Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education 25 (2019) 100199

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jhlste

Transformation process of tourism schools into faculties in Turkey

Zeynep Karsavuran[a,*], Bahattin Özdemir[b]

[a] Department of Tourism Management, Akdeniz University, Tourism Faculty, Dumlupinar Boulevard, 07058, Campus Antalya, Turkey
[b] Department of Gastronomy and Culinary Arts, Akdeniz University, Tourism Faculty, Dumlupinar Boulevard, 07058, Campus Antalya, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Higher education
Transformation of schools
School restructuring
Tourism faculties
New institutionalism
Organizational change

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore the reasons for and the process of transformation of the *tourism and hospitality management schools* into *tourism faculties* in Turkey. The transformation process started in 2012 in universities, and this study presents witnesses for the early periods of the change. Thematic analysis of qualitative data gathered from focus groups, interviews and documents showed that bringing prestige to the department and attaining a better status both in society and in the university were the main motives for the change. Additionally, discussion of findings with theories of new institutionalism indicated the effects of isomorphic processes, decoupling in organizational practices, and pragmatic approach towards sustaining the former comfortable practices of school structure. Study findings are mostly consistent with early arguments of neo-institutionalism to explain the transformation process but also challenge the theory by discussing the context-specific role of the state to regulate and manipulate the change.

1. Introduction

Tourism and hospitality departments are relatively new in the academic portfolio. Lausanne Hotel School first initiated hospitality education in 1893 in Europe, but since Lausanne offered education at an only practical level, Cornell University (1922) is acknowledged to have the first hotel school at the university level (Kozak & Kozak, 2017). While tourism was considered as an immature field (Cooper & Shepherd, 1997; Formica, 1996) in universities by the end of the 1990s, more recent studies pointed out significant progress in the last two decades (Airey & Tribe, 2005; Kozak & Kozak, 2017). Tourism has achieved a significant development in education in a century-long period. After the 1990s the number of tourism departments began to increase worldwide, and education has become more internationalised. Now tourism is a popular field of study (Airey & Tribe, 2005) and one of the departments that have high student enrolments (Airey, 2005).

Ever since tourism programmes were initiated, the question of what schools should teach has been on the agenda. Providing vocational education to produce employable graduates with technical skills (Amoah & Baum, 1997; Chen & Groves, 1999; Gursoy, Rahman, & Swanger, 2012), giving students the sense of responsibility to their society and to the natural environment (Boley, 2011; Sheldon, Fesenmaier, & Tribe, 2011; Tribe, 2002), and keeping a balance between these two ends (Airey, 2005; Dredge et al., 2012; Paris, 2011) have been the major issues for tourism education. Studies on these topics generally concentrated on curricula (Tribe, 2005) but they mostly overlooked the educational institutions that are in a crucial position to deliver the intended education. Thus research on the emergence and development of tourism schools in higher education and investigating how tourism education is structured in universities may present significant contributions to the field of tourism education.

At this point, the structuring of tourism education institutions in Turkey is a striking organizational phenomenon. Tourism

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: zkarsavuran@akdeniz.edu.tr (Z. Karsavuran), bahattin@akdeniz.edu.tr (B. Özdemir).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2019.100199
Received 9 August 2018; Received in revised form 9 May 2019; Accepted 17 May 2019

departments in universities are in a dispersed position in today's situation in the country. Four-year degree programmes could be organized as tourism and hospitality management schools or as tourism faculties. Also, some of the schools or faculties such as the School of Applied Sciences, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences have tourism management departments. There are also two-year programmes in universities that are tourism and hospitality vocational schools. The latest forms within these diverse units are tourism faculties. In 2009, the first three of tourism faculties have been founded by the Higher Education Council (YOK) as a consequence of reform for vocational and technical education training teachers (Gunbayi, 2012). Until these archetypes in 2009, there was no example of tourism faculties in Turkey. Following this recent change, the majority of the former four-year tourism schools have started to transform since 2012, and finally, these transformed faculties together with the newly founded ones have started to dominate the degree level tourism education. This process led to a significant transformation of undergraduate education in the country.

Forssell and Jansson (1996) describe organizational transformation as an organization exchanges its old organizational form for a new one. Although schools were not obliged to transform, they started to a compelling process of change at their request by abandoning their brand names and almost a half-century school history. Examining this administrative transformation might provide findings to contribute studies on organizational change and might serve to discuss epistemological and pedagogical ramifications for higher education of tourism. Belhassen and Caton (2009) emphasized that tourism departments need to develop an intellectual identity and their legitimacy for epistemological development in the field. Besides, the epistemology of tourism is a controversial topic. Tourism is considered as a discipline, as a science or as a field of study by tourism academics (Tribe, 1997) and no consensus has been achieved. Transformation of tourism schools into faculties is a recent phenomenon that could have consequences both for tourism education and tourism studies, and that might provide a new angle to discussions of epistemology and legitimacy. Thus, the present study is designed to explore driving sources for the transformation of tourism and hospitality management schools into tourism faculties. Additionally, practices of former schools in the process of transformation were also examined to explain how schools made this change happen.

2. Understanding organizational change through the lens of new institutionalism

The historical development and recent dramatic changes in tourism education generate a fertile field for arguments of organizational theories. A number of theories could be guided to explain this change. For instance, transformation to faculty could be considered as a strategic choice of each unit (Child, 1972) or it could be interpreted as a decision to create favourable environmental contingencies and to manage resource dependencies (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). However, for this study, new institutionalism is consulted since it provides a theoretical background to understand the change in the organizational field level (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) and to examine both technical and institutional environments of organizations (Scott & Meyer, 1991).

The new institutionalism in organizational analysis traces its roots to sociological approaches. This perspective emphasizes the shared systems of rules to shape action and to constrain the capacity of actors (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991). From a social constructivist view, social processes are institutionalized and take on a rule-like status, and later these institutionalized processes are taken for granted by actors (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). Thus institutionalized rules are effective to shape social thought and action. In one of the first new institutionalism papers, Meyer and Rowan (1977) argued that institutional rules might have effects on organizational structures and their implementations on actual work. Organizations may adopt institutionalized policies, techniques, and programs ceremonially as they become powerful myths of highly institutionalized contexts. Furthermore, these institutionalized rules may not meet the efficiency criteria. According to the theory, organizations need to comply with expectations of institutional environments to receive support and legitimacy even if these expectations contradict with technical requirements (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Scott & Meyer, 1991). However, in order to achieve both two ends, to support the myths of institutionalized contexts and also to take into account practical realities, elements of the structure are decoupled from activities (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Decoupling of organizational structures and daily practices provides organizations an image of that policies are adopted and secures their legitimacy while keeping their technical work free from institutional expectations. Thus decoupling is adopted as a way to overcome conflicts of institutional and technical environments.

New institutionalism mainly concentrates on institutions which connote more of stability and order (Scott, 2008), but studies also presented empirical findings and enlightening explanations for the change in organizational fields (Greenwood, Suddaby, & Hinings, 2002; Scott, 2008). Scott (2008) mentioned external and internal sources of the change. In the examination of the organizations, field level dynamics could be considered as external; and intra-organizational dynamics as internal factors.

