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Basic Concepts and Definitions

Social change occurs over time through modifications in social organizations, individuals, and society. Modifications in social organizations include changes in the work place and in policies and routines that govern groups of people. Individual modifications refer to individuals utilizing their choices by discovering and acting on their preferred roles independent of societal norms. Modifying Society refers to shifting the big picture through public policy and legislation. The modifications of these interlaced spheres create social change.

Importance to Work-family Studies

In the work-family equation, there are four major arenas in which types of modifications are influenced: 1) gender roles, 2) technology, 3) the economy, and 4) assumptions around childhood development.

By historically examining shifts in these four areas of the work-family equation, the outcome of social change based on individual, organizational, and societal level modifications becomes clear. [Click here to download diagram]

The above model provides an illustration of the three interlaced spheres of social change: individual, organizational, and societal. In the work-family field these spheres translate into ideal family norms, ideal work norms, and ideal social policy. The movement of each sphere is influenced by current norms and behaviors in connection with gender, technology, the economy, and child development. When a state of balance is reached, the spheres are in-sync and move together (Senge, 1990). When there is a shift in gender roles, technology, the economy and/or child development, a period of imbalance occurs and continues until a new balance is reached and the spheres move together again. Examples of some changes that have contributed towards our current period of imbalance include: the increased number of women in the paid workforce, the development of personal computers and the internet, changes from an industrial to a global economy, and changes in the assumptions of who and how we care for very young children.
A Historical Look at Social Change in Mainstream Society

Note: The following sections refer specifically to the mainstream norms portrayed throughout history as societal ideals. These norms are more a reality for white heterosexual middle to upper socioeconomic class families. The experiences of those in some environments where the norms were unattainable are addressed later in this article.

Pre-Industrialization: Integrated Sustainable Approach

Before industrialization, the majority of families lived on shares of land that were used for farming and self-sustainability in an agrarian society. Prior to industrialization, both women and men participated in supporting the family, though their actions were different; women were in charge of sustenance preparations, family needs, and household duties; men engaged in manual labor and trade preparations. Work done by both sexes was equally accepted and necessary; all of these duties were pertinent to family survival. Families worked to be self-sustainable (Crittenden, 2001; Reich, 2000).

Though mothers and fathers performed separate duties, they both played a role in the care of children (Crittenden, 2001; Landry, 2000; Reich, 2000). In Pre-Industrialization eras, childhood tasks consisted of being trained as young workers by accompanying the same gendered parent throughout their daily workdays. Children were not given time to mature; they moved rapidly from childhood to little adults (Landry, 2000). During this period, society was organized around an ‘integrated sustainable approach’ to work and family that meant both parents were involved in the work of sustaining the family and raising children by preparing them for their adult roles.

Industrialization: Separate Spheres Approach

During industrialization as capitalism spread, complex cities flourished. Labor in large factories and companies became the primary source of income. Tasks that used to be performed for the family goal of sustainability became further segregated into gender specific duties (Reich, 2000). Society adjusted to a completely new approach to work and family, one that was defined by two distinct ‘separate spheres’, where paid work was the ideal man’s job and unpaid care work was the ideal woman’s job.

Industrialization changed society by initiating a new economy; labor outside of the home in companies and large corporations was rewarded monetarily. This shift led to a change in the power and importance of men’s and women’s roles at home. Individuals were separated into unequal spheres of work based on gender. Men earned a salary for the family to live by working outside the home, while women filled the other half of family survival needs: unpaid care work. By the 1950’s, the expectation in the United States was to conform to living the new work and gender roles within separate spheres. These changes sparked a subsequent change in the ideal family as well (Crittenden, 2001).
In the beginning of industrialization, children were still viewed as little workers. This meant they were often pushed into the factories to work long hours for little pay. In the early 1900’s organizations formed to end child labor; in turn, this led to the development of child labor laws. People began to realize and recommend a new approach to childhood that placed importance on the early nurturing and development of children. Eventually, childhood development became a central focus of a wife’s duties. Children were no longer seen as little workers, but as developing humans needing guidance and support. They were still socialized, however, based on gender expectations. Children remained at home with their mothers who were thought to have the natural role of nurturer, while fathers were often used as disciplinarians and financial supporters (Berry, 1993).

