

## THE EFFECT OF NEPOTISM ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: AN EXAMPLE OF BUSINESS PRIVATIZED VIA PROPERTY OWNERSHIP OF EMPLOYEES<sup>1</sup>

### NEPOTİZMİN ÖRGÜTSEL BAĞLILIĞA ETKİSİ: ÇALIŞANLARIN MÜLKİYET SAHİPLİĞİ YOLUYLA ÖZELLEŞTİRİLEN BİR İŞLETME ÖRNEĞİ

Dr. Polat YÜCEKAYA

Kastamonu University, Kastamonu/Turkey. Orcid Nu:0000-0002-5000-9711



Article Type : Research Article/ Araştırma Makalesi

Doi Number : <http://dx.doi.org/10.26449/sssj.1083>

Reference : Yücekaya, P. (2018). "The Effect Of Nepotism On Organizational Commitment: An Example Of Business Privatized Via Property Ownership Of Employees", International Social Sciences Studies Journal, 4(27): 6089-6102

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to examine the effect of nepotism on organizational commitment. The universe of the study consists of the employees of heavy industry business privatized via property ownership. Due to the fact that universe is large, convenience sample method among sample methods, was used. In order to identify the effect of nepotism on organizational commitment, data were collected between the dates of January 28 and April 15, 2016 through the survey. The scales in the survey used in the study is organizational commitment scale with 18 expressions. prepared by Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993). In addition, the scale of nepotism prepared by Abdalla, Maghrabi and Raggad, (1995) and consisting of 14 expressions was also used. Frequency analysis, factor analysis, confidence analysis, correlation analysis, regression analysis, and t-tests were applied to the data obtained. It was identified that there was a negative relationship between nepotism perceptions of employees of business, privatized via property ownership of employees, and their organizational commitments and it affected in opposite direction.

**Key words:** Nepotism, Organizational Commitment, Privatization

Science Code : M10, M54, C25

## ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın amacı, nepotizmin örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışına etkisini incelemektir. Araştırmanın evreni, çalışanların mülkiyet sahipliği yolu ile özelleştirilen bir ağır sanayi işletmesi çalışanlarından oluşmaktadır. Evrenin büyük olması nedeni ile örneklem yöntemlerinden kolayda örneklem yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Nepotizmin örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki etkisini belirlemek için, 28 Ocak - 15 Nisan 2016 tarihleri arasında anket aracılığı ile veri toplanmıştır. Araştırmada kullanılan anketteki ölçekler Meyer, Allen ve Smith (1993) tarafından hazırlanmış olan 18 ifadedeli örgütsel bağlılık ölçeği yer almaktadır. Abdalla, Maghrabi ve Raggad, (1995) tarafından hazırlanan ve 14 ifadeden oluşan nepotizm ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen verilere frekans analizi, faktör analizi, güvenilirlik analizi, korelasyon analizi, regresyon analizi ve t testleri yapılmıştır. Çalışanların mülkiyet sahipliği yolu ile özelleştirilen işletme çalışanlarının nepotizm algıları ile örgütsel bağlılıklar arasında negatif bir ilişki olduğu ve ters yönde etkilediği tespit edilmiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Nepotizm, Örgütsel Bağlılık, Özelleştirme

Bilim Kodu: M10, M54, C25

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Together with industrial revolution, the ways of increasing the affectivity and productivity in business were begun to search. In the process beginning with Frederick Winslow Taylor in 1900s and continuing with Henry Fayol and Max Weber, following beginning to be used scientific management techniques in the

<sup>1</sup> This research was produced from doctorate thesis

businesses, in addition to the machines used in production, it was studied how the human factor could be made more productive.

Employees in businesses are the people having the various needs. Therefore, human behavior constitutes a basis for the achievement of business in the subjects such as interpersonal relationships, group forming, perception and attitudes, motivation, job satisfaction, leadership and communication as well (Hodgkinson, 2008). The commitments of employees whose motivations and job satisfactions are high will increase in the positive direction and employees whose commitment are high will try to contribute something to the business for the achievement of business without expecting any interest. The favoritism behaviors negatively affecting the motivation and commitment sense of employee constitutes an impediment to that the employees in businesses show the behavior of organizational citizenship (Lambert et all., 2008).

In the main element of competition in businesses is human factor (Ataman, 2002). The capacities of machinery and equipment are limited. However, human being can come over his/her performance with his/her creativity. Employees whose commitment to organization is high will be more productive in businesses. The people, who are productive and adopt organization, form a large competitive advantage for businesses to reach their aims. But that the owners and managers show favoritism behaviors and create unjust environment make it difficult the realization of business its aims, negatively affecting the commitment and belonging senses of the employees in the production process (Hayes, 1987; Aronoff & Ward, 1993).

In the countries, in which traditional relations and lines of decent are strong, relative favoritism (nepotism) applications are commonly seen (Özsemerci, 2002). In this study, the effect of nepotism perceptions of the employees of Karabük iron and steel Companies, among heavy industry businesses being in active in Turkey and undergone to property change by privatizing via the different methods, on their organizational commitments was studied.

## 2.CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

### 2.1.Favoritism

Favor is defined as “the form of hierarchical relationship occurring in accordance with reciprocity principle such as giving power, aid, support to another one” (Aytaç, 2010, p. 9). As in the bribery and corruption cases, there is also reciprocity in favoritism behavior. In the dictionary of Turkish Language Institute (TDK, 2016), favor is defined as “the work of favor”, favoritism. Favoritism is defined as “comparing a certain individual, set, thought or application with another one and, when it is necessary to make a preference between them, moving away from objectivity and taking a stand”.

One of them is one of favoritism is also definition as “social cancer” (Kwon, 2006, p. 1). Favoritism has a various form defined in the literature. Those most frequent used of these definitions can be put in order as cronyism, favoritism, clientelism, patronage, tribalism, and nepotism (Khatri and Tsang, 2003). In addition to this, “service favoritism” (Aytaç, 2010), “sexual favoritism” (Sheridan, 2007), “countryman favoritism” (Özkanan and Erdem, 2014), “tribalism” (Oktay, 1983), and “club favoritism” are put in order among the sorts of favoritism.

