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Abstract

Introduction. School anxiety is often defined as a set of symptoms grouped into cognitive, psychophysiological and motor responses emitted by an individual in school situations that can be perceived as threatening and/or dangerous. School anxiety may be influenced - among other relevant school variables - by the perception of social climate and the daily violence witnessed by students at school. The aim of this study is to identify whether there are different combinations of school anxiety-provoking situations which give rise to different anxious profiles. Furthermore, it claims to verify whether there are differences between these profiles in terms of the variables: perception of social climate and peer violence.

Method. The sample consists of 365 high school students. School anxiety was measured using the School Anxiety Inventory; the social climate was measured with the School Social Climate Questionnaire and peer violence with the Daily School Violence Questionnaire.

Results. Cluster analyses have identified three profiles of school anxiety. The results showed statistically significant differences among the three anxiety profiles in the following variables: (1) teacher climate (low and high anxiety) and (2) personal experience of suffering violence (low and medium anxiety; low and high anxiety). The differences were of low-to-moderate intensity.

Discussion and Conclusion. The findings of this study are relevant because they provide a more comprehensive analysis of school anxiety and differences in other relevant variables in an educational context, such as the school social climate and peer violence.
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Perfiles de ansiedad escolar: Diferencias en Clima Social y Violencia entre Iguales.

Resumen

Introducción. La ansiedad escolar es definida como un conjunto de síntomas agrupados en respuestas cognitivas, psicofisiológicas y motoras emitidas por un individuo ante situaciones escolares que son percibidas como amenazantes y/o peligrosas. Entre variables escolares relevantes, la ansiedad escolar puede estar influída por la percepción del clima social y la violencia cotidiana observada en el centro por parte del alumnado. El objetivo de este estudio fue identificar si existen combinaciones entre las distintas situaciones que provocan ansiedad escolar dando lugar a diferentes perfiles ansiosos. Además, se persigue comprobar si existen diferencias entre estos perfiles en las variables percepción de clima social y violencia entre iguales.

Método. La muestra estuvo compuesta por 365 alumnos de educación secundaria. La ansiedad escolar fue medida con el Inventario de Ansiedad Escolar, el clima social se midió con el Cuestionario de Clima Social del Centro Escolar y la violencia entre iguales mediante el Cuestionario de Violencia Escolar Cotidiana.

Resultados. Los análisis de conglomerados identificaron tres perfiles de ansiedad escolar. Los resultados indicaron diferencias estadísticamente significativas entre los tres perfiles en las variables clima referente al profesorado entre los grupos con baja y alta ansiedad escolar y en experiencia personal de sufrir violencia entre el grupo con baja y media ansiedad escolar y entre el grupo con baja y alta ansiedad escolar. La magnitud de las diferencias halladas fue de baja a moderada.

Discusión y Conclusiones. Los hallazgos de este estudio resultan relevantes ya que aportan un análisis más exhaustivo de la ansiedad escolar y de las diferencias observadas en otras variables relevantes en el ámbito educativo, como son el clima social del centro escolar y la violencia entre iguales.

Palabras Clave: ansiedad escolar, clima social, violencia entre iguales, adolescencia.
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Introduction

School anxiety is often defined as a set of symptoms grouped into cognitive, psychophysiological and motor responses emitted by an individual in school situations that can be perceived as threatening and/or dangerous (García-Fernández, Inglés, Martínez-Monteagudo & Redondo, 2008). Epidemiological studies show that school anxiety is relatively frequent and may affect up to 18% of children and adolescents aged 3 to 14 (Bados, 2005; Granell de Aldaz, Vivas, Gelfand & Feldman, 1984).

A relevant number of research studies have tried to identify, classify and define children and adolescents’ fears in general terms (Burham, 2005, 2009; Ollendick, 1983; Sandín, 1997; Scherer & Nakamura, 1968; Valiente, Sandín, Chorot & Tabar, 2003) as well as, although to a lesser extent, situations generating school anxiety (Méndez, García-Fernández & Olivares, 1996; Morris, Finkelstein & Fisher, 1976; Steinhausen, Müller & Winkler, 2008; Swartz, Reyns, Henson & Wilcox, 2011). However, there are still some research gaps, such as analysing the relationship between school anxiety and other relevant variables in the school context, as well as studying the differences produced by these variables with regards to groups that suffer from low and high school anxiety.

