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**Abstract**

The paper draws on an interpretive study which evaluated a project entitled ‘Supervision: a business service to schools’[[1]](#endnote-1). The research evaluated the school leaders’ original and developing understanding of the purpose and effectiveness of supervision (Reid & Soan, 2015). The evaluation was positive and the expectations were exceeded: as one participant stated, “A wonderful learning development opportunity.” The challenging context for the participants is described in the paper and the nature of the supervision service is outlined, alongside the methodology for the research. Those using the service were volunteers and the main benefit was seen as *restorative*, within the concept of the *normative*, *formative* and *restorative* functions of supervision (Inskipp & Proctor, 1993). Drawing on the work of Foucault, the service is also examined in terms of the wider discourses that surround the practice and a cautionary note is raised.

**Context**

Principals, Head Teachers, Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators (SENCOs) and other Senior Leaders in schools in England (as well as Family Liaison Officers and Mentors) are supporting families on a regular basis with many severe social issues including domestic violence, abuse, kidnap, and drug and alcohol addiction. Such issues will have an impact on the ability of children of these families to access and engage with learning, and managing this is part of the daily work of many educators. However, this regular engagement with such severe social issues is likely to be emotionally detrimental to education professionals’ well–being and hence to their ability to maintain roles, such as SENCO and other senior posts, long term unless there is some form of specialist ‘clinical’ supervisory support.

Recognising this need, our university, in partnership with The Diocese of Canterbury, offered a supervision service to senior staff in a number of primary/junior schools in the county, alongside undertaking an evaluation study to identify whether a supervision service to schools was considered beneficial. The schools were all in ‘areas of social and economic disadvantage’. The service entailed each participant receiving six, two hour supervisory sessions over the course of an academic year with an experienced supervisor. Over a period of two years, between 2014 and 2016, seven participants volunteered to complete a qualitative questionnaire at three points of receiving the supervision service (at the start, mid-way and after the final supervisory session). In the first year of the service the supervisor described the process and summarised the issues raised in the sessions. This paper refers to the supervisor’s comments and reports on the findings from the evaluation study of the participants’ questionnaires from the first and second year of the project. There will be a second study in 2017/18 to extend the evaluation, via conducting in-depth narrative interviews with participants who are continuing into a third year of the service, plus seeking the views of the funder of the project on the impact of the service

Before progressing further, I should clarify what is meant by ‘clinical’ supervision and outline the purpose of the supervisory service discussed. The literature on supervision is extensive and cannot be included in this brief paper, although relevant references are added. Using the term clinical supervision can help to avoid confusion with line management supervision. Clinical supervision is used in the therapeutic and nursing professions and involves the practitioner discussing their case work and related professional issues with an experienced supervisor. The latter may or may not be a senior colleague and may be part of the organisation or an external expert. Whether the supervisee is new to their role or an experienced practitioner the purpose is to reflect on practice, learn from the experience and to ensure that a good service is offered to ‘clients’ or patients. For practising members of the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy supervision is compulsory. Other helping services allied to health professionals may offer clinical supervision to their practitioners and the practice can be found in social work, the probation service and other helping services.

In the project, the purpose of the supervision service was agreed with the funder and shared with the participating schools. The purpose was to provide an external supervisor so that senior managers and SENCOs had an opportunity to reflect on, air and discuss professional practice issues in a confidential setting. Thought was given to how a ‘safe space’ was created where issues could be shared and explored, outside of the normal teaching hours. An outcome was the opportunity to consider strategies for developing professional practice, through fulfilling the *formative*,*normative* and *restorative* functions of supervision (Inskipp and Proctor, 1993). In other words, to attend to the development of best practice, the management of best practice and provide a space to discuss and manage the emotionalandpsychological effects of the work.

**Establishing the service**

In terms of the delivery of a supervisory service, potential participants were identified through The Diocese and all participants were volunteers. The offer comprised six by two hour sessions delivered to four participants on a one-to-one basis, and to three participants in a group setting. The service was offered on the school’s premises, although this was negotiable and two participants preferred to meet with the supervisor away from the school setting in a mutually agreed alternative location. As noted above, the supervision sessions in the first year were facilitated by an experienced counsellor, educator, researcher and supervisor based at the University. In the second year other experienced colleagues from the University acted as supervisors. A number of principles were established within the contract for the service and discussed with supervisees in the first session. These were considered key to the successful development of an effective supervisory relationship.