The “ideal mother” was defined as one responsible for staying home to raise the children, watch over the family, provide care for aging relatives, cook meals, clean the house, do household duties, and organize the unpaid care work she was responsible for carrying out. Young girls were raised with these goals in mind. On the other hand, the “ideal father” was a successful “breadwinner”: a man that worked in the paid labor force to earn money for his family’s needs. From a young age boys were not socialized to provide care work, but exclusively to be future financial providers for their families. The overall number of women in the paid work force was low compared to men, and the overall number of men doing housework was low compared to women (DeGroot & Fine, 2003).

Concomitantly, a new “ideal worker” norm developed, defined as an employee primarily dedicated to his paid job. Workers were rewarded when they performed as if they had no other wants and needs in life than to serve their employers. The ideal worker was willing to drop anything for his career to insure job security, provide for his family, and fulfill the American dream of upward mobility. The ideal worker was directly in line with the role of the hardworking yet emotionally disconnected ideal father (Bailyn, 1993; Degroot & Fine 2003; Perlow 1997; Williams, 2000).

“Work” was redefined to encompass only those positions that were performed outside the home for pay; care work lost value with the industrialized distribution of monetary compensation • whether that was the work of caring for children or caring for sick or aging relatives (Folbre, 2002). One pertinent example of this shift in value is the economic struggle women now endure after a divorce. Before a divorce both types of work are required and part of the family equation, a woman taking care of domestic duties also increases the man’s ability to be successful at paid work. After a divorce, however, women have to fight for financial rewards, are left to do the unpaid care work, and also have to find an alternative way to financially support their families (Crittenden, 2001).

With the industrialized economy, changes in organizational norms and gender ideology took place and new social policy and regulations were implemented to support these changes.

*An Increasing State of Imbalance: WWII and Beyond*
During World War II, women began to fill the paid work positions previously filled by men now serving in the armed services. This experience opened women to new individual possibilities that were in conflict with mainstream organizations and society at that time (Landry, 2000). After the war, a “family wage” was provided for a brief period of time that assured most men could once again provide for their families and women could return to the home. However, as more jobs became available and wages dropped, women became a growing presence in the paid labor force, adding to the already existent group of working class women (Albelda, 2001).

The women’s movement of the 1960’s and 1970’s provided support for another significant shift in women’s behavior under the ideal of gender equality and equal opportunity for women (Albelda 2001; Gore, 2002; Reich, 2000). Society and its organizations began to change, and as women started to gain a presence in the workforce they became less financially dependent on their husbands. These steps were part of a movement towards the possibility of a more integrated life; a solution that would involve both men and women sharing paid work and unpaid care work and therefore holding a more similar value and power in society. By 2001, the majority of women with children under 18 were in the labor force (78.1% of unmarried women and 69.6% of married women.) (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2003).

Along with the 21st century came advances in technology that had a significant impact on both employees and employers. Through inventions such as personal computers, email and cell phones, work became portable and mobile. Employees could now work anywhere, anytime; businesses needed to become increasingly responsive to a global marketplace.

This shift from an industry-based economy to one that was based on an information technology brought both advantages and disadvantages. For some jobs, work became easy to redesign, but hard to contain. For instance, working from home one day a week or having a virtual conference rather than traveling to meet colleagues became increasingly accepted solutions. Expectations, however, around how quickly work could be completed and clients responded to significantly increased work demands and stress. In this sense, technology became a double-edged sword, both the means to create an integrated approach to work and life, and the culprit for work time spilling into family time.

Concurrently, the shift to a global workforce meant that many jobs were lost in the United States. Real wages have not increased and the wage gap between top-level jobs and hourly paid positions has grown. And for almost all employees, lifetime employment has become a thing of the past. These dramatic changes have made it both a necessity and a possibility for families to embrace a new model of balancing work and family where two parent households and single parent households redesign work so that they have time for the ongoing care of children. However, the possibility of a new integrated work-family approach has not been fully realized. Men are faced with internal and external expectations to continue working in the old breadwinner pattern, and with women doing paid labor, there have been few left to do the care work at home (English, 2003; Reich, 2000).
Over the last fifty years, these social, technological and economic changes have left the majority of families struggling to juggle paid work, care well for their children and aging relatives and find time for themselves, their partner and their communities. In particular this has had an impact on women who were doing one shift at work and a "second shift" at home (Crittenden, 2001; Hochschild, 2003; Schor, 1992). Men and women are still struggling to lead integrated lives and to acknowledge and change the ingrained social identities that shape both their roles at work and their roles at home (DeGroot & Fine, 2003).

