

Nepotism in Impact Employee Performance Evaluation Form with Family Business

Akyay Uygur¹, Altuğ Çağatay²

Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the causes performance evaluation and career obstacles as a result of nepotism suffered by people working in various places. Even in the new world order despite the fact of institutionalization career confusion emerged with favoritism and nepotism with managers that have applied to employees led them to feel anxiety, they felt they aren't assessed by performance evaluation they deserve. From this point this matters has led to curiosity worth investigating in the academic sense. This work is applied 100 people working in public, private and civil society organizations located in the province of Tokat and the results have been demonstrated in the presence of perspective.

Keywords: Performance evaluation, nepotism, family business

1. Introduction

It is observed that family run-businesses which have initial impact on Turkish economy are continued by young nations and the businesses are arbiter by growing day by day in economy. We can say that there is more mass structure than the structure in the world too. The structure of the running is being continued as from father to son in the countries such as Turkey where the family bonds are strong and the ones who will be the manager of the running are chosen most probably among the family members. Family-run businesses which have important roles on so many industries represent the 75-90 percent of the initiative of the world. For example, 70 percent of the companies in Europe are family-run business. The rate is 96 percent in USA, above 95 percent in Turkey. (Kalkan et al.,2013:128)

Özler (2007) explains Nepotism as regulation of employment relationships by taking consideration on relative relationships regardless of the factors about merit. Araslı (2006) indicates that nepotism is a concept which gives harm generally to organizational relations and aggrieves the others and he states that it affects negatively to institutionalization especially in the family-run businesses. Mostly, family priorities generally come before running rules in family-run businesses and so many family-run businesses assign one person among family members without taking into consideration of his/her capacity, skill and experiences to the important positions in the organization. This occasion appear as a negative management approach and attitude when it is evaluated in aspect of institutionalization. (İşçi, Taştan and Kozal, 2013:62)

The research answers the questions about how the family-run businesses choose the individuals within the frame of traditions of family-run business and the justice way of the individuals' performance.

The Concept of Family-Run Business

Family-run business is defined as companies which are founded by family to earn the family' keep and prevent distribution of the heritage and which leads by the one who earn the family' keep and run mostly by the family members, in which the decisions mostly are taken by the family members and there are at least two generations of the family. (Karpuzoğlu, 2001:19).

¹ Associate Prof. Gazi University, Associate Prof., Gazi Üniversitesi Golbası/Ankara

² Lecturer, Gaziosmanpaşa University, Lecturer, Almus/Tokat,

According to Longenecker and Moore (1991) it is a state that family and job overlap each other. According to Donnelly (1996) it is a company which belongs to the family at least throughout two generations and the aims and the interests of the company are the same and the states affect the company's policies.

According to Rosenblatt, de Mik, Anderson, and Johnson (1985) Family-run business is defined as running type in which multiple ownership or control are in one family's power and at least two or more family members are directly in the job. (Elalmış, 2011:6)

Family-run business is defined as "company which is founded to prevent the distribution of the family heritage and the most part of the ownership and control are in the hands of the same family and there are two or more family member are directly deal with the job." According to the definitions which are about the management of the company Chua et al (1999) define family-run businesses as the company which manages by the head of the family or the one who is responsible for the livelihood of the family and the companies which meet the requirement of at least two generations are deal with the running of the company.

According to Potobsky (1992) family-run business of which at least 51 percent of the share are in the hands of one family or the ones who have relationship each other and the majority of the senior managers are among the family and the owners of the company have daily responsibilities in the company in aspect of affinity. (Kalkan et al.,2013:129)

Welsch (1993) defines family-run businesses as "companies whose owners or his/her relatives participate in the management process of the company." According to Donckels and Frohlich (1991) "it is necessary that the family member or members have at least 60 percent of the total ownership" and to Westhead and Cowling (1997) "it is necessary that the family member or members have at least 50 percent of the total ownership"

Carsrud (1994) defines family-run businesses as the companies in which "the group who have emotional bounds" is dominant on both ownership and determining policy. According to Davis (1983) "family-run businesses are companies in which determining policy and guiding are under the effect of one or more family units." Gallo and Sveen (1991) define family-run businesses as companies in which one family has the great majority of the wealth and total control. (Asunakutlu ve Avcı, 2010:95)

