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This article offers a commentary on the studies by Ky ratzis and Guo, Goodwin, Nakamura, and Cook-Gumperz and Szymanski comprising the special issue. The special issue is situated in the history of gender studies in developmental pragmatics. The inadequately recognized role of cultural factors is highlighted.

After Lakoff (1973), at the crest of the U.S. women’s movement, stimulated a flood of studies on gender contrasts in speech, a list of differences became recurrent: compete–cooperate, command–suggest, assert–hedge, dominate–comply. Maliz and Borker’s (1982) seminal paper speculated that gender differences in talk had their origins in childhood gender segregation.

Maliz and Borker’s (1982) paper appeared, along with one by Tannen (1982) on marital miscommunication, in a volume of papers in which Gumperz and his students applied his theories of cross-talk. Gumperz argued that cross-cultural misunderstandings could arise from identifiable differences in discourse conventions, pragmatic systems, and the linguistic signals used to convey meaning and signal the frames in which talk was to be understood—the contextualization cues for interpretation. Maliz and
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Borger proposed that separate male and female peer groups in childhood created the conditions for developing different cultural systems and associated conversational behavior, leading to misunderstandings.

The time was ripe for the study of children’s gender socialization. Hymes (1962) called for studies of language socialization, and Mitchell-Kernan and Ervin-Tripp (1977) and Ochs and Schieffelin (1979; Schieffelin, 1979) laid a groundwork for studies of child language pragmatics. The Maltz and Borger (1982) theory was a stimulus, as both a research topic and a presupposition for popular books, because it seemed to provide a convenient explanation for the practical problem of adult misunderstandings.

However, there were some reasons for skepticism. Maltz and Borger (1982) oversimplified the evidence available even then. It was apparent early on that gender could test central themes in sociolinguistics, having as much complexity as other social categories, such as ethnicity. The sociolinguistic themes of language divergence, network, role ascription, and identity tactics provided possibilities for comparison in different sociocultural conditions of gender socialization. The shifts in a speaker’s linguistic features with interlocutor, activity, interactional goals, and other aspects of situation all could be studied in relation to gender.

Gender presents a special situation in which frequency of interaction and identity can be in conflict. Speech similarity has long been known to be a sensitive index of social identification. Ervin-Tripp’s (1968) summary reviewed evidence already known that at the time that language similarity between speakers increases with frequency of social interaction under conditions of equality and solidarity or identification, as in what is now called a community of practice. What happens in families where sex is different between conjugal pairs or siblings but there may be a lot of contact? We need comparisons of the effects of family composition, family interaction, and network membership of children, based on the network principle in the work of Milroy (1980) and Eckert (1989). Even home schooling provides a natural experiment.

In discussing dimensions of social variation in speech, Labov (1966) distinguished indicators, markers, and stereotypes or ideological images of speech according to social categories—the traditional meaning of stereotype in the social sciences. Role playing, questionnaires, and even metalinguistic comments by playmates might evoke stereotypes. He contrasted stereotypes with indicators, or speech differences between socially or geographically separated speakers that are neither noticed nor manipulated except by linguists—in American regional variants, for instance, the contrast in the more and less raised and rounded vowel variants of “roof.” His third category, markers, both indicated group differences and could be altered in different styles of a speaker. The stylistic variation he studied was from self-conscious reading style to spontaneous conversation. He called this difference monitoring and attributed the changes to social anxiety when vernaculars are in contact with prestige varieties. He had independent markers of monitoring, in channel cues such as speech rate, that he claimed differ in monitored and vernacular styles. Since that time, the term monitoring spread to monitoring Black in the sense of deliberate use of African American vernacular English features to signal identity. Femininity could be a form of monitoring or a performance.

Most such sociolinguistic studies of similarity, going back to dialectology, have used traditional linguistic indices like phonetic features. Maltz and Borger (1982) and Gumperz (1982) referred to a much wider range of levels of language, including interactional tactics. Not so much is known, in fact, about the transmission of these other linguistic and pragmatic features.

Stylistic research (e.g., Eckert & Rickford, 2001) on writing has extended into oral contrastive styles. Such contextual differences clearly implicate changes in syntax and other levels of language. Most obviously, changes in activity, whether required from the circumstances or chosen by the speakers, alter the goals and hence the actions, topics, and so on at all levels of language.