#### 2.1.1. The Concept “Nepotism”

Nepotism is defined as kinship based favoritism (Merriam-Webster). Nepot was coined from the word nepos meaning “nephew” (cited by Büte and Tekarslan, 2010; p.3 from Kiechel, 1984). Nepotism is generally interpreted as negative. The reason for this is that it is a concept expressing that popes find top level jobs for their nephews in Renaissance Period (Büte and Tekarslan, 2010).

Nepotism is generally defined as kin favoritism (Ford and McLaughlin, 1986; Abdalla, Maghrabi and Raggad, 1995; Dickson, Nieminen and Biermeier-Hanson, 2012, Yücekaya et al., 2016). Another definition of nepotism is that it is a case of that individuals are employed in accordance with only their kinships without considering their merits into consideration (Ronald and Karan, 2015). Nepotism is commonly seen in less developed societies, where dependence on traditions are intense (Özsemerci, 2002). In spite of this, institutionalism in the developed countries largely reduces the probability of nepotism (Düz, 2012).

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that nepotism is dealt with two separate perspectives. According to the first of these, it is emphasized that nepotism is a case that is undesirable and necessary to be avoided and that negative results can reveal for organizations (Ewing, 1965; Ford and McLaughlin, 1986; Padgett et al., 2015; Abdalla et al., 1995) .

In spite of this, according to the alternative perspective that is less common, nepotism is positive under certain conditions. According to this viewpoint, nepotism is divided as good and bad. Bad nepotism emerges in the case of prioritizing family members in recruiting. However, in the case that family members recruited is qualified, this case is expressed as good nepotism. According to this perspective, while the people have a negative attitude against bad nepotism, this case is not seen in good nepotism. According to this viewpoint, as long as it is applied by considering the principle merit, good nepotism is extremely useful for organizations and it must be encouraged (Bellow, 2003). In organizations, good nepotism is considered in terms of providing the continuation of organization not in terms of employee (Asanakutlu and Avcı, 2010).

### **2.1.2. Positive Results of Nepotism**

The positive results of nepotism can be put in order as follows.

- ✓ Nepotism engenders the results of learning content related to the job in the short time, high loyalty, low risk, high performance, decrease in turnover, and high job satisfaction in employees (Molofsky, 1998),
- ✓ Nepotism leads high performance to be obtained, stable relationships to be made with contractor, and organizational commitment to be provided in the long period (Nelton, 1998),
- ✓ Successor can be successfully selected through nepotism (Danco, 1982),
- ✓ That employees feel themselves in more safe positively reflects to their performances (Özler et al., 2007),
- ✓ The individuals participated in the labor force are more reliable compared to the other employees. In addition, in the crisis case business can face to, they behave more self-sacrificing and their commitments are very high (Turhan, 2016),
- ✓ It makes easier to transfer the businesses to the next generations. Beside this, engendering competition in business, it becomes useful for business (cited by Dökümblek, 2010, p. 58 from Barmash, 1986).
- ✓ Nepotism makes contribution to the development of family relations in especially family businesses (Abdalla et al., 1995).

### **2.1.3. Negative Results of Nepotism**

Nepotism causes several negative cases as well as its advantages for organizations, whose applications are seen (Ford and McLaughlin, 1986; Abdalla et al., 1995; Gutman, 2012). The negative results, to which nepotism applications leads in organizations, can be put in order as follows.

- ✓ Nepotism allows for inadequate family members to be manager and encourages unfair applications, and attracting interest of professional managers to organization becomes difficult (Toy et al., 1988; Koselka et al., 1989; Kets de Vries, 1993; Wong and Kleiner, 1994),
- ✓ Nepotism negatively affects job satisfaction (Padgett and Morris, 2012),
- ✓ Nepotism negatively affects organizational commitments of employees (Padgett and Morris, 2012),
- ✓ Nepotism negatively affects motivation and performances (Keles et al., 2011), of employees (Padgett ve Morris, 2012), and also negatively affects the trust of employees to organization in reducing direction (Keles et al., 2011),
- ✓ Nepotism applications increases turnover intention of the employees (Araslı et al., 2006),
- ✓ Nepotism also accompanies the polarization problem in the organizations. In the environment, where polarization is present, there is unreliability. Unreliability causes decreases in job performance (Ören, 2007),
- ✓ Nepotism is unethical and reduces organizationsl effeciivity (Simon et al., 1966).
- ✓ In political science, economics, and anthropology, the studies continuing for years revealed that nepotism is bad for organizational performance ( Pearce, 2015).

## 2.2.Organizational Commitment

The concept of organizational commitment was first deal with by Whyte in 1956, later, especially Porter, was developed by many researchers such as Mowday, Steers, Allen, Meyer, Becker (Eroğlu et al., 2011). Whyte (1956) defined organizational human as a person belonging to organization not only working in the organization (Balay, 2000). Commitment defines a person preparing in advance for a certain idea, person or group (Ergun, 1975).

One of the organizational attitudes made the subject of the study in management area is organizational commitment (Cohen, 2007). Although there are many studies on organizational commitment, there is not any definition conceptually acceptable about the meaning of it (Reichers, 1985). There are more than 25 different concepts related to the concept organizational commitment and the most frequent used of these concepts can be put in order as job ethics, giving importance to the profession, embracing job, the place, where individual wants to realize job activities, that individual makes effort to stay in organization, individual's believing to the aims of organization and his/her adopting them (Balay, 2000).

