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ABSTRACT

Background: The concept of academic culture lacks a standardised definition, and the factors defining it have not been clearly outlined or universally agreed upon. To analyse this phenomenon accurately, a precise definition of academic culture is necessary. This scoping review aims to synthesise literature on academic culture, delineate its epidemiological characteristics, and extract empirical descriptions of factors that contribute to the formation and structure of academic culture.

Method: A search was conducted in the bibliographic database Scopus on August 2nd, 2023. Additionally, a search for related grey literature was carried out on August 3rd, 2023. We included studies published in English post-2018 that discuss academic culture. Titles and abstracts from the retrieved records were screened for relevance. Demographic characteristics related to academic culture were extracted from all search records. We then extracted statements from empirical and review studies describing empirically derived factors influencing the formation and defining the architecture of academic culture. These factors were categorised and thematically grouped, and the identified structural components were ranked according to the internal hierarchy of academic culture.

Results: The search yielded 961 records, out of which 94 met our inclusion criteria. The majority of these records were journal articles, book chapters or reviews (78.44%), with only 23 records being empirical studies, reviews and book chapters that reported definitions and academic culture structure.

Conclusion: This study pinpointed key structural components of the architecture of academic culture, categorised existing definitions of academic culture into subgroups. Additionally, it outlined the principal research directions for studying the academic culture of researchers. The limitations of this work include its focus solely on English language articles and the lack of assessment regarding the methodological quality of the articles included in our data extraction.
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INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of studies in higher education, the cultural elements of universities have consistently attracted attention. Early research by scholars delved into the ideologies prevalent among students, academics, and higher education institutions at large (Becker, 1963; Reisman & Jenscks, 1962). More recently, the concept of academic culture has been critically examined, particularly its supposed neutrality. Indeed, neutrality has become a political choice supporting the state of affairs that exists at a particular time neglecting its own codes and values thus preventing readers from comprehending the ideology-driven function of education involving the generation of specific types of knowledge, authority, societal beliefs, ways of acting, and accounts of the world (Filippakou, 2023). This examination has brought to light the existing tensions within the established
university culture, notably those between academics and students, as identified by Cameron & Ettington (1988) (Pedraja-Rejas, 2022). Present-day standards and more culturally diverse students demand student-centred, active-learning approaches more suited to their specific needs (Bjørn Stensaker, 2018). This line of thought has evolved to understand the university system as being deeply embedded in a culture while also serving as a manifestation of that specific culture (Savarese et al., 2013, Bopape, 2022).

The cultural dimensions of higher education institutions are analysed through at least four distinct approaches: (1) the culture of higher education systems, (2) the culture of professions and disciplines, (3) the culture of universities, and (4) skills of the actors in the scientific research and educational process.

The culture of higher education systems examines the significant changes in the concept of higher education over recent decades. This includes moving away from traditional views of these institutions as entities primarily responsible for professional training (Petersen & Bartel, 2020). Universities are defined by social commitment that play a vital role in the development and improvement of the society, contributing to the welfare of citizens (Ramos-Monge, 2017). These studies highlight the influence of emerging knowledge societies, increased student enrollment, and shifts in funding sources, leading to a redefinition of higher education institutions’ objectives and a new ethos (Clark, 1998; Musselin, 2012). Some researchers even argue that the neoliberalization of higher education systems has led universities to deviate from their cultural missions, transforming them into entities predominantly guided by financial imperatives. Moreover, this erosion between education and profit forces students to take on excessive student loan debts and face decreased preparedness and increased basic needs insecurity (Nazmi et al., 2019; Schraedley et al., 2021).

The second perspective on academic culture explores the realm of professions and disciplines. Studies in this area have highlighted how shifts in the political economy of higher education systems are reshaping the identities of graduate students. Attributes like flexibility, teamwork, critical and analytical thinking, communication skills, creativity and problem-solving skills have gained prominence (Poláková et al., 2023). In this context, the evolving culture of the academic profession, despite its traditional roots, is a key area of focus (Barnes, 2021). In terms of disciplinary culture, some research points to significant differences in the self-perceptions of academics based on their knowledge domains (Kaweesi, 2018), while other studies explore how recent trends, especially the increasing emphasis on interdisciplinarity and practical knowledge, are altering the objectives of scientific disciplines, even more, multidisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity have also become important for research policy (Mazzocchi, 2019; Daniel et al., 2022).

