

Weideman

Educational Linguistics

Albert Weideman



A Theory of Applied Linguistics

A Theory of Applied Linguistics

Imagining and Disclosing the Meaning
of Design

 Springer

Educational Linguistics

Volume 65

Series Editor

Francis M. Hult, University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC),
Baltimore, MD, USA

Editorial Board Members

Marilda C. Cavalcanti, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil
Jasone Cenoz, University of the Basque Country, Leioa, Spain
Angela Creese, University of Stirling, Stirling, UK
Ingrid Gogolin, University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
Christine Hélot, Université de Strasbourg, Strasbourg, France
Hilary Janks, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa
Claire Kramsch, University of California, Berkeley, USA
Constant Leung, King's College London, London, UK
Angel Lin, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada
Alastair Pennycook, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

Educational Linguistics is dedicated to innovative studies of language use and language learning. The series is based on the idea that there is a need for studies that break barriers. Accordingly, it provides a space for research that crosses traditional disciplinary, theoretical, and/or methodological boundaries in ways that advance knowledge about language (in) education. The series focuses on critical and contextualized work that offers alternatives to current approaches as well as practical, substantive ways forward. Contributions explore the dynamic and multi-layered nature of theory-practice relationships, creative applications of linguistic and symbolic resources, individual and societal considerations, and diverse social spaces related to language learning.

The series publishes in-depth studies of educational innovation in contexts throughout the world: issues of linguistic equity and diversity; educational language policy; revalorization of indigenous languages; socially responsible (additional) language teaching; language assessment; first- and additional language literacy; language teacher education; language development and socialization in non-traditional settings; the integration of language across academic subjects; language and technology; and other relevant topics.

The *Educational Linguistics* series invites authors to contact the general editor with suggestions and/or proposals for new monographs or edited volumes. For more information, please contact the Editor: Amy Taylor-Snyman, Van Godewijkstraat 30, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

All proposals and manuscripts submitted to the Series will undergo at least two rounds of external peer review.

This series is indexed in Scopus and the Norwegian Register for Scientific Journals, Series and Publishers (NSD).

Albert Weideman

A Theory of Applied Linguistics

Imagining and Disclosing the Meaning
of Design



Albert Weideman 
Department of English, Faculty of the Humanities
University of the Free State
Bloemfontein, Free State, South Africa

ISSN 1572-0292 ISSN 2215-1656 (electronic)
Educational Linguistics
ISBN 978-3-031-67558-4 ISBN 978-3-031-67559-1 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-67559-1>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2024

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gwerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

If disposing of this product, please recycle the paper.

*Dedicated to all the university librarians
who have made insightful, authoritative
sources available to me over more than five
decades, and specifically to three: Lee
Goliath and Ronet Vrey of the University of
the Free State, and my wife, Anna, all special
librarians in more than one sense.*

Foreword

This book demonstrates an admirable commitment to *a different kind of applied linguistics* (AL), a new transdisciplinary branch of social science no longer encumbered by the spectres of positivism and empiricism, a discipline principally invested in the production of effective and sociologically robust solutions to social problems and challenges in which language plays a central role.

One of Weideman's most convincing claims is that a discipline cannot define itself. To me, this means that the existing body of AL research can neither be a closed epistemological bubble with its own sets of theories, concepts, models, methodologies, and ideologies nor develop sound practice by making abstraction of valuable knowledge and insight from other social scientific fields. AL is an *applied* field of inquiry, which means it is necessarily interdisciplinary. The social world in which AL phenomena can be studied is a radically open, dynamic, non-linear, complex system, itself the emergent outcome of complex causal interplays between open and emergent objects and phenomena of ontologically different kinds (e.g., people, language(s), technology, educational systems, ideologies). Additionally, our understandings of AL phenomena and problems must also be cognizant of antecedent, enduring, and powerful underlying generative mechanisms, including the unequal distribution of material and symbolic resources, the increasing (and unfortunate) neoliberalization of social and educational practices, social inequality, and environmental deterioration. Laboratory-based application of old-fashioned positivist and empiricist research strategies cannot even approximate the complexity involved here. The greatest value of this book resides in how the author makes conceptual and practical sense of the complexity of AL research foci.

Interdisciplinarity (or multi- or even trans-disciplinarity) is not, as Pennycook (2018) claims, a mere epistemological matter of balancing different systems of thought and/or discourses. It is rather a necessary response to the ontological stratification of objects and phenomena under investigation. Furthermore, because interdisciplinarity has the integration of knowledge as its central objective (Bhaskar et al., 2018), at least two core requirements come to mind: (1) careful and methodical alignment between theory, methodology, and analysis, and (2) reflexive and critical guard against casual metaphorical borrowings across disciplines. Meeting

these requirements is considerably complicated without active and sustained theoretical engagement, and, indeed, some degree of epistemic humility. As many have noted, there is an enduring tendency in our field to postulate the ‘death of antiquated principles’ coupled with the advent of ‘new paradigms’, and the related production of slogans (Schmenk et al., 2019). Weideman’s (2017) pertinent question in this regard has, in my opinion, not been successfully answered by AL scholars: *Are we merely chasing new fashions, or are there serious social and theoretical rationales for what we are designing?*

This book develops a theory of AL from three distinct yet related epistemological angles. Firstly, it emphasizes the need for, and provides insight into, the development of a clear understanding of the historical trajectory of AL research. Along with De Bot’s (2015) own history of AL, Weideman’s historical analysis is crucial to the development of a new type of AL, largely because it explores the complex interaction between material, social, intellectual, and ideological phenomena which together have shaped the field over more than a century. Aside from lending valuable support to the task of actually defining AL, Weideman’s historical viewpoint also has the benefit of documenting past developments, their potentials and limitations.

Secondly, Weideman reminds us of the need to attend to fundamentals. Sound AL design must be grounded in theory, within a robust foundational framework. This is because good practice depends on both philosophically and empirically grounded understandings of cause-effect relationships in the social world. In contrast, dichotomizing theory and practice—an enduring heritage of empiricism—is plainly mistaken and counter-productive because it fails to consider the complexity of the social world. Our senses and measuring instruments can only reveal traces of underlying generative processes, which we must then apprehend through conceptual means. Theory, in this sense, allows us to move from the *what* question to the *why* question, frees us to some extent from the confines of the local, and invites us to conceptualize alternatives and future possibilities. The radical view that theory invites a colonialist homogenization of complexity and diversity fails to recognize that, as with any forms of human understanding, theory is fallible but rectifiable through collective participation in the production of knowledge, and in light of new empirical evidence. As this book makes clear, philosophy performs the vital task of conceptual *under-labouring* (i.e., the clarification of concepts and elements core to a research project), rather than (as too many erroneously assume) reducing complex processes to singular rules or causal laws.

Thirdly, and as a crucial amendment to the claim made earlier about AL being interdisciplinary, Weideman argues that AL research has characteristics (e.g., theories, practices, etc.) that help distinguish the field from other social scientific fields, and, in a broader philosophical sense, that AL research is ‘about something’. I am in full agreement. Denying AL disciplinary status by defining it as mere ‘temporary assemblages of thought and action that come together at particular moments when language-related concerns need to be addressed’ (Pennycook, 2018: 113) succumbs to an unproductive relationism which, in part, erroneously assumes that the existence of blurred and fluid distinctions between things is ‘proof’ that ontological

differences between them do not exist. With reference to legitimate critiques of Western, colonialist, and masculinist heritages in academia, it is mistaken to conclude that if something is ideology-laden, it is by default ideologically determined. On this point, Weideman's analysis of postmodernist perspectives in AL in this volume and many other publications yields a particularly lucid and necessary critique of how excessive relativism in our field too often leads to an odd, contradictory form of reductionism.

This conceptually rich volume explores territory well beyond these three core arguments. Rich with historical knowledge, conceptual insight, pertinent empirical examples, and eruditely phrased claims, Weideman's convincing attempt at a theory of AL creates the necessary grounds for an anti-dualistic, anti-empiricist approach to AL work. It has the added merit of combining design with assessment of design, a necessary feedback loop which, as the author argues, helps ensure much needed accountability in our field. As a critical realist AL researcher, I strongly sympathize with Weideman's approach because, being inherently humanistic, it is marked by principled engagement with the complexity of human beings as language users and producers, their concerns and aspirations, their sociality, and as human agents, their relationship with material, structural, and cultural forces, as they attempt to fulfil their goals in a radically open, complex, ontologically layered, and ever-changing social world.

JALT Journal Editor, Professor, Faculty of Humanities
Hokkai Gakuen University
Sapporo, Japan
June 2024

Jeremie Bouchard

References

Bhaskar, R., Danemark, B. & Price, L. (2018). *Interdisciplinarity and wellbeing: A critical realist general theory of interdisciplinarity*. Routledge.

De Bot, K. (2015). *A history of applied linguistics: From 1980 to the present*. Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2018). Applied linguistics as epistemic assemblage. *AILA Review*, 31(1), 113–134. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.00015.pen>

Schmenk, B., Breidbach, S. & Küster, L. (2019). Sloganization in language education discourse: Introduction. In B. Schmenk, S. Breidbach & L. Küster (Eds.), *Sloganization in language education discourse: Conceptual thinking in the age of academic marketization* (pp. 1-18). Multilingual Matters.

Weideman, A. (2017). *Responsible design in applied linguistics: Theory and practice*. Springer.

Prologue

The reasons for attempting to articulate a theory of applied linguistics require some explanation. Let me deal right at the start with the foreseeable objections, before setting out the reasons why one cannot afford *not* to develop such a theory. To the sceptical colleague, who sees the task of the applied linguist more as one of getting on with the job than reflecting on what it is that applied linguistics does, an attempt to develop a theory of applied linguistics may seem a waste of time. I wish to demonstrate it is not. This book presents an argument that it is indeed worthwhile. It suggests from the outset that it will be valuable to suspend judgement on three issues, even if momentarily, so that the argument can emerge more fully. And the argument is, I believe, compelling.

The first issue on which I seek the reader's indulgence concerns the definition of applied linguistics. I can hear the disbelieving objection to attempting once again to reach any significant conclusion about this. What is evident in the regular discussions of the many definitions which have been proposed over the last 40 years (Marckwardt, 1985—first published in 1965; Malmberg, 1967; Corder, 1972; Kaplan, 1980a, b; Pennycook, 2004; Rajagopalan, 2004; Weideman, 2007a, 2017a, 2017b; McNamara, 2008, 2015; Paltridge, 2014 are a few examples) is that there is no unanimity on this issue. The best response I can give to objections to revisiting it once again is that the inconclusiveness of what constitutes the field will not disappear if ignored. With regularity, in the now more than five decades in which I have been involved in applied linguistics, it has simply given rise to a re-emergence of the question. It is exactly the inconclusiveness that impels us to reconsider, and argue the issue again. It is better not to suppress it, but to respond to it. In what better way can we react than to handle it in a responsible, theoretical manner?

The second matter is closely related to the first, and concerns a disagreement of long standing with those applied linguists who claim that they do not need theory to work in the discipline. I have not seen much argument to substantiate that claim. The excuse that I have myself produced on behalf of those who take this position is that their concern is to resolve difficult language issues with alacrity. Their work is urgent; it involves devising solutions that will beneficially affect those who are most vulnerable as regards language use. A counter argument emerges when we consider

the equally long tradition of reflection on pedagogical and other practice, and the productive and valuable contribution this makes to subsequent refinement of practice. To reflect effectively requires a framework, and theory potentially offers precisely that.

Third, this book presents an argument which takes a sharply focused view of what constitutes the discipline of applied linguistics. What that focus is will become clearer as the analysis offered here progresses. This starting point is in contrast to the popular (but in my opinion more questionable) view that applied linguistics deals in the broadest sense with ‘language’, ‘language studies’, or perhaps with all manner of issues of language use.

It will be informative to review briefly this broad and appealing definition. The website of AILA (Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée), the international organization of applied linguistics, shows a bias towards the assumption that applied linguistics is but the handmaiden of linguistics (with a capital ‘L’; cf. too Shuy, 2015; Kramsch, 2015; Mauranen, 2015), defining it as ‘an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary field of research and practice dealing with practical problems of language and communication that can be identified, analysed or solved by applying available theories, methods and results of Linguistics or by developing new theoretical and methodological frameworks in Linguistics to work on these problems’ (AILA, 2024). There is an interesting shift in the way that the work of this international scholarly organization exemplifies the definition. A decade or so ago its list of 20 or so research networks (AILA, 2015) included clearly linguistic subfields (corpus linguistics, media linguistics, user-based linguistics, socio-cultural theory in linguistics) alongside other more conventional research groupings such as second language acquisition (SLA) research, language policy studies and academic writing. In the current list of 22 research networks (AILA, 2024) we find that, as at the inception of the discipline, the groupings for language learning and teaching, including SLA, and for language policy and planning make up 15, in other words more than two-thirds of those mentioned. Not a single identifiably linguistic subdiscipline is listed: the balance is made up mostly of networks for research methodology and scholarship. This shift is illustrative of the fluidity of the definition of applied linguistics and the way that the discipline presents itself as a scholarly field. The largest and most prominent regional affiliate of AILA, the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL), however, still lists among the 25 or so strands it identifies as relevant for its 2025 conference a good nine which are distinctly linguistic subdisciplines (e.g., phonology, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, discourse and text analysis, corpus linguistics). Once again, these are complemented by clearly applied linguistic interests, such as assessment, bilingual education, language policy and planning, and teacher education.

Such a broad-church view as is evident in the conventional definition and its professional exemplifications cannot intellectually generate a useful definition of the field. Everything from sociology of language to distributive cognition and complex dynamic systems explanations of phonological variation can then be included, but each usually on its own, and often purely linguistic terms. This book presents an

alternative: a conceptual focus different from one that attempts explanation from the point of view of the lingual mode of experience.

As Cook (2015: 425) has remarked, ‘making everything and anything “applied linguistics”’ is devoid of any utility. But it may be expedient to ask why this has been so attractive. As I have argued elsewhere (Weideman, 2017b), one must perhaps look no further than developments within linguistics itself in the last 50 years. In that field, behaviourist and structuralist paradigms had to yield to the dominance of transformational generative grammar (TGG). TGG used a narrow definition of linguistics and what, from that point of view, could be legitimately investigated (Weideman, 2013a). Such a limitation excluded from scientific analysis a more broadly conceived, disclosed view of language. It should therefore not be surprising that sociolinguistic ideas, themes, and subdisciplines found their way into the more welcoming field of applied linguistics, as is evident in the earlier list of research networks within AILA (2015).