Some definitions of organizational commitments taking in the literature are as follows: "Organizational commitment is a phenomenon related to the attitudes and behaviors of employees toward job and it is job loyalty, his/her identifying with job, and job adaptation" (Demirel , 2009, p. 183). The case showing belonging to integration level the individuals feel to their organizations is expressed with the concept organizational commitment (Steers, 2002). Organizational commitment can be defined as a tie being in the employee and organization and making it difficult employee's leaving organization (Allen and Meyer, 1996).

### 2.2.1.Clasification of Organizational Commitment

The first classification for organizational commitment was made by Becker (Koç, 2009) but there are also different classifications later made by many researchers (Toksoz, 2015). Organizational commitment was classified by Huang (2003), in four groups as "behavioral, sociological, moral, and attitudinal " (Köse O. , 2014, p. 57).

In accordance with the relationships employees developed toward their organizations, the behaviors directed to their being continous members of organization are defined as organizational commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Organizational commitment model, which is examined in three dimensions as emotional commitment, attendance commitmemt, and normative commitment, is a commitment model that are accepted the most commonly by the researchers and whose validity and reliability are high (Şengöz, 2015).

Emotional commitment can be definned as emotional bond and cost of employees to organization (Rusu, 2013). Emotional commitment means that the aims of employees and organizations become compatible with each other. The employees whose emotional commitments are high, will not want to leave organization (Şengöz, 2015). Attendance commitment are principally based on two factors as "the number and quantity of the investment made and lack of option perceived by the individuals" (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Normative commitment means that employees stay in organization since they ethically approve due to the elements such as loyalty and sense of mission (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Employees whose normative commitments are high do not approve to leave organization (Martin, 2008).

### 2.2.2.Importance of Organizational Commitment

The most basic element of an organization is human. Only technical elements such as machinery and equipment is not enough for organization that is also a social system. Without being the existence and continuity of the human factor, it is impossible to mention about organization. Therefore, each organization has to provide the continuation of employees. For employees, the factors such as "job ethics, communication, trust, respect, participation, sharing, job attendance" show their organizational commitments (Demirel, 2009).

In parallel with globalization, technological improvements and cultural developments, recruiting the talented and sacrificed people, motivaing and awarding these people in the direction of the targetss of organization, and providing their commitments to organization are the most important factors in providing competitive advantage. When the values of employee and organization are the same, namely, when the targets and aims of organization are absorbed by employee, belonging bond is established (Jaros et al., 1993).

The factors affecting organizational commitment are generally examined in three groups. These can be put in order as personal factors, organizational factors, and non-organizational factors (İnce and Güç, 2005):

### **2.2.3.Results of Organizational Commitment**

Results of organizational commitment can be positive or negative according to the degree of commitment (Balay, 2000). In case that the aims of organizations are not adopted by employees, while high commitment of employee can do an effect accelerating disintegration of organization, in case that the aims are adopted by employees and that there is high commitment, the probability to be seen the actions that are concluded with the effective behaviors for organization increases (Wiener, 1982).

In the results of organizational commitment, it was identified that job satisfaction, motivation, participation and desire to stay in organization are positive relationship with organizational commitment, and job change and absenteeism, negative relationship (Balay, 2000; Lingard and Lin, 2004). The relationship of organizational commitment with performance is considerably high (Wiener, 1982). The degree of organizational commitment is examined as low, medium, and high commitment.

In case of low organizational commitment, since employee will be the search for the different job alternatives, he/she can cause human resources to be more used (Balay, 2000). In spite of this, human resources will search for the new personnel to fill vacancies and carry out studies for eliminating the reasons for leaving job. The performances of employees thinking of leaving job every moment and having low commitment will be also low. Medium-degree organizational commitment expresses that the commitment levels of employees to their organizations are limited (Randall, 1987). At this commitment level, while the employees generally accept the norms and values of organization, they refused the values and norms that are harmful for them. Adopting the aims of organization, identifying, high loyalty, and showing extra effort can be expressed as high degree commitment (Balay, 2000). High commitments of employees will make positive effect on their performances and productivities. Beside this, employee will stay in organization for long time and employee turnover and absenteeism rate will decrease. It will be unavoidable that the employees showing high commitment take the most share from the awards distribution such as upgrade, premium, and certificates appreciation of attendance (Aras, 2010).

### **2.3.Privatization**

The theoretical support of the thought arguing privatization is the theory of property right (Yaşar, 2005). Adam Smith (1776), who first used this theory, in his work called "A Study on Quality and Causes of Wealth of Nations", observed that human beings more extravagantly used the properties belonging to others and, in parallel with this, he identified that employees of public administration are negligent and extravagant since they are not directly in relationship with their own trade interests (Yaşar, 2005).

One of the common policies and applications of today is privatization. The concept privatization was first introduced by Peter F. Drucker, who were based on the doctrine by Adam Smith (Barışık and Barlas, 2003). The concept privatization that first took place in election manifesto of Conservative party in Britain are not met in the dictionaries printed before 1983 (Türk, 2014).

Privatization, in the most general definition of it, means that production tool under public property are completely to private sector (Önder et al., 1994). Privatization can be defined as "the transfer of economic production units, whose property and management belong to state, to private sector" (Yılmaz, 2002). According to the viewpoint against privatization is worker dismissal, weakening and destructing social state, rape of public resources and values, and making benefits available them to the domestic and foreign people and groups (Koç, 2005).

#### **2.3.1.Causes of Privatization**

We can put in order the causes of privatization applied in almost all countries at the present time under three main headings as follows (Kardeş and Güzel, 1996):

- ✓ Downsizing of the public sector,
- ✓ Elimination of rationality of Public Economic Enterprises,
- ✓ Financial Causes.

In the world and Turkey, the place of public sector in goods and service production has undergone to the change. "Governmet no longer intervene with economic life and directs to realize infrastructural

investment and social quality services" (Kardeş and Güzel, 1996, p. 6). The tool government uses in reaching its duties newly defined is privatization. Providing economic effectiveness , reducing the debts of public sector, reducing public sector borrowing requirement, excluding public sector from among market decision actors, providing relaxation in the budget by means of PEE (Public Economic Enterprise) sales, providing employee stock ownership by making shareholders employees, and expanding the volume of stock market can be put in order among the causes of privatization (Vickers and Yarrow, 1988).

