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Abstract: Deliberative democracy has provided fruitful ground for interactions between normative political theory and empirical political science. Scholars have successfully investigated many aspects of deliberation, but most of these studies focus on outcomes. This has left a gap in the literature regarding what goes on during the deliberative process. What happens in the black box? Utilizing unique data from four panels of the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review (CIR), I assess citizens' evaluations of deliberation as the process occurs. The CIR brings together a panel of randomly-selected and demographically-balanced citizens to evaluate ballot measures that will be going in front of voters. The panel hears directly from campaigns for and against the measure and calls upon policy experts during the multi-day public review. My analysis indicates that, on the whole, citizens evinced high levels of satisfaction with the CIR process, although there were still differences across the five days of deliberation. While there were increases in positive perceptions of citizens’ role in the process and self-reported openness to others’ views, there were mixed or negative changes in their perceptions of their ability to express their own views, the respect given them by others, and pressures to agree to things of which they were not sure. Most importantly, the data demonstrate that just looking at outcomes obscures the dynamic process that occurs across an extended deliberative process. These findings can inform deliberative practice by making designers sensitive to the ebb and flow that occurs across a deliberative panel, and focusing on how the middle period of deliberation is often the most fraught with possible breakdowns.

Deliberation: The Normative Meets the Empirical

One of the most fruitful areas of research at the intersections of normative political theory, empirical political science and political psychology has been studies of deliberative democracy (Bächtiger and Hangartner 2010). The variety and scope of this literature today is almost overwhelming. Among many other topics, scholars have examined deliberation and its relationship to civic virtue (e.g. Gronlund, Setala and Herne 2010), meta-consensus and intersubjective rationality (e.g. Niemeyer and Dryzek 2007), political knowledge (e.g. Muhlberger 2006), deliberative norms (e.g. Mansbridge, Hartz-Karp, Amengual and Gastil
storytelling (e.g. Black 2009; Jaramillo and Steiner 2014), civic attitudes and perceptions of the deliberative experience (e.g. Gastil, Black, Deess, and Leighter 2008), attitude change (e.g. Gastil, Bacci and Dollinger 2010; Gastil, Black, and Moscovitz 2004), and political efficacy (e.g. Nabatchi 2010). In this paper, I wish to contribute one small piece to this growing literature. Unlike many scholars who focus on questions of opinion change, my previous work has tried to examine those aspects of deliberation that might contribute to democratic legitimacy (e.g. Morrell 1999; Morrell 2010). While I have made several arguments that link legitimacy with empathy, I am also interested in the perceptions citizens have of the deliberative process. In this paper, I focus on this latter goal within the context of a real-world deliberation: the Citizens’ Initiative Review.

The Citizens’ Initiative Review: Real-World Deliberation

The Oregon legislature established the first legally-constituted Citizens’ Initiative Review (CIR) as a democratic forum where citizens could deliberate about ballot issues that state electorate would decide upon in subsequent elections. The goal was to provide those voters with information from the perspective of citizens like them who had studied the ballot initiatives, heard expert testimony from those who supported and opposed the initiatives, and discussed the initiatives with other citizens. Two initial CIR panels occurred before the 2010 election, and two occurred in the run-ups to elections in both 2012 and 2014. Healthy Democracy, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization based in Portland, Oregon has run every CIR to date; in addition to the CIRs in Oregon, it engaged pilot CIRs in 2014 in Jackson County, Oregon; Phoenix, Arizona; and statewide in Colorado.

Each CIR panel involves bringing together a stratified random sample of 19 to 24 registered voters for 4 to 5 days to examine and deliberate about a specific ballot measure. These citizen panelists receive information about the ballot measure, hear from groups that support and oppose the measure, interview neutral witnesses, and engage in intensive deliberation in both small groups and all together. They then produce a one-page analysis for distribution their fellow citizens. For the Oregon CIRs, this report appears in the official Voter’s Pamphlet sent to the entire electorate that includes all ballot measures.

The CIR process is unique in several ways, especially as it has appeared in Oregon over the last three election cycles. Not only does it bring together a random sample of citizens to deliberate for several days regarding one of the ballot measures, in the case of the Oregon CIRs, the results of the deliberation have a legally-established method of dissemination to the voters.

