Issue of Identity and Boundary between Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching

Hayat Al-Khatib
English Department, Arab Open University
Beirut, Lebanon

Abstract
This paper examines debate in applied linguistics stemming from disputes surrounding its nature, scope and relationship with theoretical linguistics and English language teaching. The paper inspects radical ideas on applied linguistics and the discipline's connection with linguistics and English language teaching, through an examination of conflicting definitions and contemporary research interests. Set against the theoretical frames of post-modernist and post structuralist perspectives, the discipline of applied linguistics presents a wide spectrum of perceptions and models, ranging from the restricted to the open field. The current crisis of identity and boundary between applied linguistics and English language teaching is traced to historical and conceptual premises. The historical development of the field and the main changes affecting its focus are correlated with the global spread of English and the ensuing concerns. The conceptual premise is addressed with respect to the changes in the linguistic theory. The position adopted in this paper is that applied linguistics is not an extension of English language teaching. Applied linguistics incorporates English language teaching or language in the classroom perspective and with the same clarity and precision offers through disciplined and methodological enquiry a macro frame that incorporates all aspects of language in communication. The paper concludes with the proposition of two frames in applied linguistics, each with specific concerns and possibilities: a macro applied linguistic frame which considers applications of language within the large area of interdisciplinary language-related studies, and a micro applied linguistic frame which considers pedagogic and educational concerns and is reserved for ELT.
Keywords: applied linguistics, ELT, macro and micro frames, post-structuralist, post-modernist.

Introduction
        Controversy surrounding the substance and practice of applied linguistics remains a strong feature that indicates lack of agreement on the nature of the discipline, its scope and target, specifically in relation to theoretical linguistics and English language teaching (ELT) (Kaplan, 2002; Davies, 2007; Cook, 2005). Widdowson (2006) perceives that despite institutional recognition for the field of applied linguistics, consensus in relation to what the term actually encapsulate remains a long term goal.

        Radical proponents of the pedagogic perspective perceive that applied linguistics should be solely concerned with language problems in the classroom setting (Stern, 1983; Catford, 1998; Lantoff, 2000). While contemporary research considers applied linguistics as an open field (Rampton, 1997) of meticulous enquiry into contexts of application where language, and not necessarily English, is the main focus (Kendon, 2004; Kress & Van Leeuwan, 2001).

        The aim of this paper is to explore contemporary arguments and research interests in applied linguistics to identify the scope of the discipline and hence contribute to profiling its nature and characteristics, both in relation to theoretical linguistics and English language teaching(ELT).

Issue of Identity and Boundary
   The Nature and Scope of Applied Linguistics
    Grabe (2002) proposes that contemporary applied linguistics includes linguistics but is not merely linguistics; it is relatively new and few people understand it. Within its bounds, it includes several perspectives that recognize overarching connections between predominant entities and develop theoretical models that can account for practical language use in diverse contexts. Kramsch notes (2000), "the field of applied linguistics speaks with multiple voices". It incorporates multi-disciplinary knowledge and is, therefore, of necessity, interdisciplinary (p. 317).

     Cook (2003) and Davies (1999) explain that in the last twenty years, the field of applied linguistics has considerably expanded to transcend the familiar territory of traditional scholars, and this, in Cook and Davies' view, constructed the basis of the controversy in setting the discipline's current boundaries and defining its focus. Cook (2006) confirms that applied linguistics has come to mean many things to many people.

    On the one hand, traditional scholars have recognized applied linguistics as bound in focus and orientation to making language pedagogy more effective (Catford, 1998; Lantoff, 2000; Stern, 1983). Traditional views have always associated studies on language with the educational enterprise. On the other hand, more recent scholarly works brought new conceptions of applied linguistics that make no mention of language teaching, e.g. Kaplan (2002), Schmitt & Celce-Murcia (2002), Kress & Van Leeuwan (2002), Cook (2003), and Gass & Makoni (2004).

   Contemporary Research in Applied Linguistics
     In exploring contemporary works in applied linguistics, new research interests emerge that developed beyond the pedagogic focus of the classroom. A major contributor to the discipline, Fairclough (1999) focuses his works on investigating the relationship between language and

power in the context of British politics and institutional discourse. Goddard (2002) explores the language of advertisement and electronic texts. North (2007) focuses within applied linguistics, on the role of new technologies in supporting the development of language and literacy skills. Van Dijk (1989) works on racial prejudice in language. Stubbs (2001) presents discourse prosody as an area of enquiry. Hart (2013) explores novel applications that incorporated socio-cognitive approaches in discourse analysis, to evaluate grammar patterns and structural configuration.

From a sociolinguistic focus Swann (2012a, 2012b), researches within applied linguistics, areas pertaining to the interrelationship between language, gender and sociolinguistics. Maybin (2012) authors courses for the Open University on the informal language and literary practices of children and adults, within the area of applied linguistic. Cook and Walter (2005) explore language rituals and language play within the discipline of applied linguistics. In contemporary research the focus of applied linguistics expanded beyond English language teaching and the classroom context.

Expanded Fields of Enquiry
In proposing new connections and orientations, Eckert (2013) examined the relationship between linguistic variation and social identity. Rampton (2014) explores through ethnography, ethnicity and language in adolescent communication. Macdonald (2001) focuses within applied linguistics, on the relationship between graffiti and identity and their role in the emergence of subcultures in London and New York.

Furthermore, in expanding the context of language investigation, Wilson (2009) researches within applied linguistics the language of inmates to explore prisoners' efforts to maintain social rather than institutional identities. Woodak (2000) explores the construction of national identities through language and discrimination in mass media and politics in Austria.

