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The objective of this proposal is to examine the influence of stressors and benefits related to work and family on dual-military marriage wellbeing. The central hypothesis of the proposed research is that individuals in dual-military marriages are exposed to unique stressors and benefits in the work and family domain. Those individuals in dual-military marriages who receive little or no support from either domain will experience both negative health and lower subjective feelings of wellbeing. The second year of this study has been focused on data collections and data management. We have successfully administered surveys and interviews (focus groups) to six different military bases (Fort Bragg, Fort Campbell, Fort Bliss, Fort Hood, Fort Shafter, Fort Huachuca). Data collections began July 2013. We were also been approved to administer surveys and interviews to the Arizona National Guard. This data collection started June 2013.

Initial findings suggest gender difference in types of support men and women dual-military members receive. Additionally, findings suggest differences in key relationships between dual- and nondual-military couples.
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INTRODUCTION

Approximately 8.9% of the U.S. Army is made up of dual-military members. Individuals who are in dual-military marriages not only have many demanding roles, but the roles are more likely to spillover between their work and their family. Research on the work-family interface has repeatedly shown that work-family spillover can lead to both negative and positive outcomes. There has been much research that has examined work and family experiences in the military. However, there have been very few studies that have examined the health and wellbeing of individuals in dual-military marital relationships. The objective of this proposal is to examine the influence of stressors and benefits related to work and family on dual-military marriage wellbeing. The central hypothesis of the proposed research is that individuals in dual-military marriages are exposed to unique stressors and benefits in the work and family domain. Those individuals in dual-military marriages who receive little or no support from either domain will experience both negative health and lower subjective feelings of wellbeing.

BODY

I have just begun to examine my data. Listed below are the Aims of the research protocol. In the next report, through both our quantitative and qualitative analyses I hope to provide a more in-depth review related to the four aims.

Aim 1. Determine what work and family events affect dual-military marriage individuals' work and personal health and wellbeing

Aim 2. Identify groups (e.g., sex, rank) within dual-military marriages that are uniquely affected by being in a dual-military marriage and assess why these differences are present

Aim 3. Examine how the Army can buffer the negative consequences of stress and how the Army can help individuals deal with stress that comes with being in a dual-military marriage.

Aim 4. Assess how Army personnel can deal with work and family stressors so they can be healthy Army enlisted personnel and officers.

Initial Findings. The initial findings have focused on Aim 2. We have conducted initial analyses and were able to write up some initial reports for APA. In one paper (Huffman, Barbour, Miley & Klinefelter, 2014) we examined whether dual-military women, when compared to dual-military men, experience different work-family support mechanisms that could result in decreased wellbeing. Results showed that men ($M=2.74, SD=0.43$) experienced higher levels of wellbeing than women ($M=2.58, SD=0.40, F_{(1,132)}=5.89$, partial $h^2=.04$). Additionally, men reported that their supervisors provided more supportive behavior for three of the four types of FSSB (emotional, role model, instrumental). Results of the Bootstrap estimation (Preacher & Hayes, 2004) indicated that these FSSB factors mediated the relationship between gender and wellbeing. Please see table below for analysis information.
Table 1
Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Well-being</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FSSB</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .001 Note. Reliabilities are on diagonal; FSSB = Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors

Table 2
Bootstrap Mediation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

In the second paper (Huffman, Miley, Klinefelter, & Vargas, 2014), we proposed that both dual-career and dual-military personnel possess similar levels of work resources and work demands. So although the groups experience unique resources and demands, they are both equally at risk to role conflict. However, we expect that differences in the two groups would emerge on how WFC impacts important outcomes, such as job performance and family satisfaction. We hypothesized that WFC would have a more detrimental effect for dual-career couples than dual-military couples for both job performance and family satisfaction. As expected, an ANOVA showed no significant differences in WFC between groups (F(1, 254) = 0.10, p=.75, partial eta squared = .00). Difference test between two independent rs showed differences in strength for WFC-job performance relationship for dual-career (WFC-T r=-.22; WFC-S r=-.27; z=2.0) and dual-military (WFC-T r=.01; WFC-S r=-.03; z=1.8). Finally, the WFC-family satisfaction relationship was similar for both samples. Please see table below for analysis information.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics by Dual-Career and Dual-Military Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Children</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time-based WFC</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.604**</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.325**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strain-based WFC</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.473**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Performance</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.221*</td>
<td>-.274**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.256**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.422**</td>
<td>-.279**</td>
<td>.184*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 1.46 | SD: .50