---

1 It is impossible to truly cite the empirical deliberative literature these days. I have tried to provide examples in various areas of study, but have left out many more. A few further examples of this already large and continually growing literature include: Büchsiger, Steenbergen and Niemeyer 2007; Barbas 2004; Delli Carpini, Cook and Jacobs 2004; Dryzek and Braithwaite 2000; Gastil 2004; Gastil and Dillard 1999; Karpowitz, Mendelberg and Shaker 2012; Knobloch, Gastil, Reedy and Walsh 2013; Luskin, Fishkin and Jowell 2002; McCombs and Reynolds 1999; Mendelberg 2002; Mercier and Landemore 2012; Neblo 2005; Parkinson 2006; Polletta 2008; Rosenberg 2005; Setälä 2011; Stromer-Galley 2007; and Walsh 2004, 2006.

2 See http://healthydemocracy.org/.
Unlike many other forms of mini-publics, which do not require citizens to reach any decisions, each CIR panel produces a written statement regarding the measure that includes both Key Findings and Arguments in Favor and Opposition. This requires that participants vote on several issues, but uniquely as far as I know to the CIR process, it allows those in the minority to communicate their perspectives and reasoning regarding the issue. While which side “wins” certainly becomes the focus of much of the deliberation and subsequent discussion in the broader electorate, the CIR gives a clear voice to the minority position. Finally, and most importantly for this paper, the CIR occurs over a number of days, and after each day, participants answer several questions related to the deliberative process. It is here that I wish to focus my analysis.

**Inside the Black Box: What Goes on During Deliberation**

As noted in my introduction, scholars have studied a wide range of topics relating to deliberation and deliberative mini-publics. While there are exceptions, many studies begin with citizens who have various perceptions, opinions, evaluations, and preferences, they engage those citizens in deliberation, and then they measure the changes that have occurred in those perceptions, opinions, evaluations, and preferences. Understanding that such changes occur is an important part of understanding deliberation, but I would argue that it is only one component of such an understanding. It is important, I believe, to get inside the black box of what happens *during* deliberation if we fully want to understand it; the CIR gives us a unique opportunity to do so.

Looking at the overall evaluations after the CIR process, we do see some variation across years. Figure 1.1 presents the aggregate evaluations of all CIR participants by year. These results stem from daily and end-of-review evaluations that all participants completed between 2010 and 2014. All evaluations had a 100% response rate (2010 N = 48, 2012 N = 48, 2014 N = 99).

**Figure 1.1 Participants’ overall satisfaction with the process, 2010-2014**

![Figure 1.1 Participants’ overall satisfaction with the process, 2010-2014](Figure comes from Gastil, Knobloch and Richards 2015, 11.)
Participants’ overall satisfaction with the process was very high in 2010, with lower, yet still significantly positive, evaluations in both 2012 and 2014. Between 92 and 98% of participants reported “high” or “very high” satisfaction with the process. Based upon these numbers, we can rate the CIRs as successful with regard to how those who participated viewed them. When we look at the measures across time within deliberation, however, we can see that something more interesting has occurred.

The CIRs’ unique structure allows us to shed at least some light on the black box. Here, I want to highlight specifically how opening up this box demonstrates that we may be missing something if we only look at the pre- and post-deliberation data. While we could study many aspects of what occurs during deliberation, in this paper I want to examine the evaluations citizens have of the deliberative process itself. [Note: I plan on looking more closely to see if I have missed any studies that do this; additionally, I should add those studies that have looked at pre- and post-test evaluations of the deliberative process.]

**Results: Participant Evaluations of the CIR Process**

In what follows, I present the results of the participant surveys for each of the CIR panels in Oregon in 2010 and 2012. The issues discussed at these CIRs were Mandatory Minimum Sentencing (2010 Week 1), Medical Marijuana (2010 Week 2), the Kicker Tax (2012 Week 1), and Casinos (2012 Week 2). [Note: I will be adding a better description of these issues.]

The data come from participant surveys administered at the end of each day of the CIR. The questions included a 5-point Likert scale that asked participants to respond to the following questions:

- **[Important Role]:** On a scale of one to five, with one being not at all important and five being extremely important, how important a role did YOU play in today’s panel discussions?
  
  1. Not at all Important
  2. Moderately Important
  3. Extremely Important

- **[Express Views]:** Would you say you had sufficient OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS YOUR VIEWS today?
  
  1. Definitely No
  2. Probably No
  3. Unsure
  4. Probably Yes
  5. Definitely Yes

- **[Consider Other Views]:** When hearing views different from your own today, how often did you consider them carefully?*
  
  1. Never
  2. Rarely
  3. Occasionally
  4. Often
  5. Almost Always

  *Day 5 wording was “When Other CIR Participants or Advocate Team Members Expressed Views Different From Your Own today, How Often Did You Consider Carefully What They Had To Say?”; 2012 Week 1 had no reference to “Advocate Team” in this question.