Definition of the family-run business is always hard although it is not one of the oldest and complex subjects in the history of humankind. Being a family-run business was not preferred in 1980s and 1990s but at the beginning of the 2000s after crises it was realized that being a family-run business is indeed an advantage in so many aspects and it was realized that most of the company in the world were family-run businesses. If it is needed to define the meaning of the family-run business to us as PwC it is defined as:

- The company whose shares or majority of rights to vote belong to the one who establish or buy the company or one family or relatives,
- The company in which at least one family member or representative is in the position of senior management or has daily responsibility in company management,
- It is defined in the public companies as companies in which the founder or owner of the company (or families) has at least 25 percent of the right to vote and at least one person among family participates in the company management. (PwC Research of Global Family Companies, 2012:4)

When the reasons of the founding family-run business are analyzed, the reasons range as below according to the results of the questionnaire which was applied 75 family-run business owners and their wives/husbands in USA;

- •%34 to create opportunity to their children
- •%21 to eternalize family inheritance
- •%15 to hold family together
- •%10 to create financial independence and wealth

- •%8 to their own retirement and personal plans
- •%6 to protect capable workers
- •%5 to supply financial security to family
- •%1 to be useful to society (Elalmış, 2011:10)

Performance in the Family Business

Family leaders who are committed to the long-term success of their businesses must be clear with relatives that their continuity in the business depends on good performance and growth. It is useful for families to commit to writing family employment policies that underscore this concept. Similarly, leaders must tell executives and managers that competence and accountability is essential to the business, and that this requires that they hold family members to the same standards they expect from non-family employees. (Dashew, 30:2007)

According to some researchers, family businesses outperform non-family businesses, but their performance decreases across generations. The control of firms by heirs is often associated with a lower profitability and growth of firms. Moreover, non-family firms often grow faster than family firms because family members attempt to maintain family ownership at the expense of growth. It is also assumed that the family involvement has a positive impact on business performance, but only up to a certain level; after having exceeded a certain limit, the negative effects of family involvement may prevail. This aspect is modelled using an inverted U-shaped curve (Machek et al, 2013:67)

Nepotism (Favoritism)

The concept of nepotism derived from “nepos” as a Latin word whose meaning is “nephew”. This term, frequently defined as “nepotismo” in Italian, was first used in history to define some “papa” s that derived benefits for their families. Today nepotism is used for the people that abuse their careers for the benefits of their own families. The root reason why the term “Nepotism” is seen over in negative way is the inclination of some “papa” s in Renaissance era to find senior jobs for their nephews. The applications in this term, affected the authority of the church in adverse way with demoralizing people. (Büte and Tekarslan, 2010:3)

The term favoritism, mostly known as a synonym to its usage as “protection”, “the friend at courts” “backing” can include such factors as giving priority the kinship, affinity, citizenship or friendship instead of “merit” in professional appointments. (Aktan, 1992:31)

With its meaning in Arabic language, favoritism is protecting some specific man with its common usage of backing. Nepotism can include some personal factors such as favor of kinship, friendship and citizenship. The initial form of Favoritism, which is also described as Nepotism is often seen in the societies in which traditional relations are obtained and appointment of people to a civil service due to the relation of kinship. The second term is defined as “chronism” and it is appointment of a civil servant related to the relationships such as affinity, citizenship or friendship. (Çınar, 1997: 18). Nepotism especially plays a dominant role in societies where traditional family relations, domestic mutualization and relations based on interest are common. (Erdem vd., 2013:176)

Regarding the Portuguese clergyman and his career before being appointed to its position as bishop, it is seen that he was one of the many clergymen who reached the top of the religious hierarchy due to the implementations of favoritism in 14TH century. In fact, the social web that puts Rodrigo Piresin religious hierarchy emphasizes a period when favor of kinship and relationship are important factors. In this frame, the profile of the new bishop is shaped and he is a similar figure to his counterparts, yet with his unique qualifications. (Saraiva, 2008:2)

In the societies in which domestic mutualization, conscience of interest, sense of a vocational responsibility is common, nepotism or kin selection pre-dominates the social structure. (Vergin, 1997:9).

Kin selection is a natural is a basic instinct that exists in humans (as well as in some animals, to some biologists) yet, the biological/ecological approaches of social sciences claim that nepotism is to be

classified as rational behavior. In other words, the behavior of nepotism is a rational, selected behavior rather than an arbitrary, emotional or an instinctive one. (Özler, Özler and Gümüştekin, 2007: 437-438).

