

Do Tourists and Non-Tourists Differ? A Comparative Analysis of Guest Satisfaction at Casual Dining Outlets in Himachal Pradesh through an Expectation-Disconfirmation Lens

Vishal Kaushal¹, Muskan Chauhan²

¹Senior Research Fellow, Department of Commerce, Himachal Pradesh University Shimla.

²Research Fellow, School of Management, Maharaja Agrasen University, Atal shiksha kunj, kalujhanda, Barotiwala

Abstract:

Purpose. Casual dining outlets in tourism destinations serve two structurally different guest segments—travelling tourists and resident non-tourists—yet most satisfaction studies pool them. This paper isolates and compares the satisfaction of tourists and non-tourists at casual dining outlets in Himachal Pradesh, India, and interprets the difference through the expectation-disconfirmation paradigm.

Design/methodology/approach. Primary data were collected from 500 guests (300 tourists and 200 non-tourists) selected by simple random sampling and measured on the validated 30-item Guest Perception and Satisfaction Measurement Scale (GPSMS; Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.913$). Independent-samples t-tests compared the two segments on four evaluative domains—services, cuisines, overall satisfaction, and the impact of food and services—and on the composite measure.

Findings. Non-tourists were significantly more satisfied than tourists on every domain and overall (all $p < 0.01$). Non-tourist means clustered near 23.6 ('high' band) while tourist means clustered near 20.1 ('average' band), a consistent difference of roughly 3.5 scale points and a large effect. The null hypothesis of no difference (H_0) was rejected.

Originality/value. The study provides rare Indian evidence that resident and tourist guests evaluate the same casual dining offer differently, and it explains the direction of the gap—counter-intuitively, the destination's marquee segment is the less satisfied one—through calibrated expectations. It draws out the segmentation implications for restaurateurs and destination managers.

Keywords: tourist vs non-tourist; guest satisfaction; expectation-disconfirmation; casual dining; market segmentation; culinary tourism; Himachal Pradesh.

1. Introduction

A casual dining outlet in a tourism destination is, in effect, two businesses sharing one dining room. It serves tourists—transient guests who arrive with heightened, often novelty-driven expectations formed by promotional imagery and unfamiliarity with the local offer—and it serves non-tourists, the resident and near-resident guests whose expectations are calibrated by repeated exposure. Whether these two segments derive equivalent satisfaction from the same food and service is a question with direct strategic consequences: destinations invest heavily to satisfy tourists, whose spending and word-of-mouth shape destination reputation, yet the operational reality of many outlets is dominated by resident patronage.

Despite the practical importance of the question, most restaurant-satisfaction research pools all customers into a single sample, obscuring segment differences. The comparative studies that do exist are largely set in developed economies—Wickey (2013) contrasted tourist and non-tourist satisfaction in Florida; Seyanont (2007) compared Thai and international customers in Phuket—and Wickey explicitly flagged the scope for equivalent research in developing economies such as India, where casual dining is gaining social status. The present study answers that call in the context of Himachal Pradesh, an Indian Himalayan state that received approximately 1.60 crore tourist arrivals in 2023 (Government of Himachal Pradesh, 2024) and is actively developing food and culinary tourism around its local cuisines and dining establishments.

The study's objective is to conduct a comparative analysis of the satisfaction levels of tourists and non-tourists at selected casual dining outlets in Himachal Pradesh. Its null hypothesis is:

1. **H05:** There is no significant difference between the satisfaction levels of tourists and non-tourists towards the selected casual dining food outlets in Himachal Pradesh.

Sub-hypotheses test the same difference on each of the four evaluative domains—services, cuisines, overall satisfaction, and the impact of food and services on satisfaction—so that any aggregate difference can be located within specific facets of the experience.

The paper's contribution is threefold. Empirically, it supplies rare Indian evidence, from a mature Himalayan tourism economy, on how travelling and resident guests differ in their satisfaction with casual dining. Theoretically, it interprets that difference through the reference-dependence logic of expectation-disconfirmation theory and its cognate accounts, treating the tourist/non-tourist contrast as a natural test of the prediction that calibrated expectations yield higher satisfaction. Practically, it draws out why the direction of the gap—residents more satisfied than tourists—should reshape how outlets and destinations allocate their service and marketing effort. The paper proceeds through a review of the relevant theory and comparative evidence, a description of the method, the comparative results, and a discussion of their interpretation, limitations, and implications.