- **[Felt Respect]:** How often do you feel that other participants treated you with respect today?
  
  1. Never
  2. Rarely
  3. Occasionally
  4. Often
  5. Almost Always

---

3 At the time of writing, I have only been able to evaluate the data from these two years. Future iterations of this paper will include data from the 2014 CIRs as well.
[Felt Pressure]: How often today did you feel pressure to agree with something that you weren’t sure about?

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Often  Almost Always

These measures capture various aspects of the citizens’ views of the deliberative experience. The Important Role and Express Views variables give citizens’ perceptions of their place within the deliberative process; Consider Other Views reflects citizens’ evaluations of their own openness to others in the process; finally, Felt Respect and Felt Pressure reveal participants’ judgments about how others treated them. Since we have responses to each of these questions after each day, we are able to see how these various perceptions change across the deliberation.

Results: Citizens’ Perceptions of Their Place within the Deliberative Process

Figure 1.2 evaluates participants’ evaluations of how important their role was in the process of deliberation. Not surprisingly, at the beginning of the process, they did not see themselves as having an important role, with a mean just above the “moderately important” point. This is likely because they are more involved with receiving instructions and information at the commencement of deliberation, rather than participating more actively.

Figure 1.2 Mean for Important Role by Day
By the end of the process, however, they see themselves as having a very important role. Again, this is not at all surprising, but what the CIR data allows us to understand is exactly when this change occurs.

Table 1.1 presents difference in means tests for each change in the Important Role variable by day. The last row represents the change in this variable from Day 1 to Day 5, and it is usually what we see in studies of deliberation: how participants change from the beginning of the process to the end. What the table allows us to determine, however, is when such a change actually occurs within the deliberative process itself. While there are minor positive changes across the first four days in the CIR process, it is really in the last day that the most improvement occurs in participants’ perceptions of the role in the process. The only statistically significant differences are between Days 4 and 5, and Days 1 and 5. Substantively, since the variable has a four-point range, the overall change of .698 represents 17.5% of the maximum possible, with the .396 from Day 4 to Day 5 accounting for over 56.7% of this change.

Day 5 is when citizens actively engage in producing the final reports that will appear in the voter pamphlet, so this finding is not unexpected, but it is revealing that, while they see some importance in their roles as information gatherers and analyzers, it is really in the last day of the process, the moment at which they engage in active decision-making that they feel they have the most important role. In many mini-public deliberations, participants never actually make final decisions or produce reports, as occurs in the CIR, and this data gives evidence that it is at this final decision-making moment that they feel the most important. While this may have been due to the expectations set up from the beginning—they knew they would do this eventually—and many other mini-publics never set up this expectation, I still think it is a revealing finding.

Turning to the second variable in which participants evaluate their own contributions to the deliberative process, we see a different dynamic. Figure 1.3 represents the mean scores each day on the Express Views variable. Whereas Important Role evinced a continued improvement from Day 1 to Day 5, participants showed a more varied pattern here, although encouragingly they generally gave high marks for their ability to express their views, with the mean scores after each day falling between 4 and 5.
Figure 1.3 Mean of Express Views by Day

As is clear from the figure, the differences here do not appear large, and we can confirm this by looking at the difference in means tests presented in Table 1.2. Statistically, the change from Day 1 to Day 2 was significant, while from Day 4 to Day 5 it was moderately significant. There was no significant change across the other days, or from the beginning to the end. Substantively, the changes were moderate, with the .219 drop from Day 1 to Day 2 representing 5.5% of the maximum possible change, and the .146 increase between Day 4 and Day 5 representing only a 3.7% difference.

Table 1.2 Difference in Means of Express Views by Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Express Views</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Significance (two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 to 2</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 to 3</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3 to 4</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4 to 5</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 to 5</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with Important Role, these changes likely result from the process of the CIR itself. Day 1 prepares participants for the process and allows them to ask questions about deliberation, while Days 2 through 4 involve them in information gathering and does not provide as much opportunity to give their own opinions, so a slight decrease on this variable is not surprising. Day 5, however, is when they have the opportunity to engage in creating the final report, and thus much opportunity for opinion giving, and while it would be possible that some participants
might feel shut out during this process, it is reassuring to see that there was a rebound on this measure after the last day. While these changes were not too large substantively, we again see that by looking across the deliberative process that participants go through a range of views on how they perceive their own place in the process. Without the distinctive nature of the CIR and the data generated from it, we would never be able to see this.