In extending notions of language to semiotics and communication, Scollon and Scollon (2003) employ visual semiotics in considering discourse. Chandler (2007) focuses extensively within applied linguistics on visual semiotics in relation to gender and identity.

This overview of contemporary works in the field of applied linguistics reflects a wide array of interests that transcends theoretical linguistic models and is at the same time not restricted to language teaching. Rutten (2014), in the 48th anniversary of the linguistic societies in Europe, proposed a shift in focus from structural assessment of language and language contact to explore the stakeholders' sociolinguistic conditions of the language contact, explicitly in terms of attitudes, perceptions, ideologies, identity and planning. Language analysis focused on levels beyond the correct applications of grammar and phonologic rules.

It follows from the above that contemporary research in applied linguistics expanded to include pedagogic interests, political interest, socio-cultural concerns, socio-cognitive approaches, visual semiotics, in addition to interests and applications that attempt to solve contemporary concerns where language, in all its forms, is the main feature. Our first proposition, therefore, is that the field of applied linguistics has expanded in recent years to focus on all aspects of language use.

Applied Linguistics and Contemporary Theoretical Frames
Post-Modernist and Post-Structuralist Influences
Current theoretical perceptions on applied linguistics are rooted in the post-modernist and post-structuralist thoughts of the 1980s. With the rise of relativism (Peim, 1993; Block, 1996) new possibilities were explored that extended beyond the structural realms of linguistic theory. Peim (1993) proposes a chaotic model of applied linguistics in which,

> the implications of post-structuralist, sociological and sociolinguistic theory throws into doubt all the language practice of (the discipline) English…the realization of a general field of language and textually systematically excluded from English represents greatly extended possibilities…to reconstruct English language and textuality to address issues of race, class and gender, issues in relation to culture and democracy, concerning among other things language differences and power… means to be literate (pp 8-9)

Against the stipulated structural models, Block (1996) argue for an approach to language study that is, "extremely sensitive to changes of context" (p.77). Views on the necessity of perceiving harmony with context in language use and the diverse types of knowledge and performance started to mark a new belief in the inability of any single theory to account for a phenomenon by reducing it to elementary systems. Block proposes (1996), "that we evaluate (language) theories in relation to context and purpose" (p. 77).

Critical Theoretical Models
Fairclough (1989) advocates a critical theoretical model of language studies in which he suggests that a theory on language study cannot content itself with an evaluation of the distribution and classification of language units. Fairclough (1989) proposes the need to treat language holistically and apply critical discourse technique to

> show up connections which may be hidden from people – such as connections between language, power and ideology … to study and analyze social interactions in a way which focuses upon the linguistic elements, and which sets out to show up their generally hidden determinants in the system of social relationship as well as hidden effects they may have upon that system (p.5).

Pennycook (1994) provides a similar view on an approach that, "offers a number of possibilities for engaging critically with language and meaning … (that) locates the context of language user, the speakers and their interaction in a wider social, cultural and political context.."(p. 133)

Post-structuralist and post-modernist critiques on language study, therefore, paved the way for an explanatory theory on language that extends beyond the normative perspectives of the linguistic or the social, to account for centripetal and centrifugal forces entwined with the language application. Hammersley (1996) explains, "a central feature of both linguistics and much social science in the twentieth century has been a rejection of normative approaches in favour of an exclusive concern for factual inquiry" (pp.4-5).

Extreme Open models

From an extreme post-modernist view, Rampton (1997) proposes a fluid theoretical model of applied linguistics that involves all users. Rampton's (1997) model is:

> understood as an open field of interest in language, in which those inhibiting or passing through simply show a common commitment to the potential value of dialogue with people who are different, there is no knowing where, between whom or on what the most productive discussions will emerge (p.14).

Brumfit (1997, p. 91) frames the discipline more reservedly, as concerned with the task to "theorize and analyze social roles and institutions which address language problem". Brumfit's model is structured around the notion of applied linguistics as, "the theoretical and empirical investigation of real world problems in which language is a central issue" (1997, p. 93). The contemporary theoretical frames of applied linguistics yield models of a wide spectrum, ranging from the focused and restricted to the relativist, open field and even chaotic archetypes. The following section examines the models from theoretical and pedagogic perspectives.

Applied Linguistics and Linguistics

Accommodation or Expansion?

From a more focused perspective, Brumfit (1997) perceives applied linguistics as "the theoretical and empirical investigation of real-world problems in which language is a central issue" (p.93). In attempting to position applied linguistics in relation to linguistics beyond mere accommodation, the discipline incorporates, in practice, expanded fields of investigation where language is the main concern.

Davies (1999) explains that the purpose of applied linguistics is to solve or at least ameliorate social problems involving language. The current applications, as evident in the above review, did not confine language investigation to the reconfirmation of the subfields of phonetics, phonology, syntax or morphology.   Wilkins (1997) provides:

> In a broad sense, applied linguistics is concerned with increasing understanding of the role of language in human affairs and thereby with providing the knowledge necessary for those who are taking language related decisions, whether the need for these arise in the classroom, the workplace, the law court, or the laboratory (P.7).

The structural components of theoretical linguistics: sounds and their production, words and their formation, sentences and their organization are enacted in applied linguistics to serve particular cases of enquiry. Schmitt & Celce-Murcia (2002) perceive that, "applied linguistics is using what we know about language, how it is learned, and how it is used, in order to achieve same purpose or solve some problems in the real world" (p.1).

