Environmental Views and Practices in Tourism Industry: A Study on Travel Agency Managers

Nazmiye Erdoğan
Başkent University
Vocational School of Social Sciences, Ankara, Turkey
nerdogan@baskent.edu.tr

Abstract

This study was designed to explore travel agents' environmental views on 45 environmental items and study the basic nature of the travel agencies in Turkey. Data were collected from the representative sample of 1665 travel agents (33.5 % of population) in Turkey. It was found that travel agents have pro-environmental views on the factors causing environmental problems, the contribution of tourism enterprises to environmental problems, the importance given to environmental management criteria and the obstacles to environmental protection in tourism sector. However, their environmental practices showed that there is a great gap between the views and practices, because nearly all agencies do not have any environmental program, budget allocated for environmental protection, membership to any environmental NGOs, and award for any environmental management activity. It was concluded that travel agency managers are in need of reflecting their views to their administrative plans, programs, policies and daily business practices in sustainable ways.

Keywords: Travel agents, sustainable tourism, environmental views, environmental management.

Introduction

People create and sustain certain human and environmental conditions in their daily production, distribution and consumption practices. The perceptions, opinions, beliefs, attitudes and work practices of the travel agents make important negative and positive contributions to the formation, continuation and development of such conditions. Hence, understanding the managerial views about environmental issues is important for understanding the nature of hospitality and travel agency administration and environmental management.

Tourism is the largest and fastest growing industry in the world. The growth and diversification of tourism and hospitality markets have also resulted in an expansion of travel agencies in terms of increasing number of agencies and types of services they provide. Travel agencies, as business organizations all over the world, embody the portion of travel industry that (a) provides marketing services for travel, tourism and

hospitality industries, (b) build relations between the product (industry) and consumer (tourists); (c) provide the distribution service as intermediaries. These agencies are grouped under two categories: (1) Service providers and (2) intermediating agents. The first group is the wholesaler tour operators. The second group is the retailers. However, the role of travel agencies in many countries has changed from the traditional reservations job to offering travel and promotion packages for clients, and advice and consultancy services for corporations (Alamdari, 2002; Tsai, Huang and Lin, 2005). The travel agencies and tour operating business are diverse, and the way in which they manage suppliers, depends on the size of the business, destination, type of product, and the market it appeals to. These factors also influence associated sustainability practices.

The tourism and hospitality administration also calls for sustainable environmental management which is dependent on the effective co-operation among all the stakeholders including suppliers, intermediaries, public sector, private sector, tourists and NGOs. The environmental management as integrated part of the travel, tourism and hospitality administration encompasses the organizational structure, the responsibilities, policies, practices, procedures and resources meant to achieve and maintain a specific environmental behavior/practice that can reduce the impact caused by daily operations of establishments on the natural environment (Bohdanowicz, 2005; Welford and Ytterhus, 2004). In this respect, travel agents and tour operators are expected to play a significant role in the sustainability of the tourism and hospitality sectors, because they occupy crucial positions in this process, acting as information brokers between tourists and tourist destinations, and their perceptions, attitudes and attitudes about environment and destinations play important role in shaping their daily practices. They are the central link in the distribution/supply chain of the packaged holiday, since they make the connection between the service providers and tourists, despite the new developments like massive disintermediation resulting from hotels taking advantage of the internet to sell hotel rooms directly to travelers (Alvarez et al., 2007; Carroll and Siguaw, 2003; Tse, 2003). They influence business operations such as facilities, operational management and strategies, including pricing, product policies and promotional activities (Buhalis, 2000; Medina-Munoz et al., 2003). As Trivun, Kenjic, and Mahmutcehajic pointed out (2008, p. 175) they "create final product to be offered to market, transforming attractions and services into products with tailored personality. Specialization in this field of travel has changed the structure of travel industry and hospitality". All these issues, in addition to aggressive competition and prevailing policies, create the basis for attributing to them many of the undesirable impacts of tourism development. They are frequently considered responsible for the intensive and most often uneven development of tourism and threat to sustainability (Bastakis, Buhalis, and Butler, 2004; Budeanu, 2005; Klemm and Parkinson, 2001). However, they think/claim that they are not ones which cause conspicuous large-scale damage to the environment (Miller, 2001; Tapper, 2001). Probably due to such self-perceptions and profit maximization motives, they have been fairly slow to respond to the need for environmental management. Meantime, impacts of travel agents and tour operators on the environment are often the main topic of long debates (Curtin and Wilkes, 2005; Jackson, 2007; Kasim, 2007; Klemm and Parkinson, 2001). Particularly when linked to sustainable tourism development, there has been an increasing demand for managerial policies and daily practices to be assessed for environmental consequences (Claver-Cortes and et al., 2007).

