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Abstract
The objective of this study is to examine determinants of tourist satisfaction in Amhara region in order to identify the significant factors which contribute more to tourists’ satisfaction and to come up with possible policy recommendations. Quantitative research approach with explanatory research design was employed. The constructs used in the research were formulated based on the extant literature review which includes destination image, expectation, perceived quality, and perceived value and the dependent construct being tourists’ satisfaction. Purposive sampling technique was applied and a total of 200 qualified questionnaires were used for the data analysis. Structural equation modeling using AMOS 22 was employed for data analysis. Based on the result, destination image is found to be the most important predictor and cause of tourists’ satisfaction through its total effect on the other constructs. Hence recommendation was made to focus on destination image while formulating and implementing tourism policy and strategy.
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1. Introduction
Tourism has become one of the leading industries in the world contributing 10% of global GDP and 6% of the world’s total export (UNWTO, 2015). Such immense contributions help countries to address most of their pressing challenges such as socio economic growth, inclusive development, and environmental preservation. Such pervasive and significant contributions are possible because tourism development affects not only the industry itself but also other sectors such as retail, transportations, and construction (Sadeh et al., 2012). In addition to this, tourism serves as the millions of cross cultural encounters happening every day in different parts of the world. Through such cultural linkage, tourism enhances unity of people in the long run and makes the world impartial place for all to visit and experience.

The growth of tourism relative to other industry is very encouraging which secured 4.4% growth in 2015 and a consecutive average growth of 4% since 2010 (UNWTO, 2015). Through UNWTO promotion of ‘one billion tourists one billion opportunities’, the number of tourists flows has increased and the industry has been transformed to be sustainable. As a result, tourism generated US$7.6 trillion (10% of global GDP) and 277 million jobs (1 in 11 jobs) for the global economy in 2014 (World Travel and Tourism, 2015). Besides, Tourism Towards 2030 predicts that the number of international tourist arrivals worldwide is expected to increase by an average of 3.3% a year over the period 2010 to 2030 while the highest prediction is for Africa in 2030 which is 1.8 billion (UNWTO, 2015).

Despite the increment and bright potential of tourism in Africa, the number remains low in Ethiopia. Although the number of international tourists increased as high as 641,000 in 2013/14,
this number is relatively small when compared to a neighboring country Kenya which is 1,433,000 by the same year (UNWTO, 2015) and far below from Morocco which is 10,046,000 in the same period. Based on this figure, Ethiopia’s share from international tourists’ inflow to Africa is below 1.3%. Thus, to change its 1.3% market share from tourism in Africa, Ethiopia set a vision of becoming one the top five tourist destinations sites in Africa by 2025 and devised workable strategies for increasing the number of both local and international tourists.

2. Statement of the problem

As it is the case for the country, the international tourist inflows in Amhara region is as low as 142,533 despite its huge potential. According to the region’s tourist and parks development office report, the region earned about 55 million dollar in revenue from tourism in 2014/15 from 4,646,076 local and 142,533 international tourists visiting the attractions sites in the region (Amharatours, 2015). Cognizant to this low actual contribution of tourism to the region despite the huge potential, the bureau devised different strategies to increase the number of tourists. One of these strategies is aggressive promotion of the tourism products and arranges the infrastructures such as hotels, tour guides, and other related sectors. However, satisfying the visiting tourists seems to be given less attention. In connection to this, literatures strongly argue that satisfied tourists are more likely to promote the positive experiences to other potential tourists who may not be reached by other promotional strategies. In this context, tourist satisfaction is defined as post consumption evaluations that consumers make when the consumption experience either meets or exceeds expectations (Mohammed et al., 2011). Numerous studies have established causal relationships between satisfaction and other determinant variables (Chen, 2008). Such causal relationships imply that tourist satisfaction is possible through intervention and improvement in those determinant variables. However, researchers do not agree on the exhaustive list of determinants for satisfaction. Hence, the determinants in this research are adapted from the works of (Choi & Qu, 2008; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Chen, 2008; de Rojas & Camarero, 2008) which include; destination image, expectation, perceived quality, and perceived value.

3. Objectives of the study

3.1 General objective:
The general objective of this study is to examine determinants of tourist satisfaction in Amhara region in order to identify the significant factors which contribute more to tourists’ satisfaction and to come up with possible policy recommendations.

