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1. Executive summary of the report

1.1. Why diversity and inclusion at the Donders Institute?
Science misses out if it is not by and for all of us. A diverse\(^1\) and inclusive\(^2\) work climate is important for the way we interact with each other, and for the vitality and work satisfaction experienced. The Donders Institute (DI) acknowledges the importance of and takes seriously its contribution to diversity and inclusion initiatives in higher education and science. As such, the DI diversity and inclusion principles include the creation of a safe and welcoming environment for everyone at the DI to be themselves and to develop to the best of their ability. A safe and welcoming environment is a value in itself, but also a basic requirement for the quality and sustainability\(^3\) of science. Work that does not consider diversity in perspectives is less representative and limited in societal impact.

1.2. Rationale for this report
In recent years, the DI has proactively addressed the under-representation of women at senior levels of the institute and has made some considerable progress in this respect, tripling the number of female associate and full professors in 10 years. In addition, effort has been put into internationalizing the DI, which has resulted in a multinational membership. However, diversity is not limited to gender expression, and there is still a rather ‘eurocentric’ orientation of the DI, while the representation of different social identities at the DI has remained under-explored. The experience of Donderians of inclusion at the institute has hitherto not been investigated, nor have the views of Donderians been gauged on what can be done to better support different social and demographic identities in terms of optimizing professional experience and academic development and the sustainability of science. Thus, the Donders diversity and sustainable science committee decided to survey Donderians’ experiences on these topics.

1.3. Methods
With this rationale in mind, an online survey that assessed attitudes towards diversity, inclusion and sustainability was distributed widely among Donderians in the autumn of 2020. The survey included quantifiable questions, which were complemented by rich qualitative analysis of open text. Ultimately, the survey was completed by 259 respondents that included academic and non-academic staff and a spread of academic positions (MSc student to full professor). The answers from respondents were then divided up into different demographic groups based on academic position, gender, sexual orientation, racial identity, disability (or para-ability), nationality, civil status, and parental status.

We would like to note that, in the process of creating this report (survey, analysis, writing) we have done our best to be inclusive and avoid bias, but we acknowledge that we can make mistakes, and we are open to feedback on this matter.

---

\(^1\) Diversity here refers to diversity in gender expression, ability, personality, ethnicity, sexual/romantic orientation and any other social identity facet that contributes to an individual’s uniqueness.

\(^2\) Inclusion is defined as ‘a state of being valued, respected and supported’. A simplified explanation is that if diversity is ‘being asked to the party’, inclusivity is ‘being asked to dance’; or even better: inclusivity is ‘being part of the organising committee’.

\(^3\) Sustainability here is defined as ‘research practices and work culture aimed at long-term solutions that give everyone the support they need, in order to grow and develop to the utmost of their professional and personal ability.’
1.4. Summary of results
As a general pattern, the results highlighted that many aspects of diversity, inclusivity and sustainability are experienced positively at the DI. However, several shortcomings were noted. Crucially, minority groups (e.g., concerning gender, sexual orientation etc.) reported a lower level of work satisfaction.

Diversity: Although many Donderians expressed the opinion that attitudes towards diversity are emphasized sufficiently at the DI, still a considerable proportion of the survey respondents felt diversity could be emphasized more. This was the case for minority groups, including gender expression, race, sexual orientation, nationality, and ability. The majority of respondents thought more should be done to improve gender diversity, which is important in light of the effort and attention dedicated towards the male-female aspect of diversity in past years.

Work-Life balance: Donderians generally feel they experience a reasonable work/life balance. Students, PIs as well as individuals with childcare responsibilities reported experiencing the lowest work/life balance compared to other Donderians. Striking was that, overall, Donderians reported experiencing medium to high stress levels in the past year, especially those belonging to minority groups. At the same time, Donderians felt they received only moderate support to grow. Regarding administrative support, about half the respondents felt sufficiently supported, but the majority of PIs felt they had insufficient administrative support.

Bias or Discrimination: Experience of bias or discrimination at the DI did not seem commonplace. Yet, a significant minority of Donderians did report having either experienced or witnessed discrimination/bias, with reports of discrimination being less common than those of bias. These negative experiences were more common among minority groups at the DI. Regarding the source of these biases/discrimination, Donderians felt there is still room for improvement regarding gender discrimination in particular, but also in the accommodation of different personality profiles, ‘eurocentrism’, which can lead to non-European Donderians feeling less included, and in the structure of the DI, which some experience as more hierarchical than the DI portrays itself to be.

Feeling of safety: Although reports of having felt unsafe at the institute were relatively uncommon, certain minority groups (especially women, and LGBTQ+ individuals) reported feeling unsafe or uncomfortable more frequently. Minority groups reported remaining silent, or that if they spoke up, their voices were not heard. This is a very important outcome, as diverse voices are important for an inclusive research environment, and if voices are stifled, efforts to achieve inclusivity are undermined.

Openness to personality differences: Regarding personality, only around half of respondents were pleased with how their personality was aligned with personal and professional growth at the DI. Many also expressed the opinion that the DI was not helpful in accommodating a more varied set of personality profiles, and that it was accepted that more extravert, bold or assertive personalities dominate discussions. This means that often the voices of others (e.g., those quiet, reflective and thoughtful) remain unheard, although different personalities are complementary, and add value in their own ways. Feelings of belonging to the DI were negatively affected by the apparent preference for one personality profile.

---

4 Bias: ‘a preference or an inclination, especially one that inhibits impartial judgment. An unfair act, attitude or policy stemming from prejudice. For example, preferentially hiring someone that comes from the same country as you.’

5 Discrimination: ‘the subjective/objective unequal treatment of persons of various groups, often on the basis of prejudice. For example, to pay men and women unequal amounts for the same job’
(extravert, open, confident) and for people who overwork themselves; in addition, this feeling of belonging was negatively influenced by the perceived focus of the DI on individual accomplishment and competition rather than on collaboration and support.

**Inclusivity**: the majority of respondents felt that the DI is at least moderately inclusive, with this feeling being less common among minority groups for gender expression, sexual orientation, and ability as well as those with childcare responsibilities. Respondents made suggestions for making the DI more inclusive, which concerned 1) equality, diversity, and transparency, 2) awareness, and 3) supervision, collaboration, and institute culture. Being asked about positive experiences of inclusion at the DI, many reported the inclusive and supportive atmosphere (≈32%) or the career support (29%), in addition to personal supervision, friendly colleagues, and a collaborative environment.