Contemporary Language Applications

Following the expansion of English to become an international language, "the theoretical and empirical investigation of real world problems in which language is a central issue" (Brumfit, 1997, p. 93) revolved mainly around communication in English in the global context. The focus

of western scholars turned to miscommunication, racial discourse, media and institutional discourse, among other fields of language application.

Contemporary research in applied linguistics identifies new language applications introduced by a large variety of approaches to language and discourse (Flowerdew & Li Wei, 2013). Existing sub branches of the field now include: language and education in areas of studies pertaining to first language and additional language; clinical linguistics; neurolinguistics and the study and treatment of speech and communication impairment; psycholinguistics and the study of psychological factors that enable the comprehension and production of language; language assessment and testing; the evaluation of language achievement and proficiency both in first and additional languages; workplace communication and how language contributes to the nature and power relations in institutional discourse; language planning and decisions about official status of languages and their institutional use; computational linguistics and the use of computers in language analysis and use; forensic linguistics and linguistic evidence in criminal and legal investigation; literary stylistics and the relationship between linguistic choices and literary effects; critical discourse analysis and persuasive uses of language; marketing and politics; translation and interpretation; lexicography and the planning and compiling of bilingual and monolingual dictionaries and thesauri; pragmatics and sociocultural and ethnographic communication.

It follows thus that, due to the nature of its focus and since the field of the language application is frequently associated with social and psychological contexts of politics, power, culture, ideologies, perceptions and others, applied linguistics has moved beyond the structural components of linguistics to examine interdisciplinary phenomena arising from the intersections between the fields of theoretical linguistics, pedagogy, psychology, ethnography and sociology.

The analysis of the conditions and consequences of the language application mandates interdisciplinary assessment that cannot be confined to pure theoretical linguistics profiling. Our second proposition, therefore, is that theoretical linguistics remains concerned with structural linguistic description while applied linguistics involved the application of knowledge that stems from linguistics to practical interdisciplinary matters that involves language use.

Applied Linguistics and ELT
Dependency or Autonomy?
As mentioned earlier, controversy surrounding the nature and scope of applied linguistics raised concerns on its focus. The golden enterprise in real world problems involving language was English language teaching which was exported to the globe, in all its English as a Second Language (ESL), English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as an Additional Language (EAL) forms. As a consequence of this fragmentation, applied linguistics started to slip back towards the orbit of linguistics as propositions started to resurface that applied linguistics is no more than the application of linguistics.

In this contemporary period and following the above discussion, two radical positions on applied linguistics emerge: the position of pioneering scholars who advocate applied linguistics as a dynamic and interdisciplinary field, embracing several perspectives and theoretical trends, and the position of orthodox scholars who continue to exert unyielding opposition to any

exploration that challenges the English language teaching (ELT) oriented conservatism. Applied linguistics remained vehemently defended against explorations beyond ELT focus.

Smith (2011) refers to "a current crisis in the relationship between applied linguistics and English language teaching" (plenary address). Smith (2011) identifies three substrands of the crisis that underlined the controversy, "a crisis of neglect; a crisis of unfulfilled possibilities and a crisis of faith".

The crisis of neglect refers to the inadequate treatment of the field of applied linguistics by traditional ELT practitioners. The fossilized views, maintained by academics of the previous decades whose conceptions of applied linguistics constrain it within the realms of 1970 theories, restricted conceptualizations of the discipline to linguistic driven notions. This resulted in stunted acknowledgement of its subfields. Applied linguistics, for these academics, remains the application of linguistic theory to practical tasks with the overall aim of improving English language teaching.

The crisis of unfulfilled possibilities marked overlooking the interdisciplinarity progression of the principled eclecticism that applied linguistics offered, between practice and a variety of possible source disciplines, incorporating social, political and educational considerations, to name but a few. Proponents of disciplinarity defended discipline orthodoxy within area studies, on the basis of attaining good scholarship. However, "embracing silos" has come under a lot of criticism by contemporary scholars who argue that disciplinarity, or the belief that academic work should suffice itself by its internal standards, can no longer be valid in the twenty-first century, specifically when knowledge requires more predisposition towards larger frames that can provide a more coherent and holistic representation. Frodeman (2013) argues that living in an age where academic autonomy is increasingly monitored by greater demands for accountability to society would require academics to recognize interdisciplinary trends and work with them, rather than mindlessly dismiss them. Orthodox views on pure disciplines were no longer sufficient for the state of knowledge required in the twenty-first century (Grabe, 2010).

The crisis of faith identifies doubts in the minds of conformist ELT proponents and disbelief in the ability of applied linguistics to embrace vast applications of language, above the clause level, that can inform long established theories such as Saussure's structuralism (1967), functional linguistics (Halliday & Hasan, 1989), semantics (Jackendoff, 1990; Levin & Pinker, 1991; Schiffrin, 1987), pragmatics (Austin, 1962; Levinston, 1983; Leech, 1983; Van Dijk, 1977; Yule, 1983), cognitive evaluation (Geeraerts, 2006; Croft & Cruse, 2004; Tyler, 2002; Evans *et al,* 2007), as well as pedagogic and developmental areas.

Autonomy and Interdisciplinarity
Despite fluctuating conceptual opinions, applied linguistics continued to develop beyond ELT boundaries. Spolsky proposes, "applied linguistics is now a cover term for a sizeable group of semi-autonomous disciplines, each dividing its parentage and allegiances between the formal study of language and other relevant fields, and each working to develop its own methodologies and principles" (Spolsky, 2005, p. 36).