The alternative being proposed here shares a number of concerns with other proposals. We note in this instance a dissatisfaction with the notion of ‘application’ and the associated objections to the privileging of ‘scientific’ knowledge (Weideman 2017a), a concern that is shared fully by the Douglas Fir Group (2016: 21-22) who acknowledge that their ‘explicit educational goals for the field’ may omit hearing the voices, environment, and effort of language teachers. It was this uneasiness that gave rise to the call, from Spolsky (2008) and others (Hult 2008, 2010a, b; Hult & King, 2011a, b) to a transdisciplinary approach, ‘educational linguistics’, a notion first proposed, as far as I could determine, by Spolsky (1970, 1978). In the case of the model articulated by the Douglas Fir Group (2016: 24ff.) for understanding language learning, we are encouraged to conceptualize that process as a multilayered individual and, amongst others, a socially, culturally, economically, and religiously embedded one, related to a multiplicity of socially variable roles and relationships. In that, too, there is an affinity in what is being proposed here, though one retains the impression that it is the understanding of the process of language development that is most prominent. In referring to these studies, one is also struck by the attention given to the role of policy in shaping solutions to multilingual matters (e.g., Hult & King, 2011a; Du Plessis, 2021). These are issues that require us to address the political dimension of language interventions, and to which due attention will be given in Chaps. 14 and 15. Despite the similarities in perspective that we may note in these and the proposal to be made here, the main difference lies in the engagement of this book with the business of language intervention design, taking that as its primary angle of approach. A comment from a colleague who was kind enough to read the original manuscript is that the latter kind of conceptualization has the potential to break new ground in developing a new epistemological perspective for the field.

There is a further, and related reason why a sharply focused discussion of applied linguistics may be frowned upon. This is the fear that in doing that, we may be excluding some of the richness and variety that has come to be regarded as desirable in the field. Once again, experience and analysis in the mode that it is tackled in this book will confirm that, far from a reduction in diversity, a more sharply focused

perspective will generate a whole range of useful concepts. It is likely to be conceptually as beneficial, or more productive than an “anything goes” approach. This needs to be demonstrated to those who subscribe to definitions of applied linguistics that emphasize the multi-disciplinarity of the field. They may feel that a keen emphasis on conceptualizing the discipline in the way proposed here may detract from the multiple methodologies, borrowed from many other fields, that applied linguists should be utilizing. We should remember, however, that regarding diversity as desirable does not make singularity in focus objectionable. Diversity in fact presupposes uniqueness. If applied linguistics uses many perspectives from multiple fields, those fields are definable, and thus unique. Why would the characteristic way in which applied linguistics utilizes this multiplicity then itself not be of interest? For surely, if applied linguistics uses what it gathers from elsewhere in the same mode as its origin, that will make it essentially the same as that original field. It would not need to borrow; it would contribute within the discipline of origin. Yet we can, and I believe we should argue that applied linguistics has its own definable focus, and that whatever knowledge, method or analytical technique it appropriates from elsewhere, is used in the manner or mode which is characteristic of its own field. The theory of applied linguistics offered here is an exploration of this characteristic mode, the angle from which the discipline views its work, and which at the same time circumscribes it.

In one sense those who consider the work we do within applied linguistics too urgent to pause for reflection are correct. One cannot expect a discipline to define itself. Within a discipline there are simply no methodological tools to define itself. For these, one needs to venture outside the boundaries of the discipline, and into the kind of comprehensive, in some cases encyclopaedic view of philosophy. So this book is about making sense of applied linguistics by engaging with its fundamental philosophical underpinnings.

The argument in this book will make use of a philosophical framework to conceptualize not only the field of applied linguistics but also respond to the question: What makes applied linguistic concept formation possible? It will argue that there are a number of elementary concepts and ideas that are so basic to the discipline that they can neither be ignored nor avoided. Together, these ‘primitives’, fundamental concepts and ideas, will make up the theory that emerges from their analysis.

The analytical methodology of this book uses a number of concepts and terms that will enable us to grasp the fundamentals, in the shape of both constitutive concepts and regulative ideas. The conceptual apparatus I employ derives from the elaboration, by scholars like Schuurman (1972, 1977, 2009, 2022) and his mentor Van Riessen (1949) of the frameworks proposed by Strauss (2009), Dooyeweerd (1984, 2012), and others. Except for the analyses produced by me and a number of my students that will be referred to in what follows, its use here is a first in the field of applied linguistics. It may therefore need some explanation. In the first sentence of this paragraph, for example, I have used the terms constitutive and regulative (Van Eikema Hommes, 1972, 1980), which will need to be explained. Together with these terms (‘constitutive’ and ‘regulative’), there are a number of others that I have therefore placed in a Glossary, to assist understanding through greater conceptual

clarity. The analysis assumes, for example, that in addition to our theoretical perception of human subjects (agents) and the objects, entities, phenomena, events, processes, and states in which they interact, our experience has a modal horizon or structure. That is, we may abstract a modality from a concrete phenomenon or an object, referring with that to a certain mode of being, for example a physical, an emotional, a lingual, a social, an economic, and so on. The analysis will use terms like ‘modality’ to refer to these modes of experience, or to synonymous ideas like ‘aspect’, ‘function’, ‘facet’, or ‘dimension’ to describe them. At the same time, the relations among the modalities will be described as expressing their coherence with one another, and termed ‘analogies’. Alternative terms for analogies will be ‘echoes’, ‘references’, or ‘traces’. Furthermore, two kinds of analogies will be distinguished: backward looking analogies (‘retrocipations’) and forward-looking analogies (‘anticipations’). Why they refer backward or forward depends on their relative position to others, which will be explained in detail in Chap. 3. These concepts and ideas are part of the methodological tools we shall employ to answer the question of what makes applied linguistic concept formation possible.

The importance of this last point is not to be underestimated. When we accept that our experience also contains a modal horizon, the many modes of experience that we can distinguish—the numerical, the spatial, the technical, the aesthetic, the juridical, the ethical, and so forth—are not only to be taken up as ways or modes of being, but at the same time also as modes of explanation. This book will especially focus on how the mode of experience that we call the technical modality can be employed to explain applied linguistic concept formation.

This brings me to the final response to the sceptical. The question is that of usefulness. What use is a theory of applied linguistics? At a seminar at the University of Ghent in late 2022, generously arranged by Bart Deygers, I addressed this topic with the help of Constant Leung and Jordi Heeren. The lecture referred to a subfield of applied linguistics, language assessment, but its first part was titled ‘The practicality of theory’. This book presents a longer answer to the question about the usefulness of theory, as well as a response to the valuable inputs of these and other colleagues participating on that day.

The matter of inputs into the debate introduces a last argument in favour of developing a theory of applied linguistics that is singularly focused on the facet of the design of language interventions. A challenge for the robustness of any theory must be the extent to which it can do justice to different paradigms operating in the discipline. In applied linguistics, the great divide lies between modernism and postmodernism. The theory being developed in this book at every turn seeks to appreciate the relative contribution of the many variations of these two major paradigms. By evaluating the merits of each, communication across the divide becomes possible. It is difficult to assess the merits of a competing paradigm when one is closely wedded to another. For me, one of the greatest strengths of the systematic analysis offered here lies in its ability to assess the impact but also the blind spots of each variety of approach in the field. It is an invitation both to honour the strengths of different approaches and directions, and to recognize their weaknesses.

The analysis will not limit itself to the discussion of different directions and paradigms. The book will refer at every possible juncture to examples of designs and plans we develop to solve vexing language problems. This brings me to another potential difficulty for the reader: many of the examples of language interventions that will be discussed in the chapters that follow are taken from the context that I am most familiar with, the complicated language situation in South Africa. In each mention of designed solutions to the many problems besetting this country, I have tried to sketch briefly the context and background, but it may be that this is not sufficient. For a wider discussion, the reader may do well to refer to the global perspective on the South African context which Read and Du Plessis (2021) have set out, as well as (for language teaching at secondary school) Du Plessis, Steyn, and Weideman (2016); Weideman, Du Plessis, and Steyn (2017); and Heugh et al. (2017: 202–207). For the context of language issues in higher education, Du Plessis's (2021) exposition will be equally informative, as will the numerous studies of language tests and assessment which are brought together in the bibliography of the Network of Expertise in Language Assessment (NExLA, 2023).

Whatever the context or the paradigm from which the plans for language interventions stem, the analysis will refer throughout to how we employ fundamental applied linguistic concepts in many different ways. We examine these fundamentals to enlighten us about what our design work entails, but then also to inform us about how to refine these designs. In a word: from each of the elementary applied linguistic concepts and ideas presented here there will emerge an appeal to the designers of language solutions. From the concepts and ideas thus identified we shall be able to formulate principles to which the designers of language interventions respond. Such design principles, I hope to show, are not created by the analysis, but are already present in what we do as applied linguists. We simply need to identify them more concisely. For that, we need a theory of applied linguistics. The conceptual richness and utility we may find in such a theory is what this book intends to celebrate.

My hope is that we shall give shape to the principles of design revealed in our theoretical analysis ever more responsibly. We do that not for the sake of theory, but for the benefit of those affected. Those at the receiving end of our solutions for pervasive and stubborn language problems indeed need them to be responsibly designed. About this, there is little argument.

Bloemfontein, Free State, South Africa

Albert Weideman

Acknowledgements

My journey in systematically examining the foundations of the disciplines that I have been involved with during my career as an academic goes back some way. It started in the late 1960s, when I was fortunate to be exposed to a philosophy that made such analyses possible. In the 1970s, discussions with many colleagues, spread across a number of other disciplines, further enriched my understanding. These interactions confirmed my initial hunch that this philosophy was applicable widely. The follow-up conversations with Danie Strauss in particular have not yet ended. His own work has revealed to me just how comprehensive and wholesome in outlook the philosophical framework is which has for both of us shaped our professional lives as academics.

It is a pity that the untimely death of Henk van Eikema Hommes and the distance between South Africa and the Netherlands have prevented me from further discussion of the work that he did in jurisprudence, or that Egbert Schuurman has offered in technology. I have mentioned before that I owe a special word of gratitude to the late Phil Brouwer, who very early on in my engagement with this 'applied' science, alerted me to the fact that many so-called applications were in fact technically stamped, design activities. We have both joked, subsequently, that we may one day be found to have been horribly wrong, but have consoled ourselves that being proved wrong is an inevitable part of the scholarly experience.

I must give a sincere word of thanks to the students, now colleagues, who have completed doctoral theses under my supervision, and who have all enriched my understanding with their work on some dimension or component of the theories I was proposing. Gustav Butler has in his own way taken some of the implications for course design further. Tobie van Dyk, also of North-West University, and Avasha Rambiritch (University of Pretoria) have both made singularly valuable applications of the foundational framework I have used in my scholarship for many years, and which is the basis also of this book. Gini Keyser's postgraduate work has been a revelation in its sensible application of this theory, as has Rebecca Patterson's discussion and analysis with me of the typicality of academic discourse. Laura Drennan (University of the Witwatersrand) has employed components of the methodology to the validation of a language test. The design of communication courses for nurses

by Marilize Pretorius of the University of Antwerp involves an application of the framework in the subfield of language course design. At the University of Southern Queensland, the productive and now institutionalized application by Jonathan Green and his colleagues of the idea of a five-phase process for language test design, discussed in Chap. 2, has been particularly heartening. I hope that these views will have the same value and more to those who follow in their footsteps.

A very special thanks to my wife for her support over many years. I am deeply grateful for the sober and sensible approach she has always offered, as well as for the perspective she brings from her profession as librarian. This is the inspiration for her indefatigable efforts to make all manner of information accessible and presented consistently.

I am indebted to all.

Hermanus
October 2023

Albert Weideman

Contents

1	Theorizing History: The Design and Preparation of Language Solutions	1
1.1	How Did It Begin? With High Expectations	1
1.2	From Expectations to Fundamentals	4
1.3	The Usefulness of Attending to Fundamentals	6
1.4	Two Initial Hinge Points: The Historical and the Systematic	8
1.5	How Did the Field Evolve? By Relativizing the Authority of Science	10
1.6	Where Does That Leave the Design of Language Teaching and Assessment?	13
1.7	The Principles of Responsible Design	15
2	Process and Plan: The Five Phases of Applied Linguistic Design	19
2.1	Where Does the Design Process Begin?	19
2.2	Technical Continuity and Discontinuity	21
2.3	The Theoretical Justification of Design	23
2.4	The Concept of Design Phases in Applied Linguistics	25
2.5	Phases and Sub-Stages of Language Intervention Design	27
2.5.1	Phase 1: Awareness and Identification of the Language Problem	28
2.5.2	Phase 2: Technical Imagination and Current Knowledge Applied	32
2.5.3	Phase 3: An Initial Technical Solution Is Tested	33
2.5.4	Phase 4: Reconsideration: An Analytical and Theoretical Justification Is Sought	35
2.5.5	Phase 5: The Blueprint Is Revised and Finalized	38
2.6	From Process and Practice to Principle	39
3	The Nucleus of Design: Abstracting from Artefact to Modality	41
3.1	Technical Norm and Technical Fact	41
3.2	Utilizing Abstraction to Begin Theorizing Applied Linguistics	43

3.3	The Nuclear Moment of Design	44
3.4	Traces of Others: Analogical Concepts	45
3.5	Applied Linguistic Concepts and Ideas	45
3.6	Building Blocks and Lodestars	48
4	Systematicity: Examining Unity and Multiplicity in Design.....	51
4.1	A First Fundamental Concept	51
4.2	Technical Order and System	53
4.3	The Rejection of System	57
4.4	Design Teams and Their Creations: Technical Subjects and Objects	60
4.5	Subjective and Objective Technical Facts	62
4.6	Subjective and Objective Technical Unity: Homogeneity	66
4.7	A First Systematic Point, But Not the Last	71
5	Range and Scope: The Limits of Applied Linguistic Designs	73
5.1	From Technical Series to Technical Sets: Extension, Range, Continuity, Magnitude	73
5.2	Technical Scope: Its Material and Formal Sides	74
5.3	Size and Extension: Technical Subjects and Objects.....	79
5.4	Instructional and Assessment Spaces: Subjective and Objective Technical Facts	81
5.5	Parameters for Technical Objects.....	83
5.6	Looking Back, Looking Ahead	86
6	Consistency: The Reliability of Language Interventions	87
6.1	Consistency, Reliability, Constancy.....	87
6.2	Standardization and Consistency.....	89
6.3	Technical Agents: Persistence and Flow	91
6.4	The Consistency of Technical Objects.....	93
6.5	Constancy Conceptualized.....	95
7	Adequacy: The Validity of Language Plans, Courses and Tests.....	97
7.1	Validity, Adequacy as Indication of Quality	97
7.2	Disclosures of Validity.....	98
7.3	Validity, Interpretation, and Argument.....	99
7.4	Subjective Validation and Objective Validity.....	102
7.5	Technical procedure and Technical Process.....	104
7.6	The Factual Quality of Technical Objects	106
7.7	A Few Concluding Remarks About Objective Technical Validity.....	108
8	Differentiation: The Organization and Adaptation of Language Solutions.....	111
8.1	Vitality, Organization and Technical Life	111
8.2	Technical Development and Maturity in Design	112
8.3	Technical Ecology and Emergent Organization.....	115