Results: Citizens’ Evaluations of Their Openness to Others

Turning to participants’ evaluations of how carefully they considered the views of others, Figure 1.4 elucidates a pattern similar to that of the Important Role variable, although with changes of a slighter magnitude. This arises mainly because they begin with such high evaluations of their own openness, something that we should probably expect. It is probably unlikely that people will evaluate themselves as close-minded in a deliberative process of which they are a part.

Table 1.3 presents the underlying statistics illustrated in Figure 1.4 and confirms that, despite the expected positive self-evaluations, there was a gradual increase day-to-day in participants’ evaluations of their own openness. These minor changes do not come close to reaching the level of statistical significance, however, and it is only in comparing Days 1 and 5 that the data do so.
Table 1.3 Difference in Means of Consider Views by Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consider Views</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Significance (two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 to 2</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 to 3</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3 to 4</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4 to 5</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 to 5</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, unlike Important Role, in which Day 5 was much more important in affecting changed perceptions, here there was a gradual change across many days. While this represents a case in which a pre-test/post-test like comparison would have captured the change, we are still able to determine more precisely that the change was more gradual across the entire deliberative process, with some hints that it accelerated across the second half of the CIR. The .156 difference is also much less than we found with Important Role, being more akin to the smaller changes in found with the Express Views variable. Substantively, it represents only 3.9% of the possible maximum change possible.

Results: Citizens’ Perceptions of How Others Treated Them

The final two variables I am presenting—Felt Respect and Felt Pressure—speak to the one of the key components of many (although not all) deliberative theories: reciprocity. Reciprocity represents the idea that participants in deliberation much treat their interlocutors with mutual respect and be open to faithfully listening to them. Jürgen Habermas, for example, argues that deliberation is a process of reciprocal recognition, implied by the very nature of politics itself, wherein individuals who compose society come together to do good for everyone (1996, 21). Contrary to a marketplace of ideas, Habermas contends, “the paradigm is not the market, but dialogue” (1996, 23). In deliberating, citizens do not simply put ideas on display but actually have reciprocal discussions among themselves. For Rawls, citizens must adhere to the criterion of reciprocity, which “requires that when those terms are proposed as the most reasonable terms of fair cooperation, those proposing them must also think it at least reasonable for others to accept them, as free and equal citizens, and not as dominated or manipulated, or under the pressure of inferior political or social position” (Rawls [1996] 2005, 446). The criterion of reciprocity excludes domination, manipulation or pressure exerted on others.

While measures such as the Discourse Quality Index (DQI) often include components that attempt to measure reciprocity objectively (see Steiner, Bächtiger, Spörndli and Steenbergen 2004), in this case the measures ask participants their subjective experiences with respect and pressure. There are advantages to measuring deliberative quality objectively, but I would argue that unless participants themselves feel that others respect them and do not put undue pressure on them to change their minds, we would be amiss to argue that, despite these perceptions, reciprocity occurred during the deliberations. There might be cases where participants unfairly judge these matters, but on average, a deliberation characterized by the presence of reciprocity ought to evince subjective evaluations of its presence amongst citizens.
Figure 1.5 elucidates that, on average, the CIR process did lead to positive evaluations of reciprocity by participants, with the means across all five days at the high end of the variable’s range. As with previous variables, however, there were significant changes across the five days of deliberation.

![Figure 1.5 Mean of Felt Respect by Day](image)

Table 1.4 demonstrates that, unlike previous variables, perceptions of respect, although they remained high, tended to decline across the deliberation. The most significant decline occurred between Days 2 and 3; Day 3 involves participants in hearing the arguments of the proponents and opponents of the measure, as well as background witnesses. They also began engaging in small and large group conversations led by moderators to distill the information, reveal lingering questions about the initiative, and identify the most important information for voters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felt Respect</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Significance (two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 to 2</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 to 3</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3 to 4</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4 to 5</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 to 5</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This period during the CIR process is the most open to conflict, and thus, provides the greatest threat to reciprocity. Anecdotal evidence from observers of the CIR process noted that, while there was conflict among participants, much of the conflict in several deliberations occurred between the participants and the opponents or proponents of the initiatives. [Note: There is work on this that I need to get a citation for it.]

Still, while overall evaluations of respect were high, and the decrease was not substantively large, we can see that the conflict in deliberation can threaten reciprocity; the .177 decrease from Day 2 to 3 represents 4.4% of the possible change. Although there did appear to be some rebound in perceptions of respect from Day 4 to 5, an encouraging development, this measure was still on average .167 lower at the end of Day 5 than it was at the end of Day 1, 4.2% of the possible change.

Yet it is only by having the data presented here that we can begin to identify were this threat to reciprocity exists. I hope to engage in further analysis of the data and transcripts to identify what exactly occurred in the middle days of the deliberative process that led to this decrease, but what is special about this CIR data is that it allows us to hone in on exactly when the decrease happened in order to better understand it.

