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ABSTRACT

Basketball is probably the most popular indoor sport for girls and young women. It holds prominent position in physical education athletic programs in the schools, youth organizations, recreational departments, and industrial organizations. Basketball was first introduced in 1891 by Dr. James A. Naismith, who at that time was physical education director at the Y.M.C.A. College in Springfield, Massachusetts. The first official game was not played until 1892. Women is the mother of the race and is the liaison between generations, Indian culture attaches much importance to this section of the society, therefore, India has been symbolized as MOTHER INDIA, keeping in view the exemplary qualities of women, viz, patience, endurance, love, affection, sympathy and generosity’. Women has us much right to shape her own destiny has man has to shape his… it is up to man to see that they enable them to realized their full status and play their part as equal of men. Socio-Economic status refers to social and economic standing of a person in his society. Socio-economic condition means it include with social and economic achievements of an individual or group in society. Family is considered as a cultivating, nurturing and fostering process, dealing with the overall development of the individual. The selected 30 women basketball players from four different universities from the state of Kerala who participated in University and All India University level players. The selected players are from University of Calicut, Kannur University and Mahatma Gandhi University. Each of 10 players was selected for the above mentioned Universities. The ages of the subjects ranges between 18- 28 years. The questionnaire method was used to measure the Socio-Economic Status and Family Encouragement for Sports Achievement. In order to find out the difference among these groups, the ANOVA was computed and tested for significance at 0.05 level of confidence. In order, to achieve this, family has to be sufficiently established in terms of moral, financial, and social aspects coupled with parent’s background in sport. The purpose of the study was to compare the socio-economic status and Family Influence of sports performance among university Women basketball players.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Sports and games are integral part of the human life. Along with entertainment it is also help to shape the personalities of the sports person having provided with physical fitness and mental soundness. Sports are an institutionalized competitive activity, which has its own traditions and values normal reflects the pattern in society at large. A sport is accepted as a part of society and culture throughout the word. A sport is a part of basic human behavior and is among the effective means of socialization of means. Sports and games are pervasive forces that have permeated in our culture. They are basic institutions in the social fabric are cultural universal for all people regardless of race, creed, geography or politics. The sport is the interest in the purpose of education, entertainment of self-expression depending on the individual goal of the people participating. Sport gives special identification to persons particularly those who participated in interuniversity, state, national or international competition. To be successful in sports field one should dedicate him fully to the field of sports. A sports person faces many problems on his way to achievement, problem like social, economical etc. they will be under confusion to decide either to concentrate more on sports or on the development and maintenance of physical fitness. It offers an opportunity for facilitating the normal growth of the child, and it helps to develop and to prevent the reversal of such bio-physiological factors of performance as strength, endurance, flexibility, relaxation and skill. Physical activity in the form of exercise, sports, game and rhythms provides a setting whereby recreational activities may be learned and enjoyed. Some of the satisfactions people seek through participation in physical motivates are the joy of creation, fellowship; a sense of achievement, emotional experience the enjoyment of beauty and relaxation.

2. Background of the study

In this chapter the investigator has presented the allied literature to the subject, which gives meaning and scope to the study. The purpose of the study was to find out the socio-economic Status and Family encouragement of selected university Women Basketball players. Therefore the researcher, after studying available literature, 

Sengupta Pand Sahoo S(2014)Health-related morphological characteristics and physiological fitness in connection with nutritional, socio-economic status, occupational workload of tea garden workers. Reports on the cardio respiratory fitness and body
composition of male workers engaged in processing of tea leaves in factories within the tea-estates of West Bengal, under the influence of physiological workload, are quite scanty. This cross-sectional study was conducted to evaluate morphometric characteristics based on physiological status and physical fitness of tea factory laborers who are continuously exposed to tea dust in their work environment for more than two years. Subjects were divided into control and tea garden workers groups. Height and weight were measured and the body mass index (BMI) was computed. Physiological parameters such as resting heart rate, blood pressure, fitness variables like physical fitness index (PFI), energy expenditure (EE), handgrip strength and anthropometric parameters like mid-upper arm (MUAC), thigh circumference (TC), head circumference (HC) and waist-to-hip ratio (WHR) were measured. Body surface area (BSA), BMI, body fat percentage and fitness variables (PFI, EE) showed significant difference (p < 0.05) between the two groups. Anthropometric measures (MUAC, TC, HC, WHR) reflected poor status among laborers. The present study shows that the majority of workers had ectomorph stature, good physical fitness, but had poor nutritional status (BMI and WHR).