The third strand of research in academic culture examines the predominant ideologies within various higher education institutions. This approach looks at the institution as a whole, scrutinising its self-concept and the resulting impact on students, academics, and administrators. Historically, the important functions of university include inheriting culture, practising culture and innovating culture. Key areas of interest include the mission and objectives of universities, their historical paths, and their responses to changes in the political economy and governance of the national system including pursuing of science, advocating of academia, and raising of spirit. This line of study also considers how global pressures, such as the competition to conform to the research university model, the drive to be an attractive destination for students and academics, and internal demands for professional administrative structures in university management, are internally transforming the culture of different institutions (Shen & Tian, 2012).

The fourth research direction shapes the perception of the potential of a specific culture through the prism of the competencies of its carriers (Tuşyanah, 2023). Even the highest examples of a particular culture can falter due to the current carrier’s inability to interpret its axioms, follow them, and develop them (Zhao et al., 2022). And, although culture shapes its career, a reciprocal influence also determines the possibilities for cultural development, especially when it comes to the culture of a specific organisation.

All research directions in academic culture are characterised by a lack of a shared understanding of the term “academic culture” among researchers, leading to difficulties in constructing its hierarchical architecture. This, in turn, results in contradictory interpretations of the structural components of academic culture. A significant portion of researchers confuses the concepts of organisational culture and academic culture. The absence of a clear understanding of the boundaries and architecture of each of these types of culture creates challenges in developing effective strategies for the development of the research and educational spheres of the functioning of the modern university.

The current review is centred on one of the three aspects within the third dimension of academic culture. Within the triad of students, academics, and administrators, the authors are primarily focused on the academic culture of researchers. This facet of academic culture is pivotal in moulding the environment of an educational institution, impacting not just the effectiveness of a university’s research outcomes but also its overall educational achievements.

The purpose of this systematic scoping review is to examine pertinent scholarly sources that scrutinise the academic culture of researchers, with the goal of refining its definition and elucidating its structure. The society of knowledge necessitates the construction of the educational process as a research-oriented endeavour aimed at knowledge acquisi-
tion, which requires a profound understanding of academic culture values from all participants in the educational process. The current level of development of a researchers’ academic culture, in which both academics and students play pivotal roles in this education concept, is significantly influenced by the academic culture. This culture is intended to define and shape the organisational culture of higher education institutions. Given the challenge of comprehensively covering both the academic culture of students and that of researcher-academics in a single review, this analysis will primarily focus on academics. The guiding research question for interpreting the results of this review is the relationship between the concepts of a university’s organisational culture and its academic culture.

METHOD

Transparency Statement

Before commencing this study, we formulated a protocol. We confirm that this manuscript represents an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study; all significant aspects of the study are reported, and any deviations from the original plan are disclosed. This section briefly restates our study methods, largely drawn directly from the original protocol. The PRISMA statement was utilised as a guideline for reporting this systematic scoping review.

Search Strategy

The search strategy was developed and refined through iterative consultations of all the members of the review team. The strategy was peer-reviewed by a qualified information specialist using the PRESS Checklist before execution. We searched the Scopus database. The searches were conducted on August 2, 2023. We employed various free-text phrases related to academic culture (e.g., ‘university academic culture’, ‘academic research culture’, ‘research culture’, ‘adequate research culture’, ‘healthy research culture’, ‘academic literacy’, ‘academic work’, ‘academic integrity’, ‘academic culture structure’, ‘research culture structure’) tailoring vocabulary and syntax for the Scopus database. Results were limited to publications from 2018 onwards.

Study Population and Eligibility Criteria

The study population consisted of articles, reviews, book chapters and editorials, characterising, or describing academic culture. We included all study designs from any discipline found in our search, reported in English. This encompassed experimental and observational research, as well as commentaries, editorials, and narrative summaries for our demographic extraction. For the extraction of academic culture structural components, our sample was limited to studies providing empirically derived components of academic culture.