In general terms, there are many situations that may cause school-related anxiety (e.g. playing during recess, talking in class, classmates, exams, etc.). Therefore, based on the literature review on the subject, school anxiety can be grouped into four major categories: (a) anxiety about school failure and punishment; (b) anxiety about aggression; (c) anxiety about social evaluation in the school climate; and (d) anxiety about school evaluation. Likewise, most research studies have aimed to assess school anxiety by means of questionnaires, inventories or scales and have gathered situations or items that could be classified in the above-mentioned categories. On the whole, it has been proven that these are the most frequent school situations according to scientific literature. Additionally, research has also found significant correlations among the school anxiety-provoking situations, thus proving the existence of a tight relationship among them (Dunn, 1970; García-Fernández, Espada, Orgilés & Méndez, 2010; García-Fernández, Inglés, Martínez-Monteagudo, Marzo & Estévez, 2011; Méndez, 1988).
School anxiety may be influenced, among other relevant school variables, by the perception of social climate and the daily violence witnessed by students at school (Astor, Benbenishty, Zeira & Vinokur, 2002; Martínez-Rodríguez, 2004; Thomas, 2010). Likewise, these two variables have been widely studied in scientific literature (Castro & Gaviria, 2005; Espinoza, 2006; Fernández-Baena et al., 2011; Gázquez, Pérez & Carrión, 2011; Guil and Mestre, 2004; Infante et al., 2003; Moreno, Estévez, Murgui & Musitu, 2009; Sánchez, Rivas & Trianes, 2006). As for school climate, writers have mainly focused on two research fields: academic climate and classroom social climate.

The former refers to the extent to which the learning environment stimulates effort and emphasizes cooperation (Roeser & Eccles, 1998), while the latter is defined as the quality of the student-teacher relations and student interpersonal relations (Emmons, Comer & Haynes, 1996), or also as the perception, on the part of students and teachers involved, of personal well-being as well as positive feelings of being accepted and valued by others in daily interaction (Trianes, 2000). It has been observed that an adequate school climate presents positive effects on the psychological adjustment of students (Kuperminc, Leadbeater & Blatt, 2001; Roeser & Eccles, 1998), especially on those at risk of academic, emotional or behavioural difficulties (Felner et al., 1995; Haynes, Emmons & Ben-Avie, 1997), and is often associated to healthy development and an optimal learning, thus reducing maladaptive behaviour (Kuperminc, Blatt & Leadbeater, 1997; Ladd, 1990; Parker & Asher, 1987; Westling, 2002). Further interventions aimed at improving social climate also found positive outcomes in school and social adaptation (Comer, Ben-Avie, Haynes & Joyner, 1999; Romasz, Cantor & Elias, 2004) and in the capacity of coping, in self-concept and self-esteem, in empathy and sociability (Aciego, Domínguez & Hernández, 2003). Based on this research, school social climate may have an influence on the school anxiety levels. However, no current relevant research has yet clarified this relationship.

Nevertheless, low or medium impact interpersonal peer violence is a current subject of study. Interpersonal peer violence usually takes place when an individual or group of individuals is insulted, physically assaulted, socially excluded or isolated, threatened or intimidated by others on a particular occasion and in a non-repetitive way (Ortega, del Rey & Mora-Merchán, 2001). This phenomenon is known as daily peer violence, and it refers to those environments in which students solve interpersonal conflicts by means of unjustified aggressive acts, which are reciprocal and very frequent, for the most part,
and also of a low-to-moderate level of intensity (Fernández-Baena et al., 2011). Recent research shows that suffering this type of violence, without incidents of bullying or mistreatment, can also predict personal maladaptation and psychopathology (Cangas, Gázquez, Pérez-Fuentes, Padilla & Miras, 2007; Trianes, 2004).

**Objectives and hypothesis**

Based on this approach, the present study has two main objectives: (1) to find out if there are different profiles among students with school anxiety; and, (2) once these profiles are identified and defined, to find out if there are significant differences among them in relation to some of the selected educational variables, such as social climate and school daily violence.