**Experiences of mentorship**: PhD candidates were the most likely to have a mentor (or "confidant", arranged by the Donders Graduate School), but were the least satisfied with the quality of the mentorship they received. Minority groups were more likely to seek out mentorship by themselves. There was an indication that those who seek out mentors themselves experience higher benefit from it. In terms of support felt, most Donderians felt they received an adequate amount of support from colleagues and supervisors, with some minority groups reporting a little less support. Overall, most Donderians felt they received less support from the institutional level. Especially, a lack of opportunity for personal and professional development was raised; indicating the need for more attention to advice on alternative career paths and family planning for women. Some respondents also felt that their supervisors do not take their personal needs into account and do not provide enough guidance.

**Effects of the Covid-19 pandemic.** The most frequently reported negative consequence of the pandemic was that research got put on hold. Respondents with childcare responsibilities seemed to feel they had less time for work and so did more senior academic staff, those with a para-ability, and those not in a relationship were most likely to report missing out on networking opportunities. Work-related stress appeared to increase more for minorities in terms of nationality and race during the pandemic.

1.5. Recommendations

In general, the survey has shown that DI is perceived by its students and employees as a relatively diverse and inclusive environment. However, substantial efforts are still needed in a number of areas. Even after 10 years of putting effort into two aspects of diversity, i.e. male-female inequalities and internationalisation, even these aspects are still experienced as not yet satisfactorily solved. Indeed, despite achieving important milestones, male-female equality and more general aspects relating to gender expression (e.g. binary vs. non-binary gender expression) will need to remain an important diversity topic in the coming years. Further, although the DI’s ability to attract international researchers and students is notable, it is also perceived to be ‘eurocentric’. Next to this, it is time to extend the focus of this work to other aspects of diversity; these include but are not limited to the expression of sexual orientation, racial identity, para-ability, civil status, parental status, and personality.

Here, we provide specific suggestions, derived from analysing the survey results, which we would like the DI board to consider; we as a committee see those recommendations as a starting point for taking next steps to collaborate with the board and other DI groups in order to advance equality and inclusion at the DI. To note, for each point we describe the specific suggestion and then provide an example of what action could be taken to address it. As a general note, however, we would like to emphasize that we find it

---

6 Mentor: ‘a more senior person with the task of providing support and career advice’
essential that the responsibility for these and any other diversity-promoting actions lie with the leadership of the DI; no undue burden should be placed on under-represented minority group. We would also like to make a general suggestion to the board that - to show commitment to inclusivity and a willingness to change - resources, in terms of personnel or earmarked funds (or both), are allocated to diversity and inclusion-promoting activities. Transforming our research culture, policies and decision-making such that it truly provides equal opportunities to all requires actions on multiple levels which can only be achieved if the necessary resources are committed to them.

Finally, please note that the suggestions below are just a starting point, and that the real aim of the current report is to bring to the attention of the board the current issues regarding diversity at the Donders Institute. Our specific recommendations for consideration by the DI board are:

- **Increase visibility** of the commitment of the DI towards embracing diversity, inclusion, and sustainability, internally and externally. Already in a short timeframe, a lot can be done in this regard. For example, we can place the DI diversity and inclusion principles in a more prominent position on the DI website and intranet, we can refer to them in standard recruitment texts, and we can have adapted versions of the DI logo on social media to draw attention to diversity and inclusivity.

- **Provide additional training** on diversity, inclusion, and sustainability to all levels of staff. For example, we can organise Donders Sessions on these topics, offer ally training, training in cultural consideration as well as making it a requirement for all BAC committee members to have undergone some form of equality training. We would strongly also encourage members of the DI board to undergo these forms of training.

- **The DI policy on harassment** needs to be clear and accessible, and additional training in this area may be required, in particular for senior staff (such as PIs). The DI leadership should actively promote a research culture where any form of harassment and discrimination is not tolerated and where individuals feel safe to speak up on these issues. For example, links to confidential support should be given a prominent position on the DI webpage, and we stimulate the DI to consider hiring a dedicated diversity officer.

- **Train senior researchers to open up communication** in their groups about aspects related to diversity and inclusion, such as work pressure - work pleasure balance, gender balance, cultural consideration and personality profiles. For example, lessons can be learned and material adapted from various workshops that have been conducted across different departments of the DI on these topics (such as the Human Genetics department at the RUMC).

- **Foster an open and safe working atmosphere** that welcomes different views and voices. A particularly important point in this regard is a better accommodation of different personality profiles. To give an example, introverts may prefer to communicate in writing whereas extraverts may prefer to communicate verbally. Similarly, different personalities thrive in different working environments. As such, the way we organise offices and events (to name but two examples), as well as policies on allowing people to work from home, needs to take into consideration these varying needs. For example, it may be constructive to organise future events such that participants can participate in different ways (e.g. in writing via comments in a zoom gathering or by simply speaking up). More tips on how to accommodate different personalities in the workplace can be found here.

- **Mentorship** is important, but mentees report the highest satisfaction with a mentor they chose themselves. Rather than directly providing mentors, we should thus, for example, enable researchers to choose their own mentor, after having been provided information on aspects to take into account in this choice and how to engage their mentors.

- The survey highlighted that many Donderians experience a high level of stress and that the COVID19 pandemic has negatively impacted their work. Multiple workshops and training programmes currently
exist at the DI and Radboud campus that help individuals cope with stress. The DI should, for example, make such workshops visible and accessible to Donderians.

- Through the survey, we noticed that the most critical assessment of aspects of diversity, inclusivity, and sustainability came from minority groups in our institute. We must make sure we hear these critical voices when evaluating our progress in improving the institute’s performance on these aspects. This could, for example, be done by establishing an advisory committee or focus group that is regularly consulted on specific aspects.

1.6. Final thoughts and remarks
The Donders Diversity and Sustainable Science committee would like to emphasise that beyond extending our focus to consider all aspects of our identity that make us unique, we should also consider using a more intersectional approach to our endeavours that aim to promote a more equitable and inclusive research environment. Namely, describing individuals in binary terms (e.g. male vs female, White vs Black etc) does not capture the complexity of an individual’s identity, as most of us belong to multiple distinct identity groups. Moreover, these layers of intersectionality have an important implication of how we experience our environment and how prevalent biases and societal inequalities affect us. Thus, moving forward we would encourage the DI to take an intersectional approach to achieving an inclusive and sustainable research environment. Finally, as we progress with our efforts, we need to develop new ways to help bring everyone on board with us. Our objectives will only be reached if we each play our part and feel we have a part to play. We need to acknowledge this and keep it at the back of our minds in all our endeavours.