Note. Dual-career is displayed on left diagonal and dual-military is displayed on right diagonal; *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed); ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed); N = 302
### Status of Tasks

1. Table A provides an update on the 31 tasks listed within the statement of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task #</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Time – Quarters</th>
<th>Update (October 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Obtain HRPS approval</td>
<td>Q1.1, Q1.2</td>
<td>Complete: HRPS was approved. When needed– amendments are submitted. Most of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amendments have been letters of support from commanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Hire Research Coordinator</td>
<td>Q1.1</td>
<td>Complete: Research coordinator was hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Updated Literature Review</td>
<td>Q1.1</td>
<td>Completed; always being updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Site Visit (USAMRMC)</td>
<td>Q1.2</td>
<td>Completed: Attended the IPR – August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Interview Protocol</td>
<td>Q1.2</td>
<td>Completed: Interview protocol was completed, and revised as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>Initiate Communications with organizations</td>
<td>Q1.2</td>
<td>Complete: Communications were initiated, and are ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>Survey Instrument Development</td>
<td>Q1.2</td>
<td>Survey instrument was developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>Qualitative Software Training</td>
<td>Q1.2</td>
<td>Complete: Training has been completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
<td>Interview Training</td>
<td>Q1.2</td>
<td>Complete: Training has been completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
<td>Interview Phase Scheduling</td>
<td>Q1.2^1</td>
<td>Complete: Interviews have been scheduled, and most are complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 11</td>
<td>Qualitative Software Training</td>
<td>Q1.2</td>
<td>Complete: Training has been completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 12</td>
<td>Data Collection Scheduling</td>
<td>Q1.2, 1.3</td>
<td>Complete: Data collections have all been scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 13</td>
<td>Pilot Interview Questions</td>
<td>Q1.3</td>
<td>Complete: Interview Questions – piloted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 14</td>
<td>Pilot Survey Questions</td>
<td>Q1.3</td>
<td>Complete: Survey Questions – piloted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 15</td>
<td>Data Collection - Interview Personnel</td>
<td>Q1.4, 2.1, 2.2</td>
<td>Ongoing: We have completed 25 thus far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 16</td>
<td>Data Collection – Quantitative</td>
<td>Q1.4, 2.1, 2.2</td>
<td>Ongoing: We have collected 1297 married personnel who have completed the survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 17</td>
<td>DoD Program Review – year 1</td>
<td>Q1.4</td>
<td>Completed report (June 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 18</td>
<td>Submit yearly local IRB continuation</td>
<td>Q1.4</td>
<td>IRB submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Breakdown of quarters under current schedule with grant beginning Feb 15:

Q1.1: Feb 2012 – Apr 2012  
Q1.2: May 2012 – Jul 2012  
Q1.4: Nov 2012 – Jan 2013

Q2.1: Feb 2013 – Apr 2013  
Q2.2: May 2013 – July 2013  
Q2.3: Aug 2013 – Oct 2013  
Q2.4: Nov 2013 – Jan 2014

Q3.1: Feb 2014 – Apr 2014  
Q3.2: May 2014 – Jul 2014  

Dyadic Data

Currently we have 73 dyads (married couples). This was probably one of the bigger challenges that we have encountered. We have two data collections left. We will be focusing on obtaining more dyads in these two final data collections. Working closely with our POC’s at the next two data collection locations, we have ensured that as many current dual-military personnel as possible are in attendance for survey administration. We also updated our research support request that was sent to the posts we will be visiting to include an invitation for both members of a dual-military couple to attend. Protocols for reaching out to dual-military spouses post data collection to complete an online survey have been revised to yield more respondents.

Demographic Data for Enrolled Subjects
Table 2 provides a breakdown of the data we have collected thus far:

**Table 2. Demographic data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Married: Dual-Military</th>
<th>Married: Not Dual Military</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Male: 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female:</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Female: 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 – E4:</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>E1 – E4: 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 – E9:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>E5 – E9: 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 – 06:</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>01 – 06: 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1-W5:</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>W1-W5: 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White:</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>White: 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American:</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Black/African American: 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic:</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Hispanic: 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian:</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Asian: 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander:</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Pacific Islander: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American:</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Native American: 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Other: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Status</td>
<td>Has Children: 50%</td>
<td>Has Children: 74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Data.** We have conducted 25 focus groups and have completed the transcription of the interviews. The research team is just beginning to code and analyze these data. We do not have enough of the task completed to speak to themes and general findings.

