



E-ISSN: 3108-4176

APSSHS

Academic Publications of Social Sciences and Humanities Studies

2022, Volume 3, Page No: 1-15

Available online at: <https://apsshs.com/>

## Annals of Organizational Culture, Leadership and External Engagement Journal

# An Investigation into Hotel Employees' Perceptions of Institutionalization Levels

Cemal Ersin Silik<sup>1</sup>, Burcu Ilgaz<sup>2\*</sup>, Yusuf Dündar<sup>3</sup>, Mükerrerem Atalay Oral<sup>4</sup>

1. Faculty of Tourism, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Ankara, Turkey.
2. Tourism and Travel Services, Manavgat Vocational School, Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey.
3. Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy, Ankara, Turkey.
4. Business Administration Program, Elmali Vocational School, Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey.

### Abstract

Institutionalization is a process that requires adaptation and alignment with the environment, ensuring stability and value in the organizations. The tourism sector holds significant importance in the economic growth of all countries. As a result, institutionalization is considered a critical management approach for tourism businesses to navigate competitive market conditions, maintain profitability, and sustain their market presence. This research aimed to evaluate the perceived level of institutionalization among 368 employees from 50 five-star hotels in Antalya. The study employed descriptive statistics along with factor analysis, t-tests, and ANOVA tests. The findings showed that employees' perceptions of formalization, cultural power, professionalization, and consistency differed depending on factors such as the total workforce size, bed capacity, and the operational duration of the hotels where they worked.

**Keywords:** Antalya, Organizational behavior, Tourism, Institutionalization, Hotel establishments.

**How to cite this article:** Silik CE, Ilgaz B, Dündar Y, Atalay Oral M. An Investigation into Hotel Employees' Perceptions of Institutionalization Levels. Ann Organ Cult Leadersh Extern Engagem J. 2022;3:1-15. <https://doi.org/10.51847/STntgu2esi>

**Received:** 20 Decembr 2021; **Revised:** 25 Februar 2022; **Accepted:** 27 February 2022

**Corresponding author:** Burcu Ilgaz

**E-mail** ✉ [burcuilgaz@akdeniz.edu.tr](mailto:burcuilgaz@akdeniz.edu.tr)

### Introduction

In the face of global competition, organizations can only expand and establish a presence in international markets through an effective management system [1]. Management systems play a crucial role in enabling businesses to maintain their existence and optimize resource utilization [2]. Given the growing importance of management systems and ongoing transformations in the business landscape, management science has increasingly turned its attention to institutionalization [3]. Institutionalization facilitates a more rapid and lasting adaptation of businesses to the ever-evolving economic environment, allowing them to sustain their operations independently of individuals while maintaining a distinctive, flexible, and autonomous structure that differentiates them from competitors [4].

Institutionalization signifies the alignment between establishments and their operating environment, evolving [5]. This process necessitates transformation, requiring businesses to modify their structural elements, particularly their organizational framework and system, to achieve compatibility with external conditions [6]. Institutionalization emphasizes the interaction between the external environment and the organization, fostering alignment that ultimately enhances an establishment's stability and value. By undergoing this transformation, businesses strengthen their ability to persist and remain viable. Reaching an institutional state indicates that an establishment has gained acceptance within its environment and attained sustainability [7]. Furthermore, institutionalization ensures that businesses can operate and grow without relying on specific individuals [8, 9]. To achieve this, organizations must be restructured based on established principles and standards, requiring



© 2022 The Author(s).

Copyright CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

both management and personnel to be knowledgeable and ensuring that operations are driven by expertise and informed decision-making [10, 11].

Institutionalization can also be described as a systemic concept that explains organizational transformation while guiding establishments in adapting to their environment. It represents a structured and regulated set of activities emerging from the interaction between an organization and its external surroundings, encompassing the implementation of rules, procedures, and practices derived from this framework [12]. Another definition highlights institutionalization as the process in which an establishment develops the necessary organizational and managerial systems to meet contemporary demands, determines appropriate operational standards and principles essential for institutionalization, and documents them for practical application [13].

From an organizational perspective, institutionalization entails adopting rules, standards, and rational management principles that are independent of individuals. It involves creating systems that track changes in the external environment, structuring the organization following these developments, integrating business methods and procedures into the organizational culture, and ultimately shaping a unique identity that sets the establishment apart from others. This process enables the organization to become more systematic and cultivate an efficient working environment [14].

Tourism establishments, operating within the tourism sector—often referred to as the “smokeless industry”—play a crucial role in the economies of developing nations by generating foreign currency inflows and helping to reduce trade deficits. To remain competitive, these establishments must implement strategic measures to navigate intense market conditions, maintain profitability, and sustain their market position. Tourism significantly contributes to national economic growth, and its success relies heavily on employees engaged in labor-intensive roles [15, 16]. From this perspective, institutionalization serves as a critical management framework for tourism businesses.

This study focused on employees working in five-star hotels in Antalya. Data were collected from 368 employees across 50 five-star hotels using survey methods between September and October 2019. The study employed descriptive statistics, along with t-tests and ANOVA tests. The reliability of the measurement tool was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient, while the validity of the measurements and the interpretations drawn from them were evaluated through explanatory factor analysis. Statistical software was used to analyze the survey data.

### *Theoretical Framework*

Institutional Theory, which underpins the concept of institutionalization, was initially introduced by Philip Selznick in 1948. Selznick [17] described institutionalization as a process through which values and ideas are disseminated, and shaped by both organizations and individuals while also being constrained by external factors [18]. Meyer and Rowan [19] conceptualized institutionalization as a series of processes, expectations, and facts that become established norms within social thought and behavior. Meanwhile, DiMaggio and Powell [20] characterized institutionalization as a mechanism that organizations utilize to navigate uncertainty, stating that institutions often emerge by emulating and adjusting to the practices of successful organizations within their environment [21]. One of the key aspects associated with institutionalization is the formulation of work descriptions, organizational structures, and documented procedures [22].

Broom and Selznick [23] described institutionalization as a neutral concept referring to “the emergence of orderly, stable, socially integrating patterns out of unstable, loosely organized, or narrowly technical activities.” The institutionalization process begins when organizations adopt the values present within both their internal and external environments. This process should be closely monitored by leadership to assess both its advantages and potential risks. Zucker [24] suggested that the level of institutionalization varies based on the environment in which an action occurs, as well as the role and position of the individual involved. She further argued that as institutionalization progresses, cultural continuity naturally takes hold [25].