 As an indication of our purpose in the project, the following from Schuck and Wood is useful, ‘Supervision is a collaborative process in which the supervisor works with the supervisee to explore their work reflectively. ... Fundamental to the relationship is good rapport and a working alliance’ (2011, p.15). In defining supervision, Harris and Brockbank draw on the work of a number of writers (Harris and Brockbank, 2011, p.153) and suggest the following as descriptors: support, a series of tasks, a developmental process, training, a consultative process, a reflective process, an interpersonal interaction, an impossible profession, keepers of the faith (and they suggest the last one is a little grandiose). In attempting to define what clinical supervision is, there appears to be a consensus about what it is not, and although the effects may not be entirely separate, most writers would separate supervision from therapy.

The literature on the purpose, functions, theoretical and conceptual frameworks, methods, models, tasks and practice is, as mentioned earlier, extensive. Which function is required within a supervisory session at a particular point will vary according to the context, current circumstances and the experience of the supervisee. In many cases the opening or ‘presenting issue’ may appear to be about a formative or developmental task relating to an on-going situation, but the underlying restorative function may need to be addressed in supervision before the practitioner can find the resource or solution to the presenting issue.

To fulfil the functions of supervision, it takes a skilled supervisor with the advanced skills to listen and to ask appropriately challenging questions to move beyond superficial work that fails to address the central issue. Effective supervision is about asking good open questions, not about giving the answers. Good questions help the supervisee to find their own answers, supported by the relationship, the ‘working alliance’. This does not mean that suggestions which may be helpful are never offered, but these must be carefully timed, appropriately discussed and tentative.

The model used in the projectcan be described as integrative(Reid andWestergaard, 2013), which recognises that different approaches will help to address some, but not all of the aspects that a supervisee is likely to bring to a supervision session. The integrative model provides a framework within which the functions of supervision can be met. Egan’s (2007) three stage model used in counselling and other helping interactions provides the structure that can guide a session. Egan’s model offers a process that moves from identifying the issue, considering options and planning for change. Equally important are the core attitudes derived from the person-centred approach of Rogers (1961); i.e., empathy, congruence and unconditional positive regard. There is a risk that any integrative model can treated superficially, but those new to supervision, or unfamiliar with the Egan model, can explore further (e.g. Reid and Westergaard, 2013). The three stages can be summarised as:

* Enabling the supervisee to tell the story of ‘where they are’ at the current time with their ‘problem’ / or a particular case
* Enabling the supervisee to explore the options available to resolve the problem / move forward with the case
* Enabling the supervisee to suggest, evaluate and plan action for the future.

**Clinical supervision in schools – the process in practice**

In order to explain the process and highlight the key issues that participants discussed during the first year of the supervisory service, the supervisor provided an anonymised case study. In summary, all supervision sessions took place in a private and confidential space. Sessions were not interrupted or overheard, ran for two hours in each case, within the agreed time boundaries. Brief records of each session were kept by the supervisor as agreed at the outset. These records are confidential and were not shared with the supervisees’ employing organisation. The sessions began with each supervisee sharing their feelings about their day in the ‘here and now’, as a way to set that to one side. This enabled them to reflect and focus on the issues that they identified as being the priority for the session – they also chose the order for this exploration. Sometimes issues from previous sessions were reviewed, if the supervisee thought that this would be helpful, but often new material was brought each time; thus the agenda for the session was set by the supervisee. The sessions were both reflective and solution focused. Supervisees worked hard to explore the issues they were bringing, to ‘tell their story’ and then evaluate possible courses of action that would help to effect positive change. Occasionally, supervisees used the time to offload, if they felt weighed down by a particularly complex or emotional issue. On other occasions the sessions focused much more on discussing practical strategies rather than emotional issues. This was entirely guided by the supervisee and the supervisor’s task was to listen with empathy and without judgment, and ask appropriate questions, summarise, use appropriate challenge when required, alongside applying the skills of immediacy and silence to encourage deep reflection.