**Recommended Future Work.** At the March 2014 MOMRP meeting, Dr. Koehlmoos’ expressed the need to extend this research to Marine Corps personnel. Although there is very little research on Marine Corps personnel, it appears that dual-military Marine Corps personnel do experience unique challenges and related negative consequences. Currently 7.9% of married Marine Corps personnel are in dual military marriages (Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, 2012). Additionally, 61.6% of married female Marine Corps members are in dual military marriages, the highest percentage of all service branches (Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, 2012). Arnenstein (2011) reported that the divorce rate was higher for Marine Corps officers who were in dual military marriages when compared to Marine Corps officers who were not in dual military marriages. With this in mind, I intend to follow up on this research population and submit a grant focused on Marine Corps personnel.

**KEY RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- Initial results suggest that women are not provided with similar support mechanisms that are afforded to men.
• Work-family boundaries are more flexible for dual-military couples than for dual-career couples, allowing for more work-family management.
• Although both dual-career and dual-military couples experience role conflict, the effects on job performance (but not family satisfaction) were most detrimental for dual-career couples.

REPORTABLE OUTCOMES


CONCLUSION

Thus far we have only begun to examine our data. In our initial analyses we found some interesting findings and associated implications. In the first conference paper, the findings that women are not provided with similar support mechanisms that are afforded to men could be problematic since gender differences at work have been shown to be attributed to the management of stress (Bellman, Forster, Still, & Cooper, 2003). If women in dual-military marriages are not offered support, they are at an additional disadvantage in the workplace when compared to men. The findings provide insight to the importance of family supportive supervisor behaviors for men indicating that when support was high the resultant wellbeing was high.

In our second conference paper, our results provide support for the contention that work-family boundaries are more flexible for dual-military couples than for dual-career couples, allowing for more work-family management. We found that although both dual-career and dual-military couples experience role conflict, the effects on job performance (but not family satisfaction) were most detrimental for dual-career couples. It could be that the resources gained from being in a dual military marriage (e.g., shared understanding of military expectations) could buffer the stressors of role conflict. Interestingly, for both groups there was a strong negative relationship between WFC and family satisfaction, suggesting that this buffering effect might not protect the family domain.
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Dual-Military Marriages:
Which Gender Receives the Supervisor’s Support?

A dual-military marriage is defined as a “married couple in which both partners are enlisted or commissioned by the military” (Huffman & Payne, 2006). Approximately 8.9% of married personnel in the U.S. Army are dual-military personnel (Department of the Army, 2009). Whereas there has been much research that examined work (e.g., Deans & Byrne, 2009) and family (e.g., Bradley, 2007) experiences in the military, there have been few studies that have examined the wellbeing of dual-military personnel.

Dual-military personnel deal with stressors that stem from both the work and the family domain. Negative outcomes associated with these stressors can decrease when the personnel believe that the organization is supportive of their work-family needs (Huffman, Youngcourt & Castro, 2008). Family supportive supervisor behavior (FSSB), one type of support, has been shown to positively influence employees through emotional support, instrumental support, role modeling behaviors and creative work-family management (Hammer, Kossek, Zimmerman, & Daniels, 2007).

The current study examined whether dual-military women, when compared to men, experience different work-family support mechanisms that could result in decreased wellbeing. According to the differential vulnerability hypothesis (McDonough & Walters, 2001) women are more likely to appraise stress as being more taxing (Eaton & Bradley, 2008) due to their avoidance of discomfort which suggests they would benefit from supervisor support. Yet paradoxically, gender itself could influence provisions of support. Since the military is considered a gendered occupation (Blackburn & Jarman, 2006), men could be provided with support that is not necessarily provided to women. Based on this gendered structure and the
premises of ascriptive allocation of resources (Bielby, 2000), it is proposed that men receive more support at work compared to women and that these support mechanisms explain why gender is related to wellbeing.