1.7. Authors of the report
This internal report was put together by the Donders Diversity and Sustainable Science (DSS from hereon) committee. The DSS committee consists of >15 Donderians from different levels of their careers, DI centres, and different social identities, under the chairmanship of Dr. Freyja Olafsdottir and Prof. Corina Greven; Prof. Tansu Celikel acts as DSS portfolio holder in the DI board.

2. Extended summary

2.1 Introduction

A diverse environment is known to benefit research and decision-making [Smith, D. G., & Schonfeld, N. B. (2000)] in a recent statement (see here) the Donders Institute (DI) emphasised that it values the significant role diversity plays in meeting its research goals. DI expressed its strong aspiration to create a research environment that is open and inclusive to all, enabling each individual to grow academically, irrespective of what social identity(s) they may identify with. Indeed, in recent years, the DI has proactively addressed the under-representation of women at senior levels at the institute and has made considerable progress in this respect. For example, the number of tenured female academic staff has nearly tripled in 10 years. However, diversity is not limited to gender expression; the representation of

---

7 Diversity, here, refers to diversity in gender expression, ability, personality, ethnicity, sexual/romantic orientation and any other social identity facet that contributes to an individual’s uniqueness.

different social identities at the DI has remained under-explored. Furthermore, the experience of inclusion at the institute has hitherto not been investigated, nor have Donderians’ views been surveyed in order to gauge what remains to be done to better support Donderians belonging to different social identities and how the institute’s research environment can be made more sustainable⁹. With these caveats in mind, the Donders diversity and sustainable science committee (DSS from hereon) put together a survey to address these questions.

2.2 Methods

2.2.1. Survey

LimeSurvey was used to create an anonymous survey. The survey was advertised via e-mail lists, the Donders weekly newsletter and the Donders Mattermost channel. All academic and non-academic staff as well as master’s students enrolled in the Donders Cognitive Neuroscience masters were encouraged to fill in the survey. The survey was not extended to Bachelor’s students at Radboud University as the Donders Institute does not have its own Bachelor’s programme and thus their inclusion was deemed to be beyond the scope of the survey.

Given the survey asked a series of potentially identity revealing questions, the survey had to comply with GDPR guidelines in order to ensure anonymity and fair treatment of participants’ data. The following steps were taken in order to comply with these:

1. Participation in the survey was voluntary; no person was required to fill in the survey.
2. Participants were required to provide informed consent prior to filling in the survey.
3. No identity revealing survey question (such as a question about a person's gender, sexual orientation, nationality etc) was mandatory.
4. Participants’ answers were fully revocable (via a random number generator), i.e. a participants’ data will be deleted upon their request.
5. The data from the survey was kept on a secure server (CNAS) only accessible to the DSS members responsible for analysing the data.
6. Survey data will be stored for up to 5 years, after which they are deleted and only summary information may be continued to be stored.

Furthermore, the motivation for asking sensitive questions about an individual’s identity was explained in all advertisements of the survey as well as on the front page of the survey itself.

2.3 Analysis

In this report we provide a descriptive analysis of the answers to the survey questions that provide quantifiable data. To note, we did not perform hypothesis testing of the quantitative data as this was not permitted given the uneven sample size of the demographic groups (e.g. White vs non-White, heterosexual vs non-heterosexual) and particularly due to the small number of individuals belonging to minority groups in terms of race, sexual orientation, gender and ability. As such, we caution the interpretation of effects in our data and we encourage the reader to consider the report as a starting point.

⁹ Sustainability here is defined as research practices and work culture aimed at long-term solutions that give everyone the support they need, in order to grow and develop to the utmost of their professional and personal ability.
point for further investigation into the experience of inclusion at the DI. Next to quantitative research questions, the survey also contained open-ended questions that were answered via free text. The latter were analysed using qualitative thematic analysis. Thematic analysis of the open-ended questions was performed via an inductive approach, carried out along subsets of the open-ended questions. For example, experiences of, or witnessing biases and discrimination were compiled into one set of answers. Open-ended questions were then assessed by the authors on a question by questions basis. This was followed by the identification of codes, and themes throughout the text of each question. Responses were clustered within these themes, and were then synthesized into a conceptual overarching conclusion bringing together the input from the various respondents within the single theme.

2.4 Contributions
Survey creation: Danae Papadopetraki, Ella Bosch, Freyja Olafsdottir, Tansu Celikel
Data analysis: Joey Zhou, Danae Papadopetraki, Freyja Olafsdottir, Rogier Kievit, Rayyan Toutounji, Tansu Celikel, Willeke Menks, Christienne Damatac

All committee members contributed to reviewing the draft of the survey and report.
3. Results

3.1 How diverse is the Donders?

The survey measured attitudes toward diversity and inclusion, and diversity parameters of some 259 respondents were allocated to the following demographic groups:

- **Academic position**: Master’s student, PhD, Post-doc, PI.
- **Gender**: male, female, non-binary.
- **Sexual orientation**: straight, non-straight
- **Racial identity**: white vs non-white
- **Disability (or Para-ability)**: no disability, para(dis)ability
- **Nationality**: Dutch, non-Dutch
- **Civil status**: single, non-single
- **Parental status**: parent, non-parent

We recognise the sub-group definitions in some instances are not ideal. For example, the subgroup ‘non-white’ entails a wide range of racial identities, which may or may not share common experiences besides *not* being a member of the majority group. Additionally, we recognize that some of these definitions are artificial and arbitrary. Yet, as only a limited number of respondents belonged to each of the minority sub-groups (e.g. identifying as Black) we felt using these broad categorizations allowed us still to report and compare the experience of respondents belonging different social identities; in this case, whether respondents belonged to the minority or majority group. To clarify, we define the majority vs minority distinction relative to representation of a particular group at the DI.

Most respondents were between the ages of 25 - 34, predominantly identified as Dutch, female, white and straight, identified as atheist and reported not having any disability (para-ability). Most respondents were in a relationship without any offspring. Moreover, the survey sampled attitudes from Donderians belonging to different academic and professional categories (ranging from Master’s students to full professors). Given the limited sample size, we did not perform any multifactorial analysis of dependencies across the variables at this time. Since age corresponded largely with academic position it was not used as an indicative parameter for attitudes and identity. For a full analysis of the demographic breakdown of the survey samples please see Figure S1.