In every case, once the purpose of supervision was explored and understood, and as the relationship between supervisor and supervisee/s developed, every supervisee engaged fully and worked hard to reflect on their practice. By taking time to step away from the work, supervisees were able to see for themselves often small and straightforward actions that can be taken in order to effect change. A number of key issues or themes was raised during the sessions. Many of these were shared across the participants, working in different schools. The themes noted by the supervisor were evident in the responses from the supervisees who participated in the research study - these are highlighted later.

**Methodology of the evaluation study**

 Before engaging in the supervisory service those participants who took part in the evaluation had an opportunity to discuss the research study and clarify the purpose and process. An information sheet was sent in advance and a consent form signed. Ethical approval for the research was granted by the University. Participants were then asked to complete the first qualitative questionnaire, which had been piloted in advance. Participants were informed that the questionnaire would be completed again on two further occasions, at mid-point of the service and on completion of the study. The completed questionnaires were sent to the researcher, not the supervisor, in the first year. One participant was unable to complete the third questionnaire due to a health issue which meant they were not at school at this time.

It was agreed that all participants would receive a copy of the evaluation report. The evaluation report did not name individual schools or individual participants who took part. All participants were free to withdraw at any time without having to give a reason (none did, other than as mentioned above for non-associated health reasons). Each qualitative questionnaire opened with the same statement to re-introduce the purpose of the study. The questions were kept very similar to allow for comparison, but were adapted slightly to reflect the passage of time and the growing experience of supervision of the participants. An additional question was added to the final questionnaire to assess the impact of the supervisory service once it was completed. Participants were free to write as much or as little as they wished. Over the two years, seven participants completed the questionnaires (20 in total).Our research questions, as reflected in the questionnaire were:

1. What is the participants’ current understanding of the purpose of supervision?
2. What aspects of their role do they think would benefit from engaging in a process of supervision?
3. What would they envisage the impact of engaging in supervision might be in terms of their well-being?
4. What would be the main goals of supervision in terms of their practice?
5. What are their expectations from involvement in the supervision service, both personally and professionally?

When all the questionnaires were received, the responses were anonymised and combined for each stage and a thematic analysis took place. The two researchers conducted a separate analysis and then met to share their individual results which were closely aligned. Each year, the findings were disseminated in a report to the participants, the supervisor(s) and to the funder for the service.

**Findings**

The results were overwhelmingly positive. The findings are not claiming to be representative and the sample is small, but as an illustrative case the comments are powerful.

*Questionnaire 1*

At the start of the service participants saw the purpose of supervision as a time to “develop ways of dealing with the aftermath of managing emotionally charged situations” in a confidential space. There was a desire to off-load the stress that the role brings. When asked about how that role would benefit from engaging in supervision, the responses included professional as well as personal considerations. They referred to the need to perform well in challenging situations with children, families, agencies and at times other staff members, within a context of targets and Ofsted (the school inspectorate) expectations. Supervision, in a confidential setting, was perceived as a way to manage these challenges, “to enhance a work/life balance and to keep strong and reflective for families.”

Creating a work/life balance was a key theme throughout the material as participants recognised the need to take care of themselves in order to take care of others in their work. It was also thought the supervision would “help to develop strategies to manage work-based pressures”. All the participants were striving to be consistent, to do a good job and to persevere – there is a strong sense that they saw supervision as a way to ‘keep on keeping on’. One participant spoke of “sleepless nights and worrying about school 24 hours a day”. Enjoying time away from school seemed to carry feelings of guilt for this person, also expressed as “hoping supervision would stop me feeling that I should always be doing more.” When asked to assess the need for a supervisory service on a scale from 0 (no need) to 4 (high need), two participants scored 2 (the middle position) and the others scored 3 or 4. When asked what they hoped to achieve via supervision for their practice, there was some difference of view about the purpose or functions of supervision at this early stage. For example, one participant thought it would be a confidential area for “discussing difficult pupils”. The same person also spoke of the weight of responsibility they experienced in their role and expressed the desire that supervision “will allow me to continue in my role to support vulnerable pupils.” Another spoke of expecting that supervision “would help me to identify specific situations in which I feel pressure” and here there is a suggestion of the learning space that supervision can provide in order to develop skills and strategies. The need to avoid burn-out and to continue in a role they valued as committed professionals is very apparent in the responses.