Research that has contributed to Institutional theory [19, 24, 26] highlights the theory’s core argument: organizations structure their processes and frameworks in response to their institutional environment. This environment consists of external elements, including rational structures, rules, norms, and belief systems that have evolved through modernization [25].

The institutional approach emphasizes a resemblance between the structural and procedural characteristics of organizations and the external environment in which they operate. This similarity, referred to as isomorphism, plays a crucial role in aligning organizations with their surroundings. Businesses within the same industry tend to develop comparable structures and operational models due to shared environmental pressures. When all organizations in a given sector display this pattern, the phenomenon is termed “institutional isomorphism.” In essence, businesses within the same field begin to resemble each other in both structural design and operational practices. Institutionalization within business management commences with the implementation of systematic procedures. Developing structured processes for core functions such as raw material procurement, inventory management, production flow, financial transactions, and record-keeping marks the beginning of institutionalization, regardless of the business’s scale [22].

Tolbert and Zucker [27] introduced a model to explain the institutionalization process. This model suggests that factors such as technological advancements, legal mandates, and market-induced challenges trigger new forms of organizational

adaptation. The process unfolds in three distinct stages, beginning with habitualization, where routine patterns of behavior emerge. The second stage, objectification, involves the widespread acceptance of these behavioral patterns. Finally, in the sedimentation stage, these behaviors become ingrained in the organization, attaining an externalized and self-sustaining reality [28].

Tolbert and Zucker [27] further examined institutionalization by categorizing it into different phases, distinguishing between pre-institutionalization, semi-institutionalization, and full institutionalization. **Table 1** below presents a comparative analysis of these stages.

**Table 1.** Stages of institutionalization and comparative dimensions [27]

Dimension	Pre-institutionalization stage	Semi-institutionalization stage	Full institutionalization stage
Processes	Habitualization	Objectification	Sedimentation
Characteristics of adopters	Homogeneous	Heterogeneous	Heterogeneous
Impetus for diffusion	Imitation	Imitative/normative	Normative
Theorization activity	None	High	Low
Variance in implementation	High	Moderate	Low
Structure failure rate	High	Moderate	Low

Organizations are influenced by three primary institutional mechanisms that shape decision-making: mimetic mechanisms, coercive mechanisms, and normative mechanisms. Coercive mechanisms arise from political pressures and concerns related to legitimacy. Mimetic mechanisms involve organizations replicating the strategies and approaches of competitors due to uncertainty in managerial decision-making. Normative mechanisms are linked to professionalization within the organization [29].

A review of previous studies [3, 30-34] indicates that institutionalization is commonly examined through five key dimensions: formalization, professionalization, transparency, cultural power, and consistency [35]. An overview of these dimensions is outlined below.

### *Formalization*

Formalization refers to the establishment of clearly defined processes, responsibilities, and decision-making authority within an organization [34]. It involves standardizing and documenting key operational elements such as rules, roles, and procedures [36]. A formal structure provides a framework for managing control and coordination within an organization, reflecting its institutionalized principles [31]. According to Pugh *et al.* [37], the structural configuration of an organization is closely linked to the nature of its activities, with various contextual factors influencing structural diversity [38].

### *Professionalization*

Professionalization emphasizes that tasks and operations within an organization should be carried out by individuals with specialized expertise, ensuring a well-balanced allocation of duties, authority, and responsibilities [9]. There is a common belief that professionalization strictly entails employing individuals from outside a family-owned business. However, it also includes assigning roles to family members based on their competencies, qualifications, and experience [3]. Furthermore, Apaydin [31] defines professionalization as fostering a work environment that promotes professional attributes such as independence and continuous development, along with maintaining connections with relevant industry and professional organizations.

### *Transparency*

Transparency involves making organizational information accessible to the public in an accurate, clear, and comprehensive manner [34]. Frequently associated with accountability in the literature, transparency ensures that organizations disclose their information truthfully and completely. It also serves as a key factor in enhancing overall performance [30].

### *Cultural Power*

Cultural power, also known as organizational culture, represents the collective beliefs and values that influence employee behavior and decision-making within an organization [34]. It reflects the degree to which organizational values and cultural norms are embraced across the institution. The stronger the alignment of employees with the ethical guidelines, values, and principles that define the organization's culture, the more robust the cultural framework becomes [31].

### *Consistency*

Consistency ensures that an organization's actions align with its objectives and that commitments are honored [3]. According to Jaworski and Merchant [41], consistency refers to an organization's ability to fulfill its commitments. Additionally, it

encompasses the alignment between an organization's mission, strategy, and operations, as well as maintaining a coherent approach in comparison to similar institutions within the same sector [31].

### *Literature Review*

Research on institutionalization spans multiple dimensions, including its interplay with human resource management practices [29, 34, 42], challenges that may arise [6, 43], development of criteria measurement scales [38], employee perception in hotel businesses [21], and its influence on job satisfaction [44]. Other studies have examined its role in institutional entrepreneurship [35], its implementation in catering services [45], variations based on business structures [3], and its effect on emotional labor [46]. Further research has linked institutionalization to business performance [31], feasibility assessments in hotel management [47], quality of working life [48], competitive strength [49, 50], and the adoption of strategic management tools [51].

Among the studies closely aligned with the present research, Aylan and Koç [21] explored how hotel employees perceive institutionalization. Their findings indicate that staff working in chain hotels, internationally recognized brands, and establishments managed by professional executives reported a stronger institutionalization perception than those in other hotel businesses.

Akkuş and Bilen [34] investigated how institutionalization relates to human resource management within organizations. Their findings confirmed a significant correlation, echoing the results of Yılmaz and Kitapçı [42], who demonstrated that strategic human resource management facilitates institutionalization. Meanwhile, Boselie *et al.* [29] observed that the influence of human resources management depends on an organization's institutionalization level. It was found to be more pronounced in entities with lower institutionalization, such as hotels, whereas its impact was relatively weaker in highly institutionalized organizations like hospitals and local governments.