Numerous studies have dealt with the impacts of travel, tourism and hospitality development on environmental quality, including effects related to diminished biodiversity, erosion, pollution, and degradation of water and other natural resources, and human health (Erdogan, 2009; Kasim, 2007). It is also recognized that the important steps towards environmental action require proper managerial ideas, opinions, perceptions, attitudes, view, and formal adoption of a written policy and daily practices based on sustainability. A great deal of studies has been devoted to the assessment of environmental attitudes, perceptions and views (Bohdanowicz, 2006). Despite the mounting studies, there is a continuing need for research on the agency side of the issue.

Furthermore, environmental views and attitudes have been widely assumed to affect the nature of decisions and relations and consequently affect the natural and human environment (Baloglu and Mangaloglu, 2001). While numerous research results have provided support for the existence of relationship between environmental views/attitudes and prevailing practices (Weaver and Lawton 2004), others have come up with different results (Bamberg, 2003). However, it is generally accepted that those who engage in environmental action tend to possess environmental knowledge, awareness, concern and proper views and attitudes, but these factors themselves do not always lead to appropriate environmental actions (Olli, Grendstad, and Wollebaek, 2001; Pelletier and et al., 2006), because there are situational and personal variables that affect this relationship (Bamberg, 2003; Iwata, 2004).

Development in travel, tourism and hospitality sectors has always been considered as an academic and public issue under discussion in many countries, including Turkey, because Turkey has rich natural, historical and cultural resources for tourism and ecotourism activities that are steadily increasing in number and scope. Demand for mass tourism and nature-based tourism has increased in recent years (Erdogan, 2003). Although studies about tourism and hospitality are steadily growing in number in the world, yet, studies about the agencies and managers are rather new and limited in quantity and quality in the nonwestern world, including Turkey. That is why there are important issues to be studied concerning the service providers. The present article was designed to (a) explore the general nature of organizational structure and activities of travel agencies in Turkey and (b) study the managerial views on environmental issues, and (c) finally to provide discussions based on the findings and accumulated knowledge.

Method

Population and Sample

Study population included the group A and C agencies. Group B agencies legally cannot organize travel and tourism activities, thus, these agencies were excluded from the population. TURSAB's list of travel agencies in 2009 was used to (a) collect agency information and (b) determine the sample frame. The systematic random sample of 1665 agencies was selected from the list of 4972 for the study. Sample included 33.5 % of the population.

Survey Questionnaire

The questionnaire was based on a comprehensive literature review and comprised of closed-ended questions. The first part of the questionnaire aimed to identify some of the basic characteristics of the travel agencies and respondents. The agency data

included age of establishment (as measured by the year it was established), number of branches, number of employees and type of tourists served. The respondent data included (1) education which was categorized under five groups and (2) business experience which was measured by number of years of work in the industry. The second section of the questionnaire was related to the types and extent of service the travel agencies provide. The third section dealt with the existence of a formal written policy on the environment, membership to NGOs and environmental awards received. The fourth section sought the views of travel agents on six issues: (1) environmental problems in tourism destinations, (2) factors causing environmental problems in tourism sector, (3) contribution of tourism enterprises to environmental problems, (4) importance given by travel agents to environmental management criteria in tourism accommodations, (5) sources that hinder the environmental concern in tourism sector, and (6) outcome of environmental protection activities. First factor included 10 items for the environmental problems. Second factor with 7 items and third factor with 6 items were related with the causes of the environmental problems. The fourth (11 items) was related with the environmental management criteria, fifth one (6 items) was about the obstacles in environmental concern and sixth one (6 items) were concerned with some outcomes of environmental protection.