According to Brumfit, applied linguistics must draw on psychology, sociology, education, language teaching, success and failure, cultural and gender issues, technology and lack of resources in its attempt to find solutions to real world problems (1997).

Widdowson (1997) proposes to differentiate between perceptions of "linguistics applied" and "applied linguistics". In his seminal work on Models and Fictions, Widdowson (1984) explains that, "applied linguistic can be understood as a kind of linguistics, like historical linguistics or folk linguistics. This presumably allows its practitioners to define an independent perspective on the general phenomenon of language and to establish principles of enquiry without necessary reference to those which inform linguistics. With linguistics applied we do not have this option. Whatever, we do with linguistics; however we apply it, the informing principles which define this area of enquiry, already pre-established, must remain intact"(p. 21).

It follows that linguistics applied is theory-driven application that tests the extent of a specific linguistic feature, while applied linguistics is an autonomous and problem oriented discipline. Our third proposition is that while linguistics applied is solely focused on ELT and its subcategories of ESL, EFL and EAL, applied linguistics is concerned with all contexts of language use, beyond the classroom. The following section provides a chronological analysis of the development and change in the field of language studies.

The Chronological Perspective
The Historical Premise
  Cook (2005) identified three historical phases contributing to the change in focus and the resulting controversy: the pre-1980s period, the pre-1990s period and the present time. According to Cook (2005) each period was associated with a change in the conception of applied linguistics as well as a change in its perspective and focus.

In its early use, applied linguistics was taken to mean a more linguistically informed approach to language teaching. Between 1960-1970 it was taken for granted that applied linguistics was about language teaching. Early applied linguistics was largely seeking to bridge the gap between the theoretical linguistics and the reality of classroom pedagogical practices. One of the factors that contributed to this association was the development of second language acquisition field of study, following the spread of English to non-native contexts of use. Therefore, in the minds of English language practitioners of the period, English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL), as ELT precepts, became synonymous with applied linguistics. In 1970s two new trends were developed: contrastive linguistics and the psychology of second language learning, both seen from the perspective of classroom needs. Therefore, the development of applied linguistics gained more territory, as an ELT-focused discipline, with the increasing interest in EFL and ESL. The popularity of the term grew later on when journals and institutes in many countries embraced this designation.

Progressive Recognition in Research
Since 1980 the term, applied linguistics, has begun to be used to refer to a growing diversity of language-related areas beyond pedagogic contexts (Brumfit, 1991). The Journal of Applied Linguistics published by the University of Michigan, which was one of the most prominent orthodox journals belonging to the orthodox tradition of Charles Fries and Robert Lado, started

to accept in 1993 a range of coverage beyond the pedagogic context. This in itself constituted a significant departure from the traditional ELT oriented perspective. The journal's editors remarked that they encouraged the submission of manuscripts from diverse disciplines, including applications of methods and theories from linguistics as well as culture, cognition, pragmatics, psycholinguistics, cognitive sciences, ethnography, ethnomethodology, sociolinguistics, sociology, semiotics, educational inquiry and cultural studies.

Moreover, the contemporary brochure of applied linguistics of Mouton de Gruyter, one of the world's leading publishers in the fields of linguistics and communication now includes a diverse range of humor studies, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, rhetoric, language teaching, language acquisition (L1 and L2), psycho/neuro linguistics, text processing, translation, computational linguistics, corpus linguistics, machine translation, language control and dialectology. Routledge series on applied linguistics now publishes in the areas of intercultural communication, pragmatics, language and education, language and interaction, language and gender, literacy, bilingualism, English for academic purposes, second language acquisition, translation, grammar and context.

In addition, the Oxford journal of Applied Linguistics now accepts contributions in the areas of computer mediated communication (CMC), conversation analysis, corpus linguistics, critical discourse analysis, deaf linguistics, discourse analysis and pragmatics, first and additional language learning, teaching and use, forensic linguistics, language assessment, bilingualism and multilingualism, language planning and policies, language for special purposes, lexicography, literacies, multimodal communication, rhetoric and stylistics and translation.   Therefore, contemporary reputable publishers are now considering a wider spectrum of works in the field of applied linguistics that surpass ELT and encompass research and theory from an array of interdisciplinary fields.

Beyond Normative Models
Conversely, in more recent works, conversational analysts, semioticians and sociolinguistics are proposing highly revolutionary frames for applied linguistics that focus on paralinguistic models. Cook (2001), Kress & Van Leeuwan (2001) and Finnegan (2002) are suggesting that multimodal systems of communication, nonverbal communication and paralanguage are inseparable from language and essential to language and communication analysis. Ironically English language testing providers were the first to incorporate such propositions in their models, e.g. Oxford Online Placement Test (OOPT), International English Language Testing Scheme (IELTS) and others. Therefore, our fourth proposition is that, in the current period of computer mediated communication, applied linguistics is considering nonverbal and multimodal modes of communication. It is ameliorating according to the new dimensions of application and users. It is making use of technology to develop its focus and application beyond traditional prescriptivism and to embrace communication in all its forms. The following section examines the conceptual development of applied linguistics.

The Conceptual Premise
Developments in Conceptual Frames
The changes in linguistic theory in the 1970s saw a shift away from the description and study of language, seen purely as a formal system, towards the study of language as

communication. The structural approach to language was not able to deliver the anticipated outcomes. Moreover, linguistics itself has changed over the last twenty years (Applied Linguistics 21.1, pp. 3-25).

However, the above contemporary growing conceptions of applied linguistic were not accepted without opposition. Traditional scholars continued to work within the preset structural boundaries of applying language theories to teaching and learning and thus ignoring the interdisciplinary developments in the field.