Institutionalization-related obstacles have been analyzed in studies focusing on family-run businesses. Akyol and Zengin [6] identified several challenges, including communication issues, lack of structured planning, generational conflicts, demographic constraints, role ambiguity, high employee turnover, internal power struggles, and workplace gossip. Similarly, Özbay and Ellidört [43] highlighted institutionalization difficulties in family businesses, citing impulsive managerial decision-making, strategic choices being centralized within the business owner's authority, informal decision-sharing among family members, exclusion of non-family employees from key decision-making processes, and challenges in executing decisions due to conflicting viewpoints.

The role of institutionalization in improving work environments was examined by Marta *et al.* [48], who found a positive effect on the quality of working life. Examining its connection to emotional labor, Çetinkaya and Korkmaz [46] observed that workplaces with structured job descriptions and well-established rules encouraged employees to engage in higher levels of emotional labor. These findings suggest that institutionalization fosters a work culture where emotional labor is more prevalent. Similarly, Demirci *et al.* [44] explored the relationship between institutionalization and job satisfaction, finding a direct positive association. Their research suggests that hotels aiming to enhance employee satisfaction should prioritize institutionalization efforts.

The impact of institutionalization on strategic management tool adoption was examined by Kurt and Yeşiltaş [51], who established a strong link between the two. Their findings suggest that as businesses institutionalize further, they are more likely to integrate strategic management practices [51, 52].

Tengilimoğlu and Akgöz [3] analyzed institutionalization within different business structures, revealing that hotels operating year-round exhibited higher levels of formalization and cultural cohesion compared to seasonal ones. Their study also highlighted that non-family-owned hotels demonstrated greater levels of formalization than those managed as family businesses. Additionally, Karacaoğlu and Sözbilen [35] examined the role of institutionalization in fostering institutional entrepreneurship in accommodation businesses, concluding that higher institutionalization levels contribute significantly to entrepreneurial practices within such establishments.

### **Materials and Methods**

The research sample consisted of employees from five-star hotels in Antalya, where a significant portion of Turkey's tourism accommodations is concentrated. Specifically, 19.5% of tourism-licensed accommodations are located in Antalya, with five-star hotels representing 42.3% of these establishments [53]. Data collection was carried out through a survey method between September and October 2019. The survey was distributed to employees of 50 five-star hotels, which collectively employed 14,167 individuals. Of the 750 surveys distributed, 404 were returned completed, with 368 deemed valid for analysis. This resulted in a response rate of 49.1%.

The survey included demographic questions related to gender, age, education, marital status, employment duration, and hotel characteristics such as employee count, bed capacity, years of operation, type of establishment, and seasonality. The 5-point

Likert scale (1: Absolutely agree to 5: Absolutely disagree), as developed by Apaydın [54], was used to assess the level of institutionalization associated with the employees' perception of their workplace. The scale contained 26 items across four dimensions: formalization (four items), professionalization (six items), cultural power (five items), and consistency (eleven items).

To analyze the demographic features of the employees, their perceptions of institutionalization, and the relationship between these perceptions and demographic or hotel characteristics, several statistical methods were employed. These included frequency and percentage analysis, arithmetic mean and standard deviation, t-tests for independent samples (for variables with 2 groups, such as gender), and ANOVA (for variables with more than 2 groups, such as education level). Parametric assumptions, such as the normal distribution of data, were verified for each group and dimension. When significant differences were found in multi-group variables, the Bonferroni test was applied when variances were homogeneous, or Tamhane's T2 test was used when homogeneity was not met. Levene's test was used to check for variance homogeneity. In cases where homogeneity of variances wasn't met, the results from Welch and Brown-Forsythe's statistics were preferred over the standard ANOVA results. The reliability of the measurement tool was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, and validity was confirmed through exploratory factor analysis. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software.

## Results and Discussion

### *Findings on Demographic Characteristics*

**Table 2** provides an overview of the demographic characteristics of the participants. Most of the respondents were male (65.8%), aged between 31 and 40 years (47.6%), with a university degree (52.7%). Most participants were married (59.8%) and held the position of chef (13.3%) at their current hotel. Additionally, a significant portion of the participants had been employed in their current role for 1 to 3 years (43.8%).

**Table 2.** Distribution of study participants by demographic characteristics

Dem. Charact.	Groups	f	%
Gender	Female	126	34.2
	Male	242	65.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100</b>
Age	21-30	82	22.3
	31-40	175	47.6
	41-50	88	23.9
	51-60	23	6.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100</b>
Level of education	Primary school	28	7.6
	High school	137	37.2
	University	194	52.7
	Postgraduate	9	2.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100</b>
Marital status	Married	220	59.8
	Single	104	28.3
	Divorced/Widow(er)	44	12
	<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100</b>
Assigned duty (position)	General manager	24	6.5
	Purchasing manager	1	.3
	Accounting-finance manager	21	5.7
	Human resources manager	5	1.4
	Marketing sales manager	4	1.1
	Front office manager	18	4.9
	Catering manager	32	8.7
	Housekeeping manager	27	7.3
	Technical manager	2	.5
	Security manager	23	6.3
	Public relations manager	25	6.8
	IT manager	1	.3
	Quality manager	21	5.7
	Entertainment manager	22	6
	Floor supervisor	25	6.8
	Chef	49	13.3

	Accounting supervisor	24	6.5
	HR supervisor	24	6.5
	Bar supervisor	20	5.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100</b>
Term of employment	Less than 1 year	71	19.3
	1-3 years	161	43.8
	4-6 years	106	28.8
	7-9 years	20	5.4
	10 years and above	10	2.7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100</b>

### Findings Regarding the Features of the Hotels from the Perspective of the Employees

**Table 3** displays the distribution of hotel employees based on the characteristics of the hotels they are employed at. The majority of participants worked at hotels with 201-300 employees (32.1%), a bed capacity ranging from 601 to 800 (41.6%), and a business history of 6 to 10 years (39.7%). Most of the hotels were classified as domestic chain establishments (65.2%) and operated throughout the year (73.6%).

