The aim of this theoretical paper is to discuss some “liquid society” reflections on contemporary leadership. We suggest that business environment mirrors the social problems of the society because the changes in small group behavior reflect the changes in the big group (society) behavior. The deformations in the social behavior cause deformations in organizational behavior too. By tracing the social changes and their studies, we outline some negative characteristics of contemporary management concerning leadership, to appear as result of social values decline. The stronger is the focus on consumerism and individualism in society, the bigger are the deformations that occur in management of people in organizations. Destructive leadership, also known as dark leadership or dysfunctional leadership creates and supports behavioral deformations as aggression on the job place, humiliation, mobbing, bullying, stress, burnout and other destructive behaviors. The result of the social values decline we see to be manifested through the results of destructive leadership as: lack of employee commitment, low job motivation, team-work problems, interpersonal conflicts, strong individualism that narrows employees’ focus, employee lack of identity with the company, increased levels of job related stress, burnout. With this paper we try to provoke further discussion on the presented problem, as well as we call for action for understanding and avoiding the negative impact of the social values decline on organizational level in general, and on contemporary leadership in particular.
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Introduction
Living in 21st century and witnessing the fast changes that occur in technology, society and human development is a challenge itself. Nowadays the biggest challenge is to see how the three of them actually interact. The evolution of technology is supposed to help economy develop faster. The development of economy is supposed to help society develop in a better way, ensuring people better lives and higher standard of living. But is this what happens? It is confirmed that the technological progress changes the society and people’s lives. The agricultural society was transformed into industrial one exactly through the technological progress. Together with it changes occurred in family structures, work relations, settlement patterns, economic and political power configurations, and also in behavior patterns and value systems. It appears that in our latest society the information and technologies play key role for economic and social development. In sociology it is well known that a change in technology leads to a change in culture, thus all seven elements of culture are being affected: social organization, customs and traditions, language, religion, arts and literature, forms of government, economic systems. But while all these changes take place, some of them take the shape of deformations for the society and in this paper we want to focus on such one - the change of values, being an element of the culture.

Changes in culture by all means affect cultural values1 - they are the commonly held standards of what is acceptable or unacceptable, important or unimportant, right or wrong, workable or unworkable, etc., in a community or society. In this paper we focus our attention on the change of values in society and their impact on organizational level and contemporary leadership. The so called “liquid society” could be defined as kind of a social deformation and reflects the moral crisis in 21st century. The liquid society represents the results of too fast technological development, not followed by social development occurring with the same speed. We claim that the business environment reflects the social changes, no matter positive or negative ones, and introduces them to organizational level. This way, social deformations appear as organizational deformations too. The negative characteristics of contemporary management concerning leadership, we see as result of social values decline and the moral crisis of 21st century.

1 http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/cultural-values.html
1. The phenomenon called “Liquid society”

The liquid society originated from the Bauman’s “liquid modernity”. Bauman is considered the father of the post modernity theory and is renowned especially for his analyses of the links between modernity and Holocaust as well as for his definition of modernity and post modernity. He specifies the typical characteristics of the transition period of modernity that shifts into post modernity. The focus of his studies on liquid modernity is on ethical and moral issues that accompany the shift from one social form to another. The transformations in politics and society that were brought by the globalization issue also fall in his research focus. His preference for liquid modernity could be perceived as a response to the decline of postmodernism. Bauman\(^7\) was the first one who used the term “liquid” in a study about the contemporary state of the society: he brought up the “fluidity” as the leading metaphor for the present stage of the modern era. Fluids neither fix space nor bind time. Fluids do not keep to any shape and they are constantly ready to change it. He finds the fluids characteristics quite appropriate to point out the instability, constant changeability and uncertainty of the modern society. Bauman’s liquid modernity suggests a rapidly changing order that undermines all notions of durability\(^3\). Confronting the modernity, Bauman sees in it the roots of the contemporary social transformations (seen as negative by him) that lead to more materially and less spirituality oriented human world. He uses the liquids to characterize a society of liberalization, flexibility, reference melting, mixture of values and representatives of dissimilar cultures\(^4\). The dissatisfaction that rises as response to the incapability of the modern world to oppose to the emerging and deepening conditions of inequality brings up to the surface the question about how capable the society is to deal with any instance of social change.