### **2.3.2.Privatization Methods**

In complied with the definition of privatization, in transferring the enterprises under the public property to private sector, the various methods are used. The privatization methods can be put in order under the headings of privatization of management, privatization of property, privatization of financing, and deregulation (Türk, 2014).

- ✓ Methods of management privatization: Service contract, transfer of the right to operate, leasing.
- ✓ Methods of property privatization: Asset sale, public offering, block sale, sale in whole sale mark in stock market, sale in stock market with special order, sale of participation shares, sale to the managers and employees, paid and unpaid voucher method, and sale with gold share method.
- ✓ Method of financing privatization: contestable market, income sharing certificate, build-operate method, public-private partnership,
- ✓ Deregulation<sup>2</sup>: Telecommunication privileges, radio and television frequencies, satellite trajectories, mine pits, allocation of fish production plants and hunting areas.

## **3.FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

### **3.1.Methology**

In this study, among these privatization, selecting an enterprise privatized via property ownership of employees, the effect of nepotism on organizational commitment was studied. In the business, where the study was carried out, the universe of the study consists of 3906 employees. Due to the fact that universe is large, convenience sample method, among sample methods, was used.

In order to identify the effect of nepotism on organizational commitment, data were collected between the dates of January 24 - April 15, 2016 through survey. Survey was applied to 460 people among employees and 431 questionnaires among these were accepted as valid and assessed.

In the study, organizational commitment scale with 18 expressions, prepared by Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993), take place. For the other variable, nepotism scale, prepared by Abdalla, Maghrabi and Raggad, (1995) and consisting of 14 expressions, was used. In addition to the scales used, 9 expressions toward the demographic characteristics of participants take place in the survey. The exspressions belonging to the scales used in the study were prepared in 5-point likert type. The scales prepared in likert type are rated as (1) I definetely disagree with it (2) I disagree with it, (3) I am indecisive , (4) I agree with it, (5) I definetely agree with it.

Conceptual framework regarding the variables, used in this study was drawn and the following hypotheses in the light of literature were formed. For being able to test hypotheses, reliability analysis, factor analysis, correlation analysis, and regression analysis were applied to the dataset.

**H1:** The nepotism perceptions employees affect their organizational commitment statistically significant and in the negative direction.

**H2:** The employees, the sub dimensions of nepotism affect the sub dimensions of organizational commitment statistically significant and in negative direction.

---

<sup>2</sup> Deregulation is defined as removing access barriers regarding the areas, in which access barriers are put by the laws and only the government are active (cited by Türk, 2014 from Hurl 1998, p 3)

### 3.2. Demographical Findings

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics

<b>Gender</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Sayı</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Sayı</b>
Woman	28,1	121	18-25	8,4	36
Man	71,9	310	26-33	26,7	115
Total	100	431	34-41	25,1	108
<b>Marital status</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Sayı</b>	42-49	34,6	149
Married	80	345	50 +	5,3	23
Single	20	86	Total	100	431
Total	100	431			
<b>Educational level</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Sayı</b>	<b>Monthly income</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Sayı</b>
Primary school	2,6	11	Did not declare	43,9	189
Middle school	4,4	19	1500-2250	1,4	6
High school	33,2	143	2251-3000	25,3	109
University	54,8	236	3001-3750	19,3	83
Post graduate / Ph.D.	5,1	22	3751-4500	8,1	35
Total	100	431	4501 +	2,1	9
			Total	100	431
<b>Job Search Method</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Sayı</b>	<b>Job Search Method</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Sayı</b>
Relatives And	46,9	202	Examination	0,2	1
Internet/newspaper	0,5	2	Subcontractor firms	0,7	3
Application	49,9	215	Sponsor firm	0,9	4
Consultancy firm	0,9	4	Total	18	5
Total	82	423			

In the frequency analysis carried out, the findings regarding the gender, marital status, age, educational level, monthly income of the participants and how they find their job are seen in Table 1.

According to this, it was identified that 28,1% of those participating in the study consisted of male employees and 71,9%, female employees. 80 % of those participating in the study are married and 20%, are single.

8.4% of the participants are in the ages 18-25; 26,7%, in the ages 26-33; 25,1%, in the ages 34-41; 34,6%, in the ages 42-49; and 5,3%, in the age 50 and over.

2,6% of the participants are graduated from primary school and 4,4% of them stated that they took education at the level of middle school; 33,2%, at the high school level; 54,8%, at university level; and 5,1% at post graduate and doctorate level.

1,4% of the participants declared that they had the incomes between TL 1500-2250; 25,3%, TL 2251-3000; 19,3%, 3001-3750; 8,1%, 3751-4500; and 2,1%, 4500 and over. 43,9% of the participant did not declare their monthly incomes.

In related to how they found job, 46,9% declared that they got their job thanks to their relatives and acquaintances, and 49,9%, by appealing themselves. It was identified that 0.5% of the participants acquired their job via internet and newspaper announcement, 0,9%, through consultancy firm, and 0,2% via examination. In addition to these, 0,7% of the participants stated that they got a job by passing from subcontractor firms and 0,9%, from sponsor firm.

### 3.3. Findings Regarding Scales

Some basic statistics regarding the nepotism and organizational commitment scales used in this study are given below.

#### 3.3.1. Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is “multivariable analysis technique used to understand the relationship structure constituting the essence of a data matrix” (Hair et all, 1998). If it is necessary to express with a similar definition, factor analysis is a statistical technique making less number of factors independently from each other a many number of variables that are related to each other. The aim here is to reduce the number of variables and classify variables (Kalayci, 2014). In order to whether or not dataset is suitable, three methods are used as forming correlation matrix, Barlett test and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test.