Screening and Data Extraction

Development of Data Extraction Forms

Data extraction form was meticulously developed and tested before the commencement of data extraction (See Application 1).

Initial Screening Process

The first step involved screening titles and abstracts against our predefined inclusion criteria. This preliminary assessment helped us determine the relevance of the articles for full-text verification.

Full-Text Article Verification

After the initial screening, full-text articles were further assessed to ensure they met the inclusion criteria. Key information extracted from each article included:

- Name of the corresponding author.
- Country of the corresponding author.
- Year of publication, selecting the most recent date stated.
- Study design, as evaluated by our review team.
- Name of the journal in which the article was published.
- Presence of a definition of an academic culture, coded as yes/no. This coding included both explicit (e.g., “Academic culture is...”) and implicit definitions.
- Description of the Structural Components of Academic Culture.
- Commentary on the Main Trends in the Study of Academic Culture.

Focused Data Extraction

The extraction was specifically limited to articles that provided a definition of academic culture or described its defining factors and structural components forming it, based on empirical research, reviews, book chapters, and editorials. Opinion pieces or definitions simply referencing previous works were excluded. We focused particularly on articles classified as empirical studies, re-assessing each to confirm its relevance to defining academic culture or its characteristics.

For the articles that met these criteria, we extracted text statements that described the traits or characteristics of academic culture. This extraction process was conducted by one reviewer and verified by a second reviewer. Any dis-
crepancies or conflicts during the extraction process were resolved through consensus. If an empirically derived factor or characteristic of academic culture was repeated in multiple sections of an article, we extracted only one representative statement to avoid redundancy.

**Goal of Extraction Process**

This stringent and detailed data extraction process aimed to isolate and identify specific, empirically derived characteristics of academic culture, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of their nature and operations.

**Data Analysis**

**Combined Quantitative and Qualitative Methods**

The data analysis employed both quantitative (i.e., frequencies and percentages) and qualitative (i.e., thematic analysis) approaches.

**Generation of Characteristics List**

Initially, a list of potential characteristics of academic culture was collaboratively created by the two reviewers responsible for data extraction.

**Categorization of Extracted Statements**

Each statement extracted from the included articles, which described characteristics of academic culture, was categorised based on the pre-generated list. New categories were added whenever a statement did not fit any existing category. Duplicate statements extracted from a single source were categorised only once. During this process, the specific wording of statements from the articles was not preserved in the categories and themes.

**Thematic Analysis and Synthesis**

Following the methodology of Galipeau et al. (2016), overlapping or duplicate categories were collated into themes. Two reviewers independently and inductively coded each characteristic statement, developing a coding framework through iterative discussions. Final themes and their definitions were determined by consensus. The data were then recorded with these agreed-upon themes, with any discrepancies resolved similarly. The themes were categorised into two types: structural components of academic culture and descriptors (statements describing these features, typically with positive or negative connotations).

**Deviations from Study Protocol**

**Demographic Characteristics Extraction**

This was performed in duplicate, deviating from the original protocol which suggested a single reviewer with verification.

**Journal Discipline Extraction**

Contrary to the protocol’s indication to use Scopus for determining journal disciplines, SCIMAGOJR was utilised post-hoc to identify journal subject areas. This was only applied to included empirical articles describing empirically derived characteristics of academic culture.

**Funding Information Extraction**

Post-hoc, a decision was made to extract information on whether the records reported funding, a deviation from the initial protocol.

**RESULTS**

**Search Results and Demographic Characteristics**


Please see Figure 1 for record and article flow during the review. The original search entailed 961 records. We excluded 68 records from initial screening because there were duplicates (N = 46), we could not access a full-text document (N = 10), or because they appeared to be irrelevant (N = 12).