3.2 Specific objectives:
The specific objectives of the study are to:
- Examine the factors which significantly contribute to satisfaction
- Measure the direct effect of each of the determinants to tourists’ satisfaction
- Scrutinize the indirect effect of the determinants to tourists’ satisfaction

4. Conceptual framework and Research Hypotheses

Tourist satisfaction is one of the most important concerns of competitive destinations as it considerably influences the tourists choice of a destination, the consumption of products and services and the decision to visit the destination in the future (Bhat & Qadir, 2013). Satisfied tourists tend to communicate their positive experience to others (word of mouth) and they tend to visit the places repeatedly. This implies that, satisfying tourists has not only immediate result of satisfaction (Huh et al., 2006; Bosque and Martin, 2008); it has also tremendous effect on future sustainability. Hence identifying what makes tourists satisfied should be of major issue to the tourism practitioners and researchers (Bosque and Martin, 2008; Chen and Tsai, 2007). However, scholars do not have consensus as to which determinant factors (variables) are more important in determining tourists’ satisfaction. Aliman et al., 2014, for example, argue that perceived value is the mediating variable between tourists’ satisfaction and its determinants such as destination image, tourists’ expectation, and perceived quality. However, they failed to explain
whether there exists any correlation or causation among the determinant variables themselves. Other researchers such as Bhat & Qadir, 2013 tried to see measures of tourists’ satisfaction in terms of the five dimensions of service quality. This approach lacks conceptual clarity and context specific variable in such a way that it lacks to specifically recommend which specific variable determines most and failed to recommend tourism specific strategy and policy as a result. And still other scholars such as Sadeh et al., 2012 propose a complex framework for explaining tourists satisfaction and use such variables as destination image, tourist expectation, perceived value, tourists complaints, and tourists loyalty. In their complex model, they put destination image as the only exogenous variable which determines tourists’ satisfaction directly and through affecting perceived value indirectly. And they went to further propose that tourists’ satisfaction itself is a mediating variable which affects both tourists complain and loyalty. However, this complex model doesn’t include other important determinant variables such as perceived value. Therefore, having examined different tourism literatures, the researchers formulated the following conceptual framework to effectively explain determinants of tourists’ satisfaction.

![Figure 1: The standardized research model](image)

### 4.1 Destination image
The destination image is defined as an individual’s mental representation of the knowledge, feelings, and overall perception of a particular destination. According to Wang (2009), destination image has been frequently proved to have direct effect on tourist behavior that is tourist expectation and perceived value. Hence, in this destination image is expected to have direct effect on tourists’ expectation. Accordingly,

H1: Destination image has a direct and significant effect on tourists’ expectation

### 4.2 Tourist expectation
Tourists’ expectation refers to the image created about a product prior to experience. Furthermore, the expectation of the tourists can be formed based on the image that they have from the destination before the travel. Hence, tourist expectation directly affects both the perceived value and satisfaction (Lee et al., 2007 and Wang, 2009). Hence;

H2: Tourists expectation has a direct and significant effect on perceived value

### 4.3 Perceived Quality:
Perceived value is the value tourist’ expectation of a package of services they will get in and along the destination. Literature argues that perceived quality is formed as a result of destination image (Kvist and Klefsjo, 2008). The package of services which form perceived quality includes the quality of the attraction, accommodation, food, transport, local environment, tourist centers, tour guides, and the like. Hence, it is expected that perceived quality has significant direct effect on perceived value. Hence,

H3: Perceived quality has a direct and significant effect on perceived value

H4: Destination image has a direct significant effect on perceived quality
4.4 Perceived value
Perceived value is defined as the customer’s assessment of the services based on the perceptions of what is received and what is given’ (Zeithaml, 1988). This perception directly influences the satisfaction of the customer. This implies that when tourists perceive that the quality of services given to them is greater than the money paid by them, the satisfaction is created. Hence,
H5: Perceived value has direct and significant effect on tourists’ satisfaction
H6: Destination image has a direct and significant effect on perceived value

4.5 Tourist Satisfaction
Tourist satisfaction is created by the comparison of pre-travel expectations and post-travel experiences (Chen and Chen, 2010; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000). Such a claim argues that when experiences of a tourist compared to the expectation results in feeling of gratification, the satisfaction is created. Therefore, satisfaction is created by the comparison of the customer’s experience before and after consumption.