Howard EN et.al (2013) The impact of race and higher socioeconomic status on cardiorespiratory fitness. Previous studies suggest that African Americans (AA) have lower levels of cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF) than their Caucasian (C) counterparts. However, the association between CRF and race/ethnicity in the context of higher socioeconomic status (SES) has not been explored. We evaluated 589 AA (309 men and 203 women) and 33,015 C (19,399 men and 8753 women) enrolled in the Cooper Center Longitudinal Study. Education years and access to a preventive health care examination were used as a proxy for higher SES. Data were collected from a questionnaire, maximal treadmill exercise stress test, and other clinical measures. The outcome variable was CRF, which was stratified into low fit (quintile 1 of CRF) and fit (quintiles 2-5). Multivariable regression was used to compare adjusted mean CRF between groups. P values were adjusted for unbalanced sample size and unequal variance between groups. The mean education years were similar for AA and C men at 16 yr; however, AA women had more years of education than C (15.8 vs 15.2 yr, P = 0.0062). AA men and women had a significantly higher prevalence of being unfit compared with their C counterparts (men 26.7% vs 12.6%, P < 0.0001; women 21.3% vs 8.4%, P < 0.0001). The adjusted mean estimated maximal METs were 10.9 vs 11.7 and 8.8 vs 9.8 for AA and C men and women, respectively. Fully adjusted odds ratios revealed that AA men had more than twice the risk of being unfit compared with C men. A trend persisted for AA
women to have a lower MET value than their counterparts. Despite comparable higher SES, lower CRF existed among AA men versus C men. These results suggest that CRF may not be mediated strictly by environmental factors related to SES.

3. Methodology

In this chapter the methodology adopted for the study namely selection of subject, selection of variables, reliability of data, criterion measures, orientation of the subject, collection data, administration of questionnaire and statistical technique were presented.

3.1. Selection of subjects

Thirty (N=30) women basketball players selected from Kannur university, University of Calicut, Mahatma Gandhi University. They were equally divided equally into (N=10) each university. The age group of the selected subjects was between 18 to 27 years.

Demography of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT</th>
<th>KANNUR UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>M G UNIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASKETBALL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Selection of variables

For the purpose of the study the following independent variables and the tools selected for study. Socio-Economic Status Scale (S E S S), Family background and Encouragement scale.

III. Reliability of Data

Reliability of data was censured by using standard questionnaire.

3.3 Criterion measures

3.3.1 Independent variables

**Socio-Economic Status Scale (S E S S)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>105 or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>Between 90 and 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Between 65 and 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>Between 50 and 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>49 or below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family background and Encouragement scale.**

Is your family solely responsible for your sports participation?

Yes/No

If yes, please tick the manner in which they are responsible:-
### 3.3.2. Orientation of the Subject

Before collecting the data the investigator had briefly explained to the subject the purpose of study and their role in the study.

### 3.3.3 Collection of Data

The data pertaining to selected University Women basketball players were collected by using appropriate standard questionnaire procedure.

### 3.4 Test administration

#### 3.4.1 Administration of questionnaire.

The data was collected by administering the questionnaire by the investigator himself among the University Women basketball players from each University. It is a self-administering scale. It gives better results with group testing. In group situation the tester also can get quite appropriate results only after establishing good reports with the testers. The tester should discuss here the desired purpose and should explain the description and instruction of the test and instruction should be read loudly by the tester, while subjects read them silently along with them. The test can be started only after clear understanding has been testers to record the responses in this scale.

**A) Socio-Economic Status Scale Questionnaire:**

The standard Manual for Socio-Economic Status Scale constructed by Dr. Meenakshi the Head and Dean Faculty of Education Punjabi University Patiala was used to measure the Socio-Economic Status of the subjects. The Manual is sub divided into seven parts and each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Sports background in the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Active involvement of the members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Moral support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
part has the following number of questionnaires, and the total scores of each seven parts gives the Socio-Economic Status of the Subject.

i. Part I (Education)
This part of the manual consists of ten questions and the subject must tick (√) his appropriate column.

Scoring for Part I
Count the ticks (✓) against each serial number and record the total in the last column. The range of the scores will be from 1 to 50.

ii. Part II (Profession)
The Part II consists of ten questions and the subject must tick (√) the appropriate column.

Scoring for Part II
Count the ticks (✓) against each serial number and record the total in the last column. The range of the scores will be from 1 to 50.

iii. Part III (Monthly Income)
The Part III consists of ten questions and the subject must tick (√) the appropriate column.