**Table 3.** Distribution of hotel employees based on the features of their hotels

Features	Groups	f	%
Number of hotel personnel	0-200	42	11.4
	201-300	118	32.1
	301-400	106	28.8
	401-500	73	19.8
	501-600	23	6.3
	≥ 601	6	1.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100</b>
Hotel bed capacity	200-400	14	3.8
	401-600	36	9.8
	601-800	153	41.6
	801-1000	103	28
	≥ 1001	62	16.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100</b>
Hotel's time in business	1-5 years	40	10.9
	6-10 years	146	39.7
	11-15 years	118	32.1
	16-20 years	59	16
	≥ 21	5	1.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100</b>
Hotel's type of business	Foreign hotel chain	25	6.8
	Domestic hotel chain	240	65.2
	Foreign independent hotel	9	2.4
	Domestic independent hotel	94	25.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100</b>
Seasonality status	Seasonal	97	26.4
	Year-round	271	73.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>100</b>

### Results from Descriptive Statistics, Reliability Analysis, and Exploratory Factor Analysis

**Table 4** presents the results from the institutionalization principles scale (IPS), which evaluates hotel employees' perceptions of their establishments' institutionalization levels. Reliability analysis, using Cronbach's alpha, and validity assessment through explanatory factor analysis showed that all items remained relevant, with none requiring removal from the scale. Furthermore, the explanatory factor analysis identified three factors within the consistency dimension of the scale, each having an eigenvalue greater than 1.

**Table 4.** Findings from the scale

Scale	W. A.	Standard deviation	Factor loads	Reliability coefficient
-------	-------	--------------------	--------------	-------------------------



Factors obtained from the explanatory factor analysis	<i>IPS</i>		3.76	0.46	0.891
	<i>Formalization dimension</i>		3.53	0.70	0.704
	-	Our hotel provides employees with handbooks covering topics such as safety and working conditions.	3.36	1.11	0.735
		Operational guidelines are documented for employees in our hotel.	3.84	0.88	0.767
		A handbook outlining established rules and procedures is available in our hotel.	3.46	0.86	0.716
		Task definitions are clearly outlined in writing at our hotel.	3.45	0.99	0.706
	<i>Explained cumulative total variance %</i>				53.466
	<i>KMO and Bartlett's test</i>		<i>KMO</i>		
			0.617		
			<i>Bartlett's test p</i>		
			0.000		
	<i>Professionalization dimension</i>		3.55	0.86	0.934
	-	Promotions in our hotel are based on the performance and skills of employees.	3.70	0.84	0.892
		Our professional supervisors are involved in the approval of new policies.	3.60	0.95	0.933
		Our hotel has a specialized focus.	3.58	0.97	0.923
		Professionals play a role in selecting new hires for our hotel.	3.71	1.04	0.923
		Our hotel maintains a high level of professionalism.	3.43	1.09	0.787
		Employees are recognized and rewarded based on their performance and skills at our hotel.	3.28	1.05	0.774
	<i>Explained cumulative total variance %</i>				76.485
	<i>KMO and Bartlett's test</i>		<i>KMO</i>		
			.872		
			<i>Bartlett's test p</i>		
			0.000		
	<i>Cultural power dimension</i>		3.46	0.77	0.885
	-	In our hotel, employees can easily reach agreements even on challenging issues.	3.29	1.03	0.874
		There is a clear understanding among employees in our hotel about the correct and incorrect ways to approach tasks.	3.30	0.96	0.940
		Employees across various departments in our hotel share a unified corporate vision.	3.35	0.98	0.930
		There is a strong alignment of purpose between hotel departments and across different levels (subordinates/supervisors).	3.39	0.85	0.885
		Our hotel has a robust culture of corporate commitment among its employees.	3.98	0.83	0.461
	<i>Explained cumulative total variance %</i>				70.122
	<i>KMO and Bartlett's test</i>		<i>KMO</i>		
			0.801		
			<i>Bartlett's test p</i>		
			0.000		
	<i>Coherency dimension</i>		4.09	0.45	0.804
Factor 1		The strategic objectives and actions (activities) of our hotel are aligned.	4.07	0.82	0.800
		In our hotel, business flow processes and organizational structure are in harmony.	3.89	0.87	0.908
		Our hotel operates with consistency.	3.76	0.85	0.851
		Our hotel fulfills the commitments it makes to its stakeholders (other institutions, customers, and employees).	3.72	0.73	0.853
		The strategies and business processes in our hotel are well-aligned.	3.92	0.74	0.913
Factor 2		The technical skills of our hotel's employees align with our business processes.	4.21	0.78	0.738

Factor 3	All actions, processes, and structures in our hotel are exactly as described to external auditors.	4.14	0.84	0.915
	In our hotel, rewards and punishments are applied consistently to all individuals under similar circumstances.	4.21	0.81	0.873
	The processes and structures in our hotel are comparable to those of other establishments in the same sector.	4.32	0.71	0.867
	Our hotel responds to similar situations consistently.	4.38	0.64	0.878
	In our hotel, managerial decisions align with the vision, mission, and strategy.	4.35	0.61	0.847
<b>Explained cumulative total variance %</b>				<b>79.162</b>
<b>KMO and Bartlett's test</b>				<b>KMO 0.729</b>
				<b>Bartlett's test p 0.000</b>

The results in **Table 4** suggest that the institutionalization level of the hotels is generally perceived positively by employees ( $\bar{x} = 3.76$ ). Among the various components, the consistency dimension stands out with a particularly favorable perception ( $\bar{x} = 4.09$ ). However, the cultural power dimension received comparatively lower scores ( $\bar{x} = 3.46$ ). Additionally, the average scores for all items in the scale exceed 3.00, with employees showing strong agreement on statements such as “our hotel reacts to similar situations in similar ways” ( $\bar{x} = 4.38$ ), “in our hotel, managerial decisions are taken in line with the vision, mission, and strategy” ( $\bar{x} = 4.35$ ), and “the processes and structure of our hotel are similar to those of establishments doing the same business in the same sector” ( $\bar{x} = 4.32$ ). On the other hand, responses to statements like “employees of our hotel are awarded following their performance and skills” ( $\bar{x} = 3.28$ ), “in our hotel, it is easy to reach a compromise between employees even in difficult matters” ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ), and “in our hotel, there is a clear understanding among the employees on the right and the wrong ways to do things” ( $\bar{x} = 3.30$ ) were less favorable.

The findings on whether demographic characteristics influence employees' perceptions of the four institutionalization dimensions are shown in **Table 5**.

. For the formalization dimension, employees' responses varied according to age, education level, and years of service at the hotel. Post-hoc tests did not identify significant differences linked to age or education but revealed that employees with longer tenures tended to view formalization more positively.