Role-playing research, like Andersen’s (1990, 1996), has shown that from an early age children are able to simulate the speech of others, first in terms of phonetic and prosodic features, then lexicon, speech acts, and eventually even subtle features like discourse markers. Andersen’s research shows that it is possible to identify which features speakers are capable of changing according to circumstance. However, the activity marked as role play is only one way speakers take different voices, whether in building a narrative, making a joke, or accomplishing some interactional goal by a stance shift. A changing voice can allude to a person or a social category recalled by the speech. Codeswitching is an extreme case.

Speech accommodation theory (Giles & Coupland, 1991) implies that changing group composition from separate to gender-mixed groups might alter speech. According to this theory, our speech becomes more like that
of the addressees we like or want to impress, according to our abilities, and less like that of the addressees we do not like. In this case, girls playing with boys might change their activities and discourse to accommodate.

On the other hand, divergence might lead to greater contrast in certain types of play. Some situational contexts maximize gender marking. If something in the context or activity evokes a different gendered reference group, we can expect that individual speakers might “monitor male,” or masculinize, speech or “monitor female,” or feminize, speech. Whether these changes are to what Labov (1966) called stereotypes in the usual sense, or to markers, remains to be seen. Speech accommodation theory has not been applied to pragmatic and discourse features. This is a call to the examination of situational effects on styles within the individual’s repertoire, as for example in some of the articles in Eckert and Rickford (2001). Both group composition and activity effects appear in the work reported in this issue.

RANGE OF PAPERS

The articles in this issue draw on data that are varied in age, from infancy and preschool (Nakamura; Kyritzis & Guo) to middle childhood (Goodwin; Cook-Gumperz & Szymbanski). Social dynamics will change with social development; thus, comparisons across age present confounding problems. The focus of the collection is on cultural contrast among Chinese, Japanese, Mexican American children of recent immigration, middle-class White Americans, and a heterogeneous California school sample. The activities studied range from the child-controlled activity of playground jump rope (Goodwin) to adult-enabled but peer-controlled play in the presence of adults (Kyritzis & Guo; Nakamura) to classroom activities where tasks are assigned by adults (Cook-Gumperz & Szymbanski). There is a problem in comparison with so much variation; similar types of activities and the same ages across cultural environments cannot be contrasted directly. What can be hoped, given that range, is the emergence of some hypotheses about the factors involved and a look to future comparisons to fill in the gaps. In short, this is the hypothesis-forming stage of the enterprise. However, this evidence already disconfirms some widely believed generalizations.

CROSS-CULTURAL VARIATION

According to the separate worlds hypothesis (SWH), biology is not destiny, but it is social grouping by gender that produces results that look like genetic bias, as if males and females create separate subgroup cultures. Gender cultures could be similar from one American sample to another if there is a macrocultural effect from family or school socialization by adults or older children, or from corporate culture through commercial influences. A more serious test is whether the separate worlds exist, and are alike, cross-culturally. Whiting and Edwards (1988), on the basis of an extensive program of careful observation in many widely diverse societies, concluded that “girls get more practice in nurturance and pro-social dominance, boys in egoistic dominance and challenge” (p. 278). However, this difference, they added, could be the result of gender socialization through adult assignment of girls and boys to different settings and tasks in the societies they studied. It could disappear if these activity contrasts did not exist. Kyritzis and Guo head straight for a cross-cultural critique of the SWH to which Kyritzis (1992) contributed supporting data earlier.

SETTING AND ACTIVITY CHOICES

Where adult society sets up a model of strongly contrasting concerns and settings for men and women, should we expect children to pick up on that contrast? However, this would only happen if gender is salient in the local family and school culture as a social dimension. There is no reason to presuppose that girls do not want to be Superman, or boys to play mother. Kyritzis (1994) found, indeed, girls who invented “Superkitty.”

In Japan as in the United States, there were strong contrasts in the settings usually chosen by children in schools: rough-and-tumble play, trucks, cars, and superheroes versus playhouse and tea party for girls, but there was overlap in that both chose blocks and playing store. In the U.S. data, girls chose the dollhouse area more, boys the block area more, and Marx and Kyritzis (1998) found active resistance by preschool boys to domestic play as they got older. Marx and Kyritzis confirmed, and Naka-
mura confirms, Thorne's (1993) observation of peer pressure regarding activities by the late 3s. Marx and Kyratzis reported that there was more pressure on boys than on girls in their sample.