2. Review of Literature

2.1 The expectation-disconfirmation paradigm

Oliver's (1980) expectation-disconfirmation theory (EDT) holds that satisfaction is a function not of absolute performance but of the discrepancy between prior expectations and perceived performance. A guest who expects little and receives adequate service experiences positive disconfirmation and is

satisfied; a guest who expects a great deal and receives the same adequate service experiences negative disconfirmation and is less satisfied. EDT therefore predicts that, holding actual performance constant, segments with lower or better-calibrated expectations will report higher satisfaction. This prediction is central to interpreting any tourist/non-tourist comparison, because the two segments differ systematically in the expectations they bring to the outlet.

EDT is the best known of a family of comparison-based satisfaction theories, and the alternatives sharpen its predictions. Assimilation theory, derived from Festinger's cognitive-dissonance work, argues that consumers reduce the discomfort of an expectation–performance gap by shifting their perception of performance toward their expectation, so that experience is partly assimilated to what was anticipated. Contrast theory predicts the reverse—consumers exaggerate the gap, so that a disappointment is felt more acutely and a pleasant surprise more intensely than the objective difference warrants. Assimilation-contrast theory (Anderson) integrates the two by proposing a 'latitude of acceptance': discrepancies small enough to fall within it are assimilated, while larger discrepancies fall into a 'latitude of rejection' and are contrasted. Negativity theory holds that any departure from a firmly held expectation produces negative arousal, and adaptation-level theory observes that the reference standard itself is not fixed but adapts to accumulated experience. Equity theory reframes the comparison in terms of fairness—whether the guest's outcomes are proportionate to inputs relative to the provider and to other guests. What unites these accounts is the premise that satisfaction is reference-dependent: the same meal can satisfy one guest and disappoint another because they judge it against different standards. This is exactly the condition that separates tourists from residents.

2.1.1 Why tourist and resident reference standards diverge

Tourism is, by definition, a departure from routine, and travellers approach it with heightened anticipation. The novelty of an unfamiliar destination, the 'special occasion' framing of a holiday, and the aspirational imagery of destination marketing all tend to inflate tourists' reference standards for every component of the trip, including food. Residents and near-resident non-tourists, by contrast, form their standards from repeated, ordinary exposure to the local dining scene; their expectations are concrete, price-anchored, and realistic. Adaptation-level theory predicts precisely this: the resident's reference point has adapted to the actual local offer, whereas the tourist's has been set, in part, by imagination and promotion. Holding the outlet constant, EDT then implies that residents will experience more positive disconfirmation—and hence greater satisfaction—than tourists. The empirical question this study addresses is whether that theoretical prediction holds in the casual dining outlets of an Indian tourism destination, and how large the resulting satisfaction gap is.

2.2 Expectations of tourists versus residents

A body of hospitality research documents that first-time and infrequent visitors form expectations from external cues—advertising, brand image, guidebooks, and the general anticipation that surrounds travel—whereas repeat and resident customers form expectations from direct experience (Kivela, Inbakaran, & Reece, 1999). Novelty and the elevated 'special occasion' framing of a trip tend to raise tourists' reference standards, while familiarity moderates residents' standards toward the realistically attainable. Perceived

value and price sensitivity (Zeithaml, 1988; Ryu & Han, 2010) further differentiate the segments, as residents typically possess sharper reference prices for local food. EDT thus leads to a directional expectation: at a given outlet, residents (non-tourists) should tend to report higher satisfaction than tourists.

2.3 Food as a travel motive: the culinary tourist

The tourist segment is not homogeneous, and food occupies a growing place in travel motivation. Culinary or gastronomic tourism—travel in which experiencing local food and drink is a primary or significant purpose—has become a recognised niche, and destinations increasingly market regional cuisine as a distinctive attraction. For the culinary tourist, the casual dining outlet is not merely a place to refuel but a venue of the destination experience itself, which raises both the salience of the meal and the standard against which it is judged. This intensifies the reference-standard divergence described above: a tourist who has travelled partly for the food arrives with especially elaborated expectations of authenticity, distinctiveness, and quality, and is correspondingly harder to satisfy than a resident for whom the same dishes are everyday fare. The heterogeneity of tourist motives—leisure explorers, business travellers, and dedicated food lovers among them—means that the tourist/non-tourist comparison captures an average over segments whose expectations themselves vary, a point returned to in the discussion.

