



INTERNATIONAL

JOURNAL of HUMAN STUDIES

ULUSLARARASI İNSAN ÇALIŞMALARI DERGİSİ

ISSN: 2636-8641

Cilt/VOLUME 1

Sayı/ISSUE 2

Yıl/YEAR: 2018

Gönderim: 19-10-2018 – Kabul: 25-12-2018

The Role of Demographic Characteristics on Nepotism Perception: A Study on the Employees of Hospitality Businesses in Trabzon

Cengiz GAZELOĞLU¹

Eren ERKILIÇ²

Engin AYTEKİN³

Abstract

Starting from the very early stages of recruitment, nepotism can be expressed as some employees' being favored or having an unfair promotion at work regardless of their career, knowledge, skills, level of education, experience or other qualifications due to their relation with the management team. The perception of nepotism is one of the major problems encountered in both public and private businesses. In this context, the aim of this study is to find out whether the nepotism perceptions

¹Cengiz Gazeloğlu, Dr. Lecturer, Süleyman Demirel University, Faculty of Science and Literature, cengizgazelolu@sdu.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-8222-3384

²Eren Erkiliç, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University, Ardeşen Tourism Faculty, eren.erkilic@erdogan.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-8222-3384

³Engin Aytakin, Afyon Kocatepe University, School of Foreign Languages, caytekin@aku.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-8222-3384

of the employees of the hospitality businesses differ according to some demographic characteristics. Within the scope of the research, survey technique was used to determine the nepotism perceptions of employees of hospitality businesses. Accordingly, the nepotism scale was implemented on the employees of hospitality businesses operating in Trabzon. In the analysis of the data, t-test and variance analyzes were used as well as descriptive statistics. SPSS software was used in the analysis of the data. It was determined that nepotism perceptions of the employees of the hotel businesses participated in the research are low. In addition to that, it was discovered that there is no difference between the demographic characteristics of employees and their nepotism perceptions.

Keywords: *Nepotism, Hospitality Businesses, Employees of Hospitality Businesses, Statistical Analysis, Trabzon*

Introduction

According to Oxford English dictionary, the origin of the “nepotism” word is derived from the words “nephew” or “nepot” in Latin. These words refer to the children of a person's brother or sister, the “nephew or cousin. Likewise, according to the dictionary, nepotism means providing the relatives with special support (especially in terms of employment) by a dignitary person (Hornby, 1985, p. 566). However, the Turkish Language Association defines the concept of nepotism as favoring relatives and close friends (TDK, 2018).

Nepotism is defined as an individual's being recruited and promoted regardless of his knowledge, skill, talent, level of education and experience; enabling an individual to work in more suitable working conditions than other employees. This individual obtains such factors through his kinship relations (Özsemerci, 2003, p. 20). According to another definition, nepotism is called as acting favorably to the individuals due to their close relations with management and ensuring unjustified progress in the field of business without taking level of recruitment, promotion, provision of more appropriate working conditions and their knowledge, skill, talent, level of education and experience

into consideration (Linda and Brian, 1994, p. 10). According to Bierman and Fisher (1984, p. 634), nepotism is called as the recruitment or promotion of unqualified employees only by considering their relationships with the business owners.

Nepotism usually refers to a negative situation and it stems from the nepotist attitudes of some popes in the Renaissance era. Some of the popes of the period placed unqualified nephews to the top positions in the managements regardless of the merit element (Karacaoğlu and Yörük, 2012, p. 47). It is seen that in the twentieth century nepotism became a battle for relatives with the use of political patronage, and anti-nepotism policies started to be implemented (Bellow, 2003). Nepotism, which is widely encountered in business life as in many other fields, is one of the biggest management diseases faced by organizations. In this context, the concept of nepotism makes negative connotations (Tunçbilek and Akkuş, 2017, p. 169).