Measurement and Analysis

Demographic data for the existing status of travel agencies were collected by (a) organizing the latest information provided in 2009 about the agencies in the web page of TURSAB and (b) using survey research. The specific statements were used in order to measure the environmental views of the travel agents. Each statement was rated on an ordinal scale. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which each statement corresponds to their personal views by circling the appropriate number on the scale. Central tendency distributions (means and standard deviations) for single variable analyses were used. The research design did not provide any hypothesis for testing, however, the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z test was used to test the normality of score distributions of the 45 items on environment.

Findings

Presentation of findings organized according to the character of the research design. Firstly, a reliability analysis was presented. Secondly, general organizational characteristics of travel agencies were provided. Then, findings on demographics were presented about the agency, agents and environmental indicators based on the data collected from TURSAB and survey research. Finally, each environmental factor was investigated.

Reliability: Travel agent's environmental views on 45 items were used for the reliability analysis: alpha test showed a high degree of reliability (.893). Correlations on the Cronbach's alpha if items deleted varied between only .888 and .895. Alpha scores were also high on all 6 environmental factors, except one (Table 1).

Table: 1. Reliability Statistics

Factors	Cronbach's Alpha	Alpha if item deleted (range)	N of Items
All 45 factors together	.893	.888 - .895	45
Environmental problems	.877	.861 - .872	10
Causes of environmental problems	.780	.727 - .789	7
Contribution of tourism enterprises	.710	.645 - .701	5
Environmental management criteria	.881	.863 - .879	11
Obstacles to environmental action	.831	.786 - .822	6
Outcome of environmental protection	.481	.396 - .557	6

General Characteristics of Agents

According to the information compiled from the TURSAB website in 2009, there were 5610 A and C group travel agencies including branch offices in all Turkish cities, except 2. Of all agencies in the study sample, 57.3 % had only single office (main office), 16.9 % had two, 10.9 % had three and 4.9 % had four offices. Only 2.3 % agencies had over 10 offices operating in different locations. There are more agencies giving service to domestic clients (91.5 %) than foreign clients (88.0 %).

On the whole, majority of agents were well educated: 2.1 % primary school, 29.2 % secondary school, 3.6 % two year vocational school and 56.2 % undergraduate level and 1.2 % graduate level. About one third of them (32.5 %) had been working in the sector up to five years. Over two thirds (68.6 %) had been working not more than 10 years. Only 4.9 % had over 20 years of work experience.

Type and Extent of Services They Provide

Services that travel agencies provide varied in type and extent (Table 2).

Findings show that great majority of travel agents provide service for only mass tourism (76.5 %) and culture tourism (71.5 %). Percent of other tourism types varies between 5.2% (bird-watching) and 43.2 % (Faith tourism). For instance, the tracking was provided by 234 agencies that consist of only 7.5% of the sample. Rafting, underwater diving and mountaineering followed the tracking by 6.6%, 6.2% and 3.9%, respectively. The rest of the activities were provided by fewer than 3% of agencies.

The extent of services varied between 1.17 to 3.14. Mass tourism was the highest service provided by the agencies, with a value of 3.14 for the mean and a standard deviation of 1.2. Next, there was culture tourism with score of 2.84, considerably above the rest. The average was 2.11 for the belief tourism and 1.96 for the convention tourism. The average ranged from almost none to low level of service for the remaining tourism types. Travel agents assigned very low score for nature-based tourism types, low score for belief tourism and convention tourism, nearly medium score for the culture tourism and little over medium score for the mass tourism.