We were unable to test whether our survey data is representative of the Donders Institute in general, since data on diversity parameters is not readily available at the Donders. The exceptions are the Donders Graduate school and the Donders Cognitive Neuroscience Research Master Programme where female PhD candidates outnumber their male counterparts 2:1 in each programme. For the PostDocs, PIs and support staff such data was not available. The first hurdle when it comes to measuring gender, is that the data is scattered between centres and some individuals might be counted at multiple centres. The other diversity parameters are measured against the general Dutch population, which brings its own intricacies. For example, the Dutch general census does not measure racial identity, but migration background. Therefore, it is hard to cross compare the data obtained in the survey.
Although the numbers on racial identity do not inform us whether the diversity of racial identity at Donders is representative of the regional, national or European diversity, it provides a general snapshot of the current diversity landscape at Donders. In future surveys, by extending the questionnaire to include ethnical background of the respondents, we expect to gather sufficient information to track racial and ethical diversity to ensure bias does not impact progression towards an equitable working place.

A parameter that does provide a direct chance for cross comparison is the prevalence of individuals with a disability (or para-ability). Only 8% of respondents reported having a para-ability/disability in contrast to 21% of the general Dutch population. An additional striking statistic is that of the 27.17% of survey respondents who indicated they had children, 13% said they shouldered most of the responsibility - this compares to 3% in the general Dutch population³.

3.2 Attitudes towards diversity

In the following section we inquired about Donderians’ experience of diversity at the DI and whether they felt diversity was emphasised sufficiently. To note, answers to these questions were obligatory. Firstly we asked ‘In your opinion, how diverse is the Donders Institute?’. Respondents gave their answer on a 5-point likert scale with a score of five indicating they find the Donders to be extremely diverse. In general Donderians find the institute to be somewhat diverse (mean = 3.16, SD = 0.80). Interestingly, respondents belonging to a minority group in terms of gender, race, sexual orientation and nationality tended to give a less agreeable rating than those belonging to the majority group in each case (Figure 1). Moreover, diversity ratings seemed to go down with academic rank.
Further, we enquired about particular forms of diversity and whether the respondents felt the Donders could improve the representation of each diversity form. Specifically, we asked if the Donders could improve its gender, racial, cultural, ability, personality, sexual orientation and nationality diversity. Overall, the survey respondents seem to feel the Donders could improve the most in terms of gender, cultural and ability diversity (percent yes response to “we need to increase diversity in X”: 28.19% for (X being) ability, 35.91% for culture, 43.63% for gender, 17.37% for nationality, 21.24% for personality, 48.26% for race). As such, we will discuss these results in more detail (please see Figure S2 for full results for each question).

Interestingly, the highest proportion of respondents felt more could be done to improve gender diversity, this was particularly the case for more senior respondents and respondents belonging to minority groups in terms of gender (i.e. non-binary) and sexual orientation. Further, respondents with childcare responsibilities also felt improvements could be made on this front compared to respondents without childcare responsibilities. It is interesting that Donderians feel gender representation is the most pertinent given how much effort and attention has been dedicated towards this aspect of diversity in past years. This could mean that the efforts were helpful as people have become more aware of issues regarding gender representation, and/or that it has become more acceptable to speak up about it, but also rightfully suggests that the gender representation issues require further attention.
Many Donderians also felt the DI could do more to improve in terms of both cultural and racial diversity, which was particularly the case for minority groups in terms of gender, race, sexual orientation, nationality and ability. PIs were also the most likely to report feeling improvements could be made in this area compared to other position groups. Finally, respondents who reported being married/in a relationship as well as those with childcare responsibilities also felt improvements were necessary. Considering diversity in ability, a smaller but substantial proportion of respondents felt more could be done to increase representation in this area. Particularly, respondents belonging to minority groups in terms of gender (i.e. non-binary), sexual orientation, nationality and individuals with a disability felt ability diversity could be improved at the institute.

Finally, we asked the survey respondents what they felt about attitudes towards diversity at the Donders. Specifically, we asked ‘What is your opinion about the attitude towards diversity at the Donders Institute?’ To summarize, although many Donderians feel attitudes towards diversity are emphasized sufficiently at DI, a considerable proportion of the survey respondents felt diversity was not emphasized enough. This seemed to particularly be the case for minority groups for gender expression, race, sexual orientation, nationality and ability (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. Is diversity emphasised sufficiently at the Donders Institute?
3.2 Quality of life

In this section of the survey we enquired about Donderians’ experience of keeping a work/life balance, of stress and support and also whether they had experienced/observed negative biases and/or discrimination against themselves/others at DI.

**Work-life balance**

Work-life balance was probed using five questions on a 5-point Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree, see Appendix A for full questions). Due to high correlations between four out of the five individual questions, the averaged ratings from the four questions that correlated were used in subsequent analyses. For this composite work/life balance question score, a higher score indicated a higher agreement with the statements in each of the four questions we asked and thus an experience of a higher work/life balance.

Average work-life balance scores were somewhere in the middle (Mean=3.49 SD = 0.95, see Figure 3) suggesting Donderians feel they experience some degree of work/life balance. However, we also observed some differences between some of the demographic subgroups. Particularly, we found the minority groups in terms of race (non-White), nationality (non-Dutch) and ability (para-abled) reported lower work/life balance ratings on average. Moreover, master’s students and PIs also reported lower work/life balance than PhDs and postdocs.

The fifth question on work-life balance was aimed at parents in particular to assess how easily they felt they could juggle childcare and work responsibilities. It seemed answers to this question were a bit less agreeable than for other work/life balance questions and few subgroup differences were observed (see figure S3).

In sum, Donderians generally feel they experience some level of work/life balance. Yet, the observed differences between some of the demographic subgroups suggests that certain minority groups experience a lower degree of work/life balance than others. Moreover, it seems students as PIs as well as individuals who have childcare responsibilities experience lower work/life balance than other Donderians. These group differences should be investigated further.
In addition to work-life balance, we also wanted to capture experienced stress in the last year (2020). Overall, respondents reported medium to high levels of stress (mean = 3.47, SD = 0.93, Figure 4). Stress ratings were particularly high for non-binary individuals, non-heterosexual, non-Dutch and disabled respondents. Thus, it seems Donderians have experienced a relatively high amount of stress in the past year, especially those belonging to minority groups (in terms of gender, sexual orientation, nationality and ability).