Similarly, the professionalization dimension showed differences based on age, education, and work duration. The posthoc analysis did not clarify how employment duration impacted responses, but it did indicate that employees in the (51 to 60) age group had a more favorable perception ( $\bar{x} = 3.96$ ) than those in the (31 to 40) age group ( $\bar{x} = 3.43$ ). Moreover, employees with postgraduate education had more positive views ( $\bar{x} = 4.46$ ) compared to high school ( $\bar{x} = 3.49$ ) and university graduates ( $\bar{x} = 3.51$ ).

For the cultural power dimension, responses varied according to gender, age, and education level. Men ( $\bar{x} = 3.53$ ) had a more positive perception compared to women ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ), and employees in the (51 to 60) age group ( $\bar{x} = 3.92$ ) showed more favorable opinions than those in the (21-30) ( $\bar{x} = 3.36$ ) and (31-40) ( $\bar{x} = 3.39$ ) age groups. Higher educational levels were also linked to a more positive outlook in this dimension. Finally, no significant demographic differences were observed for the consistency dimension. Overall, marital status did not appear to affect employees' perceptions, but age and education level were important factors.

**Table 5.** Comparison of evaluations based on demographic characteristics of study participants

Dms.	Variables	Groups	N	W. A.	S.D.	Levene's test (p)*	t/F/W-BF	P	Post-hoc
Formalization	Gender	Female	126	3.46	0.49	0.000	-1.569	.118	No difference
		Male	242	3.56	0.78				
	Age (years)	21-30	82	3.42	0.60	0.168*	3.370	0.019**	(-) *****
		31-40	175	3.47	0.71				
		41-50	88	3.65	.71				
		51-60	23	3.84	.75				
	Level of education	Primary school	28	3.49	1.05	0.000	3.078-2.189 ****	0.041**/0.97	(-) *****
		High school	137	3.41	0.75				



Professionalization	Marital status	University	194	3.60	0.59	0.019	0.602-0.553 ****	0.549/0.577	No difference
		Postgraduate	9	3.86	0.50				
		Married	220	3.55	0.75				
		Single	104	3.47	0.59				
		Divorced/Widow(er)	44	3.57	0.66				
	Term of employment	< 1 year <sup>a</sup>	71	3.39	0.71	0.643*	4.441	0.002***	(a to d, e; b to e) *****
		1-3 years <sup>b</sup>	161	3.48	0.67				
		4-6 years	106	3.56	0.66				
		7-9 years <sup>d</sup>	20	3.90	0.77				
		≥ 10 years <sup>e</sup>	10	4.15	0.74				
	Gender	Female	126	3.66	0.73	0.000	1.854	0.065	No difference
		Male	242	3.49	0.91				
	Age (years)	21-30	82	3.57	0.76	0.410*	3.320	0.020**	(b to d) *****
		31-40 <sup>b</sup>	175	3.43	0.84				
		41-50	88	3.66	0.91				
		51-60 <sup>d</sup>	23	3.96	0.95				
	Level of education	Primary school	28	3.85	0.75	0.013	11.956-7.092 ****	0.000*** / 0.000***	(d to b, c) *****
		High school <sup>b</sup>	137	3.49	0.81				
		University <sup>c</sup>	194	3.51	0.89				
		Postgraduate <sup>d</sup>	9	4.46	0.47				
	Marital status	Married	220	3.59	0.88	0.154*	1.208	0.300	No difference
		Single	104	3.44	0.84				
		Divorced/Widow(er)	44	3.61	0.75				
	Term of employment	< 1 year	71	3.70	0.85	0.658*	2.882	0.023**	(-) *****
		1-3 years	161	3.46	0.86				
		4-6 years	106	3.47	0.84				
		7-9 years	20	3.92	0.87				
		≥ 10 years	10	4.02	0.73				
Cultural Power	Gender	Female	126	3.33	0.69	0.001	-2.533	0.012**	Difference present
		Male	242	3.53	0.80				
	Age (years)	21-30 <sup>a</sup>	82	3.36	0.74	0.256*	4.447	0.004***	(d to a, b) *****
		31-40 <sup>b</sup>	175	3.39	0.76				
		41-50	88	3.58	0.79				
		51-60 <sup>d</sup>	23	3.92	0.56				
	Level of education	Primary school	28	3.51	0.85	0.111*	7.393	0.000***	(b to c, d; c to d) *****
		High school <sup>b</sup>	137	3.27	0.71				
		University <sup>c</sup>	194	3.56	0.76				
		Postgraduate <sup>d</sup>	9	4.24	0.50				
	Marital status	Married	220	3.50	0.78	0.361*	0.953	0.387	No difference
		Single	104	3.37	0.73				
		Divorced/Widow(er)	44	3.48	0.75				
	Term of employment	< 1 year	71	3.47	0.67	0.314*	1.427	0.224	No difference
		1-3 years	161	3.44	0.78				
		4-6 years	106	3.39	0.78				
		7-9 years	20	3.77	0.85				
		≥ 10 years	10	3.76	0.81				
Consistency	Gender	Female	126	4.11	0.43	0.185*	0.779	0.437	No difference
		Male	242	4.08	0.44				
	Age (years)	21-30	82	3.99	0.54	0.003	2.518-2.422 ****	.062/.067	No difference
		31-40	175	4.13	0.42				
		41-50	88	4.12	0.40				
		51-60	23	3.99	0.24				
	Level of education	Primary school	28	4.13	0.45	0.267*	0.210	0.889	No difference
		High school	137	4.09	0.41				
		University	194	4.08	0.47				
		Postgraduate	9	4.00	0.33				
	Marital status	Married	220	4.12	0.44	0.521*	1.136	0.322	No difference
		Single	104	4.05	0.42				

	Divorced/Widow(er)	44	4.04	0.46				
	< 1 year	71	4.03	0.43				
	1-3 years	161	4.08	0.45				
Term of employment	4-6 years	106	4.11	0.43	0.441*	1.213	0.305	No difference
	7-9 years	20	4.24	0.41				
	≥ 10	10	4.22	0.54				

If  $P > .05$ , the variances for the variable are homogeneous (equal); \*\* $P < .05$ ; \*\*\* $P < .01$ ; \*\*\*\* Welch/Brown-Forsythe, \*\*\*\*\* Bonferroni, \*\*\*\*\* Tamhane T2

### *Findings from the Analysis of Participants' Perceptions Regarding Hotel Institutionalization Levels Based on Hotel Characteristics*

The findings from the analysis presented in **Table 6** highlight how the participants' perceptions of institutionalization dimensions are influenced by specific characteristics of the hotels they work at.

