Tour Operators as well as travel agents are the intermediaries in the Tourism industry. The development of Tourism Industry of any country, to a great extent, depends on the performance of the various intermediaries marketing. It has been observed that the most significant dimensions of services provided by tourism marketing intermediaries are: Use of professional experience on schedules of train connections, religious pilgrimages, advises on the type of itineraries which travelers select, serve travelers with well trained multilingual guides, provide information relating to destination, climate etc., sells packaged tours and sometimes escorting groups personally, etc.

Intermediaries typically perform three main functions. First, they adjust the discrepancy of assortment through the processes of sorting, accumulation, allocation and assorting. Second, they minimize distribution costs through routinising and standardizing transactions, which makes the exchange more efficient and effective. Finally, Intermediaries facilitate the searching process of both buyers and sellers by structuring the information essential to both parties, providing a place for both parties to meet each other and reducing uncertainty.

The term distribution denotes the methods by which a product or a service is distributed from producers to the consumers. The middlemen are the link and if the link is strong, the production succeeded in raising the tourist’s influx. The middlemen are wholesalers, buying tourism products in bulk and then making them available to the retailers, the travel agents. The travel agents are the retailers.
The tour operators buy a range of tourism products in bulk, vis; air line seats, they package the tourist products and sale either to travel agents or direct to the tourists, hotel accommodations, coach transfers etc;

The rapid development of tourism has contributed to the increasing domain of tour operators. In this competitive arena, tour operators are seen both as influential sources of information and as distribution channels, that affect tourist images and decisions (Gartner, 1993\(^1\), Woodside and Lysonski, 1989\(^2\)).

In fact, they provide information to potential travelers (Baloglu, 1997\(^3\); Gitelson and Crompton, 1983\(^4\); Hseish and O'Leary, 1993\(^5\)), develop and promote destination packages (Gartner and Bachri, 1994\(^6\)), determining market trends, prosperity of destinations and suppliers, and affecting the demand levels for destinations.

Therefore, tour operators can be considered as an enterprise that transform production inputs such as environmental attractions and tourist services, in order to provide travelers with tools to create new products with a tailored personality and originality with respect to the single components.

In fact tour operators, owing to their cenn in the information network and their know - how, are able to identify and connect the various centralized services such as overnight stay and transport, homogeneously by price and quality level, based on a previous segmentation in relation to travel and expenditure capacity.

The tourism value chain starts with the customer order. Customer or tourists have some alternative when they purchase the tourism product.

These intermediaries can arrange their travel plan with the help of tour operators or outbound travel agents (Package travel) that is that has the advantage of taking professional advice on the Whole Holiday Package without any thinking or arrange it
themselves (individual travel), which allows them to be flexible in their travel experience.

Incoming travel agents can be used to make transfer arrangements from/to the airport or train station, harbor, etc; to/from the hotel and for daily excursions and other activities held at destinations.

According to Wynne (2000), the international tourism industry is characterized by large numbers of small suppliers who are globally scattered.

According to Bhatia (2006), the main role of travel agent is to provide to their customers a convenient location for the “purchase” of various elements of travel like transport, accommodation and several other ancillary services associated with holiday and travel.

According to Robert and Joy (2001), “a travel agent is an intermediary who derives financial in the form of a commission by linking suppliers of tourism services with consumers through the provision of reservation, ticketing and other services.” A travel agent is any person who sells travel products on commission basis. A person selling travel who meets certain minimum qualifications can vary widely according to who uses the term or sets the standards.

The travel agents act as booking agents for holidays and travel disseminate information and give advice on such services. This role can be summed up as follows:

a) To give advice to the potential tourist on the merits of alternatives destinations.

b) To make necessary arrangements for a chosen holiday which may involve booking of accommodation, transport or other relevant services associated with his travel
In other words, a travel agent is an intermediary providing a direct link between the consumer and the suppliers of tourists services such as airlines transport companies, Hotels, auto rental companies; etc.

The travel agent is the one who acts on behalf of the principal i.e.; the original provider of tourist service such as an airline company, Hotel Company shipping company, insurance company, railways or a tour operator. An agent sells the principal’s services and is rewarded by a commission.

A Tour operator’s aim is to create customer loyalty to them rather than to any of the destinations they are selling. However, destinations are able to sell their products to many distributors and therefore are not compelled to be able to be loyal to any tour operator. Conversely, tour operators act as a catalyst of demand in the sense of understanding market needs and directing them to destinations (Jenkins, 1991). They also influence the process of improving quality standards, since tour operators monitor the performance of the whole tourist industry and, in many cases, assesses client satisfaction after their trip. So far, active local community and government support in developing the destination image, that can be adapted to changing tastes and new market segments, and the collaboration of local suppliers can turn these effects into positive opportunities for destinations.