Figure 3. Work/life balance at the Donders Institute

Experience of stress and support
Finally, we enquired about whether Donderians felt they had sufficient support to grow at the Donders on a similar scale as before. Results suggest Donderians felt they had a moderate amount of support to grow (mean = 3.51, SD = 0.97). Smaller differences were observed between the subgroups, although it seemed non-binary and non-heterosexual individuals as well as Donderians of more senior academic rank experiences lower support than the rest (see Figure S4). To note, we also asked a specific question about whether respondents felt they had sufficient administrative support. On the whole, about half the respondents responded positively to this question (overall 47.25%), but some notable subgroup differences were observed. In particular, the majority of PIs felt they had insufficient administrative support (89.29%). These results are shown in Figure S5.

In summary, minority groups (sexual orientation, disability, and nationality) seemed to have experienced a higher degree of stress in the past year. In terms of support, smaller between group differences were observed, although it seems generally that more senior academic staff feel less supported (at least in terms of administrative support), and so do minority groups in terms of gender and sexual orientation (non-binary and non-heterosexual individuals).

Experiences of Bias and Discrimination

To address the issue of experiences of bias and discrimination, we asked a series of questions about whether the survey respondents had either experienced or observed biases and/or discrimination at the Donders and how included and safe they felt at the Donders. Given the sensitive nature of these questions, no question was mandatory. Here, we defined biases as ‘a preference or an inclination, especially one that inhibits impartial judgment. An unfair act, attitude or policy stemming from prejudice. For example, preferentially hiring someone that comes from the same country as you.’
On average 19.31% of respondents indicated they had experienced negative biases, and 27.03% had reported witnessing negative biases. Although this is a minority of respondents it nevertheless represents a significant proportion of DI. Overall, minority groups (gender, race, sexual orientation, nationality, and disability status) reported increased experiences (see Figure 5), and observations of negative biases in action (Figure S6). Additionally, people in higher ranking positions (PIs and Postdocs) also reported increased experiences and observations of bias relative to PhDs and master’s students. Finally, single individuals and those with childcare responsibilities also reported higher experiences and observations of biases than the rest. These results show that although experience of bias at the DI is not commonplace, a substantial proportion of Donderians still report having experienced this; further such experiences seem to be particularly prevalent among minority groups in terms of gender, race, sexual orientation and nationality as well as those of more senior academic ranks and those not in a relationship. It seems imperative that we try to understand these results further and assess to what degree duration of employment at the DI contributes to the observed results (given more senior Donderians were more likely to have reported experiencing/witnessing bias).

It should be noted, as well, that witnessing biases against others were more commonplace than reports of actual experiences of bias. This could be for multiple reasons. Firstly, perhaps people feel more comfortable reporting having observed biases against others. Alternatively, it could reflect the fact that multiple individuals may report witnessing the same instance of a bias thus inflating the actual frequency of this form of inequality. However, it is also plausible that this discrepancy between reports of experience vs witnessing of bias may reflect the fact that individuals who have experienced negative biases against them are no longer at the DI, whereas those who witnessed those biases are. In any case, we should strive to understand the source of these biases and make it our goal to prevent them.
We next sought to investigate how many Donderians have experienced or witnessed discrimination at the DI. In this context, discrimination is defined as ‘the subjective/objective unequal treatment of persons of various groups, often on the basis of prejudice. For example, to pay men and women unequal amounts for the same job”. Relative to experience of bias, experiences of discrimination were less common, 9.65% reported experiencing discrimination of some kind (Figure 6), and 15.44% witnessing of discrimination (figure S7).

Women were most likely to report having experienced discrimination. This was also true for minority groups in terms of sexual orientation, nationality, race, and disability status. Smaller differences were observed between other demographic groups. To note, no master student reported having experienced discrimination, and only minor differences were observed between the other position groups. Thus, again we find consistent differences between majority and minority groups at the DI, with the experience of minority groups being worse than that of majority groups.

In order to deepen our understanding of how people felt discriminated against or experienced negative biases towards them, we also explored the respondents’ answers to open-ended questions using a thematic qualitative analysis. The most prominent type of discrimination was related to gender, and subjective experiences included accounts of harassment and sexism. The general feeling was that not enough was being done about this issue. Biases and discrimination were also reported in regard to hierarchy. Though the Dutch system is supposedly flat, complaints were put forth in the survey on discrimination, especially in the context of support staff (i.e., research assistants or technical support groups). Further, although the Donders appears to be multicultural, people also reported discrimination based on race and ethnicity. The main theme in this regard was that although the Donders is international, it remains highly Eurocentric, and differences in culture that may deviate from dominant
European cultures have resulted in people feeling discriminated against on some level. Finally, personality traits seem to be a cause of suffering. Specifically, there seems to be a one-fit-all feeling in terms of personality profiles at the Donders, with more consideration needed to accommodate both introverts and extraverts.

In summary, experience of bias or discrimination at the DI does not seem to be commonplace. Yet, a notable minority of Donderians do report having either experienced or witnessed discrimination/bias. These negative experiences are more common among minority groups at the Donders. Further, the thematic analysis gave insight into what the source of these biases/discrimination may be. Interestingly, despite recent efforts to re-balance gender ratios at the DI, Donderians still feel there is room for improvement in terms of gender representation. Moreover, concerns about Euro-centrism seem to be prevalent, which may lead to non-European Donderians feeling less included at the institute. Finally, it seems a number of Donderians experience the DI as more hierarchical than the DI portrays itself to be and feel varied personality profiles are not accommodated as expected. As such, these findings highlight a number of potential issues surrounding feelings of inclusion at the DI and point to what the source of these issues may be.

Feelings of Safety

In a similar vein, we asked ‘have you ever felt unsafe’ [at the DI]. Although a minority of respondents answered ‘yes’ to this question (overall 15.57%, Figure 7), reports of feeling unsafe seemed particularly prevalent among non-binary individuals, master’s students, non-heterosexual, and individuals with a disability. As such, although reports of having felt unsafe at the institute were relatively uncommon, a relatively high proportion of individuals belonging to minority groups in terms of sexual orientation, disability status and gender, as well as those studying for a master’s at the institute, reported having at some point felt unsafe at the institute.
Figure 7. Experience of safety at the Donders Institute.