8.4	Potential, Adaptation, Growth	117
8.5	Factual Technical Differentiation.....	122
8.6	What Does It Mean for Design?	125
9	Intuitive Appeal: Perception and Attractiveness of Applied Linguistic Artefacts	129
9.1	Design and Emotion.....	129
9.2	Subjectivity, Affect, Sensitivity and Awareness.....	131
9.3	Motivation, Volition, Attitude, Aptitude: The Normative Conditions for Design.....	136
9.4	Identity, Professional Stories, and the Expression of Feelings	138
9.5	Reflection: Looking Back	140
10	Theoretical Defensibility: Finding a Rationale for Designs	143
10.1	Science Supports Design	143
10.2	Theory, Construct, and Rationale.....	145
10.3	Applications at Secondary School Level	148
10.4	Construct Validity: A Disclosing Concept.....	150
10.5	Empirical Analysis: Factual Support for Designs	154
10.6	Experimentation and Refinement.....	156
10.7	Looking Back, Looking Ahead	158
11	Meaningfulness: Interpreting Applied Linguistic Designs	161
11.1	Technical Expression and Signification.....	161
11.2	Blueprints as Technical Norms for Language Interventions	163
11.3	Imagination and Experimentation: Adjusting Blueprints	167
11.4	Specifications as Further Normative Technical Conditions for Design	168
11.5	Informativity and Factual Technical Records	172
11.6	Interpretability and Meaningfulness	174
11.7	An Interwoven Set of Disclosures	176
12	Accessibility: Socially Appropriate Language Interventions	179
12.1	Historical Hinge Points: Accessibility	179
12.2	Technical Interaction, Implementation and Appropriateness.....	181
12.3	The Interaction of Technical Subjects and Objects	181
12.4	Taking Interaction One Step Further: Access	183
12.5	Technical Implementability	188
12.6	Technical Fit: The Appropriateness of Designs	191
12.7	A Plethora of Analogical Ideas	196
13	Utility: Developing Efficient Language Interventions	197
13.1	Efficiency and Utility: Further Disclosures	197
13.2	Usefulness	198
13.3	Technical Excess and Equilibrium.....	201
13.4	Factual Technical Savings and Imagination.....	206
13.5	Technical Transactions, Exchanges and Innovation.....	209

13.6	Technical Means: Designing in Resource Scarce Environments	213
13.7	An Interwoven Set of Ideas	215
14	Alignment: Harmonizing Language Policies, Tests and Courses	217
14.1	Harmonization and Alignment.....	217
14.2	The Normative Appeal to Harmonize	218
14.3	Institutional Alignment of Policy, Assessment and Course Design.....	221
14.4	Eclecticism and Technical Dissonance	224
14.5	Resistance to Innovation	226
14.6	The Excitement of Invention	227
15	Accountability: Seeking Justice in Designs.....	229
15.1	Justice and Its Conceptual Approximations.....	229
15.2	The Internal Connection: Technical Justice.....	231
15.3	Correction, Rectification and Repair	232
15.4	Justice and Fairness	236
15.5	Accountability	239
15.6	Language Assessment Literacy as a Disclosure of the Juridical	241
15.7	Anticipating Impact, Disclosing Meaning.....	245
16	Care, Compassion and Respect: Crafting Ethical Interventions	247
16.1	Care and Compassion as Drivers of Design.....	247
16.2	Codes of Ethics: Signals of Professional Duty	248
16.3	Consequential Validity: Ethical Impact	251
16.4	Designing with Integrity; Designs with Integrity	252
16.5	Revisiting Fairness: The Elimination of Bias	253
16.6	A Subjective Take on Compassion and Care	258
16.7	Drudgery and Alleviation, Vulnerability and Consolation.....	259
16.8	An Ever More Complicated, Layered Technical Duty.....	260
17	Trustworthiness: Building Reputable Designs.....	261
17.1	Faith and Commitment in Design	261
17.2	Language Ideology.....	263
17.3	Beliefs and Assumptions in Design	266
17.4	Reputability and Trustworthiness	268
17.5	Security	270
17.6	Taboos	271
17.7	Celebration and Inspiration	272
Glossary	275
References	279
Index	299

About the Author

Albert Weideman is Professor of Applied Language Studies and Research Fellow at the University of the Free State. He was the founder and first CEO of the Inter-Institutional Centre for Language Development and Assessment (ICELDA), a partnership of four South African universities. He was the first chairperson of the standing committee on fiscal strategy for the International Language Testing Association (ILTA) and is currently coordinator of the Network of Expertise in Language Assessment (NExLA). The language tests he has designed or helped to develop have been used in tertiary institutions in South Africa, Vietnam, Namibia, Singapore, Australia, Belgium and the Netherlands. His research focus is on developing a theory of applied linguistics, and working responsibly within that discipline. His book, *Responsible Design in Applied Linguistics: Theory and Practice* (Springer, 2017), lays the groundwork for this. He has recently contributed to and co-edited *Assessing Academic Literacy in a Multilingual Society: Transition and Transformation* (Multilingual Matters, 2021) and *Ethics and Context in Second Language Testing: Rethinking Validity in Theory and Practice* (Routledge, 2024). In South Africa, he is a rated researcher with the National Research Foundation. His professional website (<https://albertweideman.com/>) has details of his work in the foundations of applied linguistics. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9444-634X>

Glossary

The entries in the glossary below are alphabetical, but to understand the various philosophical terms listed one should rather begin with the notion of a *modal horizon*. From this idea stem almost all of the other concepts.

The modal horizon of experience is conceived of as composed not of concrete, factual entities, but of modalities, or modes of being. Key among these modalities or aspects for the theoretical distinctions made in this book is the technical. This is the mode that is abstracted and scrutinized analytically. In abstracting it, the assumption is that there remain within it echoes or analogies of other dimensions of experience. These reflections of other dimensions within the abstracted technical modality express the coherence among the technical and the others. The analogies of other modes of experience within the technical are the basis of applied linguistic concept formation. In addition to being modes of existence, they then also function in a systematic, theoretical analysis as modes of explanation.

The modal horizon is recognized in the analysis presented here along with a dimension of entities or things. Concrete, factual relations between human agents then come into view, together with objects, artefacts, phenomena, events, processes, and states. From a technical perspective, we are able to discern a multiplicity of factual relations between human subjects in relation to other human subjects (either as designers or as users of applied linguistic designs), based on the mediation of their interaction by technical objects, the factual, designed language interventions devised in applied linguistics.

It is from this dimension of entities that we are able to abstract the key mode of interest for applied linguistics, the technical. In that sense the technical aspect is transformed from a mode of experience into a mode of (theoretical) explanation. The usefulness of modal abstraction for conceptualization and theory formation is at the heart of the argument of this book.

In this Glossary, terms in *italics* have their own, separate explanations.

Term	Explanation
abstract (v)/ abstraction	To theoretically lift (usually a modality) out of the modal horizon for analytical scrutiny, initiating <i>concept formation</i>
analogy	A <i>reference</i> within the <i>modal structure</i> of an <i>aspect</i> of experience to another <i>modality</i> , expressing the <i>coherence</i> between the two modes; see <i>retrocipation</i> and <i>anticipation</i> ; <i>modal coherence</i>
anticipation	A forward-looking <i>reference</i> within the modal structure of an <i>aspect</i> of experience to another <i>modality</i> occurring subsequently in the <i>time order</i> , expressing the <i>coherence</i> between the two modes; see <i>analogy</i> , <i>time order</i> , <i>retrocipation</i>
artefact	A factual (applied linguistic) design
aspect	<i>Modality</i> ; a <i>mode</i> of experience
coherence	See <i>modal coherence</i>
concept	Usually a <i>fundamental</i> notion, distinguishable from an <i>idea</i>
concept formation / conceptualization	Forming (technical) <i>concepts</i> and <i>ideas</i> (in applied linguistics) by <i>abstraction</i> and examining <i>analogies</i> expressing the <i>coherence</i> between the technical and other <i>modalities</i> ; see <i>abstract/abstraction</i> ; <i>modal coherence</i> ; <i>concept</i> ; <i>constitutive concept</i> ; <i>regulative idea</i>
constitutive concept	A <i>concept</i> expressing an <i>analogy</i> within the technical referring to an <i>aspect</i> that occurs before the technical in the <i>time order</i> , deriving from <i>retrocipations</i> within the technical; see <i>regulative idea</i>
dimension	Sometimes used as synonym for <i>modality</i>
echo (n)	Used in a technical sense = <i>analogy</i> ; see <i>reference</i> , <i>reflection</i> , <i>trace</i>
factual side	The dimension of a <i>modality</i> in which we discern factual entities, e.g. <i>technical subjects</i> (agents) and <i>technical objects</i> operating in response to norms, conditions, requirements and principles; see <i>norm side</i>
function	<i>Modality</i> ; a <i>mode</i> of experience
fundamental concept or idea	See <i>primitive</i> ; also <i>constitutive concept</i> ; <i>regulative idea</i>
idea	A limiting or concept-transcending notion
meaning-kernel	See <i>nuclear meaning</i> , <i>meaning nucleus</i>
meaning nucleus	See <i>nuclear meaning</i>
modality	A <i>mode</i> of experience, to be interpreted as a way of being, or a mode of explanation; synonyms are <i>aspect</i> , <i>function</i> , <i>side</i> , <i>dimension</i>
modal coherence	Is expressed by the links that analogically bind the various modalities; see <i>analogy</i> ; <i>retrocipation</i> ; <i>anticipation</i>
modal horizon	A dimension of our experience where <i>modes</i> or <i>modalities</i> are discerned, in contrast to the realm of human subjects and objects, artefacts, entities, processes, events, phases and states
modal structure	See <i>modal horizon</i>
mode (of being / of explanation)	<i>Modality</i> , <i>aspect</i> or <i>function</i>
norm side	The dimension of the <i>modality</i> in which the norms, conditions, requirements and principles governing the factual subjects and objects can be examined; see <i>factual side</i> ; <i>technical subjects</i> ; <i>technical objects</i>

(continued)

Term	Explanation
nuclear meaning	The idea of the <i>meaning kernel</i> of a <i>modality</i> , which cannot be further defined
order of time	The sequential arrangement of <i>modalities</i> within the <i>modal horizon</i> of experience; see <i>time order</i>
primitive	An <i>idea</i> that defies further definition; a <i>fundamental concept / idea</i>
reference	Used in a technical sense = <i>analogy</i> ; see <i>trace, reflection</i>
reflection	Used in a technical sense = <i>analogy</i> ; see <i>trace, reference</i>
regulative idea	An <i>idea</i> expressing an <i>analogy</i> within the technical referring to an <i>aspect</i> that occurs after the technical in the <i>time order</i> , deriving from <i>anticipations</i> or forward-looking <i>references</i> ; see <i>constitutive concept</i>
retrocipation	A backward-looking <i>reference</i> within the modal structure of an <i>aspect</i> of experience to another <i>modality</i> occurring previously in the <i>time order</i> , expressing the <i>coherence</i> between the two <i>modes</i> ; see <i>analogy, anticipation</i>
technical modality	The qualifying or leading <i>function</i> of an applied linguistic intervention or <i>artefact</i>
technical subject	A human agent, considered from the point of view of the technical <i>modality</i>
technical object	A technically stamped or qualified entity; an applied linguistic <i>artefact</i> , process, procedure, event, phenomenon, or state
time order	The sequential arrangement of distinguishable <i>modalities</i> as a series of earlier and later aspects of experience; see <i>order of time</i>
trace	Used in a technical sense = <i>analogy</i> ; see <i>reference, reflection, trace</i>

References

AAAL (American Association for Applied Linguistics). (2024). *Strands*. Retrieved May 23, 2024, from <https://www.aaal.org/2025-call-for-proposals#Strands>

Addey, C., Maddox, B., & Zumbo, B. D. (2020). Assembled validity: Rethinking Kane's argument-based approach. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 27(6), 588–606. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2020.1843136>

AERA, APA, & NCME. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. American Educational Research Association.

AILA (Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée). (2015). *About research networks: List of ReNS*. Retrieved August 13, 2024, from <http://www.aila.info/en/research/list-of-rens.html>

AILA (Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée). (2024). *What is AILA*. Retrieved May 23, 2024, from <https://aila.info/>

Alderson, J. C. (Ed.). (1984). *Evaluation: Language practical papers in English language education*. Pergamon.

Alderson, J. C. (1992). Guidelines for the evaluation of language education. In J. C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 274–304). Cambridge University Press.

Alderson, J. C., & Beretta, A. (Eds.). (1992). *Evaluating second language education*. Cambridge University Press.

Allwright, R. (2006). Six promising directions in applied linguistics. In S. Gieve & I. K. Miller (Eds.), *Understanding the language classroom* (pp. 11–17). Palgrave Macmillan.

Assessment Systems Corporation. (2017). *User manual for Iteman 4.4*. Assessment Systems Corporation.

Bachman, L. F. (2001). Designing and developing useful language tests. In C. Elder, A. Brown, E. Grove, K. Hill, N. Iwashita, T. Lumley, T. McNamara, & K. O'Loughlin (Eds.), *Experimenting with uncertainty: Essays in honour of Alan Davies* (pp. 109–116). Cambridge University Press.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford University Press.

Baker, B. (2016). Language assessment literacy as professional competence: The case of Canadian admissions decision makers. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 63–83. <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/23033>

Baker, B., & Riches, C. (2018). The development of EFL examinations in Haiti: Collaboration and language assessment literacy development. *Language Testing*, 35(4), 557–581. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532217716732>

Ball, S. J. (2015). What is policy? 21 years later: Reflections on the possibilities of policy research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 36(3), 306–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2015.1015279>

Balogh, J. (2016). A practical guide to creating quality exams. : Intelliphonics, LLC.