The Effects of Nepotism on Worker and Company

Nepotism which includes favoritism to family members in working life has both positive and negative effects on workers. Nepotism has positive effects on family members but it has negative effects on the workers and managers who are not among family members. Being at incapable one's disposal is nettlesome for a worker who is not a family member. This situation makes the workers think that there is no justice in the workplace. So, the lack of confidence affects negatively to working satisfaction, motivation and performance. (Büte and Tekarslan, 2010:6)

The reasons such as not forming professional management stages sufficiently and not actualizing transference of authority as needed in the family-run businesses in which entrepreneurs are responsible for managing at the same time give different meaning to the relation of "working satisfaction and exhaustion among workers" in family-run businesses.

One of the most distinctive features of family-run businesses is that family culture has clearly effect on company management and business strategies and giving more importance on family relations than working relations. So, family-run businesses have to take into consideration family's future as much as company's future. (Çağlar, Kendirli, Çağiran, 2006). The other reason is that the subjects are more important than the subjects of company. For example, there are so many problems along with nepotism such as work-family conflicts, competitions between siblings, injustice attitudes or perceptions among family members, family-member conflicts, and elder sibling problems. In these cases, family problems should be solved before business problems. (Aykan, 2008:139)

The company will be deprived of intellectual capital because Nepotism prevents employment of capable managers along with it causes forming untrustworthy among shareholders.

As it is known that one of the most important inputs of the organization that supplies competition advantage is "what does organization know." According to P. F. DRUCER intellectual capital is defined as "the sources which supply competition advantage in the market, and the sources add value to company."

Without question, family-run businesses are not just material assets which help family-run businesses to reach success.

At the same time, saving intellectual capital which is not one of the material assets create multiplier effect in organizational performance. (Öztürk, 2008:464). The other negative factor in family-run businesses is nepotism which is applied in family-run businesses even without noticing and affect the other workers' motivations, performances, loyalty and trust negatively. (İzsiad, 2014:55)

2. Method

The Reason of the Research and Sample

The reasons of the research are searching the effects of nepotism on the workers who work on family-run businesses and making evaluation about the policy way of personnel performance evaluation.

Multiple choice and likert scale questionnaire was applied to some family-run businesses in Tokat province. Sample number was determined as 100.

Hypothesis;

Ho: Family-run businesses' management do not show difference on applications about failures of workers who are among family members.

H1: Family-run businesses' management show difference on applications about failures of workers who are among family members.

3. Findings

Table 1: Frequency Table about State of Education

	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Literate but Not Graduate	1	1,0
Primary School	17	18,0
High School	41	59,0
Faculty/ Academy	35	94,0
Post Graduate/ Doctorate	6	100,0
Total	100	

The information about participants' states of education who take part in questionnaire is show in table 1. According to the information given above, high school level composes maximum numbers by 41 persons in the meaning of participants' states of education. The other levels are faculty and academy is in the second rank by 35 persons.

Table 2: Age Table of Participants

	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Little than 25	23	23,0
25 – 34	40	63,0
34 – 44	24	87,0
45 – 54	12	99,0
55 and above	1	100,0
Total	100	

According to the table above concerning age groups of the participants 25-34 age group takes place at the first rank by 40 percent. This state indicates that participants are mostly among middle-aged groups.

Table 3: Gender Table

	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Female	34	34,0
Male	66	100,0
Total	100	

According to gender table, participants are mostly male by 66 percent. Besides, it is seen that the percentage of the female participants is 34.

Table 4: Table of Affinity to the Company Owner

	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
My Father/My Mother	15	15,0
My brother	3	18,0
Cousin	10	28,0
My Uncle	3	31,0

Affinity Relationship by Marriage	4	35,0
My Sister's or Aunt's Husband,	8	43,0
Myself	11	54,0
No Affinity	46	100,0
Total	100	

Most of the participants chose the choice of “No affinity” about the affinity to the company owner by 46 percent. The state forms an opinion that more objective results can be reached in family-run businesses.

Table 5: Table of By Which Generation The Company Managed

	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1. Generation	55	55,0
1. and 2. Generation Together	21	76,0
2. Generation	4	80,0
2. Generation and 3. Generation Together	8	88,0
3. Generation	6	94,0
3. Generation and 4. Generation Together	6	100,0
Total	100	

Because of applying the mentioned research on the family-run businesses the answer of the question about by which generation the company managed is searched. The result is reached that the first generations manage the company by 55 percent.