Value Chain Members in the Tourism Industry

The tourism value chain starts with the customer order. Customer or tourists have some alternative when they purchase the tourism product. They can arrange their travel plan with the help of tour operators or outbound travel agents (Package travel)—that is that has the advantage of taking professional advice on the Whole Holiday Package without any thinking or arrange it themselves (individual travel), which allows them to be flexible in their travel experience. Incoming travel agents can be
used to make transfer arrangements from/to the airport or train station, harbor, etc; to/from the hotel and for daily excursions and other activities held at destinations.

In 3rd world destinations this is compounded by the secluded locations of many of the attractions, limited domestic markets and weak infrastructures. Likewise, tourists are numerous, diverse and are geographically separated from the suppliers. Many live in different time zones.

The value chain members in the tourism industry: Destinations? IBTO (Inbound Tour Operator) ? OBTO (Outbound Tour Operators) ? Travel Agent ? Tourists.

Development of Tourism Industry of any location, to a great extent, depends on the performance of the various intermediaries marketing.

It has been observed that the most significant dimensions of services provided by tourism marketing intermediaries are: Use of professional experience on schedules of train connections, religious pilgrimages, advises on the type of itineraries which travelers selection, serve travelers with well trained multilingual guides, provide information relating to destination, climate etc, sells packaged tours and sometimes escorting groups personally, etc.

The study is based on the analysis of the responses of tourists (international as well as domestic) visiting Punjab.

They were asked to identify the most significant dimensions or attributes about travel and tour operators in elevating the level of satisfaction of the tourists.
The findings of this study may be useful to tourism marketers to develop appropriate strategy in tourism marketing with regard to the role of marketing intermediaries in order to enhance the level of satisfaction of international tourists.

**Evaluation of the Level of Importance of Travel Agents Tour Operators**

In order to evaluate the performance of the intermediaries, firstly the respondents were arranged in the form of the ones using these services and the others not using ones. The purpose for doing so was only to analyse the responses of only those respondents who were experienced of using the intermediaries’ services.

From the following table it is evident that approximately 50% of the tourists use the services of these intermediaries and the other 50% depend on their own selves or some other sources.

**Table 4.1**

*Type of Travel Used by Tourists*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaged</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-packaged</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data.*

Nature of travel was categorized in to two broad categories. About 49.6 % of traveler’s used packaged tours while the remaining 50.4 % used non-packaged tours.
Performance of Travel and Tour Operators

Appropriate questions were put to the respondent tourists and data obtained was processed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics- stepwise multiple regressions.

A hypothesis was developed for the purpose of testing travel agents and tour operator's service dimension / performance dimensions in meeting the satisfaction criteria of their tourist clients.

H0: Travel agents and tour operators service /performance dimensions are not significant drivers of overall satisfaction of the tourists.

To test this hypothesis, the stepwise multiple regression analysis has been used.

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \ldots \beta_k X_k + e_i \]

Where,

- \( Y \) = tourist overall satisfaction
- \( X_i \) = travel and tour operators performance dimensions
- \( \beta_i \) = slope of the line and
- \( e_i \) = error term associated with the ith observation.

The stepwise multiple regression outputs are analyzed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.770(p)</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.51083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** (Alpha = .8449)

Source: Primary Data.
The Alpha coefficient (0.8449) for Performance dimensions of travel and tour operators is reliable, i.e., it exceeds the 0.5 threshold recommended.

The value of $R^2 = .770$ shows a strong relationship between tour and travel agents and overall satisfaction level of tourists.

The value of $R^2 = .592$ explains that 59.20% of the variation is explained and 39.80% remained unexplained.

Thus, the predictive ability of the model is moderate.

Table 4.3

Performance Dimensions of Travel and Tour Operators (ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.950</td>
<td>41.963</td>
<td>.000(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.

ANOVA output table describes the overall variance accounted for in the model.

Overall satisfaction of tourists as is indicated by an extremely large F value (41.963) and a small significant level (.000).
Moreover, the associated Sig. value is less than the significance level (p<0.05).

Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected based on the value of the F statistics shown above.

According to the stepwise multiple regression, the 9 out of the 10 Performance dimensions of travel and tour operators are important activities.