Barkhuizen, G. (2008). A narrative approach to exploring context in language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 62(3), 231–239. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm043>

Barkhuizen, G. (2011). Narrative knowing in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 391–414. <https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2011.261888>

Barkhuizen, G. (2014). Narrative research in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 47(4), 450–466. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000172>

Barkhuizen, G. (2016a). Narrative approaches to exploring language, identity and power in language teacher education. *RELC Journal*, 47(1), 25–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216631222>

Barkhuizen, G. (2016b). A short story approach to analyzing teacher (imagined) identities over time. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 655–683. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.311>

Beckner, C., Blythe, R., Bybee, J., Christiansen, M. H., Croft, W., Ellis, N. C., Holland, J., Ke, J., Larsen-Freeman, D., & Schoenemann, T. (2009). Language is a complex adaptive system: Position paper. *Language Learning*, 59(supplement 1), 1–26.

Bell, J. S. (2002). Narrative enquiry: More than just telling stories. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(3), 207–213. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588331>

Bell, D. M. (2003). Method and postmethod: Are they really so incompatible? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(2), 325–336. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588507>

Benson, P. (2021). *Language learning environments: Spatial perspectives on SLA*. Multilingual Matters.

Beretta, A. (1986). Program-fair for language teaching evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(3), 431–444. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586293>

Beretta, A. (1990). The program evaluator: The ESL researcher without portfolio. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.1.1>

Beretta, A., & Davies, A. (1985). Evaluation of the Bangalore project. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 39(2), 121–127. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/39.2.121>

Blanton, L.L. (1998). Discourse, artefacts and the Ozarks: Understanding academic literacy. In V. Zamel, & R. Spack (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures* (pp. 219–235). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (Reprint of article in *Journal of Second Language Writing* 3(1), 1–16.)

Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G.J., & Van Heerden, J. (2004). The concept of validity. *Psychological Review*, 111(4), 1061–1071. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-295X.111.4.1061>

Bouchard, J. (2021). *Complexity, emergence and causality in applied linguistics*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-88032-3>

Boyd, K., & Davies, A. (2002). Doctors' orders for language testers: The origin and purpose of ethical codes. *Language Testing*, 19(3), 296–322. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532202lt231oa>

British Association for Applied Linguistics (BAAL). (2021). *Recommendations on good practice in applied linguistics 2021* (4th ed.). British Association for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved August 7, 2023, from <https://www.baal.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/BAAL-Good-Practice-Guidelines-2021.pdf>

Brumfit, C. J. (1982). Some humanistic doubts about humanistic language teaching. In P. Early (Ed.), *ELT documents 113 – Humanistic approaches: An empirical view* (pp. 11–19). The British Council.

Burstein, J. (2023). Duolingo English test: Responsible AI standards. <https://doi.org/10.46999/VCAE5025>

Butler, G. (2013). Discipline-specific versus generic academic literacy intervention for university education: An issue of impact? *Journal for Language Teaching*, 47(2), 71–87. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v47i2.4>

Butler, G. (2017). Translating the test of academic literacy levels into Sesotho. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 51(1), 11–43. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v5i1.1>

Bygate, M. (2004). Some current trends in applied linguistics: Towards a generic view. *AILA Review*, 17, 6–22. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.17.04byg>

Carstens, A. (2009). *The effectiveness of genre-based approaches in teaching academic writing: Subject-specific versus cross-disciplinary approaches*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria. <http://hdl.handle.net/2263/24689>.

Cito. (2013). *TiaPlus users manual*. Cito M & R Department.

Cliff, A. (2021). The use of mediation and feedback in a standardised test of academic literacy: Theoretical and design considerations. In A. Weideman, J. Read, & T. du Plessis (Eds.), *Assessing academic literacy in a multilingual society: Transformation and transition* (New perspectives on language and education) (Vol. 84, pp. 75–92). Multilingual Matters.

Cliff, A., & Hanslo, M. (2009). The design and use of ‘alternate’ assessments of academic literacy as selection mechanisms in higher education. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 27(3), 265–276. <https://doi.org/10.2989/SALALS.2009.27.3.5.939>

Coetzer, J. P. (s.d.). *Functional English exercises (Lower grade), Standard IX – Form IV*. Maskew Miller.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Longman.

Cook, A. M. (1954). *Macmillan's Shorter Latin course; being an abridgement of Macmillan's Latin course – First part*. Macmillan.

Cook, G. (2015). Birds out of dinosaurs: The death and life of applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 36(4), 425–433. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv038>

Corder, S. P. (1972). Problems and solutions in applied linguistics. In J. Qvistgaard, H. Schwarz, & H. Spang-Hanssen (Eds.), *Applied linguistics: Problems and solutions. Vol. III of the Association Internationale de Linguistique Applique Third Congress, Copenhagen* (pp. 1–23). Julius Groos Verlag.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for language learning and teaching*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved August 20, 2022, from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=0900001680459f97>

Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment* (Companion volume with new descriptors). Strasbourg.

Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2001). *Language policy framework for South African higher education*. Council on Higher Education.

Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213–238. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587951>

Crookes, G., & Gass, S. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice*. Multilingual Matters.

Curran, C. A. (1976). *Counseling-learning in second languages*. Apple River Press.

Curran, C. A. (1977). *Counseling-learning: A whole-person model for education*. Apple River Press.

Davies, A. (1997). Demands of being professional in language testing. *Language Testing*, 14(3), 328–339.

Davies, A. (2008a). TESOL, applied linguistics, and the butterfly effect [Contribution to Symposium: Theory in TESOL]. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(2), 296–298. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00122.x>

Davies, A. (2008b). Accountability and standards. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 483–494). Blackwell.

Davies, A. (2011). Kane, validity and soundness. *Language Testing*, 29(1), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532211417213>

Davies, A. (2012). Who owns English? Questioning the native speaker. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 46(2), 191–201. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v46i2.12>

Davies, A. (2013). *Native speakers and native users: Loss and gain*. Cambridge University Press.

Davies, A., & Elder, C. (2005). Validity and validation in language testing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 795–813). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Davies, A., Joseph, J., & Weideman, A. (2007). The Pit Corder colloquium: Interview with Michael Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan (transcription by K. Mitchell). In M. Edwardes (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the British Association for Applied Linguistics, University of Edinburgh 6–8 September 2007* (pp. 3–10). Retrieved October 5, 2022, from https://www.baal.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/proceedings_07_full.pdf

Davison, C. (2014). *Writing in crooked lines: An analysis of writing development of neo-literate Bambara women*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.. University of the Free State.

De Bot, K. (2015). *A history of applied linguistics: From 1980 to the present*. Routledge.

De Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A dynamic systems theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 10(1), 7–21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728906002732>

De Graaff, A. H. (1980). Psychology: Sensitive openness and appropriate reactions. *Journal for Christian Scholarship*, 16(3 & 4), 135–152.

Department of Basic Education. (2011a). *Curriculum and assessment policy statement (CAPS) for English Home Language, Further Education and Training phase, grades 10–12*. Department of Basic Education.

Department of Basic Education. (2011b). *Curriculum and assessment policy statement (CAPS) for English First Additional Language, Further Education and Training phase, grades 10–12*. Department of Basic Education.

Department of Education. (1997). Language in education policy 14 July 1997, in terms of The National Education Policy Act, 27 of 1996. *Government Gazette* 18546, Notice 1701, 19 December. Government Printer.

Department of Higher Education (DHET). (2020). The language policy framework for public higher education institutions. *Government Gazette* 43860, Notice 1160, 30 October. Government Printer.

Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). (2018). Draft language policy for higher education. *Government Gazette* 41463, Notice 147, 23 February. Government Printer.

Deygers, B. (2017). Just testing: Applying theories of justice to high-stakes language tests. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 168(2), 143–163. <https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.00001.dey>

Deygers, B. (2018). Book review: Evaluating language assessments [by Antony John Kunنان]. *Language Testing*, 36(1), 154–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532218778211>

Deygers, B. (2019). Fairness and justice in English language assessment. In X. Gao (Ed.), *Second handbook of English language teaching* (Handbooks of education). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58542-0_30-1

Deygers, B., & Malone, M. E. (2019). Language assessment literacy in university admission policies, or the dialogue that isn't. *Language Testing*, 36(3), 347–368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532219826390>

Deygers, B., & Malone, M. (2023, June). *Standing on the shoulders of giants: Revising the ILTA code of ethics*. Paper presentation. 44th language testing research Colloquium, New York, United States.

Deygers, B., & Vanbuel, M. (2022). Advocating an empirically-founded university admission policy. *Language Policy*, 21, 575–596. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-022-09615-6>

Deygers, B., Van den Branden, K., & Van Gorp, K. (2017). University entrance language tests: A matter of justice. *Language Testing*, 35(4), 449–476. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532217706196>

Deygers, B., Bigelow, M., Lo Bianco, J., Nadarajan, D., & Tani, M. (2021). Low print literacy and its representation in research and policy. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 18, 463–476. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2021.1903471>

Di Pietro, R. J. (1975). The strategies of language use. In P. A. Reich (Ed.), *The Second LACUS Forum, 1975* (pp. 462–467). Hornbeam Press.

Di Pietro, R. J. (1976). Contrasting patterns of language use: A conversational approach. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 33(1), 49–61.

Di Pietro, R. J. (1978). Verbal strategies, script theory and conversational performances in ESL. In C. Blatchford & J. Schachter (Eds.), *On TESOL* (pp. 149–156). TESOL.

Di Pietro, R. J. (1979). Verbal strategies in the modern language classroom. *The Bulletin*, 57(2), 3–10.

Di Pietro, R. J. (1981). Discourse and real-life roles in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(1), 27–33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586370>

Di Pietro, R. J. (1982). Strategic interaction from texts: Converting written discourse into spoken conversation. In W. Frawley (Ed.), *The proceedings of the Third Delaware symposium on language studies*. Plenum Press.

Di Pietro, R. J. (1987). *Strategic interaction: Learning languages through scenarios*. Oxford University Press.

Dobie, B. A., & Piper, B. H. (1981). *Towards success in English – Standard 9*. McGraw-Hill.

Dooyeweerd, H. (1984). *A new critique of theoretical thought* (Vols 1–3). (Republication by Paideia Press, Jordan Station, Ontario of the 1969 edition by the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company).

Dooyeweerd, H. (2012). *Encyclopedia of the science of law* (The collected works of Herman Dooyeweerd; Series A, Vol. 8/1). Paideia Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31(3), 117–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480001315X>

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). New themes and approaches in second language motivation research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 43–61. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000034>

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Affect in lifelong learning: Exploring L2 motivation as a dynamic process. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Learners' stories: Difference and diversity in language learning* (pp. 22–41). Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). Individual differences: Interplay of learner characteristics and learning environment. *Language Learning*, 59(Suppl. 1), 230–248. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00542.x>

Dörnyei, Z. (2010). The relationship between language aptitude and language learning motivation: Individual differences from a dynamic systems perspective. In E. Macaro (Ed.), *Continuum companion to second language acquisition* (pp. 247–267). Continuum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2011). Researching complex dynamic systems: 'Retrodictive qualitative modelling' in the language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 47, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000516>

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizer, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research*, 2(3), 203–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136216889800200303>

Dörnyei, Z., & Kormos, J. (2000). The role of individual and social variables in oral task performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 275–300. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880000400305>

Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). 'Information gap' tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(2), 305–325. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586546>

Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(Supplement), 19–47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.123010026-7902/16/19-47>

Dreitzel, H. P. (Ed.). (1970). *Recent sociology, no. 2*. Collier-MacMillan.

Drennan, L. (2019). *Defensibility and accountability: Developing a theoretically justifiable academic writing intervention for students at tertiary level*. Doctoral dissertation, University of the Free State. KovsieScholar Repository. <http://hdl.handle.net/11660/10888>

Drennan, L. (2021). Assessing readiness to write: The design of an Assessment of Preparedness to Present Multimodal Information (APPMI). In A. Weideman, J. Read, & T. du Plessis (Eds.), *Assessing academic literacy in a multilingual society: Transformation and transition* (New perspectives on language and education) (Vol. 84, pp. 195–216). Multilingual Matters.

Du Plessis, C. (2017). *Developing a theoretical rationale for the attainment of greater equivalence of standard in the Grade 12 Home Language exit-level examinations*. Doctoral dissertation, University of the Free State. KovsieScholar Repository. <http://hdl.handle.net/11660/6421>

Du Plessis, T. (2021). Institutional language policy and academic literacy in South African higher education – A two-pronged or a forked-tongue approach? In A. Weideman, J. Read, & T. du Plessis (Eds.), *Assessing academic literacy in a multilingual society: Transformation and transition* (New perspectives on language and education) (Vol. 84, pp. 2–21). Multilingual Matters.

Du Plessis, C., & Weideman, A. (2014). Writing as construct in the Grade 12 Home Language curriculum and examination. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 48(2), 127–147. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v48i2.6>

Du Plessis, C., Steyn, S., & Weideman, A. (2013). Towards a construct for assessing high level language ability in Grade 12. In *Report to the council for quality assurance in general and further education and training (Umalusi) on home language examinations*. ICELDA.

Du Plessis, C., Steyn, S., & Weideman, A. (2016). Die assessering van huistale in die Suid-Afrikaanse Nasionale Seniorcertificaatksamen: Die strewe na regverdigheid en groter geloofwaardigheid. *LitNet Akademies*, 13(1), 425–443. <http://www.litnet.co.za/die-assessering-van-huistale-in-die-suid-afrikaanse-nasionale-seniorcertificaatksamen-die-strewe-na-regverdigheid-en-groter-geloofwaardigheid/>

Early, P. (Ed.). (1982). *ELT documents 113 – Humanistic approaches: An empirical view*. The British Council.

Economist, The. (2012). Pretty profitable parrots. Schumpeter column. 12 May, p. 60.

Ellis, N. C., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). Language emergence: Implications for applied linguistics – Introduction to the Special Issue. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4), 558–589. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml028>

ETS (Educational Testing Services). (2022). How the TOEFL ibT test meets your needs. Retrieved October 3, 2023, from <https://www.ets.org/toefl/score-users/ibt/about/how.html>

Foley, J. A. (Ed.). (2004). *Language, education and discourse: Functional approaches*. Continuum.

Fourie, F.C.v.N. (1981). *A structural theory of the nature of the firm*. Doctoral thesis (Economics) Harvard University. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/34441443_A_Structural_Theory_of_the_Nature_of_the_Firm

Fourie, F.C.v.N. (Ed.). 2018. *The South African informal sector: Creating jobs, reducing poverty*. HSRC Press.

Frank, C., & Rinvolucri, M. (1983). *Grammar in action*. Pergamon.