As we enter the 21st century, there have been numerous steps to accommodate the changes that have taken place, and to find a new equilibrium where the roles of individuals, organizations, and society are once again in sync. However, research shows that the struggle for balance still leaves parents overworked at home and on the job, and too often leaves the needs of children, aging relatives and communities inadequately attended (DeGroot & Fine, 2003; Gore, 2002; Reich, 2000).

State of the Body of Knowledge

Over the last twenty years, various key players in society, employers, religious institutions, nonprofit and for profit organizations, as well as families began making changes in an attempt to ease the work-family struggle. The changes included full-time child care options, including sick child care, on-site child care and after-school care programs, more fast-food options and on site conveniences, as well as an increasing array of services geared towards employees caring for sick or aging relatives. These developments, among others, provided coping mechanisms for women to juggle both the responsibilities of paid work, and those of family care (Garey, 1999; Heymann, 2001). Often "pitched" to women, it was not even recognized that men might be in need of these services as well. Further, little change occurred that helped people to take advantage of new technology that would allow a more integrated approach to work and life. The solutions that were being developed still reflected a separate spheres attempt to ease the work-family struggle; solutions that would free up parents from care work so that they would have more time for paid work.

Over time, more integrated work policies were developed and once again pitched to women who were interested in staying involved in care work while continuing paid work. These policies included flexible schedules, paid maternity leave, telecommuting and other alternatives. In conjunction with advances in technology, this allowed more mothers to do their jobs efficiently while working less than full time or working in part from home. However, research shows that often those who took advantage of extra time off or flexible schedules were regarded as less than ideal workers without a full commitment to their careers; these workers were not promoted as quickly, and were often taxed for their time taken off for family responsibilities (Fried, 1998). Furthermore, because there was no change in gender and parenting norms along with society and organizations, even though flexible work options could be used by either
men or women, the majority of employees who used these options were women, setting up inequalities in
the work place (Crittenden, 2001).

One of the most telling examples illustrating our current period of imbalance is the vociferous debate
around how, as a society, we want to care for our children. As more mothers entered the workforce, there
was also a dramatic increase in the use of full-time childcare. This allowed women and men to fill the
demands of paid work and compete as ideal workers.

However, this change was also accompanied by increasing concern for the well being of children who
were left primarily in the care of those other than their parents. While research shows that the effects of
full-time childcare are inconclusive, most agree that close attention and individual nurturing relationships
are key to healthy childhood development (Greenspan & Salmon, 2002). Surveys also show that the
majority of parents, both male and female, want more time with their families. Worried about the time
children spent away from their family and the lack of individual attention they received in day care,
mothers and fathers found themselves in a struggle between caring for their children and being taken
seriously at work (DeGroot & Fine, 2003; Williams, 2000).

To cope with these problems, parents have taken various approaches to balancing work and family
depending on many factors of their experience. Some parents continue to fall into traditional family roles
with the mother staying home full time and the father working outside the home full time. In 2001, 19.4%
of married couples with children had just the father working while 5.8% had just the mother working

Other families use full-time childcare while married or single parents work full-time. Alternatively, a
growing number of parents have set up “one parent flex” solutions where one parent uses a flexible work
schedule to do part time work around the other parent who works full time. The parent who flexes their
schedule works while the children are in school or part time childcare (DeGroot & Fine, 2003). In 2001,
52.7% of married couple families consisted of two working parents (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2003).
Within many of these families, however, mothers have not completely traded their care work role for
breadwinner patterns; generally mothers are the ones working less than their full time male counterparts,
especially during their children’s pre-school years (Cohen & Bianchi, 1999).

