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Abstract

Although most prior studies have presented the collaborative process through a literature review, we have investigated the causality of the 3Cs process based on empirical studies. A total of 327 valid questionnaires were examined using frequency, descriptive statistics, and correlation analyses and structured equation modelling. Trust and relationship commitment among SMEs were found to be factors affecting the process of collaboration (3C's: communication, cooperation, and coordination). The process of collaboration (3C's) affects performance and satisfaction. The process showed that satisfaction. Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) need to establish trust and mutual relationship in advance for the collaboration process, and thereafter, it is necessary to build a strategy for accomplishing task performance and performance and gradually concentrate the limited resources of SMEs through the process of collaboration.
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1. Introduction

Enterprises in Korea have perceived customers' needs and technology changes in the era of rapidly changing and competition in the world to set up prompt counteraction system and to survive. Small business(SMEs) is difficult to have all of resources and capability enough to take actions against changes of environment and to have difficulty at scale and ability because of small scale (Baum, 1996). In South Korea, about 3 million SMEs did business in 2010 to occupy 99.9% of total businesses to have about 88% of total number of employees.

Most of SMEs have difficulties at technical business and doing business of product, and marketing and distribution after doing business, so that they need to overcome a lot of obstacles in enterprise life cycle. When business strategies and marketing strategies are not done in time, SMEs may be difficult to survive. Collaboration strategy is needed. Single enterprise shall produce 25% to 40% of the production in industrial unit by themselves and outside suppliers shall supply
remaining quantity (Porter, 1990), and collaboration and networking with other organizations and enterprises shall share resources and capability to survive.

Therefore, two or more of enterprises can increase profit each other with open mind to grow up and to expand profit and to manage efficiently and to supplement each other.

This study suggests that the way for domestic SMEs to survive is to secure competitiveness through collaboration through interaction. The independent variables of the process of collaboration-orientation among SMEs are defined as trust and relationship commitment and communication, cooperation, and coordination, which are the parameters of 3C’s (Denise, 1999; Fuks et al., 1999) as a result, we tried to measure performance and satisfaction as factors. In other words, the study investigated effects of SMEs trust and commitment upon communication, cooperation, coordination, performance and satisfaction. The study gave implications to promote collaboration-orientation between SMEs.

2. Discussion

2.1 Collaboration-Orientations (3C’s)

The terminology of cooperation has been used with collaboration and integration to have difference between them (Dillenbourg, 1999; Kruse, 2009). Two or more of enterprises can produce profits by joint planning, operation and work (Anderson & Narus, 1990; Mohr & Spekman, 1994) to join voluntarily for joint goals (Friend & Cook, 2010).

Collaboration-orientation can be done from intangible process to tangible process, and from low strength to high strength, and from informal process to formal process. The collaboration-orientation can share integration and functions to expand relation control. In this study, cooperation is needed to communicate and to help each other. The coordination can coordinate improvements. 3C’s, in other words, communication, cooperation, coordination and coordination is (Table 1):

Table 1. Precedent studies of collaboration-orientation (3C’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Cooperation</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Research method</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badiru(2007)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Exploratory</td>
<td>Triple C Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett and Noyes(2008)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Exploratory</td>
<td>‘C’ words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise(1999)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Exploratory</td>
<td>3C Collaboration Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuks et al.(1999)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Exploratory</td>
<td>3C Collaboration Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migliaccio(2011)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Exploratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragan(2003)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Exploratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1. Communication

The communication means mutual understanding to exchange experience, prospect and rumor (Denise, 1999) and to exchange complicated product or information under unfamiliar environment and to improve mutual relations (Geykens, Steenkamp & Kumar, 1998). Frequent and open communication gives information for policy to manage enterprises (Leonidou, Paliwadana, Chari & Leonidou, 2011). The communication exchanges messages each other to negotiate tasks and to decide upon and to inform persons of project of scope of task, contribution, advantages of the task, performance plan, methods and alternatives of goal achievement and potential benefit, etc. The communication is said to exchange information of collaboration between two partners and to improve outcome (Fuks et al., 1999).
2.1.2. Cooperation

The cooperation allows two or more of individuals or organizations to put a task into practice intentionally or unintentionally. Working together and help and ability to work are simple ways. The cooperation allows men to share information by unofficial job regulation and efforts to have limitation on the resource (Jones et al., 1999; Kagan, 1991; Parkinson, 2006). The cooperation is individual not to assign to third party nor to consider mission and goal of an organization and to continue mutual reaction when necessary (Blank et al., 2003). The cooperation is said to make decision independently and to solve problems and not to integrate system according to exchange of resource information (McNamara, 2012). In this study, the cooperation can solve conflicts with independent decision-making not to integrate system in accordance with exchange of resource information. to have short term and to be unofficial and to have individual plan. Resources are independent to be responsible for one's behavior and to put goal of task into practice.

