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ABSTRACT
This report concerns a survey of the signed languages in Thailand in 2006. Wordlists and stories were collected in three major cities and two villages. Dr. James Woodward and others had previously identified five different varieties of signing in the country: namely, Old Bangkok Sign Language, Modern Bangkok Sign Language, Old Chiang Mai Sign Language, Modern Chiang Mai Sign Language, and Ban Khor Sign Language.

This survey covered the cities of Bangkok, Chiang Mai, and Hat Yai, plus the villages of Ban Khor and Pla Pak. These were places that were reported to be different from one another by the deaf and also some of the hearing who had contact with the deaf. Several wordlists and stories were collected from each of the places visited. The wordlists were transcribed by hand using the SignWriting orthography. These lists were then compared city by city, as well as comparing the city lists with the village lists.

The results of the survey suggest that there are only three distinct signed languages identified in the country: Thai Sign Language, Old Bangkok Sign Language, and Ban Khor Sign Language. There are probably still some signers of Old Chiang Mai Sign Language, but none of them were available to be videoed.

INTRODUCTION
The Ethnologue contains a comprehensive listing of the world’s languages as far as they are known, including more than one hundred signed languages. At the time this survey began, the 15th edition Ethnologue (Gordon 2005) listed only one sign language that was used throughout Thailand, with one dialect called Chiang Mai Sign Language. According to some of the people working with the deaf,1 the signed language used in Chiang Mai is very different from that in Bangkok, and that in Hat Yai is also different.

Other researchers have studied a village sign language in Ban Khor Village, and found that it was distinct from Thai Sign Language (ThSL). It is listed as a separate language in the Ethnologue.

1. THE DEAF
The deaf in any people group comprise from one to three individuals in every one-thousand births (Parkhurst 1997). Most deaf children (more than 90%) are born into families where both parents are hearing (Mitchell 2005). They have no way to learn a language, either spoken or signed. They do not learn to speak because they cannot hear, and they do not learn to sign because there is no one to teach them. Most deaf, worldwide, grow up without any language. The family will often develop a few rudimentary signs, called “home signs,” but a sign language does not occur in isolation.

Deaf children usually learn a signed language in school. The few deaf children who are born into deaf families will usually learn the sign language of their parents in the normal way that hearing children learn from their parents. If there are a group of deaf children in a school where no sign language is taught, the children will develop a sign language in a few years. For example, note that this is how Penang sign language

---

1 Some years ago, the convention was started of using upper-case deaf to refer to those who are hearing impaired, use sign language and consider themselves to be part of a community of deaf people. Lower-case deaf refers to the hearing impaired, often older people, who are more comfortable in the hearing world (Woodward 1982).
developed in Malaysia in the 1950s to 1970s (Hurlbut 2000), and this is also how Nicaraguan sign language has been developing in Nicaragua (Morgan and Kegl 2006).

Deaf children who have been to school do not necessarily learn to read the language they are taught in school. Most, if not all, written languages are based to some extent on the sound system of that language. Since the deaf child cannot hear the sounds of the written language, he has no way to decipher how it should be spoken or what the symbols on the page mean. He must memorize every word individually, as if he were memorizing a series of telephone numbers. It is small wonder then that an average deaf high school graduate in a developed country usually has a reading level of about grade 4 (primary 4). In many other countries, many deaf children who have completed school very soon lapse into illiteracy again.

1.1 THE DEAF OF THAILAND

There are about 65,000 deaf people in Thailand, although some estimates go as high as 300,000, which probably includes all late-deafened individuals, as well as those born deaf and other pre-lingual deaf.2

According to some Thai deaf and some written materials I have read, ThSL is related to American Sign Language (ASL). This relatedness is due to language contact and the creolization that has occurred between ASL and two indigenous signed languages, Old Bangkok Sign Language and Old Chiang Mai Sign Language. ASL was introduced into the deaf schools in the 1950s by American-trained Thai educators. The two older signed languages are becoming moribund now as the signers pass away. These older varieties are related to the signed languages of Vietnam (Woodward 1996) and possibly Laos.