Under the formalization dimension, variations in perceptions were observed across factors such as the total number of hotel employees, bed capacity, and the duration of the hotel's operations. Post-hoc tests did not reveal clear differences in perceptions related to the total number of personnel, though it was identified that employees in hotels with longer operational histories tended to have more positive views, particularly those in establishments with 1-5 years of service. In terms of bed capacity, employees at hotels with 601-800 beds had the least favorable perceptions compared to those in hotels with 401-600 beds and those with over 1,000 beds.

For the professionalization dimension, differences were noted based on the total number of employees, hotel size (in terms of bed capacity), hotel tenure, and the establishment type. Employees in smaller hotels (with fewer than 200 personnel) expressed more positive views than those in larger hotels. Similarly, hotel employees at smaller bed capacities (200-400 beds) showed more favorable perceptions compared to those working in larger hotels (over 1,000 beds). Furthermore, employees at hotels with shorter operational histories (1-5 years) were more positive than those at hotels with 6-20 years in business. When looking at the type of establishment, employees at foreign independent hotels reported significantly more negative views compared to those at domestic chain or independent hotels.

In the cultural power dimension, differences were identified based on the total number of hotel employees, bed capacity, and the hotel's age. Employees in hotels with over 600 personnel expressed more positive views than those in establishments with fewer staff. Moreover, those in hotels with the smallest (200-400 beds) and largest (1,001+ beds) capacities had more favorable views compared to those in the mid-sized hotels. Employees in newer hotels (1-5 years) also had more positive perceptions than those at hotels with longer operational histories.

For the consistency dimension, differences were found concerning the total number of employees, bed capacity, duration of hotel operations, and the seasonality status of the hotel. Employees at hotels with over 600 staff had the most positive views on consistency, while those in hotels with 401-500 and 501-600 employees had less favorable perceptions. Employees working at hotels with either the shortest (1-5 years) or longest (21+ years) operational histories expressed more positive perceptions compared to those at hotels with intermediate operational tenures. Additionally, employees at year-round hotels had more favorable views than those working in seasonal hotels.

In summary, it was observed that perceptions related to hotel characteristics showed less variation concerning the type of establishment and seasonality, but factors such as the total number of hotel staff, bed capacity, and operational tenure significantly influenced employees' perceptions. The professionalization and consistency dimensions demonstrated the greatest variability across hotel features.

**Table 6.** Comparison of employee perceptions of hotel institutionalization dimensions based on hotel characteristics

Dms.	Variables	Groups	N	W. A.	S.D.	Levene's test (p)*	t/F/W-BF	P	Post-hoc
Formalization	Number of hotel personnel	0-200	42	3.74	0.92	0.000	4.091-4.312 ****	.004***/.001***	(-) *****
		201-300	118	3.37	0.70				
		301-400	106	3.50	0.57				
		401-500	73	3.65	0.62				
		501-600	23	3.45	0.74				
		≥ 601	6	4.46	0.71				
	Hotel bed capacity	200-400	14	3.82	0.97	0.014	5.200-4.653 ****	.001***/.002***	(c to b, e; d to e)
		401-600 <sup>b</sup>	36	3.78	0.59				

11

Consistency	Hotel's time in business	6-10 years <sup>b</sup>	146	3.35	0.77	*****			
		11-15 years <sup>c</sup>	118	3.31	0.71				
		16-20 years <sup>d</sup>	59	3.53	0.67				
		≥ 21 years	5	4.16	0.87				
	Hotel's type of business	Foreign hotel chain	25	3.31	0.74				
		Domestic hotel chain	240	3.48	0.79				
		Foreign independent hotel	9	3.49	0.37	0.046	0.396-0.527 ****	.756/.665	No difference
		Domestic independent hotel	94	3.45	0.73				
	Seasonality status	Seasonal	97	3.42	0.74	0.597*	-0.537	0.592	No difference
		Year-round	271	3.47	0.78				
	Number of hotel personnel	0-200	42	4.18	0.45	0.796*	2.985	.012**	(f to d, e) *****
		201-300	118	4.12	0.41				
		301-400	106	4.09	0.40				
		401-500 <sup>d</sup>	73	3.99	0.50				
		501-600 <sup>e</sup>	23	3.95	0.45				
		≥ 601 <sup>f</sup>	6	4.55	.52				
	Hotel bed capacity	200-400	14	4.43	0.56	0.045	1.804-2.488 ****	0.138/0.050**	(-) *****
		401-600	36	4.06	0.33				
		601-800	153	4.05	0.44				
		801-1000	103	4.08	0.45				
		≥ 1001	62	4.14	0.42				
	Hotel's time in business	1-5 years <sup>a</sup>	40	4.26	0.49	0.413*	4.809	0.001***	(a to b; e to b, c, d) *****
		6-10 years <sup>b</sup>	146	4.04	0.43				
		11-15 years <sup>c</sup>	118	4.06	0.41				
		16-20 years <sup>d</sup>	59	4.08	0.43				
		≥ 21 years <sup>e</sup>	5	4.73	0.43				
	Hotel's type of business	Foreign hotel chain	25	3.97	0.40	0.503*	1.127	0.338	No difference
		Domestic hotel chain	240	4.11	0.45				
		Foreign independent hotel	9	4.19	0.25				
		Domestic independent hotel	94	4.06	0.43				
	Seasonality status	Seasonal	97	4.00	0.51	0.007	-2.018	.045**	Difference present
		Year-round	271	4.12	0.41				

If  $P > .05$ , the variances for the variable are homogeneous (equal); \*\* $P < .05$ ; \*\*\* $P < .01$ ; \*\*\*\* Welch/Brown-Forsythe, \*\*\*\*\* Bonferroni, \*\*\*\*\* Tamhane T2

## Conclusion

The tourism sector plays a crucial role in the economies of developing nations, highlighting the strategic importance of institutionalization for tourism businesses. It helps these businesses navigate competitive environments, achieve profitability, and maintain their market position. Institutionalization is typically defined through five key dimensions: professionalization, formalization, cultural power, transparency, and consistency.

