



A Comparative Study For Green Management Practices in Rome and Alanya Restaurants From Managerial Perspectives

*Hulusi DOĞAN^a, Oğuz NEBİOĞLU^b, Mehmet DEMİR AĞ^a

^aAdnan Menderes University, Economics and Business Faculty, Aydın/Turkey.

^bAkdeniz University, Alanya Vocational School, Antalya/Turkey.

Keywords

Green management
Green practice
Restaurants
Tourism industry
Alanya
Rome

Article History

Received:

03.03.2015

Accepted:

15.05.2015

Abstract

This study aims to find an answer for the question that is whether there are differences between Rome and Alanya restaurants' green management practices from managerial perspectives. So, the study focuses on measuring and comparing the perceptions of Italian and Turkish restaurant managers with green management practices in their own restaurants. Because of their tourism potential and being one of the most important destinations of the country, Rome and Alanya were selected as research areas in the study. Restaurants in the centre of both cities were included in the research. Restaurants located in the city centre were visited and explained the voluntary participation and the aim of the research. In total 181 responses, 98 from Turkish and 83 from Italian, were obtained in January and March 2015. Research results indicate that water-saving, energy saving practices, selective collection of solid residues, and reduction in the use of environmentally dangerous products are important for both Italian and Turkish restaurant managers. But t-test results do show that there are some outstanding differences between the priority preferences of Italian and Turkish restaurant managers for green management practices.

*Corresponding author
hulusidogan@gmail.com (H. Doğan)

INTRODUCTION

Serious environmental problems such as global warming, waste and pollution have increased the awareness of people for environmental issues as well as the value of green-based activities. Beyond a colour, “green” has gained a broader meaning with the different phrasal combinations such as green design, green behaviour, green manufacturing, green image, green product, green purchasing, green logistics, green industry, green management etc. In a general sense, “green” implies an “eco-friendly” approaching to everything in every time and every place. Thus, increasing sensitivity to environment matters has encouraged organizations as well as restaurants to be or go “green” (Kim et al., 2013; Han et al., 2009; Dewald et al., 2014; Pirani and Arafat, 2014; Wang et al., 2013). And people expect managers to:

- use resources wisely and responsibly,
- protect the environment,
- minimize the amounts of air, water, energy, minerals, and other materials used in the final goods people consume,
- recycle and reuse these goods to the extent possible, rather than drawing on nature to replenish them,
- respect nature’s calm, tranquillity, and beauty,
- eliminate toxins that harm people in the workplace and communities,
- reduce greenhouse gas emissions and avoid activities that do irrevocable damage to the climate (Marcus and Fremeth, 2009).

At this point, finding answers for some questions creates a great interest. What do restaurant managers think about green practices in their businesses? Do managers’ sensitivities to environmental issues change from gender or nationality perspectives? Which green practices are the most important for restaurant managers? In this context, this study focuses on the sensitivity levels and priority preferences of both Italian and Turkish restaurant managers for green management practices in their businesses. Italy and Turkey are selected for this study because of the following incentives: (1) Italy and Turkey are rivals in tourism industry. Of these two countries, the former ranks fifth with 48 million and the latter remains sixth with 38 million visitors in the world’s 10 top tourism destinations according to international tourist arrivals ((UNWTO, 2014); (2) the former is a member of European Union, the latter has been waiting for an announcement of membership acceptance; (3) both countries have a wide range of environmental, cultural, historical assets as well as beaches on Mediterranean coasts and a popular cuisine in the world.

Literature Review

“Green restaurants” have been defined as “new or renovated structures designed, constructed, operated, and demolished in an environmentally friendly and energy-efficient manner” (Namkung and Jang, 2013; Lorenzini, 1994). Compared to a traditional restaurant, a green restaurant devotes effort to the three Rs (reduce, reuse, and recycle) and the two Es (energy and efficiency) (Gilg et al.,

2005; Namkung and Jang, 2013). In addition, Jang et al. (2011) indicated that green restaurant refers to one that offers a selection of green food menu items that use locally grown or organic certified food, as well as one that implements green practices. Chen et al. (2013) suggested that green restaurants refer to restaurants that provide green food on their menus, such as organic, local and sustainable food, and restaurants that integrate green practices into their service process to implement the idea of environmental protection and ecological maintenance.