Based on prior empirical evidence, it is expected that: (a) the combination of school anxiety situations will produce different anxiety profiles and that (b) there will be statistically significant differences among the school anxiety profiles in relation to school climate, teacher climate, personal experience of suffering violence and observed school violence.

**Method**

**Participants**

The total number of participants involved in the research was 452 students from 1st to 4th year of Secondary Education in the city of Malaga (Spain), from whom 52 (16.35%) were excluded due to omissions or mistakes in their answers or for not having obtained their parents’ written informed consent to take part in the study; and a further 35 (5.02%) were excluded on the basis that they were non-native speakers and had a low level of Spanish. Therefore, the sample finally consisted of 365 students aged from 12 to 16 years old \( (M = 13.71; DT = 1.47) \). The distribution of the sample was as follows: 1st course of Secondary Education (57 males and 53 females), 2nd course (65 males and 46 females), 3rd course (36 males and 25 females) and 4th course (52 males and 31 females). The Chi-square test for homogeneity of frequency distribution revealed the
lack of statistically significant differences among the eight Gender x Course groups ($\chi^2 = 2.46; p = .482$).

**Instruments**

*School Anxiety Inventory* (IAES in Spanish) (García-Fernández et al., 2011) aims to assess anxiety situations and responses in high school students (aged 12 to 18) by means of three anxiety response scales and four situational factors. Students must choose from 0 to 4 (0 = *never*; 4 = *always*) the frequency of each response in each particular situation. The higher the score, the higher the level of school anxiety.

The four situational factors consist of sentences explaining 23 school situations to be completed by students based on their cognitive, behavioural and psychophysiological responses; namely: (a) *Anxiety about School Failure and Punishment* (ASFP), which includes 8 items associated to situations of school failure (*e.g.* “failing an exam”) and punishment (*e.g.* “being sent to the head teacher”); (b) *Anxiety about Aggression* (AA), which consists of 6 items associated to anxiety derived from the possibility of suffering physical or verbal assault from peers (*e.g.* “being insulted or threatened”); (c) *Anxiety about Social Evaluation* (ASE), which includes 5 items assessing fears of a social nature related to public speaking (*e.g.* “speaking to the class”); and finally (d) *Anxiety about School Evaluation* (ASE), which includes 4 items related to situations where academic competence is assessed (*e.g.* “taking a written exam”).

Likewise, the factors associated to the three response system are: (a) *Cognitive Anxiety* (CA), which consists of 9 items expressing thoughts, feelings, *etc.*, about the different school situations (*e.g.* “I am afraid of making mistakes”); (b) *Behavioural Anxiety* (BA), which includes 5 items reflecting behavioural aspects that are easy to observe when facing certain situations (*e.g.* “my voice trembles”); and (c) *Psychophysiological Anxiety* (PA), which consists of 5 items assessing the reaction of the nervous system as a consequence of the above mentioned situations (*e.g.* “I get nauseous”).

The exploratory and confirmatory factorial analyses conducted by García-Fernández et al. (2011) supported a structure of four correlated situational factors which explained 74.97% of the total variance, as well as a structure of three factors relating to anxiety-
responding systems which explained 68.64%, 67.70% and 58.51% of the total variance in relation to cognitive, psychophysiological and behavioural anxiety respectively.

The internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach alpha) for the IAES scores were: .93 (ASE), .92 (AAFP and AA), .88 (AAE), .86 (CA and PA) and .82 (BA). The test-retest reliability (2-wk interval) was: .84 (AAFP and ASE), .83 (AAE), .78 (AA), .77 (CA), .75 (PA) and .74 (BA). The present study only used the scores obtained in the four situational factors of the IAES. The concurrent validity was examined by means of correlation coefficients between the IAES and the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI; Spielber, Gorsuch & Lushene, 1970). The correlations found were positive and statistically significant.