Universal and Unitary Frames

Chomskyan linguistics and other cognitive and structural approaches considered language as a structural universal and uniform system regardless of the context of application. This view continued to influence conceptions and approaches to language studies despite diverse learners' needs. The proposed structural components influenced applied research specifically in second language acquisition. Chomsky's linguistic rules were not pedagogic explanations of language functioning but rules of great abstractness and intricacy, inherent in the structure of language. Focusing on structure was not helping language students communicate effectively. Insights into the abstract nature of language and the structural theories could not explain aspects of language in communication.

Language teaching was exclusively about getting learners to understand and use language in its spoken and written forms. This was not successful without reference to influential social and cultural prompts and expectation, which are integrated with it and fundamental to the appropriate imparting and comprehension of the linguistic performance. Stern (1983) points out that, "the practical demands of a communicative approach to language teaching ran ahead of existing (linguistic) theory and research" (p.178).

Contextual Frames

Lyons (1999) explains: "theoretical linguistics studies language and languages with a view to constructing a theory of their structures and functions and without regard to any practical applications that the investigation of language and languages might have, whereas applied linguistics has its concerns in the applications of the concepts and findings of linguistics to a variety of practical tasks including (but not solely constrained to) language teaching" (p.35). The linguistic form was no longer the main concern.

The changes from structural and phonetic to communicative language approaches resulted from realizations of the impractical and unreliable considerations of language theories dissociated from psychological and social considerations.   Krashen's influential theory on second language acquisition in 1982 reflected the increasing influence of pyscholinguistics and advocated new pedagogic principles of comprehensible input in second language acquisition. This again challenged the foundations of purely theoretical perspectives in language teaching and provided a radical alternative to the memorization of structural and linguistic rules. Mimicking in audiolingualism and drilling in grammar were soon abandoned as research established the need to consider the language performance within real communication encounters and assess the appropriateness of language in relation to context of application.

A substantial body of work on communication moved away from a view of language as a separated self-contained system towards the description and analysis of language as a channel of communication that complements other semiotic systems (Finnegan, 2002; Kendon, 2000 & 2004; McNeil, 2000). The shift included in the analysis of language theoretical concepts from sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, pragmatics and semantics. Instructing linguistic knowledge was not enough, as evident in the performance of learners.

The conceptualization of language as communication had an impact on the micro-context of ELT, among others. Language teaching started to include aspects of social and cultural norms of communication. Students were required to develop communicative skills and functional competence in addition to mastering language structures. At the same time, the developing conceptions on language application and language as communication could not be restricted to English language teaching and the classroom.

Widdowson (1997) contends, as oversimplistic, the reigning conceptions on applied linguistics as synonymous with language teaching, "I want to question the common assumption that a linguistic model of language must of necessity serve as an underlying frame of reference for language teaching" (p. 9). The joint American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) and the International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA) world congress in 2005 presented 1263 sessions covering novel topics, themes and approached. The journal Applied Linguistics currently identifies areas of interest where submissions are invited in the following fields: first and second language learning and teaching, critical linguistics, discourse analysis, language in education, language planning, languages testing, lexicography, stylistics and rhetoric, translation, multilingualism and multilingual education. A similar range of interest is reflected in British Association of Applied Linguistics (BAAL) conferences Special Interest Groups (SIGs), scientific commissions of the learned societies for applied linguistics as well as post graduate programs and survey books (Cook, 2005).

Synthesis of Multiple Frames

Hudson (1999) conceives of applied linguistics as a synthesis of research from many disciplines, including but not solely focused on, linguistics. Cook (2003) perceives of applied linguistics as, "the academic discipline concerned with the relation of knowledge about language to decision making in the practical world" (p.125).

Sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, semantics, speech act theory and pragmatics had a major impact on the analysis of language in context, culminating in a radical reaction to the predominant restrictive view of language teaching. Wilkins (1976) produced a notional syllabus of language teaching that changed the traditional foundations of language teaching as it applied Halliday's functionalism and Austin's speech acts which focused, in guiding the teaching syllabus, on the notions and functions that the learner needs in order to communicate .

In addition, the Council of Europe, in the 1970s, developed new syllabi to language teaching that were based on semantic and sociolinguistic concepts including the notions and functions of language (Van Ek, 1975). The new syllabi provided inventories that specified learners' roles in specific situations, settings and topics. English language teaching expanded to target the sociolinguistic context of the language in its quest for appropriateness of performance.

At a later date and with the extension of scope to cover, "the theoretical and empirical investigation of real world problems in which language is a central issue" (Brumfit, 1997, p. 91), applied linguistics was utilized in the study of spoken and written discourse and incorporated gender issues, social stratification, neurological concerns, language dysfunction, learning strategies, special learning needs, power and ideology. Pennycook (2004) argues, "critical applied linguistics opens up a whole new array of questions and concerns, such as identity, gender, access, ethics, disparity, difference" (pp. 803-804).

Widdowson (2000) notes that in the past, "it all seemed straightforward enough: linguistics decontextualized language and applied linguistics re-contextualized it, and reconstructed reality in the process. In this respect, linguistics was the science (like physics) and applied linguistics its technology (like engineering)" (p.4).