**INTERACTIVE EXPOSURE EFFECTS**

One would expect that boys and girls on the margins of peer groups, children with twins or older siblings different in sex, or offspring of single parents, might show variation in language features related to gender. The whole interaction network of a child needs to be studied (Barker & Wright, 1951; Eckert, 1989). Boys and girls in families and neighborhoods do not live in isolation from each other, and play networks in neighborhoods can be fortuitous as well as chosen by young children. Girls might be in neighborhoods where there are no other girls and, as a result, might play with boys in boys’ preferred activities. Several of these studies address factors that can reverse or neutralize the behavioral contrasts seen in the separate worlds research. The SWH assumes that the child's network is primarily of the same gender and also that the child's reference group is gendered.

Nakamura is the best placed to raise these questions, both because the Japanese language has such pervasive gender marking and because she followed children in both school and home and, thus, of the authors in this group, comes closest to observing their whole network. Because Japanese women usually stay at home with young children and fathers work late, mixed-sex nursery schools are, for both boys and girls, sometimes the most important contact with masculine speech outside of TV. Nakamura points out that this is especially true of firstborn children. Therefore, some girls’ speech becomes more masculine when they enter preschool. At the school, children who preferred mixed-sex play groups had different language use patterns, so that, according to Nakamura, “a 3-year-old boy who preferred to play with girls sometimes the used feminine sentence-final particle wa, a 5-year-old girl who preferred to play with boys consistently used masculine linguistic forms” (p. 38). Of course, we do not know from the standpoint of identity marking which came first, friendship choice or linguistic features that may reflect speech accommodation.

**ADDRESSEE AND ACTIVITY EFFECTS ON LINGUISTIC FEATURES**

The Japanese data provide a valuable extreme in the extent of linguistic contrast between expected male and female speech, affecting self-reference, lexical choices, addressee-governed politeness levels, and pragmatic tactics. Although these contrasts are discussed normatively in Japan, Nakamura and other recent work on adult Japanese speakers suggests that in practice there is considerable variation as well as historical change. These so-called gender contrasts are also setting- and addressee-related, not just speaker-determined, however, so that women at work sound more masculine and men talking to babies more feminine. Each child displays variation. Nakamura has shown that quite young children know self-reference forms, sentence-final particle probabilities, some lexical forms, and phonological styles that have feminizing or masculinizing effects.

How are these contrasts learned and maintained? Nakamura, who collected data both in homes and at school and with a peer, commented that peers were more likely to tease, taunt, and reject deviants, with pressure on both boys and girls. The U.S. data show examples of both boys and girls pressuring conformity from boys (Marx & Kyratzis, 1998). Is there less pressure on girls?

**FRIENDSHIP GROUPS**

Because peer groups are important sources of language pressure to conformity both in speech activities and speech styles, we can compare the composition of friendship groups. Thorne (1993) and Marx and Kyratzis (1998) looked at groups over time in schools and noted that as children mature, they join larger groups, and larger groups are more likely to be homogeneous in gender. Age-homogeneous groups were also more likely to be gender homogeneous. In families and neighborhoods, on the other hand, children play with the child at hand, and differences in age or gender matter less. Certainly, we can expect that neighborhood, school,
and culturally specified activities all will affect these groupings and the knowledge they provide.

The differences Kyritzis and Guo found in preschool group composition may also be related to the type of play normal in groups of various sizes. Kyritzis found that mixed-sex larger groups did borderwork that we might expect would maximize speech divergence. In the U.S. preschools she studied, she observed that in mixed groups of three or more, play occurred that downgraded female roles so that girls might have decided to play in girl-only groups instead. This cultural practice, which Kyritzis found but Guo did not see in Beijing, where teachers set up groups, can be consequential for group composition.

These issues definitely change with age, along with the type of play. In middle childhood playgrounds Thorne (1993) and Goodwin studied, certain types of play were open and accessible to newcomers, and others were less so.