In 1945, the United Nations declared that all disabled people were entitled to education, but the news did not reach Thailand until 1947. There were deaf people among the King’s relatives, so, at that time, a woman was sent to Gallaudet College to study sign language. On her return to Bangkok in 1951, she started to teach a class of twelve deaf children. The first school for the deaf was founded in 1951 and has now become Sethsation School for the Deaf. Another school for the deaf was built in Dusit in 1952. The principal of the school later founded the Association for the Deaf Alumni on July 11, 1969. It started with ninety-three members and was later renamed the Thailand Association for the Deaf. By 1983, the association was recognized by the government under its current name, the National Association of the Deaf in Thailand (NADT). It has been funded from overseas for various projects, and the government will grant money for a special project upon submission of a proposal. The accomplishments of the NADT include introducing signed news on the TV in 1989, licenses for deaf motorcyclists and vehicle drivers in 1998, allowing deaf students to go to mainstream schools in 1999, and hiring interpreters paid by the government in 2002. The NADT hopes to push for more deaf teachers to be trained to teach in the deaf schools, and also hopes to be able to provide the nation with professional interpreters.

At Mahidol University, there is a college, Ratchasuda College, for special education students, most of whom are deaf. The government grants scholarships to deaf students who must be recommended by both the school for the deaf they are attending and also by the college. Among other courses, deaf teachers are trained at Ratchasuda College.

---

2 Pre-lingual deaf means those who are born deaf, or who become deaf before they learn to speak well.
There are two deaf staff members at the college who have obtained their M.A. degrees from Australia.

Suan Dusit College is the other tertiary-level college which accepts deaf students.

There are other deaf associations or deaf clubs in the major cities, such as Bangkok, Chiang Mai, Hat Yai, Yala, and Taburi. Many of the deaf were members of these clubs before, but they are not so keen now and membership is dropping off. Some clubs organize workshops and lectures to teach life skills, as well as such things as AIDS prevention, drama, etc.

There are ten to twelve schools for the deaf in Thailand, and some special education schools (schools for the handicapped) have classes which include the deaf. Signing is permitted in all of the schools. Some hard-of-hearing children in deaf schools are sent to hearing schools for some of their classes. Some of these children do not have an interpreter when they take art classes, so they have to copy from their classmates.

One of the regular schools in Bangkok takes in some of the hard-of-hearing children. All of the schools for the deaf have dormitories for children from more distant places, but, in Bangkok, there is only one dormitory, which is for girls. There are no kindergartens, but the classes go from class 1 up to class 12. The children are automatically promoted to the next class at the end of the school year.

There is a certain amount of social stigma with being deaf, but it does not seem to be as strong as in some other countries. Some parents do not like their children to sign, and some deaf have been taught that it is not acceptable to sign in public.

Many deaf are unemployed, but some are self-employed as vendors, or work as beauticians, tailors, artists, or with computers, etc. For their leisure activities, some deaf take up evening classes or exercise classes. For the most part, the deaf like to meet and chat in buffet restaurants.

The government provides discounted fares on the buses for the disabled, including the deaf, and Thai Airways also gives discount fares to them.

A dictionary of ThSL was published in 1990 (Suwanarat). In the editor’s preface, the Editor-in-Chief, Owen P. Wrigley, commenting on the use of Swedish Sign Language, states: “The essential policy, however, was to recognize the primacy of the native sign language as the first and primary vehicle for communication and instruction. Speech and written skills are taught as second language skills. The clearly successful results of international research are sufficient for a Thai policy to be adopted, recognizing ThSL as the first and primary language of instruction for all deaf Thais, using Thai sign as the medium of improved instruction both for written Thai and all other academic subjects in the full curriculum.” (Emphasis is the Editor’s.)

ThSL was acknowledged as "the national language of deaf people in Thailand" in August 1999, in a resolution signed by the Minister of Education on behalf of the Royal Thai Government.