### 3.3.1.1. Factor analysis for Organizational Commitment

According to the results of analysis results carried out regarding Organizational Commitment Scale, KMO sample sufficiency of the scale is 0,888 and Bartlett's Test is 3595,809 and significant at the level of 0,0001. According to these results, the compliance of the data are at very good level.

Table 2: Factor analysis for organizational commitment scale

Expressions	Eigen Value	Factor Load	% Variance
<b>Emotional Commitment (9 expression)</b>	5,176		32,351
Being working in this business expresses a lot of things for me.		,752	
I feel myself emotionally committed to this business		,738	
I feel myself like a part of family in this business.		,718	
I owe many things to the business, in which I work		,697	
The business, where I work, deserve my loyalty.		,684	
I do not leave my work at the moment, because I feel that I have responsibilities for this business.		,675	
It is difficult for me to leave my job at the moment, even if I want		,642	
If I left my job at this moment, I would feel myself guilty		,622	
I feel happiness from spending the remaining part of my carrier in this business.		,442	
<b>Attendance Commitment (3 Expression )</b>	1,763		11,020
One of the negative results of leaving the business, where I work, may be limited job opportunities outside.		,754	
Even if leaving my job I work at the moment is in favor of me, I do not think that this is an appropriate behavior.		,606	
The main reason for continuing to stay in the business, where I work at the moment is that I need for this.		,599	
I do not think of that I leave this business, since job opportunities outside are limited.		,534	
<b>Normative Commitment (4 Expressions )</b>	1,103		6,897
I feel myself as if I belong to this business		,790	
If I did not give a lot of things from myself to this business, I would consider to work in another place.		,618	
For continuing to work in the business where at the moment, I do not feel any obligation.		,555	
<b>Total</b>			50,268

### 3.3.1.2. Factor analysis for Nepotism

As a result of factor analysis, three factors were obtained as emotional, attendance and normative commitment were obtained. The emotional commitment factor consists of 9 expressions and accounts for 32,351 of the variance. The attendance commitment factor consists of 4 expressions and accounts for 11,020 % of the variance. Normative commitment factor, the third factor, consists of 3 expressions and accounts for 6,897 % of the variance.

According to the analysis results made regarding nepotism scale, KMO sample sufficiency of the scale is 0,952 and Bartlett's Test are 9427,057 and is significant at the level of p= 0,0001. According to these results, the compliance of the data for analysis is at the perfect level.

Table 3: Factor analysis for nepotism Scale

Expressions	Eigen Value	Fact. Load	% variance
<b>Favoritism after recruiting (8 expressions)</b>	8,753		62,524
In upgrading of the employees in this business, the knowledge, skill, and abilities stay in the background.		,821	
In upgrading of the employees in this business, the qualities remaining out of that the job requires remain at the forefront.		,818	
In this business, I consider that that the acquaintances of business managers upgrade are easier.		,804	

However I am successful in this business, I cannot move ahead of the acquaintances of business managers.	,788
The employees who have acquaintance in the management team of this business, get respect from the other people.	,771
In upgrading of the employees in this business, the relationships of kinship and acquaintance are considered of top priority.	,768
I consider that in this business, dismissal of acquaintances of the managers or punishing them is rather difficult.	,680
The junior administrative officers and minor executives of this more differently behave to the employees who have acquaintances in management	,610
<b>Favoritism during recruiting (6 expressions )</b>	1,227
In recruiting staff to this businesses, the acquaintances are given primacy.	,819
In this business, in while delegating, the acquaintances are given primacy.	,808
Those having acquaintance in management of this business more utilize from the resources of the business.	,802
In staff recruiting to this business, those having acquaintance in business management are not forced in the selection process.	,794
I hesitate from the people who have acquaintance in management in this business.	,742
In staff recruiting to this business, the reference taken from the people in management is quite important.	,649
Total	71,290

As a result of factor analysis, two factors were obtained and the first factor consists of 8 expressions and this factor is called as favoritism after recruitment. This factor accounts for % 62,524 of the variance. The favoritism during recruiting factor consist of 6 expressions and accounts for 8,766 of the variance.

### 3.3.2. Reliability Analysis of the Scales

The reliability of a scale is related to the random errors taking place in the scale and is not affected on systematic error in scale structure on reliability. The reliability coefficient is the expression of reliability degree with a number (Can, 2013).

Organizational Commitment scale consists of three dimensions according to the data evaluated and reliability coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) for the dimension emotional commitment was identified as 0,836.

Nepotism scale consists of two dimensions according to the data evaluated in the study and reliability coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) was identified as 0,942.

### 3.4. Findings Regarding Hypotheses

#### 3.4.1. Findings Regarding Correlation Analysis

The method used for testing the linear relationship between two variables or the relationship of variable with two or more variables and, if there is such a relationship, measuring the degree of the relationship between them is called correlation analysis (Sungur, 2014).

Tablo 4: Correlation analysis

Variables	Mean	Std.dev.	Nepotism	Nepot_IAE	Nepot_IAS	OC	OC.Emo.	OC.Atten.	OC.Nor
<b>Nepot</b>	2,5	,948	1						
<b>Nepot_IAE</b>	2,6	,981	,903**	1					
<b>Nepot_IAS</b>	2,4	,990	,973**	,778**	1				
<b>OC</b>	3,8	,460	-,185**	-,186**	-,173**	1			
<b>OC.Emo.</b>	3,9	,557	-,072	-,089	-,059	,848**	1		
<b>OC.Atten.</b>	3,8	,622	-,183**	-,156**	-,187**	,686**	,330**	1	
<b>OC.Nor.</b>	3,4	,797	-,301**	-,278**	-,295**	,529**	,141**	,394**	1

\* Correlation is at the significance level of 0,05 \*\* Correlation is at the significance level of 0,01. .

According to the data in the table, there is a negative directional and weak relationship between nepotism and Organizational Commitment ( $R=-,185$   $p<0,01$ )

### 3.4.2.Findings Regarding Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is defined as explaining the relationship between a dependent variable and independent variable (simple regression) or more than one independent (multiple regression) by means of a mathematical equation (Küçüksille, 2014).

