things:

* Students may use English in order to understand the meaning.
* Students may use English in order to explain what they understood.
* Students can access to the rich and multi-dimensional meaning of the words.
* Students can have the increased input and exposure.
* Negotiation of meaning will occur.
* Negotiation of forms will occur.
* Students can retain information in English through repetitive use.
* Retained information will make production easier.

1.2. Bottom-up Processing and Top-down Processing

Research has shown that there are three types of reading processes: bottom-up (Gough, 1972; LaBerge & Samuels, 1974), top-down (Goodman, 1967;
Smith, 1978), and interactive (Rumelhart, 1977; Stanovich, 1980; Eskey & Grabe, 1988). Many research findings were in support of a top-down processing approach, particularly when the “Schema Theory” by Rumelhart became the mainstream approach in reading pedagogy (Hayashi 2000). Guessing from the context, asking questions before reading the text, skimming and scanning, and schema activation are some of the main tasks of this approach. Whereas the top-down approach may be effective in an English-as-a-second-language (ESL) setting or for first language learners, some argue that it may not be appropriate in an EFL setting because its lack of focus on linguistic elements may not contribute to students’ linguistic ability improvement.

A question arose, therefore, as to how learners understand the meaning by using top-down process, without knowing vocabulary items and grammatical structures (Kadota, 2003; Kadota & Noro, 2001; Kanaya, 2003, 2004; to name a few). One cannot tell his novice students, who have zero or little knowledge of the target language, to “understand the meaning of the text in English” or to “explain in English what you understood”, or even to “exchange your ideas on the issue with your partners”. Top-down processing is not possible unless there is bottom-up processing. So how can a teacher enhance bottom-up processing in target-language-only or -dominant instruction? And what could a teacher do to enhance top-down processing?

2. Target-Language-Only Methodology for Reading Classes

2.1. Four Quadrants of Language Proficiency

It is possible for students of various proficiency levels to understand meaning without relying on translation, using both a bottom-up and top-down approach. Cummins’ system of four quadrants defining language proficiency (1979, 2000) offers a useful approach to understand this. Cummins (1979) made a fundamental distinction between conversational aspects - Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) - and academic aspects of language proficiency - Cognitive and Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). Its developed version using abstractness and context-dependency defines language proficiency in four phases by combining two elements: cognitive involvement and contextual support (Cummins, 2000). See Figure 1 below.
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Figure1: Language Proficiency defined in contextual support and cognitive involvement

The four quadrants include phase A (cognitively undemanding + context embedded), phase B (cognitively demanding + context embedded), phase C (cognitively undemanding + context reduced), and phase D (cognitively demanding + context reduced). Performance on highly contextualized language tasks does not predict performance on less contextualized tasks such as defining the meaning of words (ibid., p. 64). Language tasks which are cognitively undemanding and with embedded context (Phase A) will facilitate the learners’ language acquisition most easily, while those that are cognitively demanding and with reduced context (Phase D) will require higher linguistic and cognitive competency. Elaboration in the teacher talk and the material adjustment based on this definition could become effective comprehension aids for students.

2.2. Controlled Input as Comprehension Aids

When a teacher attempts to increase target language use in reading classes, one option is for classroom directions to be given in the target language while all other instructions or stories are shared in Japanese. However, the input increase should happen in a way that the readers can gain sufficient clues and hints that aid comprehension. Moreover, input must include rich context and scaffolds based on linguistically controlled complexity.

The following table (Table 1) explains techniques the writer used for different aspects of text processing in reading classes, according to the complexity of
Table 1: Elaborate Techniques for Helping Learners Understand the Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>body language</th>
<th>Use gestures and mime.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>word rephrasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realia, examples</td>
<td>Show it. Act it out. Give examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| definitions of the words | Define the meaning of the word in English by using an English-English dictionary.  
                           - definition (core features)  
                           - attributes (characteristic features) |
| guessing from context | When students do now know the exact meaning of the word, they may guess from the context or explain some of the features they captured. |
| paraphrasing         | Restating the meaning in other expressions.  
                           -Teacher provides paraphrased text.  
                           -Teacher input includes paraphrased messages.  
                           - Teacher helps students paraphrase. |
| making inferences    | Students make inferences from the text. |

tasks.

The three methodological pillars used in order to enhance not only top-down but also bottom-up processing were: 1) using an English-English dictionary; 2) paraphrasing; and 3) visualizing the information by using graphic organizers.

An English-English dictionary at the students’ starting language proficiency was prepared. What was important in using English-English dictionaries was to select the level that was appropriate to the students and to have the students understand how to use the dictionary and be familiar with it. Day-one activities included vocabulary activities that helped the students have a better understanding of the organization of the dictionary. Students were stimulated by rich definitions and attributes to obtain a clear semantic image of the lexical items.