We can see a similar pattern in participants’ perceptions of feeling pressure from others to agree to something of which they are not sure; Figure 1.6 illustrates that the middle part of the deliberative process had the greatest effects on these perceptions.

![Figure 1.6 Mean of Felt Pressure by Day](image)
As with respect, participants reported generally high levels of reciprocity, in this case signified by the low means, which represent little pressure from others. [Note: I plan on reverse coding this in the future so that it makes more sense.] This measure of levels of reciprocity scored well on average, but again, across the deliberative process there were significant changes, and not toward greater reciprocity.

Table 1.5 establishes that there was a highly statistically significant increase in reported pressure between Days 1 and 2, and a moderately statistically significant change between Days 3 and 4. While there appeared to be a slight rebound in this measure between Days 4 and 5, this was not statistically significant, and the earlier changes meant that participants reported statistically significant higher levels of pressure after Day 5 than they did after Day 1. Substantively, these changes represented 4.0% (.158), 4.2% (.167), and 6.9% (.274) of the possible change in the variable. The change from Day 1 to Day 5 was the most substantively significant one found outside of the changes in the Important Role variable.

### Table 1.5 Difference in Means of Felt Pressure by Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felt Pressure</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Significance (two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 to 2</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 to 3</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3 to 4</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4 to 5</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 to 5</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there were some differences between the two reciprocity measures, the general pattern was the same. Overall, participants reported high levels of perceived reciprocity, but the middle days during the deliberation tended to have a negative effect on those perceptions. There appeared to be some rebound between Days 4 and 5, but in the end, the earlier decreases largely remained in place. On the one hand, the high levels of reciprocity are encouraging, but on the other, it is important to be cognizant of the main risks to reciprocity that exist during the give and take of deliberation. Further analysis of the transcripts and other data from the CIR will hopefully provide some insights into what specifically tended to affect perceptions of reciprocity. In the end, however, if it were not for the unique data from these deliberations that allow us to look inside the black box, we would not have a good idea of from where these risks may arise.

**Conclusion: Looking Inside the Black Box**

We can reach several conclusions from this examination of these various measures of the perceptions of deliberation. Initially, the data show that if we simply used pre- and post-test measures of people’s perceptions, we would miss much that went on during the deliberative process. In many cases, there is variation across time that it is important to understand.
This is where studying the CIRs can get complicated, especially when one is interested in this dynamic procedure across time. By its very nature, the CIR process involves a small number of citizens, and thus, any statistical analysis of the data from the participant surveys must confront a small-N problem. If we were to dig further into the data in search of an explanation, the complications only compound. Some preliminary analysis I have completed indicates that, in addition to the changes across time, there may have been changes in these five measures across the different CIRs. The panels for each of these consisted of only 24 participants, and trying to separately analyze each one increases the small-N problem even further. This means that traditional time series analysis, or even lagged regression, is highly unlikely to produce satisfactory results given the number of controls we would have to introduce for each panel.

A simpler test, and one that I have executed here, is to simply compare the means for each measure from day to day, and from the first day to the last. This lacks some sophistication, but it does demonstrate that there are some statistically significant differences for many of these comparisons; this is encouraging. There also appear to be at least some patterns within the pooled data that make some sense given the very nature of the CIR process. The variation that does exist is generally confined to a small range, but given the naturally truncated nature of the measures—participants were generally positive—that any differences at all exist, and some that appear substantively significant, is revealing.

In order to answer fully understand these differences, it is important to supplement the statistical analysis with a qualitative analysis of the process that occurred during the CIRs and the transcripts of the deliberations. There is anecdotal evidence, for example, that the citizens on one particular panel clashed with one set of experts at a particular time in the process. Investigating this more closely using the transcripts might allow us to explain better some of the variations we see on the reciprocity measures during the middle of the deliberative process.

What is important about this study, however, is that we it encourages us to look for such explanations, and even targets where to look. Deliberative democracy allows us to connect normative political theory and empirical examinations of our political world. The Citizens’ Initiative Review also allows to connect both with political practice. I have tried to show that the CIR also gives us a unique opportunity to examine what goes on in the process of deliberation; we can start peeking inside the black box. I have not answered all the questions about citizens’ perceptions of deliberation, but hopefully, I have made the box perhaps a bit less black, perhaps a dusky gray. With just a bit more light, we will be able to more fully understand how citizens perceive the various processes of deliberation, and what steps we might take to make those already positive perceptions even better.
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