The economic forces appearing due to the social change can influence the development and the shape of multinational organizations by turning them into multicultural ones. The same applies to the labor migration that influences the labor market and turns it not only into multinational one but also into multicultural one. Considering the idea of the social liquidity it can be précised that the liquidity of the social system leads to the perspective of a deep and strong mutation. It means that in order to be understood better, the liquefaction should be studied at interactional level as it affects the manifestation of human behavior in the context of society. Bauman and Donskis\(^5\) going further in the discussion about the side effects of the liquefaction on the society represented in the lack of morality, refer to four great dystopias of our contemporary world: Aldous Huxley’s “Brave New World”, George Orwell’s “1984”, Yevgeny Zamyatin’s “We”, and Michel Houellbecq’s “The Possibility of an Island”. There they seek to point out the key questions and by answering them to outline the modern world of our society. On the ground of this, the moral blindness is defined by Bauman and Donskins as philosophical diagnosis.

It will be fair to indicate that the solid and fluid state of modernity can be traced back to Max Weber and other sociologists after him, engaged in studying the social transformations. They put the fundaments of the liquid modernity but it was described and explained recently at its best by Bauman. From one side, as Weber states, modernity appears solid because of the fast centralization of institutional power. This topic was also included into Weber’s focus\(^6\) when he tried to particularize the differences between traditional, legal-bureaucratic and charismatic authority. Giddens\(^7\) states something similar too - that solidification of modernity can be viewed as analogous to the transition from traditional to legal-bureaucratic authority. From this point of view,

bureaucratic structures may look as if they are more solid than traditional ones but the specific thing is that they appear to be vulnerable to the “softening” effect of charisma. Modernity is perceived as solid on the base of the combined power of the institutions and defeats any individual attempt to keep tradition in place. Despite this solidity this power is not regarded as absolute\(^8\). What change the situation are the charisma and the reflexivity that constitute the solvents being able to dissolve the existing institutional arrangements.

From the other side, Michel Foucault sees the power as something that is rather exercised than possessed: power is not attached to any interests and factors but is incorporated in numerous practices\(^9\). It should be defined that the activities dealing with power concern the exercise or operation of power at a micro level\(^10\). There the networks and strategies interface to produce a highly complex picture of how modern institution works. Actually what seems real is not the power of the institutions themselves but the practices related to power that take place inside them. Exactly the practices inside are the ones that soften the reality and despite the solidity of the institutions due to their power, provoke social changes to occur. This means that the solid modernity is just a myth because solidity is not guaranteed. Nevertheless, in situation of collision between solidity and liquidity of the institutional power there appear strong situations of resistance and contradictions that at the end work as a softening agent for the society. After that softening leads to liquidity. Or in other words: as we live in a world defined by the shape-shifting of capital and labor, modernity can be described as amorphous - liquid.

**From liquid modernity to liquid society:** the position of Umberto Eco\(^11\) develops further the liquid social phenomenon in his latest book (2017) “Chronicles of a Liquid Society”. There he relates to the modern society and discusses issues as: popular culture and politics, being seen, conspiracies, the old and the young, mobile phones, mass media, racism, good manners and the crisis in ideological values as well as the unbridled individualism that have become the backdrop of our lives - a liquid society in which it is not easy to find a polestar, though starts and starlets abound. His core idea is to share his opinion and to reveal the total decline of social values that leads society to liquid state, with no borders to hold its members inside and causes loss of identity.

The issue concerning values is studied by psychologists, sociologists, social psychologists, researchers from the fields of management, marketing, media and communications etc. This proves their importance and key role that they have for the collective and individual behavior. Values as element of the culture usually are perceived as the borders in which the individuals place their behavior. But when the values are fluid and liquid then individuals have no certain standards for behavior. When a mixture of cultures is placed in a liquid society then it increases the unstructured mixture of values.

Whenever there are upcoming changes in society it is well known that the old construction must be destroyed in order to open space for the new one to take place. Our 21st century society, based on globalization and post modernity, relays on the fast developing of the new technologies and the world without borders. In this fast development of new technological era the moral and mental development of human factor is left behind to try to catch up, if possible. Recently the discussions about the various suitable applications of the artificial intellect increase the sense that humans, if continue to be unable to find back their morality and identification, will be left behind, overcame by the machines. We join all those researchers who insist that until the balance between material and spiritual/mental world is not gained back, the threat for the human race to disappear is still in full power. Because of this, further we will try to trace the origin of this problem.