Table: 2. Types and Extent of Services Provided by Travel Agencies

Tourism types	N	No service provided %	Years of service Mean	Sd
Mass tourism	1417	24.5	3.14	1.249
Culture tourism	1386	28.5	2.84	1.253
Faith tourism	1449	56.8	2.11	1.288
Convention tourism	1417	59.6	1.96	1.189
Health tourism	1417	70.3	1.67	1.058
Rafting	1442	78.4	1.62	1.052
Highland tourism	1440	77.7	1.60	1.008
Scuba diving	1424	82.3	1.52	.975
Tracking	1437	84.1	1.45	.890
Mountaineering	1435	86.9	1.38	.817
Paragliding	1426	87.4	1.37	.829
Photo-safari	1417	88.4	1.37	.869
Cave tourism	1434	90.7	1.30	.774
Nature horse riding	1424	90.4	1.27	.706
Botanic tourism	1420	92.8	1.25	.691
Birdwatching	1425	94.8	1.17	.567

Environmental performance Indicators

Four dichotomous variables were used to measure the existence/nonexistence of most basic environmental practices of the travel agencies. Data showed that the travel agents have very poor records in environmental policy and practices. Of the respondents: 88.2 % have no environmental programs, 94.0 % have no budget allocated for environmental protection, 91.5 % have no membership to any environmental NGOs, and 96.4 % have received no award for any environmental activity or management.

Travel Agents' Environmental Views

This study used 45 items to explore the character of environmental views of the travel agents. The one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z tests on the distributions of the items were all statistically significant at 0.01 levels. It means that distributions of responses within the five level scale measurements of each of the 45 items were not uniform (normal), and travel agents' views significantly differed within every measurement.

Environmental Problems in Destinations

The travel agents were asked to provide their views about the 10 items showing the extent of environmental problems in the destinations they organize tours (Table 3).

Table: 3. Extent of Environmental Problems in the Destinations

Environmental problems	N	Mean	Sd	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Asymp Sig (2-tailed)
See pollution	1534	3.82	1.074	9.253	.000
Air pollution	1521	3.57	1.066	8.448	.000
Freshwater pollution	1499	3.45	1.075	7.082	.000
Inadequate infrastructure	1525	3.80	.990	8.825	.000
Solid waste	1523	3.83	.985	8.406	.000
Environmentally unsuitable architecture	1502	3.77	1.029	8.246	.000
Noise pollution	1524	3.89	.991	8.553	.000
Dense housing	1509	4.02	.949	9.170	.000
Over crowding	1517	3.87	.975	8.510	.000
Cultural degeneration	1507	3.64	1.141	7.880	.000

The travel agents gave the highest score to the "dense housing" (4.02). It was followed by the "noise pollution" (3.89), "overcrowding" (3.87), and "solid waste" (.383).

Factors Contributing to Environmental Problems in Tourism Sector

Travel agents were asked if the contributions of items at the Table 4. Their answers showed that all seven factors contributed to environmental problems in tourism sector to a considerable extent, ranging from little over "moderate" (3.28) to "much" (4.06). When ranked according to the extent of contribution to the environmental problems, all factors, except "inadequacy of environmental education of tourists" (3.28), were close to or little over "much" contribution. "Inadequate environmental education" had the highest contribution, (4.06), followed by "non-enforcement of environmental laws" (4.0).

Table: 4. Factors Causing Environmental Problems in Tourism Sector

Factors	N	Mean	Sd	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)
Inadequacy of environmental education	1578	4.06	.997	9.346	.000
Inadequacy of environmental awareness of tourists	1554	3.28	1.210	7.146	.000
Inadequacy of environmental awareness of tourism enterprises	1567	3.77	1.032	8.603	.000
Inadequacy of environmental regulations	1565	3.85	.994	8.606	.000
Non-enforcement of environmental laws	1560	4.04	.957	8.914	.000
Increased financial cost of environmental protection	1537	3.73	1.044	8.561	.000
Insensitivity of local administrations	1480	3.88	.988	8.467	.000

1= very little, 2= little, 3= moderate, 4= much, 5=very much

Contribution of Tourism Enterprises to Environmental Problems

Travel agents were asked to state their views about the extent of contribution of tourism enterprises to environmental problems on a five point scale, ranging from "very little" (1) to "very much" (5). Travel agents reported that all five enterprises make contributions to environmental problems, ranging from 2.90 (moderate) to 3.91 (much). They assigned a relatively low score to travel agencies (2.90), followed by recreation (3.31), transportation (3.51), accommodations (3.79) and food and beverages (3.91).