These reports were followed up with open-ended questions, again analyses using qualitative thematic analysis. The main reports of feeling unsafe or uncomfortable at the Donders were related to gender-based issues. Predominantly females felt unsafe or uncomfortable for various reasons such as due to sexual harassment, or their gender roles as dictated by stereotypes. Sexual harassment is very important here, as it takes many forms such as not taking female Donderians seriously, physical and emotional harm, and employment related hurdles. One prominent comment was that a participant in the survey said they did not feel safe coming out as trans at the Donders. Other less frequently reported issues include body shaming, microaggressions (racially targeted), and fear of performance due to external pressures (PI and PhD).

The biggest outcome of feeling unsafe among almost all people who answered this question was that they either remained silent, or their voices went unheard. This is a very important outcome and its impact will be felt on a fundamental level for the individuals affected. Diverse voices are important for developing an inclusive research environment, and when these voices are stifled efforts to achieve inclusivity are undermined.

In summary, minority groups reported feeling unsafe more frequently. The consequences of this are seen in the open-ended questions, where people reported that their voices remained unheard. This has strong implications on amplifying diversity, and creating an inclusive space.

Feelings of belonging at the Donders Institute

Finally, in order to gauge Donderians’ feeling of belonging at the institute, we asked a series of questions about how they felt their personality contributed to their career development, whether they felt at home at the DI and whether they felt the DI to be an inclusive environment to work or study.
In terms of personality, on average the respondents gave a rating of 3.18 (SD = 0.94), suggesting perhaps that they feel their personality somewhat helps them to develop at the DI. Only minor differences were observed between most of the demographic groups, although it seems heterosexual individuals felt their personality helped them develop more than non-heterosexual individuals and similarly Donderians with childcare responsibilities also felt their personality helped them more than those without childcare responsibilities. Please see figure S8 for the full results.

In addition, survey respondents were presented with two open-ended questions regarding personality. We first asked, “Please elaborate on how you feel your personality helps/deters you from developing at the Donders?” Secondly, we asked them, “How could we take into account your personality better?” The two prevailing themes emerged from thematic analysis which centred around introversion vs. extroversion and workaholism and competition.

In general, about half of respondents were pleased with the way their personalities have led to their development at the Donders Institute, while the other half feel as if their introversion deters them from personal and professional growth. There were also several reports of social anxiety or speaking up freely, which were sometimes mentioned alongside a more introverted personality. Most poll responses indicated that the generally accepted and encouraged personality profiles are those that are open, confident, and extraverted. However, extraverted and assertive women still experience disdain from male counterparts and male PIs who perceive such women to be arrogant and harsh. Extraverted individuals seem to be happy with the way the institute is: collaborative, helpful, and open. On the other hand, introverts feel that the institute, overall, is not helpful. They often feel isolated and miss out on a range of opportunities—from networking and collaborating, to socializing and building new friendships. Nevertheless, some extraverts do feel that they often have to conform to the expectations of introverts, since the institute seems to mostly consist of introverts. The structure of the workplace, as well as of events, could be more integrative for both extroversion and introversion.

Specifically, how office spaces are organised could be reconsidered. Currently, many people share an office with others who are not in the same research group. There are obvious benefits to such an approach, however, it seems to also have resulted in greater isolation in some cases, especially for introverts as there is no motivation to speak with officemates. In a similar vein, a semi-quiet zone (unlike the canteen) could be created, where only soft talking is allowed so that introverted, hypersensitive, or socially anxious people can better attend to social interaction. Similarly, an area with comfortable seating, sunlight, and windows to allow moments of relaxation and decompression in the middle of work, may help more anxious individuals and serve to promote well-being in general at the institute. With regard to extraverts, more social events could perhaps be organised in order to accommodate their needs.

Aside from the perceived preference towards extroversion, respondents also felt that the institute prefers those who overwork themselves. The institute and supervisors discourage broad interests or hobbies unrelated to work. Likewise, this kind of culture focuses on individual accomplishment and
competition, rather than collaboration and support. People who are very assertive—many of whom are PIs—dominate discussions, whether in a small group or institute-wide meeting. This accepted behaviour demonstrates to everyone else that only those who interrupt and speak loudly are rewarded or respected. As such, more effort should be made to encourage greater involvement of trainees, students and postdocs in discussions, rather than just PIs or PIs talking first. For example, moderators could play a more active role in meetings and seminars: choose people to speak in the order in which they raised their hands, do not allow interruptions, and set a limit for the amount of time someone speaks during a discussion. More quiet events could also be included, in which people can have in-depth discussions within smaller groups. The importance of so-called team-science has been given more visibility in past years. Yet, the perception still remains that an individual’s accomplishments are valued more than one’s contribution to a collaborative project.

To enquire about the survey respondents’ experience of inclusion we asked two questions, the first directly asked about feeling included, while the other asked whether respondents felt like they were at home at the DI. Inclusion was clarified in this context by giving the following definition ‘a state of being valued, respected and supported’. The majority of respondents gave a rating of 3 or 4 on these questions, suggesting they feel the Donders is at least moderately inclusive (see figure S9). Small differences were observed between the different subgroups, although it seems the majority groups in terms of gender (i.e. male and females) and sexual orientation (heterosexual individuals) feel the Donders is more inclusive than the minority group in each case. In terms of feeling at home at the DI, the differences between the subgroups were more exacerbated (Figure 8). Namely, differences were observed between hetero- and non-heterosexual individuals, binary and non-binary individuals, as well as individuals with and without a disability or childcare responsibilities. Moreover, PIs reported feeling most at home at the Donders (perhaps reflecting the extended time some PIs may have spent at the DI).
In summary, although the Donders is perceived to be somewhat inclusive by many Donderians, this feeling seems less common among minority groups in terms of gender expression, sexual orientation, and ability as well as those with childcare responsibilities.

In a follow-up question, we asked respondents an open-ended question: “How could the Donders be more inclusive?” Three main themes became apparent: equality, diversity, and transparency; awareness; and supervision, collaboration, and institute culture. These themes will be discussed below.