First, the institutional field is a strong determinant of change (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996). Organizations sharing the same institutional environment are subjected to similar environmental pressures. In the process of following environmental pressures, organizations will eventually change their structures and become isomorphic to each other. According to DiMaggio and Powell (1983), isomorphic change occurs through the effect of three mechanisms: 1) *coercive isomorphism* resulting from political influence or power dependencies by the pressure from other organizations; 2) *mimetic isomorphism* emerges as a reaction to uncertainty by modelling other organizations that are considered as successful; and 3) *normative isomorphism* stems from shared norms by the effect of professionalization. For example, Labianca, Fairbank, Thomas, Gioia, and Umphress (2001) examined the process of inter-organizational monitoring in academia and found that universities imitate the others with reputation and high prestige rankings. In another study concentrated on academia, Gioia and Corley (2002) discussed how media rankings of business schools in US universities had driven schools towards a focus on factors that are included in raking systems. According to the study findings, schools seeking for reputation and image and competing for prospective students and recruiters need to change their structures following the field dynamics. Through the process of isomorphism, organizations tend to be similar in their formal structures since isomorphism

triggers a convergent change (Scott, 2008). In addition to isomorphic convergence, organizations also undergo divergent change (Scott, 2010). Fields may create not only similar environmental pressures but also inconsistent pressures that trigger speculations and variations of practices (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991; Scott, 1991; Powell, 1991; Oliver, 1991; D'Aunno, Sutton, & Price, 1991). For example, Townley (2002) found that actors follow a pragmatic approach and develop different responses to a change in the organizational field as a consequence of competing rationalities. Lee and Pennings (2002) examined the adoption of a novel governance structure by Dutch accounting firms and showed that some of the organizations kept their traditional structure while the others followed the change. Evidence also comes from a study on drug abuse treatment units. D'Aunno et al. (1991) examined the units when they moved to a fragmented environment and exposed to new beliefs and practices as a result of diversification. Researchers found that organizations would respond to new beliefs that conflict with the traditional ones on the basis of two criteria; 1- Organizations would rank the institutional demands and conform the ones primarily which are necessary for gaining a minimum level of legitimacy; 2- Organizations would adopt the practices on the basis of their visibility to external groups.

Second, studies indicated the significance of intra-organizational dynamics and the role of actors to initiate organizational change. Holm (1995) discusses institutions as nested systems that stand for the interconnectedness of actions guided by institutions, and actions aiming to manipulate institutions. Powell (1991) suggests the inclusion of interests and the pursuit of power in institutional analysis. In an attempt to explain heterogeneity and change, Powell (1991) noted that actors seeking legitimization for changes that enhance their prestige and power might use institutionalized rules for their interests. In a similar vein, Fligstein (1991) discussed that change is possible when it is coherent with the actors' interests or by the effect of new actors gaining power. Following these discussions and including intra-organizational dynamics, Greenwood and Hinings (1996) pointed out the dissatisfaction with interests as an underlying reason to trigger change. Durand and McGuire (2005) examined the domain expansion of accreditation agencies and found evidence for institutional opportunism as actors try to maintain their legitimacy in their existing domain and also strive for legitimacy building in new domains. This line of research gives credit to organizations as a response to institutional pressures and enables a more pro-active view of new institutionalism (Dacin, Goldstein, & Scott, 2002; Durand & McGuire, 2005; Oliver, 1991).

As seen from the existing literature, the question of why processes are retained, adopted, and discarded by individual organizations is a complex issue and requires a holistic approach to examine both the institutionalized organizational fields and intra-organizational dynamics. Besides, Czarniawska and Joerges (1996) argue that change could not be simplified as a result of environmental effects or strategic choices of organizations, but it is a result of a blend of intentions, random events, and institutional norms. Thus, examining the transformation of tourism education requires an exploratory and holistic approach to be able to evaluate the process with all the relevant dynamics.

3. Change in higher education of tourism

As new institutionalism suggests, it is essential to evaluate the environmental effects and field level dynamics in order to understand a change in the organizational forms of educational units. Tourism literature points some dynamics that might affect higher education of tourism. First, the tourism industry is one of the critical elements of the field. Developments in tourism education have been very much related to the changes and growth in the industry. For example, Reichel (2005) noted that the penetration of international hotel chains and restaurants into the Israeli market affected expectations from higher education. Similarly, Pearce (2005) referred to the industry lobby initiatives to develop a tourism programme in Australian universities. Educational institutions were founded prevalently in various locations by the evolvement of international mass tourism (Cooper & Shepherd, 1997). Consequently, programmes were mostly designed according to the needs of the industry (Airey, 2005). Findings from a study on prospectuses of degree courses offered in the UK showed that vocational, career and industry issues are the key elements of tourism curricula (Airey & Johnson, 1999). Besides, numerous studies focus on schools' responsibility in producing skilled, well-trained and employable graduates, and strive to specify sector expectations from educational units (i.e., Amoah & Baum, 1997; Cecil & Krohn, 2012; Gursoy et al., 2012). Hence developments in the industry are proved to have a particular impact on educational institutions.

Second, governmental regulations have a transformative impact on higher education (Dredge et al., 2013). Governments play the critical role as holders of research funds and other educational resources. For example, Huimin and Hobson (2008) state that the curriculum tends to be general in the breadth of knowledge rather than specialised in China since specialised universities face challenges in gaining resources from the government. Traditional teaching and research functions of universities have also been shifted in Australia in response to the demands of government (Dredge et al., 2013). Reichel (2005) similarly mentions the role of the nation-state as a centralised decision maker in Israel. Turkey is also characterised by a "significant state influence in the higher education" (Kipping, Üsdiken, & Puig, 2004, p. 99). Especially the law enacted in 1981 for higher education fostered the state influence and dominance on universities. A central authority named Higher Education Council (YOK) was created by this law which imposed a standardization of structures and academic disciplines for the whole higher education (Üsdiken, Topaler, & Koçak, 2013, p. 190). As educational units are required to follow governmental regulations, this process might create an isomorphic convergence by the effect of coercive mechanisms as described by DiMaggio and Powell (1983).

Third, global effects are crucial to creating change in higher education. Although the process of economic restructuring by the neoliberal economic policies has allowed for more autonomous universities (Aubke & Ring, 2008), it reduced the financial support from governments (Dredge et al., 2013). Slocum, Dimitrov, and Webb (2019) argue that a decrease in public funding causes education to become more market-driven. Then education moves towards training people for jobs and becoming vocational schools, rather than introducing them with critical thinking (Caton, 2014; Gioia & Corley, 2002). Neoliberal ideologies are not actively present in state universities in Turkey (Slocum et al., 2019) that might preserve education from market pressures but might bring

about expectations to support national economic agendas. In addition to funding, neoliberalism also created a more competitive environment globally (Dredge et al., 2013). According to Wisansing (2008), international education is one of the world's fastest growth sectors which forces universities to create global programmes to attract international students. Despite the tensions between localisation and globalisation (Munar, 2007), global forces (such as the Bologna process, the Tuning Project, UNWTO's TedQual) demand the convergence of higher education systems and bring a certain level of standardization to programmes (Aubke & Ring, 2008; Dredge et al., 2013, 2012; Munar, 2007; Wisansing, 2008). As tourism schools might try to benefit from the legitimacy provided by these accreditation bodies (Durand & McGuire, 2005), this process might create an isomorphic change in the higher education of tourism.

Fourth, the legitimacy of tourism education and tourism as a field of study could influence tourism programmes. How tourism is perceived as a field of study in academia and how it is considered as a career option by prospective students affect research funding opportunities and students' preferences. Employment in service industries is generally viewed as a low-status career (Cooper & Shepherd, 1997; Marinakou & Giousmpasoglou, 2015). Huimin and Hobson (2008) found that parents do not want their children to work in serving sectors. Similarly, Charles (1997) detected the reluctance in choosing tourism as a career option. Students' university preferences are affected by the reputation of tourism programmes (Aubke & Ring, 2008). Furthermore, the status of tourism departments in universities is not strong, and the departments are not supported enough. Historically the funding problems (Steene, 2012) and scholars' effort to establish credentials of tourism as a serious subject (Cooper & Shepherd, 1997) are mentioned, and a recent study by Wang (2010) shows that problems persist for tourism departments. According to Wang's (2010) study conducted in China, the status of tourism in universities is lower than other subjects, and tourism academics have problems in receiving funds for research and their departments. Belhassen and Caton (2009) argued that these problems of the legitimacy of tourism departments are not an epistemological issue but a political one. In Turkey, similarly, academics have faced problems such as Higher Education Council cancelled tourism associate professorship for a decade until 2011. On that period, tourism scholars strived for legitimacy building such as coordinating conferences to discuss the epistemological status of tourism, to evaluate the programmes of bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees in the country.