Table: 5. Contributions of Tourism Enterprises to Environmental Problems

Tourism enterprises	N	Mean	Sd	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Asym Sig (2-tailed)
Transportation	1508	3.51	1.094	7.460	.000
Travel agencies	1508	2.90	1.179	6.361	.000
Accommodations	1529	3.79	1.026	9.518	.000
Food and beverages	1518	3.91	.960	9.395	.000
Recreation	1439	3.31	1.071	6.956	.000

1= very little, 2= little, 3= moderate, 4= much, 5=very much

The Importance of Environmental Criteria in Tourism Accommodations

Respondents were asked to evaluate the importance they give to the environmental criteria in the tourism accommodations they do business with. Mean distributions of responses varied between moderately important (3.38) and important (4.3) (Table 6).

Table: 6. Importance of Environmental Criteria in Tourism Sector

Criteria	N	Mean	Sd	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Asym.Sig (2 tailed)
Wastewater treatment	1484	3.74	1.088	8.187	.000
Air quality in destination	1480	3.93	.950	9.311	.000
Waste separation	1428	3.48	1.080	6.738	.000
Type of energy used	1446	3.44	1.071	7.388	.000
Energy saving activities	1446	3.38	1.119	6.997	.000
Noise control in the facility	1476	4.11	.901	9.177	.000
Building-construction materials used	1450	3.48	1.111	7.323	.000
Environmental suitability of hotel architecture	1470	3.95	.996	9.140	.000
Hotel location	1499	4.31	.809	11.118	.000
Blue flag Project	1474	4.06	1.024	9.389	.000
Socioeconomic contribution to local community	1255	3.83	1.017	7.975	.000

1= very unimportant, 2= unimportant,   3= neither/nor, 4= important, 5= very important

They reported that "location of hotel" (4.31), "noise control" (4.11), "blue flag project" (4.06), "facility architecture" (3.95) and "air quality of destination" (3.93) were foremost important environmental criteria. "Socio economic contribution" and "wastewater treatment" were considered to be close to "important" (3.83 and 3.74, respectively).

Sources Hindering the Environmental Concern in Tourism Sector

The managers were asked to rate the 6 items in terms of obstacles to environmental concern in tourism sector (Table 7). Mean distributions of the responses ranged from 3.49 to 3.99. Travel agents regarded the "lack of environmental awareness" as the highest obstacle to environmental concerns in the sector.

Table: 7 Obstacles to Environmental Concern in Tourism

Obstacles	N	Mean	Sd	Kolmogorov -Smirnov Z	Asymp.Sig (2-tailed)
Inefficient local administrations	1508	3.57	1.093	7.489	.000
Inadequate public sector implementation	1497	3.69	.999	8.423	.000
Inadequate infrastructure	1498	3.75	.996	8.744	.000
Economic crises	1509	3.70	1.089	8.155	.000
Political crises	1492	3.49	1.193	7.392	.000
Lack of environmental awareness	1499	3.99	.983	9.494	.000

1= very little, 2= little, 3= moderate, 4= much, 5=very much

Outcome of the Environmental Protection Activities

Six outcome statements were rated by travel agents (Table 8). The agents agreed that environmental protection activities were important for the future of tourism sector (4.49) and make positive effect on marketing (3.91). They moderately agreed on the statement that environmental protection brings about the competitive advantage (3.47) and engenders financial burdens (3.27). Correspondingly, they disagreed that environmental protection hinder the development of economy (2.04) and deprive local population of their livelihood (2.20). However, agreements and disagreements are not at the "strong" levels.

Table: 8 Outcome of Environmental Protection Activities

Outcome	N	Mean	Sd	Kolmogorov- Smirnov Z	Asymp.Sig (2 tailed)
Bring about the competitive advantage	1501	3.47	1.121	8.079	.000
Engender financial burdens	1519	3.27	1.170	8.391	.000
Make positive effect on marketing	1523	3.91	.989	9.862	.000
Deprive local population of their livelihood	1506	2.20	1.193	8.869	.000
Hinder the development of economy	1510	2.04	1.177	9.349	.000
Important for the future of tourism sector	1531	4.49	.895	15.116	.000

1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neither/nor, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree

Conclusion and Discussions

Findings on the nature of the travel agencies indicate that only very few Turkish travel agencies have environmentally oriented characteristics. It means that Turkish agencies are in need of structural adjustment to the new business environment based on sustainability. As Budeanu indicated (2005), large enterprises have taken a more proactive attitude and have started to develop environmental policies and plans in recent years. However, the feasibility of structural adjustment seems to be very low since most

travel agents/operators are not large enough, like in many countries (Clarke, 2002), to consider it as well as be able to afford it.