According to Pacific, Gas and Electric’s Food Service Technology Center, restaurants consume the largest amount of energy in the world compared to other types of commercial buildings (Jeong, et al, 2014). Restaurants and other food-service facilities use 2.5 times more energy per square foot than other commercial buildings (Dewald et al., 2014; Ham and Lee, 2011). In addition, restaurants generate a greater amount of garbage daily than most other retail businesses. For example, restaurants in the USA consume a vast volume of disposable products, water and energy, with the annual cost of electricity and gas averaging \$161 dollars per seat (Stys, 2008). Additionally, restaurants are responsible for about 33% of all electricity used in the United States, and an average restaurant uses about 300,000 gallons of water each year (DiPietro et al., 2013a). Therefore, the adverse effects on the environment from the restaurant industry would be considerable if such business did not pursue green practices (Chou et al., 2012).

As more customers recognize the seriousness of environmental problems, the consumer choices are becoming more ecologically conscious as they purchase products and services that are environmentally friendly (Han, Hsu and Sheu, 2010). Also some statistics confirm the reality of being green as well as the increasing demand for “green” products and services. For example, 79% of U.S. consumers believe that a company’s environment practices influence the products and services they recommend to others. And 64% of consumers worldwide are willing to pay a higher price for goods and services that produce lower greenhouse gas emissions. According to the results of a survey of consumers by market research firm TXN, 94% of Thai, 83% of Brazilian, 45% of British and 53% of US respondents were willing to pay more to help the environment (Tran, 2009). Also according to National Restaurant Associations, 62% of consumers said they are more likely to spend their money at a restaurant if they know it is green (NRA, 2011; Namkung and Jang, 2013). So, the focus on being environmentally has urged the restaurant industry to invest enormous efforts into developing and promoting eco-friendly goods, and encouraged restaurant industry professionals to establish green organizations such as Green Restaurant Association, Green Table Network, Green Table Australia etc.

For example, Green Restaurant Association (GRA), established in USA in 1990, is a national non-profit organization that provides a convenient and cost-effective way for restaurants, manufacturers, distributors, and consumers to become more environmentally responsible. To obtain a green certification from GRA, restaurants have to get enough points in the following categories (Green Restaurant Association, 2007):

1. **Water Efficiency:** The goal is to promote water efficiency and conservation in restaurants.

2. **Waste Reduction and Recycling:** The goal is to encourage foodservice facilities to move toward the goal of becoming zero-waste, through reducing waste output, increasing stock of reusable items, and recycling and composting what is left.

3. **Sustainable Furnishings and Building Materials:** The goal is to encourage foodservice facilities to make environmentally responsible purchasing decisions when considering furnishings and building materials.

4. **Sustainable Food:** The goal is to encourage foodservice facilities to prefer sustainable, organic foods and local family farms.

5. **Energy:** The goal is to encourage restaurants to move toward the goal of becoming carbon-neutral and using only sustainable sources of energy.

6. **Disposables:** The goal is to encourage restaurants to use products that are made from bio-based materials, or materials that have been previously recycled and made into these new products.

7. **Chemical and Pollution Reduction:** The goal is to provide restaurants with tools to decrease their contribution to climate change, indoor air pollution, the polluting of waterways, and soil degradation.

The Green Table Network (GTN), established in 2007, is a Canadian not-for-profit organization to acknowledge food service operators who have committed to improving their environmental performance while serving the best quality, tastiest food imaginable. To be a Green Table Network member, restaurants have to make the following benchmark commitments: eliminating styrofoam and non-recyclable plastics; implementing comprehensive recycling programs; using water wisely; adding/feature at least one sustainable protein menu item; installing/upgrade to efficient lighting; adopting a 'sustainability philosophy' (Green Table Network, 2007).

Green Table Australia (GTA) is an education and certification program that supports and recognises Australian restaurants, cafes and catering businesses that are doing what they can to reduce their impact on the environment. In order to become Green Table accredited, businesses must:

- recycle all paper material, glass, plastic and metal,
- send food waste to compost or green waste,
- use appropriate stock management techniques to reduce waste in general,
- use natural gas to run stoves and ovens,
- use a minimum of 20% green electricity,
- replace all light fittings with energy efficient globes,
- reduce energy consumption in general,
- install water efficient/low flow taps on all faucets,
- install dual flushing toilets,

- use biodegradable and non-toxic cleaning products,
- use products that can be recycled and are biodegradable wherever possible (Green Table Australia, 2013).

The Sustainable Restaurant Association (SRA) is a not for profit membership organization, based in the United Kingdom, which aids restaurants to become more sustainable and guides customers towards more sustainable choices. Since its launch in 2009, the organization (SRA) has been taking expert advice to draw up a blueprint for the planet-friendly restaurant in five key areas; water saving, workplace resources, supply chain, waste management, and energy efficiency (Sustainable Restaurant Association, 2009).