Fifth, beliefs, ideas, normative thoughts, and philosophies have an essential role in the design and structure of educational institutions. Jafari (2001) describes the evolution and development of tourism knowledge as the scientification of tourism, but the epistemological stand of tourism is a controversial topic. Developing a comprehensive definition and embracing all aspects of tourism is quite an issue since it refers to "whatever is linked with the act of tourism" (Tribe, 1997, p. 641). Evaluating the epistemological discussions for tourism, Tribe (1997) suggests that tourism is neither a discipline nor a science, but a field of study benefiting from multiple disciplines to understand the phenomenon of tourism. He developed a figurative conceptualization for the creation of tourism knowledge and discerned between tourism business and non-business studies. It is possible to observe the pedagogical ramifications of business and non-business ends in the higher education of tourism. The effect of the approach mentioned above which suggests producing employable graduates for the industry could be traced in technical courses and compulsory internships. Making room for liberal reflection in this skills-based vocational training and finding the desired balance between them have provided the basis of discussion in tourism (Caton, 2014; Dredge et al., 2012). By the beginning of the 1970s, scholars started to discuss social, cultural, political and environmental effects of tourism, which induced the same arguments in tourism education and training (Inui, Wheeler, & Lankford, 2006). Tourism was considered as a broader phenomenon by discussing the sociological and philosophical foundations (i.e., Tribe, 2001; 2002), and education programmes were encouraged to include these dimensions in their curricula. Tribe's (2002) philosophic practitioner, which is to include both of the vocational and non-vocational ends, is mostly cited in this line of research. The existence of these dual ideologies might create inconsistent field pressures and might make communication between the two fields difficult (Tribe, 1997). However, according to Paris (2011), there is a general agreement between scholars that a balance between vocational and liberal aspects of tourism should be achieved. These studies are important to point out a normative belief of how tourism should be taught, and that could mainly affect the design of curricula.

The factors that affect tourism education could be summarized as follows; industry's expectations, governmental regulations, global effects, the legitimization of tourism as a field of study, as a career option, and as a university subject, and normative pressures. These factors might also be apparent in the case of tourism faculties in Turkey. The history of university-level tourism programmes dates back to 1960s in the country. As the industry has expanded, the number of degree level programmes has increased consistently. Today the number of four-year degree programmes has reached up to a hundred. However, the literature on Turkish higher education for tourism, which mostly concentrated on curriculum development and training, is scarce to explain the transformation of education. Despite the explanations presented for the field level dynamics, there is not much information to correlate these factors to the present case of transformation. In addition, the role of actors and intra-organizational dynamics are missing in these studies. This paucity in the field required an explorative design for the present study.

4. Methodology

This study explores the transformation process of tourism and hospitality management schools into tourism faculties in Turkey. As discussed in the literature, the organizational transformation could be a result of environmental effects, random events, institutional norms, and intentions of organizations (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996). Thus, an examination of various effects and various data sources is needed in order to understand the process of transformation. Qualitative data collection methods of document review, focus group meetings, and individual interviews were conducted for that purpose.

4.1. Data collection

Documents for Review: First, guide of Turkish Higher Education Recruitment and Placement Council (OSYM), official gazette notices and university web pages were examined to specify the transformed schools. Out of 37 faculties, 21 were transformed from schools to faculties. Curriculums of departments were also collected in this process. Thirty curriculums of departments were available for document review. Merely the collection of documents was presenting the situation of faculties as consequences of the change but leaving reasons for transformation unexplored. Thus focus group meetings were planned to gain greater insight with the help of collective discussion.

Focus Groups: The first focus group conducted with seven academics as since this group had specific responsibilities and roles in the process of change. This meeting was held in a transformed faculty. Two questions were posed to them; 1- What were the reasons for transformation?, 2- How this process of change handled? The meeting with academics took 90 min. Later, a focus group with administrative personnel was planned since they were in a position to accomplish the necessary duties in the process of change. Six administrative personnel of a transformed faculty were in the second group who witnessed the process of change. We asked about their expectations from this change and practices during the process in a 50-min meeting. We had another focus group meeting with students since they are one of the key stakeholders and their expectations could be important for the reasoning of the change. Eight of the students were the participants of the third and last focus group who were asked about their perceptions of being a school or a faculty-student and about their observations of changes. Duration of the last meeting was 70 min.

During the focus group meetings, a tape recorder was used with the permission of participants. Voice records were transcribed following the group meetings by researchers. Focus group meetings presented rich data for analysis. However, these meetings were conducted solely in one organization, and further data was needed to understand the change in the organizational field level by the examination of similar organizations.

Interviews: Data from focus groups revealed that architects of change were academicians while other groups have limited information about the process. This exploration allowed researchers to further design interviews with academicians from other transformed faculties. Additionally, preliminary findings of focus groups were used to prepare an interview form that could be consulted during individual interviews. The form consisted of the five questions below. In line with the objectives of the study, interview questions were posed about the reasons and process of the transformation. Detailed questions regarding the structuring process of the faculties, departments, and curriculums are included to be able to understand the process of change. Last, we asked about interviewees' evaluations about the transformation that provided a chance to add if there was something they forgot to mention.

1 What were the reasons for the transformation of schools?
2 Could you explain the process of decision making for change and the structuring process of the faculty?
3 How was academic and administrative structure formulated following the change?
4 How were curriculums and contents of courses prepared?
5 Could you generally evaluate the process for your organization? Comparing to the earlier school structure, in which way your department has changed?

The average duration of interviews was 50 min. Semi-structured interviews were conducted face-to-face by visiting the participants' offices. Twenty-five academicians from 8 established tourism schools which are transformed to faculties participated in the study. The average tenure of participants in their departments was 18 years, and the majority of them also had administrative responsibilities during transformation.

4.2. Data analysis

First, we have analysed the content of documents (OSYM, YOK, official gazette notices, and university web pages). The documents showed the number and the structure of faculties, terms for application for students, and the structure of departments. Curriculums were also analysed in this process. There were 30 curriculums from 15 faculties available which accept students. To analyse the curriculums that include numerous courses, we have developed a coding scheme by consulting from the existing literature (Elting, 1984, pp. 312–314; Ring, Dickinger, & Wober, 2009; Wang, Ayres, & Huyton, 2013). The scheme was revised according to the Turkish case by following expert opinions of 8 tourism scholars. Researchers met with scholars between the 9th and 17th of February 2015 to discuss the coding.

Transcribed texts from focus group discussions and individual interviews were analysed by employing inductive coding since there was no existing literature to support the creation of codes. Detected codes at the first cycle were conceptualized and grouped to themes by researchers as a result of repetitive readings of texts and discussions on codes. Coding is the process of naming or labelling of data chunks (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014) and mainly necessary for data reduction (Richards, 2005) which helps to organize and explain findings of the study. While some research methodologists consider coding as preparatory work, Miles et al. (2014) argued coding is a deep reflection of data itself and it is a form of early and continuing analysis. As advised by researchers, the coding of empirical data later helped researchers to present the study findings.

4.3. Trustworthiness

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), trustworthiness can be evaluated based on the four criteria; credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility was fostered by peer debriefing and triangulation in this study. Peer opinions were requested both for the coding of curriculums and the interview form, and revisions were made according to expert opinions. Triangulation of sources and methods were also accomplished. The effort to gather data through three techniques (document reviews, focus group discussions, and individual interviews) enhanced the trustworthiness of findings by triangulation of methods (Denzin, 2009; Flick, 2009). By including the views of different parties (academicians, administrative personnel, and students) for completeness, triangulation of data sources (Shih, 1998) is also achieved. Transferability was enabled by purposeful sampling and specification and presentation of detailed thick descriptions. To ensure dependability and confirmability, the focus group and individual interviews are tape recorded and kept in an electronic database with the other documents reviewed. Two researchers coded all the data, then came together to discuss the coding and agreed upon the final structure. This peer check made coding more suitable for analysis and also helped to increase the trustworthiness of findings which is considered as a kind of external auditing and as a meaningful attempt to establish trustworthiness by promoting dependability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Additionally, findings are presented with supporting quotations to the established themes. These efforts were to ensure the coherence among the data, findings, and interpretations and to minimize any bias, which facilitated confirmability and so trustworthiness of the study.