The important activities performed by the tour and travel agents are:

1. Use of professional experience on schedules of train connections.
2. Religious pilgrimages.
3. Advises on the type of itineraries which travelers select.
4. Serve travelers with well trained multilingual guides.
5. Provide information relating to destination, climate etc.
6. Sells packaged tours and sometimes escorting groups personally.
7. Provides information to travelers on hotels and accommodations.
8. Handles and advises on details of modern travel like currency exchange, health requirements.
9. Sells tickets to travelers on all modes of travel, arranges transfer of passengers’ and luggage between terminals.

The intermediaries, on the specific request of the tourist, help them in organizing music, serves as an intermediary between travelers and supplier’s of services), are found significantly related to tourist satisfaction level on Performance dimensions of travel and tour operators at p< 0.05, While 4 Performance dimensions of travel and tour operators are excluded for being less important at p > .05.
### Table 4.4

Performance Dimensions of Travel and Tour Operators (Regression Coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.745 .130</td>
<td>28.698</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses Professional Experience On Schedules Of Train Connections, Religious Pilgrimages.</td>
<td>.347 .036 .897</td>
<td>9.515</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serves As An Intermediary B/Travelers &amp; Supplier's Of Services</td>
<td>.306 .117 .338</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advises On The Type Of Itineraries Which Travelers Select</td>
<td>4.236 .409 5.032</td>
<td>3.599</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serve Travelers With Well Trained Multilingual Guides</td>
<td>.503 .123 .571</td>
<td>4.078</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Information Relating To Destination, Climate Etc;</td>
<td>3.244 .373 3.218</td>
<td>8.688</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sells Packaged Tours &amp; Sometimes Escorting Groups Personally</td>
<td>.669 .186 .923</td>
<td>3.599</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides Information To Travelers On Hotels &amp;Accommodations</td>
<td>.314 .126 .422</td>
<td>2.485</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handles &amp; Advises On Details Of Modern Travel Like Currency Exchange, Health Req.</td>
<td>2.440 .288 2.432</td>
<td>8.475</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sells Tickets To Travelers On All Modes Of Travel</td>
<td>.281 .036 1.363</td>
<td>7.807</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arranges Transfer Of Passengers &amp; Luggage's B/N Terminals &amp; Organizing Music</td>
<td>2.221 .299 2.033</td>
<td>7.426</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: overall satisfaction level of respondent Tourists.

Source: Primary Data.
Type of Travel Arrangement Pattern by Tourists

The type of travel arrangement made by the various respondent tourists was studied by asking them a particular question about the same. The responses were tabulated and the analysis has been shown on the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Self</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/employer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>07.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>08.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour operator</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.

Tourist’s travel arrangements were classified into five categories. A bit above 38% of tourists used self-travel arrangement, 29.3% used tour operators, 7.8% used their office or employer, and travel agents were used by 8.3% and a bit above 3% used other methods of travel arrangements.
Type of Tour Package Schemes Used by Travelers

The type of package tour used by the 134 respondents having stated to have used this was tabulated and the same has been depicted with the help of the following table.

Table 4.6

Type of Tour Package Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tour Package Scheme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Cultural tour packages</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure tour packages</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03.7</td>
<td>03.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Seeing tour packages</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilgrimage tour packages</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study tour packages</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>04.5</td>
<td>04.5</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountaineering tour</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01.5</td>
<td>01.5</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Life tour Package</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02.4</td>
<td>02.4</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All purpose tour Package</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special interest tour packages</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07.5</td>
<td>07.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.
Type of tour package schemes used by travelers was classified into nine categories. Nearly 27% of tourists used sight seeing tour package scheme, approximately 24% used pilgrimage tour packages, nearly 18% used all purpose tour packages and pilgrimage tour packages, nearly 10% used cultural tour packages, nearly 4.5% used study tour packages, about 7.5% used special purpose tour packages whereas only 2.4% tourists were using it for wild life and 1.5% for maintaining.

Table 4.7

Average Duration of Stay for Packaged Tourists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 05 nights</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 10 nights</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 15 nights</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 nights</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.

Estimated average duration of stay for a packaged tourist was classified into four categories. Nearly 71% of traveler’s estimated duration of stay was upto 05 Nights, and nearly 16% stayed upto 10 nights and more nearly 07% stayed for upto 15 nights and it is only for the remaining 6% who stay for more than 15 nights.
It is revealed that the tourists availing packaged tour facilities do not stay for very long duration.

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Up to 05 nights</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 10 nights</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 15 nights</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 nights</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03.7</td>
<td>03.7</td>
<td>100-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.