During this period of imbalance and shifting opportunities, the roles within the family that currently hold
women responsible for both flexible paid work and care of the family while holding men responsible for full
time paid work, have not been widely challenged. In fact, it is our conflicting assumptions around the
value of paid work and the unpaid work of caring for children that either has the potential of keeping
society entrenched in outdated assumptions both at work and at home, or launching men, women,
organizations and social policy towards a new integrated paradigm. At present, families, communities,
and society are suffering from these outdated gender norms and time struggles (Hewlett, Rankin, & West,
However, if society, organizations, and individuals challenge the problems of everyday work norms, gender norms, and parenting norms, social change can occur that would allow parents, as well as all other individuals, to have more integrated and egalitarian solutions both at work and at home (DeGroot & Fine, 2003; Gerson, 1993).

A Note About Those Outside the Mainstream: Unable to Live the Ideal

Although middle class society had adopted a new separate spheres approach to work and family during the industrialized economy, working class and poor families did not have the financial means necessary to carry out the idealized separate spheres approach. For the unemployed and working poor, public policy was created in an effort to aid those incapable of living by ideal social norms on their own. For working class families, modifications were made within the family system as a way to survive when reliance on one parent’s wage was not an option.

The Unemployed and Working Poor

Prior to the late twentieth century welfare was developed to allow working moms to stay at home with their children in accordance to the ideal gender roles of that time. During this period poor single mothers on welfare faced few options; there were often no “ideal men” filling a breadwinner role in their families, instead the government provided financial support. Welfare allowed mothers the opportunity to fulfill the “ideal mother” role- the assumption was that mothers who received welfare could stay home with children full time, though part time work in the low-wage end of the labor market was often needed to supplement the payments as well (Albelda, 2001).

However, in 1996, as society’s expectations began to shift around a mother’s full time parenting role at home, there was a significant policy shift around welfare. Policy reflecting the shifting social norms promoted welfare reform that made it mandatory for recipients to work at full time jobs outside of the home, often in minimum wage paying, non-flexible positions. However, the well being of children was put on the line; work-family struggles intensified because people had to find childcare for the time they spent doing paid labor outside of the home. Research has revealed many negative effects of children living in families that are dependent on long hours of work with little pay (The Across the Boundaries Project, 2002). To manage work and family, many relied on low cost, and in turn sometimes, low quality daycare, while others depended on complicated kinship networks.

Despite negative stereotypes, these parents were just as concerned and focused on their children as any other parents. They felt the work family struggle of dual-earner couples; however poor families had even fewer available resources than others, which in turn created even more stress on family and children’s development (Furstenberg, Cook, Eccles, Elder, & Sameroff, 2000). New welfare policy in 1996 displayed the societal judgment of unpaid care work being unvalued labor in our economy. It also
reflected society's continuing inability to imagine integrated solutions where parents would work while still being encouraged to stay actively involved in the care of their children. The inadequate tools used to promote social change and an 'updated' work-family solution amongst the poor mirrors our current state of imbalance that values outside work over care work, intensifies family struggles, and falls short of a successful solution.

**Working Class Families**

Working-class families have always faced tough choices in the struggle between work and family. Given the ideal worker and the ideal parenthood norms emerging in the industrial age, and the types of jobs and wages available to working class men, it became an economic necessity for working class women to perform paid work in addition to the unpaid care work they performed at home. However, for working class women, to work outside the home was in direct conflict with the mainstream ideal woman (Landry, 2000).

Although wages and lack of job security pushed women to work, when women made that decision their families became culturally stigmatized. In particular, the conflict between the cultural ideal and economic reality had the strongest impact on working class mothers as they struggled to blend paid work, maintain an image of femininity and manage their husbands’ feelings around being unable to be the sole financial provider for their families (The Across the Boundaries Project, 2002; Albelda, 2001). White and black working class families • both of which could not afford to have a wife at home- responded differently to this situation, and to the ideal mother and ideal father roles that were flourishing in mainstream society (Landry, 2000).

Whites tried to find ways to uphold the ideals by sending children to work or taking in boarders and struggling to get by on reduced incomes. In this way they could more likely appear to the outside world as having succeeded in adopting societies ideals (Landry, 2000). A measure of success in these working class families was having a mother able to stay at home.

Since in many ways black women already faced racial prejudice that excluded them from the “ideal woman” or “ideal mother” roles, and black men faced even more societal road blocks towards becoming “ideal workers”, it became much more of a norm within the black community for both parents to work. To do so, black men and women relied on kin networks for daycare while struggling to find work as white immigrants were hired ahead of them (Landry, 2000).