*Questionnaire 2*

At the mid-point of the service their understanding of the purpose and functions of supervision had developed and the responses are (not surprisingly) more nuanced, for example “the chance for us, as senior leaders, to talk freely and openly to an independent listener.” And, “an opportunity to reflect …resolving emotional conflicts through discussion and compartmentalising the issues.” The benefits they perceived at this point stress the support that supervision provides in terms of the development of their leadership of others, alongside the management of their own emotions. One said, “I am surprised at how far reaching this process has become, and how it has made me reflect back into previous headships and events with families…” The benefits of being provided with a safe reflective space are echoed by others as supervision took place “in a calm but purposeful atmosphere.”

The word purposeful is significant – supervision is not a cosy chat, it is hard, purposeful work for all involved. One said, “I feel less stressed after a supervision session, I put things into perspective… I realise I have a choice in how I cope with stress.” There is evidence of movement in that statement and the notion of choice in how to react to challenging situations, in contrast to being overwhelmed by stress. Another said they now realised “that colleagues are feeling as stressed as I was.” This points to the isolation that they may be experiencing, particularly perhaps the Head of a school. Once again participants referred to the value of the confidential space that can be provided by a skilled supervisor who is independent of the school. Participants were also asked to look back to their responses in the first questionnaire and to assess the impact of supervision at this mid-point. The help and support was described as “invaluable … allowed me the space to think and reflect and to keep strong and resilient.” In the group setting there was recognition that the opportunity to share and learn from each other was effective. For another participant the development involved a broader perspective on the work, as no longer over-whelmed by stress – this was described as being able “to see the big picture”. There was also a sense that the problems that were evident in their challenging work roles were being recognised as inherently difficult, rather than caused by personal inadequacies or an inability to cope. Overall the level of reflexivity had increased.

In terms of scores against the ‘need’ for a supervisory service, these are all now 3 and 4 (high), with all the participants expecting their goals will be met. In considering what else may have changed with regard to their practice as a result of engaging with supervision, one said, “I have on occasions made different decisions for better well-being in relation to issues or dilemmas discussed during a session.” Another spoke of actively looking forward as they recognised that they can change the situation, rather than “just accepting things the way they are”. This suggests that beyond coping better, there is a growing sense of ‘agency’ for this individual. Participants make reference to the benefits of being listened to within a dedicated time away from the work – “headspace” leading to the ability to plan and move forward. One said, “Having the time to stop and reflect in this way is a totally different kind of professional development. One where issues can be shared and addressed without anxiety, fear of burdening others, or appearing vulnerable or unable to cope.” Again reference was made to “better work/life balance”.Also expressed as “taking control back”, suggesting a sense of increased professional autonomy and a way of managing, “the pressure of expectation placed on the role of Head Teacher in order to make myself a more effective practitioner.” One Head Teacher commented, “The sessions have had an immediate impact. I come out of each session ‘uplifted’ because I can see a solution and I have a plan as to how to address an issue. This is a highly effective method of solution focussed support for Headteachers”.

*Questionnaire 3*

The final questionnaire was completed once the supervisory sessions had ended. The participants had by this stage arrived at a confident understanding about the purpose of supervision, for example: “Supervision is the opportunity to talk confidentially to an independent listener, about issues that, if bottled up, could seriously affect your emotional wellbeing and mental health.” And; “An opportunity to reflect upon life within education and discuss the issues faced that are emotionally draining, with a view to resolving these emotional conflicts through discussion and compartmentalising the issues.” Plus; “To give the chance to offload and a chance to reflect rather than taking things home or worrying about them.”

In enumerating the benefits of supervision participants repeated points made before, but with a stronger emphasis. They highlighted the importance of having a structured process that was independent and confidential. The experience was constructive, countering against the isolation that the weight of their responsibility imposes on them. The ‘safe space’, to develop their thinking and strategies for managing their complex work, was viewed as crucial. The ability to “park work” and gain a new perspective was a major benefit – suggesting that supervision provided a very necessary *restorative* space.

Looking back on the experience they recognised the importance of an empathic and non-judgemental listener, which appears to be of particular significance in a context of targets and Ofsted inspection. They also mentioned physical benefits – “being able to sleep better at night.” At the end of the project all the participants scored 4 (the highest score) in terms of the need for a supervisory service and agreed their needs were met. The opportunity for time for “quality reflection” was mentioned and how the goals they work towards in the desire to be effective in their work are all interconnected. Regarding their ongoing expectations, they all wanted the service to continue. Such statements as “a wonderful learning opportunity” highlight the on-going reflexive learning that develops from supervision – the *formative* function.