**Method/Results/Discussion**

Participants were part of a larger study that examined the experiences of married military personnel. Inclusion criterion was dual-military marriage status (N=133). Participants completed measures of wellbeing (GHQ; Goldberg & Huxley, 1980) and FSSB (Hammer et al., 2007). Results showed that men (M=2.74, SD=0.43) experienced higher levels of wellbeing than women (M=2.58, SD=0.40, F(1,132)=5.89, partial η²=.04). Additionally, men reported that their supervisors provided more supportive behavior for three of the four types of FSSB (emotional, role model, instrumental). Results of the Bootstrap estimation (Preacher & Hayes, 2004) indicated that these FSSB factors mediated the relationship between gender and wellbeing.

The findings that women are not provided with similar support mechanisms that are afforded to men could be problematic since gender differences at work have been shown to be attributed to the management of stress (Bellman, Forster, Still, & Cooper, 2003). If women in dual-military marriages are not offered support, they are at an additional disadvantage in the workplace when compared to men. The findings provide insight to the importance of family supportive supervisor behaviors for men indicating that when support was high the resultant wellbeing was high. Future studies need to examine strategies to ensure that women receive similar types of supportive behaviors.
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Military and Family Boundaries:

How Integration Buffers Dual-Military Marriages

Dual-career families are characterized by partners who are both committed to their professional occupations (Huffman & Frevert, 2014). Being in a dual-career family brings unique demands on each individual and on the family as a whole (Elloy & Mackie, 2002). Dual-military couples, a type of dual-career marriage, encounter their own unique demands due to the nature of the military (e.g., living separately; Huffman & Payne, 2005). For both groups it can be a challenge to find a balance between family and work demands, which hinders important work and family outcomes.

Job Demands-Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006) provides rationale for why dual-career marriages can potentially lead to role conflict (Elloy & Mackie, 2002). We propose that both dual-career and dual-military personnel possess similar levels of work resources and work demands. So although the groups experience unique resources and demands, they are both equally at risk to role conflict (Hypothesis 1).

However, we expect that differences in the two groups would emerge on how WFC impacts important outcomes, such as job performance and family satisfaction. Boundary theory suggests that the more roles are integrated the less impact they have on role boundary violations (Ashcroft, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000). Dual-military couples have higher amounts of role integration than other couples (Teplitzky, 1988) and therefore the interaction between work and family leads to fewer negative outcomes. Not only does this integration provide for flexibility, but the role contrast between the two couples is minimal making the transition from work to family more manageable (Ashcroft et al., 2000). We hypothesize that WFC would have a more detrimental effect for dual-career couples than
dual-military couples for both job performance (Hypothesis 2) and family satisfaction (Hypothesis 3).

**Methods/Results/Discussion**

Military members who were either dual-career or dual-military were recruited from units from several Army installations. Participants (N=302) completed a survey that examined work-family conflict (Carlson, Kacmar & Williams, 2000), family satisfaction (Carver & Jones, 1992), and job performance (Griffen, Neal & Parker, 2007).

As expected, an ANOVA showed no significant differences in WFC between groups (F(1, 254) = 0.10, p=.75, partial eta squared = .00) supporting hypothesis 1. Difference test between two independent rs showed differences in strength for WFC-job performance relationship for dual-career (WFC-T r=-.22; WFC-S r=-.27; z=2.0) and dual-military (WFC-T r=.01; WFC-S r=-.03; z=1.8) supporting hypothesis 2. The WFC-family satisfaction relationship was similar for both samples rejecting hypothesis 3.

Our results provide support for the contention that work-family boundaries are more flexible for dual-military couples than for dual-career couples, allowing for more work-family management. We found that although both dual-career and dual-military couples experience role conflict, the effects on job performance (but not family satisfaction) were most detrimental for dual-career couples. It could be that the resources gained from being in a dual military marriage (e.g., shared understanding of military expectations) could buffer the stressors of role conflict. Interestingly, for both groups there was a strong negative relationship between WFC and family satisfaction, suggesting that this buffering effect might not protect the family domain.
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Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics by Dual-Career and Dual-Military Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Children</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time-based WFC</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.604**</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.325**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strain-based WFC</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.473**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Performance</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.221*</td>
<td>-.274**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.256**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.422**</td>
<td>-.279**</td>
<td>.184*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 1.46, 1.47, 3.67, 3.05, 4.31, 3.16
SD: .50, .50, 1.02, 1.10, .64, .98

*Note.* Dual-career is displayed on left diagonal and dual-military is displayed on right diagonal; *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed); ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed); N = 302
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