The composition of groups appears to affect speech in large measure through the choice of activities. Lampert and I, in an analysis of Garvey's data on the CHILDES database, studied changes in children's humor in preschool dyads that were selected as male pairs, female pairs, and recombined mixed pairs. We thus could see the same child with a different partner, as Guo could. There were strong gender differences in single-sex dyads. Boys engaged in more buffoonery and naughtiness, girls in verbal play and dress-up. The mixed groups were in between: Girls sang and did wordplay significantly more when paired with a girl than with a boy, but with boys they engaged in more physical clowning and less verbal humor (Lampert, 1996). It appears that children's activities are negotiated, and as Marx and Kyritzis (1998) reported, the same child can shift with different play partners to different kinds of play, with consequences for gendered speech features. Kyritzis and Guo report that in mixed preschool U.S. groups, boys were dominant, girls compliant. Girls asked questions, asked permission, and gave explanations more than boys did in such groups. However, mixed groups in China did not reveal the same contrasts at all; therefore, we cannot assume that these differences are universal. As Kyritzis and Guo note, the relative number of boys and girls in a group may alter activity preferences and dominance.

In looking at situational effects on gendered features, Nakamura notes that when playing with other girls, girls' speech had more beautification forms, hedges, collaborative sentence-final particles like ne and no, and speech acts such as asking questions and asking and giving permis-

sion. These feminine forms appeared primarily in role play, whereas the speech between girls out of role play was neutral. They must reflect the types of roles the girls were representing in their play.

With male peers, boys increased assertive speech and frequency of adversarial particles like yo and zo. Because they often played superheroes with other boys, it is not surprising that they had a high rate of making commands. In contrast, boys might play more feminine games with the mother when no peers were present, but we do not know how much their speech was adjusted to the context. These differences in form related to gender are more extreme cases of the types of speech act differences Kyritzis (1992) and Kyritzis and Ervin-Tripp (1999) found for same-sex best friend dyads in play settings.

CONFLICT

The "separate cultures" theory predicts that in mixed groups there should be evidence of culture clashes and misunderstandings. Speech accommodation theory predicts accommodation unless the children dislike each other or they are in a gender-marked activity. If we look at conflicts that occur in mixed groups, we see no such evidence of cross-gender misunderstandings.

Kyritzis and Guo (1996) found that conflicts in the U.S. preschool sample occurred mainly in terms of the planning of play. In the Chinese data in Beijing and Taipei, on the other hand, conflicts were part of role-play enactment or being funny (e.g., male-female teasing over "nuisance" behavior). There was no evidence that these conflicts arose from misunderstandings. In my data on Anglophones learning French from playmates in France (Ervin-Tripp, 1986), I found a theme in role play might be teacher and naughty pupil, allowing the teacher to display authority and punish the pupil. This naughtiness was programmed into the script by the children.

In the Chinese data, boys also play at "nuisance" with each other; therefore, it is not specifically reserved for mixed play. Kyritzis and Guo interpret teasing by being naughty as a form of establishing intimacy. This is an argument compatible with recent research on teasing showing that when done in a friendly, not hostile, key and equitably distributed, teasing increases group cohesion (Keltner et al., 1998).
DOMINANCE

The Chinese naughtiness play provides an opportunity for girls to play roles of power in mixed groups. In the Chinese preschool data, boys were more compliant with girls’ orders than with boys’, and girls could undertake punitive roles in play, even to the extreme of a girl scolding her “father” (Kyratzis & Guo, 1996).

The Chinese data make it clear that in gender-mixed groups, hierarchy and domination are possible by girls, given dominant numbers or appropriate activities. In school-age children, Goodwin also found, first in her African American studies (Goodwin, 1990) and later in her work on jump rope, that girls in their own territory were competent in conflict and competition, and did not provide mitigations more than boys.

Cook-Gumperz and Szymanski show us another case where girls can be powerful. A school has defined cooperating mixed-gender groups of children as a “family.” In these families, it was often the case that girls took the lead in organizing the group tasks. This frame, when invoked, licenses girls to be powerful. Female power is seen in girls’ sarcastic, mocking statements and boys’ compliance in these classrooms. It is not clear whether this leadership derives from the metaphor of the mother in the Latino family, who has power within the household, or from the power of the teacher. The techniques of control are similar to those used by teachers, namely raising the vocal volume or codeswitching to get attention or identify separate exchanges.