In another approach, Safina (2015) asserts that nepotism brings about simulation of superior positions and even the whole departments for close relatives. The researcher goes on giving the example of such artificially created position and department: strategic development director and department of strategic development. The writer explains that this position is not needed at all and is actually invented since it is the Director General himself who must deal with these matters.

Gjinovci (2016) believed that the choice of relatives, who does not have the necessary qualities, creates the opinion and gives the impression of a classic nepotism and harmful to the organization and the economy in general. The author calls nepotism as a kind of corruption, and indicates that it may threaten legal norms, democracy, human rights and freedom, along with undermining the system of state management, social justice and fairness, and distorting fair competition, and hindering economic development and moral basis of society, which was put forward by Strasburg Convention (1999).

Ford and Mclaughline (1985, p. 59) explained the disadvantages of Nepotism in terms of organization. It is clear that nepotism leads to negative effects on the employees because the organizational jobs are provided with those who do not deserve them. It is also stated that decision-making processes within the organization will be adversely affected. Some of the drawbacks caused by Nepotism can be listed as follows (Arslaner, Erol and Boylu, 2014, p. 65; Asunakutlu ve Avcı, 2010, p. 94; Erdem, Ceylan and Saylan, 2013, p. 176; Özsemerci, 2003, p. 15; Büte and Tekarslan, 2010, p. 4; Büte, 2011, p. 386; Çalışal, 2015, p. 92):

- Increased dissatisfaction of non-family employees,
- The emergence of the conflict situation,
- Unnecessary promotions,
- Decrease in motivation,
- Unfair management approach,
- The feeling of regret after promotion and, the emergence of the question whether the promotion is caused by success or kinship relations,
- Performance loss,
- The emergence of unequal pay system,
- Decrease in sense of belonging

- Continuation of Lack of experience

On the other hand, Dailey and Reuschling (1980) indicated that nepotism may serve some advantages to small and family businesses due to ensuring an effective way to recognize committed employees to the company. Also, they highlighted that it may cause an increase in job satisfaction and morale due to its impact on strengthening the family work environment. Parallel to these ideas, it is believed that nepotism generally benefits from the population within the family for employment, and merit is merely based on familial relationships or family career choices (Jones et al., 2008, p. 18). Contrary to the drawbacks of nepotism mentioned above, there are positive effects on employees. These effects are influential only on family members and can be listed as follows (Büte and Tekarslan, 2010, p.4; Özler et al., 2007, p. 438; İyüşleroğlu, 2006, p. 47; Lakshminarasimhan, 2011):

- Family members make more sacrifice,
- Employees who work with the people they know feel themselves safer,
- Family members know the job better within the sustainability of the business,
- Employees have a low rate of leave of employment except for exceptional situations,
- The selection of the managers among the family members,
- It leads to economize in training costs when recruiting.

As a result, the concept of nepotism adds up to one's providing employment for their relative and family members regardless of their abilities by using his own power and authority (Karakaş and Çak, 2007, p. 78). In this context, the employees of hospitality businesses may be sensitive about the perception of nepotism. In addition, administrative decisions such as career plans, payment applications and recruitment can have a significant impact on this perception. While nepotism perception may produce some positive results, it is frequently regarded as a negative concept. Because hospitality businesses are labor-intensive enterprises, performance of the employees is extremely important. It is thought that as the nepotism perceptions of the employees in these hospitality businesses increases, the expected performance of the employees can move towards such a negative direction. The demographic characteristics of employees also have a significant impact on these sensitive situations mentioned above. As a matter of fact, in this study, it is examined whether demographic characteristics of employees have a role on their nepotism perceptions.

The Aim and Importance Of The Research

The purpose of this study is to find out whether the nepotism perceptions of the employees of the hospitality businesses differ according to some demographic characteristics. To achieve this goal, some information was given about the subject in this research and parallel with the purpose of research, a survey was conducted on the employees of the certified hospitality establishments by Ministry of Culture and Tourism, operating in Trabzon; and the findings of the study have been presented.