**Equality, diversity, and transparency.**

Most poll respondents felt that the Donders Institute could be more inclusive with regard to how employees are hired, paid, and promoted. Responses within this theme mainly focused on the lack of diversity at levels of management and leadership and its downstream effect on institute practices. In particular, participants feel that the PIs and the board of directors are mostly white, cisgender, heterosexual men from similar backgrounds and are thus not representative of the institute body. As a result, students, postdocs, and other employees from minority groups do not always feel safe or at liberty to voice their own opinions. This absence of diversity also pervades the institute at lower levels, wherein most people who are recruited and hired are not from diverse backgrounds. Thus, the desired feeling of inclusion can only be achieved if the Donders Institute hires and promotes in a more diverse fashion—at all levels—with respect to race, gender, sexuality, and socioeconomic status. Additionally, in order to elevate employees to leadership roles in a fair and diverse manner, there must be transparency in how people are hired, evaluated, and promoted. Participants feel that the present ambiguity in criteria has often led to bias and nepotism.

A final subtopic in this theme highlights salary inequality, especially for PhD students, wherein those hired through an external grant have a substantially lower income than their counterparts hired through an internal grant. If the Donders Institute aspires to be more inclusive, then it must attract those from more diverse backgrounds through equal pay for equal work and, thus, equal treatment.

**Awareness.**

The second most common theme in responses pointed to cultivating diversity awareness in the Donders Institute. Participants recognise and appreciate that this poll is a preliminary step towards general awareness of issues related to inclusion. However, they feel that more steps, like diversity training—especially for PIs—and ally training, as well as the proactive, outspoken promotion of diversity are essential. Responses shared the sentiment that the explicit consideration of minority needs will translate into diverse hiring and equal treatment.
More minor, yet still apparent, themes clustered around the culture that flows through the Donders Institute. Respondents seem to be troubled by the limited breadth of accepted personality profiles, life goals, and perspectives. Supervisors seem to encourage introverted, anti-social, individualistic, competitive, and workaholic behaviour. There is a lack of emphasis on openness, team science, cooperation, and collaboration. Even when employees do interact with each other, they mainly do so within their own research group or with those who have the same nationality.

We also asked respondents about positive experiences of inclusion at the Donders. Many reported the inclusive and supportive atmosphere (~32%) or the career support (29%) at the DI as most positive. Specifically, personal supervision, friendly colleagues, and the collaborative environment were frequently mentioned as positive experiences. A smaller group of respondents especially appreciate the well-organised social events (9%) and value Donders for seeing diversity (9%) and inclusiveness (5%) as important topics.

### 3.4 Mentorship & support

To investigate further feelings of support, we asked the participants a series of questions about their experience with mentorship at the Donders and to what extent they feel supported by the colleagues and supervisors.

**Mentorship**

The word mentor was described to specifically refer to a more senior person with the task of providing support and career advice. This person is generally not the supervisor and often connected to an official mentoring program organised by the institute or by affiliated faculties. We found that the proportion of people with an official mentor/confidant varied enormously in each demographic category (ranging from 10 to 80%, see Figure S10). PhD students were most likely to have an official mentor (approximately 80%), compared to 10% of the PI’s. This high proportion of PhD students with an official mentor/confidant likely reflects the strong mentoring and confidant programs already in existence at DI. Minority groups (gender, sexual orientation, nationality) were more likely to indicate they had a mentor, possibly reflecting an increased need perceived by these groups, or a more proactive approach in seeking guidance. Interestingly, respondents without childcare responsibilities were more likely to report having a mentor than those with childcare responsibilities. However, these findings may be linked to the age of respondents as well as time available for respondents with childcare duties. Furthermore, the majority of respondents indicated that their mentor had indeed been arranged by the institute (see figure S11).

We also inquired whether Donderians without mentors would like to have one. Although the majority indicated that they would like to have a mentor, there was a high degree of variability in the survey participants responses (see Figure S12). Individuals with a disability, PhD students, women and non-binary individuals were the most likely to indicate they wanted a mentor. Further, minority groups in
terms of sexual orientation and nationality were more likely to report wanting to have a mentor than their majority group counterpart and so were single individuals and respondents without childcare responsibilities. Thus, these results perhaps suggest the DI should pay particular attention to the mentorship needs of minority groups at the Donders, as well as female Donderians and those of a more junior academic rank. Further, although respondents with childcare responsibilities were less likely to indicate that they wanted mentorships one should take into account that these individuals preferences may be influenced by lack of time, in which case it could be interesting to inquire whether they would appreciate alternative forms of mentoring that could accommodate their schedules.

Finally, to assess how Donderians value the mentorship they receive, we asked if they felt their mentorships supported their professional development (1 to 5 Likert scale). On average, Donderians judged the mentorship in a neutral fashion (mean = 2.84, SD = 1.32): not particularly supportive or unsupportive of their professional development (Figure 9). Among the different seniority levels, PhD students seem to feel the least that the mentorship they receive supports their development. This result is striking as the majority of PhD students have an official mentor. This suggests that some improvement could be made to the way mentorship for PhD students at the DI is arranged. Interestingly, the minority groups (gender, race, sexual orientation, nationality, disability status) as well as those not in a relationship rated the mentorship they received more highly than those belonging to the majority group and those in a relationship. As minority groups are the ones more likely to have an official mentor but are more likely to have a mentor that was not arranged for them by the institute, this perhaps suggests the experience of mentorship is influenced by how much the mentorship is sought by an individual and/or how it is arranged.
Figure 9. Experience of mentorship

In summary, PhD candidates reported the highest level of mentorship, but were also the least satisfied with the quality of the mentorship they received. Minority groups also reported higher usage of mentorship arranged by the DI. This may indicate a higher need for mentorship in this group. This is supported by the results showing that minority groups were also more likely to seek out mentorship when they did not have an assigned mentor. Interestingly, minority groups were also more satisfied with their mentors, indicating that the assigned mentorship program may not be as effective as hoped, or that those who seek out mentors may experience higher benefit from it. Additionally, one aspect worth considering is the time and ability to participate in mentoring, as reflected in the PI group, and those with childcare responsibilities: these groups may not be engaged in such activities due to lack of time.

Support

In addition to mentorship, we also asked the survey participants about how supported they felt in their environment. Specifically, if they felt supported by their supervisor(s), colleagues and the institute.