2.1.3. Coordination

The coordination is said to be intentional behavior concerning mutual reaction (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). The coordination is an official stage of the cooperation to have role of some of programs and to be individual and to be stronger than communication and cooperation and to synchronize joint goal and purpose (Ragan, 2003). The coordination controls joint mission and principles based on formal contract. Contract procedure and assignment of manager and joint standard can solve disputes between agencies. (Corbett & Noyes, 2008). In this study, the coordination is said to be unofficial and to have one stage higher structure and to have authority and responsibility.

2.2 SMEs relationship factor

2.2.1. Trust

Trust is said to be expectation and belief on another one's motives and intention (Rempel & Holmes, 1986), and exchange partner's trust means the other party's belief and faithfulness (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Belief in partner's knowledge of doing to keep honest, trust and performance (Kumar, Hibbard & Stern, 1994). The trust is favorable expectation of emotion, cognition and behavior of individuals or organizations.

2.2.2. Relationship Commitment

Relationship commitment keeps relations with belief and effort to have valuable relations (Moorman, Desphande & Zaltman, 1992) to strengthen current relations and to keep partners (Seabright, Levinthal & Fichman, 1992). Relationship commitment promises continuity between partners to keep relations for a long time (Heide & John, 1990), and long term relation requires short term sacrifice to get long term benefit (Gundlach, Achrol & Mentzer, 1995).

2.2.3. Performance

Performance is to make effort in order to accomplish specific purpose and goal (Jurison, 1999), and enterprise performance that is direct performance at cooperation between enterprises (Paulraj, Lado & Chen, 2008) to lessen costs and to improve services and to include income (Stuart, Verville & Taskin, 2012). Project with common task accomplishes resources to attain purpose and goal (Jurison, 1999).

2.2.4. Satisfaction

Satisfaction is said to be expectation and satisfaction of enterprises to attain performance and to have affirmative and friendly emotion at rating of interest parties (Anderson and Narus, 1990), and to keep affirmative relation to attain...
performance between parties. Satisfaction between enterprises at collaboration-orientation does not start from temporary relation to be influenced by long time relation. So, mutual reaction at satisfaction with collaboration shall be concentrated on performance and profit to believe in continuous relation keeping (Ganesan, 1994).

2.3 Hypotheses

2.3.1. Relation between factors (trust and relationship Commitment) and collaboration 3C’s)

Reducing uncertainty in trust relationships is because organizations have reliable collaborative attributes when they trust other organizations (Geyskens & Steenkamp, 1995). Trust between partner enterprises can increase collaboration through communication (Anderson & Narus, 1990; Mohr & Spekman, 1994), In the path relationship, the relationship between each member or organization is more cooperative than mutual trust, sometimes conflicts result in positive effects (Ganesan, 1994; Morgan & Hunt, 1994), In this study, trust is thought to be important at promotion of SMEs 3C’s.

H 1: Trust between SMEs has significantly positive influence upon collaboration-orientation (3Cs: communication, cooperation and coordination).

Relationship commitment had affirmative influence upon communication at study on communication between manufacturers and customers (Zhao, Huo, Flynn & Yeung, 2008). Team commitment had affirmative influence upon team cooperation (Chang, Sheu, Klein and Jiang, 2010). Trust and commitment of relation between organizations had affirmative influence upon cooperation and coordination (Payan and Svensson, 2007). This study gave hypothesis of relationship commitment of SMEs mutual relation.

H 2: Relationship commitment between SMEs has significantly positive influence upon collaboration-orientation (3Cs: communication, cooperation and coordination).

2.3.2. Relation among 3C’s, performance and satisfaction

Communication has positive relation with performance (Pincus, 1986) and communication, coordination and mutual support had important influence upon performance (Hoegl & Gemuenden, 2001). Technical cooperation had affirmative influence upon enterprise performance (Hagedoorn and Schakenraad, 1994). Hypothesis between 3C’s and SMEs performance is :

H 3: 3C’s (communication, cooperation and coordination) between SMEs has significantly positive influence upon performance.