The results were interpreted in line with the purpose of the study and some recommendations were put forward for the interest of the related parties. It is expected to contribute to the literature related to the subject as well as to create a source of data for hotel managers by determining the nepotism perceptions of employees of hospitality businesses in Trabzon. Employee diversity in the

tourism sector, communication, management styles, relationships of hotel managers with employees in the sector and family ties affect the nepotism perception of employees. However, some negative states such as decrease in employees' sense of trust and belonging to the organization and performance along with having concerns for the future and no career plans may possibly come up due to the nepotism perception. In this context, the findings gathered in line with the research problem are considered to be very important in terms of the subject of the research. In addition to its contribution to the literature, it is considered that it will be an important source of data for the related institutions, organizations and managers.

Method

The population of the study is constituted of the employees working in the certified hospitality establishments by Ministry of Culture and Tourism. According to the data supplied by Trabzon Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism (2018), there are 46 tourism facilities certified by Tourism Ministry in Trabzon province. These facilities in total have 2829 rooms and 5806 beds. According to the “Labor Force Survey in the Hospitality and Tourism Industry” conducted by the Ministry of Tourism in (1989) and Ağaoğlu (1992, p. 114), the number of personnel per room is 0.70 and the number of personnel per bed is 0.35 when it is calculated covering overall average star hotels and other facilities in Turkey. Based on these averages, when the number of personnel is calculated according to the number of rooms in Trabzon, the number of staff is obtained as (2829 x 0.70) 1980,3. On the other hand, when the number of personnel is calculated according to the number of beds, the number of staff is achieved as (5806 x 0.35) 2032.1. According to these results, it was agreed to calculate the population of the study by taking the number of staff according to the number of beds, and the population of research has been decided as 2032 hotel employees.

Because the population of the research consists of several numbers of units and due to cost limitation of the research, sampling was performed. The following sampling volume calculation formula proposed for quantitative research has been used. Özdamar (2001, p. 257) described the population with less than 10.000 units as limited universe and gave the formula for calculating the sample size by taking into account the type of the variables related to the research subject (quantitative). The formula for the sample size to be calculated taking the “1- α ” confidence level into account has been given in Table 1.

Table 1. Formula Regarding the Calculation of Sample Size

Variable Type	Limited Population (N<10000)
For (Quantitative Average))	$n = \frac{N \cdot t^2 \cdot p \cdot q}{d^2 \cdot (N - 1) + t^2 \cdot p \cdot q}$

Source: Özdamar (2001:257).

N: Number of Population Units,

n: Sample size,

For Z_{α} : $\alpha = 0.05, 0.01, 0.001, 1.96, 2.58$ and 3.28 values,

d= Sample error,

t distribution of critical values with $t_{\alpha, sd} = sd$ degree of freedom ($sd = n - 1$).

When $t_{\alpha, sd}$ critical values are $sd = n-1 \rightarrow 5000$, they can be taken equal to Z_{α} values.

Accordingly;

$$n = \frac{2032 \cdot 1,96^2 \cdot 0,5 \cdot 0,5}{0,05^2 \cdot 2031 + 1,96^2 \cdot 0,5 \cdot 0,5} = 323$$

When the formula is put into implementation, the minimum number of samples is reached (300). The table by Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan (2004) supports the above calculation. As for ± 0.03 , ± 0.05 and ± 0.10 sampling errors, the sample sizes required to be drawn from different population sizes are given in Table 2 (Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan, 2004, pp. 49-50).

Table 2. Sample Sizes

Population Size	± 0.03 Sampling Error (d)			± 0.05 Sampling Error (d)			± 0.10 Sampling Error (d)		
	p=0.5 q=0.5	p=0.8 q=0.2	p=0.3 q=0.7	p=0.5 q=0.5	p=0.8 q=0.2	p=0.3 q=0.7	p=0.5 q=0.5	p=0.8 q=0.2	p=0.3 q=0.7
100	92	87	90	80	71	77	49	38	45
500	341	289	321	217	165	196	81	55	70
750	441	358	409	254	185	226	85	57	73
1000	516	406	473	278	198	244	88	58	75
2500	748	537	660	333	224	286	93	60	78
5000	880	601	760	357	234	303	94	61	79
10000	964	639	823	370	240	313	95	61	80
25000	1023	665	865	378	244	319	96	61	80
50000	1045	674	881	381	245	321	96	61	81
100000	1056	678	888	383	245	322	96	61	81
1000000	1066	682	896	384	246	323	96	61	81

Source: Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan (2004, p. 50).