2. THE PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY

The purpose of the survey is to determine which variety, or varieties, of sign language used in Thailand would be the most useful in which to produce literature that communicates well for all the Thai deaf.
Since ThSL has been influenced by ASL, another objective is to determine how closely ThSL and ASL are related. Are they two dialects of the same language, or are they related but separate languages?

3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This paper addresses the following questions:

1. How many varieties of ThSL are there in Thailand? Is there one variety of ThSL that is understood by all the deaf?

2. In comparing the ThSL wordlists with the ASL list, are they clearly the same or clearly different? Will further research be needed?

3. What are the attitudes of the signers to their own language and to other language varieties?

4. APPROACH

In the survey, the principal tools I used were to ask questions and video record people showing me the sign they use for a given word in a standard wordlist. The list of words chosen was basically the same list as that which was developed by the participants in the sign language courses at the University of North Dakota in 2002 and is the same list that I have used in other Asian countries.

The lists of words elicited from different people in different places were compared using a method described below.

It is difficult to determine what the percentages of similarities mean when comparing the wordlists, but I think it is safe to conclude that, for the comparison method I am using, if the percentage of similarities between the wordlists from two cities is greater than 85%, this indicates that these lists represent two varieties of the same sign language. However, if the results show percentages below 60%, we are probably dealing with different languages and the signers would not really understand each other. The same is true in comparing ASL and ThSL.

If the results of the wordlist comparisons fall between 60% and 85%, further research may be needed to determine the need for language development in the signing community.

The attitudes of the signing community are sometimes an important factor in determining the need for language development, and may override the conclusions based merely on wordlist percentages.

5. THE SURVEY TRIP

In 2006, I went to Thailand to carry out a survey of the signed languages used by the deaf of Thailand. A deaf person, Yvette Aarons, who is English speaking and knows ThSL, helped explain the situation of the deaf in Thailand, and put me in contact with a Thai deaf lady who helped fill in a language profile about the deaf of Thailand, their educational opportunities, etc. We wanted to find out the current sign language situation among the deaf in Thailand as compared to the time when James Woodward’s (1996) work was carried out and his findings published 10 years previous to our research. Having read some of his work, including an article referring to his comparisons of the various Thai and Vietnamese signed languages, it seemed that the main centres of the signed languages in Thailand were Bangkok and Chiang Mai. He also mentioned Ban Khor Sign Language (BKSL) as being distinct from the
other signed languages. Colleagues in Thailand also told me that the variety of ThSL in the south was distinct from that used in Bangkok.

Woodward had collected data from four signing communities in Thailand:
(1) Modern ThSL (used by all signers under age 40 and some signers above 40 in urban areas in Thailand at that time), (2) Original Chiang Mai Sign Language (Metro Chiang Mai, signers above 45), (3) Original BKSL (Metro Bangkok, signers above 45), and (4) BKSL (used in certain rice-farming villages in the Ban Khor area, all ages.)

In each place visited, we were able to get two-to-three wordlists from the deaf who were born in that area and attended school there. There is enough similarity between ThSL and ASL, that I know, that I was able to communicate somewhat with the deaf.

BAN KHOR
We started our research by visiting Ratchasuda College, where we met the two deaf men who are teaching there. James Woodward had written a paper about BKSL which had been published by the college. Unfortunately, no copy was available, and I have not yet been able to obtain a copy of his research on the deaf of Ban Khor.

We planned a trip to Ban Khor village for data collection, including both the deaf men, as they also wanted to do research on that sign language. Ban Khor is a village in Nakorn Phanom Province in the extreme north-east of Thailand. In the provincial capital, we encountered a young hearing man who was selling items in the night market. He was proficient in ThSL and had a deaf assistant, a college student, who was from Pla Pak (meaning “Red Fish”). We learned that Pla Pak is a village with many deaf who have their own signed language.

We visited the Deaf Association in Nakhorn Phanom and learned about their work. We went to Pla Pak first and found the young deaf man’s father, who is also deaf. He agreed to be videoed, so we all went to a house that had electricity for the videoing. I was also able to video a deaf lady there.