Estimated average duration of stay for non-packaged tourists was also classified into four categories. A bit above 60% of traveler’s estimated duration of stay was up to 5 nights, about 24% stayed up to 10 nights, about 12% stayed up to 15 nights and it is only in case of about 4% tourists from the non-packaged category that stay in Punjab for more than 15 nights.
Comparison of the Opinions of the Tour and Travel Agents and Tourism Executives

The level of importance to which various tourism policy makers attach to and the opinions of the tour operators about the same need to be checked to find out the issues on which both these important groups attach equal importance for tourist attraction.

This is done to extract the common issues i.e. on which both of these groups have an agreement and these issues need to be taken utmost care of for attracting tourists and for framing the tourism strategies.

Further, the common issues on which both these groups have again an agreement that are the least important, these parameters need to be given the least importance while framing the tourism marketing strategy.

In order to know as to which are the most important aspects for attracting tourists, the responses of the various tour operators and the policy makers were obtained on 17 items which were considered important.

The responses obtained from both the groups of respondents, (Tour Operators and Policy Making executives) were tabulated and the means and standard deviations were calculated for all the 17 factors.

By using these values, t-test was applied and the acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis was checked by comparing the calculated value of the t-test and the table value.

The acceptance or the rejection of the null hypothesis by using t-test has been shown in table 4.9 below.
TABLE 4.9
Agreement/ Non Agreement on Factors of Tourist Attraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Tour Operators (N=25)</th>
<th>Policy Executives (N=15)</th>
<th>t-test (Calculated Value)</th>
<th>Acceptance/ Rejection of Null Hypothesis (Ho)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scenic Beauty</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Season</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Historic Places</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cultural Value</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Friends/ Relatives</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table values of t-test at 5 % Level of significance from the two tailed test is 2.0244.

Source: Compiled from the primary data.
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The observations of the study, about the various parameters, have been discussed below.

**Location**

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2.$

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Tourism Location by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is same.

$H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2.$

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Tourism Location by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is not same.

**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Scenic Beauty**

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2.$

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Scenic Beauty by Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is same.

$H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2.$

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Scenic Beauty by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is not same.

**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Season**

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2.$

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Tourism season by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is same.
HI: \( \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \).

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Tourism season by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is not same.

**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**Climate**

Ho: \( \mu_1 = \mu_2 \).

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Climate by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is same.

H1: \( \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \).

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Climate by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is not same.

**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Shopping Facilities**

Ho: \( \mu_1 = \mu_2 \).

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Shopping Facilities by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is same.

H1: \( \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \).

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Shopping facilities by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is not same.
**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**Distance**

**Ho:** $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Distance by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is same.

**H1:** $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on distance by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is not same.

**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**Safety**

**Ho:** $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Safety by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is same.

**H1:** $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Safety by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is not same.

**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Cleanliness**

**Ho:** $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.
i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Cleanliness by the Tour Operators and Policy Making Executives is the same.

H1: μ1 ≠ μ2.

i.e. the mean of the importance of importance laid cleanliness by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is the same.

**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Historical**

Ho: μ1 = μ2.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Historical Places by Tour Operators and Policy Making executives is same.

H1: μ1 ≠ μ2.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Historical Places by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is not the same.

**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Cultural**

Ho: μ1 = μ2.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Cultural Values by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is the same.

H1: μ1 ≠ μ2.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Cultural Values by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is not the same.
Result: From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Entertainment

Ho: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Entertainment by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is the same.

H1: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Entertainment by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is not the same.

Result: From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Cost

Ho: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Cost by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is the same.

H1: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Cost by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is not the same.

Result: From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Friends/Relatives

Ho: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Friends/Relatives by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is the same.
Hi: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Friends/Relatives by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is not the same.

**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**Accommodation**

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Accommodation by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is the same.

$H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Accommodation by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is not the same.

**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**Language**

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Language by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is the same.

$H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$.

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Language by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is not the same.

**Result:** From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives, the null hypothesis is rejected.
Food

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2.$

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Food by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is the same.

$H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2.$

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Food by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is not the same.

Result: From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making Executives, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Transportation

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2.$

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Transportation by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is the same.

$H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2.$

i.e. the mean of the importance laid on Transportation by the Tour Operators and the Policy making Executives is not the same.

Result: From the values obtained by the Tour Operators and Policy Making Executives, the null hypothesis is rejected.

From the above table, it is observed that out of the 17 factors the null hypothesis for only 8 factors have been accepted and for the remaining 9 it has been rejected. Thus it is only in case of the factors: Location, Scenic Beauty, Climate, Safety, Cleanliness, Historical Places, Cultural Values and Entertainment that the tour and travel agents and the policy making executives equal importance whereas in case of the factors: Season, shopping, distance, cost, friends and relatives advisory support...
from the company, services, accommodation, language, Food and Transport there is an obvious conflict among these two groups as far as their level of importance is concerned.