Fulcher, G. (2004). Deluded by artifices? The Common European Framework and Harmonization. *Language Assessment Quarterly: An International Journal*, 1(4), 253–266. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15434311laq0104_4

Fulcher, G. (2010). *Practical language testing*. Hodder Education.

Fulcher, G. (2012). Assessment literacy for the language classroom. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9(2), 113–132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.642041>

Fulcher, G. (2015). *Re-examining language testing: A philosophical and social inquiry*. Routledge.

Fulcher, G., & Davidson, F. (2007). *Language testing and assessment: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (1998). What is literacy? In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures* (pp. 51–59). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gentes, A. (2017). *The in-discipline of design: Bridging the gap between humanities and engineering*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65984-8>

Graham, C. (1978). *Jazz chants for children*. Oxford University Press.

Graham, C. (1986). *Small talk*. Oxford University Press.

Green, R. (2013). *Statistical analyses for language testers*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Green, A. (2014). *Exploring language assessment and testing: Language in action*. Routledge.

Green, J., Davis, C., Harmes, M., Judith, K., & Weideman, A. (2024). Using a five-phase applied linguistics design to develop a contextualized academic literacy placement test for pre-university pathway students. Accepted for publication. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 1–27.

Guyer, R., & Thompson, N. A. (2011). *User's Manual for Iteman 4.2*. Assessment Systems Corporation.

Habermas, J. (1970). Toward a theory of communicative competence. In H. P. Dreitzel (Ed.), *Recent sociology* (Vol. No. 2, pp. 115–148). Collier-MacMillan.

Habte, A. (2001). *The development of supplementary materials for English language teaching in a scarce resource environment: An action research study*. Mini-dissertation. University of the Western Cape, Bellville.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (2000). Fairnesses in language testing. In A. Kunنان (Ed.), *Fairness and validation in language assessment: Selected papers from the 19th Language Testing Research Colloquium, Orlando, Florida* (Studies in Language Testing, Vol. 9, pp. 30–34). Cambridge University Press.

Hart, H. (1984). *Understanding our world: An integral ontology*. University Press of America.

Heugh, K. (2013). Where 'whole language' literacy and 'communicative' language teaching fail. *HSRC Review*, 11(1), 14–15.

Heugh, K., Prinsloo, C., Makgamatha, M., Diedericks, G., & Winnaar, L. (2017). Multilingualism(s) and system-wide assessment: A southern perspective. *Language and Education*, 31(3), 197–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2016.1261894>

Hjelmslev, L. (1963). *Prolegomena to a theory of language* (Whitfield, F.J., Trans.). University of Wisconsin Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/410221?origin=JSTOR-pdf>

Hong, T.P.N. (2013). *A dynamic usage-based approach to second language teaching*. Doctoral dissertation. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Horwitz, E. K. (1987). Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 119–129). Prentice Hall.

Hosenfeld, C. (1974). Cora's view of learning grammar. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 35(4), 602–607.

Hosenfeld, C. (1976). Learning about learning: Discovering our students' strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 9(2), 117–129.

Hult, F. M. (2008). The history and development of educational linguistics. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 10–24). Blackwell.

Hult, F. M. (2010a). Theme-based research in the transdisciplinary field of applied linguistics. In F. M. Hult (Ed.), *Directions and prospects for educational linguistics* (pp. 19–32). Springer.

Hult, F. M. (Ed.). (2010b). *Directions and prospects for educational linguistics*. Springer.

Hult, F. M., & King, K. A. (2011a). Introduction: Global and local connections in educational linguistics. In F. M. Hult & K. A. King (Eds.), *Educational linguistics in practice: Applying the local globally and the global locally* (pp. xviii–xxvi). Multilingual Matters.

Hult, F. M., & King, K. A. (Eds.). (2011b). *Educational linguistics in practice: Applying the local globally and the global locally*. Multilingual Matters.

Hymes, D. (1971). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.

ICELDA (Inter-institutional Centre for Language Development and Assessment). (2023). Retrieved September 20, 2023, from: <https://icelda.com/>

IELTS (International English Language Testing System). (2022). *Choose IELTS – The world's favourite test of English*. Retrieved September 22, 2022, from <https://www.ielts.org/for-test-takers/why-choose-ielts>

Ihlenfeldt, S. D., & Rios, J. A. (2022). A meta-analysis on the predictive validity of English language proficiency assessments for college admissions. *Language Testing*, 40, 276–299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532221112364>

ILTA (International Language Testing Association). (2020a). *Code of ethics*. Retrieved April 26, 2023, from <https://www.iltaweb.org/page/CodeofEthics>

ILTA (International Language Testing Association). (2020b). *Guidelines for practice in English*. Retrieved April 26, 2023, from <https://www.iltaweb.org/page/ILTAGuidelinesforPractice>

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2017). Language assessment literacy. In E. Shohamy, I. Or, & S. May (Eds.), *Language testing and assessment. Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 257–270). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02261-1_19

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). (2022). *Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS)*. Retrieved September 15, 2022, from <https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2011/international-results-pirls.html>

Jakobovits, L. A., & Gordon, B. (1974). *The context of foreign language teaching*. Newbury House.

Jamieson, J. (2014). Defining constructs and assessment design. In A. Kunnam (Ed.), *The companion to language assessment* (Vol. II, Part 7). John Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla062>

Joseph, J. (2017). Extended/distributed cognition and the native speaker. *Language and Communication* 57 (37–47). (Special issue: Breaking down barriers in applied linguistics: studies in honour of Alan Davies (1931–2015); edited by C.D. Leymarie & S.B. Makoni.) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2016.12.008>

Kane, M. T. (1992). An argument-based approach to validity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(3), 527–535. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.3.527>

Kane, M. T. (2001). Current concerns in validity theory. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 38(4), 319–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3984.2001.tb01130.x>

Kane, M. T. (2010). Validity and fairness. *Language Testing*, 27(2), 177–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532209349467>

Kane, M. T. (2011). Validity score interpretations and uses: Messick lecture, Language testing research colloquium, Cambridge, April 2010. *Language Testing*, 29(1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532211417210>

Kane, M. T. (2016). Explicating validity. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 23(2), 198–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2015.1060192>

Kane, M. T., Kane, J., & Clauzer, B. E. (2017). A validation framework for credentialing tests. In C. W. Buckendahl & S. Davis-Becker (Eds.), *Testing in the professions: Credentialing policies and practice* (pp. 20–41). Routledge.

Kaplan, R. B. (1980a). Toward a redefinition of applied linguistics. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *On the scope of applied linguistics* (pp. 9–12). Newbury House.

Kaplan, R. B. (1980b). On the scope of linguistics, applied and non. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *On the scope of applied linguistics* (pp. 57–66). Newbury House.

Kaplan, R. B. (Ed.). (1980c). *On the scope of applied linguistics*. Newbury House.

Karavas-Doukas, E. K. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 187–198. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.3.187>

Karavas-Doukas, K. (1998). Evaluating the implementation of educational innovations: Lessons from the past. In P. Rea-Dickens & K. Germaine (Eds.), *Managing evaluation and innovation in language teaching: Building bridges* (pp. 25–50). Longman.

Knoch, U. (2021). The challenges of providing expert advice in policy contexts. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 10(1), 30–48. <https://doi.org/10.58379/woic6861>

Knoch, U., & Elder, C. (2013). A framework for validating post-entry language assessments (PELAs). *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 2(2), 48–66. <https://doi.org/10.58379/YZLQ8816>

Knoch, U., & Macqueen, S. (2020). Construct. In *Assessing English for professional purposes* (pp. 39–70). Routledge.

Koch, E., & Dornbrack, J. (2008). The use of language criteria for admission to higher education in South Africa: Issues of bias and fairness investigated. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 26(3), 333–350. <https://doi.org/10.2989/SALALS.2008.26.3.3.630>

Kotze, H., & McKay, V. (1997). *Molteno early literacy and language development project evaluation report*. ABET Institute, UNISA.

Kramsch, C. (2008). Ecological perspectives on foreign language education. *Language Teaching*, 41(3), 389–408. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005065>

Kramsch, C. (2012). Imposture: A late modern notion in poststructuralist SLA research. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(5), 483–502. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams051>

Kramsch, C. (2015). Applied linguistics: A theory of the practice. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(4), 454–465. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amy039>

Krashen, S. (1978). The monitor model for second language acquisition. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 1–26). Center for Applied Linguistics.

Krashen, S. (1980). Relating theory and practice in adult second language acquisition. In S. Felix (Ed.), *Recent trends in research on second language acquisition* (pp. 185–204). Gunter Narr.

Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Pergamon.

Kroes, H. (1991a). *Evaluation of the Easing into English project*. Urban Foundation.

Kroes, H. (1991b). Die evaluering van taalonderrig: 'n Voorbeeld uit die praktyk. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 25(3), 30–40.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. In *International Encyclopedia of unified science*, 2(2). University of Chicago Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/ foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 27–48. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587197>

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. Yale University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006a). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006b). Applied linguistics in the age of globalization [Manuscript translated and published in Portuguese]. In L. P. Moita Lopes (Ed.), *Por uma linguistica aplicada indisciplinar* (pp. 129–148). Parabola Editorial.

Kunnan, A. J. (2000a). Fairness and justice for all. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *Fairness and validation in language assessment: Selected papers from the 19th language testing research colloquium, Orlando, Florida* (pp. 1–14). Cambridge University Press.

Kunnan, A. J. (Ed.). (2000b). *Fairness and validation in language assessment: Selected papers from the 19th Language Testing Research Colloquium, Orlando, Florida* (Studies in language testing) (Vol. 9). Cambridge University Press.

Lamendella, J. T. (1979). The neurofunctional basis of pattern practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 13(1), 5–19. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3585971>

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Lee, N., Mikesell, L., Joaquin, A. D. L., Mates, E. W., & Schumann, J. H. (2009). *The interactional instinct: The evolution and acquisition of language*. Oxford University Press.

Lepota, B., & Weideman, A. (2002). Our ways of learning language. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 36(3 & 4), 206–219. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v36i3-4.5987>

Levine, G.S. (2020). A human ecological language pedagogy. *The Modern Language Journal* 104(S1). Supplement: Monograph series, W. Lowie (Ed.).

Lightbown, P. M. (2000). Anniversary article. Classroom SLA research and second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(4), 431–462. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/21.4.431>

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Lillis, T. (2003). Student writing as 'academic literacies': Drawing on Bakhtin to move from critique to design. *Language and Education*, 17(3), 192–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780308666848>

Linacre, M. (2018). A user's guide to Winsteps Ministep Rasch-model computer program. *Program, 4.3.0*, s.1.

Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal, 58*(4), 319–326. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.4.319>

Littlewood, W. (2014). Communication-oriented language teaching: Where are we now? Where do we go from here? *Language Teaching, 47*(3), 349–362. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000134>

LTEST-L. (2022). Financial incentives: TOEIC and TOEFL score comparison. 13–18 September. Listserve for language testing. Retrieved October 2, 2023, from: <http://lists.psu.edu/archives/ltest-l.html>

Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation. Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Macdonald, C. (1988). Teaching primary science in a second language: Two teaching styles and their cognitive concomitants. In A. Weideman (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 6th Southern African Applied Linguistics Association Conference: Styles of teaching and styles of learning* (pp. 115–127). University of the Free State.

Macdonald, C., & Burroughs, E. (1991). *Eager to talk and learn and think: Bilingual primary education in South Africa*. Maskew Miller Longman.

Mackay, R. (1994). Undertaking ESL/EFL programme review for accountability and improvement. *English Language Teaching Journal, 48*(2), 142–149. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/48.2.142>

Macqueen, S., Pill, J., & Knoch, U. (2021). Trust the test: Score-user perspectives on the roles of language tests in professional registration and skilled migration. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment, 10*(1), 49–69. <https://doi.org/10.58379/MAKH4553>

Maley, A., & Duff, A. (1978). *Drama techniques in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Malmberg, B. (1967). Applied linguistics. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5*, 1–2.

Marckwardt, A. (1985). Old paths and new directions. In F. Smolinski (Ed.), *Landmarks of American language & linguistics* (pp. 240–245). United States Information Agency. (Reprinted from *On teaching English to speakers of other languages, Series 1* (pp. 3–8), by V.F. Allan, Ed., 1965, National Council of Teachers of English).

Marsland, B. (1998). *Lessons from nothing: Activities for language teaching with limited time and resources*. Cambridge University Press.

Maseko, B. (2022). Translanguaging and minoritised language revitalisation in multilingual classrooms: examining teachers' agency. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, 40*(2), 162–176. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2022.2040370>

Mauranen, A. (2015). Closing summary. *Applied Linguistics, 36*(4), 488–492. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv045>

Mayne, R. (2022). Straw methods: Clearing up misconceptions about ALM. *Language & History, 65*(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17597536.2022.2116264>

McNamara, T. (2008). Mapping the scope of theory in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(2), 302–305. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00124.x>

McNamara, T. (2012a). Poststructuralism and its challenges for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 33*(5), 473–482. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams055>

McNamara, T. (2012b). Language assessments as shibboleths: A poststructuralist perspective. *Applied Linguistics, 33*(5), 564–581. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams052>

McNamara, T. (2015). Applied linguistics: The challenge of theory. *Applied Linguistics, 36*(4), 466–477. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv042>

McNamara, T., & Roever, C. (2006). *Language testing: The social dimension*. Blackwell.

McNamara, T., Knoch, U., & Fan, J. (2019). *Fairness, justice and language assessment: The role of measurement*. Oxford University Press.

Mecham, S.A. (2023). *Language ideology in the ACTFL speaking proficiency guidelines* (Publication no. 9924). Master's thesis, Brigham Young University. BYU ScholarsArchive. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/9924>

Messick, S. (1980). Test validity and the ethics of assessment. *American Psychologist*, 35(11), 1012–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.35.11.1012>

Messick, S. (1981). Evidence and ethics in the evaluation of tests. *Educational Researcher*, 10(9), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2333-8504.1981.tb01244.x>

Messick, S. (1988). The once and future issues of validity: Assessing the meaning and consequences of measurement. In H. Wainer & I. H. Braun (Eds.), *Test validity* (pp. 33–45). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 13–103). American Council on Education/Collier Macmillan.