2.4 Comparative studies of dining segments

Empirical comparisons bear out the general premise that segments evaluate the same offer differently. Seyanont (2007) found divergent service-quality perceptions between Thai and international customers of casual dining restaurants in Phuket. Dziadkowiec and Rood (2015) reported statistically significant cross-cultural differences in casual-dining preferences between Polish and American respondents. Wickey (2013) compared tourist and non-tourist satisfaction across eight dimensions of the casual dining experience in Florida, establishing the tourist/non-tourist comparison as a meaningful axis of analysis while noting the developing-economy research gap. Yoon and Jung (2011) demonstrated that affective responses mediate satisfaction in casual dining, underscoring that segment differences may operate through emotion as well as cognition; and related work on food and food-serving quality (Namkung & Jang, 2007; Ponnampalnam & Balaji, 2014) and on perceived value (Ryu et al., 2008; Zeithaml, 1988) supplies the attribute space over which such comparisons are drawn. What remains scarce is direct Indian evidence comparing travelling and resident guests at casual dining outlets—the contribution of this study.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Design, sample, and instrument

The study is exploratory–descriptive and was executed through the normative survey method. A sample of 500 guests—300 tourists and 200 non-tourists—was drawn by simple random sampling from guests of selected casual dining outlets in Himachal Pradesh (600 questionnaires were distributed and 500 fully completed instruments retained). Satisfaction was measured on the Guest Perception and Satisfaction Measurement Scale (GPSMS), a 30-item, five-point instrument with established content and face validity

and high internal-consistency reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.913$). Each of the four evaluative domains is scored on six items (range 6–30), and the composite pools the domains.

The study area, Himachal Pradesh and specifically its capital Shimla, was chosen because it presents the tourist/non-tourist duality in a pronounced form: a long-established hill destination with heavy and seasonal tourist inflows layered over a substantial resident and regional-visitor population, and a dense concentration of casual dining outlets serving both. This makes it a natural setting in which to observe how the two segments evaluate a common offer. The 300:200 tourist-to-non-tourist ratio reflects the researcher's aim of adequately powering both group estimates while approximating the guest mix at the sampled outlets. Guests were approached at outlets during ordinary trading, and the same instrument, administration mode, and scoring were applied to both segments, so that any measured difference is attributable to the guests rather than to differences in how they were surveyed.

3.2 Analysis

Independent-samples t-tests compared the tourist and non-tourist means on each domain and on the composite measure. Because both groups were scored on the same six-item metric, the mean difference is directly interpretable as the satisfaction gap between segments. Domain means were additionally classified using the study's four-band rubric (10–15 = low; 16–20 = average; 21–25 = high; 26–30 = very high). The independent-samples t-test is the appropriate procedure here because the two groups are distinct and unrelated, the dependent measure is a continuous summated score, and the design compares exactly two group means; the approximate symmetry of the score distribution and the substantial group sizes ($n = 300$ and $n = 200$) support the test's assumptions. Unlike the one-sample tests used to gauge absolute satisfaction against an ideal, the between-groups comparison is not mechanically biased toward significance, so both the significance and the magnitude of any difference are informative.

4. Results

On every domain, non-tourists reported significantly higher satisfaction than tourists ($p < 0.01$). Table 1 presents the domain-level comparisons. The services gap was 3.50 points (tourists 20.06 vs non-tourists 23.56; $t = 26.71$); the cuisines gap 3.56 points (20.07 vs 23.64; $t = 27.09$); the overall-satisfaction gap 3.52 points (20.06 vs 23.58; $t = 26.76$); and the food/service-impact gap 3.51 points (20.05 vs 23.56; $t = 26.60$). In each case the tourist mean falls in the 'average' band (16–20) and the non-tourist mean in the 'high' band (21–25).