We went on to Ban Khor, which one of the deaf men from Ratchasuda College had visited before. At Ban Khor, a large group of deaf and their hearing relatives assembled to meet us. I chose a lady about 55 years old, as well as a younger man and woman to sign the wordlist. This was the first village sign language I had seen where the deaf people had signs for some colours. They only had signs for black and white, but according to Nonaka (2004), she found someone in Ban Khor who had a sign for red also.
BANGKOK
We were able to video some deaf artists in Bangkok, two of whom were from
Bangkok, and one was from Hat Yai, a town in the south.

In Bangkok, I was also able to video an older deaf man in order to get some of the
signs used by the older signers whose sign language was Old Bangkok Sign
Language.

HAT YAI
Later, in Hat Yai, in southern Thailand, I was also able to video one man and one
woman who each signed the wordlist and a story.

CHIANG MAI
In Chiang Mai, I contacted a deaf centre which produces videos for the deaf and
where I was able to video two of the young men from that centre who each signed a
wordlist and a story.

While in Chiang Mai, I made enquiries about contacting older signers who would
know Original Chiang Mai Sign Language, but none of the deaf I met knew any older
deaf in the city. Therefore, I was not able to video anyone of that age group.

Altogether, I was able to video deaf people in five different places: Bangkok, Chiang
Mai, Ban Khor, Pla Pak, and Hat Yai.

6. METHODOLOGY
In videoing the deaf, we used a two-part wordlist (see Hurlbut 2007). Part 1 consists
of 111 pictures of items, such as animals, food items, implements, vehicles, people,
and a few verbs. Part 2 consists of items that are difficult to picture. There were 138
written words in Thai, such as terms for nature, adjectives (including some opposites),
some nouns that are difficult to draw, some verbs, etc. The reason that Thai is used is
that it is the language taught in the schools for the deaf. To make elicitation more
natural, related items are arranged in categories, where possible.

In each place visited, one or more deaf signed the words on the wordlist, and these
were videotaped using a camcorder and 8 mm videotapes. After that, he or she was
asked to sign a personal story about some incident that had happened to them.

In comparing the wordlists, I look at various parameters of the signs (Liddell and
Johnson 1989); the handshape, orientation, location, contact, movement, and non-
manuals. If two of these parameters are identical, then the sign is probably similar on
the two lists, but I weigh the parameters of the sign differently.

---

5 Some researchers in Bangkok believe that the sign language in southern Thailand is distinct from that
in Bangkok. However, when the deaf in Hat Yai were asked where people signed differently from
them, they only mentioned the signing in the north of the country, especially Nakorn Phanom Province,
i.e. the deaf in Ban Khor and Pla Pak.
4 This deaf centre, Deaf Ministries International (DMI), is a group that is staffed mostly by deaf and
works among the Deaf in a number of countries.
5 In her article, Angela M. Nonaka spells this language as Plaa Pag. Since I do not know Thai, and all
the people that I was involved with are deaf or hard of hearing, I do not know which is the correct way
to write it! In her article, she also mentioned two other village sign languages used in the villages of
Huay Hai and Na Sai.
6 Non-manuals include facial expressions, eye movement, eyebrow movement, mouth movements, etc.
as well as head movements and body movements, such as twisting or tilting the body.
1. **Handshape**: This seemed to be the most important criterion, as a change in handshape only will often change the meaning of a sign.

2. **Location**: The location of a sign seemed to be quite important, so was ranked higher than some other parameters. Signs on the head and face were given a heavier weighting than those made farther from the head, when deciding on similarities or differences between different forms of the signs.

3. **Movement**: Movement seems to be somewhat less important in signed languages than handshape, but the movement can also carry a lot of weight for some signs.

4. **Orientation**: Orientation refers to the direction of the palm of the hand which can face up or down, forward or backward, or on an angle. For certain signs, the orientation is crucial. (For example, in ASL, “children” is signed with the palm facing down, but the handshape and movement are the same as for “thing,” where the palm faces up.) Sometimes orientation does not seem to matter, especially the orientation of the non-dominant or base hand.