In terms of support from supervisors, the majority of Donderians reported feeling supported by their supervisors (mean = 4.14, SD = 0.89). Although master’s students and those with disabilities reported a slightly lower rating (see Figure S13, PIs were excluded from this analysis). The majority of respondents felt supported by their colleagues (mean = 4.11, SD = 0.75, see Figure S14). The biggest difference was observed for gender, where non-binary individuals seemed to feel less supported by their colleagues.
than men and women, and for sexual orientation, where non-heterosexual individuals feel less supported than their heterosexual peers. Finally, perceived support from the institute seemed somewhat lower across all groups (mean = 3.53, SD = 0.85, see Figure 10) compared to colleague and supervisor support. Particularly, minority groups in terms of gender and sexual orientation seemed to feel the least supported.

![Figure 10. Feelings of support by the Donders Institute](image)

In summary, most Donderians felt they received an adequate amount of support from colleagues and supervisors, with some minority groups (non-heterosexual, and non-binary individuals) reporting a little less support. Overall, most Donderians felt they received less support at the institutional level, with the same trend in the same minority groups seen here.

Respondents were also asked open-ended questions about what support they need. The top two prevailing themes on what kind of support Donderians need emphasized a lack of opportunity for development—personal and professional. Donderians feel that all of their time is expected to be completely research-focused and are often discouraged to take courses or avail themselves of growth opportunities. First, there seems to be a common need for more time (e.g. through less teaching requirements), as well as greater encouragement and visible occasions for taking courses, or joining other learning and career development activities (e.g. internships or peer coaching). Second, participants perceive a lack of support in the form of no change in the amount of responsibilities or obligations once they have acquired other research-related activities (e.g. acquiring editorship, or
managing a large grant). Third, pressure to solely focus on one’s own research project has led to a need for greater support in development outside of academia (e.g. better advice on alternative career paths, how to formulate a curriculum vitae, and family planning, especially for women).

The lack of encouragement for professional and personal development seems to stem from unsatisfactory supervision. Importantly, some respondents feel that their supervisors do not take their personal needs into account and do not provide enough guidance. This is a critical aspect as this influences the likelihood that an individual will make use of available career development opportunities and personal experience of support and well-being. Thus, it is essential PIs are well-informed of professional/personal development opportunities available to members of their group and that the importance of availing oneself of these opportunities clearly communicated. Further, avenues for additional supervision and/or mentorship could be made available so that those who need more support in specific domains (e.g. statistics, neuroimaging, transitioning from-masters-to-PhD-to-post-doc, counselling,) can receive individual assistance.
3.5 Summary: COVID19 effects

The vast majority of respondents indicated that the Covid pandemic has influenced their work. Although some reported a positive effect on their work, the vast majority reported exclusively negative effects (see Figure 11).

![Figure 11. Effects of COVID19 pandemic](image)

The most frequent negative consequence of the pandemic was that research got put on hold. Almost 70% of PhD students and PIs, and approximately 50% of Master students and postdocs reported this problem (see Figure S15). Many people (~40%) also missed networking opportunities, although this was a more frequent problem for researchers at a postdoc level or higher (see Figure S16). Moreover, many respondents with a disability reported missing out on networking opportunities due to the pandemic and so did individuals not in a relationship and those with childcare responsibilities.
Approximately one third of Donderians reported that the pandemic affected them negatively because they had less time for work, this was particularly the case for respondents with childcare responsibilities (26.64%, see Figure S17). Moreover, Donderians of more senior academic ranks also reported having less time for work due to the pandemic and so did respondents in a relationship (perhaps as these respondents are also more likely to have childcare responsibilities). In terms of time for research work, PIs were the most likely to report having less time for this aspect of their work (~50%, see Figure S18) - perhaps this relates to the increased management load that followed the pandemic. Moreover, ~30% of respondents with childcare responsibilities also reported having had less time for research - perhaps due to them generally having less time for work as a result of having to juggle childcare and workload more intensively during the pandemic. Other groups were less likely to report having experienced this negative side effect of the pandemic. Other possible negative effects of the pandemic such as publication delays, missing out on grant opportunities and experiencing extensive illness were less commonly reported.

In response to the question whether the COVID19 pandemic had increased work-related stress, the respondents on average gave a response that suggested that they slightly agreed with this question (mean = 3.21, SD = 1.15), although a broad spectrum of responses was observed (Figure 12). Interestingly, the minority groups in terms of race, nationality and ability were more likely to report feeling the pandemic had increased work-related stress. Smaller differences were observed between the other groups.
In summary, it seems that many individual differences exist in how the pandemic has influenced work at the Donders Institute. Respondents with childcare responsibilities seemed to feel they had less time for work and so did more senior academic staff. However, it also seems work-related stress has increased more specifically for minorities in terms of nationality and race. Finally, although missing grant opportunities and delayed publications due to the pandemic were rare, for some critical moments in one’s career these can have important negative consequences for these individuals. As such, the varied consequences of the pandemic on researchers, students and staff of different levels should be investigated further in order to ensure Donderians development is not unfairly disadvantaged by the pandemic.

Figure 12. Has the COVID19 pandemic increased work-related stress?
3.6 Suggestions for improvement

In the last section of the survey we enquired about what aspects respondents felt could be changed such that their experience of working at the Donders would improve. We gave a list of 6 possible points of improvement and asked them to indicate on a 5-point Likert scale the extent to which they felt each point would make a difference. The six points of improvement we enquired about were: 1) training in awareness, 2) having an official mentoring programme, 3) support with administrative duties, 4) transparent promotion criteria, 5) training for mentors/confidants, and 6) enhancing the role of confidants. For all six possible points of improvement, the respondents generally agreed with (overall mean = 3.80; training in awareness: mean = 3.59, SD = 1.04; official mentoring programme: mean = 3.74, SD = 0.94; admin support: mean = 3.77, SD = 0.90; transparent promotion: mean = 4.01, SD = 0.84; training for mentors/confidants: mean = 3.86, SD = 0.82; enhancing the role of confidants: mean = 3.67, SD = 0.88). Although it seemed respondents belonging to minority groups in terms of race, sexual orientation, nationality and ability agreed more with the suggested improvements. Below is an example of the results we obtained for one of these questions, the results for the other questions can be found in Figures S19-24).

Figure 13. Can awareness training improve your experience of working/studying at the Donders Institute?
On the whole the respondents felt the six suggested improvements would improve their experience of working at the DI. As agreement ratings were particularly high for minority groups, which also represent the group more likely to experience bias and discrimination, perhaps particular attention should be paid to implementing these changes.
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