ED 439 470   CS 510 282

AUTHOR   McDowell, Earl E.
TITLE   An Investigation of High School Students' Perceptions of
                Reticence and Cognitive Communication Competence.
PUB DATE   2000-00-00
NOTE   20p.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Cognitive Measurement; *Communication Apprehension;
                Communication Research; High School Students; High Schools;
                Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Competence;
                *Shyness; *Social Cognition
IDENTIFIERS   Communication Behavior; *Communication Competencies

ABSTRACT
                This study addressed issues of communication apprehension
and adaptability by examining relationships between reticence and cognitive
communication competence, including differences between gender and age
groups. The methodology included participant self-ranking according to a
six-dimensional reticence skill system, and ranking according to the 22-point
cognitive communication competence scale, which measures cognitive
involvement before, during, and after communication. Results indicated that:
(1) twenty-two high school students were identified as high reticence, 43
middle, and 25 low reticence; (2) significant differences occurred among
reticence groups on planning, modeling, reflection, and consequence cognition
scores; (3) no significant differences occurred among gender or age groups;
(4) high anxiety students are also reticent about knowledge, timing,
organization, delivery, and memory; (5) twenty-five percent of high school
students hesitate to engage in social interaction; (6) the more knowledgeable
the student the more likely the transition from observer to participant; and
(7) reticent students do not visualize communication as a dyadic
communication process and consequently lack social interaction skills.
Additional research should utilize the reticence and cognitive communication
instruments, and longitudinal studies should examine potential reticence
decreases. Appendixes contain sample reticence scales and assessment forms.
(Contains 19 references and 4 tables.) (EF)

An Investigation of High School Students' Perceptions
of Reticence and Cognitive Communication
Competence

Earl E. McDowell
University of Minnesota
Department of Rhetoric
92 Classroom Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55108

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

Abstract

The results indicate that significant positive relationships exist between all reticence variables and between all cognitive communication competence variables ($p < .01$). Significant relationship exist between anxiety and presence cognition, between knowledge and modeling cognition, between organization and presence cognition, and between delivery and modeling cognition ($p < .01$). Post hoc analyses reveal significant differences between high and low reticent groups in rating planning cognition, modeling cognition, reflection cognition and consequence cognition ($p < .05$). These results are discussed in this paper.

Over the past 30 years the reticence construct has undergone an evolution. Initially, Phillips (1965) coined the term "reticent" to refer to the notion that there are people who have difficulty communicating across a range of situations . He defined reticence as a "personality-based, anxiety disorder." In 1977 he shifted the definition to include it as a problem of inadequate communication skills. Later Phillips (1984) indicated: "When people avoid communication because they believe they will lose more by talking than by remaining silent, we refer to it as reticence." The most recent work of Phillips (1991; Kelly, Phillips, and Keaten, 1995) delineates the nature of these skills deficiencies."

The reticence construct assumes the skills deficiencies defining the problem correspond to the rhetorical canons of invention, disposition, style, delivery, and memory. The significance of the construct is made apparent by the subsequent development of cognate concept of communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1970 and 1984), unwillingness to communicate (Burgoon, 1976), and conversational skills (Spitzberg and Hunt, 1987). Based on a review of Phillips' research, Keaten, Kelly, and Finch (1997) developed the reticence scale. The investigators generated items focusing on the social conversation context, which McCroskey (1984) termed a generalized context measure. The rationale for referring to the social conversation that those who have trouble in this context usually have difficulty in other contexts. The authors generated four items for six areas: anxiety, knowledge, timing, organization, delivery and memory.

Specifically, the Keaten, Kelly, and Finch study (1997) was designed to test the following hypotheses:

1. The Reticence Scale is moderately and positively related to the PRCA-24;

4

2. The Reticence Scale is moderately and negatively related to
Conversational Skills Rating Scale (CSRS);

3. The Reticence Scale is moderately and negatively related to the WTC.
The results indicate that there were moderate, positive correlations between the
Reticence Scale and the PRCA -24 variables except public discussion, which
obtained a low correlation. Moreover, moderate negative relationships existed
between the Reticence Scale and both the Conversational Skills Rating Scale and
Willingness to Communicate. Overall, the relationships accounted for less than
50 percent of the variance.