5. Research Methodology
In order to examine tourist’s satisfaction, the researchers used quantitative research approach with explanatory research design. The data were collected from both local and non local tourists who visited the region. Because there was an infinite and unidentified number of tourists’ in the data collection period, it was impossible to prepare the sampling frame in advance. As a result, the sampling technique was purposive where 245 tourists were asked to fill the standardized questionnaire right after their visits and 200 questionnaires qualified for analysis. Respondents were requested to give a score to the determinants’ of satisfaction and satisfaction constructs systematically using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from very low (1) to very high (5) and very dissatisfied (1) to delighted (5), respectively.

Reliability of the instrument was measured using inter item consistency measures of Cronbach’s alpha. And it was found to be 0.832 which is well above the minimum recommended value of 0.7. And the confirmatory factor analysis was applied using AMOS 22 to test how the hypothesized model fit the data and each of the likert scale items fit their respective construct. Based on the probability values, only the significant observed variables were retained to measure the latent variable while some three items were deleted from all the items presented due to their low or null contribution in measuring the claimed construct.

Finally, the structural equation modeling was employed to test the effect of each of the determinant factors on tourist satisfaction (Wang, 2009; Raajpoot et al., 2010). The regression weights and significance values were calculated and compared under the total effect values. Besides, the total effects of each of the determinant constructs were decomposed into direct and indirect effects to specifically identify how each exogenous construct is important determinant of the subsequent effect constructs directly and indirectly.

6. Data Analysis and Interpretation
6.1 Introduction
The analysis begins with presenting the correlation between variables in the model. The result of the correlation coefficients indicates how strong or weak the relationship is between variables concerned. Then the inferential statistics presents the structural equation modeling results obtained from the Amos 22 outputs. These data describe the casual relations between and among the exogenous variable, mediating variables, and the endogenous variables.

6.2 Correlation Analysis
The correlation results indicate the extent to which each of the constructs relate to one another keeping the causation undecided.
Table 6.1 Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>per.quality</th>
<th>per.value</th>
<th>satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per.quality</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per.value</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the strength of correlation, the correlation between destination image and expectations is the highest (0.64) followed by destination image and perceived quality (0.63). This strength makes sense in that developing strong destination image about the tourist’s attraction package of products help tourists to develop better expectations about the products. The implication is that building good destination image through integrated marketing communication is the essential process in tourism development process. Besides, most tourists decide where to go, what to visit, and how to get there from their homes if the information is available to them. Hence, using a variety of techniques to reach the potential tourists right from their country of origin makes a difference in creating good destination image and thereby influences tourists to make decision in favor of the given place than other places. Still the correlation between destination image and perceived value (0.52) and destination image and satisfaction (0.48) remain considerably high which further strengthens the relevance of destination image.

6.3 Inferential Statistics Results

6.3.1 Introduction

Table 3.2 provides a summary of the key measures of fit for each of the constructs in the model estimated by Maximum Likelihood Estimates. Hair et al. (2010) suggest that researchers should provide a minimum of “one absolute fit index and one incremental fit index and that three to four fit indexes provide adequate evidence of model fit. Furthermore, Kline (1998) also suggests the inclusion of a fit index that adjusts the explained variance for the model’s degree of complexity. Accordingly, this research used five fit indexes, including the suggested incremental fit index (IFI), absolute fit index (GFI), and residual fit index (RMSEA). Besides, the fitness of the model was estimated with Bay’s probability which is a more complex and robust estimator of model fitness. In this regard, it was found to have 0.35 posterior predictive values where the perfect fit has 0.5 values. Hence this model is fit for the analysis.

Table 6.2 :Model goodness fitting test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Goodness Fitting</th>
<th>Recommended Value</th>
<th>The Model value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFI (goodness of fit index)</td>
<td>&gt;0.9</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA (root mean square error residual)</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI (norm fit index)</td>
<td>&gt;0.9</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI (comparative fit index)</td>
<td>&gt;0.9</td>
<td>0.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI (incremental fit index)</td>
<td>&gt;0.9</td>
<td>0.992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesized research model was estimated via Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) by using AMOS 22. The overall fit of the proposed model was quite satisfactory (e.g. RMSEA = 0.09, CFI = 0.991, GFI =0.994, and IFI = 0.992). All values meet the criterion of preferable values, except the RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) which is slightly higher than the recommended value. Therefore, the model is found to be fitted for goodness and hence the analysis was done accordingly.
6.3.2 Maximum Likelihood Estimates

Maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) is by far the most common method and literatures recommend that unless the researcher has good reason, this default should be taken. MLE makes estimates based on maximizing the probability (likelihood) that the observed covariance are drawn from a population assumed to be the same as that reflected in the coefficient estimates. That is, MLE picks estimates which have the greatest chance of reproducing the observed data. In connection to this, the following regression estimates were obtained from our analysis.