On the other hand, some research shows that implementing green or environmentally responsible practices have a positive influence on customer's purchasing behavior and loyalty in the hospitality industry. A recent study indicates that 70% the consumers were willing to pay more for a "green" restaurant experience (Dewald et al., 2014). Jeong et al. (2014) examined the impact of eco-friendly practices on green image and customer attitudes. They found that customers' perceptions of green practices positively influence a restaurant's green image, which also positively influences customers' attitudes toward the restaurants. According to Jeong et al. (2014), by implementing green attributes, restaurants can inspire customers to structure a mental image of a particular restaurant's greenness. Furthermore, this constructed green image can assist customers in developing a positive attitude toward the restaurant, which would ultimately affect customers' dining decisions. Also, Graci and Dodds (2008) supports this argument. They concluded that some of the benefits of being green are an increased brand image. This increased brand image and corporate reputation are one of the most priceless assets an organization has, thereby giving the organization a competitive advantage (Graci and Dodds, 2008; DiPietro et al., 2013a) Similarly, DiPietro et al. (2013a) studied guest perception of green practices in 25 restaurants in the United States and found that there is a positive relationship between guests' personal green practices and their desire to go to restaurants more often that have implemented green practices.

A recent study by Hu et al. (2010) done in Taiwan showed that more than most of the respondents (53.7%) were willing to make an extra payment of 2-6% of the price to eat green restaurant and 33.1% of them were willing to make an extra payment of 8-12%. The study also found that more than 67% of respondents appreciate restaurants using local food on their menus. Because compared with imported or foreign food, the transport energy used and the carbon emissions created during the production and marketing process of local food are relatively less, which is beneficial to the reduction of the carbon footprint and the alleviation of the global green house effect (Jones et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2013). According to the results of a study by Iaquinto (2014) for 29 independently-owned casual restaurants in Japan, 90% of the restaurants owners stated that they have become much more active at finding local suppliers. The vast majority of the operators in this study (74%) stated that they are always

seeking ways to be thoughtful about their impact on the environment.

Although little literature exists on the influence of gender and nationality on the environmental sensitivity, some surveys had interesting findings. For example, Dutta et al. (2008) examined customer perceptions regarding green practices in restaurants in India and the United States. They found that U.S. consumers are more willing to pay for green practices than are Indian consumers. The study indicated that consumers in India were more conscious about health and green practices than they were in the United States. In another study, Choi et al. (2009) studied consumers' environmental concerns and actual behaviors in the lodging industry in the United States and Greece and found that people in Greece had higher levels of awareness, attitudes, and involvement, with the environmentally responsible practices. The study indicated that the more knowledge consumers have about green practices, the more likely they are to choose those organizations that implement green practices. Alonso-Almeida (2013) conducted a survey among students and restaurant managers to measure their sensitivity to environmental issues and found that in the case of both the group of students and the group of managers, women were more concerned about environmental management than men. In a study by DiPietro et al. (2013b) female customers were more conscious regarding green practices. But, in a different study done in Taiwan, Hu et al. (2010) found no significant differences between the genders regarding customers' intention to patronize a green restaurant. Therefore the following hypotheses are proposed in the study:

H1: There are differences between the sensitivity levels of Turkish and Italian managers for environmental practices in their businesses.

H1a: There are differences between the sensitivity levels of Turkish and Italian male managers for environmental practices in their businesses.

H1b: There are differences between the sensitivity levels of Turkish and Italian female managers for environmental practices in their businesses.

H2: There are differences between the sensitivity levels of Turkish male and female managers for environmental practices in their businesses.

H3: There are differences between the sensitivity levels of Italian male and female managers for environmental practices in their businesses.

Research

In this study, data were collected through a questionnaire adapted from the original survey created by Alonso-Almeida (2013) and green management policy indicators developed by Wang et al. (2013). Demographic survey part of the questionnaire was composed of 5 variables. And 18 variables, 10 from Alonso-Almeida (2013) and 8 from Wang et al. (2013), existed on the second part of the questionnaire to measure the sensitivity of restaurant managers towards applying green management practices in their restaurants. Variables for green practices were translated into Turkish

and Italian. And after having back-translated, the questionnaires were handed in to restaurant managers who accepted to fill out.

The instrument consisted of 18 items answered on a seven-point Likert which anchors very important (= 7) and not at all important (=1). SPSS pc + version 16.0 was used for statistical analysis in the study. Differences in the responses between the both Turkish and Italian groups were tested by T-Test Analysis.