Much research has been completed on the psycho-motor and to a more
limited extent the affective domain of communication competence (e.g.
communication apprehension and willingness to communicate). Duran and
Spitzberg (1995) indicate that cognitive communication competence is defined as
the ability to perceive and anticipate situation variables that have the potential to
influence one's communication choices, the ability to select behaviors adaptive to
those situational variables and anticipate the consequences of those behavioral
choices; the ability to perceive how the other is responding to one's
communication choices and general reflection about performance.

Other research by Phillips (1984) focused on cognitive communication
competence. Spitzberg and Cupach (1984) defined communication competence
as "an individual's ability to adapt effectively to the surrounding environment
over time." They summarized the fundamental competence as follow: "the sine
qua non of fundamental competence in cross situational adaptability. . . theories
are concerned with the acquisition and development of adaptability and its
cognitive precursors." Duran and Spitzberg (1995) concluded that the cognitive

dimensions of competence is a set of mental processes that include the following:

> The ability to perceive situational variables that have the
> potential to influence one's communication choices (e.g. , who
> will be there, where it is, what people will be talking about , etc.);
> the ability to select behaviors adaptive to those situational
> variables and anticipate the consequences of those behavior
> choices; the ability to perceive how the other is responding to one's
> communication choices and alter those choices to refine one
> behavioral repertoire for future encounters; and, general
> reflection about performances. Thus, the cognitive dimensions
> of competence involves several important mental activities of a
> proactive and reflective nature.

Previous research by Greene (1984), Spitzberg and Cupach (1984), Cody and

McLaughlin (1985), and Spitzberg and Brunner (1991) were used by Duran and

Spitzberg to reach the above conclusions.

Based on a review of previous cognitive communication competence, as

well as assessing the validity of a measure of communication competence,

Duran, Kelly, Schwager, Carone, and Stevens, (1993), Duran and Spitzberg

(1995) revised the original instrument to include three constructs:

communication knowledge (Spitzberg, 1990), interaction involvement (Ceegala,

1981), and self- monitoring (Snyder, 1974, 1979) developed and assessed the

validity a measure of cognitive communication competence. Each construct has

high reliability and validity. Research by Sptizberg (1990) found that self-

monitoring was significantly related to communication knowledge (r= .62);

knowledge was significantly related to ability to modify self-presentation (r= .59)

and sensitivity to expressive behavior (r=. 55). They concluded that cognitive

communication competence is conceptualized as an individual's ability to think

about communication contexts prior to, during, and after engaging in social

interactions. They tested the following hypotheses:

1. Cognitive communication competence is positively related to communication knowledge.

2. Cognitive communication competence is positively related to interaction involvement.

3. Cognitive communication competence is positively related to self-monitoring. The results of the factor analysis produced the following five factors that accounted for 57 percent of the variance with reliabilities ranging from .68 to .86: planning cognitions, presence cognitions, modeling cognitions, reflection cognitions, and consequences cognitions. The three hypotheses were accepted.

No research has been completed to determine the relationships between the reticence and cognitive dimensions of competence. That is this is an exploratory study designed to determine the relationship between and among reticence variable, between and among cognitive communication competence variables, between the two sets of variables measured across the same subjects, and differences between gender groups and among age groups on both reticence and communication variables. Below is a list of the hypotheses:

Research Questions:

1. What are the relationships between and among reticence variables?

2. What are the relationships between and among cognitive communication variables?

3. What are the relationships between reticence variables and cognitive communication variables?

4. What differences exist between gender group in rating the dimensions of reticence variables?

5. What differences exist between age groups in rating the dimensions of cognitive communication competence variables?

INSTRUMENTS

a. Reticence

Kelly, Keaten, and Begnal (1992) develop the reticence Skill which focuses on how individuals assess their feelings and skills in social settings. It consists of six dimensions: (1) feelings and anxiety, (2) knowledge of communication topics, (3) timing skills, (4) organization of thoughts, (5) delivery skills, and (6) memory skills. Participants used a 6-point likert scale to measure to rate their level of agreement with each statement. Scores for each dimension range from 1 to 21. The total score range from 6 to 126. The overall reliability of the total scale was .95. with the six dimensions reliability coefficients ranging from .82 to 92 (See Appendix A).

b. Cognitive Communication Competence Scale

This is a 22-item scale designed to measure planning cognitions, modeling cognitions, presence cognitions, reflection cognition and consequence cognitions (See appendix B). Five factors accounted for 57 of the variance. The five dimensions are summarized below:

(1) Planning cognition reflects the anticipation, mental rehearsal and monitoring of topics of conversation. A sample item: "Before a conversation, I think about what I am going to say."