The additional question in the final questionnaire asked participants to express how they feel supervision had affected them both professionally and personally. Participants spoke of being more relaxed and better able to do their challenging work. One said: “Supervision has been the only time when I can be honest about how I am feeling: in the school context senior leaders have to ‘put a brave and positive face’ on at all times, support their staff and not let their fears / emotions show. I cannot discuss my concerns with others as it is not professional to burden staff with my worries – they have their own.”

Anxiety can be seen “as a weakness and judged accordingly” whereas supervision provides a confidential and non-judgemental space. Others spoke of “enhanced professional judgements” of being “refreshed and a lot calmer” of having the ability to “improve work/life balance”. The participants were invited to make final comments, one said: “I did not realise how much I needed the chance to just talk about worries and stresses.” Another said; “So often we would say ‘I really haven’t got time for this today’ – however the positives of these sessions always made us feel better about the situations we were faced with and made us realise how important they were.”

Participants were able to comment on the wider benefits to the school: “Being able to really focus, identify and discuss the impact of these concerns with a supportive, experienced and skilled listener has been invaluable and has helped me resolve some of the most challenging problems that I just couldn’t see a way of resolving on my own. Supervision has been hugely beneficial, not just to my own well-being but on the school effectiveness.” There is recognition throughout the material that this is a constructive use of protected time with wide beneficial effects, both personally and professionally. The need for protected time is essential for achieving these benefits. Hawkins and Shohet refer to the battle coal miners had in the UK, to ‘wash off the dirt of their labours’ in the employers’ time, rather than their own, and state, ‘Supervision is the equivalent for those that work at the coal-face of personal distress, disease and fragmentation’ (2006, p.58).

**Discussion: supervision and the discourses we live by**

The evaluation of the questionnaires shows that at the beginning of the service participants were experiencing work related anxiety and stress, and were having difficulty in creating a work / life balance. Equally it was clear that they all wanted to do a good job, to take care of others in their work and to persevere with their roles. Increasingly they recognised that the supervision sessions provided them with a safe, calm and purposefulatmosphere in which to reflect and problem solve. After the final supervision sessions, they highlighted that to be constructive it was vital that the service needed to be a structured process, independent, confidential and delivered in a ‘safe space.’ There are three consistent themes which emerged from the feedback on the supervision sessions, they are:professional safety, professional and personal resilience, and professional development– all provided via the learning space of clinical supervision.

The discourse that supervision is a ‘good thing’, then, could not be denied from the evidence gathered derived from the views of those involved. But a cautionary note is required for the development of a supervisory service in any context. To introduce the service, we used the language of business to ease the process with funders and school leaders, and our report focused on the organisational benefits which flowed from the supervised person to the professional advantages of the service. There are discourses at play here. But, there are power issues here too: supervision can be viewed as a confessional practice, discipline at a distance, or what Foucault referred to as a ‘technology of the self’ (1994, p.87). So we need to beware a common sense view that supervision is always a ‘good thing’. Drawing on the work of Foucault, Barker (1998) states that institutional practices, such as supervision, need to be examined for the underlying power issues that may be hidden. Such an examination aims to ‘disturb the tranquillity with which they [social practices] are accepted’ (1998, p.106). Writing from the perspective of counselling, Feltham reminds us that ‘supervision is at least partly a form of surveillance’ (2002a, p.27). This tension relates to the collaborative enterprise of supervision as being non-judgemental, empowering and supportive, and, in contrast, concerned with standards, monitoring, accountability and, potentially, the disciplining of the participant (Reid, 2007).