Table 6: Company Management Table

	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Family Members	45	45,0
Professional Managers	23	68,0
Consultants	5	73,0
Shareholders	27	100,0
Total	100	

It is seen that the answer is family members by 45 percent of the question about by whom the management position and managers in the family-run businesses compose. In the second rank, there are shareholders by 27 percent and this situation shows us that there are different families. So, the applied questionnaires reached their aims that is to say, family-run businesses' whose managements are on the hands of family members can be searched.

Table 7: Discriminate Made Favor of Family Members in Performance Evaluation Table

	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Yes	50	50,0
No	50	100,0
Total	100	

As a result of questionnaire which was about performance evaluation applied on sample, the participants answered the question of is there any discrimination favor of family members in the company as yes by 50 percent and no by 50 percent. So, an equal division is seen.

Table 8: Table of Fair Wages Policy in Company

	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Yes	70	70,0
No	30	100,0
Total	100	

The answer about fair wages which are one of the important subjects which affect participants' motivations and performances is searched. The result as there is a fair wages policy was reached according to the participants' yes answer by 70 percent.

Reliability Scales;

Table 9: Statistics of Charges Politics Reliability

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,796	3

It is the result which is obtained according to the answers of the questions about personnel's charges politics concerning to reliability analyses. The searched reliability was found as 0,772 as a result of comparing three questions with Cronbach's Alpha scale. The rate states that it is a reliable scale. (Cronbach's Alpha=70>x)

Table 10: Statics of Nepotism Reliability

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,847	7

The reliability scale which is presented about nepotism questions. The scale was found as reliable in the rate of 0,847 as a result of comparing seven questions with Cronbach's Alpha scale. The rate has acceptable meaning.

Table 11: Differences between Family Members Who Work in Family-run businesses and the Other Workers according to Working Conditions

	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
There are Advantages Space/Room/Place	23	23,0

They have Flexible Working Hours	13	36,0
They can Take More A Day Off	4	40,0
Their Equipments are newer/better	4	44,0
There is no Difference	47	91,0
Other	9	100,0
Total	100	

The answer of the question about what are the working conditions of the family members' workers was taken as there is no difference by 47 company workers. So, by the result, it is understood that the working conditions between the workers and the family members' workers are the same.

Table 12: Anova Test which Shows the States of Workers' Failures in Performance Evaluation According to the Structure of Company Management

		Squares Total	df	Average Square	F	Sig.
Performance Evaluation for Workers	Among Groups	29,414	6	4,902	3,60	,003
	In Groups	126,626	93	1,362		
	Total	156,040	99			

p=0,05

A meaningful result was reached by getting the result rate of 0,003 according to the Anova test which was done between the evaluation of the workers who work on the family-run businesses and company management who made the performance evaluation.

Table 13: Anova Test which Shows the State of Family Members' Failure on Performance Evaluation According to the Structure of Company Management

		Squares Total	df	Average Square	F	Sig.
Performance Evaluation for Family Members	Among Groups	15,406	6	2,568	1,698	,130
	In Groups	140,634	93	1,512		
	Total	156,040	99			

p=0,05

A meaningful result was not reached by getting the result rate of 0,130 according to the Anova test which was done between the evaluation of the family members who work in family-run businesses and company management who made the performance evaluation.

4. Result

Made according to the literature;

In the organization of research in the field of family business has been shown to be associated with concepts such as performance and continuity with the concept of nepotism. (Asunakutlu and Avcı, 2010; Ichniowski, 1988; Erdem, Ceylan And Seylan, 2013; İyışşeroğlu, 2006; Kiracı ve Alkara, 2009; Dökümbilek, 2010; Büte, 2011a, Büte, 2011b; Karacaoğlu ve Yörük, 2012).

The presence or level of nepotism dealt with many domestic and foreign resources related to that, and it is seen that the solutions found in the assumption about what will happen in the organizational results. (Ennew vd., 2000; Mattila and Patterson, 2004; Araslı vd., 2006; Büte, 2011b, Asunakutlu and Avcı, 2009).

According to the results to be obtained in consequence of scientific conclusion in the research by means of questionnaire;

A meaningful result, in rate of 0,003 is obtained according to the Anova Test that is implemented through the performance evaluation of the family-run-business stuff and the management who run the evaluation.