Though mainstream gender norms have shifted and working women are no longer ostracized, working class families are still struggling to remain financially stable in jobs with little flexibility, are often overlooked in policy application, and are without the means to purchase good quality childcare. This struggle and lack of resources leads to families that face extreme hardship trying to uphold traditional
roles at home (as historically seen in white families), or hectic dual earner patterns with mothers working full time or part time (as historically seen in black families) (Landry, 2000).

Similar to other populations, societal and organizational shifts are still needed, as well as a change in the individual aspects of gender and parenting roles to achieve a successful integration for the working class.

**Future- Where We Are Going**

We are currently in a state of imbalance; families struggle to manage time and money. We are living in an outdated system that still supports separate spheres living; while there has been some change, women are still doing the majority of care work and fewer hours of paid work than men, and men are still doing the majority of paid work and little care work (Bornstein, 1995; Coltrane, 1997). Social policy, work norms and family norms reinforce these patterns and contribute to the continuation of an outdated system.

Outdated norms from a separate spheres paradigm continue to collide with contemporary shifts in gender norms, work options and economic realities. However, our current period of imbalance will ultimately shift towards synchronization, and actions can be taken to more rapidly promote a new period of balance. To reach a new state of work-family synchronization in the 21st century, organizations, individuals, and society must change to support a new alignment of 1) gender roles, 2) work norms, 3) the economy and 4) the developmental needs of children. Given the current state of each, this means: 1) accepting and supporting that men and women are capable of the same quantity and quality of family care, household duties, and paid work, 2) using technology and other means to re-design jobs so that employees have more time for their lives outside of work, 3) addressing the large employment gap between overworked professionals and unemployed citizens as well as the resulting lack of livable wages, and 4) acting on the recognition that children benefit from significant and extended involvement from their parents. To take action on all three levels (organizationally, individually, and socially) these changes must be implemented at work, in social policy, and within families.

**At Work**

Organizations benefit in the long run from providing flexible work options and allowing workers time to invest in their family and community roles outside of work. With the advancement in technology over the last few decades there are many new ways to redesign work to better fit the employer’s need for efficient and high quality production while also meeting the needs of employees to gain flexibility and integrated lives (Bailyn, 1993; Friedman, Christensen, & DeGroot, 1998; Perlow, 1997; Rapoport, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2001).

Workers at all levels need to push for reasonable norms at work and set boundaries around time, including people in leadership positions. Managers must look internally and act as role models for the
value of work-life balance, and externally at systems and behaviors that support their workers (DeGroot & Fine, 2003; Kofodimos, 1993). Work must be evaluated on quality, not necessarily just by the amount of time spent working. Flexible work options should be offered and encouraged for both men and women at all points in their careers, including the option of being phased into retirement slowly rather than abruptly at the age of 65 (DeGroot & Fine, 2003). These changes must take place across the board in organizations and for all workers- not just those who have the power and influence to privately negotiate such a change. In fact, large-scale boundaries affecting the workplace must be set by social policy, unions and workers, and supportive management (Folbre, 2002).

Social Policy

New gender norms, work options, and economic realities provide both the need and the opportunity to develop a new integrated approach to work and life where workers are guaranteed the right to invest in their lives outside of work, whether that time is used for the care of young children, aging relatives, or to be active community members.

There have been many steps taken in the past to ensure employees have some basic needs of family care and personal health met. The outcome can be seen in such policy as FMLA, which guarantees covered employees access to unpaid leave for up to 12-weeks for health related issues. (For more information on worker and family friendly policy developed throughout history see research and information specific to FMLA, the labor movement and workers rights.)

However, many existing policies only apply to some people some of the time. In the future, social policy that supports all people to lead integrated lives must affect all people all of the time. To do this we must develop new social policies that make it affordable for everyone to have time outside of work and still be able to earn enough money to meet their financial needs (Folbre, 2002; Reich, 2002; Rifkin, 2000). Such policy would include implementing a 35-hour workweek. (It is important to note, for the 80% of workers who become parents, a thirty-five hour flexible work week would mean little need for outside childcare for families with school age children. Two parents working 35 hours a week can meet the majority of their before and after school care needs simply by jointly flexing the beginning and end of their work days.) Another policy that would aid in work-life integration is the availability of affordable benefits, in particular health care benefits, that are available to individuals separate from employment. People no longer hold just one career or position for the majority of their working life, health insurance should not depend on job security. Finally, in order for these new policies to become affordable realities, livable wages for all workers must also be enforced.