Mhlongo, P.S. (2019). *Language learning beliefs and motivation of Foundation and Intermediate Phase Education students in developing mastery in English*. Master's thesis, University of the Free State. KovsieScholar Repository.. <https://scholar.ufs.ac.za/handle/11660/9941>

Mhlongo, P. S., Du Plessis, C., & Weideman, A. (2020). Investigating education students' language learning beliefs and motivation for learning. *Journal for Language Teaching.*, 54(1), 97–121. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v54i1.1>

Mhlongo, P. S., Du Plessis, C., & Weideman, A. (2022). The development of a motivation for language learning questionnaire in multilingual South Africa: Context and use. *Per Linguam*, 38(1), 118–141. <https://doi.org/10.5785/38-1-987>

Moskowitz, G. (1978). *Caring and sharing in the foreign language classroom: A sourcebook on humanistic techniques*. Newbury House.

Moskowitz, G. (1982). Self-confidence through self-disclosure: The pursuit of meaningful communication. In P. Early (Ed.), *ELT documents 113 – Humanistic approaches: An empirical view* (pp. 20–33). The British Council.

Mountford, J. (1965). 'Bradley's Arnold' Latin prose composition. Longmans.

Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., & Hooper, M. (2017). *PIRLS 2016: International results in reading*. IEA.

Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design*. Cambridge University Press.

Murphy, R. S. (2010). Where does psychology and second language acquisition research connect? An interview with Zoltan Dörnyei. *The Language Teacher*, 34(2), 19–23. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTLT34.2-3>

Myburgh-Smit, J. (2015). *The assessment of academic literacy at pre-university level: A comparison of the utility of academic literacy tests and Grade 10 Home Language results*. Master's thesis, University of the Free State. KovsieScholar Repository. <https://scholar.ufs.ac.za/handle/11660/2081>

Myburgh-Smit, J., & Weideman, A. (2021). How early should we measure academic literacy? The usefulness of an appropriate test of academic literacy for Grade 10 students. In A. Weideman, J. Read, & T. du Plessis (Eds.), *Assessing academic literacy in a multilingual society: Transformation and transition* (New perspectives on language and education) (Vol. 84, pp. 117–131). Multilingual Matters.

NExLA (Network of Expertise in Language Assessment). (2020). *ILTA Etiese kode in Afrikaans gepubliseer*. <https://nexla.org.za/2019/02/01/ulta-etiese-kode-in-afrikaans-gepubliseer/>

NExLA (Network of Expertise in Language Assessment). (2023). *Bibliography of language assessment*. <https://nexla.org.za/research-on-language-assessment/>

Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 279–295. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587464>

Oller, J. W. (1973). Discrete-point tests versus tests of integrative skills. In J. W. Oller & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Focus on the learner: Pragmatic perspectives for the language teacher* (pp. 184–199). Newbury House.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Newbury House.

Oxford, R. L., & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on language learning strategies: Methods, findings, and instructional issues. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 404–419. <https://doi.org/10.2307/326876>

Özçelik, O., & Kent, A. K. (2023). *Designing effective language learning materials for less commonly taught languages: A research-based guide*. Georgetown University Press.

Paltridge, B. (2014). What motivates Applied Linguistics research? *AILA Review*, 27, 98–104. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.27.05pal>

Park, E. K., Vass, G., & Davison, C. (2022). Korean *Bibimbap* mothers' family language policies (FLPs) for their children's bilingualism in Australia. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 45(3), 272–298. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.20001.par>

Patterson, R., & Weideman, A. (2013a). The typicality of academic discourse and its relevance for constructs of academic literacy. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 47(1), 107–123. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v47i1.5>

Patterson, R., & Weideman, A. (2013b). The refinement of a construct for tests of academic literacy. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 47(1), 125–151. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v47i1.6>

Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(4), 589–618. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587534>

Pennycook, A. (1994). Critical pedagogical approaches to research. In A. Cumming (ed.) *Alternatives in TESOL research: descriptive, interpretive, and ideological orientations*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 690–693. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587555>

Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly (Special topic issue: Critical approaches in TESOL)*, 33(3), 329–348. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587668>

Pennycook, A. (2000). The social politics and the cultural politics of language classrooms. In J. K. Hall & W. G. Egginton (Eds.), *The sociopolitics of English language teaching* (pp. 89–103). Multilingual Matters.

Pennycook, A. (2004). Critical applied linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 784–807). Blackwell.

Pennycook, A. (2018). Posthumanist applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 445–461. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aplin/amw016>

Popham, W. J. (1997). Consequential validity: Right concern – Wrong concept. *Educational Measurement: Issues and practice.*, 16(2), 9–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.1997.tb00586.x>

Pot, A. (2013). *Diagnosing language ability: An analysis of TALPS*. Master's thesis, Applied Linguistics, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. https://icelda.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Diagnosing_academic_language_ability.pdf

Pot, A., & Weideman, A. (2015). Diagnosing academic language ability: Insights from an analysis of a postgraduate test of academic literacy. *Language Matters*, 46(1), 22–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2014.986665>

Pretorius, M. (2015). *The theoretical justification for the design of a communicative course for nurses: Nurses on the move*. Master's thesis, University of the Free State. KovsieScholar Repository. <http://hdl.handle.net/11660/683>.

Raatz, U., & Klein-Braley, C. (1981). The C-test – A modification of cloze procedure. In T. Culhane, C. Klein-Braley, & D. K. Stevenson (Eds.), *Practice and problems in language testing* (pp. 113–138). University of Essex.

Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The philosophy of applied linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 397–420). Blackwell.

Rambiritch, A. (2012). *Accessibility, transparency and accountability as regulative conditions for a post-graduate test of academic literacy*. Doctoral dissertation, University of the Free State. KovsieScholar Repository. <https://hdl.handle.net/11660/1571>.

Rambiritch, A., & Weideman, A. (2016). Telling the story of a test: The Test of Academic Literacy for Postgraduate Students (TALPS). In J. Read (Ed.), *Post-admission language assessment of university students* (pp. 197–216). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39192-2_10

Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice* (revised ed.). Harvard University Press/Belknap Press.

Read, J. (2010). Researching language testing and assessment. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 286–300). Continuum.

Read, J. (2015). *Assessing English proficiency for university study*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Read, J. (Ed.). (2016). *Post-admission language assessment of university students*. Springer.

Read, J., & Du Plessis, C. (2021). Introduction: A global perspective on the South African context. In A. Weideman, J. Read, & T. Du Plessis (Eds.), *Assessing academic literacy in a multilingual society: Transformation and transition* (New perspectives on language and education, Vol. 84, pp. xxiii–xxvii). Multilingual Matters.

Rea-Dickens, P., & Germaine, K. (1992). *Language teaching evaluation*. Oxford University Press.

Rea-Dickens, P., & Germaine, K. (Eds.). (1998). *Managing evaluation and innovation in language teaching: Building bridges*. Longman.

RELX. (2022). *Responsible artificial Intelligence principles at RELX*. Retrieved August 11, 2023, from: <https://www.relx.com/corporate-responsibility/engaging-others/policies-and-downloads>

Riazi, A. M. (2017). *Mixed methods research in language teaching and learning*. Equinox.

Rinvolucri, M. (1982). Awareness activities for teaching structures. In P. Early (Ed.), *ELT documents 113 – Humanistic approaches: An empirical view* (pp. 50–58). The British Council.

Roberts, J. T. (1982). Recent developments in ELT, Parts I and II. *Language Teaching*, 15(2 & 3), 94–110, 174–194. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800009563>

Roberts, J. T. (1986). The use of dialogues in teaching transactional competence in foreign languages. In *ELT documents 124: The practice of communicative teaching*. The British Council/ Pergamon.

Robinson, M. (2015). *The givenness of things: Essays*. Picador.

SADiLAR (South African Centre for Digital Language Resources). (2022). Retrieved September 12, 2022, from <https://www.sadilar.org/>

Salaberry, M. R., & Weideman, A. (2024). Context, construct, and ethics. In M. R. Salaberry, A. Weideman, & W. L. Hsu (Eds.), *Ethics and context in second language testing: Rethinking validity in theory and practice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003384922>

Salaberry, M. R., Weideman, A., & Hsu, W. L. (Eds.). (2024). *Ethics and context in second language testing: Rethinking validity in theory and practice*. Routledge.

Schildt, L., Deygers, B., & Weideman, A. (2024). Language testers and their place in the policy web. *Language Testing*, 41, 338–356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02655322231191133>

Scholtz, D. (2015). *A comparative analysis of academic literacy specifications for a standardised test and academic literacy requirements for reading and writing in a range of disciplinary contexts*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Cape Town. OpenUCT.. <http://hdl.handle.net/11427/16866>.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. Jossey-Bass.

Schuurman, E. (1972). *Techniek en toekomst: confrontatie met wijsgerige beschouwingen*. Van Gorcum.

Schuurman, E. (1977). *Reflections on the technological society*. Wedge Publishing Foundation.

Schuurman, E. (2009). *Technology and the future: A philosophical challenge* (H. D. Morton, Trans.). Paideia Press (Original work published in 1972 as *Techniek en toekomst: Confrontatie met wijsgerige beschouwingen*).

Schuurman, E. (2022). *Transformation of the technological society*. Dordt Press.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Sebolai, K. (2016). *The incremental validity of three tests of academic literacy in the context of a South African university of technology*. Doctoral dissertation, University of the Free State. KovsieScholar Repository.. <https://hdl.handle.net/11660/5408>.

Sebolai, K. (2021). Generic academic literacy testing: A logical precursor for faculty-specific language teaching and assessment. In A. Weideman, J. Read, & T. du Plessis (Eds.), *Assessing academic literacy in a multilingual society: Transformation and transition* (New perspectives on language and education) (Vol. 84, pp. 151–169). Multilingual Matters.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 209–231.

Selinker, L., & Douglas, D. (1985). Wrestling with 'context' in interlanguage theory. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 190–204.

Sellan, R. (2017). Developing assessment literacy in Singapore: How teachers broaden English language learning by expanding assessment constructs. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 6(1), 64–87.

Shaalukeni, L. (2000). *Learner-centredness and group work in second language teaching: A shattered dream. The case of five primary schools in the Ondangwa West region, Namibia*. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of the Western Cape.

Shoaib, A., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Affect in lifelong learning: Exploring L2 motivation as a dynamic process. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Learners' stories: difference and diversity in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Shohamy, E. (2000). Fairness in language testing. In A. Kunan (Ed.), *Fairness and validation in language assessment: Selected papers from the 19th Language Testing Research Colloquium, Orlando, Florida* (pp. 15–19). University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate.

Shohamy, E. (2001). *The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests*. Pearson Education.

Shohamy, E. (2004). Assessment in multicultural societies: Applying democratic principles and practices to language testing. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 72–92). Cambridge University Press.

Shuy, R. W. (2015). Applied linguistics past and future. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(4), 434–443. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv016>

Skehan, P. (2003). Task-based instruction. *Language Teaching*, 36, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480200188X>

Spolsky, B. (1970). Linguistics and language pedagogy – Applications or implications? In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics: Linguistics and the teaching of standard English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 143–155). Georgetown University Press.

Spolsky, B. (1978). *Educational linguistics: An introduction*. Newbury House.

Spolsky, B. (2008). Introduction: What is educational linguistics? In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 1–9). Blackwell.

Spolsky, B., & Hult, F. M. (Eds.). (2008). *The handbook of educational linguistics*. Blackwell.

Steunpunt Centrale Toetsen in Onderwijs. (2022). *Website with information*. Retrieved September 16, 2022, from <https://steunpuntoetsen.be/>

Stevick, E. W. (1971). *Adapting and writing language lessons*. Foreign Service Institute.

Stevick, E. W. (1980). *Teaching languages: A way and ways*. Newbury House.

Stevick, E. W. (1982). Humanism. In P. Early (Ed.), *ELT documents 113 – Humanistic approaches: An empirical view* (pp. 7–10). The British Council.

Steyn, S. (2014). *Towards the development of equal and fair Home Language assessments: Outline of a pilot study*. Interim report to Umalusi (Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training).

Steyn, S. (2018). *A theoretical justification for the design and refinement of a Test of Advanced Language Ability (TALA)*. Master's thesis, University of the Free State. KovsieScholar Repository. <http://hdl.handle.net/11660/10275>

Steyn, S. (2021). Pathways to parity between parallel tests of language ability: Lessons from a project. In A. Weideman, J. Read, & T. du Plessis (Eds.), *Assessing academic literacy in a multilingual society: Transition and transformation* (New perspectives on language and education) (Vol. 84, pp. 132–147). Multilingual Matters.

Strauss, D. F. M. (2009). *Philosophy: Discipline of the disciplines*. Paideia Press.

Strauss, D. F. M. (2012). Die moontlikheidsvooraardes van metafoorgebruik [Conditions of possibility for the use of metaphor]. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe*, 52(4), 613–618.

Strauss, D. F. M. (2014). What is a line? *Axiomathes*, 24(2), 181–205. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10516-013-9224-5>

Taalkommissie van die Suid-Afrikaanse Akademie vir Wetenskap en Kuns. (2018). *Afrikaanse woordelys en spelreëls* (11th edition; 3rd printing with corrections). Pharos Woordeboeke.

Tannenbaum, R.J. (2018, July 2–6). *Validity aspects of score reporting* [Contribution]. Re-conceptualizing, challenging, and expanding principles of test validation [Symposium 4]. 40th Language Testing Research Colloquium, Auckland, New Zealand.

Taylor, L. (2009). Developing assessment literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 21–36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190509090035>

Taylor, L. (2013). Communicating the theory, practice and principles of language testing to test stakeholders: Some reflections. *Language Testing*, 30(3), 403–412. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213480338>

Terrell, T. D. (1985). The Natural Approach to language teaching: An update. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 41(3), 461–479. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1982.tb06970.x>

Tesfamariam, H. (2000). *The alignment of the grade 8 English Syllabus in Eritrea with its implementation in the classroom*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of the Western Cape.

Uccelli, P., Barr, C. D., Dobbs, C. L., Galloway, E. P., Meneses, A., & Sanchez, E. (2015). Core academic language skills: An expanded operational construct and a novel instrument to chart school-relevant language proficiency in preadolescent and adolescent learners. *Applied PsychoLinguistics*, 36, 1077–1109. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S014271641400006X>

Umalusi (Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training). (2012a). *The standards of the National Senior Certificate Home Language examinations: A comparison of South African official languages*. Umalusi.

Umalusi (Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training). (2012b). *Developing a framework for assessing and comparing the cognitive challenge of Home Language examinations*. Umalusi.

Umalusi (Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training). (2012c). *Technical report on the quality assurance of the examinations and assessment of the National Senior Certificate (NSC) 2012*. Umalusi.