2. The consumerism and the decline of values

The concern about decline of social values is not new. In 1998 a study on social trust and value change investigates the problem of the value change and the decline of social capital in American youth\textsuperscript{12}. There the first thing cited is a statement from the famous book of Alexis de Tocqueville “On Democracy in America” (Volume 1: 1835, Volume 2: 1840): “Democracy favors the taste for physical pleasures. This taste, if it becomes excessive, soon disposes men to believe that nothing but matter exists. Materialism, in turn, spurs them on to such delights with mad impetuosity. Such is the vicious circle into which democratic nations are driven”\textsuperscript{13}. The study points out that the social trust is seen as an important cornerstone of social capital. The high societal levels of social trust have been linked to a number of positive outcomes. The social trust is précised there as a sign of social solidarity and cohesion as well as linked to the strong economic performance. In theories of social capital, social trust is referred to both - an outcome and a cause of high levels of civic involvement. Also, the social trust plays the role of a constraint on immoral behavior - people who believe others are trustworthy are themselves less likely to lie, cheat or steal\textsuperscript{14}. When levels of trust erode, they result in less obedience in people’s behavior to normative rules in their own conduct.

We suggest that the relation between the decline of social values and the liquid society can be explained further through consumerism and individualism: the two faces of one monster - globalization that helps to destroy the moral and ethical fundaments of the modern society.

\textit{Consumerism}

“Consumerism is the belief that personal wellbeing and happiness depends to a very large extent on the level of personal consumption, particularly on the purchase of material goods”\textsuperscript{15}. The democracy caused the emergence of free market economy and gave people the freedom of their own desires and choices. The consumerist society can be recognized and defined by people’s devotion of a great deal of time, resources, energy and thought to consumption. The overall meaning of life in this type of society is “consumption is good”, and the more of it the better. The capitalist profit-driven market competition has pervasive influence on even well developed economies to grow in total output and not just in productivity. Talking about profits, all the time there is a question to be answered: is it better to keep consumption levels constant while doubling leisure time, or is it better to double the consumption levels and keep leisure time constant. As the free market economy stimulates making bigger and bigger profits, and profits are made by selling goods and services, the competition between the companies on local, national and global markets becomes stronger and sometimes even violent. Competition engulfs huge amount of all kind of resources for advertising and marketing strategies and companies are forced to rearrange their investments in a better way, most often by deciding to cut or reduce other expenses (like labor). All this appears to stimulate productivity growth that is channeled into continuous market expansion that results finally in tremendous bias, favoring growth in consumption instead of leisure. This bias is emerging in a strong way especially during economic crisis times.

\textit{Consumerism and Individualism}

“Individualism is the idea that the individual’s life belongs to him and that he has an inalienable right to live it as he sees fit, to act on his own judgment, to keep and use the product of his effort, and to pursue the values of his choosing. It’s the idea that the individual is sovereign, an end in himself, and the fundamental unit of moral concern”\textsuperscript{16}.

\textsuperscript{16} https://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2012-spring/individualism-collectivism/
Traits in individualism\textsuperscript{17} can be seen as manifestation of:

- “I” identity;
- Promotion of individual goals, initiative and achievement;
- Individual rights are seen as being the most important. Rules attempt to ensure self-importance and individualism;
- Independence is valued; there is much less of a drive to help other citizens or communities than in collectivism;
- Relying or being dependant on others is frequently seen as shameful;
- People are encouraged to do things on their own; to rely on themselves;
- People strive for their own success.

From the other side, to be able to do the comparison between the two culture systems, the typical traits in collectivism can be seen as manifestation of:

- Each person is encouraged to be an active player in society, to do what is best for society as a whole rather than themselves;
- The rights of families, communities and the collective supersede those of the individual;
- Rules promote unity, brotherhood, and selflessness;
- Working with others and cooperating is the norm; everyone supports each other;
- The community, family or nation is more and above the individual;
- Strong cohesive group.