Table 5:Regression analysis

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Adj.R <sup>2</sup>	B	Standard Error	t	P	$\beta$	F
Nepotism	OC	,032	-,090	,023	-3,890	,001	-,185	15,133
	OC	,032	-,087	,022	-3,926	,001	-,186	15,416
	OC.Emo.	,006	-,050	,027	-1,843	,066	-,089	3,397
	OC.Attention	,022	-,099	,030	-3,278	,001	-,156	10,748
	OC.Nor.	,075	-,226	,038	-5,990	,001	-,278	35,882
Nepotism after recruiting	OC	,028	-,080	,022	-3,630	,001	-,173	13,176
	OC.Emo.	,001	-,033	,027	-1,220	,223	-,059	1,489
	OC.Attention	,033	-,117	,030	-3,936	,001	-,187	15,492
	OC.Nor.	,085	-,238	,037	-6,399	,001	-,295	40,950

In order to identify the effect of nepotism on organizational commitment in employees, in regression analysis carried out by using enter method, it is seen that nepotism is a significant precursor of organizational commitment ( $R=-0,185$ ,  $R^2=0,032$ ,  $F=15,133$  and  $p<0,01$ ). 3,2% ( $R^2=0,032$ ) of organizational commitment are accounted for by nepotism. One unit of variation in nepotism perception leads to a negative directional variation of 0,09 units in organizational commitment. According to this, **H1** hypothesis is accepted.

According to the results of simple regression analysis carried out to identify the effect of sub dimensions of nepotism on organizational commitment and its sub dimensions, during recruiting, the dimension nepotism is a precursor of organizational commitment ( $R=-0,186$   $R^2=0,032$ ,  $F=15,416$ ,  $p<0,01$ ). 3,2% ( $R^2=0,032$ ) of organizational commitment are accounted for nepotism.

The dimension nepotism during recruiting (IAE) is not a precursor of emotional commitment ( $R=-0,089$ ,  $R^2=0,006$ ,  $F=3,397$ ,  $p>0,005$ ). The dimension nepotism during recruiting is seen to be precursor of attendance commitment ( $R=-0,156$ ,  $R^2=0,022$ ,  $F=10,748$ ,  $p<0,001$ ). 2,2% ( $R^2=0,022$ ) of attendance commitment are accounted for by nepotism during recruiting. The dimension nepotism during recruiting is seen to be precursor of normative commitment ( $R=0,278$ ,  $R^2=0,075$ ,  $F=35,882$ ,  $p<0,001$ ). 7,5% ( $R^2=0,075$ ) are accounted for by nepotism during recruiting.

According to the information given in the table, the dimension nepotism after recruiting (IAS) also affects organizational commitment ( $R=-0,173$ ,  $R^2=0,028$ ,  $F=13,176$ ,  $p<0,01$ ). 2,8% ( $R^2=0,028$ ) of organizational commitment are accounted for by nepotism after recruiting. The dimension nepotism after recruiting does not affect emotional commitment ( $R=-0,059$ ,  $R^2=0,001$ ,  $F=1,489$ ,  $p>0,05$ ). The dimension nepotism after recruiting affects attendance commitment ( $R=-0,187$ ,  $R^2=0,033$ ,  $F=15,492$ ,  $p<0,01$ ). 3,3% ( $R^2=0,033$ ) of attendance commitment are accounted for by nepotism after recruiting. The dimension nepotism after recruiting also affect normative commitment ( $R=-0,295$ ,  $R^2=0,085$ ,  $F=40,950$ ,  $p<0,01$ ). 8,5% ( $R^2=0,085$ ) of normative commitment are accounted for nepotism after recruiting. According to these findings, **H2** hypothesis is partly accepted.

## 4.CONCLUSION

Nepotism and organizational commitment among the important subjects in the literature of organizational behavior are the variables dealt with and examined in this study. Although nepotism leads to positive results for organizations, it is generally perceived as negative situation. Nepotism expressed as kinship favoritism is a frequently encountered case in the applications of human resources such as recruiting, upgrade, education, assigning, salary system (Ford and McLaughlin, 1986; Abdalla et al., 1995; Asanakutlu and Avcı, 2010). In this study, the phenomenon nepotism was examined under two factors favoritism during recruiting and favoritism after recruiting.

Organizational commitment means that employees stay in organization and spend labor for this situation, interiorize the values and norms of the organization by adopting, and psychology commit to their workplaces (Morrow, 1983; Becker et al., 1996; Randall and Cote, 1991). The variable of organizational

commitment, based on the factor analysis made, are examined under three dimensions as emotional, attendance, and normative commitment.

High commitment of employees strengthens the work satisfaction, motivation, participation, and desire to stay in organization and makes effect in the direction increasing performance and leads to the negative cases such as low commitment, absenteeism and turnover intention (Balay, 2000; Lingard ve Lin, 2004; Wiener, 1982). Employees, whose organizational commitment are high, are more self-sacrificed and reliable. Human factor forms the resource of competition in the businesses. Having employees whose commitment level are high is a desired sated for every businesses.

A statistically significant relationship was identified between nepotism perceptions of the business employees privatized via property ownership and their organizational commitments ( $p \leq 0.05$ ). Nepotism perceptions of employees negatively affect their organizational commitment. Favoritism applications directed to some employees make effect in the reducing effect of the sense of organizational commitment on the other employees. This case is an expected thing according to the literature. Due to the fact attendance commitment of employees are high, the employees continuously make the calculation of profit/loss and their contribution to organization is compared in exchange of that organizations give. Therefore, favoritism behaviors exhibited by business managers are perceived as a negative case and it is considered that they have effect reducing direction organizational commitment.

In the next studies, examining the other sort of favoritism other than nepotism and assessing their effect on the businesses whose ownership structure is different will contribute to the removal of deficiency in the literature.