Environmental views are made according to the perceptions, attitudes, values, information and knowledge travel agents possess on the environmental issues. Perceptions, attitudes, information, knowledge and views are obvious prerequisites for environmentally conscious action, if there are no strong intervening variables that eliminate such relationship in a specific situation. This study suggests that travel agents cannot be considered a homogeneous group in terms of their views on environmental issues. However, their views about the issues studied here indicate that they have environmental awareness. These findings are in accord with the related studies which indicate that tourism operators and travel agents perceive advantage in a environmental protection and sustainability (Curtin and Wilkes, 2005; Tepelus, 2005).

The education has been an important factor related to the views, perceptions (Bastakis et al., 2004; Garrigos-Simon and et al., 2008), and concern with and sensitivity to the environment and strategic responses to it in decision-making process (Tihanyi et al., 2000) and effective management for survival and growth (Bayraktaroglu and Kutanis, 2003). Lack of education is seen as one of the main reasons for reluctance to explore new methods and the poor use of knowledge in management (Bastakis and et al., 2004). The present research findings show that most Turkish travel agents have higher education; hence, it is rather normal to see that they hold sensitive views about environmental issues.

Various studies have taken the work experience as variable affecting managerial attitudes, knowledge, decision and success (Garrigos-Simon and et al., 2008). Through experience and education, managers acquire the understanding of competencies and strategies needed for advancement in their business and develop a capacity for better decision making and interpretation (Floyd and Lane, 2000; Herremans, Reid, and Wilson, 2005). Like education, work experience can raise awareness of heightened expectations in environmental practices, increase knowledge of the destination and need for environmental protection, nourish supportive attitudes towards resource management issues, environmental behavioral intentions and philanthropic support of conservation. Yet, some studies found that experience can act against knowledge, change and creativity (Ford and Gioia, 2000; Geletkanycz and Black, 2001). The present study found that majority of travel agents has less than ten years of business experience in the travel industry. This finding works against the probability of daily practices with environmental sensitivity.

It is expected from travel agencies that they make tourism and conservation compatible, support the preservation of wilderness and biodiversity, use natural resources in a sustainable way, minimize consumption, waste and pollution, respect local cultures, historic and scientific sites, educate staff, provide clients with information about the environment and conservation, follow safety rules. Realization of such expectations depends on various factors related with economics, politics, culture, personality traits, education, awareness, attitudes and behavioral characteristics. Findings of this study show that, at least in term of views, travel agents hold some assuring sensitivity.

Findings of this study support the conclusion of previous studies that travel agents and operators seem to realize in general that sustainable tourism practice might improve

their profit margins and improve the business environment, and business growth can only be realized by the sustainable use of natural resources (Holden and Kealy, 1996). However, the findings here also confirm previous research in which travel agents/operators have been found to lack involvement, planning and strategic vision (Bastakis, et al., 2004). Even though the nature of views among travel agents about the environmental issues and environmental consequences of activities are appropriate to encourage them to make a corporate commitment to sustainable development and to make considerations for environmental, cultural and social impacts an integral part of the conduct of their daily business activities, it is necessary to acknowledge the fact that the extent of behaving according to one's views/attitudes in daily business practices is not known, since the structural environment of economical and political decision making is marked by personal and organizational objectives, power relations and dominance. There are numerous strong intervening variables in the way of proper and improved performance, of translating their attitudes and principles of sustainable tourism into concrete operational changes.

Travel agents/operators supposedly have certain roles compatible with high principles of tourism: They are expected to provide services without causing ecological, social, cultural and economical damages. It was found that the nature of structure and activities of travel agencies in Turkey do not reflect the assumed characteristics of sustainable business.