From this point of view, the hypothesis of H₀ was rejected. In other words, it is stated that stuff working for a family-run-business bring about more negative results compared to the members of the mentioned family. This obviously reveals that the conditions are harder for the people out of family and they go through a harder process in a vocational aspect.

In terms of nepotism, it becomes evident that the favourism to family members is more dominant.

In the other test which was applied in the same way;

According to the Anova test implemented through the members working for their family business, with their performance evaluation, a meaningful result cannot be obtained in rate of 0,130 from the view of H₀ normal stuff; it has a provision of rejection.

The concept of nepotism which exists throughout the history of humankind causes problems for all management kinds. Along with the problems, it shows itself as obligation because of trust issue.

It is thought as a certain decision which is supported by everyone that science is an issue which should be consulted to solve the problem of leading expert, informed and educated personnel for developing industry along with certain requirement of merit indication. However, the state of merit concept's occurrence as favoritism in the meaning of behavior which is thought as structural in the meaning of attitude reveals the requirement of studying on the subject in detail. Impulse of taking family members to higher positions along with the mutual relations which are one of the most important issues affects human behaviors can oblige to do nepotic behaviors.

Persons want to trust to the ones who are or will be together in improving the company because of trust impulse of humankind and a person prefers to trust on the ones who are closest to him/her.

The thinking of workers who are not family members negligence the workings much more than family members cause nepotism among persons.

It is thought that workers can be able to reach high positions just by means of supplying trust impulse to the employer. Moreover, it is convicted that more universal consent statements and concepts can be get by means of doing research about structural state and attitudes on family-run businesses which are organizational structure.

References

- Aktan, C. C. (1992). *Politik Yozlaşma ve Kleptokrasi; 1980-1990 Türkiye Deneyimi*, İstanbul: Alfa Yayıncılık, ss.31
- Araslı, H., Bavik, A. ve Ekiz, E. H. (2006), "The effects of nepotism on human resource management: The case of three, four and five star hotels in Northern Cyprus", *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, Volume:26, No.7/8, p.295-308.
- Asunakutlu, T. ve Avcı, U. (2009), "Nepotizm-iş tatmini ilişkisi: Aile işletmelerinde bir inceleme", 17. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, Osmangazi Üniversitesi İİBF İşletme Bölümü, 21-23 Mayıs, Eskişehir, p. 730-736.