Table 1. Independent-samples t-tests comparing tourists and non-tourists by domain

Domain	Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean diff.	t	p
Services	Tourists	300	20.06	1.557	3.500	26.71	0.000**
Services	Non-tourists	200	23.56	1.230			
Cuisines	Tourists	300	20.07	1.557	3.560	27.09	0.000**
Cuisines	Non-tourists	200	23.64	1.245			

Domain	Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean diff.	t	p
Overall satisfaction	Tourists	300	20.06	1.557	3.520	26.76	0.000**
Overall satisfaction	Non-tourists	200	23.58	1.246			
Impact of food & service	Tourists	300	20.05	1.570	3.507	26.60	0.000**
Impact of food & service	Non-tourists	200	23.56	1.230			

**** Significant at the 0.01 level. Source: primary data.**

The domain-by-domain pattern is worth reading closely, because its uniformity is itself a finding. On services, non-tourists' more favourable view (23.56 vs 20.06) is consistent with residents' familiarity with local service norms and their calibrated expectations of staff conduct and procedure. On cuisines, the gap is largest in absolute terms (3.56 points), which is intelligible given that food is the attribute most heavily loaded with tourists' authenticity expectations and residents' everyday familiarity; the same regional dishes that a tourist judges against an idealised standard are, for a resident, simply good local food. On overall satisfaction and on the food/service impact, the gaps (3.52 and 3.51) reproduce the same structure. That the difference neither concentrates in a single domain nor varies materially across domains indicates a pervasive, standard-level difference between the segments rather than dissatisfaction with any particular attribute—precisely what reference-dependence theories predict when two groups apply different reference points to the same offer.

4.1 Composite comparison and hypothesis decision

On the composite satisfaction measure, tourists scored 20.06 (SD = 1.557) and non-tourists 23.55 (SD = 1.235), a difference of 3.49 points that was highly significant ($t = 26.60$, $p < 0.01$). The null hypothesis H_{05} —that there is no difference between the satisfaction of tourists and non-tourists—was therefore rejected. The consistency of the result is notable: across four domains and the composite, the gap varies only between 3.49 and 3.56 points and every t-statistic lies between 26.6 and 27.1, indicating a stable, uniformly large segment difference rather than a difference confined to one facet of the experience.

Table 2. Composite (overall) comparison of tourist and non-tourist satisfaction

Group	N	Mean	SD	Band	Mean diff.	t	p
Tourists	300	20.06	1.557	Average	3.49	26.60	0.000**
Non-tourists	200	23.55	1.235	High			

5. Discussion

The central finding is unambiguous and, on its face, counter-intuitive: at the same casual dining outlets, resident non-tourists are consistently and significantly more satisfied than travelling tourists. Because both segments experienced the outlets on a common metric, the difference cannot be attributed to different outlets; it reflects a difference in how the two segments evaluate a comparable offer.

Expectation-disconfirmation theory provides the most parsimonious explanation (Oliver, 1980). Non-tourists, familiar with the local casual dining scene, hold calibrated and comparatively modest expectations that outlets readily meet or exceed, producing positive disconfirmation and high satisfaction; they are also, as the instrument's own items suggest, more compromising and more easily satisfied. Tourists, by contrast, arrive with elevated expectations amplified by the novelty and 'special occasion' framing of travel and by promotional imagery, so that the same performance yields smaller positive—or even negative—disconfirmation and lower satisfaction. The direction of the gap is thus not evidence that outlets serve tourists worse, but that tourists judge them against a higher reference standard.

This interpretation carries a pointed strategic implication. The aggregate 'high satisfaction' verdict that emerges when segments are pooled is buoyed by the resident majority's generosity and masks a more modest, 'average'-band experience among tourists—the very segment whose satisfaction most shapes destination reputation, repeat visitation, and word-of-mouth. A destination that reads only the pooled figure risks complacency about a tourist experience that is, in fact, its weaker performance.