![Figure 2: The standardized research model](image)

When the model is expressed in tabular form below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation &lt;--- Destination</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per.quality &lt;--- Destination</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per.value &lt;--- Destination</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per.value &lt;--- Expectation</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per.value &lt;--- per.quality</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction &lt;--- Expectation</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction &lt;--- per.quality</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction &lt;--- per.value</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.3 Hypotheses Test

Before attempting to test the hypotheses, it is better to restate them in line with the outputs of the model. Hence, hypothesis one states that destination image has significant direct effect on tourists’ expectation. Accordingly, the evidence from the diagram and table indicates that the regression coefficient of 0.64 which is strongly significant (p-value 0.000). Hence, hypothesis one is accepted implying that destination image has significant positive direct effect on tourists’ expectation.

Hypothesis two states that tourists’ expectation has a direct and significant effect on perceived value. Accordingly the empirical evidence supports this claim with standardized regression value of 0.33, with p-value of 0.000. Hence, hypothesis two is accepted implying that expectation has direct positive effect on perceived value.
Hypothesis three states that perceived quality has direct significant effect on perceived value. Accordingly, the empirical evidence slightly supports this hypotheses with beta value of 0.22 and with p-value of 0.047 almost 0.05 which is equivalent to the level of significance applied for the test. The result supports just marginal significance implying that perceived quality has direct significant value on perceived value.

The fourth hypothesis states that destination image has a direct and significant effect on perceived quality. Thus, the empirical evidence supports this claim with standardized beta value of 0.42 and p-value of 0.000. Hence, hypothesis four is accepted implying that destination image has a direct and significant effect on perceived quality. The fifth hypothesis states that perceived value has significant direct effect on tourists’ satisfaction. Accordingly, the empirical evidence supports this claim with standardized beta value of 0.23 and p-value of 0.000. Hence, hypothesis five is accepted implying that perceived value has a direct significant effect on tourists’ satisfaction. Finally, hypothesis sixth states that destination image has a direct and significant effect on perceived value. It is supported by beta value of 0.22 and p-value of 0.007 implying that destination image has a direct and significant effect on perceived value.

Generally, the empirical evidences provided strong supports for the research hypotheses, except for the third hypothesis, and all the research hypotheses are accepted. Hence the hypotheses testing result is found to be statistically significant and all the six alternative hypotheses are accepted.

6.4 Discussion
Expectations about tourists’ future experience have strong positive effects on satisfaction directly and indirectly through affecting perceived value. But expectation itself is also caused by destination image. Hence, it is one of the mediating construct for the model in this study. Theoretically, satisfaction is the difference between expectation and actual performance. Furthermore, expectation about good experience would help tourists decide to visit a certain destination. Hence, more expectation may increase the likelihood of potential tourists to decide in favor of visit. On the other hand, more expectation needs even more actual performance to be offset in order for satisfaction to happen. Hence, there must be an optimal level of arousing expectations for the practical and reasonable level of satisfaction.

Similarly, perceived value is the mediating construct in the model. It is caused by perceived quality, destination image, and expectation. All of its causing constructs have significant positive effect on it. However, its effect on tourists’ satisfaction is expected to be higher than its actual value, which is 0.225. The possible explanation for having lower than expected value may be that perceived value can affect some other variable than satisfaction though it is out of the scope of the current study to clearly identify which specific variable that may be.