(2) Presence cognitions reflect an awareness of how the other is reacting to a conversation. A sample item is: "During a conversation I am aware of when it is time to change the topic."

(3) Modeling cognitions reflect an awareness of contextual variables that provide information that serves to inform interaction choices. A sample item is: "When I first enter a new situation, I watch who is talking with whom."

(4) Reflection cognitions tap a process of reflecting upon a performance with the objective to improve one self-presentation. A sample item is: "After a conversation, I think about what I said."

(5) Consequence cognitions reflect a general awareness and concern for the effects of one's communication performance. A sample item is: " Generally I think about the effects of my communication" (see Duran and Spitzberg, 1995). See Appendix B

RESULTS

The results indicate that 90 (42 males and 48 females) students from a large midwestern high school completed the survey instruments during the spring semester 1999. The results, reported in Table 1, reveal that significant correlations (p < .001) existed among all reticence variables. Most relationships account for 60% of the variance. Likewise, significant relationships (p < .01) existed among all cognitive communication variables. No significant differences occurred between gender groups and among age groups in rating dependent measures. Based on these results, post hoc analyses were completed to determine if significant differences (p < .05) existed among reticence groups in terms of rating cognitive communication competence variables. Composite reticence scores, ranging between 24 and 144, were used to place all participants into high, medium and low reticence groups. Specifically, students scoring (97.17) one standard deviation above the mean were classified into the high reticence group; students scoring(52.41) one standard deviation below the mean were classified into the low reticence group, while students scoring (53 and 97)

between one standard deviation below the mean and one standard deviation above the mean were classified into the middle reticence group. The results indicate that 22 students were classified into the high reticence groups and 25 students were classified into the low group, while 43 students were classified into the middle group. The results indicate that significant differences occurred among reticence groups on planning cognition score, modeling cognition scores, reflection cognition scores, and consequence cognition scores (p < .01). Based on these results the Scheffe procedure were completed to determine differences between high and middle groups, high and low groups, and middle and low groups. The results, reported in Table 4 indicate that significant differences occurred between the high and low reticence groups in rating planning cognition, modeling cognition, reflection cognition, and consequence cognition scores (p < .05). Significant differences also occurred between high and middle group on modeling cognition scores.

Discussion

An interpretation of the results seem to indicate highly significant relationship among all reticence variables That is high school students who are high in anxiety are also reticent about knowledge, timing, organization, delivery, and memory. Unlike the Penn State study (Kelly, et al, 1994), where anxiety had the highest mean rating, in this study timing (X= 13.68) and delivery (X= 13.13) had the highest mean ratings. This seems to indicate that approximately 25 percent of high school students hesitate to engage in social interaction and when they do they feel that they muddle words, stumble over words, and don't speak fluently.

An interpretation of the cognitive communication competence results indicate that reflective cognition scores (X= 18. 82) and planning cognition scores (X= 16) are rated the highest. This indicates that high school students are most concerned about before and after communication.

The relationships between sets of variables show that the strongest significant relationship exist between delivery and modeling cognition (r= .53), accounting for 25 percent of the variance. This seems to make sense as the highly apprehensive student is highly reticent in the sender role, but is more relaxed in the receiver role. Likewise, the relationship between knowledge and modeling cognition (-.39), accounting for 16 percent of the variance. This seems to indicate that the more knowledgeable a student is the more likely he/she is to move from an observer role to a participant role.

An interpretation of the post hoc analyses seems to show that wide significant differences exist between the high and low reticence groups in rating cognition variables. For example, the high reticence student doesn't plan, isn't aware when it is time to change topics, doesn't reflect upon the communication, and is not aware of his/communication performance.

Overall, the results suggest that high school student who are reticent do not visualize communication as a dyadic communication process, and, as a result, lack social interaction skills. The wide differences between high and low reticent groups suggest that high school students might benefit my participating in a program similar to the Penn State Reticence Program.

Future research should be completed utilizing these two instruments. For example, a large group of participants should complete the instruments. A sample of students could complete the instrument in the junior high and senior

high levels. In addition, longitudinal studies might be completed to discover if reticence decreases as students move from one educational level to another. Other research should be done to try to identify differences between high and low reticent groups and the cognitive communication competence variables.