The magnitude of the gap deserves emphasis, not only its direction. A difference of roughly 3.5 points on a 6–30 domain scale corresponds to about one full band of the interpretation rubric—enough to move tourists from 'average' to the non-tourists' 'high'. Relative to the within-group standard deviations (around 1.2–1.6 points), the between-group difference is more than twice the typical spread of scores within either group, which is a large effect by any conventional standard and is reflected in the very high t-statistics. The segment difference is therefore not a statistical curiosity inflated by large samples; it is a substantial, practically meaningful divergence in experienced satisfaction.

The result also connects to loyalty and behavioural outcomes. Satisfaction is a principal antecedent of revisit intention and positive word-of-mouth, and the two segments differ in how those outcomes matter to a destination. Non-tourists, already highly satisfied, represent a loyal base whose repeat patronage sustains outlets across seasons; tourists, less satisfied and unlikely to return soon, influence the destination chiefly through the reputation and recommendations they carry home. A satisfaction gap concentrated in the tourist segment thus threatens precisely the word-of-mouth channel on which destination growth depends—an outcome that the pooled statistic conceals and that this disaggregated analysis brings to light. Two cautions temper the conclusions. First, the study measures satisfaction but not expectations directly; the EDT explanation, though well supported by theory and by the pattern of results, is inferential rather than tested, since expectation scores were not separately elicited. Second, the segments may differ on characteristics other than tourist status—income, age, visit frequency, dining occasion, or cultural background—that were not controlled and could contribute to the gap. Establishing that expectation calibration, rather than a confound, drives the difference requires designs that measure expectations and adjust for demographics.

A third consideration is the internal heterogeneity of the tourist segment. Tourists range from leisure explorers and business travellers to dedicated culinary tourists, and these sub-segments plausibly hold different expectations of the dining experience—the food lover's standard being the most exacting. The reported tourist mean is therefore an average across a more variable population, and the true satisfaction gap may be wider for some tourist sub-segments than the aggregate suggests. Disaggregating the tourist segment by travel motive is a natural extension of this work. Relatedly, the study captures satisfaction at a single point during what is, for tourists, an unusual and elevated occasion; whether the same guests would judge the outlet differently in a routine context cannot be determined from cross-sectional data.

5.1 Relation to prior evidence

The finding is consistent with, and extends, the small comparative literature. Wickey (2013) established the tourist/non-tourist comparison as a meaningful axis in a US setting and identified satisfaction-score differences between the segments; Seyanont (2007) and Dziadkowiec and Rood (2015) documented that customer origin and culture shape restaurant evaluations. The present study contributes what that literature identified as missing—direct evidence from a developing-economy, Indian tourism destination—and adds a clear directional result with a well-specified theoretical mechanism. It also demonstrates that the difference is stable across every facet of the experience rather than confined to service or to food, strengthening the case that a general reference-standard difference, rather than a specific attribute deficiency, is at work. In doing so, the study treats the tourist/non-tourist contrast not merely as a marketing segmentation but as a natural experiment on expectation-disconfirmation theory, in which two groups experience a common offer against systematically different standards and respond as the theory predicts.

6. Implications and Recommendations

6.1 A segmented service strategy

The results argue against a single, undifferentiated service strategy. Because tourists apply a higher reference standard, outlets seeking to raise tourist satisfaction should manage expectations as actively as they manage performance. Accurate menu descriptions and imagery, transparent pricing, and clear signalling of what a dish is and is not can align tourists' anticipations with the delivered experience, narrowing the disconfirmation gap without any change in the food itself. Staff prepared to interpret regional dishes for unfamiliar guests—explaining ingredients, heat levels, and how a dish is traditionally eaten—convert uncertainty into a curated experience. Showcasing authentic local cuisine, which culinary tourists specifically seek, turns novelty from a liability (inflated, vague expectations) into a satisfier (a distinctive, memorable meal that meets a concrete promise of authenticity).

6.2 Protecting the resident base

For resident non-tourists, already highly satisfied, the strategic priority shifts from raising satisfaction to converting it into durable loyalty. Recognition of regulars, targeted discounts, consistency of quality across visits, and responsiveness to feedback will protect the base whose repeat patronage sustains outlets

through the troughs between tourist peaks. Because residents' satisfaction is anchored in realistic expectations, the chief risk to it is inconsistency—an off day that violates a well-formed standard—so operational reliability matters more for this segment than novelty or spectacle.