The girls Cook-Gumperz and Szymanski describe display a variety of tactics of domination and resistance. One girl subverts another’s dominance, and another rebels and subverts the collaborative assessment of two others.

POWER AND TERRITORY

From the earliest ages of mobility, territory is identified with persons or groups (e.g., Daddycar, Mommycar). The first factor that appears to be important in defining who will be in power is territory. In my work on requests, I was surprised to find that territory affected mitigation. In requests between adults in an office requests from outside to inside an addressee’s territory were mitigated (Ervin-Tripp, 1976). Kyratzis and Guo (1996) noted that girls and boys played together in the block area, but when they did so, boys were dominant. The block corner in that grade in that school was male territory.

Goodwin’s study shows us a microhistory of social change. We see that at the beginning, jump rope was female territory. The consequence was domination by the girls. This domination was displayed in many ways—by commands from the girls and compliance by the boys, control of rules by the girls, and control of access. However, the development of expertise by the boys altered the power relations, giving boys less subordinate status in the activity. This change was only possible, of course, because of the school culture that did not promote territorial segregation.

In some societies, there is a power division by territory, with females in the family having power within the household and males having power outside the household. Representations that identify relative power only on the basis of outside roles may not represent gender accurately (e.g., Arab families, as in Morocco; Davis, 1980). Kyratzis and Guo explain the finding of female power in Chinese domestic scenarios by generalizing that women carry more power inside a household, to which males comply. Cook-Gumperz and Szymanski suggest similar power in Latino families.

Kyratzis’s data are contrasted in that they show a dispreference for family play (Marx & Kyratzis, 1998) and a downgrading of female power in other mixed-sex activities such as doctor play (Kyratzis & Guo, 1996). Boys’ dispreference for mixed-sex family play may eliminate possible occasions for girls to exert power. Home is apparently not a territory of power for mainstream U.S. females. The data here suggest that courtship might be the only context of mixed-sex play where American preschool girls could assert dominance, unlike their Chinese counterparts, who do appear to assert power in domestic arenas (Kyratzis & Guo, 1996). The pattern of request forms in middle-class U.S. families, as documented by Ervin-Tripp, O’Connor, and Rosenberg (1984), which suggests less power for mothers than for fathers and children, is also consistent with a devaluing of the home domain in American culture. The downgrading of women in U.S. families appears to be visible to youngsters 4 years old (Andersen, 1990), as seen in elicited family roles in puppet play.
EXPERTISE AND POWER

The question raised by Goodwin's results is the relation between territory and expertise. When boys and girls are assessed by the same criteria in mixed groups, traditional territorial dominance can give way. Does expertise trump territory? After 1 month of practice, as boys become more skilled, those who are most skilled issue directives and metaterror which permit and initiate talk. However, in the last game, girls still defined the important parameters of play.

"Boys begin to use the aggravated directive style of girls when they become more skilled in the game. The use of imperative forms and counter moves is related to acquired skill rather than one's gendered identity," according to Goodwin.

Kyratzis and Guo raise a similar issue about expertise in their analysis of shifting dominance in the studies of interaction over a Play-Doh "machine." In the Chinese data, male and female dominance could be construed as based on domains of skill, with girls dominant in moral and emotional topics and boys in technical, gadget issues, even when the play materials were the same. Here changing the topic or activity can be a tactic for assuming dominance.

GENDER DIFFERENCES

Are speech contrasts simply a consequence of the typically different setting and activity selections by boys and girls? In some settings, no differences appear. A student in my lab, Elena Escalera, observing snacktime, found no gender contrasts at all in talk with a same-sex friend in an activity that is neutral.

Yet, gender often remains a strong variable. In some studies, even when the same toys are presented, boys and girls, on average, did different things with the same toys. According to Nakamura, preschool boys more often fight and throw things; girls spend more time planning than enacting with the same play material. Girls do more family scripts, boys do more good-guy–bad-guy scripts of the sort seen on TV (Kyratzis, 1992). When Nakamura tried to establish comparable situations, she found that boys' dialogue was still dominated by challenges, conflict, and commands and contained slang and masculine terms. The girls' talk was comparatively neutral. Boys might use feminine language with the mother but would not do so with other boys, whereas girls used some masculine forms when in rough-and-tumble play and fighting. Kyratzis and Guo (1996) found that even when Guo tried to control setting and materials with Play-Doh in China, the boys and girls focused on different issues, which then affected their dominance in the interaction.