Baynham (2001) confirms that, "applied linguistics … has undergone a significant broadening of its scope and now contributes its theoretical perspective to a range of areas" (p. 26). It has expanded its scope to understand practices and recognize the complexities of language communication not only in the classroom. Major subfields now include; discourse analysis, conversational analysis, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, translation studies, computational linguistics, language learning and teaching including second language acquisition and language testing, pragmatics and corpus linguistics (Brumfit, 1991; Cook, 2003; Widdowson, 2000). The fifth proposition is that the discipline started a strong departure from conservative beliefs and practices to embrace contemporary multiple concerns and offer, through methodological and disciplined enquiry, linguistic insights assisting other disciplines. This expansion, however, was not without a price. So amidst arguments and counter arguments on the nature and scope of applied linguistics how should we perceive the discipline and construe its relationship with linguistics and English language teaching?

The Macro and Micro Frames of Applied Linguistics
Pedagogic Focus
The growing number of English language learners in the last decades compelled English language studies to focus mainly on the problems of language teaching and learning within a pedagogic perspective of English language in EFL, ESL and EAL contexts in the applied linguistics approach. Crystal (1997) provides that there will be around 350 million second language speakers of English and 100 million highly competent foreign language speakers. Native speakers of English are around 427 million, according to the same source (p. 360). The spread of English to non-native contexts provided reasons to focus on developing the area of English language teaching in the main subfields of language acquisition through research and experimentation. In some contexts, the relationship of applied linguistics to second language pedagogy is misleading to the point of misrepresentation. However, the current debate is also expanding the ELT theme through arguments and counter arguments on World Englishes, global English and the internationalization of English in lingua franca contexts.

On the one hand, Crystal (2001) defends the need to associate applied linguistics with English language teaching, "the most well developed branch of applied linguistics is the teaching and learning of foreign languages, and sometimes the term is used as if this were the only field involved" (p.23). Corder, too, adopts a pedagogic orientation to his proposition, (1973), "of all

the areas of applied linguistic, none has shown the effects of linguistic findings, principles and techniques more than foreign language teaching – so much so that the term 'applied linguistic' is often taken as being synonymous with that task" (ii).

Therefore, following the spread of global English as an international language to many parts of the world, applied linguistics developed a separate area of theoretically inspired and respectable research into language acquisition. The term applied linguistics became mainly associated with second language acquisition. However, in the process of language acquisition, a learner was expected to learn the discourse of the target language within a short period. Form was not the only concern. Learners needed to be able to use structural elements appropriately in different social situations.

Sociolinguistic Frame

Hymes underlined the need to expand the focus within ELT itself, "there are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless" (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, pp.153-155). In addition, the global spread of English brought with it new anxieties on cultural relativity and appropriateness and wider concerns on identity, ideology and dominance as language became the vessel of thoughts and ways of life to its users.

After World War II and the expansion of English, English Language teaching brought to focus a number of problems that learners encountered in second language acquisition, as well as a number of problems associated with teachers, trainers and supervisors who lacked adequate language knowledge and teaching skills. From this perspective, applied linguistics in the pre-1980 period was mainly focused on solving pedagogic language problems; ESL, EFL, EAL, first and second language acquisition including cognition and understanding, assessment, practices, training and all aspects relating to pedagogic linguistics (Grabe, 2010) .

Jenkins (2014) proposed that from the late 1970s research into English for speakers for whom it is not the mother tongue has grown dramatically (CLERA conference). Interest in different English varieties used and more recently English as the lingua franca (ELF) explored how English is used in intercultural communication. From this perspective, applied linguistics moved to a wider cultural arena and was no longer centrally engaged with English language teaching (ELT). Despite pedagogic interest in this context, applied linguistics is concerned with the application of linguistic theories, methods and findings to language problems in contexts of application that are not limited to the classroom. Sociolinguistics, a major field within applied linguistics, focuses on language problems in all social contexts of use.

The golden years of ELT oriented applied linguistics in the UK were between 1970s and 1980s with the wide spread of the communicative approach that charted syllabus design and the principles of practice. Communicative language teaching (CLT), or the communicative approach, emphasized interaction as both the means and ultimate goal of language study. Language was conceptualized in the context of communication. The communicative approach, however, acknowledged the societal influences in the academic and educational syllabi. A later expansion of the scope included language problems in translation, lexicography rhetoric, advertisement, marketization, journal gendered language, racial discourse, institutional discourse, language and power, computer-mediated-communication, cultural, political alignment

and stranding of language, pragmatics and miscommunication. Seidlhofer & Breivik (2004) perceive of contemporary applied linguistics as a "mediated intervention which seeks a negotiated settlement of language problems through the reconciliation of different and sometimes conflicting perspectives" (ii-iii).

From another angle, the widening of the scope brought with it implicit threats of embracing interdisciplinary to scholars accustomed to working within the safe havens of their monolithic disciplines. Seidhofer & Breivik (2004) confirm: "since such (language) problems do not fit neatly into the idealized categories of any particular discipline, dealing with them, must involve ranging across disciplines. The impression is sometimes given, indeed that it is this interdisciplinarity that distinguishes applied linguistics from linguistics itself" (ii-iii).

Language in the Classroom or Language in Communication?
With regards to the latest developments in applied linguistics, the problem is unmistakably reflected in mainly two strands of academic positions: the first position characterizes early perceptions, during the mid-seventies, that associates applied linguistics solely with language teaching. The position remains vehemently defended by old fashioned scholars who resist views on the development of the field beyond classroom boundaries. The second position characterizes more contemporary claims, advanced by scholars who adopted a functional interpretation and applied the discipline across a wider interdisciplinary area.