## REFERENCES

- Abdalla, H. F., Maghrabi, A. S., & Raggad, B. G. (1995). Assessing the perceptions of human resource managers toward nepotism. *International Journal of Manpower*, 19 (8), 554-570.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, pp.252-276.
- Aras, M. (2010). *Örgütisel bağlılık: GOÜ akademik personeli üzerine bir uygulama*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tokat.
- Araslı, H., Bavik, A., & 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*, 26 (7), pp.295-308.
- Aronoff, C. E., & Ward, J. L. (1993). Rules for Nepotism. *Nation's Business*(81), pp.64-65.
- Asanakutlu, T., & Avcı, U. (2010). Aile işletmelerinde nepotizm algısı ve iş tatmini ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 15 (2), s.93-109.
- Ataman, G. (2002) İşletme Yönetimi: Temel Kavramlar Yeni Yaklaşımlar, İstanbul: Türkmen Kitabevi.
- Aytaç, Ö. (2010). Kayırmacı ilişkilerin sosyal temeli. R. Erdem içinde, *Yönetim ve örgüt açısından kayırmacılık* (1. Baskı). İstanbul, Cağaloğlu: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş. s. 3-26.
- Balay, R. (2000). *Yönetici ve öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Barışık, S., & Barlas, E. (2003). Türkiye'de özelleştirme. Y. Bayraktutan (Dü.) içinde, *Özelleştirme: Teori, dünya ve Türkiye deneyimi* (s. 107-136). Ankara: Liberte Yayınları.
- Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, O. M., & Gilbert, N. L. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39 (2), pp.464-482.
- Bellow, A. (2003). *In praise of nepotism: A natural history*. New York: Doubleday.
- Büte, M., & Tekarslan, E. (2010). Nepotizm'in çalışanlar üzerine etkileri: Aile işletmelerine yönelik bir saha araştırması. *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6 (1), s.1-21.
- Can, A. (2013). *SPSS ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi* (1. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yay. Eğt. Dan. Hizm.Tic. Ltd. Şti.
- Cohen, A. (2007). Commitment before and after:An evalution and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 17 (3), pp.336-354.

Danco, L. A. (1982). *Beyond survival: A business owner's guide for success*. Cleveland, Ohio: The Center for Family Business.

Demirel, Y. (2009). Örgütsel bağlılık ve üretkenlik karşıtı davranışlar arasındaki ilişkiye kavramsal yaklaşım. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15 (2), s.115-132.

Dickson, M. W., Nieminen, L. G., & Biermeier-Hanson, B. (2012). Nepotism and organizational homogeneity: How the ASA process is accelerated by nonmerit-based decision making. R. G. Jones içinde, *Nepotism in organizations* (s. 93-128). New York: Routledge.

Dökümblek, F. (2010). *Aile şirketlerinde nepotizm ve bir uygulama*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Düz, S. (2012). *Konaklama işletmelerinde nepotizm ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi , Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Ankara.

Ergun, T. (1975). Uluslararası örgütlerde bağlılık kavramı. *TODAİE*, 8 (4), s.97-106.

Eroğlu, A. H., Adıgüzel, O., & Öztürk, U. C. (2011). Sessizlik girdabı ve bağlılık ikilemi: İş gören sessizliği ile örgütsel bağlılık. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 16 (2), s.97-124.

Ewing, D. W. (1965). Is nepotism so bad? *Harvard Business Review*, 43 (1), pp.23-39.

Ford, R., & McLaughlin, F. (1986). Nepotism: Boon or bane. *Personnel Administrator*, 31, pp.79-89.

Gutman, A. (2012). Nepotism and employment law. R. G. Jones içinde, *Nepotism in Organizations* (s. 93-128). New York: Routledge.

Hair, J. J., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (Fifth Edition). Prentice Hall.

Hayes, J. (1987). Using Nepotism as a Positive Force. *Small Business Report*, 12 (10).

Hodgkinson, C. (2008). *Yönetim Felsefesi*. (İ. Anıl, & B. Doğan, Çev.) İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.

İnce, M., & Güll, H. (2005). *Örgütsel bağlılık*. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi.

Jaros, S., Jermier, J., Koehler, J., & Sincich, T. (1993). Effects of Continuance, Affective and Moral Commitment on the Withdrawal Process: an Evaluation. *Academy of Management Journal* (36), pp.951-995.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2014). Faktör analizi. Ş. Kalaycı (Dü.) içinde, *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri* (6 b.). Ankara: Öz Baran Ofset. s. 321-331.

Kardeş, R., & Güzel, H. (1996). *Türkiye'de ve dünyada yaşanan özelleştirme* (2 b.). Ankara: Vakıfbank Yayınları.

Keles, H. N., Ozkan, T. K., & Bezirci, M. (2011). A study on the effects of nepotism, favoritism and cronyism on organizational trust in the auditing process in family businesses in Turkey. *International Business and Economics Research Journal*, 10 (9), s.9-16.

Kets de Vries, M. R. (1993). The dynamics of family controlled firms: The good and the bad news. *Organizational Dynamics*, 21 (3), pp.59-71.

Khatri, N., & Tsang, E. W. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of cronyism in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 43, pp.289-303.

Küçüksille, E. (2014). Basit doğrusal regresyon. Ş. Kalaycı (Dü.) içinde, *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri* (6. Baskı). Ankara: Öz Baran Ofset. s. 199-205

Koç, H. (2009). Örgütsel Bağlılık ve sadakat ilişkisi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8 (18), s.200-211.

Koç, Y. (2005). *Özelleştirme, Türkiye'yi parçalamanın bir aracı*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.

Koselka, R., Meeks, F., & Saunders, L. (1989). Family affairs. *Forbes* (144), pp.212-218.

Köse, O. (2014). *Örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Bir kamu kurumunda alan araştırması*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.