5. Findings

Documents showed that the national Council of Higher Education (YOK) defines the school and faculty structures. Both units are 4-year degree programs, but there are specific differences in their unit structures that faculties have more bureaucratic but also more democratic structure comparing to schools. Faculties are better in ensuring pluralism in decision making by the participation of departmental boards and representation of academicians. For schools, decision making and the structure of the unit is more centralised where the director plays the key role. Additionally, the goal of education seems to differ between schools and faculties. Where there is an emphasis on scientism for faculties, the emphasis is on vocational training for schools in YOK's definitions.

The transformation of schools into faculties is vital for students, too. Recruitment and placement of students for universities carried out by OSYM as a central authority. According to documents of OSYM, applicants have to take a two-staged exam for faculties, but the first stage is adequate to apply for schools.

Findings from websites, on the other hand, introduced the present status of faculties. Almost all of the transformed faculties have the same four departments namely; tourism administration, gastronomy and culinary arts, tourist guidance, and recreation management. While all faculties have tourism administration department active in education, none of them has accepted students for recreation management at the time of this study conducted in 2015, as being a recently founded department in tourism faculties.

Table 1 presents the categories used for coding degree courses which perfectly works for both compulsory ones and electives and

Table 1
Categorization of curriculums.

Categories	Sub-categories
Management	Accounting/Finance/Investment Courses
	Management and Organization Courses
	Public Relations/Marketing Courses
Tourism Domain	General Tourism Courses
	Tourism Management Courses
	Interdisciplinary Aspects and Impacts of Tourism
Economics and Law	Economics Courses
	Law and Regulations Courses
Information Systems	Basic Computing Courses
	Vocational Packaged Software
Behavioural and Cognitive Improvement	Behaviour and Communication Courses
	Ethics
Gastronomy and Culinary Arts	Gastronomy
	Kitchen Practice
	Arts Courses
Tourist Guidance	Tourist Guidance Field Courses
	History and Archaeology Courses
	Art History Courses
	Geography Courses
Foreign Languages	
Numerical Courses	
Thesis/Field Project	
Internship[a]	
Other Courses[b]	

[a] *Compulsory for all of the departments.*
[b] *Courses not applicable for above categories.*

Table 2
Transformation to tourism faculties.

Main Themes	Themes	Content
Roots	Vision	30-years opinions and thoughts for transformation
	Preparations	Making school ready for transformation by lobbying, developing graduate studies, and initiating departments
Reasons	Status and prestige	Enhancing status and gaining prestige, both in universities and in the society, by resolving the confusion with 2-year vocational schools, improving communication with press and prospective students, and fostering the representation in universities
	Stakeholders' expectations	Stakeholders' (YOK, university board, academicians, administrative staff, students, sector, professional chambers) expectations to transform
	Employment Opportunities	Greater employment opportunities for faculty graduates, job openings in state offices and various industries
	Scientification	Development of departments, improvement of the scientific background of education, increasing and developing the academic portfolio
	Unit Performance	More democratic structure in decision-making, better level of applicants
	Sense of Competition	Perceived competition in higher education of tourism, avoidance of falling outside the change
Process	Central Authority	Governmental institutions such as YOK, Ministry of Education that shape the higher education of the country by laws or regulations
	Norms	Beliefs and rules for higher education of tourism
	Meetings	Meetings on departmental programmes and curricula with academicians and other stakeholders
	Uncertainty	Not being able to determine the practices, to take actions, to foresee the consequences of decisions made
	Time Pressure	Perceived time pressure for decision making and changes, the need for prompt reaction
	Mimicry	Modelling similar organizations, adopting or copying the practices and structures of other units
	Criticisms	Criticisms and revisions of initial decisions
	Structural Change	Initiating the agencies of a formal structure such as departments, departmental and faculty boards
	Cultural Change	Perceived need to overcome the school habits and to adopt faculty culture by transformation
	Pragmatism	Taking advantage of faculty labelling in the representation of the unit and receiving sources but avoiding or postponing the requisites of faculty structure

for each department in tourism faculties although the intensity of categories slightly changes between departments. The examination of curriculums showed that all faculties have a compulsory internship in their programs. Domains of management and tourism stand for the founding pillars of tourism education. Foreign languages (English, German, French, and Russian mostly) is the other important domain for all departments with many hours in the schedule.

The important finding from coding of curricula is the isomorphism between faculties and between each department. At first view, one could get an impression of the diversity of courses easily (by more than 800 courses named differently). However, it is possible to categorize these numerous courses examining their contents by employing these 12 categories presented in Table 1.

Furthermore, the analyses of focus group and individual interviews resulted in three main themes (Table 2) which are **historical roots** (vision and preparations of schools for transformation), **reasons** (status and prestige; stakeholders' expectations; employment opportunities for graduates; scientification; unit performance; sense of competition), and the **process** of transformation (central authority; norms; meetings; uncertainty; time pressure; mimetism; critics; structural change; cultural change; and pragmatism).

Findings of the study revealed that the transformation of schools into tourism faculties was on the agenda of directors and academicians for more than 30 years. Both focus group participants and interviewees quoted the hope for transformation as "30 years dream". However, *preparations* and *vision* refer that roots could not only be explained with dreams but also embraces some initiatives. Lobbying with central authorities, developing doctoral programmes, and initiating departments and graduate programmes were mentioned during interviews as preparations for the faculty structure.

Six sub-themes were identified for reasons for transformation, but *status and prestige* emerged as the dominant reason mentioned by each participant. Faculty as a label of the unit is expected to bring status in the university and in the eyes of the society by enhancing its reputation. Schools are generally confused with two-year vocational schools by potential applicants and by employers, and faculty as the label of the unit could resolve this confusion. The confusion caused by name resemblance explained by one of the participants as follows [all quotes presented in this study have been subjected to authors' translation from Turkish to English.]:

> *"… The president of the Higher Education Council visited our school once. We had a conversation about our school for two hours. While leaving, he said; you are great as a vocational school. At that time, I decided that it is not good for the unit to continue as a school. Even the president of higher education confuses our school with two-year vocational schools." (P3)*

Even the shortened name is important for academics to communicate better with the stakeholders. Respondents hoped that faculty would appear more frequently on the press and gain better recognition. It will also be free from the image of school graduates getting low-skilled jobs, and that could eventually improve the prestige of the unit. In addition to these arguments, there is an expectation for enhanced status in universities by the faculty structuring since faculties are represented in university boards and have more power in decision-making. Representation at university boards and voting power of faculties are mentioned during interviews to receive greater sources and to communicate the problems of the unit better.

Stakeholders' expectations for change was another pushing factor for units. Expectations of students, families, and personnel of schools were mentioned during focus groups and individual interviews. Notes from focus group meeting with students indicated the

perceived advantage of being a faculty graduate. Faculty graduates are perceived to have greater job opportunities. Greater *employment opportunities* were expected from faculties and pointed by participants as a reason for transformation. Following the transformation, graduates would have greater employment opportunities in applying for jobs in the tourism industry and other industries. For example, graduates of tourism schools had no change in employment in the ministry of tourism since the jobs were only offered for faculty graduates. Great recruiters such as banks or state offices have very few job offers for school graduates; thus transformation into faculties would widen job opportunities. An academician explained this advantage as follows:

"… Now we have the same opportunities with the Faculty of Management. Our graduates have the same opportunities from now on and could apply to banks or for jobs of auditing." (P10)

Besides providing opportunities for future employment, the faculty is considered as the centre for the academic progress of the field. Establishing faculties in the country would trigger the change in curricula to include more theoretical and academic courses, could strengthen academicians' motivation to research by the improvement of master's and doctoral programmes, and that will eventually contribute to *scientification* of tourism education. Scientification is expected to improve by initiating departments and attracting qualified scholars as explicated in some of the quotations below. However, some interviewees discussed scientification as an obligation or as an output of the transformation, rather than logic for the change. Thus scientification is not found to be as strong reasoning as other themes.