- Asunakutlu, T., Avcı, U., (2010). Aile İşletmelerinde Nepotizm Algısı Ve İş Tatmini İlişkisi Üzerine Bir Araştırma, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, ss. 95
- Aykan, E., (2008) Aile İşletmelerinin Çatışma Nedenleri Ve Çatışma Yönetimi Stratejileri: Kayseri İlinde Bir Uygulama, 3. Aile İşletmeleri Kongresi Kongre Kitabı, ss. 139
- Büte, M. (2011a), "Kayırmacılığın çalışanlar üzerine etkileri ile insan kaynakları uygulamaları ilişkisi: Türk kamu bankalarına yönelik bir araştırma", Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Cilt:15, Sayı:1, s.383-404.
- Büte, M. (2011b), "Perceived nepotism and its relation to job satisfaction, negative word of mouth and intention to quit", Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, Volume: 10 Issue:36, p.187-203.
- Büte, M., Tekaslan, M., (2010). Nepotizm'in Çalışanlar Üzerine Etkileri: Aile İşletmelerine Yönelik Bir Saha Araştırması, Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, Bahar 2010, Cilt:6, Yıl:6, Sayı:145, 1:1-21, ss.1-6
- Çağlar, İ., Kendirli, S, Çağırın, H., (2006) "Aile Kültürünün İşletme Kültürü Üzerindeki Etkisinin Çorum KOBİ'leri Açısından İncelenmesi", 2. Aile İşletmeleri Kongresi Kongre Kitabı, İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi, 14-15 Nisan 2006, İstanbul.
- Çınar, Kerim (1997) Kamu Yönetiminde Yozlaşma ve Rüşvet, Türkiye Genç İşadamları Derneği, İstanbul, ss.18
- Dashew, L. (2007). Performance management systems should include family employees, Family Business Agenda ss. 30
- Dökümbilek, F. (2010), Aile şirketlerinde nepotizm ve bir araştırma, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Elalmış, Ö. E., (2011). Aile İşletmelerinde Kuşak Çatışmalarından Kaynaklanan Yönetim Sorunları Bursa İli Örneği, Atılım Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Tezi, ss.6 - 10
- Ennew, C.T., Banerjee, A.K. ve Lee, D. (2000), "Managing word of mouth communication: Empirical evidence from India", International Journal of Bank Marketing, Volume:18, No:2, p.75-83.
- Erdem, B., Ceylan, U., Saylan, U. (2013) Aile İşletmelerinde Nepotizm ve Örgütsel Bağlılık İlişkisi: Kütahya'da Faaliyet Gösteren Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Araştırma, Uludağ Üniversitesi Uludağ Journal of Economy and Society Cilt/Vol. XXXII, Sayı/No. 2, 2013, pp. 171-197
- Ichniowski, T. (1988), "The new nepotism: Why dynasties are making a comeback", Business Week, April, p.106-109.
- İşçi, E., Taştan, S.B., Kozal, A., (2013). Örgütlerde Kurumsallaşma Düzeyinin Nepotizm Üzerine Etkisinin İncelenmesi: Hastane Çalışanları Örneği, Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi, Sayı 3, ss.62
- İyişleroğlu, S. C. (2006), Aile şirketleri: Adana ve çevresinde faaliyet gösteren aile şirketlerinde nepotizm uygulamasının tespitine yönelik bir araştırma, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.
- İzsiad, İzmir Sanayici ve İşadamları Derneği, (2014). Kurumsallaşma, ss.55
- Kalkan, A., Bozkurt, Ö. Ç., Oktar, Ö. F., Türk, M., (2013), Aile İşletmelerinde Yöneticilerin Demografik Özellikleri Ve Yönetim Fonksiyonları İle İlgili Karşılaştıkları Sorunlar Üzerine Bir Araştırma, Uluslararası İktisadi ve İdari İncelemeler Dergisi, Yıl:6 Sayı: 11, Yaz 2013 ISSN1307-9832, ss.128 - 143

- Karacaoğlu, K. ve Yörük, D. (2012), "Çalışanların nepotizm ve örgütsel adalet algılamaları:Orta Anadolu Bölgesinde bir aile işletmesi uygulaması", *İş,Güç; Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, Cilt: 14 , Sayı: 3, s.1-12.
- Karpuzoğlu, E. (2001). *Büyüyen ve Gelişen Aile Şirketlerinde Kurumsallaşma*, İstanbul: Hayat Yayınları, ss. 19
- Kiracı, M. ve Alkara, İ. (2009), "Aile işletmelerinde kurumsallaşmaya verilen önem ve turizm sektöründeki konaklama işletmeleri üzerine bir araştırma: Alanya-Eskişehir örneği", *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, Cilt: 11, Sayı:1, s. 167-197.
- Machek, O., Hnilica, J., Brabec, M. (2013) *Characteristics Of Family Businesses In The Czech Republic*, *European Scientific Journal* December 2013 /SPECIAL/ edition vol.4 ISSN: 1857 - 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431
- Mattila, A.S. ve Patterson, P.G. (2004), "Service Recovery and Fairness Perceptions in Collectivist and Individualist Contexts", *Journal of Service Research*, Volume:6, No:4, p.336-346.
- Özler, H., Özler, D.N. & Gümüştekin G.E. (2007). "Aile İşletmelerinde Nepotizmin Gelişme Evreleri ve Kurumsallaşma", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (17), 437-450.
- Öztürk, A. T., (2008) *Değişen Çağın Aile İşletmelerinde Kurum Kültürünün Yerleştirilmesinde Profesyonel Yöneticilerden Beklentiler*, 3. Aile İşletmeleri Kongresi Kongre Kitabı, ss.464
- PwC *Küresel Aile Şirketleri Araştırması 2012 Türkiye Sonuçları*, Aile Şirketleri: 21. Yüzyılın vaz geçilmez iş modeli, ss.4
- Saraiva, A. M. S., (2008). *Nepotism, illegitimacy and papal protection in the construction of a career: Rodrigo Pires de Oliveira, Bishop of Lamego (1311–1330)*, e-JPH, Vol. 6, number 1, ss.1-12
- Vergin, N. (1997), *Evrensel Değerler Karşısında Akrabanın Akrabaya Yaptığı*, *Yeni Yüzyıl*, ss. 9