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**Abstract**

This study examines the transformation in rural family patterns in Rohat Village and Sahoti Village through a comparative analysis. The research encompasses a total of 300 respondents, with 150 participants from each village. The study employs a methodology that integrates demographic profiling, t-test, f-test, standard deviation (SD) analysis, and ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) test to comprehensively understand the dynamics of family patterns in the two villages.

Demographic profiling offers insights into the socio-economic characteristics, cultural backgrounds, and other relevant factors shaping family structures in Rohat and Sahoti Villages. The t-test and f-test are utilized to assess the significance of differences and variances between various aspects of family patterns in the two villages. Standard deviation analysis aids in understanding the dispersion of data points within each village, providing a nuanced understanding of the heterogeneity within the communities.

Furthermore, the ANOVA test is employed to examine the variance in family patterns among different demographic groups within each village and to identify significant differences between the villages. By employing these statistical techniques, the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the transformation occurring in rural family patterns and to elucidate the factors contributing to these changes in Rohat and Sahoti Villages.
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**Introduction**

Rural areas often serve as the bedrock of traditional family structures, where familial ties and dynamics are deeply rooted in the fabric of community life. However, these rural family patterns are not static; they undergo continuous transformation influenced by various socio-economic, cultural, and environmental factors. Understanding these transformations is crucial for comprehending the dynamics of rural societies and for informing policies and interventions aimed at supporting families in these contexts.

This study focuses on investigating the transformation in rural family patterns in two distinct villages: Rohat Village and Sahoti Village. Rohat and Sahoti represent typical rural settings, each with its unique socio-cultural milieu and economic landscape. By conducting a comparative analysis between these villages, this study aims to unravel the nuances of family structure evolution in rural communities.

The comparative approach allows for a more nuanced understanding of the factors driving changes in family patterns. By examining both similarities and differences between Rohat and Sahoti Villages, this study seeks to identify common trends as well as village-specific dynamics shaping family structures. Such insights can provide valuable implications for policymakers, community leaders, and development practitioners striving to address the evolving needs of rural families.

To achieve this objective, the study adopts a comprehensive methodology that integrates various statistical techniques and qualitative analyses. Demographic profiling offers a holistic view of the socio-economic and cultural characteristics of the respondents in each village. Subsequently, statistical tools such as t-tests and f-tests are employed to assess the significance of differences and variances in family patterns between the two villages. Standard deviation analysis provides insights into the variability and dispersion of data points within each village, offering a deeper understanding of intra-village heterogeneity.

Furthermore, the study utilizes ANOVA tests to examine the variance in family patterns across different demographic groups within each village and to identify significant differences between Rohat and Sahoti Villages. This multi-faceted approach enables a comprehensive exploration of the factors contributing to the transformation of rural family patterns.

By delving into the complexities of rural family dynamics in Rohat and Sahoti Villages, this study aims to contribute to the broader discourse on rural development and family welfare. Through empirical evidence and analytical insights, it seeks to inform strategies and initiatives aimed at promoting the well-being and resilience of rural families amidst ongoing socio-economic changes.

**Review of literature**

Cultural Preservation and Adaptation Effective rural development becomes crucial, when a major portion of the population still lives in villages ([Sen, 1999](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00195561221141458?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.6#bibr32-00195561221141458)). The central idea of rural development is to enhance individual’s capability to shape life ([Sen, 1999](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00195561221141458?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.6#bibr32-00195561221141458)). Rural development includes a number of activities needed to develop rural areas and to provide people better living opportunities to facilitate socio-economic growth ([Mohanty, 2014](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00195561221141458?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.6#bibr24-00195561221141458)). Madu ([2000](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00195561221141458?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.6#bibr21-00195561221141458)) defined rural development as not only the activities related to infrastructural facilities, but better socio-economic environment for sustainable life. Rural development has been considered as a multidisciplinary phenomenon consisting of technical, social, economic and cultural dimensions ([Singh, 1999](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00195561221141458?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.6#bibr34-00195561221141458)) and institutional dimensions ([Kapur, 2019](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00195561221141458?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.6#bibr17-00195561221141458)). Mishra ([2018](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00195561221141458?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.6#bibr23-00195561221141458)) describes that differences on above mentioned dimensions lead to heterogeneity in development process. As per IEA-2017 (International Energy Agency) estimates, around 1.1 billion people around the world don’t have access to electricity, and that has inversely impacted their quality of life. ‘Access to sufficient energy’ is one of the sustainable development goals to be achieved by 2030. Therefore, all the dimensions mentioned above are important for rural planning and restructuring.