This study focused on employees from five-star hotels in Antalya, employing a survey method for data collection. The survey, conducted between September and October of 2019, targeted staff from 50 different five-star hotels. In addition to demographic questions (gender, age, education level, marital status, tenure) and hotel characteristics (employee count, bed capacity, years in operation, type of establishment, seasonality status), the 5-Point Likert Scale developed by Apaydın [54] was utilized. This scale, comprising 26 items, assesses the perceived level of institutionalization and measures employee views across four dimensions: formalization (four items), professionalization (six items), cultural power (five items), and consistency (eleven items).

Descriptive statistics, factor analysis, t-tests, and ANOVA tests were applied in the study. Results indicate that the institutionalization level in hotels is favorable, with an average score of 3.76. The consistency dimension received the highest employee perception score (4.09), while cultural power received the lowest (3.46).

The study further reveals that employees' views on formalization, professionalization, cultural power, and consistency differ based on hotel characteristics such as total staff, bed capacity, and years in operation. However, marital status did not significantly affect perceptions, whereas age and education level were influential factors.

A review of existing literature on institutionalization shows its various aspects, including links to human resource management practices [29, 34, 42], challenges [6, 43], scale development [38], levels of employee perception [21], connections to job satisfaction [44], impacts on institutional entrepreneurship [35], applications in catering establishments [45], and the effects on business performance and competitiveness [31, 49]. Notably, the study by Aylanand Koç [21] aligns with the present research, focusing on understanding hotel employees' perceptions of institutionalization.

### *Recommendations*

This research aims to contribute to both the academic literature and the hospitality industry. The findings offer valuable insights into the concept of institutionalization within the hospitality sector. Additionally, the results provide useful information for business managers regarding their employees' perceptions of institutionalization. Future research could explore institutionalization variables with different variables, samples, and research methodologies to further deepen understanding.

### *Limitations*

The scope of this study is limited to employees of five-star hotels located in Antalya. Consequently, the findings are specific to this group, and generalizations to all hotel establishments may not be applicable.

**Acknowledgments:** We wish to express our gratitude to the five-star hotels in Antalya for assisting with the data collection process. Our thanks also go to all hotel employees who voluntarily participated in the research.

**Conflict of interest:** None

**Financial support:** None

**Ethics statement:** Ethical approval for this research was obtained from 50 five-star hotels in Antalya, allowing the collection of data within the framework of the permissions granted. Only those hotel employees who voluntarily agreed to participate were included in the study.

## **References**

1. Shmatenko O, Plieshkova O, Bielezorova O, Shmatenko V, Drozdova A, Strashnyi V, et al. Analysis of the Ukrainian market of antibacterials for systemic use for the treatment of military personnel with craniocerebral injuries. *Arch Pharm Pract.* 2020; 11(2): 176-81.
2. Sboeva SG, Klyueva YA, Burdaev NI, Zaharchenko MA. Development of methodical bases for business process management optimization in clinical trials. *J Adv Pharm Educ Res.* 2019; 9(2): 137-42.
3. Tengilimoğlu E, Akgöz E. Examination of institutionalization degree according to the business structure: a survey on hotel enterprises. *Ömer Halis Demir Univ Acad Rev Econ Admin Sci.* 2019; 12(2): 229-51.
4. Çakır BÖ, Bedük A. Employees' evaluations of enterprise resource planning (ERP) and perceptions of institutionalization. *Selçuk Univ J Institute Soc Sci.* 2013; (30): 81-91.
5. Selznick P. Institutionalizm 'old' and 'new'. *Administrative Science Quarterly.* 1996; 41(2): 270-77.
6. Akyol C, Zengin B. The institutionalization problems in tourism sector, family businesses sample. *J Acad Rev.* 2014; 41: 1-22.
7. Dilbaz S. The Management of Family Business in The Growing and Institutionalizing Period: The Case of Karaman, Unpublished Master's Dissertation, Selçuk University Institute of Social Sciences, Konya; 2005.
8. Akça N. General Characteristics of Family Enterprises and Institutionalization a Research in Denizli. Unpublished Master's Dissertation, Pamukkale University Institute of Social Sciences, Denizli; 2010.
9. Yıldız A. Recommendations for Family Businesses. İstanbul: Sistem Publishing; 2008.
10. Uzunçarşılı Ü, Toprak M, Ersun O. Company culture and business principles. İstanbul Chamber of Commerce Publications, 4, İstanbul; 2000.
11. Moghaddam ZA, Dehkhodania A. Study of feasibility, validity, reliability, and norm-finding of scale of social styles in employees of Tehran regional electricity company. *Int J Pharm Res Allied Sci.* 2020; 9(1): 9-13.