Information and communication have influence upon members’ satisfaction and performance (Schuler, 1986), and members having active communication has high relation with satisfaction (Robert & O’Reilley, 1984). Enterprises can get earning from relationship path to cooperate and to keep effect at satisfaction (Wong, 2000). Cooperation of fellow workers of banks has influence upon satisfaction (Singh and Kaur, 2009). In this study, satisfaction after 3C’s was important.

H 4: 3C’s (communication, cooperation and coordination) between SMEs has positive influence upon satisfaction..

2.3.3. Relation between performance and satisfaction

Causal relation between performance and satisfaction varies depending upon scholars: Performance has influence upon satisfaction, and excellent doing and high performance give high satisfaction (Spector, 1997; Judge, Bono, Thoresen &
Patton, 2001). Performance is linked with compensation to give job satisfaction (Locke, 1970), and performance can be cause of satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5: Performance between SMEs has significantly positive influence upon satisfaction.

3. Designs

3.1 Models

This study investigated effects of relationship factors of SMEs upon 3C's and effects of 3C’s upon results. At first, the study investigated relation between performance and satisfaction by mediation of trust and relationship commitment upon 3C’s (communication, cooperation and coordination). Model of relationship was (Figure 1):

![Fig 1: Model](image)

3.2 Sample design and analysis

Questionnaire was used to inspect models and theses and to collect material and to do empirical analysis. Questionnaire with multiple questions was used to inspect interviewees personally, by post and by Internet (mobile). The interviewees were CEO, directors and managers of SMEs in South Korea. 500 copies were used and 327 copies were used for investigation after excluding questionnaire with poor answer and class for 3C's activity decision making. Both SPSS Version 18.0 and AMOS Version 16.0 were used. \( \chi^2 \), RMR, GFI, AGFI, NFI, CFI and other test statistics were used to inspect by structure equation analysis.

3.3 Variables

Trust and relationship commitment, communication, cooperation, coordination, performance, satisfaction and others were used. Exogenous variables included trust and relationship commitment, and five questions were used to inspect trust (Ganesan, 1994) and to inspect relationship commitment (Gruen, Summers and Acito, 2000). Communication was tested (Kumar et al., 1994) and cooperation was tested (Kahn, 1996) and coordination was tested (Heide and John, 1990). Performance was tested (PMBOK, 2004) and satisfaction was done (Anderson and Narus, 1990). The variables had five scales, for instance, 1 of 'No, not at all' and 5 of 'very much true'.

4. Findings

4.1 Characteristics of the Sample

The study investigated 327 interviewees by empirical analysis to find out relation with trust, relationship commitment, 3C’s, performance and satisfaction.

Men occupied 242 persons (74%), and job title consisted of CEO of 93 persons (28.4%), general manager of 82 persons (25.1%) followed by 67 directors (20.5%), 39 assistant managers (11.9%) and 37 managers (11.3%). Business type consisted of 66 manufacturing business (20.2%), 48 technical service (14.7%), 45 construction business (13.8%), information and communication (13.5%), 42 transportation (12.8%), 39 health (11.9%) and 9 food service (2.8%).

4.2 Reliability

Cronbach’s α was used to get reliability and internal consistency reliability method was used. (Churchill, 1979). SPSS 18.0 was used. Reliability analysis of five variables for exogenous variables trust and relationship commitment had 0.853 and 0.837 of Cronbach’s α coefficient each to have high reliability. Reliability analysis of five variables for endogenous variable, communication, cooperation and coordination had 0.834, 0.840 and 0.814 of Cronbach’s α coefficient each to have high reliability. The reliability of the four variables for Performance and satisfaction had 0.869 and 0.825 of Cronbach’s α coefficient to have high reliability. Trust, relationship commitment, communication, coordination, performance and satisfaction had more than 0.8 of Cronbach’s α coefficient to have good reliability (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988).