Because of their tourism potential and being one of the most important destinations in the country (Martinelli, 2008; Dogan et al., 2012; Barutcu et al., 2011), Rome and Alanya-Antalya were selected as research areas in the study. Restaurants in the centre of both cities were included in the research. Restaurants located in the city centre were visited and explained the voluntary participation and the aim of the research. In total 181 responses, 98 from Turkish and 83 from Italian, were obtained in January and March 2015.

Results

As seen from Table 1, a total of 181 completed questionnaires were returned from restaurateurs, 54.1% were Turkish and 45.9% were Italian. And demographic statistics of restaurant managers were presented in Table 1. As can be seen from Table 1, the majority of Turkish respondents were male (86.4%) and 13.6 percent were female. Half of Turkish respondents were owner managers and nearly 50% held high school degree. Turkish respondents were categorized by age: 18-20 years (5.1%), 21-30 years (23.7%), 31-40 years (42.4%), 41-50 years (22.0%) and 51 years and over (6.8%).

Table 1. Demographics findings for restaurant managers

Demographics findings			Demographics findings		
Nationality	Italian	Turkish	Position	Italian	Turkish
Respondent (%)	45.9%	54.1%	Owner manager	45.8%	50.0%
			Manager	54.2%	50.0%
Age	Italian	Turkish	Education	Italian	Turkish
18-20	-	5.1%	Elementary	-	27.2%
			High School	43.9%	49.5%
21-30	21.6%	23.7%	University	50.0%	20.4%
31-40	44.6%	42.4%	Master-Doctorate	6.1%	2.9%
41-50	19.3%	22.0%	Gender	Italian	Turkish
51 and over	14.5%	6.8%	Male	61.5%	86.4%
			Female	38.5%	13.6%

As presented in Table 1, 61.5% of Italian respondents were male and 38.5% were female. Half of Italian respondents held university degree, and 45.8% were owner managers. Italian respondents were also categorized by age: 18-20 years (0.0%), 21-30 years (21.6%), 31-40 years (44.6%), 41-50 years (19.3%) and 51 years and over (14.5%). One of the most interesting demographics findings is that Italian restaurant industry employs more women holding management position than Turkish restaurant industry.

Table 2 shows the descriptive and t-test data for the environmental practices adopted by restaurants according to manager nationality. As can be seen in Table 2, not all the practices seem to be relevant for the managers. In fact, it is only in the case of four of them that the means are above 5.00 for both Italian and Turkish managers. Thus, the four most important environmental practices are listed in the following order of priority: 1) selective collection of solid residues; 2) water-saving practices; 3) energy-saving practices; 4) use cloth napkin or reprocessed paper napkin. All these variables have values over 5, and in 3 cases Turkish managers developed this kind of practice to a greater extent than Italian managers. But in 1 case, use cloth napkin and use electronic order system, Italian managers had developed this kind of practice to a greater extent than Turkish ones.

Table 2. Comparison of Italian and Turkish Restaurant Managers for Research Items: T-Test Results (1=not at all important, 7=very important)

Items For Green Management Practices	Nationality	Mean	Std. Dev.	F.	p.
Reduction in the use of environmentally dangerous products.	Turkish	6.440	0.867	13.584	0.000*
	Italian	4.940	1.476		
Energy-saving practices.	Turkish	6.288	1.099	0.028	0.868
	Italian	5.060	1.132		
Water-saving practices.	Turkish	6.406	1.019	1.092	0.298
	Italian	5.080	1.192		
The firm trains its employees in environmental matters	Turkish	6.016	1.293	0.552	0.459
	Italian	4.857	1.384		
Compensation is given to employees with environmental initiatives	Turkish	5.864	1.395	16.840	0.000*
	Italian	4.240	0.893		
Use of ecological arguments in marketing campaigns	Turkish	5.271	1.817	6.101	0.015
	Italian	4.460	1.181		
Organization of environmental activities by the firm	Turkish	5.644	1.494	1.005	0.318
	Italian	4.620	1.243		
Selective collection of solid residues	Turkish	6.440	0.793	3.452	0.066
	Italian	5.080	1.226		
The firm has a long-term environmental approach	Turkish	5.813	1.252	0.017	0.895
	Italian	4.620	1.323		
Quantification of environmental savings and costs	Turkish	5.762	1.164	5.201	0.025*
	Italian	4.480	1.446		
Integrate green	Turkish	5.661	1.656	13.452	0.000*