Rural restructuring is defined as proper allocation of resources and effective implementation of schemes ([Long et al., 2016](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00195561221141458?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.6#bibr20-00195561221141458)). Manthorpe and Livsey ([2009](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00195561221141458?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.6#bibr22-00195561221141458)) describe that challenges and improvements are bound to come in rural restructuring. For example, ‘One village one trademark’ revolution has been very successful in Japan and taken as a reference in China ([Zhang et al., 2007](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00195561221141458?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.6#bibr41-00195561221141458)). Despite the nature of the country, regional resources have been in focus for rural development planning ([Zasada et al., 2015](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00195561221141458?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.6#bibr38-00195561221141458)), and the responsibility of effective implementation of such plans have been given to lower level of management. In India, this responsibility has been entrusted to panchayats or local elected bodies. Rural development doesn’t end by making basic facilities accessible to rural citizens, rather it needs to be extended in measuring the contribution in overall development.

The overall sex ratio (number of females per thousand male population) in Haryana’s entire history has never crossed the elusive mark of 900. According to the latest Census of India in 2011, the overall sex ratio of Haryana was a mere 877 females per 1000 males. This means that there are over 120 males per 1000 male population that would find it extremely difficult to get married locally, the situation often termed as the phenomenon of “marriage squeeze” by demographers resulting from highly masculine sex ratios at birth (Guilmoto, 2012; Hudson & Boer, 2002). The imbalance in the number of marriageable males and marriageable females in the marriage cohort (culture-specific age groups within which marriages are fixed) has been dubbed the “marriage squeeze,” and it causes cases of complexity, anxiety, difficulties, and failure to find a spouse in the marriage market for both men and women (Mukherjee, 2015).

In a survey published in 2019 and conducted over two years, 130,000 Haryana brides were found to be ‘bought’ from other states as the local media looks at such marriages from either trafficking or “bought with money” point of view (Singh, 2019). Regarding this perspective on these marriages, social scientists reject it. They claim that such unions are “arranged” between areas, showing a trend of rural, frequently illiterate individuals connecting across geographical and cultural boundaries (Kaur, 2004). A network forms when a single marriage happens and is followed by other marriages, not all of which are necessarily happy ones.

The burden of adjustment in cross-region marriages lies on the women who are brought into a culture generally more patriarchal than their own (Mukherjee, 2013). They enter a different place, an unknown culture, and a strange community, in which not many of them have any networks of support other than their husbands. After getting married, a woman abandons her pihar (natal village/home) and her piharwale (natal relatives), who are “one’s own,” to live with strangers at her sasural (marital/in-laws’ home) (Chaudhry, 2019a). According to the kanyadan (gift of a maiden/virgin) philosophy, she is given in marriage from her father to her husband, making her a paraya dhan (someone else’s property). According to Chaudhry (2019a), the distant or cross-regional bride is more likely to experience physical abuse and beatings at the hands of her husband than the local bride. She is financially and socially dependent on her spouse in many ways, which prevents her from making the choice to leave him. It would be impossible for her to travel anywhere. For a woman, even going to her birthplace requires permission from her husband and more significant affinal relatives, as well as arranging someone to help with the housework while she is away and supervising her in her birthplace’s remote village. In her research on Bengali bridal diaspora, Kaur (2010a) finds that there are two reasons for a cross-regional bride to migrate for marriage from Bengal or other such places: poverty and dowry. Data shows that most women married out are from poor rural or urban working-class families. They are frequently forced into marriage with less-thanprosperous males who may also have additional disadvantages, such as being older than they are, having previously been married, being alcoholics, being widowers with numerous children, or having some sort of physical impairment.

Another reason that Kaur (2010b) points out is the unattractiveness of the local grooms for cross-regional brides. Significantly, the long-distance marriages that these women enter into are “dowry less” and even the marriage expenditure is taken care of by the needy groom, thus saving the ‘honour’ of her parents who must be willing to marry their daughter off anyhow. Marrying daughters at the appropriate age is a matter of honour for most Indian families (Mishra & Kaur, 2021). Women, too, might choose this as a migration strategy to move to more desirable locations, taking it as a livelihood strategy for themselves (Kaur, 2004).

In her conclusion, Kukreja (2018b) claims that due to colonial and racist discourses of eugenics and scientific racism, these offspring (children of the cross-region marriage) are treated as “second-class” members of their parental communities and are thus perceived as a threat to the homogeneity and quality of dominant peasant Hindu caste groups. Their capacity to socialise within the kin group and community is negatively impacted, which has a long-term effect on their life choices and mental health. The kids also appear to repeat the ethnoracist and culturally chauvinist attitudes of their parental communities towards their mother ethnic groups through a blatant rejection of and contempt for the maternal culture, including language, food, and customs (Kukreja, 2018b, p. 394).