Table 1
Relationships among Reticence Variables

	A	K	T	O	D	M
A		.82	.84	.87	,88	.9
K			.76	.81	.80	.81
T				,87	.87	.85
O					.91	.88
D						.93
M						

p < .001 for all relationships
A= Anxiety
K= Knowledge
T= Timing
O= Organization
D= Delivery
M= Memory

Table 2
Relationships among Cognitive Communication
Competence Variables

	PC	MC	PreC	RC	CC
			Variables		
PC		.48	.50	.50	.57
MC			.43	.60	.55
PerC				.29	.34
RC					.62
CC					

PC=   Planning Cognitions
MC=   Modeling Cognitions
PerC=Presence Cognitions
RC=   Reflection Cognition
CC=   Consequence Cognitions
P < .001 for all relationships

Table 3
Relationships between Reticence Variables and
Cognitive Communication Variables

	A	K	T	O	D	M
PC	-.03	-.22*	.07	-.25**	.11	.09
MC	-.08	-.39***	-.05	-14	-.53***	.15
PreC	-.35***	.08	-.15	-.32	-.19*	-.19*
RC	-.01	-.009	.02	-.07	.04	-.03
CC	-.04	-.18	-.03	-.06	.13	.05

*   p < .05
**   p < .02
*** p < .001

A= Anxiety   PC= Planning Cognitions
K= Knowledge   MC= Modeling Cognitions
T= Timing   PreC=Presence Cognitions
O= Organization   RC= Reflection Cognitions
D= Delivery   CC=Consequence Cognitions
M= Memory

Table 4

Scheffe Results between Reticence Groups
and Cognitive Communication
Competence Variables

Variables	Levels	P	F
Planning Cognitions	High vs Low	3.97	.05
Modeling Cognitions	High vs Low	4.43	.05
	High vs Moderate	4.27	.05
Reflection Cognitions	High vs Low	4.67	.05
Consequence Cognitions	High vs Low	4.13	.05

Appendix A

Reticence Scale

DIRECTIONS: This assessment instrument is composed of 24 statements concerning your skills as a communicator. Please indicate in the space provided the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) mildly disagree, (4) mildly agree, (5) agree, or (6) strongly agree. These statements refer to your communication skills when meeting a stranger at a social gathering. Please work quickly; just record your first impression.

___ 1. I am nervous when talking. (Anxiety)
___ 2. I know what to say. (Knowledge)
___ 3. I wait too long to say what I want to say. (Timing)
___ 4. I organize my thoughts when talking. (Organization)
___ 5. I stumble over my words. (Delivery)
___ 6. I remember what I want to say when talking. (Memory)
___ 7. I am relaxed when talking. (Anxiety)
___ 8. I am unaware of what to say. (Knowledge)
___ 9. I say things at the time I want to say them. (Timing)
___ 10. My thoughts are disorganized. (Organization)
___ 11. I clearly say what I want to say. (Delivery)
___ 12. I forget what I want to say when talking. (Memory)
___ 13. I feel tense when talking. (Anxiety)
___ 14. I know what to discuss. (Knowledge)
___ 15. I hesitate too long to say what I want to say. (Timing)
___ 16. I arrange my thoughts when talking. (Organization)
___ 17. I muddle my words. (Delivery)
___ 18. I recall what I want to say when talking. (Memory)
___ 19. I am comfortable when talking. (Anxiety)
___ 20. I am unfamiliar with what to say. (Knowledge)
___ 21. I say things when I want to say them. (Timing)
___ 22. My thoughts are jumbled. (Organization)
___ 23. I fluently say what I want to say. (Delivery)
___ 24. I lose sight of what I want to say when talking. (Memory)

Scoring Instructions:
Anxiety = 11+Q1+Q13-Q7-Q19
Knowledge = 11+Q8+Q20-Q2-Q14
Timing = 11+Q3+Q15-Q9-Q21
Organization = 11+Q10+Q22-Q4-Q16
Delivery = 11+Q5+Q17-Q11-Q23
Memory = 11+Q12+Q24-Q6-Q18

Appendix B

Directions: The following are statements about the communication process. Answer each as it relates to what you generally think about concerning social situations. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provided.

5 = Always true of me
4 = Often true of me
3 = Sometimes true of me
2 = Rarely true of me
1 = Never true of me

Planning Cognitions
_____ 1. Before a conversation I think about what people might be talking about.
_____ 2. Before a conversation I mentally practice what I am going to say.
_____ 3. Before a conversation I think about what I going to say.
_____ 4. When I first enter a new situation I think about what I am going to talk about.
_____ 5. During a conversation I think about what topic to discuss next.