concepts into marketing programs	Italian	4.100	1.035		
Building energy audit system to monitor the consumption of energy	Turkish	5.576	1.599	3.271	0.073
	Italian	4.280	1.178		
Building water audit system to examine the leak of water, and rapidly repair	Turkish	5.559	1.488	1.980	0.162
	Italian	4.440	1.197		
Put power, water, energy saving posters in the kitchen, bathroom, office	Turkish	5.762	1.579	1.367	0.245
	Italian	4.540	1.265		
Use cloth napkin or reprocessed paper napkin	Turkish	5.186	1.969	14.058	0.000*
	Italian	5.960	1.049		
Select suppliers with an environmental management system or environmental commitment	Turkish	5.322	1.591	3.573	0.061
	Italian	4.367	1.149		
Do not use disposable tableware in the dining room	Turkish	5.898	1.748	0.689	0.408
	Italian	4.300	1.265		
Announce green management policies and practices to the employee	Turkish	6.050	1.089	3.229	0.075
	Italian	4.720	1.340		

*p<0.05

According to the findings in Table 2, six most important environmental practices are listed for Turkish restaurant managers in the following order of priority: 1) selective collection of solid residues; 2) reduction in the use of environmentally dangerous products; 3) water-saving practices; 4) energy-saving practices; 5) announce green management policies and practices to the employee; and 6) the firm trains its employees in environmental matters. All these variables have values over 6.

For Italian restaurant managers, five most important environmental practices, having values over 4.9, are listed in the following order of priority: 1) use cloth napkin or reprocessed paper napkin; 2) water-saving practices; 3) selective collection of solid residues; 4) energy-saving practices; and 5) reduction in the use of environmentally dangerous products. For both Italian and Turkish restaurant managers, four common variables, exist in the five most important environmental practices. These are: water-saving practices; energy-saving practices; selective collection of solid residues; and reduction in the use of environmentally dangerous products.

According to t-test results, seen from Table 2, there are five main differences between Italian and Turkish restaurant managers in the adoption of environmental practices. Turkish restaurant managers are keener to use the following 4 environmental practices than Italian managers: “reduction in the use of environmentally dangerous products” with a mean of 6.440 by Turkish restaurant managers and 4.940 by Italian managers; “compensation is given to employees with environmental initiatives” with a mean of 5.864 by Turkish managers and 4.240 by Italian ones; “quantification of

environmental savings and costs” with a mean of 5.762 by Turkish managers and 4.480 by Italian managers; and “integrate green concepts into marketing strategies” with a mean of 5.661 by Turkish restaurant managers and 4.100 by Italian restaurant managers. On the other hand, Italian managers are keener to use the only one environmental practice than Turkish ones: “use cloth napkin or reprocessed paper napkin” with a mean of 5.960 by Italian managers and 5.186 by Turkish managers. Thus, t-test results indicate that H1 is supported. In other words, research results confirm that there are differences between the sensitivity levels of Turkish and Italian managers for environmental practices in their businesses.

As can be seen in Table 3, H1a and H1b are supported according to the t-test results. There are six main differences between the sensitivity levels of Italian and Turkish male managers, but only two differences between Italian and Turkish female in the adoption of environmental practices. Turkish male managers seem to be more interested than Italian men in the adoption of these 5 variables: “reduction in the use of environmentally dangerous products”, “compensation is given to employees with environmental initiatives”, “selective collection of solid residues”, “quantification of environmental savings and costs”, and “integrating green concepts into marketing strategies”. But Italian male managers show a higher concern to use cloth napkin or reprocessed paper napkin in their businesses than Turkish male managers. On the other hand, Turkish female managers seem to be more interested than Italian female in reducing the use of environmentally dangerous products. The second difference is the use of ecological arguments in marketing campaigns, which Turkish female managers are also keener to use (see Table 3).

Table 3. Comparison of Gender Differences for Research Items: T-Test Results (1=not at all important, 7=very important)

ITEMS FOR GREEN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	Nationality	Male Managers			Female Managers		
		Mean	F	p	Mean	F	p
Reduction in the use of environmentally dangerous products.	Turkish	6.411	11.288	0.001*	6.625	5.114	0.032*
	Italian	4.806			5.157		
Energy-saving practices.	Turkish	6.333	0.000	0.926	6.000	0.539	0.470
	Italian	5.161			4.894		
Water-saving practices.	Turkish	6.392	1.472	0.229	6.500	0.540	0.469
	Italian	5.096			5.052		
The firm trains its employees in environmental matters	Turkish	6.000	0.552	0.460	6.125	0.328	0.572
	Italian	4.871			4.833		
Compensation is given to employees with environmental initiatives	Turkish	5.960	7.454	0.008*	5.250	3.403	0.077
	Italian	4.258			4.210		
Use of ecological arguments in marketing campaigns	Turkish	5.254	1.991	0.162	5.375	4.928	0.036*
	Italian	4.548			4.315		
Organization of environmental activities by the firm	Turkish	5.666	1.292	0.259	5.500	0.015	0.903
	Italian	4.709			4.473		
Selective collection of solid residues	Turkish	6.549	6.423	0.013*	5.750	0.002	0.964
	Italian	5.193			4.894		
The firm has a long-term environmental approach	Turkish	5.843	0.016	0.899	5.625	0.163	0.690
	Italian	4.677			4.526		