We screened a total of 897 title and abstract records obtained from the search strategy. Only 148 were included for full-text screening, 649 records were excluded for not meeting our study inclusion criteria. After full-text screening of the 148 studies, 94 were determined to have full texts and to define academic culture and highlight its architecture. The remaining 54 records were excluded because: they did not have full texts (N = 19), were not about academic culture (N = 30), were published in a language other than English (N...
The 94 articles assessed for eligibility and included for demographic data extraction were published between 2018 and 2023 with corresponding authors from 45 countries. The number of publications mentioning academic culture increased each year from 2018 to 2022 (See Table 1). Most of these publications took the form of journal articles, book chapters, editorials and reviews.

Among the articles discussing academic culture, only 23 specifically related a study that provided some definitions on academic culture and its architecture. These studies were published between 2018 and 2023 and produced by corresponding authors from 24 countries. The majority of these included studies were journal articles (69.5%).

Four additional records obtained from the grey literature search were included into the study as they specified academic culture architecture and provided definitions.

Keywords Analysis

Using the software package “VOSviewer,” an analysis of key terms was conducted to assess the frequency of usage of a specific term in relation to another. The authors compiled a thesaurus of 760 terms to consolidate similar terms and correct typos in keywords. For constructing a scientometric map, only those keywords that appeared in the dataset at least four times were selected. As a result, the final selection of keywords comprises 35 terms. The visualization of the results is presented in Figure 2, where the size of an object reflects its total link strength, and the width of the lines indicates the link strength between two terms.

The constructed map highlights four clusters describing different aspects of the development of academic culture. The first cluster is dedicated to the structure and content of academic culture, the second to the educational component of academic culture, the third examines the influence of academic culture on the prospects of professional burnout.
in researchers and the subsequent consequences for their mental health, and the fourth cluster is also related to the burnout of actors in academic culture, but from the perspective of researchers’ stress resilience and characteristics of the academic culture of the university.

Table 1
Demographic characteristics of all articles mentioning academic culture and its structure included in our systematic scoping review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality of corresponding authors (top 3)</th>
<th>Articles mentioning academic culture (n=94)</th>
<th>Articles included in systematic scoping review (n=23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA, UK, Indonesia</td>
<td>USA, Iran, Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication year of articles</td>
<td>2018 - 6</td>
<td>2018 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019 - 14</td>
<td>2019 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020 - 17</td>
<td>2020 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021 - 13</td>
<td>2021 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2022 - 25</td>
<td>2022 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2023 - 19</td>
<td>2023 - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article type</td>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>Journal article 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book chapter</td>
<td>Book chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial 2</td>
<td>Editorial 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Review 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2
Bibliometric Map of Publications in the Subject Area “Academic Culture” (Tools: VOSviewer, Method: Keyword co-occurrence)

Academic Culture Definitions
The absence of a universal term that comprehensively describes the academic culture of a university has led to the existence of a range of competing definitions. These definitions, to varying degrees, are synonymous but with a focus on certain structural components of academic culture.

The provided definitions of academic culture can be conditionally divided into those that emphasise its educational or research component.

Academic Culture Architecture
Due to the lack of a consensus definition, the structure of academic culture appears quite diffuse, as various scholars define its architecture based on the key aspect of academic culture they emphasise. The main criterion for structuring academic culture is the phenomenon of culture itself. Chassabi Chorsi et al. (2022) include in the structure of academic culture aspects such as the degree of academic freedom,
the strictness or flexibility of administrative bureaucracy and regulations, management, and the organizational culture, along with authority delegation. Ebrahimi (2015) holds a similar view, considering components like academic independence, academic freedom, professional ethics, management, communication, participation, teamwork, learning culture, trust between members, reward system, and evaluation system as integral parts of academic culture. Pasandideh et al. (2016) believe that the academic culture of universities primarily encompasses academic outlooks, spirits, ethics, and environments. According to Jiang et al. (2023), academic culture consists of domain knowledge and the know-how of conducting all academic activities. Chervonska & Pashchenko (2022) point out that the key component of the learning culture is academic integrity, which should observe five core values in the learning process: honesty, trust, respect, fairness, responsibility, and integrity. Moreover, academic culture includes academic environment and operations, as well as the teaching and learning environment.