Well-crafted public policy that was specifically designed to promote work-life integration for families would reflect the changing needs of children and families. For parents with children under three years of age, public policy could be designed that gave family members and extended family members such as,
grandparents, aunts and uncles, the right to re-design their work hours and participate in the care of infants and toddlers. Not only would this have a significant and positive impact for families, it would also create an increased supply of high quality and affordable child care for young children. Universal pre-school options for children starting at the age of three would also have a dramatic and positive effect for families. Another important piece for the well being of all children, parents, and employers would be a recommitment to high quality public education. The hours that children are in school play a large role in work-family integration and child development; high quality affordable education is a necessity that should be provided for everyone. Lastly, as the baby boomers continue to age, families will increasingly need supportive polices that address the care of sick and aging relatives.

Further, as we look into the 21st century, and the wave of changes that have been set off by the technology revolution, we must also design social policy that actively recognizes our connection to a global economy and the lives of men and women balancing work and family needs outside of the United States. Companies now participate in a global marketplace. The benefits of this expanded marketplace if met unchecked, create a vicious cycle where companies compete globally to find the cheapest labor and highest profits • too often at the cost of families both inside and outside the United States. Progressive public policy, now more than ever, must look outside of national borders to develop equitable and sustainable solutions for all (Reich, 2002).

At Home

However, changes in organizations and changes in public policy will not on their own successfully mandate new roles within families (Haas, 1992). There will also need to be a shift in the decisions made privately between mothers and fathers around childcare, housework, and paid work. More specifically, to create a shift towards integrated thinking, men and women must not just look externally at the unequal patterns that have developed, but also look internally at their own unique contributions towards these patterns.

Both men and women struggle with figuring out new ways to approach care work that significantly involves men (DeGroot & Fine, 2003; Deutsch, 2000; Williams, 2000). In some families it is women who have a hard time giving up control of the care of children and they consciously or unconsciously exclude men from care work. In other families it is men who find it challenging to attempt work-redesign, very often because their definition of fatherhood is intricately tied to the financial well being of their families. There are also families where both parents constrict the involvement with care work because of a drive for upward mobility. In these families lifestyle expectations create a demand for long work hours that extend significantly beyond those required to meet the basic needs of family (DeGroot & Fine, 2003; Deutsch, 2000; English, 2003; Schor, 1992).

These types of struggles are based on deeply ingrained socialization; people develop images of who they are and who others are based on patterns of relational experiences from an early age. This happens to
both boys and girls as they develop their own sense of self, and in particular as they begin to define themselves as future workers and caregivers. Clearly external forces have a profound impact on the choices individuals make, however these internalized assumptions, in particular around gender roles, create one of the most tenacious forces to perpetuate the outdated separate spheres work and family paradigm (Miller & Stiver, 1998; Real, 2002).

However, individual images and patterns can be revised throughout life. With conscious reflection and awareness of ingrained patterns, people can begin to unpack the effects of gender socialization and work to challenge them. By discussing the personal experiences that might have influenced these patterns, men and women can become aware of how these personal patterns affect their choices. This in turn can lead to the opportunity of consciously setting up new choices, and a more integrated solution that more accurately fills the needs of families (Coltrane, 1997; Greenspan & Salmon, 2002; Pruett, 2000).

Parents who have taken action to create a more integrated solution by sharing care work, paid work, and household duties, have found profound benefits both at work and at home, including creating a stronger bond to each other. However, the benefits of an integrated solution are not confined to two parent households. Single parent homes also benefit from an integrated approach by bringing in the support of other single parents, family members, or friends to share in the care of children (Bornstein, 2002). All family members can benefit from this more integrated approach of “shared care.” In fact the benefits can extend beyond today into the future, as children who have experienced progressive role models become even more capable of challenging outdated norms as they raise the next generation of children (DeGroot & Fine, 2003).

By supporting men and women to act on the potential for change both at work and at home, encouraging more extensive organizational change, and supporting progressive social policy, the fullest possible social change can occur. By doing so, this will shift the current state of imbalance to a renewed period of balance and open the next chapter in history to one where integrated lives become the norm.
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