Paraphrasing begins when the teacher begins the class. Teacher talk could in-
clude background information and rich images of the context, which would give the students sufficient scaffolds. An increase in input means an increase in comprehension aids. While paraphrasing can be provided by the teacher as classroom input, students can also learn to restate meaning by using an English-English dictionary or by recycling vocabulary they learned from the text.

2.3. Visualizing by Using Graphic Organizers

Graphic organizers (or advanced organizers), the third methodological pillar, are known to be effective tools which help students logically understand the text and organize their ideas (Montone, 1994; Monroe, 1997; Gil-Garcia, 2003). They include diagrams (cluster diagrams, Venn diagrams, tree diagrams, etc.), charts (flow charts, etc.), tables, webs, grids, story lines, time lines, and so on. The graphic organizers help students generate ideas, develop their thinking process, describe characteristics and attributes, organize/compare/contrast/classify/sequence information, and re-organize the obtained information. Regardless of student proficiency level or the contextual complexity of the text, graphic organizers can be used to help students connect the “known” to the “unknown” and re-organize the knowledge they gained (Gil-Garcia, 2003).

In the pre-reading phase of reading classes, graphic organizers were used to help students activate schema, access necessary background information, have a good reason to read the text, predict what they will read, or explore possible vocabulary they will meet in the text. Graphic organizers were also used during the in-reading phase. For example, vocabulary was explained by showing both defining features and characteristics features in the semantic mapping (webs). Semantic mapping was one effective activity to expand the readers’ mental image of vocabulary in any phase of reading. By using graphic organizers, bottom-up processing can possibly be reinforced by rich and multi-dimensional features of the concept conjured by a word. Instruction and post-reading activities that used graphic organizers helped the students ensure that they understood, structure the text and understand the writers’ point of view, use the information obtained from the text to extend their own ideas critically and logically, and connect their reading experience to productive writing. By organizing the obtained information and structuring the text, students were practicing focusing on key phrases, key sentences, and key paragraphs in a way that allowed them to critically and se-
lectively look at each item of information given. It gave the students completely
different angles from which they look at the reading text than translating the text
consecutively word by word would.

The following sections will discuss the results of the pre- and post-surveys
administered to the students who were taught in the method described so far.

3. The Study

3.1. Research Questions

The two research questions are: 1) To what extent will students’ attitudes
toward the target language use change over a single semester? 2) With what
aspects in a reading class did students show more reliance on or preference for
their first language? And, therefore, what aspects and dimensions in a reading
class will require more elaborate techniques in using the target language?

3.2. Subjects

The original participants were eighty university students in two freshmen
reading classes. Responses from seventy-two students who had completed both
the initial and final administrations were used. They were all non-English major
students, majoring either in economics or in bio-science. None of them had
experience of living or studying in English-speaking countries.

3.3. Method

The questionnaires were administered to the participants on the first day in
April and after the final exam on the last day in September 2003 by the writer.
The questionnaire consisted of twenty items based upon a 5-point Likert scale
with values of 5 (“I strongly agree”) to 1 (“I strongly disagree”). The questions
were given to see if students were more inclined to rely on or prefer their first
language use in a particular task, which conversely would indicate their
acceptance of or preference for using the target language. The original
questionnaires were written in Japanese. Higher scores indicate the stronger
reliance on or preference for the use of Japanese. Lower scores indicate the
stronger acceptance of or feeling of security toward the use of the target
language.
3.4. Results and Analysis

The reliability of the instrument was examined using Alpha reliability analysis \( (\alpha = .897) \) and Guttman Split-half analysis (.798). They provided acceptable coefficients. Because the number of participants was small, goodness-of-fit and independence between variables were measured by using a \( \chi^2 \)-square test. Significant differences were found on eighteen of twenty pre-survey items and on nineteen items of twenty post-survey items. This supports the validity of the survey.

In order to compare the students' initial attitude and the final attitude, a matched t-test was performed. The mean score and standard deviation of the pre-survey and post-survey are shown in Table 2 below. The mean scores of all twenty post-survey question items were higher than those of the pre-survey items. Also see the graph in Figure 2.