4.3 Confirmatory factor analysis

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was done to investigate effects of trust and relationship commitment upon performance and satisfaction with mediation of communication, cooperation and coordination. After getting rid of question below than standardised coefficient, the study tested models (Table 2) to rate indexes to get optimum model. All of factors were proper (λ>.50) and t of more than +1.965 was significant. Confirmatory factor analysis was done to investigate trust and relationship commitment: χ²=68.751(p=.000, df=2.644), GFI=.955, AGFI=.953, CFI=.967, NFI=.940, IFI=.949, TLI=.955, RMR=.024 and RMSEA=.071. Confirmatory factor analysis was done to investigate communication, cooperation and coordination: χ²=103.802(p=.001, df=1.674), GFI=.952, AGFI=.930, CFI=.974, NFI=.939, IFI=.975, TLI=.968, RMR=.022 and RMSEA=.045. Confirmatory factor analysis was done to investigate performance and satisfaction to satisfy rating standard: χ²=18.301(p=.019, df=2.288), GFI=.982, AGFI=.954, CFI=.991, NFI=.983, IFI=.991, TLI=.982, RMR=.023 and RMSEA=.063 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993). CR was 0.8 and AVE exceeded 0.6 to satisfy standards, that is to say, more than 0.6 of CR and more than 0.5 of AVE (Bagozzi and Yi(1988).

Table 2. Confirmatory factor analysis result of all of the units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring Items</th>
<th>Standardised coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ We and our partners believe in business skills.</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ We and our partners trust each other fully.</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>13.267</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ We and our partners rely on each other.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>11.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ We and our partners are candid.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Relationship commitment**

- We and our partners are honest with each other. 0.675 11.698
- We and our partners are doing their best. 0.643 - 0.635 0.874
- We and our partners strive to continue the deal. 0.706 12.416
- We and our partners are highly engaged. 0.783 11.011
- We and our partners continue the relationship. 0.756 10.774

**Communication**

- We and our partners have two-way communication. 0.669 - 0.622 0.892
- We and our partners have frequent information exchanges. 0.686 12.951
- We and our partners have open dialogue with each other. 0.687 10.475
- We and our partners influence each other’s ideas. 0.764 11.366
- We and our partners are good enough to exchange information. 0.688 10.499

**Cooperation**

- We and our partners are committed to working together. 0.785 - 0.634 0.874
- We and our partners like to work together. 0.783 13.896
- We and our partners want to work together for our goals. 0.691 12.23
- We and our partners cooperate and share information and ideas. 0.678 11.957

**Coordination**

- We and our partners immediately modify unnecessary tasks. 0.704 - 0.623 0.863
- We and our partners work together to align key business issues. 0.802 11.979
- We and our partners coordinate execution processes and procedures. 0.672 10.548
- We and our partners are constantly coordinating their activities. 0.67 10.529

**Performance**

- We and our partners performed within the scope of our work. 0.734 - 0.638 0.862
- We and our partners performed within a given schedule. 0.80 12.899
- We and our partners have a positive outcome. 0.754 12.331

**Satisfaction**

- We and our partners have a positive relationship. 0.907 - 0.675 0.922
- We and our partners have a good relationship. 0.773 17.728
- We and our partners are satisfied with the results. 0.905 23.017

*** p<.001; Composite Reliability (CR); Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

### 4.4 Mean, standard deviation and correlation

Correlation between factors was (Table 3). Factors had mean, standard deviation and correlation. Factors had very much positive correlation (significant level of 0.01). Models coincided with variables of hypothesis.

Each factor had high correlation with close relation between factors. We will perform a hypothesis test according to the structural equation model among research units.

**Table 3. Correlation between measurements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Relationship commitment</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Cooperate</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3.955</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>630**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.5 Models

At testing of overall models, optimum model was found to be: $\chi^2=37.383$($p=.000$, df=6.231), GFI=.968, AGFI=.850, CFI=.965, NFI=.960, IFI=.966, TLI=.978, RMR=.026 and RMSEA=.127 <Figure 2>. The model was found to satisfy testing standards more than indexes of common rating standards did, and to describe causal relations between concepts (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson & Tatham, 2006).

![Figure 2](image_url)

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

**Fig 2**: Analysis result of structural equation for testing of hypotheses

### 4.6 Testing of hypotheses

This study investigated variables, for instance, trust and relationship commitment of exogenous variable, and communication, cooperation, coordination, performance and satisfaction (Table 4).