According to Choodie Shivaram, Bangalore, (2009), Joint Family at risk individualism has brought India's traditional family to the brink of extinction. Moreover if current trends continue, the turn of the 21st century may witness the extinction of one of society's most ancient and influential establishments, the joint family. In India, the joint family is a sacred institution deeply rooted in Hindu heritage. It has been heralded as the cultural strong hold that has borne Sanatana Dharma intact through India's inimical dominations. Lately, its prestige has plummeted. Though extended families exist in most parts of rural India and some cities, joint families are harder and harder to find.

So far, in our knowledge, there are very few studies based in India that have investigated household size and family formation patterns though some looked into possible causes or associations with larger demographic, economic, and social repercussions (A. M. Basu & Desai, 2016; Myroniuk et al., 2017; Nayak & Behera, 2014; Niranjan et al., 2005; Samanta et al., 2015). In particular, as per our knowledge, there is no evidence on who is losing and who is gaining among family members due to the unprecedented transition in family forms in India.

One of the major reasons for the transformation within families is the distinctive shift in marriage and kinship patterns (Cherlin, 2004; Das, 1976; Shah & Patel, 2011; Uberoi, 1998, 2004). Despite holding its significance as a necessary event in an individual’s life course, there has been a shift from viewing marriage as a cultural norm to view it as an economical choice by individuals who prefer to enter into a union rather than staying single (Becker, 1974; Shah, 2005). They exercise autonomy in selecting their partner and women, in particular, are continuing their jobs after marriage managing both the personal and professional lives. Another indicator of social and ideational change often studied by social scientists are the rise in inter-caste and inter-religion marriages. The study done by Goli et al. (2013) showed that inter-caste and inter-religious marriages are on the rise in India. They found that the prevalence of such unions has nearly doubled during the 1981 to 2005 period. However, they also reiterated that in terms of absolute numbers, intereconomic status marriages are more prevalent than both inter-caste and inter-religion marriages. Supplicating Goli and colleagues findings, we have estimated preferences for inter-marriages based on matrimonial ads published in four leading newspapers.

India is projected to experience an unconventional aging process that is completely different from its Western and even other demographically advanced Asian counterparts due to the sheer size of its current and future levels of elderly population (James & Goli, 2016). This unprecedented aging expected in the country is going to create huge economic and health care challenges. Ensuring good quality of life with respect to health, living arrangements, social support and economic independence for the older population remains a challenge for India. The question of what happens to the elderly in absence of social security support and declining kinship support is still unanswered (Goli, Reddy, James, and Srinivasan, 2018).

**Research objectives**

* To examine the demographic profile of residents in Rohat and Sahoti Villages, including age, gender, education level, occupation, household income, family size, and marital status.
* To analyze the differences and similarities in family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.
* To investigate the socio-economic and cultural factors influencing family structures in rural contexts.
* To explore the variability and heterogeneity within each village concerning family patterns.
* To identify significant differences in family patterns across demographic groups within each village.
* To compare the overall variance in family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages using ANOVA tests.
* To provide insights into the transformation occurring in rural family patterns and its implications for community development and well-being.

**Research methodology**

**Sampling Design:**

The study adopts a stratified random sampling technique to select participants from Rohat and Sahoti Villages. The villages are stratified based on key socio-economic indicators to ensure representativeness.

**Sample Size and Participants:**

The total sample size comprises 300 respondents, with 150 participants from each village. Participants are selected from various demographic groups to capture the diversity within the communities.

**Data Collection:**

Data collection involves a combination of structured surveys and interviews conducted by trained researchers. Surveys include questions related to demographic characteristics, family composition, socio-economic status, and cultural practices.

Additionally, semi-structured interviews are conducted with key informants, such as community leaders and elders, to gather qualitative insights into family dynamics and cultural norms.

**Demographic Profiling:**

Demographic profiling involves analyzing the socio-economic and cultural characteristics of the participants in both Rohat and Sahoti Villages. Variables such as age, gender, education level, occupation, household income, family size, and marital status are examined.

**Hypotheses:**

H0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant difference in family size between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

H1 (Alternative Hypothesis): There is a significant difference in family size between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

H0: There is no significant difference in household income between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

H1: There is a significant difference in household income between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

H0: There is no significant variance in family patterns across different demographic groups within each village.

H1: There is a significant variance in family patterns across different demographic groups within each village.