Table 2: Mean score, standard deviation, and matched t-test in pre- and post-survey

\[(n=72)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-survey</th>
<th>Post-survey</th>
<th>t-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The teacher should know the students' first language (Japanese).</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reading class should be conducted in Japanese.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students should use Japanese in reading class.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher-student communication should be made in Japanese.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The teacher should explain meanings of vocabulary in Japanese.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The teacher should explain sentence structures in Japanese.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The teacher should explain contextual meaning in Japanese.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Comprehension checks should be given in Japanese.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The teacher should give directions on what to do in Japanese.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean1</th>
<th>SD1</th>
<th>Mean2</th>
<th>SD2</th>
<th>Mean3</th>
<th>SD3</th>
<th>Mean4</th>
<th>SD4</th>
<th>Mean5</th>
<th>SD5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. The teacher should make announcement on exams and others in Japanese.</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The exam questions should use Japanese.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>5.346</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The teacher should use Japanese when students don’t understand.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Students should ask questions in Japanese.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.597</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Students should ask in Japanese for an English word they are looking for.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.649</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When students interpret context details, Japanese should be used.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.268</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. When students think about the text organization or the writer’s viewpoint, Japanese should be used.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4.892</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. When students exchange their ideas about what they read, they should use Japanese.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.027</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Japanese translation of the reading material should always be provided.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.213</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Japanese translation will help students fully and completely understand the text.</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Unknown words should be studied by using a dictionary or translation rather than guessing from the context.</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p<.05, ** = p<.01, *** = p<.001

(A five-point Likert scale was used, indicating “5” as strong reliance to or preference for the use of Japanese and “1” as strong acceptance of or preference for the use of English.)

(The original question items were given in Japanese.)

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the differences in the means of the twenty question scores of the pre-survey and the post-survey. In this radar graph, the marker nearer the outer circle indicates that the students had a stronger reliance on or preference for their first language and the marker nearer the center indicates that they had stronger acceptance or preference for the target language.
4. Discussion

4.1. Positive Change toward Target Language Use

The results of the pre- and post-survey indicated that the students' overall attitude toward their own use of the target language had become positive over the course of one semester. As shown above in Figure 2, all the markers became nearer the center, indicating that the students' attitude had a positive shift toward target language use.

Three interesting observations about the attitude change could be made. Firstly, the students' attitude changed into a positive perception of target language use on thirteen items with statistically significant differences (items 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18), while none of the twenty items showed even the slight negative slide. Those thirteen items included the following categories: the general target language use in a reading class by the teacher and the students; the target language use by the teacher for explaining vocabulary, structures, and meanings; the target language use for helping students have deeper comprehension; the target language use in post-reading discussions; and its use on exams. The second observation to be made is that, among the seven items which did not show significant differences (items 1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 19, 20), there were several
items that had relatively high scores in the beginning of the semester and kept the similarly high scores in the end of the semester (for example, items 1 and 10). This indicates that there were a few aspects with which the students’ attitude of relying on or preferring Japanese had been strong and had not changed over the semester. Those categories were the teacher’s knowledge of students’ first language, and the use of Japanese for making exam announcements or other notices. The third observation is that there were also a few items that had relatively low scores in the beginning of the semester and kept similarly low scores at the end of the semester (for example, items 19 and 20). In this case, the students had an idea of accepting English or preferring English as the instruction medium even before or when their reading class started.

The score distribution profile for each item is shown in Figure 3 below. The dotted areas of the bars (Figure 3) indicate the ratio of the students who either strongly agreed or agreed with the use of Japanese for the specified task. In other words, the longer the dotted areas of the bars are, the more students relied on or preferred to use Japanese. The striped areas of the bars indicate the ratio of the students who either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the use of Japanese for each task. In other words, the longer the striped areas of the bars are, the more students preferred or accepted the use of English as a means of instruction or as a means of performing class tasks.

The items on which the students showed a significantly different positive change toward the use of English can be divided into four categories: the general use of the target language in class; target language use in the teacher’s instruction and explanation; the target language as a means of comprehension; and the target language as a means of response making. Use of the target language in the university reading class was not highly negatively received in the first place and the students’ positive perception was reinforced by experiencing its actual use ($t = 3.150$, df $= 71$, $p = .002$). There was also a positive attitude change among the students toward their own use of the target language for communicating and asking questions, while their attitude toward the use of the target language by the teacher for giving instruction or explanations about vocabulary, sentence structures, and meaning or context also shifted positively (pre-survey mean $= 3.26$, post-survey mean $= 2.72$, $t = 3.372$, $p = .001$; pre-survey mean $= 4.03$, post-survey mean $= 3.51$, $t = 3.831$, $p = .000$; pre-survey mean $= 3.42$, post-survey mean
<General English use in class>
Reading class conducted in Japanese.
Students use Japanese.
Students ask questions in Japanese.
Students ask for English words in Japanese.

<English use in instructions>
Vocabulary explained in Japanese.
Grammar structures explained in Japanese.
Meanings explained in Japanese.

<English use for comprehension>
Detailed context explained in Japanese.
Comprehension questions given in Japanese.
Use Japanese when visualizing information.
Japanese translation should be given.