The model seems complex whereby each construct is estimated to have effect on the subsequent result constructs. Furthermore, the effect of a construct, say, destination image has direct effect to perceived quality, perceived value, and expectation. However, destination image has also indirect effect on perceived value through its effect on perceived quality and expectation. Hence, it is better to break the total effect of the constructs presented in the previous diagram in to direct and indirect effect to clearly indicate how well each construct is causing or caused directly and/or indirectly by its predicting construct.
As it is well depicted in the model, there exists only one exogenous construct (destination image) which has a strong positive effect on the immediate endogenous (mediating constructs) of perceived quality, perceived value, and expectation. This makes sense that developing strong destination image enables tourists to develop positive expectation about the likelihood of their experiences in their contemplated destination. And strong destination image can cause individuals’ perceived quality since it is the only evidence they have before travel. Similarly, destination image enables tourists to estimate the likelihood of the values they expect to obtain and in return to their pay for the destination. Furthermore, the payment is better measured in economic cost than in mere birr payment for the travel.

Table 6.4: Standardized Direct Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>per.quality</th>
<th>per.value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per. value</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The zero values in the above table indicate that given the model presented, there are no direct effects of the respective constructs on the other constructs because there is no direct arrow joining them. However, it does not guarantee whether there is no theoretical or empirical evidence supporting such claim. Accordingly, the direct effect of destination image on satisfaction is assumed to be null logically and even in the model. This is because satisfaction is the result of comparative values of expectation and actual performance. Hence, destination image has to do with forming expectation in tourists mind than directly affecting satisfaction. However, as it is presented in the total effect model, destination image has positive and significant effect on expectation and perceived quality with 0.643 and 0.421 (p-value 0.000 of both) respectively.

The indirect effects of constructs refer to construct’s effect on other construct through affecting another construct called mediating construct. As it is presented in the following table, destination image has indirect effect on perceived quality through affecting expectation. The indirect effect of destination image on satisfaction is positive and significant, which is 0.483 and p-value of 0.000. Besides, as it can be imagined, if there is strong direct effect of a given construct on mediating constructs, the probability of its indirect effect of the construct which is directly caused by that given mediating construct is higher. By and large, it is empirically shown that destination image has strong positive effect on all of the three mediating constructs. And those mediating constructs have strong and significant effect on satisfaction. Accordingly, the indirect effect of destination image on satisfaction is also strong.

Table 6.5: Standardized Indirect Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>per.quality</th>
<th>per.value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per. quality</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per. value</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indirect effect of destination image on perceived value is also strong and significant, which is 0.305 (p-value 0.000). Similarly, the indirect effect of expectation is significant, which is 0.178 (p-value 0.012). It was presented in the direct effect table that expectation has strong and significant direct effect on satisfaction. Hence, getting such dual effect may imply that expectation is very significant construct to focus on and any attempt to improve tourists’
satisfaction should focus on improving expectations. However, the indirect effect of perceived quality on satisfaction and expectation on perceived value are insignificant with values of 0.034 and 0.05 respectively.

7. Implication and Limitation of the research

7.1 Implication of the research

It was assumed in the conceptual framework and supported by extant literatures that the most determinants of tourists’ satisfaction are the destination image, tourists’ expectation, perceived value, and perceived quality. And each of these constructs are hypothesized and empirically evidenced by previous researchers that these constructs are categorized in to exogenous construct (destination image) and mediation constructs such as expectation, perceived value, and perceived quality, and endogenous construct or effect construct called tourists’ satisfaction. In connection to this, destination image is singled out to be the only exogenous variable in the model because all of the other constructs are influenced by it directly or indirectly.

Accordingly, the managerial implication out of such relation can be stated as destination image is the most important construct of all the constructs in tourists’ satisfaction. Hence, the destination image must be at the heart of any tourism strategy development and implementation. Creation of distinct image on the potential tourists’ mind deserves huge investment as its expected effect is assumed to be higher. Furthermore, how destination image is created deserves another research. However, destination image can be effectively created and communicated through integrated communication tools such as advertisements, publicity, personal selling, and sales promotion. The application of social media and social networks are also of great help in creating and enhancing destination images.

8. Limitation of the research

The study used purposive sampling simply because the sampling frame could not be obtained prior to the data collection. However, had probability sampling been applied to select respondents, the generalizability and transferability of the findings to other settings and to the country in general could have been better and robust. Hence, the selected samples may not be representative. The second limitation of the study is attributed to the small sample size. As it is presented in the methodology part, only 200 qualified questionnaires were used for data analysis. Although this number is fairly large to meet the central limit theorem of normality, it may not be sufficient since the region studied is very wide with a number of tourists’ visiting throughout the year. Therefore, more samples could have enhanced the representativeness of the respondents.
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