Van den Branden, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Task-based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Van den Branden, K., Bygate, M., & Norris, M. J. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Introducing the reader. In K. Van den Branden, M. Bygate, & J. M. Norris (Eds.), *Task-based language teaching: A reader* (pp. 1–13). John Benjamins.

Van der Slik, F., & Weideman, A. (2010). Examining bias in a test of academic literacy: Does the *Test of Academic Literacy Levels (TALL)* treat students from English and African language backgrounds differently? *Journal for Language Teaching*, 44(2), 106–118. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v44i2.71793>

Van der Walt, J. L., & Steyn, H. S. (2007). Pragmatic validation of a test of academic literacy at tertiary level. *Ensovoort*, 11(2), 138–153. <https://hdl.handle.net/10394/2841>

Van Dyk, T. (2010). *Konstitutiewe voorwaardes vir die ontwerp en ontwikkeling van 'n toets vir akademiese geletterdheid*. Doctoral dissertation, University of the Free State. KovsieScholar Repository. <http://hdl.handle.net/11660/1918>.

Van Dyk, T. (2021). What the data tell us: an overview of language assessment research in South Africa's multilingual context. In A. Weideman, J. Read, & T. du Plessis (Eds.), *Assessing academic literacy in a multilingual society: Transition and transformation* (New perspectives on language and education) (Vol. 84, pp. 218–236). Multilingual Matters.

Van Dyk, T., & Weideman, A. (2004a). Switching constructs: On the selection of an appropriate blueprint for academic literacy assessment. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 38(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v38i1.6024>

Van Dyk, T., & Weideman, A. (2004b). Finding the right measure: From blueprint to specification to item type. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 38(1), 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v38i1.6025>

Van Dyk, T., & Weideman, A. (2024). Toegepaste taalkunde. Forthcoming in W.A.M. Carstens (Ed.), *Kontemporäre Afrikaanse taalkunde*.

Van Dyk, T., Murre, P., & Kotzé, H. (2021). Does one size fit all? Some considerations for test translation. In A. Weideman, J. Read, & T. du Plessis (Eds.), *Assessing academic literacy in a multilingual society: Transition and transformation* (New perspectives on language and education) (Vol. 84, pp. 52–74). Multilingual Matters.

Van Eikema Hommes, H. J. (1972). *De elementaire grondbegrippen der rechtswetenschap: Een juridische methodologie*. Kluver.

Van Eikema Hommes, H. J. (1980). In I. G. J. Scholten, D. F. Scheltens, H. J. Van Eikema Hommes, & Rechtbeginselen. (Eds.), *De rechtsbeginselen volgens de transcendentaal-empirische methode*. W.E.J. Tjeenk Willink.

Van Els, T., Bongaerts, T., Extra, G., Van Os, C., & Janssen-van Dieten, A. (1984). *Applied linguistics and the learning and teaching of foreign languages* (R.R. van Oirsouw, Trans.). Edward Arnold.

Van Riessen, H. (1949). *Filosofie en techniek*. J.H. Kok.

Van Rooy, B., & Coetzee-Van Rooy, S. (2015). The language issue and academic performance at a South African University. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 33(1), 31–46. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2015.1012691>

Wakeman, A. (1967). *English fast*. Hart-Davis Educational.

Walz, J. (1996). The classroom dynamics of information gap activities. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 481–494. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1996.tb01259.x>

Weideman, A. (1984a). From communicative to transactional competence. In K. Chick (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Third National Southern African Applied Linguistics Association Conference* (pp. 202–212). University of Natal.

Weideman, A. (1984b). On the possibility of synthesizing humanistic and communicative approaches to language teaching. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 18(3), 2–9.

Weideman, A. (1984c). General and typical concepts of textual continuity. *SA Journal of Linguistics*, 2(1), 69–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10118063.1984.9724165>

Weideman, A. (1985). Vier rigtings in kommunikatiewe taalonderrig. *Neon*, 48, 42–51.

Weideman, A. (2001). The old and the new: Reconsidering eclecticism in language teaching. *Per Linguam*, 17(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.5785/17-1-131>

Weideman, A. (2002a). *Designing language teaching: On becoming a reflective professional*. BE at UP. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317360677_Designing_language_teaching_On_becoming_a_reflective_professional

Weideman, A. (2002b). Overcoming resistance to innovation: Suggestions for encouraging change in language teaching. *Per Linguam*, 18(1), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.5785/18-1-7>

Weideman, A. (2003a). Towards accountability: A point of orientation for post-modern applied linguistics in the third millennium. *Literator*, 24(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.4102/lit.v24i1.282>

Weideman, A. (2003b). Assessing and developing academic literacy. *Per Linguam*, 19(1&2), 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.5785/19-1-89>

Weideman, A. (2003c). Justifying course and task design in language teaching. *Acta Academica*, 35(3), 26–48. Retrieved October 4, 2023, from: <http://hdl.handle.net/11660/6820>

Weideman, A. (2006a). Transparency and accountability in applied linguistics. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 24(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073610609486407>

Weideman, A. (2006b). Assessing academic literacy in a task-based approach. *Language Matters*, 37(1), 81–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228190608566253>

Weideman, A. (2006c). A systematically significant episode in applied linguistics. *Journal for Christian Scholarship*, 42(Special edition 1), 231–244. <https://pubs.ufs.ac.za/index.php/tcw/article/view/103>

Weideman, A. (2007a). The redefinition of applied linguistics: Modernist and postmodernist views. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 25(4), 589–605. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073610709486483>

Weideman, A. (2007b). Overlapping and divergent agendas: Writing and applied linguistics research. In C. van der Walt (Ed.), *Living through languages: An African tribute to Rene Dirven* (pp. 147–163). African Sun Media.

Weideman, A. (2007c). Towards a responsible agenda for applied linguistics: Confessions of a philosopher. *Per Linguam*, 23(2), 29–53. <https://doi.org/10.5785/23-2-54>

Weideman, A. (2007d). *Academic literacy: Prepare to learn*. Van Schaik.

Weideman, A. (2009a). *Beyond expression: A systematic study of the foundations of linguistics*. Paideia Press in association with the Reformational Publishing Project. <https://albertweideman.files.wordpress.com/2016/04/beyond-expression-by-albert-weideman.pdf>

Weideman, A. (2009b). Constitutive and regulative conditions for the assessment of academic literacy. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 27(3), 235–251. <https://doi.org/10.2989/SALALS.2009.27.3.3.937>

Weideman, A. (2009c). Uncharted territory: A complex systems approach as an emerging paradigm in applied linguistics. *Per Linguam*, 25(1), 61–75. <https://doi.org/10.5785/25-1-29>

Weideman, A. (2011a). *Straddling three disciplines: Foundational questions for a language department. Acta Varia I. 30th D.F. Malherbe Memorial Lecture*. University of the Free State. https://albertweideman.files.wordpress.com/2016/04/straddling_three_disciplines_foundational-questions.pdf

Weideman, A. (2011b). *A framework for the study of linguistics*. Van Schaik/Paideia Press.

Weideman, A. (2011c). Academic literacy tests: Design, development, piloting and refinement. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 45(2), 100–113. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v45i2.6>

Weideman, A. (2011d). Ensuring coherence: Two solutions to organizing poetic language. *Koers*, 76(3), 449–460. <https://doi.org/10.4102/koers.v76i3.37>

Weideman, A. (2012). Validity and validation beyond Messick. *Per Linguam*, 28(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.5785/28-2-526>

Weideman, A. (2013a). The modal delimitation of the field of linguistics. *Journal for Christian Scholarship*, 49(4), 95–122.

Weideman, A. (2013b). Applied linguistics beyond postmodernism. *Acta Academica*, 45(4), 236–255. <https://journals.ufs.ac.za/index.php/aa/article/view/1424>

Weideman, A. (2013c). Academic literacy interventions: What are we not yet doing, or not yet doing right? *Journal for Language Teaching*, 47(2), 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v47i2.1>

Weideman, A. (2013d). Innovation and reciprocity in applied linguistics. *Literator*, 35(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/lit.v35i1.1074>

Weideman, A. (2015a). Autoethnography and the presentation of belief in scholarly work. *Journal for Christian scholarship*, 51(3), 125–141. <https://pubs.ufs.ac.za/index.php/tcw/article/view/382>

Weideman, A. (2015b). Uneasy lies the head: Poststructuralism in the midst of paradigm contestation in applied linguistics. *Koers*, 80(4). <https://doi.org/10.19108/koers.80.4.2247>

Weideman, A. (2017a). *Responsible design in applied linguistics: Theory and practice*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-41731-8>

Weideman, A. (2017b). Is die toegepaste taalkunde 'n onderdeel van die linguistiek? *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe*, 57(1), 137–153. <https://doi.org/10.17159/2224-7912/2017/v57n1a11>.

Weideman, A. (2017c). Does responsibility encompass ethicality and accountability in language assessment? *Language & Communication*, 57, 5–13. Breaking down barriers in applied linguistics: studies in honour of Alan Davies (1931–2015); edited by Cassie D. Leymarie and Sinfree B. Makoni. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2016.12.004>

Weideman, A. (2017d). The refinement of the idea of consequential validity within an alternative framework for responsible test design. In J. Allan & A. J. Artiles (Eds.), *Assessment inequalities: Routledge world yearbook of education* (pp. 218–236). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315517377>

Weideman, A. (2018). Positivism and postpositivism. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (Revision of 2013 contribution). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0920.pub2>

Weideman, A. (2019a). Degrees of adequacy: the disclosure of levels of validity in language assessments. *Koers*, 84(1). <https://doi.org/10.19108/KOERS.84.1.2451>

Weideman, A. (2019b). Validation and the further disclosures of language test design. *Koers*, 84(1). <https://doi.org/10.19108/KOERS.84.1.2452>

Weideman, A. (2019c). Definition and design: aligning language interventions in education. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, 56, 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.5842/56-0-782>

Weideman, A. (2019d). Assessment literacy and the good language teacher: four principles and their applications. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 53(1), 103–121. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v53i1.5>

Weideman, A. (2020). Complementary evidence in the early stage validation of language tests: Classical test theory and Rasch analyses. *Per Linguam*, 36(2), 57–75. <https://doi.org/10.5785/36-2-970>

Weideman, A. (2021). A skills-neutral approach to academic literacy assessment. In A. Weideman, J. Read, & T. du Plessis (Eds.), *Assessing academic literacy in a multilingual society: Transformation and transition* (New perspectives on language and education, Vol. 84, pp. 22–51). Multilingual Matters.

Weideman, A. (2022). Context, construct, and validation: A perspective from South Africa. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 19(2), 124–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2020.1860991>

Weideman, A. (2023a). Context is everything. Or is it? In D. F. M. Strauss (Ed.), *Discovering Dooyeweerd* (pp. 471–476). Paideia Press.

Weideman, A. (2023b). The practicality of theory: Reciprocity, assessment and applied linguistics. *SPIL Plus*, 66(1), 177–196. <https://doi.org/10.5842/66-1-935>

Weideman, A. (2024a). Yardsticks for the future of language assessment: Disclosing the meaning of measurement. In M. R. Salaberry, A. Weideman, & W. L. Hsu (Eds.), *Ethics and context in second language testing* (pp. 220–234). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003384922>

Weideman, A. (2024b). Advancing professionalisation: The achievement of language assessment literacy [Forthcoming]. In B. Baker & L. Taylor (Eds.), *Learning about assessing language: A matter of literacy or competency development?* (Studies in language testing). Cambridge University Press.

Weideman, A., & Deygers, B. (2024). Validity and validation: An alternative perspective. In M.R. Salaberry, A. Weideman, A., & W.L. Hsu (Eds.), *Ethics and context in second language testing: Rethinking validity in theory and practice* (pp. 28–50). : Routledge.

Weideman, A., & Rousseau, M. (1991). *Starting English*. Centaur/Heinemann.

Weideman, A., & Visser, S. (1986). A measure of texture: Cohesion in English radio drama dialogue and actual conversation. *South African Journal of Linguistics*, 4(2), 87–105.

Weideman, A., Tesfamariam, H., & Shaalukeni, L. (2003). Resistance to change in language teaching: Some African case studies. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 21(1 & 2), 67–76. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073610309486329>

Weideman, A., Patterson, R., & Pot, A. (2016). Construct refinement in tests of academic literacy. In J. Read (Ed.), *Post-admission language assessment in universities: International perspectives* (pp. 179–196). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39192-2>

Weideman, A., Du Plessis, C., & Steyn, S. (2017). Diversity, variation and fairness: equivalence in national level language assessments. *Literator*, 38(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/lit.v38i1.1319>

Weideman, A., Read, J., & Du Plessis, T. (Eds.). (2021). *Assessing academic literacy in a multilingual society: Transformation and transition*. (New perspectives on language and education, Vol. 84). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788926218>

Weir, C., & Roberts, J. (1994). *Evaluation in ELT*. Blackwell.

Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy: Planning and implementing learner training for language learners*. Prentice Hall.

Wenden, A., & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Prentice Hall.

Wesche, M. B. (1979). Learning behaviours of successful adult students on intensive language training. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 35(3), 415–430. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.35.3.415>

Wesche, M. B., & Skehan, P. (2002). Communicative, task-based, and content-based language instruction. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 207–228). Oxford University Press.

West, G. (2017). *Scale: The universal laws of life and death in organisms, cities and companies*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Wilkins, D. A. (1976). *Notional syllabuses: A taxonomy and its relevance to foreign language curriculum development*. Oxford University Press.

Woodward, T. (1988). *Loop input: A set of strategies designed to help language teacher trainees and teachers' self help groups add variety to training sessions*. Pilgrims Publications.

Wright, A., Betteridge, D., & Buckby, M. (1979). *Games for language learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Wylie, C., & Lyon, C. (2017). Supporting teacher assessment literacy: A proposed sequence of learning. *Teachers College Record*, 22193.

Xi, X. (2008). Methods of test validation. In E. Shohamy & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Language testing and assessment* (Encyclopedia of language and education) (Vol. 7, pp. 177–196). Springer.

Yeld, N. (2000). *The construct of the academic literacy test (PTEEP)* [Mimeo]. University of Cape Town.

Yeld, N. (2001). *Equity, assessment and language of learning: key issues for higher education selection and access in South Africa* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Cape Town.

Young, D. (2005). After 25 years, is SAALA making a difference to our research, understanding, teaching and language praxis in our multilingual society? [Keynote address] In J. Geldenhuys & B. Lepota (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Joint SAALA/LSSA 2005 Conference* 7 July 2005, Dikhololo (pp. 37–650). SAALA.