School Social Climate Questionnaire, (CECSCE in Spanish) (Trianes, Blanca, de la Morena, Infante & Raya, 2006). The CECSCE assesses the school social climate and the teacher climate by means of 14 items. The school social climate refers to the extent to which the learning environment stimulates effort and emphasizes cooperation. The teacher climate refers to the quality of the student-teacher relations, i.e. the perception, on the part of students and teachers involved, of personal well-being and positive feelings of feeling accepted and valued by others in daily interaction. The focus of the questionnaire is therefore on interpersonal relations between students and teachers. It has two factors: (a) School Climate (SC), consisting of 8 items reflecting the school social climate and assessing students’ perception of help, respect, safety and comfortability attitudes in the school (e.g. “when there is an emergency there is always someone to help me out” or “my high school is a very safe place”; and (b) Teacher Climate (TC), consisting of 6 items relating to the student-teacher relationship, and which represents a perception of satisfaction with teacher interaction, analysing teachers’ behaviour according to values of justice and respect (e.g. “the teachers in this school are nice to students” or “when students break the rules they are treated fairly”).

Results show an alpha of .77 for the SC factor and .72 for the TC factor. The test-retest (9-month interval) showed a correlation of .61 between both measurements.

Daily School Violence Questionnaire, (CUVECO in Spanish) (Fernández-Baena et al., 2011). The CUVECO has been created using the California School Climate and Safety
Survey items (CSCSS; Rosenblatt & Furlong, 1997). This scale assesses demographic aspects, perception of school climate, safety, social support, social desirability, victimization in relation to school violence and hostility. Items are presented in a Likert-type scale of 5 points (1 = never and 5 = almost always).

Several factorial analyses of main components with oblimin rotation were conducted in order to analyse the factorial structure of the CUVECO. With the aim of studying the stability of the factorial solution, the sample was randomly divided into two parts, each of which was submitted to factorial analysis. Finally, a factorial analysis was conducted on the total sample. The factorial solutions found in both parts coincided and included both the same items and approximate saturations.

Two factors were obtained which explained 33.31% and 15.51% of the variance respectively. The first factor named Personal Experience of Suffering Violence (PESV) consisted of 8 items reflecting assault of a physical, verbal or psychological nature, suffered by students who are victims of daily peer violence. This factor presented positive saturations over .30 in all items (e.g. “I have been punched or kicked”). The second factor named Observed School Violence (OSV) included 6 items mainly referring to violent behaviour among peers, observed by students in the school. This factor also presented high and positive saturations in all items (e.g. “students get in fights”). Both factors presented a significantly low correlation with a value of .31.

The internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach alpha) for the CUVECO scores were: .85 (PESV) and .74 (OSV). The test-retest (6-month interval) was conducted within the same academic year, with a correlation of .63 between both measurements.

With the purpose of studying the convergent validity, the scores obtained from the CUVECO were related to those obtained in the School Social Climate Questionnaire (CECSCE) (Trianes et al., 2006). Thus, the scores from the suffered violence factor were associated (p <.01) to the School Social Climate measurement (r = -.15), but not to the Teacher Climate variable measurement. As for the scores from the observed violence factor, they were associated (p <.01) to the School Social Climate measurement (r = -.34) and to the Teacher Climate variable measurement (r = -.18).
**Procedure**

An interview was conducted with the head teachers, directors of studies and/or school counselors of the participant schools, in order to explain the aims of the research, describe the assessment instruments, ask for permission to apply them, and encourage cooperation on their part. Questionnaires were collectively administered in the class by the research staff. Instructions were read aloud, stressing the importance of not leaving any blank answers. Members of the research staff were present at the time of administering the test, in order to answer questions and check that each student had filled out his own. The IAES took an average time of 25 minutes, while the CECSCE and CUVECO took 5 minutes respectively.

**Data Analysis**

A quick cluster analysis was conducted in order to identify the school anxiety profiles of the students. The clustering procedure follows one of two methods: hierarchical and non-hierarchical. The former is most commonly used for this type of research. The main difference between hierarchical and non-hierarchical clustering is that, in the latter, the researcher must specify the groups to be made beforehand. The quick cluster analysis used in this study is a non-hierarchical method and a reallocation method, that is, it allows for an individual that had been allocated to a certain group at a certain point in the process to be reallocated to another group at a later date if such reallocation was found to optimize the selection criteria. The cluster analysis is the most appropriate procedure to identify profiles in a large sample (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998).