In this context, simple random sampling method (Ural and Kılıç, 2006, p. 41) has been used, and a total of 506 surveys were conducted onto the employees of the hotel businesses in Trabzon. This is because it was thought that there would be incomplete surveys or may be faulty and non-returning surveys. 112 questionnaires were excluded due to being incomplete and incorrect. 394 questionnaires were regarded as suitable for evaluation and were subjected to analysis. A review of the literature about nepotism has been carried out and survey implementation was conducted between 4 May and 10 July, 2018 in order to determine the nepotism perceptions of the employees in the hotels in Trabzon.

The survey used as data collection technique, within the framework of the application of the research, consisted of 14 closed-ended and 5-point Likert-type expressions has been adapted to the employees by Asunakutlu and Avcı (2010). The survey is formed of three dimensions namely favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism and favoritism in the recruitment process. In the first part of the survey, the demographic and some other individual characteristics of the employees of the hotel businesses have been given. The second part of the survey consists of the scale to determine the

nepotism perceptions of the employees. In the scale, the perception of nepotism was measured in three dimensions and consisted of a total of 14 expressions. These expressions have been graded with a five-point Likert scale, which are “Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree”; and were coded as follows: “1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree”. High scores in the Nepotism scale indicate the increase in the employee perception. The participants were asked to mark the answer that was most appropriate to them.

Independent sample t test and one-way Anova were used in the study. The T test allows the researchers to get results about whether or not there is a statistically significant difference between the mean of two independent samples. In addition to that, analysis of variance is used to determine whether there is a statistical difference between samples in a study with more than 2 independent groups. Besides, when the sig. value calculated to test the difference between groups in variance analysis is found less than 0.05, post-hoc tests are used. However, prior to this, it is necessary to test whether the variances between the groups are equal. Tukey test is performed if the variances are equal whereas in cases where variances are not equal, Tamhane’s T2 test is performed.

Findings

In this part of the study, the analyses on whether the factors such as favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism and favoritism in recruitment process differ statistically according to demographic characteristics of the participants have been presented.

Table 3: Differences Among Factors by Gender

Variables	Factor	Group	n	\bar{x}	Std.	(p)
Gender	FAVORITISM IN PROMOTION	Female	162	2.67	1.20	0.174
		Male	232	2.84	1.14	
	TRANSACTION FAVORITISM	Female	162	2.67	1.18	0.361
		Male	232	2.78	1.14	
	FAVORITISM IN RECRUITMENT PROCESS	Female	162	2.83	1.20	0.246
		Male	232	2.97	1.14	

According to Table 3, there are 162 females and 232 males participants in the study. As a result of the analysis, it was understood that there was no statistically significant difference among the averages of any of the factors such as favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism and favoritism in recruitment process between men and women. It can be accepted that there is no difference in the nepotism perception between the women and men working in the hospitality establishments in Trabzon. Karacaoğlu and Yörük (2012), Özüren (2017) and Pelit et al. (2017) obtained similar results in their studies. A study by Düz (2012) concluded that nepotism perceptions of men were higher

compared to the women. Sarıboğa (2017) precipitated in the study that there is a significant difference between nepotism perception and the gender and added that women's averages on favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism and favoritism in recruitment process are higher.