Quantification of environmental savings and costs	Turkish	5.823	6.322	0.014*	5.375	0.020	0.889
	Italian	4.548			4.368		
Integrate green concepts into marketing programs	Turkish	5.686	9.638	0.003*	5.500	1.564	0.223
	Italian	4.161			4.000		
Building energy audit system to monitor the consumption of energy	Turkish	5.529	3.093	0.082	5.875	0.004	0.951
	Italian	4.225			4.368		
Building water audit system to examine the leak of water, and rapidly repair	Turkish	5.509	1.459	0.231	5.875	0.009	0.924
	Italian	4.354			4.578		
Put power, water, energy saving posters in the kitchen, bathroom, office	Turkish	5.705	2.303	0.133	6.125	2.111	0.159
	Italian	4.580			4.473		
Use cloth napkin or reprocessed paper napkin	Turkish	5.117	10.325	0.002*	5.625	2.902	0.101
	Italian	5.967			5.947		
Select suppliers with an environmental management system or environmental commitment	Turkish	5.254	2.780	0.099	5.750	0.347	0.561
	Italian	4.290			4.500		
Do not use disposable tableware in the dining room	Turkish	5.882	0.683	0.411	6.000	0.732	0.400
	Italian	4.258			4.368		
Announce green management policies and practices to the employee	Turkish	6.078	2.614	0.110	5.875	0.259	0.616
	Italian	4.766			4.736		
Reduction in the use of environmentally dangerous products.	Turkish	6.411	11.288	0.001*	6.625	5.114	0.032*
	Italian	4.806			5.157		

To test the other two hypotheses, H2 and H3, t-test was also applied to nationality gender and the environmental practices adopted. Test results indicate that there is no significant difference between Italian men and women in the adoption of environmental practices. Thus, H2 is rejected. But t-test results indicate that Turkish men seem to be more interested than Turkish women counterparts in selective collection of solid residues with a mean of 6.549 by men and 5.750 by women (p=0.002<0.05; F=10.115). Therefore, H3 is supported.

Conclusion

The first finding of the current study is that four of the five most important green practices are the same for both Italian and Turkish restaurant managers, although their priorities change. These are (1) selective collection of solid residues, (2) reduction in the use of environmentally dangerous products, (3) energy-saving, and (4) water-saving practices. This finding is supported in previous studies (Wang et al., 2013; Wang, 2012; Alonso-Almeida, 2013; Jang et al., 201; Hu et al., 2010; Choi and Parsa, 2006; Gilg et al., 2005). For example, Wang (2012) identified and classified the most-utilized green practices in restaurants as recycling and composting of products, and use of energy and water-efficient equipment. In Dewald et al.’s study (2014) for US consumer attitudes towards “green” restaurants, the respondents viewed the categories of water-efficiency practices, waste reduction, recycling, and energy efficient practices “important”, but only chemical and pollution reduction as “most important”. According to Dewald et al., the recycling efforts and reduction of chemicals should also

be part of the restaurant's message. Wang (2012) also recommended the use of eco-friendly cleaning products for dishes, tables, and floors. In a study, Alonso-Almeida (2013) also found that reduction in the use of environmentally dangerous products and water-saving practices were in the list of three most environmental practices in restaurants. And this study tried to shed light on the key role of special advertising campaigns focusing on water and waste management and the best practices.

The second finding is that Turkish restaurant managers are giving more importance than Italian ones to green practices except the use of cloth napkin or reprocessed paper napkin in their businesses. But this finding can not create a conclusion that Turkish restaurant managers apply greener practices than Italian ones. On the contrary, it can be concluded that Turkish restaurant managers are aware of urgency in adopting of environmental measures in their restaurants, as green management standards and satisfaction with green practices can change from culture to culture, person to person etc. Moreover, Italian restaurant managers may have adopted green practices and more satisfied with their actual efforts for green measures than Turkish ones. Because Italy is a member of European Union, and waste management-environment protection policy and legislation is quite advanced in Europe (Priani and Arafat, 2014). So, the research results do not indicate managers' perceptions for the success level of green practices, but only their importance rankings for green management practices in their restaurants. In short, further research needs to determine the success levels of green practices used in both Italian and Turkish restaurants.