Our final proposition concerns arriving at a reconciliation that incorporate orthodoxy and liberal trends in applied linguistics and hence overcome the controversy. Chapelle (2013) in his Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics argues that the future of Applied Linguistics is in the constant evolution of communication and specifically through technology. Orthodox scholars are concerned with assessing rapprochement with ELT through expanding language emphasis. More contemporary trends are advocating multiple lines of approach that can provide linguistic insights and assist other disciplines.

There are large implications for language planning and language teaching in terms of strict adherence to linguistic orthodoxy or the incorporation of current socio-cultural approaches brought about by globalization and the major issues within its focus. It seems reasonable to propose macro and micro frames for the field of applied linguistics, each committed to specific concerns and dimensions. The macro frame for applied linguistics is associated with the large area of interdisciplinary language-related study, including forward onlooking and computer mediated communication. On the other hand, all relevant issues related to its educational application and classroom work can be associated with a micro frame of applied linguistics reserved for ELT.

Conclusion
In the late twenty years or so there has been considerable expansion in the field of applied linguistics into new domains of real world problems, where new topics were explored. This has had the consequence of developing the focus and scope of applied linguistics beyond the pedagogic perspective.

Applied linguistics has developed in the previous years from applications of the structural components of language in the primary context of the classroom to an interdisciplinary field of enquiry that encompass language and communication in contemporary contexts of use. The historical development of the discipline was associated with the conceptual evolution of the term to embrace functional and pragmatic domains, in addition to pedagogic and structural components.

In contemporary times, the theoretical foundations of languages have been set. These continue to function as the basis for language analysis and experimentation. However, with the advancement of communication modes to include the verbal and the visual, the explicit and the implicit, the field of applied linguistics continues to expand. Pedagogic and educational concentration on ELT in applied linguistics, legitimate as they be, cannot discount or substitute current or future wider areas of application.

Old distinctions and comfortable boundaries are becoming blurred and new conceptualizations and realizations are emerging. The current state of affairs in relation to ELT is in flux. The pre-defined static and "neat" categories no more hold true. The position of one standard pedagogic model of English is challenged by the multiple models of World Englishes. Distinctions between English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a lingua franca (ELF) incorporate into the debate notions of power, legitimacy and social justice. The current state of research necessitates revisiting ELT practices and a counter movement from the restricted core to the interdisciplinary bounds of applied linguistics where meanings, users and texts combine to add insights to interpretations and pedagogy.

Reforming the concept along the line suggested above should provide a means to construct a model of applied linguistics that incorporate English language teaching or language in the classroom perspective and with the same clarity and precision offers through disciplined and methodological enquiry a macro frame that incorporates all aspects of language in communication.

About the Author

Dr. Hayat Al-Khatib is Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics and Head of the English Department at the Arab Open University – Lebanon. Before joining the Arab Open University in August 2002, she taught at the Institute of Education, University of London and Goldsmiths College, University of London. Al-Khatib's research interests include bilingualism, second and foreign language learning, open education, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, semantics, functional grammar and semiotics. Al-Khatib's research has appeared in international refereed journals. Hayat Al-Khatib is a member of several professional organizations, including the British association of Applied Linguistics (BAAL) and Research Support Group at the University of London, and the co-editor of the Linguistic Journal.

References

Austin, J. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. Harvard University Press.
Block, D. (1996). Not so fast: some thoughts on theory culling, relativism, accepted findings and the heart and soul of SLA. *Applied linguistics, 17 (1)*: 63-83.

Brumfit, C.J. (1997). How applied linguistics is the same as any other science. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7 (1)*: 86-94.

Catford, J. (1998). 'Language learning and applied linguistics'. *Language learning 48* (4): 465-496.

Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics: The Basics.* Routledge.

Cook, G. 2003. *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Cook, G (2004). *Genetically Modified Language*. Routledge.

Cook, G (2005). 'Calm seas or troubled waters? Transitions, definitions and disagreement in applied linguistics'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 15(3) pp. 282–301.

Cook, G and B. Seidlhofer (eds.) (1995). *Principles and Practice in Applied Linguistics.* Oxford University Press.

Cook G. and T. Walter. (2005). 'Rewritten rites: language and social relations in traditional and contemporary funerals'. *Discourse and Society*, 16(3) pp. 365–391.

Corder, P. (1973). *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Penguin.

Croft, W. and D. A. Cruse. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. 2001. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Blackwell publishers.

Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language (2ⁿᵈ edition).* Cambridge University Press.

Davies, A. (1999). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.

Eckert, P. & S. McConnell-Ginet. (2013) *Language and Gender*. Cambridge University Press.

Evans, V. B. Bergen and J. Zinken. (2007). *The Cognitive Linguistics Reader*. Equinox.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power.* Longman.

Finnegan, R. (2002). *Communicating. The Multiple Modes of Human Interconnection.* Routledge.

Flowerdew, J. and Li Wei (eds.) (2013). *Contemporary Applied Linguistics,* vol. 3. Bloomsbury publishing. \

Frodeman, R. (2013). *Sustainable Knowledge: a Theory of Interdisciplinarity*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Gass, S. and S. Makoni (eds.) (2004). *World Applied Linguistics.* AILA Review 17.

Gee, J. (2005). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Routledge.

Geeraerts, D. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Goddard, A. (2002). *The Language of Advertising*. Taylor and Francis.

Grabe, W. (2010). 'Applied Linguistics: a twenty first century discipline' in R. Kaplan (ed) *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* Oxford University Press.

Grice, P. (1989). 'Logic and conversation'. *Studies in The Way of Words*. Harvard University Press. 22-40.