Modeling Cognitions
_____ 6. When I first enter a new situation I watch who is talking to whom.
_____ 7. When I first enter a new situation I try to "size up" the event.
_____ 8. Generally, I study people.
_____ 9. Generally, I am aware of people's interests.

Presence Cognitions
_____ 10. During a conversation I am aware of when a topic is "going nowhere."
_____ 11. During a conversation I am aware of when it is time to change the topic.
_____ 12. During a conversation I pay attention to how others are reacting to what I am saying.
_____ 13. During a conversation I know if I have said something rude or inappropriate.

Reflection Cognitions
_____ 14. After a conversation I think about what the other person thought of me.
_____ 15. After a conversation I think about my performance.
_____ 16. After a conversation I think about what I said.
_____ 17. After a conversation I think about what I could have said.
_____ 18. After a conversation I think about what I have said to improve for the next conversation.

Consequence Cognitions
_____ 19. Generally, I think about how others might interpret what I say.
_____ 20. Generally, I think about the consequences of what I say.
_____ 21. Generally, I think about how what I say may affect others.
_____ 22. Generally, I think about the effects of my communication.

REFERENCES

Burgoon, J. K. (1976). "The unwillingness to communicate scale: Development and validation." Communication Monographs, 43, 60-69.

Cegala, D. J. (1981). "Interaction involvement: A cognition dimension of communicative competence. Communication Education, 30, 109-121. Duran R. Kelly, Schwager, K., Carone, S., and Stevens, S. (1993). "Toward the development of a measure of cognitive communication competence." Paper present at the meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, New Haven, CT.

Cody, M., and McLaughlin, M. (1985). "The situation as a construct in interpersonal communication research." In ML. Knapp & G.R. Miller (Eds.) Handbook of interpersonal communication (pp. 263-312). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Duran R., and Spitzberg, B. (1995). "Toward the development of cognitive communication competence." Communication Quarterly, 43, 259-275.

Greene, J. (1984). "A cognitive approach to human communication: An action assembly theory. " Communication Monographs, 51, 289-306.

Keaton, J., Kelly, L., & Finch, C. (1997). "Development of an instrument to measure reticence." Communication Quarterly, 45, 37-51.

Kelly, L. Keaten, J., & Begnal, C. (1994). "Refinement of a typology of reticent communicators." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans.

Kelly, L., Phillips, G.M. & Keaton, J. A. (1995). "Teaching people to speak well: Training and remediation of communication reticence." Speech Communication Series of Applied Communication. Cresskill, N. J. Hampton Press Inc.

McCroskey, J. (1970). "Measures of communication-bound anxiety." Speech Monographs, 37, 269-277.

McCroskey, J. (1984). "The communication apprehension perspective." In J. Daly & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension (pp.13-38). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Phillips, G.M. (1965). "The problem of reticence." Pennsylvania State Annual, 22, 22-38

Phillips, G.M. (1977). "Rhetoritherapy vs. the medical model: Dealing with reticence." Communication Education, 26, 34-43.

Phillips, G.M. (1984). "Reticence: A perspective on social withdraw." In J. A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey(Eds.), Avoiding Communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication (pp. 51-66). Beverly Hills: Sage

Phillips, G.M. (1991). Communication incompetencies: A theory otraiing oral performance behavior. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. Spitzberg, B. H. and Cupach, W. R. (1984). Interpersonal communication competence. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Snyder, M. (1974). The Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Behavior, 30, 526-537.

Snyder, M. (1979). Self-monitoring processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental psychology (Vol. 12, pp 86-128). New York: Academic Press.

Spitzberg, B. H. and Hunt, H. T. (1987). "The measurement of interpersonal skills in instructional context." Communication Education, 36, 28-45.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1990). "The construct validity of trait-based measures of interpersonal competence." Communication Research Reports. 7, 107-115.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

CS 510 282

Reproduction Release
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: *An Investigation of High School Students' Perceptions of Reticence and Cognitive Comm.*	
Author(s): *Competence, Earl E McDowell*	
Corporate Source: *University of Minnesota*	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY ____ ____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY ____ ____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY ____ ____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
↑ [X]	↑ [ ]	↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only
Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.		

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: *McDowell*	Printed Name/Position/Title: *Earl E McDowell*
Organization/Address: *University of Minnesota*	Telephone: *612-624-3657* Fax:
	E-mail Address: *McDowool@email.umn.edu* Date: *5/17/00*

ERIC