The school anxiety profiles have been defined based on the different combinations of the four situational factors (Anxiety about School Failure and Punishment, Anxiety about Aggression, Anxiety about Social Evaluation and Anxiety about School Evaluation) assessed by the IAES (García-Fernández et al., 2011). After standardizing the direct scores, a cluster analysis was conducted in order to eliminate the effect produced by the differences in the school anxiety measurements (given that the number of items is not the same in all sub-scales).

The criterion followed when selecting the number of clusters was to maximize the inter-cluster differences with the aim of establishing the highest possible number of groups.
with different combinations. Once the school anxiety profiles were identified, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted in order to study the statistical significance of the existing differences among groups in relation to perception of the school climate, teacher climate, personal experience of suffering violence and observed violence in the school. Given that there were more than two groups, the Scheffé post-hoc procedure was conducted as a multiple comparison test. All statistical analyses were calculated using the SPSS 16.0 software.

Results
Identification of School Anxiety Profiles
The results from the quick cluster analysis differentiated three groups, each of which had different levels of intensity with regards to the four situational factors of school anxiety (see Figure 1).

The first group consisted of 141 students (38.63%) and was characterised by low scores relating to the four situational factors. This group was defined as a Low School Anxiety (LSA) group. A second group consisted of 163 students (44.66%) and was characterised by average scores in relation to each of the factors. This group was defined as an Average School Anxiety (ASA) group. At last, a third group consisted of 61 students (16.71%) and was characterised by high scores in relation to all factors. This group was defined as a High School Anxiety (HSA) group.

![Figure 1. Representation of school anxiety profiles identified through cluster analysis](image)

**Figure 1. Representation of school anxiety profiles identified through cluster analysis**

AAFP: Anxiety about Academic Failure and Punishment; AA: Anxiety about Aggression; ASE: Anxiety about Social Evaluation; ASE: Anxiety about School Evaluation; LSA: Low School Anxiety; ASA: Average School Anxiety; HSA: High School Anxiety.
Inter-group Differences

ANOVA results show statistically significant differences between the three school anxiety profiles with regards to the variables: Teacher Climate and Personal Experience of Suffering Violence (see Table 1).

The post-hoc comparisons (Scheffé test) show that the differences are between the LSA Group and the HSA Group with regards to the Teacher Climate variable, as the HSA Group obtained higher scores in this variable than the LSA Group. The difference was of moderate intensity ($p = .003, d = -.51$). Thus, students with a high level of school anxiety have a better perception of teacher climate than those with a low school anxiety.

As for the Personal Experience of Suffering Violence variable, results show statistically significant differences between the LSA Group and the ASA Group ($p = .011, d = -.39$) and between the LSA Group and the HSA Group ($p = .010, d = -.39$). Nevertheless, the difference was of low intensity in both cases. Thus, students with an average and high level of school anxiety have suffered more instances of school violence than those with a low level of school anxiety (see Table 1).

**Table 1. Differences in school anxiety profiles in relation to the studied variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>LSA A (SD)</th>
<th>ASA A (SD)</th>
<th>HSA A (SD)</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>25.99 (4.99)</td>
<td>26.30 (4.94)</td>
<td>25.67 (5.59)</td>
<td>F(2,362) = .371, p = .690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>20.81 (4.14)</td>
<td>21.60 (3.67)</td>
<td>22.86 (3.76)</td>
<td>F(2,362) = 6.051, p = .003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESV</td>
<td>11.41 (3.90)</td>
<td>13.09 (5.15)</td>
<td>13.16 (5.68)</td>
<td>F(2,362) = 5.403, p = .005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSV</td>
<td>16.85 (5.21)</td>
<td>17.22 (5.43)</td>
<td>18.13 (5.31)</td>
<td>F(2,362) = 1.215, p = .298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SC: School Climate; TC: Teacher Climate; PESV: Personal Experience of Suffering Violence; OSV: Observed School Violence; LSA: Low School Anxiety; ASA: Average School Anxiety; HSA: High School Anxiety.
Discussion and Conclusions

The first aim of this study was to identify groups with different levels of school anxiety which had been self-reported by the students themselves. Once achieved, the second aim was to check whether there were statistically significant differences among these groups in relation to school climate, teacher climate, personal experience of suffering violence and observed school violence.