"… Augmenting the number of faculty members, but with the qualified staffs, was expected." (P1)

"… We were not able to establish specialized departments when it was a school." (P22)

"… Faculty means more scientific, more specialized education, development of a better level of graduate studies to me." (P4)

Participants of the study also perceive faculty to be more democratic as an organizational structure. They expected that transformation would improve the *performance* of the unit. To illustrate, one participant described the performance as follows; "*Schools are more primitive organizations, but faculties are institutionalized" (P18)*. Especially decision-making process is discussed for unit performance. Solely the director could make decisions in schools, but in faculties, departments have certain voice and participation in decisions. However, it is important to note that, some of the participants also criticized the bureaucratic structure of faculties since the workflow is very slow in faculties comparing to schools. Considering the unit performance, students' success is also mentioned by participants. An improvement in the education and performance is expected with more hard-working and demanding applicants because of the compelling entry conditions to faculties.

Lastly, the followers of the change feel the pressure to transform due to the *perception of competition*. Following the existence of faculties in the higher education field of tourism, students generally applied for faculties, and that affected the rankings of tourism departments. Schools, which fell behind the faculties, have felt the pressure for transformation. Thus, the perception of competition was effective in diffusing the change in the field.

Along with the reasons for the change, data analysis provided specific findings to explicate the transformation process together with the conditions affecting the configuration of the unit. Ten themes are identified to illustrate the process. Findings point out the significance of agents such as YOK and ministry of education which are coded as *central authorities*. Although universities are identified as autonomous organizations in Turkey, they need to receive central authorities' approval for structural changes. Thus, governmental agencies played the key role to start, maintain and finalize the process. Schools have been able to apply to transform when the government's attitude towards higher education has changed since 2009. YOK was responsible for screening the applications and monitoring the changes. Further, YOK directed and manipulated the framework for newly introduced faculties. Four departments in faculties could be discussed as one of the examples:

"What exactly YOK delegate said was, we confirm the present four departments for tourism faculties. This is the frame; other options are not possible." (A1-Focus group meetings)

When it comes to developing curricula for departments, the *norms* for tourism education were influential. Interdisciplinary status of tourism, including theoretical and technical subjects, and competency in foreign languages were specified in data analysis as norms to affect the education in faculties. Following the transformation, new faculties feel the pressure to improve scientification, but they are not exempt from providing vocational courses to respond to the expectations of the tourism industry.

Meetings organized by central authorities, faculties, or departments were also effective to shape structures. Exchange of views on new departments and building of consensus on curricula appear to be the ultimate aim of these meetings. The significance of both norms and central authorities is detected from narrations about meetings. For example, each interviewee mentioned one particular meeting held in 2009 by the participation of YOK delegates and directors of tourism and hospitality schools where the departments of faculties were determined. This meeting held in Cappadocia appears to bring standardization to the departments of faculties. Four departments namely tourism administration, gastronomy and culinary arts, tourism guidance, and recreation management are founded in tourism faculties. Former tourism and hospitality schools used to have tourism and hospitality programmes while some established schools had travel agencies management, and hospitality management programmes. Only a few schools had food and beverage management programmes. Thus new departments (gastronomy and culinary arts, tourist guidance, and recreation management) that need to be founded in faculties appeared as a significant challenge. Department heads of tourism faculties had meetings in this process of determining the scope of education and developing curricula.

Development of new departments and the need to change workflow according to faculty structure caused a high level of *uncertainty* for members. Staff had to learn the workflow required, and the operation of departmental and faculty boards. Academicians

were challenged to find and employ experts of the field, to develop curricula and to determine the content of courses for newly founded departments. Tourism academics have experience in the education of tourism management, but the establishment of tourism faculties introduces three new departments. Interviewees expressed that the process was all obscure at the beginning. The transformation was not taken for granted, and schools felt insecure about the YOK's approval. Transformation of schools had been suppressed for decades; thus schools also had concerns if governmental agents would change their attitude again and transformation would not be warranted.

"… There was an expectation for years, and what will happen tomorrow is not clear. We could not take the risk of it, and we rushed to apply while the conjuncture was convenient." (A6-Focus Group Meeting)

" … The attitude of YOK was told for the departments. Now we can see the different departments, but at that time there was such a thought that we could not change it, YOK might reject it, cannot get an approval." (P9)

"… We worked fast. It was even said that 'This train is departing. Let's catch this train.' This is Turkey anyway; you cannot be sure what will happen in the future." (P1)

As stated in the above quotations, faculties also faced *time pressure* to accomplish the process in association with uncertainty. Especially continuing education without an interruption required an extra effort of academicians for the development of new departments and curricula. *Mimicry* stands out as a strong theme since schools need to do the changes rapidly in an uncertain environment. Study findings revealed that most of the schools follow and copy the practices and structures of faculties which are considered as successful organizations or to have close links with central authorities. Interviewees and participants of focus groups explained that they copied the organization structure, departments, and curriculums of other faculties to overcome the uncertainty.

"… We examined the curriculum of gastronomy and culinary arts department of Gazi University since it is one of the established universities." (P9)

"… Since we did not have tourist guiding beforehand, we adopted the curriculum of Nevşehir University. We planned the same curriculum with slight changes." (A4-Focus Group Meeting)

However rapid decisions were criticized in a later period, and initial decisions and practices were revised. For instance, curriculums are updated by taking opinions from professional chambers. Thus *criticism* of the process has appeared as another theme shaping the process.

Transformation to faculty required significant changes. First units have to comply with the laws and regulations for higher education that formulate the *structural change*. Constitution of faculty and departmental boards, principals for the assignment of deans and department heads are all identified by regulations. Hence the effect of coercive mechanisms is mostly experienced in changes made in unit structure.

Nevertheless, bringing changes to practice was a real challenge for new faculties. Overcoming the past habits coming from schools, actualizing *cultural change* together with the structural change was problematic. While the label and the structure of the unit were changed, practices mostly remained unchanged. Some of the interviewees affirmed that they do not know the requirements of a faculty, but generally this duality is criticized as "Nameplate at the door of the building has been changed but nothing else." Dean acting like a director of a school without calling faculty board for meetings as well as the low participation of academicians in boards were pointed out as examples of continuing school habits. Some quotations are as follows:

"… We have school culture from the past and now face difficulties to adopt faculty culture. I mean the inconsistency between school and faculty culture is the main reason for problems now as a consequence of the rapid change." (P7)

"… A unit cannot be a faculty by just changing the nameplate at the door. There should be customs, traditions, but it might take years for traditions arise." (P24)

Additionally, participants of the study commented that it is normal for the change to take time and used a Turkish idiom which could be translated as "making it up as you go along." They also told that none of them really knew how to handle this process, so they just made it up in the process of transformation. Furthermore, *pragmatism* is found in maintaining the inconsistency between practices and the structure. Units want to take advantage of faculty labelling in gaining prestige and status, but they avoid the requirements of a bureaucratic workflow. Participants of focus group meetings explained this pragmatism as follows:

"… It was all about getting a faculty label, nothing else matters." (A1-Focus Group Meeting)

6. Discussion

This study attempted to understand the transformation of tourism and hospitality management schools into tourism faculties in Turkey. Relevant documents are reviewed, and focus group meetings and individual interviews are conducted to examine this process. Analysis of qualitative data provided findings of the roots, reasons, and process of a significant transformation in higher education of tourism. Findings showed that the transformation of tourism schools into tourism faculties was a thirty-years dream for tourism academics. While pressures of both technical (scientification, unit performance, sense of competition, employment opportunities) and institutional (status and prestige, stakeholders' expectations) environment for transformation are found, findings of the study actually provide support to Scott and Meyer's (1991) argument that schools operate in strong institutional and weak technical

environments. As cited in the literature, tourism is perceived as a low-status career (Charles, 1997; Cooper & Shepherd, 1997; Huimin & Hobson, 2008; Marinakou & Giousmpasoglou, 2015), and increasing the reputation of educational units is crucial since it affects the preferences of prospective students (Aubke & Ring, 2008) and recruiters (Gioia & Corley, 2002). Transformation to faculties is perceived to be an essential initiative for that end. Data analysis also revealed that status and prestige is the strongest theme for the reasoning of transformation. In addition to gaining prestige in the eye of external groups, the status of tourism programmes in universities is also crucial to receive funds (Steene, 2012; Wang, 2010). Transforming into faculty provided attaining more power in university boards and decision making. However, during focus group meetings and interviews, expectations of gaining status and prestige are mostly explained with ideological or emotional justifications in content rather than with technical reasons. Thus, study findings showed the pressures of strong institutional environment. As Belhassen and Caton (2009) discussed, legitimacy is a political issue, and transformation into faculty is expected to enhance the legitimacy of tourism education.