Regarding the characteristics of individualism it is assumed by sociologists as one of the modern social evils. But the attention of psychologists is also focused there as all radical states of personality mean misbalance and personality deformations, especially when regarding the identity. Arnett\textsuperscript{18} argues that globalization has its primary psychological influence on issues of identity. As précised before, globalization stimulates individualism and slowly melts the local cultures and rites, as well as the way people identify themselves with local culture and local society. The unification of education systems, invention of technology in everyday life, rising age of entering marriage and parenthood in urban areas, and employment mobility are considered as positive outcomes of the globalization. But at the same time there are some quite serious negative ones: competition of the companies on the global market is seen as a disturbing source of labor exploitation. This is valid most often for the group of young ones that are hired through low-paying subcontracting arrangements, not offering much in benefits and job security.

The decline of values

The increasing individualism infiltrates through the younger generations even in societies with strong collectivistic set and changes the shape of their economic behavior. The best mediator for this appears to be the liquid society with its liquid culture borders that are no longer able to hold inside the traditional cultural norms and beliefs and to keep them as they are. Fehr and Hoff\textsuperscript{19} discuss how the globalization and the consumerism affect the individual change of preferences and what is more - how they reflect on society. The preferences based on individualism prevail over the ones based on collectivism. This processes shape-shift the social values even in traditional societies and ethno groups and the result is defined as loss of identity. Leibbrandt\textsuperscript{20} adds to the negative effects of globalization by enlightening another side effect of the globally stimulated consumerism: the way social preferences relate to market performance.

It can be summarized that the increased competitiveness on global scale affects different society groups, cultures, companies’ market behavior, the behavior of their employees, and causes the domino effect by “softening” the society - liquidness spreads on all levels and deprives society from stable values and identity, deforming and reducing at the same time the importance of moral and ethical issues. This causes decline of value systems on individual level too. Humans are

\textsuperscript{17} http://psychology.wikia.com/wiki/Collectivist_and_individualist_cultures
\textsuperscript{19} Fehr E, Hoff K. Tastes, castes and culture: The influence of society on preferences. Econ J. 2011;121(556):396–412.
designed by nature as group belonging creatures but the modern individualism deprives them of the support of the group. These way individuals suffer loss of identity by losing the stable borders of social norms for what is good and what is bad, what is moral and what is ethic. The liquidness of the society transfers on individual level too and creates spiritual emptiness.

3. The organizational culture as projection of the social culture

Despite that organizational culture obviously influences behavior inside the company and is something that leaders can change, there is still little consensus on what organizational culture really is. The values and behaviors that contribute to the unique social and psychological environment of an organization. Organizational culture includes an organization's expectations, experiences, philosophy, and values that hold it together, and is expressed in its self-image, inner workings, interactions with the outside world, and future expectations. It is based on shared attitudes, beliefs, customs, and written and unwritten rules that have been developed over time and are considered valid.

Social system is a complex set of human relations that interact in various ways. It is organization of individuals into groups or structures that have different functions, characteristics, origin or status. A social system might break a larger population down into family groups, races, religious affiliations, gender, wealth categories and social classes. These demographic distinctions can be used by the business to better target their promotional and sales efforts.

As Hatch and Schultz state, one of the primary challenges faced by contemporary organizations, stem from the breakdown of the boundary between their internal and external aspects. Previously it was typical for the organizations to be able to divide their internal functioning from their external relations in the environment because the contacts between insiders and outsiders were very limited. The external relations were handled mostly by top executives and the departments related to HRM, marketing, purchasing, PR and strategic planning. From the other side, the internal relations were handled by middle and lower level managers, HRM, engineering, production and accountant departments. However, the 21st century, globalization and technical progress redefined what was accepted before as matters of external relations and included them in as part of the daily activities of almost all company members. Networking, business progress, reengineering, flexible manufacturing, and delaying appeared to be among the changes that caused the collapse of internal and external relations as defined categories in the organizational practice. The boundaries of the external and internal relations changed, following the social, economic, political and culture changes of globalization. Hatch and Schultz argue that, increasingly, the actions and statements of top managers simultaneously affect organizational identity and image. Ravasi and Schultz go further in revealing the organizational identity threats as one of their findings, related to this research is, that organizational culture is a central construct in understanding the evolution of organizational identities in the face of environmental changes, suggesting that collective history, organizational symbols, and consolidated practices provide cues that help members make new sense of what their organization is really about and give that new sense to others.