5. **Contact**: The presence or absence of contact and the kind of contact was taken into consideration only if it seemed important for that particular sign.

6. **Non-manual signals (NMS)**: there were very few signs that seemed dependent on NMS, since many of the respondents only used them for a few signs, such as smile, angry, sour, etc. For those particular signs, of course, the NMS were considered important in evaluating the sameness or difference when comparing signs.

7. **Number of hands**: Usually, the use of one or two hands was not significant. If there was some doubt about whether the signs were similar or not, the fact that one or two hands were used was taken into account.

There are nearly always one or more signs on a list that are questionable as to similarity with signs on another list, but they are always very few.

### 7. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

#### 7.1 ANALYSIS OF THE WORDLISTS

In comparing the signs in different wordlists, those that were identical were marked as such, and those that were similar had their own category. For the final comparisons, these two groups were combined into one. The reason for having a category of “identical” was in case questions arose of whether certain signs were really similar or not. The ones that were marked “identical” did not need to be revisited. The criteria for analyzing signs as the same or similar were based on the categories listed in section 6. They are ranked in order of importance, as defined by the author.7

In deciding whether two signs were similar or not, a minimum of two parameters had to be the same. For example, if the handshape of the dominant hand and the movement were the same in the two signs, they were regarded as similar, even if only one hand was used instead of two hands. However, if the handshape was similar, but not identical, and the movement was also similar, but not identical, then the use of one or two hands became an important factor in deciding similarity. For example, “cat” was considered different in one set of comparisons, because the handshape, movement

---

7 Others have used slightly different ranking.
and orientation were all a bit different, even though the sign was in the same location. Differences in the non-dominant hand were sometimes ignored, especially an open or closed thumb as those handshapes are considered to be allophones (Liddell and Johnson 1989).

A working assumption was that everyone living in the same city would know all the signs used by those from whom I was eliciting the words. Thus, when comparing the signs from two cities with each other, if a sign from one subject was the same or similar to any one of the signs from the other city, the two were counted as similar for that item. Often there were clear regional differences in the way the deaf signed certain items. Sometimes, all the subjects would sign a Thai word using exactly the same sign, and those in a different city would also sign exactly alike, but the signs used in one city were quite different from those in the other.

7.2 INTERPRETATION CRITERIA

Steven and Diane Parkhurst (2007), using a method similar to the method I am using, hypothesized the following criteria for evaluating the results of wordlist comparisons:

**Lexical Similarity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% – 40%</td>
<td>different language family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% – 60%</td>
<td>different language, same language family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% – 70%</td>
<td>likely to be considered a separate language but intelligibility testing is necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% – 80%</td>
<td>unable to determine if same or different language; intelligibility testing is necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% – 95%</td>
<td>same language, different dialect; intelligibility testing necessary to determine how distinct the dialects are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% – 100%</td>
<td>same or very similar dialects of the same language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a follow-up communication, Steven Parkhurst (2007) had this comment:

I would say that if similarity is above 80%, it's not really necessary to do intelligibility testing—unless you have anecdotal data saying that there is some possible miscommunication or some other issue that makes things harder to understand. I would still say that for most lists that have less than 60% similarity, you're going to need an adaptation. The 60–80% range is the big "iffy range" and needs more testing.

Albert Bickford (2007) was not quite so definite, but had this to say:

Most of the studies I've seen tend to come up with similarity figures around 85–100% for two wordlists from the same language, and around 10–40% for two unrelated languages. So, if two samples score in the 30%–65% range, I'd say there is likelihood they've had some historical contact (not necessarily genetic, it might be borrowing or creolization), but they are probably not mutually intelligible. I'd expect that other factors would lead us to conclude that they are separate languages, and unless there is anecdotal evidence that they may be dialects of the same language, I'd just assume they are distinct languages and not test further. Between about 60% and 90%, I'd want to look much closer at other types of evidence to help determine if they should be considered the same language or dialect, if they can use the same video materials, etc. I'd consider things such as attitudes toward other varieties of
signing, perceptions of sameness or difference, evidence of regular communication between two groups, and if necessary RTT testing [recorded text testing]. But, I wouldn't rely on wordlist comparisons alone to make that judgment (as the scale above implies). Rather, I'd use the wordlist comparison to distinguish clear cases from unclear ones, so as to focus the more time-intensive survey work on those situations where it is most needed.