However, it is possible to speculate that establishing tourism faculties might contribute to epistemological and pedagogical discussions in the field. Former departments were affiliated with faculties of management, school of applied disciplines or tourism schools. While tourism schools and schools of applied disciplines were devoted to vocational education based on skills development training, departments in faculties of management were benefiting from the legitimacy of a more mature field of business. However, the affiliation with faculties of management leads to a dominance of management approach in tourism departments such as application-oriented approaches to manage and sell the tourism product (Belhassen & Caton, 2009). Jafari (2001) argues that free-standing tourism education units would contribute to the specialization and scientification in the field. Thus, it is plausible to argue that tourism faculties might provide a platform for the discussions of epistemological foundations of tourism with its business and non-business aspects as described by Tribe (1997; 2002). Faculties have already triggered departmentalization in the undergraduate education (tourism management, gastronomy and culinary arts, tourist guidance, and recreation management) and pluralization in master's and doctoral level programmes. Although it was not one of the strong reasons as attaining status and prestige, the perceived need for scientification is one of the critical findings of this study. Following the transformation into faculties, academics emphasized that they need to improve education to provide more scientific knowledge. There was also a perceived need for employing experts, not only in the management of tourism but in various domains of tourism research.

Examining the process of transformation showed the effect of field level dynamics. Faculties examined for the study are isomorphic in their structures. Processes that similarize the units were identified, and all three of isomorphic mechanisms (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) were detected to influence transformation. First, the organizational structure has been shaped by regulations. Thus organizational structures of faculties have become isomorphic by the effect of coercive mechanisms. Findings discussed with the theme of the central authorities provide support to the effect of coercive processes. Kipping et al. (2004) described Turkish higher education as a strong state influence. YOK as the council to coordinate universities has manipulated the process by imposing standard four departments for all tourism faculties. Although the departments were not determined by a formal regulation, faculties were under informal pressures since they were not in a position to question proposals of YOK as a result of power dependencies. Findings of the study showed the effects of governmental bodies (Dredge et al., 2013) and coercive isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) but no global effects are observed in the process of change.

Second, the norm of tourism education to balance vocational and theoretical courses (Airey, 2005; Paris, 2011; Tribe, 2002), to build competency in foreign languages (Tribe, 2005), and to produce well-rounded graduates by internships and skill-building courses (Amoah & Baum, 1997; Chen & Groves, 1999; Gursoy et al., 2012) has been creating normative pressures on the planning of curricula. Data from interviews and review of curriculums reflected the effect of normative isomorphism. Findings are consistent with Meyer and Rowans' (1977) views on institutional environments to shape organizations, and with DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) views that universities, professional and trade associations are important centres to diffuse normative rules.

Third, units imitated each other in the process of initiating departments and planning curricula. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) suggested that uncertainty is influential in creating mimetic processes. Findings of the present study provide support to this argument. The departments of gastronomy and culinary arts, tourist guiding, and recreation management which are founded by the transformation were not familiar to tourism academicians. Imitating the departments of foreign universities or modelling themselves on recent tourism faculties were discovered in data analysis. Reichel (2005) cited that schools receive available American and British syllabi and adapt them to their conditions in Israel. Turkish scholars mentioned a similar process during transformation. They adapted the curricula especially from English-speaking countries, and later adopters followed the emerged structure in the country. As discovered by Labianca et al. (2001), they monitored the long-established departments with high prestige. Consequently, tourism faculties have become largely isomorphic by the effect of these coercive, normative and mimetic processes. This isomorphism could also be considered to stimulate standardization of programmes. According to Koh (1994), the standardization of education is essential for professional recognition. Faculties could support standardization under the effect of these isomorphic processes.

However, the case of tourism faculties slightly contradicts Scott's (1987) view that voluntarily adopted changes would be less superficial. The transformation was a 30 years-dream that finally came true, but decoupling found in data analysis displays the problems in conformity to faculty structure. Findings presented with the themes of structural and cultural change showed that faculties are successful in meeting the structural requirements of the transformation, but their actual practises are decoupled from the formal structure. As Townley (2002) observed in cultural organizations, tourism faculties decouple internal work practices from formal structures in the early period of transformation. The findings are also consistent with D'Aunno et al.'s (1991) views that organizations would rank institutional demands and adopt the practices on the basis of their visibility to external groups. Transformed faculties adopt the changes primarily which are visible to the outside of the organization in the purpose of gaining legitimacy. In addition, findings of the study point out that the transformation of schools was aimed to bring status and prestige more than for technical improvements. Pragmatist and opportunist approach is found in desiring the faculty labelling without conforming the

requisites of a faculty. Pragmatism in that sense is one of the significant findings of the present study while it is not well discussed in institutionalism except a few studies referring to Suchman's (1995) pragmatic legitimacy. Opportunist and pragmatist approach to transformation to take advantage of faculty status but avoiding or decoupling the requisites of faculty structure is an important finding of this study that calls for further attention in future studies.

From the institutionalist perspective, another interesting finding of the study is that government bodies create uncertainty in the organizational field. According to the classics of neo-institutionalism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991; Meyer & Rowan, 1977), the state is a rationalizing actor affecting the emergence and diffusion of formal organizing in order to standardize and control social units. While the state is considered as great rationalizer (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991) in US-born theory, Özen (2014) argues that this may not be the case for Turkey where state frequently creates instability in economic and social life with its unpredictable and arbitrary actions. In this case, newly founded faculties feel the pressure of uncertainty created by central authorities and endeavour to adopt the structures that are assumed to be approved. Thus, study findings support Özen's (2014) suggestions to recontextualize the new institutional theory to the Turkish case, particularly concerning the role of the state.

The findings of the present study also contribute to the discussions on the research level in neo-institutionalism. Findings provide support to Greenwood and Hinings' (1996) views to examine intra-organizational dynamics to understand organizational change. Former schools were dissatisfied with their status in universities and sought to translate their interests into the favourable allocation of organizational resources. Additionally, schools were disadvantageous in attracting applicants because of its low prestige in society. Dissatisfaction with interests and capacity for action are argued by Greenwood and Hinings (1996) as drivers of change. Similarly, Powell (1991) recognizes the capacity of actors seeking legitimization for changes that enhance their prestige and power, and Scott (2010) mentions the role of human activities and social relations to understand systems. Empirical evidence is also provided for proactive roles of actors seeking reputation and image, creating isomorphic convergence (Labianca et al., 2001), and maintaining and developing legitimacy (Durand & McGuire, 2005). Present study findings show the active role of academicians to transform the schools along with power dependencies. In Turkey, tourism academics utilized an opportunity to transform schools into faculties in order to attain status and prestige. Faculties which used to train teachers for vocational and technical secondary education institutions were closed due to the employability problems (Gunbayi, 2012). Three of the faculties to train tourism teachers were replaced with tourism faculties in this process. Thus, the first faculties are founded by a random event as described by Czarniawska and Joerges (1996). Following the archetypes emerged in the field, tourism schools started to apply for transformation into faculties.

However, the emphasis on actors and intra-organizational dynamics does not necessarily mean falsifying macrostructures to form organizations. Although schools used to believe they were ready to transform and have the capacity to, the change was only possible when central authorities approve it. Besides, the transformation process is reasoned and accomplished under institutional pressures. There was ambivalence in the process of change. As Czarniawska and Joerges (1996) suggest, change is a result of a blend of actors' intentions, institutional norms, and random events in the broader higher education. While this study confirms Greenwood et al.'s (2014) suggestions to focus on organizations, it also provides support to the earlier discussions of theory (Meyer & Höllerer, 2014). Thus, addressing the arguments on research levels in neo-institutionalism (Scott, 2010), the present study recognizes the importance of field level structures, participating organizations, and actors working within these organizations.