Smith and Dugan argue that there are continuing substantial differences in modal cultural values of organization employees and that these are largely consistent with differences reported by others. The results of their study suggest that the cultural dimensions of society defined by Hofstede as individualism-collectivism and power distance may be better defined as representing varying

21 https://hbr.org/2013/05/what-is-organizational-culture
22 http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/organizational-culture.html
23 http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/social-system.html
orientations toward continuity of group membership (loyal involvement/utilitarian involvement) and varying orientations toward the obligations of social relationship (conservatism/egalitarian commitment). We consider that these findings express important characteristics of organizational culture that are quite similar to the social culture ones. What is more, we see the transformation of the social culture changes to be transferred through globalization and liquidity into organizations too. It means that in strongly collectivistic cultures where the chance liquidity to occur is weak, the organizations are eager to help individuals to identify themselves with the working group much easier, as well as to identify themselves to the company. In organizations with prevailing orientation to collective type of culture, organizational values have stronger positive impact on all levels of employees. Managers imply in their leadership style cooperation, support, socialization, rewards and development opportunities, commitment, and open channels for communication. In organizations with prevailing orientation to individualistic type of culture bureaucracy, stress and management deformations are more often to occur because the implied individualism stimulates liquidity of organizational values. Often are observed negative relationship changes between the levels as well as identity crisis. Individualism provokes appearance of interpersonal conflicts and conflicts of interests both - between the organizational levels, and between people on the same level.

4. Manifestation of some negative liquid society effects on leadership

Organizational sociopaths on managerial level: destructive leadership

A fast check in the scientific databases shows that over the past 6-7 years the publications on destructive leadership have increased with more than 75%. This fact speaks clearly of the increased interest to the topic and the attention to its impact on people’s management in organizations. Destructive leadership is based on sociopathic behavior that is why we have to define the term “sociopathy” first: the Antisocial Personality Disorder (APD), also known as sociopathy is described as a personality disorder characterized by a long term pattern of disregard for, or violation of, the rights of others. An impoverished moral sense or conscience is often apparent, as well as a history of crime, legal problems, or impulsive and aggressive behavior.27

Destructive leadership behaviour is defined by Einarsen, Aasland and Skogstad28 as systematic and repeated behaviour by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interest of the organisation by undermining and/or sabotaging the organisation's goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of his/her subordinates. Three categories of such destructive leadership are identified by the authors in the proposed model: tyrannical, derailed, and supportive–disloyal leadership behaviour. The model provides a useful link between the field of leadership and research on bullying, counterproductive behaviour, and aggression at work.

Different research on the theme, done by Padilla, Hogan and Kaiser29, focuses on the so-called toxic triangle: destructive leaders, susceptible followers and conductive environments. They review how destructive leadership has been discussed in the literature and note that it has not been clearly defined so far. Building on prior research, they develop a definition of destructive leadership that emphasizes negative outcomes for organizations and individuals linked with and affected by them. Then the toxic triangle is outlined by the characteristics of leaders, followers, and environmental contexts connected with destructive leadership.

Ferris et al.30 examine the leader as a bully, and explore potential consequences of strategic leader bullying behavior through the development of a conceptual model, as leader bullying

27 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antisocial_personality_disorder
behavior is construed as a form of organizational politics. Authors explore the implications of bullying as an influence behavior that is employed strategically to convey particular images and exercise influence in specific situations, potentially producing positive outcomes.

Pech and Slade\(^{31}\) study another interesting phenomenon: the existence of organizational sociopaths is not only tolerated in the company but also they are often promoted to higher managerial positions. Authors aim to reveal the reasons why organisations sometimes select and promote the wrong individuals for managerial positions. These individuals may be incompetent, they may be manipulators and bullies. They are not the best people for the job and yet not only are they selected for positions of authority and responsibility, they are sometimes promoted repeatedly until their kind populate the highest levels of the organisational hierarchy. The findings confirm that: organisational tolerance and acceptance for sociopathic managerial behaviour appears to be a consequence of cultural and structural complexity. While this has been known for some time, few authors have posited an adequate range of explanations and solutions to protect stakeholders and prevent the sociopath from exploiting organisational weaknesses. Reduction of cultural and structural complexity may provide a partial solution. Transparency, communication of strong ethical values, promotion based on performance, directed cooperation, and rewards that reinforce high performing and acceptable behaviour are all necessary to protect against individuals with sociopathic tendencies.