Johnson, K. (1982). *Communicative Syllabus Design and Methodology*. Pergamon

Halliday, M and R. Hasan. (1985). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective.* Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. , A. McIntosh, and P. Strevens. (1964). *The Linguistics Sciences and Language Teaching.* Longman.

Hammersley, J. (1996). On the foundations of critical discourse analysis. Centre for Language in Education Occasional Papers. Southampton Centre for Language in Education.

Hart, C. (2013). 'Constructing texts through grammar'. *Contemporary Applied Linguistics,* volume 3. Bloomsbury publishing.

Jackendoff, R. (1990). *Semantic Structures.* MIT Press.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *Diverse Englishes, Intercultural Communication and International Universities*. Fourth Annual CLERA Distinguished Lecture. 13 November. Aston University. Birmingham. UK.

Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H. Widdowson (eds.) *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Languages and Literatures*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press in association with the British Council. 11-30.

Kaplan, B. (2002). *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, B & Widdowson, H. (1992). 'Applied Linguistics' in W. Bright (ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistics, vol.2*. Oxford University press. 76-80.

Kendon, A. (2000). 'Language and gesture: unity or duality' in D. McNeil (ed.), Cambridge University Press. 47-63.

Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture: Visible Action as Utterance.* Cambridge University Press.

Kress, G. and T van Leeuwen. (2001). *Multimodal Discourse.* Arnold.

Langacker, R. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Langacker, R. (1999). *Grammar and Conceptualization*. Mouton de Gruyer

Lantoff, J. (2000). 'Second language learning as a mediating process'. *Language Teaching 33:* 79-96.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.

Levin, B. and S. Pinker. (1991). *Lexical and Conceptual Semantics*. Blackwell.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press

Lyons, J. (1999). *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

Maybin, J. (2012). 'Towards a sociocultural understanding of children's voice'. *Language and Education*, 27(5) pp. 383–397.

McCafferty, S. (2002). 'Gestures and creating zones of proximal development for second language learning'. *Modern Language Journal 86.2:*192-203.

McCafferty, S. (2004). 'Space for cognition: gestures and second language learning'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics 14.1:* 148-65.

McDonald, N. (2001). *The Graffiti Subculture, Youth, Masculinity and Identity in London and New York*. Macmillan.

McNeil, D. (2000). *Language and Gestures*. Cambridge University Press.

North, S. (2007). 'The Voices, the voices: creativity in online conversation'. *Applied Linguistics, 28(4)* pp. 491–496.

Peim, N. (1993). *Critical Theory and the English Teacher*. London. Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (1994). Incommensurable discourses. *Applied Linguistics 15 (2)*: 115-38.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism.* Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Rampton, B. (2014). *Crossings: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescent*. Routledge.

Richards, J. and T. Rodgers, (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Rixon, S. and R. Smith (2010). *Directory of UK ELT Research 2005-08.* British Council.

Rutten, G. (2014). Plenary address. *Managing Multilingualism.* University of Leiden, the Netherlands, 2-5 September.

Schmid, H. J. et al. (1996). *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. Longman.

Schmitt, N. and M. Celce-Murcia (2002). 'An overview of applied linguistics' in Schmitt, N. (ed.), *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. Arnold.

Scollon, R. and S. Scollon. (2003). *Discourses in Place*. Routledge.

Seidlhofer, B. (2003). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Seidlhofer, B &L. Breivik (2004). Editorial. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics 14.2.*

Smith, R. (2011). Plenary address. Crisis between Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching. *International Conference on Multiple Perceptual Frames on English Language Teaching and Research*. Centre of Applied Linguistic Research (CALR). Arab Open University in Lebanon. Beirut, March 22.

Stern, H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Stubbs, M. (2001). *Words and Phrases*. Blackwell publishers.

Swann, J. (2012a). 'Everyday creativity in English' in Allington, D. and B. Mayor (eds.) *Communicating in English: Talk, Text, Technology.* Routledge, pp. 179–208.

Swann, J. (2012b). 'Creative interpretations: discourse analysis and literary reading' in Jones, R. (ed.) *Discourse and Creativity.* Pearson Education, pp. 53–71.

Taylor, J. R. (2002). *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Van der Walt, J. (1992). 'Linguistics and second language teaching'. *Stellenbosch papers in Linguistics, Vol.25*. 169-182.

Van Dijk, T. (2008). *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge University Press

Van Dijk, T. (1977). *Text and Context. Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse.* Longman.

Van Ek, J. (1975). *The Threshold Level in an European Unit/Credit System for Modern Language Learning by Adults.* Council of Europe.

Warschauer, M. (1999). *Electronic Literacies: Language, Culture and Power in Online Education.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Widdowson, H. (1984). 'Models and fictions' in H. Widdowson (ed.), *Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2*. Oxford University Press. 21-7.

Widdowson, H. (2000). 'On the limitations of linguistics applied'. *Applied Linguistics 21:* 3-25.

Widdowson, H. (2006). 'Applied linguistics and interdisciplinarity'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, vol.16. no.1.* Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Wilkins, D. (1999). 'Applied linguistics' in B. Spolsky (ed.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Educational Linguistics*. Elsevier. 6-17.

Wilkins, D (1976) . *Notional Syllabus*. Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, D (1972). *Linguistics in Language Teaching*. Edward Arnold

Wilson, A. (2009). 'Reading the Signs: Prison Officers' mindful diagnosis of potential self-harm and suicide' in M. Büscher, D. Goodwin, J. Mesman (eds) *Ethnographies of Diagnostic. Work Dimensions of Transformative Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R. (2011). *The Discourse of Politics in Action*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.