My evaluation criteria were similar to those used by the Parkhursts. I do not feel that the difference in categories or the prioritization that I used to compare these wordlists should make a significant difference to the scores obtained. As Bickford points out, conclusions based solely on wordlists are indicators but not completely definitive, but it is not thought to be profitable to try to analyse the present data in greater detail.

7.3 RESULTS OF THE SURVEY
The village sign language has two dialects, one found in each of the villages. Woodward (1996) and others have studied and written articles about BKSL, so the name used here will be Ban Khor Sign Language, but it is to be understood that these two villages are included under one language name. Table 1 shows the fairly-close scores that were found when the lists from the two villages were compared with one another. When language materials are developed in one dialect, they should be tested in the other dialect to see how well they are understood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Comparison of wordlists from Ban Khor and Pla Pak villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ban Khor</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 2, Ban Khor and Pla Pak are combined, treating them as dialects of the same language. The rest of the data collected is shown below. The ASL lists have been compared with the lists from Bangkok.

In Table 2, it is clear that the results of the comparisons between Bangkok and Chiang Mai and between Hat Yai and Chiang Mai are the same. The comparisons between Bangkok and Hat Yai are slightly higher, perhaps because one of the Hat Yai respondents had been living and working in Bangkok for several months. Based on the scores obtained in this study, there is no evidence that the sign language used in either Chiang Mai or Hat Yai should be considered to be a separate language from that in Bangkok. However, none of the scores are high, and it may prove to be necessary to do further testing, if the deaf in different cities seem to have trouble understanding the materials developed in their language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Comparisons of wordlists in Thailand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BKK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Acronyms Used**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThSL</td>
<td>Thai Sign Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKK</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>Hat Yai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBKK</td>
<td>Old Bangkok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BK/PP</td>
<td>Ban Khor and Pla Pak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASL</td>
<td>American Sign Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are variations in the language in different areas but these are not major differences according to the deaf that I interviewed.

In talking to the deaf, there were no negative feelings conveyed to me about the different dialects of the signed language in Thailand. It was just accepted that some people sign differently.

Regarding the attitudes of the deaf to other signed languages, the only complaint from some of the deaf and others was that ThSL is being “contaminated” by ASL. They felt that ASL is encroaching on their sign language. The Thai deaf say they are trying to make their sign language more purely Thai, and want to decrease the borrowings from other signed languages, especially ASL.

As far as BKSL is concerned, it is doubtful if materials in ThSL would be helpful to those who only use BKSL. The exact number of deaf who use BKSL is not known, but it is fairly small, probably in the range of forty to fifty people at the most. Many of the deaf there seem to be learning some ThSL, so the number who use only BKSL is much smaller. Most of the native signers seemed to be in the twenty to forty year-old age range. They are not elderly, but their language seems to be changing to become more like ThSL, probably because of borrowing. Woodward (1996) found that BKSL was a distinct language from ThSL. Because of the relatively high similarity which I found with ThSL, it seems to me that BKSL is an endangered language, and it is appropriate to do research on the language as soon as possible.

**CONCLUSION**

ThSL is a well-established language which was accepted by the Thai government as a national language among other spoken minority languages in the country in 1999.

This cursory appraisal, based chiefly on wordlist comparison, suggests that there are three signed languages found in Thailand: ThSL, Old Bangkok Sign Language, and BKSL, a village sign language which is found in two villages, Ban Khor and Pla Pak, in Nakorn Phanom Province in the northeast of the country.
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