There is a danger that supervision, if imposed, can infantilise the supervisee. And the service is costly – so who should receive it, how will the employing organisation select future beneficiaries? Currently it is offered to those who work in ‘challenging schools’ where life is particularly stressful. Supervision is offered to manage the stress, but the stress is created in the macro world of funding cuts, constant policy initiatives and relentless inspection – all rooted in the discourses of school effectiveness and standards. At the local and school level there are a number of powerful discourses that shape professional practice. One of these is an instrumental discourse that suggests that ‘getting on with the job’ is paramount, but this shuts out the need to question what that job is: in other words, effectiveness measured in targets and outcomes can mask the human costs of this prevailing view. This may conflict with a discourse that promotes work/life balance and the need take care of self in order to take care of others (seen as vital in the study). Such powerful discourses, often in tension, can constitute an institutional *regime of truth*, ‘the types of discourses which it accepts and makes function as true’ (Barker, 1998, p.93). Such ‘truths’ need to be examined in the context of the participants’ daily struggles to be omnipotent school leaders. However, all the participants in our study spoke warmly about the restorative and supportive function of the practice on both a professional and personal level. But what might be the disadvantages as the service develops and continues within schools and /or is developed within our own HE institution (to be piloted in the coming year)?

Feltham regards supervision as an institution that can lead to ‘infantilisation’ and states ‘We might have learned from Foucault and others the dangers of a surveillance culture’ (2002a, p.27). This reminds us of the need to examine the assumptions inherent in our thinking about the ‘virtue’ of clinical supervision. And, also to question how supervision could itself be viewed as an aspect of Foucault’s notion of power and the products of power, as exercised through the governing practices of self-regulation, self-improvement and self-development (Edwards, 1997). This ‘governmentality’ works through educating people to govern themselves rather than through coercion – ‘Power is exercised through seduction rather than repression’ (1997, p.9). Edwards explores the concept of power and discourse whilst looking at reflective practice and the decline in professional autonomy. This is particularly important when considering supervision as an arena for identifying strategies for the self-development of the school leader.

In relation to the mandatory practice of supervision within counselling, Feltham (2002b) argues that the ‘must’ imperative is likely to lead to some practitioners taking a negative view of supervision. Resistance is constrained by the imperative to attend, but ‘withdrawal’ within the session, undermines the purpose of supervision, particularly where this is imposed and not negotiated with the individual practitioner. The caution here is that supervision can be viewed as disciplinary practice. Power is exerted in the need to attend: ‘It is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge, it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power’ (Foucault, 1980, p.52). Knowledge is required of subjects (for example, via government statistical surveys, educational reports and so on) in order for power to be exercised. In this sense power governs through knowledge of the those in the sector, but is internalised by individuals who are culturally socialised within cultural institutions. This socialisation leads to mechanisms of self-surveillance where practitioners consent to the operations of governmentality. Atkinson, considering how this functions in education, calls this ‘the collusion in our own oppression’ (2003, p.9). In relation to the study of clinical supervision with school leaders, this returns to questioning the ‘need’ for the practice. Could clinical supervision become a form of governmentality and a self-disciplining practice if seen as way of increasing competence to meet standards, and to retain senior leaders in school? Where supervision is offered and accepted this shifts the responsibility for effective ‘performance’ back to the individual and can ignore the wider social and political context that makes the job highly stressful and unreasonably demanding. There are powerful discourses ‘at work’ for senior school leaders, which govern the experience of both their working lives and have consequences in their personal lives (as indicated by our research participants).

Foucault taught us that where there is power there is resistance, but resistance at a macro level is dependent on having a powerful voice. In order to survive many school leaders, find they must comply with, rather than resist policy. Rowland (2003, p.13) argues that ‘compliance, rather than rational debate’ has become the response to government strategies within educational settings. Resistance may be possible ‘at the edges’, but resistance is most likely where subjects are positioned within more powerful discourses (Fairclough, 1995). As supervisors working with school leaders we would not want to become, in Foucault’s terms (1979), the normalised subject that also normalises others. Foucault termed the social process of producing citizens with the right attitudes as ‘techniques of the self’ (1994, p.87). Thus procedures such as clinical supervision and reflective practice may shape identity through processes of ‘self-mastery and self-knowledge’(*ibid*). In this way subjects are disciplined through the ‘normalising’ processes of institutions whose practitioners ‘police’ themselves (Edwards, 1998).

The service continues and is likely to be extended to other schools, in other areas and within our own institution. The next research project will be biographical interviews to gather richer material. As we develop the work further, we need to be mindful of the prevailing discourses that may influence a supportive, clinical supervision service that can be colonised by forces we might describe as hegemonic.
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