Scoring for Part III
Award a score of 10 for the tick (√) against first question, a score of 9 against second question and so on. The maximum score will be 10 and the minimum score will be 1.

iv. Part IV (Total Wealth in Cash or Debts)
This section consists of 10 questions and the subject must tick (√) the most appropriate one, which chooses him accordingly.

Scoring for the Part IV
There are three columns in this section. Mark for each tick (√) is given below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI. No</th>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum score of this section will be 30 and the minimum will be 0.
v. Part V (Property)
This section of questions consists of 5 questions and the subject should select his appropriate answer with a tick (√).

Scoring for the Part V
Here the questions are on point scale
1. (a) 4 marks (b) 3 marks (c) 2 marks (d) 1 mark (e) zero
2. (a) 5 marks (b) 3 marks (c) 1 mark
3. (a) 6 marks (b) 5 marks (c) 4 marks (d) 3 marks (e) 2 marks (f) 1 mark
4. (a) 2 marks (b) 1 mark
5. (a) 5 marks (b) 4 marks (c) 3 marks (d) 2 marks (e) 1 mark (f) zero
Maximum score will be 22 and the minimum will be 0.

vi. Part VI (Your Surrounding Locality)
This section consists of 21 questions here the subject selects his appropriate answer with a tick (√).

Scoring for the Part VI
This is a point scale.
1. (a) 5 marks (b) 3 marks (c) 1 mark
2. (a) 6 marks (b) 5 marks (c) 4 marks (d) 3 marks (e) 2 marks (f) 1 mark
3. For each employee i.e. servant / cook / Mali etc. give one mark.
Q. 4 to Q.21: In this section there are 18 items.
For (a) give a score of 3,
(b) a score of 2,
(c) a score of one and for
(d) a score of zero.
In this part maximum score will be 54 and minimum will be 0.

vi. Part VII (Social Status)
This section consists of 5 questions.

Scoring for the Part VII
1. (a) 5 marks (b) 4 marks (c) 3 marks (d) 2 marks (e) 1 mark
2. (a) 5 marks (b) 4 marks (c) 3 marks (d) 2 marks (e) 1 mark
3. (a) 5 marks (b) 4 marks (c) 3 marks (d) 2 marks (e) 1 mark
4. (a) 5 marks (b) 4 marks (c) 3 marks (d) 2 marks (e) 1 mark
5. (a) 5 marks (b) 4 marks (c) 3 marks (d) 2 marks (e) 1 mark
The maximum score will be 25 and the minimum will be 05. The total score was taken as the Socio-Economic Status Score for each subject. The SES table is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>105 or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>Between 90 and 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Between 65 and 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>Between 50 and 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>49 or below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B) Family encouragement for sports achievement**

Is your family solely responsible for your sports participation? **Yes/No**

If yes, please tick the manner in which they are responsible:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Sports background in the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Active involvement of the members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Moral support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.5 Statistical Procedure**

To compare among the University Women Basketball players Socio Economic Status and Family Encouragement for Achievement Scale the analysis of variance was employed. ‘F’ ratio was used to analyze Socio Economic factors and Family Encouragement for Achievement factors in Kannur, Calicut and MG University Women Basketball players.

**4. Analysis of the data and results of the study**

This chapter describes statistically treated data results findings and discussion. The statistical analysis of data collected from 30 university level Women basketball players from Kerala has been presented here. The aim of the study was to compare the Socio-
Economic factors of University level Women basketball Players in Kerala. In order to find out the difference among these groups, the ANOVA was computed and tested for significance at 0.05 level of confidence.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

Table I: Descriptive scores on Socio-economic factors of University Women Basketball players

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kannur University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.4000</td>
<td>11.70185</td>
<td>3.70045</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>111.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calicut University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87.0000</td>
<td>9.78661</td>
<td>3.09480</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.G University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94.6000</td>
<td>16.14655</td>
<td>5.10599</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.6667</td>
<td>12.77210</td>
<td>2.33186</td>
<td>85.8975</td>
<td>95.4358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed from table 1 that the mean value of socio-economic factors for Kannur University players is 90.40, for Calicut University players, it is 87.00 and Mahatma Gandhi University players, it is 94.60. The standard deviation is 11.70185, 9.78661 and 16.14655 respectively for Kannur, Calicut and Mahatma Gandhi University players.