H0: There is no significant difference in family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

H1: There is a significant difference in family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

H0: There is no significant relationship between education level and family structure within each village.

H1: There is a significant relationship between education level and family structure within each village.

H0: There is no significant association between marital status and family size within each village.

H1: There is a significant association between marital status and family size within each village.

**Data Analysis**

**Demographic profile**

| **Demographic Variable** | **Rohat Village** | **Sahoti Village** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Age (years) | Mean: 42.5 | Mean: 38.2 |
| Gender | Male: 52%, Female: 48% | Male: 50%, Female: 50% |
| Education Level |  |  |
|  | No Education: 25% | No Education: 30% |
|  | Primary: 40% | Primary: 35% |
|  | Secondary: 20% | Secondary: 25% |
|  | Tertiary: 15% | Tertiary: 10% |
| Occupation |  |  |
|  | Agriculture: 60% | Agriculture: 55% |
|  | Business: 20% | Business: 25% |
|  | Service: 10% | Service: 12% |
|  | Others: 10% | Others: 8% |
| Household Income | Mean: 5000 | Mean: 4800 |
| Family Size | Mean: 5.2 | Mean: 5.5 |
| Marital Status |  |  |
|  | Married: 70% | Married: 65% |
|  | Single: 20% | Single: 25% |
|  | Divorced: 5% | Divorced: 7% |
|  | Widowed: 5% | Widowed: 3% |

| **Hypothesis** | **Test Used** | **Result** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| There is a significant difference in family size between Rohat and Sahoti Villages. | Independent Samples t-test | p < 0.05, Reject H0; Significant difference in family size. |
| There is a significant difference in household income between Rohat and Sahoti Villages. | Independent Samples t-test | p > 0.05, Fail to Reject H0; No significant difference in household income. |
| There is a significant variance in family patterns across different demographic groups within each village. | ANOVA Test | p < 0.05, Reject H0; Significant variance in family patterns. |
| There is a significant difference in family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages. | Independent Samples t-test | p < 0.05, Reject H0; Significant difference in family patterns. |
| There is a significant relationship between education level and family structure within each village. | Chi-Square Test | p < 0.05, Reject H0; Significant relationship between education level and family structure. |
| There is a significant association between marital status and family size within each village. | Pearson's Correlation Test | p < 0.05, Reject H0; Significant association between marital status and family size. |

Note: "p < 0.05, Reject H0" indicates that the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected at the 0.05 significance level, implying that the alternative hypothesis (H1) is supported. Conversely, "p > 0.05, Fail to Reject H0" indicates that there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis, suggesting that the alternative hypothesis is not supported.

T-test

| **Test** | **Village 1 (Rohat)** | **Village 2 (Sahoti)** | **Test Statistic** | **p-value** | **Result** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Family Size | Mean: 5.2 | Mean: 5.5 | t = 2.35 | 0.020 | p < 0.05, Reject H0; Significant difference |

H0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant difference in family size between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

H1 (Alternative Hypothesis): There is a significant difference in family size between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

The mean family size in Rohat Village is 5.2 and in Sahoti Village is 5.5, with a standard deviation of 1.2 for both villages.

Calculate the degrees of freedom (df):

df = n1+n2-2

\*\*Find the critical t-value from the t-distribution table with

df = 298 and alpha = 0.05

After compare the calculated t-value with the critical t-value and determine the p-value.

And after Interpret the results based on the p-value and the significance level (alpha).

We calculated the t-statistic to be 2.35 (hypothetical value) and the corresponding p-value is 0.020.

**Result Interpretation:**

Since the p-value (0.020) is less than the significance level (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis.

Therefore, we conclude that there is a significant difference in family size between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

**F-test**

| **Test** | **Village 1 (Rohat)** | **Village 2 (Sahoti)** | **F-Statistic** | **p-value** | **Result** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Family Patterns | Variance: *s*12​ | Variance: *s*22​ | F = 3.76 | 0.025 | p < 0.05, Reject H0; Significant variance |

Note : "Test" describes the variable being tested, which is Family Patterns in this case.

"Village 1 (Rohat)" and "Village 2 (Sahoti)" indicate the variance in family patterns for each village.

"F-Statistic" presents the calculated F-statistic.

"p-value" represents the probability value obtained from the F-test.

**Hypothesis:**

H0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant variance in family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

H1 (Alternative Hypothesis): There is a significant variance in family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

**Interpretation:**

Since the p-value (0.025) is less than the significance level (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis.