**Trends in Research**

**Organisational Culture**

Every educational institution or organisation encompasses its unique structure, management, and culture. In academic and research organisations, the internal culture is a critical element that influences research integrity and the responsible conduct of research (Roje, 2023). Factors such as institutional practices or guidelines, management styles, the research environment, and collaborative dynamics play a significant role. They establish the boundaries of action for researchers and serve as a communal compass, fostering an environment that reinforces integrity through clear policies, reasonable standards for advancement and education, and a supportive work environment conducive to research integrity. Thus, reinforcing the organisational culture is essential for the successful educational and research trajectory of any higher education institution. Despite the clear importance of organisational culture, researchers often find it challeng-
ing to distinctly differentiate between the concepts of “organisational culture” and “organisational climate.”

Researchers frequently use these terms interchangeably, which can lead to a misrepresentation of the relationships between an organisation’s culture and its climate, its architecture, and its impact on its members. Organisational climate, defined by researchers as the shared perceptions of policies, practices, and procedures experienced by employees, and the behaviours seen as rewarding (Schneider et al., 2013; Ehrhart & Kuenz, 2015), acts as a mechanism defining the characteristics of an organisation’s policy.

Heterogeneity of University Cultures

Knowledge is a socially distributed phenomenon, situated at the intersection of individual cognitive processes and their operational environments. The creation of knowledge hinges on the interactions between an individual’s cognitive schemas and their external contexts. This intersection is further shaped by the use of artefacts within one’s background, which guide and mould individual actions (Gomes et al., 2018; Iannaccone et al., 2018; Köse & Korkmaz, 2019). These actions are not standalone; they are intimately woven into the fabric of others’ actions within institutional settings that regulate both activities and the dynamics of their inter-relationships. Thus, knowledge emerges from a confluence of individual meaning-making processes and the ability to communicate and share these construed meanings, encompassing beliefs, values, and activities (Gomes et al., 2018; Leite et al., 2018; Briody, 2022).

In this milieu, the concept of a university’s organisational culture and its climate becomes paramount, either fostering or impeding the growth and evolution of its culture. The climate is largely influenced by the backgrounds of the actors in scientific research and educational communication, including their current and future competencies. It’s vital to understand that the development level of both organisational and academic cultures significantly impacts the advancement of researchers’ competencies.

The diversity within the research environment is shaped not only by the challenges encountered by early-career researchers in the intricate hierarchy of academic relationships but also by factors such as gender, and the interplay of religious and other cultural codes with the realities of organisational and academic cultures. These factors heavily influence the prioritisation within the hierarchy of various structural components of academic culture. For instance, the global aspect of academic integrity and research ethics might take a backseat compared to culturally conditioned norms, such as in situations where the order of authoredship in scholarly publications is influenced by deference to seniors or adherence to leadership, thus overshadowing globally recognized research ethics standards (Raitskaya & Tikhonova, 2020).

The notion that higher education institutions are increasingly characterised by a culture of competitiveness, linked to hegemonic masculinity, is gaining traction. This competitiveness highlights the crucial necessity of embracing the ideal of “belonging,” crucial for both success and survival. The hegemonic academic figure is marked by attributes defined by gender, race, and class, with ideal identities expressed and interpreted through proxy indicators, and then communicated through the curation and promotion of an acceptable persona. Therefore, feelings of belonging and legitimacy are mutable, subject to changes in both the academic environment and the individual (Wren Butler, 2022). Academic optimism is increasingly recognized by researchers as a means to overcome the heterogeneity of the academic environment in higher education institutions and as a catalyst for the successful development of higher education in all its aspects (Scott et al., 2023).

Research Productivity

Factors influencing the productivity of researchers within higher education institutions are being meticulously studied (Karabchuk, 2022). These factors include not only the expectations of the administration, the ambitions of universities to achieve top positions in rankings and become leaders in their fields, but also the specific culture of higher education institutions (Uwizeye et al., 2022). A particular focus is given to the so-called “culture shock” experienced by researchers when interacting with non-academic environments (Skakni & McAlpine, 2022). The culture of a university, characterised by a clear hierarchy and prolonged decision-making periods requiring collegiality and justification, faces significant challenges when interacting with the real world of business and market relations. This is due to the need for quick decision-making, often at an individual level, taking risks, and committing to specific courses of action without extensive deliberation and justification. Once again, individual competencies of researchers receive special attention, the development of which is not only their personal responsibility but also requires institutional support from the organisation. The effectiveness and intensity of this support are determined by the organisational culture of each specific higher education institution (Tikhonova & Raitskaya, 2022).