Zuaro, B., Soler, J., & Björkman-Nylen, B. (2022). Language policy in Italian universities Navigating the language ambiguities of higher education internationalisation. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 46, 231–255. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.21029.zua>

Index

A

Abstractions, 5, 28, 40, 43–46, 52, 109, 182, 216
Accessibility, 9, 17, 101, 125, 134, 174, 179–196, 203, 224, 236, 237, 240, 243, 245, 249, 260, 270
Accountability, 9, 17, 47, 88, 101, 145, 174, 180, 221, 228–246, 260, 270
Adaptations, 21, 111–127, 188, 189, 210, 211, 214
Adequacy, 16, 17, 34, 47, 61, 69, 97–110, 122, 154, 158, 175, 189, 199, 205, 232, 237, 245
Alignment, 17, 32, 34, 71, 107, 119, 148, 149, 154, 171, 189, 213, 217–228, 252, 260, 273
Alignment of interventions, 32, 218, 221, 223, 224, 227
Analysis, 3, 20, 43, 51, 73, 87, 97, 119, 129, 144, 161, 182, 197, 218, 230, 247, 262
Applied linguistic artefacts, 3, 6, 7, 9, 15, 17, 20, 21, 30, 38, 39, 41–46, 48, 52, 57, 60, 66, 73–75, 78, 103–106, 112, 115, 129–141, 144, 154, 163, 171, 218, 223, 235, 241, 245, 261, 272
Applied linguistic fundamentals, 5
Appropriateness, 33, 88, 100, 101, 109, 138, 164, 181, 183, 191–196, 199
Articulations, 17, 27, 30, 31, 36, 39, 42, 53, 145, 152, 157, 162–166, 173, 174, 180
Assumptions, 7, 20, 35, 47, 49, 53, 55, 65, 108, 131, 138, 202, 208, 248, 258, 262–264, 266–268, 272, 273
Attractiveness, 16, 129–141, 218

Awareness, 4, 15, 25, 28–31, 65, 74, 120, 121, 130–135, 138–141, 166, 167, 170, 210, 211, 220, 243, 251, 258

B

Beauty, 5, 46, 109, 217, 218, 227, 271
Beliefs, 2, 4, 11–14, 59, 66, 137, 158, 219, 221, 224, 225, 244, 252, 260–264, 266–268, 270–273
Beneficence, 248, 249, 251, 259
Blueprints, 20, 38–39, 41–43, 113, 163–169, 171–173, 180, 213

C

Care, 16, 20, 36, 44, 68, 70, 176, 238, 244, 246–260
Code of ethics, 237, 241, 248, 270, 271
Cognition, 59, 130, 136, 152
Commitments, 4, 8, 117, 118, 130, 148, 149, 226, 235, 252, 261–263, 266, 272
Compassion, 44, 176, 238, 244, 247–260
Conceptual primitives, 6, 45, 46, 48, 52, 109, 118
Consciousness, 265, 266, 271
Constancy, 87, 89, 93, 95
Constitutive concepts, 46, 48, 53, 88, 89, 158, 161, 162, 243, 245
Constructs, 25–27, 35, 37–39, 42, 46, 69, 94, 98, 99, 101, 107–109, 113, 145–148, 150–156, 163–169, 171, 172, 180, 184, 199, 200, 204, 211, 213, 220, 233, 236, 242, 243, 251, 265, 269

Coordination of design, 79
 Corrections, 6, 16, 36, 58, 202, 216, 224, 230–236, 238, 244, 251, 264, 268
 Creativity, 32, 33, 218, 219, 227
 Credibility, 11, 12, 24, 101, 153, 159, 268, 271

D

Deficit, 150
 Definition of applied linguistics, 4
 Designing language solutions, 17, 62, 134, 147, 232, 243–245, 259, 263, 268
 Design principles, 7, 15, 17, 25, 39, 42, 53, 61, 72, 78, 81, 115, 132, 137, 187, 200, 218, 232, 239, 252
 Developments, 1, 6, 16, 17, 26–28, 30–38, 42–44, 48, 52, 54, 56, 59, 65, 72, 75, 78, 81, 86, 89, 91, 92, 95, 99, 105, 106, 110, 112–115, 117–122, 126, 134, 141, 144, 146, 147, 150, 151, 155, 157, 161, 163, 168, 171–173, 181, 184–187, 189, 202, 206–208, 222–226, 235, 236, 239, 242–245, 248, 258–260, 263, 264, 267, 270, 273
 Differentiation, 17, 46, 76, 81, 83, 86, 90, 94, 99, 111–127, 133, 155, 158, 232, 245
 Diligence, 20, 35, 69, 106, 248, 260
 Duty, 173, 240, 248–250, 252, 253, 260, 270, 273
 Dynamism, 23

E

Eases, 107, 125, 134, 170, 171, 188–190
 Effectiveness, change, 12
 Efficiencies, 10, 16, 17, 24, 26, 30, 46, 78, 165, 166, 188, 189, 198, 200, 201, 207, 209, 215
 Efforts, 1–3, 16, 20, 79, 92, 93, 106, 120, 176, 184, 185, 189, 213, 220, 269
 Elegance, 218
 Emotions, 127, 130, 138–141, 158, 182
 Empirical, 16, 20, 33, 38, 39, 68, 69, 71, 93, 98, 129, 137, 140, 144, 149, 154–157, 159, 173–175, 191, 192, 239, 240
 Energy, 2, 44, 46, 58, 100, 117
 Evolution, 113, 114, 271
 Experiences, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 20, 26, 27, 32, 33, 35, 36, 43–49, 51, 52, 58–60, 71, 72, 74, 75, 78, 86–89, 95, 98, 106, 118, 121, 123, 129–132, 137–139, 141, 144, 151–153, 162–164, 167, 175, 176

180–182, 190, 196, 216–218, 220, 227, 231, 242, 245, 261, 262, 272, 273
 Expression of style, 62

F

Facility, 16, 78, 84–86, 91, 95, 107, 125, 134, 135, 137, 155–157, 164, 165, 170, 181, 187–190, 213
 Fairness, 17, 37, 46, 75, 88, 101, 140, 148, 180, 207, 216, 231, 234, 236–240, 245, 250, 251, 253–260, 270
 Feelings, 10, 121, 127, 130, 131, 138–141, 266
 Fits, 25, 71, 158, 181, 191–196, 207, 212
 Freedom, 9, 42, 55, 61, 179, 265, 266, 268, 272
 Frugality, 157, 198, 216, 218, 231

G

Growth, 9, 58, 59, 72, 110–112, 116–122, 185, 207, 258, 265, 267

H

Harmony, 16, 17, 30, 31, 34, 217, 218, 221, 223, 224, 227, 267, 273

I

Impact, 55, 131, 140, 146, 162, 174, 175, 200, 207, 240, 241, 243–246, 249–252, 254, 258, 271
 Implementations, 3, 10, 16, 26, 31, 32, 36, 38, 56, 57, 62, 76, 79–81, 90, 92, 102, 122, 130, 137, 140, 149, 158, 174, 181, 189, 201, 223, 225, 232, 270
 Inclusion, 157, 184, 188, 250
 Individualization, 82, 236, 237
 Informativity, 172–174, 240, 243, 245
 Initial solutions, 33
 Integrity, 16, 39, 44, 71, 72, 101, 164, 182, 216, 225–228, 249, 250, 252–253, 260, 266, 269, 270
 Interactions, 9, 13, 16, 42, 44, 60, 65, 66, 71, 90–92, 102, 115–117, 119–121, 130, 131, 133, 134, 146, 147, 149, 150, 152–154, 162, 180–188, 190, 191, 198, 200, 214, 220, 229, 230, 247, 264, 273

Interpretations, 14, 16, 17, 59, 70, 99–102, 105, 108, 109, 120–122, 131–133, 139, 140, 153, 174–176, 199, 200, 202, 204, 220, 224, 225, 234, 238, 265, 266, 268, 269

Intuition, 130, 156, 159, 202

Inventiveness, 227

J

Justice, 5, 46, 57, 102, 106, 109, 180, 183, 184, 216, 220, 229–246, 251, 258, 259

Justifications, 2, 7, 23–25, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35–38, 47, 49, 64, 66, 68, 77, 113, 131, 144, 149, 151, 202, 226, 230–232, 237, 240, 241, 263–266, 271

L

Language interventions, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15–17, 20–39, 41, 43, 44, 49, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, 61, 62, 65, 66, 68, 75, 76, 86–95, 102, 104–106, 110–112, 114–116, 118, 122, 125–127, 130, 134, 137–141, 144, 145, 154–156, 159, 162–167, 172, 174, 177, 179–216, 221, 227, 228, 231, 232, 239–241, 244, 245, 248, 252, 253, 259, 260, 263, 265, 268, 272, 273

Leading and founding functions of designs, 20, 21

Life, 23, 35, 58, 71, 82, 113–115, 121, 137, 139, 149, 153, 158, 215, 218, 230, 235, 237, 238, 240, 244, 248, 261, 263, 270

Logicals, 25, 36, 46, 51, 98, 144, 152–154, 163, 164

Logistics, 36, 188

Love, 16, 44, 63, 238, 246, 247, 260–262

M

Malice, 248, 260

Meaning of design, 38, 43, 46, 49, 175, 218, 231, 243, 244, 258–260

Meaningfulness, 17, 100, 104, 153, 161–177, 199, 251

Modernism, 2, 4, 5, 10, 13, 15, 17, 21, 57, 59, 89, 116, 158, 175, 183, 265

Multidimensionality, 103

O

Organization, 15, 17, 25, 62, 77, 81, 93, 111, 112, 115–116, 120, 122, 124, 125, 165–167, 208, 211

P

Perceptions, 12, 129–141, 258, 271

Persistence, 91–93

Phases of design, 20, 27, 43, 79

Plans, 3, 4, 7, 10, 14–17, 19–40, 42, 47, 52, 60, 61, 72–76, 78–81, 84, 91, 92, 97–110, 112–115, 122, 126, 131, 141, 153, 159, 179, 181–183, 192, 213, 222, 232, 237

Postmodernism, 4–6, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 23, 25, 57–59, 89, 183, 262, 265

Public knowledge of designs, 241

R

Rationality, 14, 17, 25, 72, 140, 141, 144, 145, 156, 158

Rectification, 36, 230–236, 241

Regularities, 47, 58, 92

Regulative ideas, 45, 46, 48, 79, 88, 89, 161,

162, 183, 197

Relevance, 16, 51, 116, 126, 137, 183, 209, 269

Reliability, 17, 24, 46, 47, 78, 85, 87–95, 97, 100, 108, 124, 155, 157, 212, 240, 243, 250, 251, 257, 260, 270

Repairs, 29, 36, 230–236, 244

Reputability, 46, 268–270, 273

Respects, 14, 44, 54, 62, 63, 67, 71, 75, 80, 83, 86, 91, 92, 98, 111, 118–120, 159, 164, 179, 183, 184, 203, 225, 233, 237, 239, 241–243, 247–260, 269, 270, 273

Responsible design, 15–17, 36, 105, 169, 200

S

Scientific, 2, 10–12, 14, 15, 20, 23, 27, 32, 35, 37, 58, 100, 103, 130, 144, 145, 153–155, 157–159, 182, 204, 247, 262–265, 271, 273

Security, 82, 263, 270–273

Sensitivity, 34, 121, 130–135, 137, 138, 164,

165, 184, 210, 220, 258, 271

Stewardship, 273

Subjectivities, 57, 60, 102, 116, 131–135, 138, 258, 268

T

Technical appeal, 91

Technical cause and effect, 71, 89, 110

Technical coherence, 48, 53, 88

Technical consistency, 47, 83, 85, 86, 89–91, 93–95, 124, 155, 158, 194, 232, 245

Technical continuity and discontinuity, 21, 22
 Technical environment, 82
 Technical facts, 17, 42, 52, 53, 56, 62–66, 73, 81–82, 86, 95, 104, 110, 139, 172, 258, 263
 Technical forces, 98, 101, 102, 106, 199, 224, 250
 Technical imagination, 20, 22, 32–33, 35, 36, 39, 126, 144, 158, 165, 169, 196, 198, 202, 207, 209, 210
 Technical limitations, 77, 78
 Technical maturity, 113
 Technical means and ends, 37, 157
 Technical memory, 139
 Technical movement, 89
 Technical norms, 17, 41, 42, 52–57, 75, 78, 86, 90, 91, 95, 104, 110, 112, 114, 163–167, 169, 172
 Technical objects, 40, 52, 60, 61, 66, 68, 69, 79, 83, 84, 91–95, 101–104, 106–110, 115, 122, 129–131, 145, 156, 163, 165, 174, 175, 181, 182, 188, 189, 198, 206, 218, 230, 233, 234, 245, 247, 252, 263, 268
 Technical operation, 46, 72
 Technical orders, 53–58
 Technical procedures, 97, 103–105
 Technical processes, 98, 103–105, 174, 181, 233
 Technical range, 74–76, 153, 158
 Technical record of design process, 167
 Technical scope, 55, 74–79, 86
 Technical subjects, 40, 52, 58–62, 66, 79–82, 91–93, 102–105, 114, 115, 130, 131, 144, 145, 156, 168, 172, 174, 175, 181–183, 188, 198, 200, 202, 210, 218, 220, 221, 225, 227, 230, 233, 235, 242, 248, 250, 252, 262
 Technical system, 53, 55, 56
 Technical-theoretical, 159, 263
 Technical unity and multiplicity, 51, 158
 Technical vitality, 114
 Technicism, 90, 157, 159
 Theoretical justification of design, 23, 113, 263, 266
 Theory, 4, 20, 43, 52, 84, 88, 99, 111, 130, 144, 175, 187, 232, 262
 Theory of applied linguistics, 7, 14, 20, 40, 43–46, 48, 49, 52, 72, 89, 103, 104, 106, 130, 175, 176, 273
 Trade-offs, 198, 201, 202
 Transactions, 191, 198, 209–214
 Transparency, 170, 172–174, 176, 180, 237, 240, 243, 245, 249, 260, 270
 Trustworthiness, 17, 244, 261–273

U
 Usefulness, 6–8, 60, 90, 95, 101, 102, 157, 198–201, 218, 244, 251, 260

Utility, 10, 16, 17, 46, 88, 165, 197–216, 245

V
 Validity, 5, 7, 11, 17, 46, 47, 55, 61, 69, 71, 75, 89, 95, 97–110, 122, 137, 150–154, 167, 174, 175, 189, 198–200, 204, 205, 236, 238, 240, 243, 250–252, 260, 270

Volition, 130, 136–137, 141

W
 Wastage, 168, 203, 206, 213, 218