12. Cevher E. Is institutionalization a solution or a reason to disappear of small enterprises?. *J Int Soc Res.* 2014; 7(32): 583-93.
13. Aydemir B, Seymen AO, Taşçı A. Institutionalization Process in Family Businesses and a Sectoral Application, 1. Family Business Congress, Proceedings Book, İstanbul Kültür University Publication; 17-18 April 2004, İstanbul. pp. 604-17.
14. Gümüştekin E, Adsan E. A Research on The Application of Corporate Governance and Corporate Governance Principles in Family Businesses, 2. Family Business Congress, Proceedings Book, İstanbul Kültür University Publication, İstanbul; 2006. pp. 14-5.
15. Tayfun A, Palavar K, Çöp S. The relationship between the training of the hotel staff and their level of organizational commitment: a study in five-star hotels in Belek region. *J Bus Res –Turk.* 2010; 2(4): 3-18.
16. Terzi H, Pata UK. The contribution of the tourism industry to the Turkey's economic growth. *Erciyes University J Fac Econ Admin Sci.* 2016; (48): 45-64.
17. Selznick P. *TVA and The Grassroots: A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organizations*, NY: Harper Torch Books; 1948.
18. Gürol Y. *Foundations of Institutionalization in Organizations*. Second Ed. İstanbul: Beta Publishing; 2011.
19. Meyer JW, Rowan B. Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony. *Am J Soc.* 1977; 83(2): 340-63.
20. DiMaggio PJ, Powell WW. The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *Am Soc Rev.* 1983; 48(2): 147-60.
21. Aylan S, Koç H. Determining the institutionalization perceptions of hotel employees and analysis of differentiation by business properties. *J Tour Gastron Stud.* 2018; 6(4): 733-53.
22. Koçel T. *Business Management*. İstanbul: Beta Publishing; 2014.
23. Broom L, Selznick P. *Sociology: A Text with Adapted Readings*. New York: Row, Peterson; 1955.
24. Zucker LG. The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *Am Sociol Rev.* 1977; 42: 726-43.
25. Özen Ş. *New Institutional Theory: New Horizons and New Problems in the Analysis of Organizations*. Edt., Sargut, A. S. & Özen, Ş.. *Organizational Theories*. Ankara: İmge Bookstore Publications; 2010.
26. Scott WR, Meyer JW. *The Organizations of Societal Sectors*. Edt., Meyer, J.W. and Scott, W.R.. *Organizational Environments: Ritual and Rationality*. CA: Sage, Beverly Hills; 1983.
27. Tolbert PS, Zucker LG. *The Institutionalization of Institutional Theory*. Eds. S. Clegg, S., Hardy, C. And Nord, W.. *Handbook of Organization Studies*. London: SAGE; 1996.
28. Çakar M, Danişman A. *Institutional Theory*. (Edt., Sözen, H. C. & Basım, H.J.). *Organizational Theories*. İstanbul: Beta Publishing; 2012.
29. Boselie P, Paauwe J, Richardson R. Human resource management, institutionalization and organizational performance: a comparison of hospitals, hotels and local government. *Int J Hum Resour Man.* 2003; 14(8): 1407-29.
30. Alpay G, Bodur M, Yılmaz C. Performance implications of institutionalization process in family-owned businesses: evidence from an emerging economy. *J World Bus.* 2008; 43(4): 435-48.
31. Apaydın F. Effects of institutionalization on the performance of small and medium size firms. *Zonguldak Karaelmas Univ J Soc Sci.* 2008; 4(7): 121-45.
32. Çavuş MF, Demir Y. Institutionalization and corporate entrepreneurship in family firms. *Afr J Bus Manag.* 2011; 5(2): 416-22.
33. Şanal M. *A Study of Family Businesses on Institutionalization and Institutional Entrepreneurship*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences, Adana; 2011.
34. Akkuş B, Bilen A. Investigation of the relationship between human resource management practices and institutionalization in enterprises. *Munzur Univ J Social Sci.* 2020; 9(1): 38-55.
35. Karacaoğlu K, Sözbilen G. The effect of institutionalization on corporate entrepreneurship: an application in accommodation establishments in Nevşehir. *Anatolia: A J Tourism Res.* 2013; 24(1): 41-56.
36. Ferrel OC, Skinner SJ. Ethical behavior and bureaucratic structure in marketing research organizations. *J Market Res.* 1988; 25(1): 103-9.
37. Pugh DS, Hickson DJ, Hinings CR, Turner C. The context of organization structures. *Admin Sci Q.* 1969; (1): 91-114.
38. Aylan S, Koç H. A scale development study to determine institutionalization criteria of enterprises. *Gazi Univ J Fac Econ Admin Sci.* 2017; 19(2): 564-85.
39. Barnes LB, Hershon SA. Transferring power in the family business. *Fam Bus Rev.* 1994; 7(4): 377-92.
40. Yazıcıoğlu İ, Koç H. Comparative study into the level of institutionalisation of family-run enterprises. *Selçuk Univ J Institute Soc Sci.* 2009; 21: 497-507.
41. Jaworski BJ, Merchant KA. Toward a theory of marketing control: environmental context, control types, and consequences. *J Market.* 1988; 52(3): 23-39.



42. Yılmaz Y, Kitapçı H. The impact of strategic human resource management on institutionalization process. *Bus Manag Dyn.* 2017; 7(3): 26-38.
43. Özbay G, Ellidört KY. The institutionalization problems of family businesses in the tourism sector: the case of Kocaeli. *Manisa Celal Bayar Univ J Soc Sci.* 2020; 18(3): 179-95.
44. Demirci B, Ak E, Altamimi M. The relationship of institutionalisation and job satisfaction in hotel businesses: the case of Eskişehir. *Tourism and Recreation.* 2020; 2(1): 1-7.
45. Kızanlıklı MM. An investigation on institutionalization practices of food and beverage establishments. *J Tourism Gastronomy Stud.* 2018; 6(4): 833-51.
46. Çetinkaya AŞ, Korkmaz EV. Institutionalization and emotional labour behaviour: a research in hospitality organizations. *J Soc Econ Res.* 2018; 18(35): 64-77.
47. Hodari D, Samson D. Settling for less: the institutionalization of the hotel feasibility study. *J Hosp Financ Manag.* 2014; 22(2): 97-110.
48. Marta JKM, Singhapakdi A, Lee D, Sirgy MJ, Koonmee K, Virakul B. Perceptions about ethics institutionalization and quality of work life: Thai versus American marketing managers. *J Bus Res.* 2013; 66(3): 381-9.
49. Türkoğlu N, Dalgıç A. Impact of institutionalization in family owned companies and elements of intellectual capital on competitive power: a research on hospitality business. *Int J Manag Sci Info Techno.* 2017; 25: 1-17.
50. Türkoğlu N. Impact of institutionalization in family-owned companies and elements of intellectual capital on competitive power: a research on family-owned hospitality businesses. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Univ J Soc Sci.* 2018; 6(6): 819-30.
51. Kurt S, Yeşiltaş M. The effect of level of institutionalization on the usage of strategic management tools at tourism management: case of Ankara. *J Tour Gastron Stud.* 2016; 4(4): 3-19.
52. Velavan K, Natarajan M. Assessing the knowledge level of tribal farmers on indigenous agricultural practices in paddy. *World J Environ Bio.* 2020; 9(4): 13-7.
53. Hotel Association of Turkey (TÜROB) Tourism Management Certified Facilities, <http://www.turob.com/tr>, Date of Access: 06.08.2020.
54. Apaydın F. The Effects of Organizational Institutionalization and Adaptive capabilities on Marketing Activities and Organizational Performance. Gebze: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Gebze Institute of Technology, Institute of Social Sciences; 2007.