**Highest Rated Factors**

From the values of mean scores (calculated in table 4.9), on the various factors, the comparison of the six highest rated factors by both the Tour operators and Tourism policy maker executives has been depicted in table 4.10 below.

**Table 4.10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tour Operators</th>
<th>Policy Making Executives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Distance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Compiled from table 4.9

From the above table, it is depicted that it is only in case of the two parameters, ‘Food’ and ‘Cleanliness’ both - the policy making executives as well as the tour and travel agents placed them in the highest ranked factors. In case of the remaining four highest ranked factors, there is a conflict amongst the these two important tourism groups as
the opinions of the tourism executives and the tour operators and the travel agents about these remaining four high rank parameters are different from each other.

Overall, the table depicts that there is a conflict amongst these two important tourism groups as the opinions of the tourism executives and the tour operators and the travel agents on a big majority of the factors considered important for the tourism.

**Least Rated Factors**

From the values of mean scores (calculated in table 4.9), on the various factors, the comparison of the six least rated factors by both the tour operators and the tourism policy making executives has been depicted in table 4.11 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tour Operators</th>
<th>Policy Making Executives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Language</td>
<td>1 Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Accommodation</td>
<td>2 Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Climate</td>
<td>3 Friends/Relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Safety</td>
<td>4 Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Historical Places</td>
<td>5 Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cultural Values</td>
<td>6 Historical Places</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Compiled from table 4.9.*
From the above table, it is depicted that it is only in case of the parameters, 'Language', 'Accommodation' and 'Historical Places' that both of these groups have placed these parameters in the least ranked factors. In case of the remaining four least ranked factors, there is a conflict/disagreement among them as depicted in the above table.

Overall, the table depicts that there is a conflict amongst the Tourism Policy making executives and the Travel agents and tour operators as their views/opinions are divergent on many of the tourism components.

Factors of Agreement and Non Agreement

The overall analysis about all the 17 selected parameters (as calculated in table 4.9 above), the factors of agreement and Non Agreement amongst the Tour Operators and Policy Making executives have been summarized with the help of table 4.12 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Non Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td>Season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Beauty 2</td>
<td>Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate 3</td>
<td>Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety 4</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness 5</td>
<td>Friends/Relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Places 6</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Value 7</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment 8</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from tables 4.9, 4.10 and 4.11.
The above table, as already discussed in the analysis of table 4.9, depicts that out of the 17 factors, in case of 8 factors the opinions of the Policy making executives and the various tour and travel agents match with each other and for the remaining 9 factors there is a mismatch in their opinions.

Conclusion

The relationship between performance dimensions of travel and tour operators and overall satisfaction of tourists was examined using a stepwise multiple regressions. The results of this research showed that travel and tour operators service dimensions such as use of professional experience on schedules of train connections, religious pilgrimages, advises on the type of itineraries which travelers select, serving travelers with well trained multi-lingual guides, providing information relating to destination, climate etc, selling packaged tours and sometimes escorting groups personally, providing information to travelers on hotels and accommodations, handling and advising on details of modern travel like currency exchange, health requirement, selling tickets to travelers on all modes of travel, arranging transfer of passengers and luggage's between terminals and organizing music, serving as an intermediary between travelers and supplier's of services are found significantly related to tourist satisfaction level of tourists who visited Punjab. Further analysis of the study regarding performance dimensions of travel and tour operators revealed that all performance dimensions of travel and tour operators were not equally contributing to enhance the level of tourist satisfaction. For example, advises on the type of itineraries which travelers select, providing information relating to destinations, climate etc and handling and advising on details of modern travel like currency exchange, health requirement were carrying more weight respectively than other Performance dimensions of travel and tour operators in contributing to tourist satisfaction. The study also implies to travel
and tour operators to better organize themselves and build their human capital to serve
the tourists. The tourism marketers are required to have sufficiently trained multi-
lingual and professional guides to provide all the necessary information’s to tourists.

The study further examined the type of tour package schemes and the number of nights
for which the tourists stayed. It was also observed that again there was no significant
difference between the two types of tourists i.e. Packaged tour and non packaged tour

Overall it can be said that the tourism intermediaries are very important for the
development and promotion of tourism at any place. They play a significant role.

The findings of the study bring to light there are many factors about which the opinions
the policy executives and travel and tour agents differ from each other and even in
some of the factors they are rather diametrically opposite. The Government and PTDC
need to appropriately understand the common factors and strict measures be taken to
implement them by chalking appropriate marketing strategy for tourism promotion in
the state.
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