Three school anxiety profiles were identified by means of a cluster analysis. The first group with a Low School Anxiety profile (LSA Group), the second with an Average School Anxiety profile (ASA Group) and the third with a High School Anxiety profile (HSA Group). The intensity of the anxiety response has conditioned these results, as it has revealed three levels. Unlike some qualitative combinations, this study has taken into account the intensive aspect of the response. This is because, when it comes to anxiety, (maybe because its emotional nature generates curvilinear relations with other variables), the group with healthy (low) levels is separated from the group with threatening (high) levels for the psychological health. The role of the average group depends on each studied variable. Another common experience like stress also produces differentiating results on the healthy (low) group.

The three groups based on the different levels of anxiety intensity present different relations with the other studied variables, hence providing evidence to support the first hypothesis presented in this study. These groups present differences in the perception of teachers and instances of suffering violence in the school variables. Students with a high level of school anxiety present significant differences as compared to the low school anxiety group with regards to the perception of teacher climate. Thus, students with a high level of school anxiety have a better perception of their teachers with regards to their performance in terms of affectivity and support. There are currently no research studies to contrast these results. A possible reason to explain them might involve that, due to their anxiety problem, anxious students might have received more support from their teachers, as anxiety is commonly perceived as a problem that can be detected and addressed at school (Monjas, 2001). Another possible explanation might involve that, those students with high anxiety often pay more respect to figures of authority,
especially teachers, as they can provide them with a safety feeling and protection when facing the demands and difficulties of the academic year in Secondary Education.

Students with an average and high profile of school anxiety have suffered more personal instances of violence than students with low school anxiety. Casuistry is then revealed that affects students with anxiety problems, who have been involved in assaults as victims and most likely as aggressors too. Further research on stress, which is a variable closely related to anxiety, states that students with a low peer acceptance (motivated by interpersonal conflicts and very often by unjustified aggression) present high levels of stress in Primary Education (Escobar, Trianes, Fernández & Miranda, 2010) and in Secondary Education. Students involved in fights and aggressive behaviour also present higher levels of adolescent stress than those who are not (Escobar, Blanca, Fernández-Baena & Trianes, 2011). These results stress that experiencing anxiety and stress can either be a cause or a consequence of suffering interpersonal violence at school and being rejected because of it. Suffering symptoms of internalized psychopathology is therefore considered to be a risk associated to suffering violence and being involved in aggressive behaviour. These results are relatively new, as most of the previous studies have found a direct relation between stress and externalized problems in children and adolescents (Elgar, Arlett & Groves, 2003; Suldo,


Having said that, there were no statistically significant differences in the rest of the studied variables. Although some research studies have linked school anxiety to the class social climate or to interpersonal violence (Astor et al., 2002; Martínez-Rodríguez, 2004; Thomas, 2010), no research study has yet gone in depth into the variables that are included in these constructs with regards to school anxiety. Based on these results, school climate and observed violence do not produce statistically significant differences
in the different school anxiety profiles, but the most personal and close variables to students do, such as the direct relationship with their teachers or the fact of having suffered violence.

The study presents some limitations, and future studies may provide a clearer view of them. The first limitation is represented by the fact that the sample only included Secondary Education students, so that the results obtained cannot be generalized to other educational levels like Primary Education, High School and University. Future studies should use representative samples to check whether these results are maintained in other educational levels in order to increase the external validity of the findings. Additionally, further studies should administer a clinical interview or some other type of evaluation method, in order not to base the diagnosis on self-reported measurement scores only.

Despite these limitations, the results of this study are considered relevant, as they contribute to an exhaustive analysis of school anxiety and differences observed in other relevant variables of the educational field. Results may be used by teachers, school psychologists and clinical psychologists as a starting point to develop preventive actions and efficient interventions. To do so, professionals should be able to use information about the school anxiety profiles of students, with the aim to better adjust their interventions. Furthermore, the intervention packages aimed to prevent or reduce school anxiety should take into account the role played by social climate and peer violence variables. However, future studies may provide a deeper analysis of this topic.
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