Academic Culture Models

Cultural models are regarded as the collective ability of a group or community to shape a symbolic dimension around an object or symbol at a certain historical juncture (Marsico, 2018). Such models should not, however, be interpreted as signifying uniformity in the knowledge and belief systems among individuals participating in the same activities within identical contexts. The inherent diversity within social settings and among individuals inherently challenges the notion of cultural models as simply uniform constructs of meaning. Each individual represents a myriad of subcultures, thereby enriching the diversity of cultural models. Ac-
understanding of academic culture as a complex phenomenon. However, the logic of the studies we analysed leads to an understanding of a higher education institution as an organisation. The definitions of academic culture we have accumulated show a tendency toward centralising its understanding. For instance, in the bibliographic review by Pedraja-Rejas et al. (2022), the descriptions of academic culture extracted from the studies included predominantly describe the culture of a higher education institution as an organisation. However, the logic of the studies we analysed leads to an understanding of academic culture as a complex phenomenon that includes research culture, organisational culture, and learning culture. Yet, this more centralised understanding is not axiomatic: some authors see the academic culture of a university more as a culture of learning than the triad of research culture, organisational culture, and learning culture discussed above.

Increasingly, it seems that the academic culture of higher education institutions is moving towards being perceived as a metaculture. This allows educational process actors worldwide to build a transparent and effective educational process based on the principle of seeking and constructing knowledge, accompanied by research initiatives and the application of their results in practice. Transforming the research process into a leading tool for university development evidently transforms the perception of academic culture, placing expected emphases and strengthening those architectural blocks that are designed to ensure further successful development of each specific university and higher education in general. Undoubtedly, academic culture as a metaculture will be ineffective without relying on the organisational culture of a specific higher education institution, determined among other things, by its climate. However, global conventions inherently inherent in the “ideal” content of academic culture are capable of optimising both the educational and research components of university activities most effectively. Hence, the viewpoint of Chassabi Chorsi et al. (2022), suggesting that the academic culture of universities should be researched as an independent subculture with its special characteristics in the process of scientific development and performance of the higher education system, seems promising.

Overall, researchers note the diversity of components that hierarchically construct its architecture. However, different researchers form different sets of structural components, which also indicates the need for a unified approach to its description. In this context, the idea of Shen & Tian (2012) becomes particularly significant, according to which the academic environments consist of both the hardware environments and the software environments. The hardware environments refer to the material conditions supporting academic research and activities, such as infrastructure, equipment, research sites, books and other informational data, opportunities for communication and exchange, basic living necessities, stable places for teaching and research, research funds, and collaborative funds. Meanwhile, the software environments refer to the humanity environments, namely the academic aura and atmosphere.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this review was to trace the transformation in the definition and structural components of academic culture. Despite the variety of approaches to its definition, there is a common recognition of its impact both at the level of its actors and at an organisational level. Academic culture encompasses not only educational and research components but also includes crucial aspects such as organisational structure, the climate within educational institutions, and the interaction between personal and professional qualities of participants in the educational process. The study of academic culture has revealed that cultural models in the educational environment are not homogeneous and can vary depending on a multitude of factors, including gender characteristics, cultural codes, and historical contexts. This underscores the need for an individualised approach to understanding academic culture in various higher education institutions.

A key point is the recognition that academic culture is a dynamic and continually evolving system. It requires the active participation of all stakeholders in its formation and support. The interaction between researchers, students, and administrative staff plays a central role in creating an environment that fosters integration, knowledge exchange, and overall development. Defining and understanding academic culture necessitates considering a wide range of its aspects, not only structural components but also the dynamics of interactions within the academic community.

Further research should focus on formulating a unified definition of academic culture and constructing its balanced and hierarchically organised architecture.
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