6.3 Destination management and policy

For destination managers and tourism authorities in Himachal Pradesh, the finding that tourists are the less-satisfied segment is a call to embed casual dining quality within destination management rather than leaving it to individual outlets. Benchmarking of outlet quality, capability building and training for restaurant staff and managers (echoing Rivera and Murphy's, 2008, emphasis on managerial competencies), hygiene and quality standards, and the coordinated promotion of authentic culinary experiences would help ensure that the food component of the destination product matches the expectations that destination marketing itself creates. Because tourists' satisfaction is transmitted onward through word-of-mouth and online reviews, closing the tourist satisfaction gap is not only a matter of individual guest experience but an investment in the destination's reputation and future demand.

7. Conclusion, Limitations, and Future Research

Comparing 300 tourists and 200 non-tourists on a validated instrument, this study found a stable, statistically significant, and practically large difference in satisfaction at casual dining outlets in Himachal Pradesh: non-tourists are more satisfied than tourists across services, cuisines, overall experience, and the food/service impact on satisfaction. The pattern is consistent with expectation-disconfirmation theory, whereby residents' calibrated expectations are more readily met than tourists' elevated ones.

The study's limitations point to a clear research agenda. Expectations were inferred rather than measured, so future work should elicit expectation and performance scores separately to test the disconfirmation mechanism directly. Demographic and trip-related covariates should be modelled to rule out confounding, and the tourist segment should be disaggregated by travel motive to expose sub-segment differences that the aggregate conceals. The cross-sectional, single-state, single-format scope limits generalisation; multi-region, multi-format, and longitudinal replications would establish boundary conditions. Finally, linking the segment satisfaction gap to downstream outcomes—revisit intention, spending, and word-of-mouth—would quantify what the gap costs a destination and sharpen the case for tourist-focused quality intervention.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the study delivers a clear and actionable message. In the casual dining outlets of a major Indian tourism destination, satisfaction is not uniform across guests: residents, judging against realistic expectations, are well satisfied, while tourists, judging against the elevated expectations that travel and marketing create, are satisfied only to an average degree. The aggregate contentment that a pooled analysis reports is real but partial, and it is the destination's most reputationally important guests who sit on its weaker side. Recognising this asymmetry—and managing tourists' expectations as deliberately as their experience—is the practical key to raising satisfaction where it matters most for the destination's future.

REFERENCES:

1. Dziadkowiec, J., & Rood, A. S. (2015). Casual-dining restaurant preferences: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 18(1), 73–91.
2. Government of Himachal Pradesh, Department of Tourism and Civil Aviation. (2024). Estimate of domestic and foreign tourist arrivals in Himachal Pradesh. Shimla: Author.
3. Kivela, J., Inbakaran, R., & Reece, J. (1999). Consumer research in the restaurant environment, part 1: A conceptual model of dining satisfaction and return patronage. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(5), 205–222.
4. Namkung, Y., & Jang, S. (2007). Does food quality really matter in restaurants? Its impact on customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 31(3), 387–409.
5. Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 460–469.
6. Ponnampalani, A., & Balaji, M. S. (2014). Matching visitation-motives and restaurant attributes in casual dining restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 37, 47–57.
7. Ryu, K., & Han, H. (2010). Influence of the quality of food, service, and physical environment on customer satisfaction and behavioral intention in quick-casual restaurants: Moderating role of perceived price. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 34(3), 310–329.
8. Ryu, K., Han, H., & Kim, T.-H. (2008). The relationships among overall quick-casual restaurant image, perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27(3), 459–469.
9. Seyanont, A. (2007). A comparative study of the service quality of casual dining restaurants in Phuket: Perspective of Thai and international customers (Doctoral dissertation). Oklahoma State University.
10. Wickey, J. (2013). Guest satisfaction analysis of a casual dining restaurant: A comparison of tourist vs. non-tourist satisfaction scores (Master's thesis). University of Central Florida.
11. Yoon, S., & Jung, H. (2011). The effect of the physical attractiveness of employees on customer emotional response and satisfaction in casual dining restaurants. [Journal of hospitality research].
12. Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2–22.