A summary of the study findings with the corresponding concepts of new institutionalism used for theoretical explanation is presented in Table 3. The institutional and technical environment of tourism schools provided the main reasons for transformation. Isomorphism and decoupling are observed in the process of transformation. Besides, study findings confirmed intra-organizational dynamics to initiate and to maintain the organizational change. Thus, the organizational field of tourism education which embraces both institutional and technical pressures could be examined why a significant change is initiated. Isomorphism and decoupling are

Table 3
Evaluation of study findings with the concepts of new institutionalism.

Theoretical Construct	Corresponding Findings of the Study	Rationale
Institutional and technical environment	Status and prestige Stakeholders' expectations Employment opportunities Scientification Unit performance Sense of competition	Prospects of gaining status and prestige by the transformation and stakeholders' expectations from higher education indicate the institutional pressures. The aims of increasing scientification, unit performance and employment opportunities for graduates, and initiating change by the perception of competition are attempts to meet requirements of the technical environment.
Decoupling	Structural Change Cultural Change Pragmatism	Structural change is mostly accomplished, but daily practices are decoupled from formal structure. Faculties maintain the former practices of schools in a pragmatist approach and thus, a cultural change could not be created.
Isomorphism	Central Authority Norms Meetings Uncertainty Time Pressure Mimicry	Central authorities have an essential position to initiate and manipulate the change which created coercive isomorphism. Norms for tourism education and meetings are important to diffuse ideas that caused a normative isomorphism. Besides, uncertainty and perception of time pressure caused mimicry in the process that increased mimetic isomorphism.
Intra-organizational Dynamics	Vision Preparations Criticisms	Actors' vision for change in the field and their initiatives to create change were important to initiate and maintain the change. They criticised the initial decisions and had an active role in the process of organizational change.

the key concepts to explain the process of how this change is realised. In addition to these earliest suggestions of new institutionalism, the role of organizations and actors should also be examined to develop a deeper understanding of change in organizational fields.

7. Conclusions and further research

This research focuses on the transformation process of higher education in tourism in Turkey. Tourism faculties have been established since 2009 on the decades-long school heritage and started to dominate the tourism education in universities. Majority of these new faculties are the ones which are transformed from schools, but then practices of these faculties mostly remained unchanged. Consequently, units are identified as "*faculty in its label, but a school in its nature*" in the early periods of transformation.

However, departmentalization and the perceived need for scientification of tourism by the transformation could improve academic production and scientific knowledge in the field. It is also plausible to consider the establishment of tourism faculties as a confirmation of tourism as one of the major academic fields in universities and as a legitimization of it as a research area and professorship in Turkey. As cited in many scholar's works (Cooper & Shepherd, 1997; Steene, 2012; Wang, 2010) from various countries, the status of tourism departments is not strong in universities and researchers strive to establish credentials of tourism. Investing more on tourism education and establishing free-standing tourism faculties would contribute to building a scientific foundation of tourism and its education in bachelor's, master's and doctoral levels (Jafari, 2001).

From the institutionalist perspective, one of the significant and context-specific findings of this study is that central authorities do not only regulate the field by coercive mechanisms, but they also create uncertainty. Schools try to make decisions in an uncertain environment which are estimated to gain approval from central authorities. Also, study findings confirmed the explanatory power of pragmatism and opportunism in understanding organizational change. Thus, this study attempts to contribute the discussions of recontextualizing or extending arguments of new institutionalism (Greenwood, Hinings, & Whetten, 2014; Özen, 2014) but also provides support to the early papers on isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), decoupling (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), and institutions (Meyer & Höllerer, 2014) to understand a major change in the higher education of tourism.

Despite its contributions, the study is not free from limitations. Archetypes of tourism faculties were established as a consequence of reform for vocational and technical education training teachers (Gunbayi, 2012). Majority of the former tourism schools are transformed into tourism faculties, but not all of the schools had applied for the change. We were not able to question their reluctance or barriers for the change within the scope of this research. In addition, all of the transformed faculties examined for this study are organized under state universities. The findings of isomorphic processes should, thus, be viewed with some caution. In a study on the institutionalization of U.S. culinary programs, Harrington, Mandabach, Thibodeaux, and VanLeeuwen (2005) found differences between public and private programs and commented that public organizations face greater pressure to meet the standards. Samples of the present study are all units of state universities which are detected to operate under similar institutional pressures that enforce the isomorphism. Examining the transformation process solely, global effects on higher education such as the influence of accreditation bodies or competition between the educational units are not explored in this study. Another limitation is that the study focused on a specific case in a single country and did not examine the global situation of educational institutions of tourism. While gaining status and prestige were the driving forces for transformation, this might be related to the university structure and public opinion in Turkey that differentiates four-year schools and faculties, and this might differ from worldwide cases. Also, tourism is one of the prominent industries in the country, and its education might be supported in compliance with national economic agendas, while departments are being closed or are suffering from lack of resources globally (Belhassen & Caton, 2009). However, the case presented in this study is an important indicator of attempts to increase the scientification of tourism.

This study presents an early view of transformation, but a longitudinal examination of the process is missing. Future studies could examine how tourism faculties would evolve in their new fragmented environment where they might need to response conflicting demands of former and new stakeholders (D'Aunno et al., 1991). Academics of new faculties would like to ensure liberal reflection (Tribe, 1997; 2002) in curricula with the aim of scientification but also feel the sector pressure to provide vocational courses. Along with norm for higher education of tourism to find the balance between vocational and theoretical courses, there might be much more room to discuss sociological, psychological, and historical foundations of tourism by departmentalization which might also contribute to a multidisciplinary approach and moving toward specialization in the field. This line of research is potent to discuss the normative approaches to tourism education at university level.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2019.100199.

References

Airey, D. (2005). Growth and development. In D. Airey, & J. Tribe (Eds.). *An international handbook of tourism education* (pp. 13–24). Oxford: Elsevier.
Airey, D., & Johnson, S. (1999). The content of tourism degree courses in the UK. *Tourism Management, 20*, 229–235.
Airey, D., & Tribe, J. (2005). Issues for the future. In D. Airey, & J. Tribe (Eds.). *An international handbook of tourism education* (pp. 501–506). Oxford: Elsevier.
Amoah, V. A., & Baum, T. (1997). Tourism education: Policy versus practice. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 9*(1), 5–12.
Aubke, F., & Ring, A. (2008). Tourism and hospitality universities in Austria: What's in the difference? *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 20*(3), 25–29.
Belhassen, Y., & Caton, K. (2009). Advancing understandings: A linguistic approach to tourism epistemology. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(2), 335–352.
Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge.* New York: Doubleday.
Boley, B. B. (2011). Sustainability in hospitality and tourism education: Towards an integrated curriculum. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 23*(4), 22–31.