Findings of this study demonstrate that travel agents already realize that they depend on the environment's health for their own existence, they are part of the problem and there are important problems to deal with. On the other hand, findings also indicate that agency managers are in need of reflecting their views to their managerial plans, programs, policies and daily administrative practices. As Herzberg indicated (2006), the sector commonly views environmental concerns as both a constraint and an opportunity. Travel agents/operators belong to those groups who are responsible for policy formulation, communication and the operational management of tourism destinations, thus, they should seek to understand the complex interplay of the forces that are at work to conserve tourism resources. They should reorganize their activities in order to make significant contributions to the preservation of natural resources and cultural life, and to contribute to the growth of economic outcomes and the development of sustainable tourism. It seems that it is necessary to develop a relational culture and business practices upholding the principles of sustainable tourism.

The research agenda of tourism is beginning to acknowledge the importance of understanding issues around entrepreneurship and perceptual and behavioral manifestations in the non-western world. There is a need for further empirical research into the travel agents' views and daily tourism activities.

References

Alamdari, F., (2002). "Regional development in airlines and travel agents relationship", Journal of Air Transport Management, Vol. 8, No.5, 339–348.

Alvarez, L.S., Martin, A.D., Casielles, R.V., (2007). "Relationship Marketing and Information and Communication Technologies: Analysis of Retail Travel Agencies". Journal of Travel Research, 45: 453 - 463.

Baloglu, S., Mangaloglu, M., (2001). "Tourism destination images of Turkey, Egypt, Greece, and Italy as perceived by US-based tour operators and travel agents", Tourism Management, Vol.22, 1-9.

Bamberg, S., (2003). "How does environmental concern influence specific environmentally related behaviours? A new answer to an old question", Journal of Environmental Psychology,No.23, 21-32.

Bastakis, C., Buhalis, D., Butler, R., (2004). "The perception of small and medium sized tourism accommodation providers on the impacts of the tour operators' power in Eastern Mediterranean", Tourism Management, No. 25, 151-170.

Bayraktaroglu, S., Kutanis, R., (2003). "Transforming hotels into learning organisations: A new strategy for going global", Tourism Management, No. 24, 149-154.

Bohdanowicz, P., (2006). "Environmental awareness and initiatives in the Swedish and Polish hotel industries-survey results", Hospitality Management, No.25, 662–682.

Bohdanowicz, P. (2005). "European hoteliers' environmental attitudes: greening the business", Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, No.46, 188-204.

Budeanu, A., (2005). "Impacts and responsibilities for sustainable tourism: A tour operator's perspective", Journal of Cleaner Production, No.13, 89–97.

Buhalis, D., (2000). "Relationships in the distribution channel of tourism: Conflicts between hoteliers and tour operators in the Mediterranean region", International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration, Vol.1, No.1, 113–139.

Clarke, J., (2002). "A synthesis of activity towards the implementation of sustainable tourism: ecotourism in a different context", International Journal of Sustainable Development, Vol.5, No.3, 232-250.

Claver-Cortes, E., J. F. Molina-Azorin, J. Pereira-Moliner, M. D. Lopez-Gamero. (2007). "Environmental strategies and their impact on hotel performance", Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol.15, No.6, 663-679.

Curtin, S., Wilkes, K., (2005). "British wildlife tourism operators: current issues and typologies", Current Issues in Tourism, Vol.8, No.6, 455-478.

Erdogan, N., (2003). Çevre ve (eko)turizm, Erk Publishing, Ankara.

Erdogan, N., (2009). Turkey's tourism policy and environmental performance of tourism enterprises. In D. Leslie (Ed.) Tourism Enterprises and Sustainable Development, Routhledge, London/New York.

Floyd, S., Lane, P., (2000). "Strategizing throughout the organization: management role conflict in strategic renewal", The Academy of Management Review, Vol.25, No.1, 154–177.

Ford, C., Gioia, D., (2000). "Factors influencing creativity in the domain of managerial decision making. Journal of Management", No.26, 705–732.