#### Table 4. Testing result of hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path relationship</th>
<th>Standardised coefficient</th>
<th>Unstandardised coefficient</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1-1</td>
<td>Trust → Communication</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>7.396</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1-2</td>
<td>Trust → Cooperation</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>7.730</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1-3</td>
<td>Trust → Coordination</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>3.980</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2-1</td>
<td>Relationship → Communication</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>5.296</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Results

First, trust between SMEs has influence upon 3C’s (hypothesis 1). Trust was found to have positive influence upon communication (path coefficient .408; t value =7.396; p<.001), cooperation (path coefficient .443; t value =7.730; p<.001), coordination (path coefficient .254; t value =3.980; p<.001). The above results show that Anderson and Narus (1990), Mohr and Spekman (1994), Ganesan (1994), Morgan and Hunt (1994), trust is consistent with the findings of a positive effect on collaboration-orientation activities.

Second, relationship commitment between SMEs has influence upon 3C’s (hypothesis 2). Relationship commitment was found to have positive influence upon communication (path coefficient .292; t value=5.296; p<.001), cooperation (path coefficient .209; t value=3.643; p<.001), coordination (path coefficient .244; t value=3.829; p<.001). The above results show that Chen and Paulraj (2004), Zhao et al. (2008), Payan and Svensson (2007), relationship commitment is consistent with the findings of a positive effect on collaboration-orientation activities.

Third, 3C’s between SMEs has positive influence upon performance (hypothesis 3): communication is performance (path coefficient .283; t value=4.962; p<.001), and cooperation is performance (path coefficient .235; t value=4.135; p<.001) and coordination is performance (path coefficient .186; t value=3.805, p<.001). The above results show that Pincus (1986), Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001), Beamish (1987), 3C’s activities is consistent with the findings of a positive effect on performance.

Fourth, 3C’s between SMEs has positive influence upon satisfaction (hypothesis 4). communication is satisfaction (path coefficient .163; t value=3.013; p<.01), cooperation is satisfaction (path coefficient .129; t value=2,414; p<.05), and coordination is satisfaction (path coefficient .091; t value=1.990, p<.05). The above results show that Robert and O’Reilley (1984), Wong (2000), Singh and Kaur (2009), 3C's activities is consistent with the findings of a positive effect on satisfaction.
Fifth, performance between SMEs has significantly positive influence upon satisfaction (hypothesis 5): Hypothesis coefficient: .430 (t value=8.506; p<.001). The above results show that Spector (1997), Judge et al. (2001), performance is consistent with the findings of a positive effect on satisfaction.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

This study tested hypotheses to inspect effects of SMEs trust and relationship commitment upon communication, cooperation, coordination, performance and satisfaction.

The findings were:

First, SMEs trust and relationship commitment could increase 3C’s (communication, cooperation and coordination). Second, cognition on 3Cs (communication, cooperation and coordination) could increase performance and cognition on 3Cs (communication, cooperation and coordination) could increase satisfaction. Third, SMEs cognition on performance could increase satisfaction.

Implications were:

First, SMEs cognition on trust and relationship commitment increased 3C’s (communication, cooperation and coordination). Affirmative trust and relationship commitment between businesses could be made at SMEs collaboration-orientation. SMEs shall make efforts to have relationship commitment on collaboration-orientation goal based on trust.

Second, SMEs cognition on 3C’s (communication, cooperation and coordination) could increase performance, and cognition on communication, cooperation and coordination could increase satisfaction. They could be important goal of performance of SMEs collaboration-orientation. 3C’s could help SMEs satisfy with performance to grow up continuously.

Third, SMEs cognition on performance could increase satisfaction. Performance could produce affirmative behavior. So, mutual collaboration-orientation shall create performance to satisfy and to understand each other.

Lastly, sense of goal is needed to succeed in collaboration-orientation. Sense of goal cab collaboration-orientation and collaboration cannot be goal of enterprise. Each organization shall communicate, cooperate and coordinate to succeed in collaboration-orientation business.

This study has hypothesis of relation between trust, relationship commitment, collaboration-orientation(3C’s), performance and satisfaction of SMEs.

Further studies are needed to investigate more. Investigation area was concentrated on Korea in Seoul and Gyeonggi-do to require another region. Number of enterprises was small. Single business type of SMEs shall be investigated deeply from objective point of view. Further studies shall investigate 6C’s, that is to say, communication, cooperation, coordination, collaboration, convergence and consolidation with interesting subjects.
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