The third finding is that Turkish male managers only show a higher concern about selective collection of solid residues than Turkish female managers whereas there is no difference between Italian male and female managers in the adoption of environmental practices. This is not an unusual finding as the research related gender and perception of green practices is not consistent (DiPietro, 2013b). Some studies (Alonso-Almeida, 2013; Schubert et al., 2010; Hudson and Miller, 2005) found that women are more sensitive to environmental issues than men, but some studies (Hu et al., 2010; Gronhoj and Olander, 2007) found no differences between the genders related to customers' green behaviors or intentions to patronize a green restaurant.

The fourth finding is that the number of women holding management position in Italian restaurant sub-sector is nearly three times higher than that of women in Turkish restaurant sub-sector. Previous studies (England, 2010; Alonso-Almeida, 2009; McKenzie, 2007; Armstrong, 2003; Ng and Pine, 2003) show that tourism is a leading sector which is giving more employment and opportunities to women than many other sectors in the world. Although tourism is the largest fourth sector giving more employment to women in Turkey, it is interesting to note that the number of women holding management position in Turkish tourism industry is very low compared to European countries, for example in Spain, women managers represent about 46 percent of total in the restaurant sub-sector (Alonso-Almeida, 2013). Thus, more research is needed to find and understand the reasons of low-level employment of female managers in Turkish restaurant sub-sector.

On the other hand, this research is not free from limitations. One limitation was found in the narrow scope of this research. The study included the restaurants located in city centers of Rome and Alanya. Thus, future research would hopefully include other restaurants located in other destinations of Turkey and Italy for confirming the results. Also in-depth interviews with restaurant managers might be more valuable for further research. Second limitation was found in the aim of this research. The study did not have an aim to determine which ones, Italians or Turks, were not green or greener. This research only studied for exploring restaurant managers' attitudes toward environmental issues, not focused on all 9 sub-facets of green restaurant management standards; green food procurement, green menu planning, green cooking, green package for take out, green kitchen environment, green cleaning, green management policy, green customer education, and green corporate social responsibility (Wang et al., 2013). Therefore, it is a useful approach to conduct cross cultural studies that compare Italian and Turkish restaurants in all 9 sub-facets of green restaurant management standards and practices.

REFERENCES

- Alonso-Almeida, M.M. (2009). The corporate boards in the global hotel chains: analysis from a gender perspective, *Tourist Studies and Perspectives*, 18 (2), 112-125.
- Alonso-Almeida, M.M. (2013). Environmental management in tourism: students' perspectives and managerial practice in restaurants from a gender perspective, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 60, 201-207.
- Armstrong, E.K. (2003). Applications of role playing in tourism management reaching: evaluation of a learning method, *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 2 (1), 5-16.
- Barutcu, S., Dogan, H. and Unguren, E. (2011). Tourists' perceptions and satisfaction of shopping in Alanya region: a comparative analysis of different nationalities, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 24, 1049-1059.
- Chen, C.T, Cheng, C.C, and Hsu, F.S. (2013). GRSERV scale: an effective tool for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality in green restaurants. *Total Quality Management*, 1-13.
- Choi, G., and Parsa, H.G. (2006). Green practices II: Measuring restaurant managers' psychological attributes and their willingness to charge for the green practices, *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 9, 41-63.
- Choi, G., Parsa, H.G., Siagala, M. and Putrevu, S. (2009). Consumers' environmental concerns and behaviors in the lodging industry: A comparison between Greece and the United States, *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism*, 10 (2), 93-112.
- Chou, C.J., Chen, K.S. and Wang, Y.Y. (2012). Green practices in the restaurant industry from an innovation adoption perspective: Evidence from Taiwan,