Aasland et al.\(^{32}\) investigate the prevalence of the four types of destructive leadership behaviour in the destructive and constructive leadership behaviour model, in a representative sample of the Norwegian workforce. The findings are built around the statement that destructive leadership comes in many shapes and forms, with passive forms prevailing over more active ones. The results show that laissez-faire leadership behaviour is the most prevalent destructive leadership behaviour, followed by supportive–disloyal leadership and derailed leadership, while tyrannical leadership behaviour is the least prevalent destructive leadership behaviour. Furthermore, many leaders display constructive as well as destructive behaviors, indicating that leadership is not either constructive or destructive.

Schyns and Schilling\(^{33}\) argue, that an increasing number of studies investigate different forms of destructive leadership. Their meta-analysis integrates different conceptualizations of destructive leadership and analyzes the relationship between destructive leadership and outcome variables. Results indicate the negative correlations with positive followers' outcomes and behaviors (e.g., attitudes towards the leader, well-being, and individual performance) and positive correlations with negative outcomes (e.g., turnover intention, resistance towards the leader, counterproductive work behavior). The highest correlation arises between destructive leadership and attitudes towards the leader, and the next highest correlation was found between destructive leadership and counterproductive work behavior.

Casimir, G., et al.\(^{34}\) focus their research on examination of the psychosomatic model of downward workplace bullying in different cultures. Their findings confirm that the psychosomatic model is supported for both the Australian and the Ugandan samples. However, the relationship between bullying and physical symptoms is fully mediated by negative affect for the Australian sample but partially mediated for the Ugandan sample.

Side effects of destructive leadership: organizational sociopaths on individual level

The organizational sociopaths on individual level exist as continuation of the destructive leaders. The liquid organizational values and organizational culture oriented to individualism create


appropriate environment for destructive leadership to emerge and in turn - to create sociopaths on individual level. The destructive leadership multiplies itself fast on the lower organizational levels because of the power concentrated in the managerial positions. Employees observe, accept and adopt the negative destructive behavior because of the tight individual focus. Egocentrism is strongly stimulated top down to develop among the subordinates as it is an approach to block the free-minded, creative and intelligent employees that disagree with the destructive sociopath leader. The passive reaction from the top management level adds to the negative work atmosphere. The most common results for the company, coming from destructive leadership of sociopaths include:

- **Because of the proclaimed individualism:**
  - Narrowed focus of perception on the self-interests and self-values; Egocentrism;
  - Lack of identification with the company goals, values, mission, vision etc.;
  - Lack of ability for team-work;
  - Conflict between personal and organizational interests;
  - Lack of job motivation;
  - Lack of commitment;
  - Lack of service-oriented attitude when working with customers;
  - Reduced quality of performance.

- **Because of the fear of the person with power in hands (who uses the power for personal needs and against the organizational ones):**
  - Fear of loss of job;
  - Switching on the instincts for survival and they dominate over conscious mind.
  - Such a person is easy for manipulation and psychological pressure, most often appearing as bullying;
  - Increased levels of stress;
  - Burnout;
  - Cardio-vascular diseases, attempted suicide.

**Conclusion**

The paper discussed some “liquid society” reflections on contemporary leadership. We tried to reveal how business environment mirrors the social problems of the society. By tracing the social changes and their studies, we outlined some negative characteristics of contemporary management concerning leadership that appear as result of social values decline. The stronger is the focus on consumerism and individualism in society, the bigger are the deformations that occur in management of people in organizations. We find destructive leadership as main support of behavioral deformations as aggression on the job place, humiliation, mobbing, bullying, stress, burnout and other destructive behaviors. We suggest that the result of the social values decline manifested through the results of destructive leadership can be avoided by applying intelligent people's management as it may include: soft skills; emotional intelligence; learning organizations; corporate social responsibility; strategic planning of HRM.
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