We do not know how robust these gender differences are. Marx and Kyratzis (1998) found only a few children were consistently masculine or feminine in speech style; the other children accommodated to partners and changed speech with activity setting. Even so, on average there were differences.

AGE CHANGES

The subtlety of tactics noted in the studies of children in middle childhood reminds us of the importance of pragmatic development, which has not been mentioned in these studies. We know that children age 7 or older can be aware of the perspectives of others and control a wider variety of speech acts and speech events. The complexity of their discourse is greater because they are more able to plan joint events and anticipate the responses and arguments of the other. There are examples of such skills in my work on requests (Ervin-Tripp, 1982). In Cook-Gumperz and Szymanski's examples, we see a 9-year-old able to anticipate and thwart power moves and retaliate against public criticism in a complex way. Dramatic examples have been given by Goodwin (1990), such as the embedding of narrative into argument, thus shifting the participation framework and removing ground from the antagonist by publicly making him the butt of the narrative. This skillful complexity could be strategically forward looking, rather than just a series of ad hoc tactical maneuvers.

MECHANISMS OF PEER CONTROL

The SWH, as Thorne (1993) pointed out, assumes either a shared norm or uniformity of behavior, which is belied by the evidence. The strongest data on this point are the individual cases pursued longitudinal-
ly by Marx and Kyritzis (1998), who were able to show that certain children in the school they studied were bellwethers in displaying extremes of gendered activity and speech, for reasons they did not explore. Other children who joined them in play, and in activities that are differentially gendered, momentarily increased the frequency of gender indexing in speech, but another partner and another activity context could be neutral. The boundaries available in public, especially in school, change through time as norms develop and deviants are criticized. Edelsky's (1977) judgment data suggest continued increase in stereotyping in middle childhood.

MONITORING AND CONSTRUCTING, MARKING AND INDEXING

New constructs are being used in the discussion of speech variation—for example, in a special issue of Language in Society (Holmes, 1999) on gender in adults. How can we know whether speakers are “monitoring feminine” or “indexing femininity”? Nobody has proposed an independent criterion; thus, we are left with descriptive categories that appear to be interpretive. We can ask the same questions when we look at the discursive construction of femininity. Sex is physical, and already known to friends, so it cannot simply be constituted by language except in role play. However, femininity and masculinity can be. Is it happening only when girls’ behavior fits a stereotype and not at other times? Is it happening all of the time when boys play together, and, if so, what is added by this description? These definitional and empirical issues need to be resolved to keep the sociolinguistic study of gender from becoming simply a fashionable change in the language of description. Then, we can clarify theoretical positions that can allow empirical disconfirmation.

Role playing is a valuable way to find out about children’s knowledge of sociolinguistic indexes when nothing is at stake. Andersen (1996) and her collaborators had strong evidence that children come to recognize a social feature, comparative power, that they can mark by choice of discourse markers. When children are displaying feminine or masculine indexes, they may simply be identifying a role (e.g., mother, nurse, superhero or fireman); we cannot tell without finer grained controlled role or judgment studies whether gender is indexed in the choice. And it could be argued that the separation between role playing and real life is not absolute in either children or adults.

SUMMARY

These articles give a much more nuanced view of the variability across culture, age, and setting of gender marking and indexing in speech. They show us individual differences that may reflect either dispositional factors or network and socialization history. They show us that group size and composition, activity contexts, and expertise in the activity affect speech styles so much that linguistic features cannot be attributed to gender factors alone unless these contextual aspects are controlled. Above all, they provide questions about the cross-cultural generality of the Maltz and Borker (1982) speculations.

NOTES

1 Elena Escalera, who has observed half-time in a nursery school in Berkeley for 4 years, audiotaping for 2 years, noticed that boys did choose the playhouse domestic context when they were young 3s, but other boys pushed these boys to other forms of play as they got older.

2 Borderwork is a term used by Thorne (1993) to identify activities that rely on a clear male–female boundary, such as team games divided by gender, chasing, or kissing.

3 Escalera observed girls arguing over playing “bad girl” (personal communication, February 3, 2000).

4 Escalera’s dissertation is in progress.
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