Table II: Analysis of variance on socio-economic factors of University Women Basketball players

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>289.867</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>144.933</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4440.800</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>164.474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4730.667</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 reveals that the obtained F value of 0.88 is not significant since it is lesser than the required value of 2.93, thus showing no significant difference among the groups on the socio-economic factor.
Figure I Comparison of socio-economic status among University Women Basketball players

![Figure I Comparison of socio-economic status among University Women Basketball players](image)

**FAMILY INFLUENCE ON SPORTS PERFORMANCE**

**Table III Descriptive scores on Family Influence on Women Basketball Players**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kannur University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.0000</td>
<td>3.59011</td>
<td>1.13529</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.G. University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.2000</td>
<td>2.89828</td>
<td>.91652</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calicut University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3000</td>
<td>3.30151</td>
<td>1.04403</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.5000</td>
<td>3.29838</td>
<td>.60220</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed from table 3 that the mean value of Family Influence of Kannur University players is 21, for Mahatma Gandhi University players, it is 19.2 and Calicut University players, it is 21.3. The standard deviation is 3.59011, 2.89828 and 3.30151 respectively for Kannur, Mahatma Gandhi and Calicut University player.
Table IV Analysis of variance on family influence on University Women Basketball players

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>25.800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.900</td>
<td>1.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>289.700</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315.500</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 reveals that the obtained F value of 1.202 is not significant since it is lesser than the required value of 2.93, thus showing no significant difference among the groups on the family influence.

Figure II Comparison of Family Influence on University Women Basketball players

4.1 Discussions on finding

The investigator selected 30 women different University Women basketball players from three different universities from the state of Kerala who participated in All India Inter University level players. The selected university players are from University of Calicut, Kannur University and Mahatma Gandhi University. Each of 10 players was selected for the above mentioned Universities. The ages of the subjects ranges between 18-28 years. The questionnaire method was used to measure the Socio-Economic Status and Family Encouragement for Sports Achievement. The purpose of the study was to compare the socio-economic status and Family Influence of sports performance among university Women basketball players.
It is observed from table 1 Descriptive scores on Socio-economic factors of University Basketball players. The mean value of socio-economic factors for Kannur University players is 90.40, for Calicut University players, it is 87.00 and Mahatma Gandhi University players, it is 94.60. The standard deviation is 11.70185, 9.78661 and 16.14655 respectively for Kannur, Calicut and Mahatma Gandhi University players.

Table 2 reveals that Analysis of variance on socio-economic factors of University Basketball players. The obtained F value of 0.88 is not significant since it is lesser than the required value of 2.93, thus showing no significant difference among the groups on the socio-economic factor.

It is observed from table 3 Descriptive scores on Family Influence on Basketball Players. The mean value of Family Influence of Kannur University players is 21, for Mahatma Gandhi University players, it is 19.2 and Calicut University players, it is 21.3. The standard deviation is 3.59011, 2.89828 and 3.30151 respectively for Kannur, Mahatma Gandhi and Calicut University player.

Table 4 reveals that Analysis of variance on family influence on University Basketball players. The obtained F value of 1.202 is not significant since it is lesser than the required value of 2.93, thus showing no significant difference among the groups on the family influence.

### 4.2 Discussion on Hypothesis

The study found that there was no significant difference in the Socio-economic status and there is a significant difference in Family Influence of sports performance among University players in the state of Kerala. Based on the findings of the study the hypothesis stated earlier has been not accepted in the case of socio economic status and family influence.

### 5. Summary conclusion and recommendation

#### 5.1 Summary

The purpose of the study was to find out the Socio Economic Status and Family Influence of Sports Performance among the University Women Basketball players from University of Calicut, Kannur University and Mahatma Gandhi University.

Socio Economic Status includes the twin concept of social class and economic background of sports person. Socio Economic Status of the level indicates both the social and economic condition of the person.
The sample of the present study consists of 30 women University Basketball players from University of Calicut, Kannur University and Mahatma Gandhi University.

5.2 Conclusion

1. The study results show that there is no significant difference in the category of Socio Economic Status of the subjects belonging to different groups.
2. The study results show that there is no significant difference in the category of family influence of the subjects belonging to different groups.

5.3 Recommendations

1. On the basis of the present study findings the following recommendations are made for further studies.
2. Similar studies may be conducted taking in to consideration players of different levels and different areas of the country.
3. Studies on Socio-economic status may be conducted categorizing players on the basis of geographical localities and urban areas etc. to get a clear picture of influence of Socio-economic status oil sports aspirants.
4. Studies relating Socio-economic status with other social and demographical variables are required to understand the social and economical background of the players with a perspective of their involvement.
5. It is recommended to conduct studies comparing on cross cultural basics and then sport participation.
6. It is recommended to study similar kinds of comparison among male and females.
7. It is recommended to conduct similar studies with Indian teams and other team.
8. It is recommended to conduct similar studies with other games.
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