Caton, K. (2014). Underdisciplinarity: Where are the humanities in tourism education? *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sports and Tourism Education, 15*, 24–33.
Cecil, A., & Krohn, B. (2012). The process of developing a competency-based academic curriculum in tourism management. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 12*, 129–145.
Charles, K. R. (1997). Tourism education and training in the Caribbean: Preparing for the 21st century. *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research, 3*, 189–197.
Chen, K., & Groves, D. (1999). The importance of examining philosophical relationships between tourism and hospitality curricula. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 11*(1), 37–42.
Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology, 6*(1), 1–22.
Cooper, C., & Shepherd, R. (1997). The relationship between tourism education and the tourism industry: Implications for tourism education. *Tourism Recreation Research, 22*(1), 34–47.
Czarniawska, B., & Joerges, B. (1996). Travels of ideas. In B. Czarniawska, & G. Sevon (Eds.). *Translating organizational change* (pp. 13–48). Berlin: de Gruyter.
Dacin, M. T., Goldstein, J., & Scott, W. R. (2002). Institutional theory and institutional change: Introduction to the special research forum. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(1), 45–57.
Denzin, N. K. (2009). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods.* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*, 147–160.
DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1991). Introduction. In W. W. Powell, & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 1–38). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Dredge, D., Benckendorff, P., Day, M., Gross, M. J., Walo, M., Weeks, P., et al. (2012). The philosophic practitioner and the curriculum space. *Annals of Tourism Research, 39*(4), 2154–2176.
Dredge, D., Benckendorff, P., Day, M., Gross, M. J., Walo, M., Weeks, P., et al. (2013). Drivers of change in tourism, hospitality, and event management education: An Australian perspective. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 25*, 89–102.
Durand, R., & McGuire, J. (2005). Legitimating agencies in the face of selection: The case of AACSB. *Organization Studies, 26*(2), 165–196.
D'Aunno, T., Sutton, R. I., & Price, R. H. (1991). Isomorphism and external support in conflicting institutional environments: A study of drug abuse treatment units. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(3), 636–661.
Elting, R. (1984). *Typical American hospitality four-year education program. Tourism Education Congress.* Istanbul: Bogazici University.
Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research.* London: Sage.
Fligstein, N. (1991). The structural transformation of American industry: An institutional account of the causes of diversification in the largest firms, 1919-1979. In W. W. Powell, & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 311–336). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Formica, S. (1996). European hospitality and tourism education: Differences with the American model and future trends. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 15*(4), 317–323.
Forssell, A., & Jansson, D. (1996). The logic of organizational transformation: On the conversion of non-business organizations. In B. Czarniawska, & G. Sevon (Eds.). *Translating organizational change* (pp. 93–116). Berlin: de Gruyter.
Gioia, D. A., & Corley, K. G. (2002). Being good versus looking good: Business school rankings and the Circean transformation from substance to image. *The Academy of Management Learning and Education, 1*(1), 107–120.
Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(4), 1022–1054.
Greenwood, R., Hinings, C. R., & Whetten, D. (2014). Rethinking institutions and organizations. *Journal of Management Studies, 51*(7), 1206–1220.
Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(1), 58–80.
Gunbayi, I. (2012). A reform for vocational and technical education training teachers in Turkey. *International Journal of Vocational Education and Training, 20*(2), 43–49.
Gursoy, D., Rahman, I., & Swanger, N. (2012). Industry's expectations from hospitality schools: What has changed? *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 24*(4), 32–42.
Harrington, R. J., Mandabach, K. H., Thibodeaux, W., & VanLeeuwen, D. (2005). The institutionalization of culinary education. *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology, 4*(4), 31–49.
Holm, P. (1995). The dynamics of institutionalization: Transformation processes in Norwegian fisheries. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*(3), 398–422.
Huimin, G., & Hobson, P. (2008). The dragon is roaring...The development of tourism, hospitality & event management education in China. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 20*(1), 20–29.
Inui, Y., Wheeler, D., & Lankford, S. (2006). Rethinking tourism education: What should schools teach? *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sports and Tourism Education, 5*(2), 25–35.
Jafari, J. (2001). The scientification of tourism. In V. L. Smith, & M. Brent (Eds.). *Hosts and guests revisited: Tourism issues of the 21st century* (pp. 28–41). New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation.
Kipping, M., Üsdiken, B., & Puig, N. (2004). Imitation, tension, and hybridization: Multiple “americanizations” of management education in mediterranean Europe. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 13*(2), 98–108.
Koh, Y. K. (1994). Tourism education for the 1990s. *Annals of Tourism Research, 21*(4), 853–855.
Kozak, M., & Kozak, N. (2017). Institutionalisation of tourism research and education: From the early 1900s to 2000s. *Journal of Tourism History, 8*(3), 275–299.
Labianca, G., Fairbank, J. F., Thomas, J. B., Gioia, D. A., & Umphress, E. E. (2001). Emulation in academia: Balancing structure and identity. *Organization Science, 12*(3), 312–330.
Lee, K., & Pennings, J. M. (2002). Mimicry and the market: Adoption of a new organizational form. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(1), 144–162.
Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
Marinakou, E., & Giousmpasoglou, C. (2015). Stakeholders' views on the development of a higher education hospitality program in Bahrain: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 27*(2), 85–92.
Meyer, R. E., & Höllerer, M. A. (2014). Does institutional theory need redirecting? *Journal of Management Studies, 51*(7), 1221–1233.
Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340–363.
Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Munar, A. M. (2007). Is the Bologna process globalizing tourism education? *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sports and Tourism Education, 6*(2), 68–82.
Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review, 16*(1), 145–179.
Özen, S¸. (2014). Recontextualizing the new institutional conception of the state to the Turkish case. In R. Westwood, G. Jack, F. Khan, & M. Frenkel (Eds.). *Core-periphery relations and organization studies* (pp. 79–99). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
Paris, C. M. (2011). Social constructivism and tourism education. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sports and Tourism Education, 10*(2), 103–108.
Pearce, P. L. (2005). Australian tourism education: The quest for status. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 5*(3), 251–267.
Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective.* New York: Harper & Row.
Powell, W. W. (1991). Expanding the scope of institutional analysis. In W. W. Powell, & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 183–203). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Reichel, A. (2005). Tourism and hospitality higher education in Israel. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 5*(1–2), 61–88.
Richards, L. (2005). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide.* London: Sage.
Ring, A., Dickinger, A., & Wober, K. (2009). Designing the ideal undergraduate program in tourism: Expectations from industry and educators. *Journal of Travel Research, 48*(1), 106–121.
Scott, W. R. (1987). The adolescence of institutional theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 32*, 493–511.

Scott, W. R. (1991). Unpacking institutional arguments. In W. W. Powell, & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 164–182). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Scott, W. R. (2008). Approaching adulthood: The maturing of institutional theory. *Theory and Society, 37*(5), 427–442.
Scott, W. R. (2010). Reflections: The past and future of research on institutions and institutional change. *Journal of Change Management, 10*(1), 5–21.
Scott, W. R., & Meyer, J. W. (1991). The organization of societal sector: Propositions and early evidence. In W. W. Powell, & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 108–140). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Sheldon, P., Fesenmaier, D. R., & Tribe, J. (2011). The tourism education futures initiative (TEFI): Activating change in tourism education. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 11*(1), 2–23.
Shih, F. J. (1998). Triangulation in nursing research: Issues of conceptual clarity and purpose. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 28*(3), 631–641.
Slocum, L. S., Dimitrov, D. Y., & Webb, K. (2019). The impact of neoliberalism on higher education tourism programs: Meeting the 2030 sustainable development goals with the next generation. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 30*, 33–42.
Steene, A. (2012). Tourism education in Sweden: Past, present and future. *Journal of Applied Economics and Business Research, 2*(3), 147–154.
Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571–610.
Townley, B. (2002). The role of competing rationalities in institutional change. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(1), 163–179.
Tribe, J. (1997). The indiscipline of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*(3), 638–657.
Tribe, J. (2001). Research paradigms and the tourism curriculum. *Journal of Travel Research, 39*, 442–448.
Tribe, J. (2002). The philosophic practitioner. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(2), 338–357.
Tribe, J. (2005). Curriculum, development and conflict: A case study of Moldova. In D. Airey, & J. Tribe (Eds.). *An international handbook of tourism education* (pp. 77–92). Oxford: Elsevier.
Üsdiken, B., Topaler, B., & Koçak, Ö. (2013). Yasa, piyasa ve örgüt tiplerinde çeşitlilik: 1981 sonrasında Türkiye'de üniversiteler. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, 68*(3), 187–223.
Wang, M. (2010). Faculty development in China: An essential strategy for tourism education service. *Journal of China Tourism Research, 6*, 428–438.
Wang, J., Ayres, H., & Huyton, J. (2013). Is tourism education meeting the needs of the tourism industry? An Australian case study. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 22*(1), 8–14.
Wisansing, J. (2008). The three waves of internationalisation sweeping Thailand's tourism and hospitality education: Current progress and future prospects. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 20*(1), 13–19.