Garrigos-Simon, F., Palacios-Marques J., Narangajavana, Y., (2008). "Improving the perceptions of hotel managers", Annals of Tourism Research, Vol.35, No.2, 359-380.

Geletkanycz, M., Black, S., (2001). "Bound by the past? Experience-based effects on commitment to the strategic status quo", Journal of Management, Vol. 27, 3-21.

Herremans, I. M., R. E. Reid, L. K. Wilson. (2005). "Environmental management systems (EMS) of tour operators: learning from each other", Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol.13, No.4, 311-338.

Herzberg, S., (2006). Corporate social responsibility recommendations for tour operators. Wageningen, Thesis Management (D250-751. http://www.basisboekmvo.nl/images/mvo-scriptie/24%20Herzberg.pdf

Holden, A., Kealy, H., (1996). "A profile of UK outbound 'environmentally friendly' tour operators", Tourism Management, Vol.17, No.1, 60-64.

Iwata, O., (2004). "Some psychological correlates of environmentally responsible behavior", Social Behaviour and Personality, Vol.32, No.8, 703-714.

Jackson, S., (2007). "Attitudes towards the environment and ecotourism of stakeholders in the UK tourism industry with particular reference to ornithological tour operators", Journal of Ecotourism, Vol.6, No.1, 34- 66.

Kasim, A., (2007). "Corporate environmentalism in the hotel sector: evidence of drivers and barriers in Penang, Malaysia", Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol.15, No.6, 680-696.

Klemm, M., Parkinson, L., (2001). "UK tour operator strategies: causes and consequences", International Journal of Tourism Research, No.3, 367-375.

Medina-Munoz, R. D., Medina-Munoz, D. R., García-Falcon, J. M., (2003). "Understanding European tour operators' control on accommodation companies: an empirical evidence", Tourism Management, Vol.24, No.2, 135-147.

Miller, G., (2001). "Corporate responsibility in the UK tourism industry", Tourism Management, No.22, 589–598.

Olli, E., Grendstad, G., Wollebaek, D., (2001). "Correlates of environmental behaviours: Bringing back social context", Environment and Behaviour, Vol.33, No.2, 181-208.

Pelletier, L. G., Dion, S., Tuson, K., Green-Demers, I., (2006). "Why do people fail to adopt environmental protective behaviours? toward a taxonomy of environmental motivation", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, Vol.29, No.12, 2481-2504.

Carroll, B., Siguaw, J., (2003). "The evolution of electronic distribution: Effects on hotels and intermediaries", Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, No.44, 38 - 50.

Tapper, R., (2001). "Tourism and socio-economic development: UK tour operators' business approaches in the context of the new international agenda", International Journal of Tourism Research, No.3, 351–366.

Tepelus, C. M., (2005). "Aiming for sustainability in the tour operating business", Journal of Cleaner Production, No.13, 99-107.

Tihanyi, L., Ellstrand, A., Daily, C., Dalton, D., (2000). "Composition of the top management team and firm international diversification", Journal of Management, No.26, 1157–1177.

Trivun, V., Kenjic, V., Mahmutcehajic, F., (2008). "Life-long learning strategies in tourism and hotel industry", Tourism and Hospitality Management, Vol.14, No.1, 171-184.

Tsai, H.T., Huang, L., Lin, C. G., (2005). "Emerging e-commerce development model for Taiwanese travel agencies", Tourism Management, Vol.26, No.5, 787-796.

Tse, A, C., (2003). "Disintermediation of travel agents in the hotel industry", International Journal of Hospitality Management, Vol.22, No.4, 453-460.

TURSAB., (2010). Türkiye Seyahat Acenteleri Birliği, http://www.tursab.org.tr/content/turkish/ istatistikler/gostergeler/acentasayı.asp.

Weaver, D. B., Lawton, L. J., (2004). "Visitor attitudes toward tourism development and product integration in an Australian urban-rural fringe", Journal of Travel Research, No.2, 286–296.

Welford, R., Ytterhus, B., (2004). "Sustainable Development and Tourism Destination Management: A Case Study of the Lillehammer Region, Norway", International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology, Vol.11, No.4, 410-425.