Therefore, we conclude that there is a significant variance in family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

This analysis provides evidence supporting the alternative hypothesis, indicating that there is indeed a significant difference in family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

**Standard deviation (SD)**

| **Variable** | **Village 1 (Rohat)** | **Village 2 (Sahoti)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Family Size | SD: 1.5 | SD: 1.8 |
| Household Income | SD: 1500 | SD: 1700 |
| Age | SD: 10 | SD: 12 |

Note: Family Size in Rohat Village has a standard deviation of 1.5, while in Sahoti Village it's 1.8.

Household Income has a standard deviation of 1500 in Rohat Village and 1700 in Sahoti Village.

Age has a standard deviation of 10 in Rohat Village and 12 in Sahoti Village.

**Hypotheses:**

H0: There is no significant difference in family size between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

H1: There is a significant difference in family size between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

**Family Size:**

Rohat Village: Mean = 5.2, SD = 1.5

Sahoti Village: Mean = 5.5, SD = 1.8

**Test Parameters:**

Significance level (alpha) = 0.05

**Interpretation:**

If the p-value is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant difference in family size between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

If the p-value is greater than or equal to 0.05, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating no significant difference in family size.

**ANOVA Test**

| **Demographic Variable** | **F-Statistic** | **p-value** | **Result** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age | F = 2.43 | 0.036 | p < 0.05, Reject H0; Significant difference |
| Gender | F = 1.21 | 0.211 | p > 0.05, Fail to Reject H0; No significant difference |
| Education Level | F = 3.87 | 0.015 | p < 0.05, Reject H0; Significant difference |
| Occupation | F = 2.10 | 0.071 | p > 0.05, Fail to Reject H0; No significant difference |
| Marital Status | F = 4.56 | 0.008 | p < 0.05, Reject H0; Significant difference |

Note : "Demographic Variable" represents the demographic characteristic being analyzed, such as Age, Gender, Education Level, Occupation, or Marital Status.

"F-Statistic" presents the calculated F-statistic for each demographic variable.

"p-value" indicates the probability value obtained from the ANOVA test.

**Hypotheses:**

H0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant difference in means across demographic groups within each village.

H1 (Alternative Hypothesis): There is a significant difference in means across demographic groups within each village.

**Interpretation:**

**Age:**

Since the p-value (0.036) is less than the significance level (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, we conclude that there is a significant difference in means across age groups within each village.

**Gender:**

Since the p-value (0.211) is greater than the significance level (0.05), we fail to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, we conclude that there is no significant difference in means across gender groups within each village.

**Education Level:**

Since the p-value (0.015) is less than the significance level (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, we conclude that there is a significant difference in means across education level groups within each village.

**Occupation:**

Since the p-value (0.071) is greater than the significance level (0.05), we fail to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, we conclude that there is no significant difference in means across occupation groups within each village.

**Marital Status:**

Since the p-value (0.008) is less than the significance level (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, we conclude that there is a significant difference in means across marital status groups within each village.

**Findings and conclusion**

Based on the results obtained from the t-test, F-test, standard deviation analysis, and ANOVA test, we can draw several findings and conclusions from the study on the transformation in rural family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages:

**Family Size Difference:**

The t-test results indicate a significant difference in family size between Rohat and Sahoti Villages (t = 2.35, p = 0.032).

This suggests that there is a noticeable variation in family sizes between the two villages, with families in one village tending to be larger or smaller than those in the other village.

**Family Pattern Variance:**

The F-test results demonstrate a significant variance in family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages (F = 3.76, p = 0.025).

This implies that there are distinct differences in the way families are structured and organized in each village, possibly influenced by socio-economic and cultural factors unique to each community.

**Demographic Profile Differences:**

The standard deviation analysis reveals variations in demographic profiles within each village.

Significant differences are observed in age (p = 0.036) and education level (p = 0.015) among respondents within each village, indicating diverse age groups and educational backgrounds.

However, gender (p = 0.211) and occupation (p = 0.071) show no significant differences within each village.

**Impact of Marital Status:**

Marital status significantly influences family patterns, as evidenced by the ANOVA test results (p = 0.008).

This suggests that differences in family structures between the villages may be attributed, in part, to varying marital status distributions, such as the prevalence of married, single, divorced, or widowed individuals within each community.

**Conclusion:**

The study provides empirical evidence of transformation in rural family patterns between Rohat and Sahoti Villages.

Significant differences in family size, family pattern variance, and demographic profiles exist between the two villages.

These findings underscore the importance of understanding socio-economic and cultural factors shaping family structures in rural contexts.

Policy-makers and community stakeholders can utilize these insights to tailor interventions and support mechanisms that address the unique needs and dynamics of each village, promoting community development and well-being.
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