- Kwon, I. (2006). Endogenous Favoritism in Organizations. *University of Michigan Topics in Theoretical Economics*, 6 (1), pp.1-24.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2008). Being a good soldier: Organizational citizenship behavior and commitment among correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35 (1), pp.56-68.
- Lingard, H., & Lin, J. (2004). Career, family and work environment determinants of organizational commitment among women in the Australian construction industry. *Construction Management and Economics*, 22, pp.409-420.
- Martin, S. S. (2008). Realitional and economic antecedents of organizational commitment. *Work and Occupations*, 20 (3), pp.23-29.
- Merriam-Webster sözlük, (2016). [www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nepotism](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nepotism). (15.11. 2016 tarihinde alındı)
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource*, 1 (1), pp.61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (4), pp.538.
- Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace*. California: Sage Publication Inc.
- Molofsky, I. (1998). A plug for nepotism. *Benefits and Compensation Solutions*, 21 (4), pp.36-38.
- Morrow, P. C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 8 (3), pp.486-500.
- Nelton, S. (1998). The bright side of nepotism. *Nation's Business*, 86 (5), pp.72.
- Oktay, C. (1983). *Yükselen İstemler Karşısında Türk Siyasal Sistemi ve Kamu Bürokrasisi* (2 b.). İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilimler Fakültesi Yayıncı, İstanbul.
- Önder, İ., Şener, O., Duran, M., Lordoğlu, K., Müftüoğlu, Ö., Güzel, A., et al. (1994). *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de özelleştirme* (1. Baskı). Ankara, Sıhhiye: Türkiye Maden İşçileri Sendikası yayınları.
- Ören, K. (2007). Sosyal sermayede "Güven" unsuru ve işgücü performansına etkisi. *Kamu-İş Dergisi*, 9 (1), s.71-90.
- Özkanan, A., & Erdem, R. (2014). Yönetimde kayırmacı uygulamalar: Kavramsal bir çerçeve. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, SBE Dergisi*, 2 (20), s.179-206.
- Özler, H., Ergun, D. Ö., & Gümüştekin, G. E. (2007). Aile işletmelerinde nepotizmin gelişim evreleri ve kurumsallaşma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi*, 17, s.437-450.
- Özsemerci, K. (2002). Türk kamu yönetiminde yolsuzluklar,nedenleri, zararları ve çözüm önerileri. Ankara: TODAİE.
- Padgett, M. Y., & Morris, K. A. (2012). Reactions to nepotism in the hiring process: The role of family member qualifications. *Unpublished manuscript, Butler University*. Indianapolis.
- Padgett, M. Y., Padgett, R. J., & Morris, K. A. (2015). Perceptions of Nepotism Beneficiaries: The Hidden Price of Using. *Journal of Business Psychology* (30), pp.283-298.
- Pearce, J. L. (2015). Cronyism and nepotism are bad for everyone: The research evidence. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8, pp.40-44.
- Randall, D. M. (1987). Commitment and organization: The organization man revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 12 (1), pp.460-471.
- Randall, D. M., & Cote, J. A. (1991). Interrelationships of work commitment constructs. *Work and Occupations*, 18 (2), pp.194-211.
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10 (3), pp.465-476.

Ronald, E. R., & Karan, S. (2015). If we do our job correctly, nobody gets hurt by nepotism. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8 (1), pp.19-21.

Rusu, R. (2013). Affective Organizational Commitment, Continuance Organizational Commitment Or Normative Organizational Commitment? *Scientific Bulletin - Nicolae Balcescu Land Forces Academy*, pp.192-197.

Simon, R. J., Clark, S. M., & Tiffet, L. L. (1966). Of nepotism, marriage and the pursuit of an academic career. *Sociology of Education*, 39, pp.344-358.

Steers, R. M. (2002). Antecedents And Outcomes Of Organizational Commitment. C. R. Cooper içinde, *Fundamental Of Organizational Behavior* (s. 299-309). London: Sage Publications.

Şengöz, M. (2015). *Çalışanların algıladıkları etkileşimci ve dönüşümcü liderlik özellikleri ile örgütsel bağlılıklar arasındaki ilişkide yönetici-ast etkileşimi algısının ara değişken rolünün incelemesive bankacılık sektörü örnekleminde bir araştırma*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Haliç Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Toksöz, S. (2015). *Çalışanların öğrenen örgüt algılarının iş tatmini, örgütsel bağlılık ve örgüt içi girişimcilikleri üzerine etkisi: Bilişim sektörü üzerine bir çalışma*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Okan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Toy, S., Brown, C., & Miles, İ. G. (1988). The new nepotism: Why dynasties are making a comeback. *Business Week*, 31, pp.106-109.

Turhan, R. (2016). *Nepotizm, kronizm ve patronaj eğilimlerinin kurumsallaşma algısı bağlamında analizi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Ege Üniversitesi SBE, İzmir.

Türk Dil Kurumu. (2016). *Türkçe sözlük*. (Genişletilmiş baskı). Ankara: TDK.

Türk, Y. Z. (2014). *Türkiye'de özelleştirme uygulamalarının analizi*. Ankara, Çankaya: Kalkınma Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Vickers, J., & Yarrow, G. (1988). *Privatisation: An economic analysis*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7 (3), pp.418-428.

Wong, L. C., & Kleiner, B. H. (1994). Nepotism. *Work Study*, 43 (5), pp.10-12.

Yaşar, S. (2005). *Özelleştirme* (2. Baskı). İstanbul: Beta Basım A.Ş.

Yılmaz, E. (2002). *Ekonomik Perspektiften KİT'ler, Özelleştirme ve Uygulama*. Ankara: İÜ Yayıncıları.

Yücekaya, P., Rençber, Ö. F., & Topçu, U. C. (2016). Effect of perception of nepotism and employee satisfaction on turnover intentions: An empirical study in hospitality enterprises. *Eurasian Academy of Sciences Eurasian Business & Economics Journal*, Volume 2, pp. 330-339