<English use in post-reading & exam>
Post-reading discussion in Japanese.
Exams in Japanese.

□ Strongly agree. □ Agree. □ Can't decide.
□ Disagree. □ Strongly disagree.

Figure 3: Positive Attitude Change
(upper bar: pre-survey, lower bar: post-survey)
= 2.88, t = 4.179, p = .000; respectively).

One might wonder how the students reacted to processing the meaning without translating the text in these experimental classes. As reading and translating are different processes, the goals of reading classes and translation skill classes should be different. However, students often seem to try to translate the text into their first language in order to understand it. As described so far, the techniques used in these classes included vocabulary rephrasing, paraphrasing, visualizing by using graphic organizers, structuring the text, and so on. In order to understand the words and phrases, students rephrased them using an English-English dictionary or by recycling the vocabulary used in its context. In order to understand the context details, they paraphrased the context and answered the local comprehension questions given in the target language. Summary making and chart/diagram making helped them understand globally and grasp the writer’s point of view (see the section on English use for comprehension in Figure 3.) The results showed that the students’ attitude changed positively toward the target language use with respect to the interpretation of the detailed context (t = 3.268, p = .002), local comprehension questions (t = 2.056, p = .043), and visualizing or structuring the text (t = 4.892, p = .000). As to the question of the usefulness of translation (Question 18, the third cluster from the bottom in Figure 3: Japanese translation should be given), students’ initial attitude had been basically negative and their final attitude became more negative (t = 4.213, p = .000). It strongly suggests that university students felt translation is not the only one possible and the best way to learn to read. These results are worthy of being specially mentioned.

4.2. Strong Reliance on First Language

Let us now take a look at the questions which did not show significant differences. Question 1 (The teacher should know the students’ first language.: pre-survey mean = 4.03, post-survey mean = 3.99, t = 0.260, ns) and Question 10 (The teacher should make announcement of exams and others in Japanese.: pre-survey mean = 4.51, post-survey mean = 4.29, t = 1.750, ns). Although the teacher does not use Japanese often in class, students may feel more comfortable when they know the teacher can and will understand the language. This might contribute greatly to lowering the students’ affective filter.

Exam announcement and other notices (Question 10) are considered to be
an “important” and “don’t miss it” type of information. Besides, such announcements were not the routine pattern with which students had learned to function by being repeatedly exposed to them (see Figure 4 below).
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Figure 4: Strong Reliance on First Language

4.3. Strong Acceptance of Target Language

The items for which the students showed strong acceptance of the target language use include Question 19 (Japanese translation will make students fully and completely understand the text: pre-survey mean = 2.39, post-survey mean = 2.15, t = 1.453, ns) and Question 20 (Unknown words should be studied by using an English-Japanese dictionary or Japanese translation rather than guessing from the context: pre-survey mean = 2.24, post-survey mean = 2.03, t = 1.667, ns). See Figure 5 below. The results indicate that teaching reading in English or reading English without translation is a possible method.

In order for the students to be able to guess vocabulary from the context or paraphrase the passage properly and rationally, appropriate text materials are essential. There should not be more than a manageable number of unknown words. Material should be carefully selected so that context provides sufficient scaffolds to avoid the need for translation. The target-language-only reading approach can be effective only when the students’ comprehension and interpretation are supported by the teacher’s elaborating techniques, helping them create
5. Conclusion

This paper attempted to introduce the reading class taught in the target-language-only methodology and the students' attitude change toward it. The results showed that there was positive change. Students began to agree that:

1) reading class can be taught in the target language;
2) they use the target language when communicating with the teacher and other students or when asking questions in class;
3) vocabulary, sentence structures, and context details can be explained in the target language;
4) students themselves use the target language for comprehension;
5) students use the target language for structuring the whole text or understanding the author's point of view; and
6) students use the target language when exchanging their responses after reading and even when answering on exams.

As this study was conducted only over the course of one semester, one might need to further investigate their attitude change in a much longer period of time and with various levels of students. In order to make students feel more comfort-
able in reading in the second language, one needs to remember that with some aspects they are inclined to rely on the use of their first language. The comparison between the high-performance group and the low-performance group suggested that more elaborate use of the target language or help in the first language is still necessary for novice learners. Detailed descriptions of such observations will be reported at another opportunity. Future research should also include investigation of the instructional effect to insure the validity of the described teaching methodology and learning approaches.

One particular observation that is worthy of mention is that not many students presumed that translation is necessary in order to understand. This is not, of course, to deny that the first language is as an effective tool for thinking. However, it is not an absolutely necessary tool for understanding the text. There can be alternative ways to help students understand what they read in their second language.
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