- International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31, 703-711.
- Dewald, B., Bruin, B.J. Jang, Y.J. (2014), US consumer attitudes towards "green" restaurants, *Anatolia: International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 25 (2), 171-180.
- DiPietro, R.B., Gregory, S. and Jackson, A. (2013a), Going Green in Quick-Service Restaurants: Customer Perceptions and Intentions, *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*, 14, 139-156.
- DiPietro, R.B., Yang, C. and Partlow, C. (2013b), Green practices in upscale foodservice operations: customer perceptions and purchase intentions, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15 (5), 779-796.
- Dogan, H., Unguren, E. and Barutcu, S. (2012), Russian and German tourist potential and satisfaction in sustainable competitive advantage of Alanya destination, *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 7 (2), 381-399.
- England, P. (2010). The gender revolution: uneven and stalled, *Gender and Society*, 24, 149-166.
- Dutta, K., Umashanker, V., Choi, G. and Parsa, H. G. (2008). A comparative study of consumers' green practice orientation in India and the United States: A study from the restaurant industry, *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 11 (3), 269-285.
- Gilg, A., Barr, S., Ford, N. (2005). Green consumption or sustainable lifestyle? Identifying the sustainable consumer. *Futures*, 37, 481-490.
- Graci, S. and Dodds, R. (2008). Why go green? The business case for environmental commitment in the Canadian Hotel Industry? *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 19 (2), 251-270.
- Green Restaurant Association, (2007). *Certification Standards*. Retrieved 12 January 2015 from <http://www.dinegreen.com>.
- Green Table Australia, (2013). *Restaurant&Catering-Environmental Sustainability-Green Table*. Retrieved 15 January 2015, from <http://www.restaurantcater.asn.au>.
- Green Table Network, (2007). *What is Green Table-Green Table Network*. Retrieved 10 January 2015, from <http://greentable.net/home/about>.
- Gronhoj, A. and Olander, F. (2007). A gender perspective on environmentally related family consumption, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 6 (4), 216-228.
- Ham, S. And Lee, S. (2011). US restaurant companies' green marketing via a company websites: Impact on financial performance. *Tourism Economics*, 17, 1055-1069.
- Han, H., Hsu, L.T. and Lee, J.S. (2009). Empirical investigation of the roles of attitudes toward green behaviors, overall image, gender, and age in hotel customers' eco-friendly decision-making process, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28, 519-528.
- Hu, H., Parsa, H.G. and Self, J. (2010). The dynamics of green restaurant patronage. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 51 (3), 344-362.
- Hudson, S. and Miller, G. (2005). Ethical orientation and awareness of tourism students, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 62, 383-396.
- Iaquinto, A. (2014). Sustainable practices among independently owned restaurants in Japan, *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 17, 147-159.
- Jang, Y.J., Kim, W.G. and Bonn, M.A. (2011). Generation Y consumers' selection attributes and behavioural intentions concerning green restaurants, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30 (4), 803-811.
- Jeong, E., Jang, S.C., Day, J. and Ha, S. (2014). The impact of eco-friendly practices on green image and customer attitudes: An investigation in cafe setting, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 14, 10-20.
- Jones, P., Comfort, D. And Hillier, D. (2004). A case study of local food and its routes to market in the U.K., *British Food Journal*, 106 (4), 328-335.
- Kim, Y.J., Njite, D. and Hancer, M. (2013). Anticipated emotion in consumers' intentions to select eco-friendly restaurants: Augmenting the theory of planned behavior, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 255-262.
- Lorenzini, B., (1994). The green restaurant. Part II. Systems and service, *Restaurants and Institutions*, 104 (11), 119-136.
- Marcus, A. A. and Fremeth, A.R. (2009). Green management matters regardless, *Academy of Management*, August, 17-26.
- Martinelli, F. (2008). Inland tourism: social actors and tourist places, *International Review of Sociology*, 18 (1), 31-38.
- McKenzie, G.K. (2007). Belizean women and tourism work: opportunity or impediment?, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34 (2), 477-496.
- Namkung, Y. and Jang, S.C. (2013). Effects of restaurant green practices on brand equity formation, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 85-95.
- Ng, K. and Pine, R. (2003). Women and men in hotel management in Hong Kong: perceptions of gender and career development issues, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 22, 85-102.
- Pirani, S.I. and Arafat, H.A. (2014). Solid waste management in the hospitality industry: A review, *Journal of Environmental Management*, 146, 320-336.
- Schubert, F., Kandampully, J., Solnet, D. and Kralj, A. (2010). Exploring consumer perceptions of green restaurants in the US, *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 10 (4), 286-300.
- Stys, B. (2008). Green restaurants: commercial kitchens face unique challenges as well as opportunities for saving energy and materials, *Environmental Design and Construction*, 11 (5), 64.

- Sustainable Restaurant Association, (2009). *Environment/The Sustainable Restaurant Association*. Retrieved 12 January 2015, from www.thesra.org.
- Tran, B. (2009). Green management: The reality of being green in business, *Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Science*, 14 (27), 21-45.
- UNWTO, (2014). *Tourism Highlights*. Retrieved 29 March 2015, from <http://mkt.unwto.org/publication/unwto-tourism-highlights-2014-edition>.
- Wang, R. (2012). Investigations of important and effective effects of green practices in restaurants, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40, 94-98.
- Wang, Y.F., Chen, S.P., Lee, Y.C. and Tsai, C.T. (2013), Developing green management standards for restaurants: An application of green supply chain management, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 263-273.