Table 4: Differences Among Factors by Age Groups

Variables	Factor	Group	n	\bar{x}	Std.	(p)
AGE	FAVORITISM IN PROMOTION	20 and below	39	2.33	1.16	0.067
		Between 21 – 25	144	2.85	1.13	
		Between 26 – 30	99	2.87	1.21	
		31 and over	112	2.73	1.16	
	TRANSACTION FAVORITISM	20 and below	39	2.66	1.15	0.892
		Between 21 – 25	144	2.76	1.15	
		Between 26 – 30	99	2.79	1.15	
		31 and over	112	2.69	1.17	
	FAVORITISM IN RECRUITMENT PROCESS	20 and below	39	2.75	1.05	0.841
		Between 21 – 25	144	2.93	1.13	
		Between 26 – 30	99	2.93	1.16	
		31 and over	112	2.93	1.27	

According to Table 4, 39 people aged 20 and under, 144 persons aged 21 to 25, 99 persons between the ages of 26 and 30 and 112 persons aged 31 and over participated in the study. It was ended that there is no statistically significant difference among the statistical averages of these age groups in terms of the factors such as favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism and favoritism in recruitment process. In this context, it can be stated that the nepotism perception of the employees in the hospitality establishments did not change by the age groups of the employees. Similar to these current results, the studies carried out by Kaba (2018), Özüren (2017), Karacaoğlu ve Yörük (2012), Pelit ve arkadaşları (2017), Düz (2012) support these results. Sarıboğa (2017) found out that age has a significant effect on transaction favoritism and recruitment process variables. In the transaction favoritism and favoritism in the recruitment process variables, it was observed that the average of the employees aged between 18 and 25 was significantly higher than the average of employees between the ages of 26-35 and 36-45.

Table 5: Differences Among Factors by Educational Status

Variables	Factor	Group	n	\bar{x}	Std.	(p)
EDUCATIONAL STATUS	FAVORITISM IN PROMOTION	Primary education	81	2.96	1.23	0.108
		High school	190	2.66	1.16	
		University	112	2.76	1.13	
		Post-Graduate	11	3.32	1.10	

	TRANSACTION FAVORITISM	Primary education	81	2.81	1.19	.417
		High school	190	2.71	1.15	
		University	112	2.68	1.12	
		Post-Graduate	11	3.25	1.26	
	FAVORITISM IN RECRUITMENT PROCESS	Primary education	81	3.05	1.16	0.604
		High school	190	2.89	1.20	
		University	112	2.83	1.12	
		Post-Graduate	11	3.06	1.13	

In Table 5, in addition to the descriptive statistics on the educational status of the participants, you can find the results about whether there are any differences among factors such as favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism, and favoritism in the recruitment process in the educational status dimension. It is seen that 81 people graduated from elementary school, 190 people were high school graduates, 112 were university graduates and 11 were post graduates. It was specified as a result of statistical tests that in terms of these 3 factors, there was no statistically difference in the 95% confidence level among the educational groups. It can be commented that there is no difference between the level of education and the nepotism perception of employees in hospitality establishments in Trabzon. Karacaoğlu and Yörük (2012) have achieved similar results in their research. In Özüren's (2017) study, it was concluded that participants with bachelor's degrees had higher nepotism perceptions compared to the other educational groups. Sarıboğa (2017) indicated that the educational level has a significant effect on favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism and favoritism in recruitment process variables; added that the average of postgraduate graduates was significantly higher than the average of high school, associate degree and undergraduate graduates in the favoritism in promotion dimension. On the other hand, the average of high school, associate degree and bachelor's degree graduates is significantly higher than secondary school graduates in the transaction favoritism dimension. However, the average of high school, associate degree and postgraduate graduates is significantly higher than bachelor's degree holders. When it comes to the favoritism in the recruitment process, it was understood that the average of high school, associate degree, university and post-graduate graduates is significantly higher than secondary school graduates. Additionally, the averages of associate degree, university and post-graduate graduates are significantly higher than high school graduates.

Table 6: Differences Among Factors by Marital Status

Variables	Factor	Group	n	\bar{x}	Std.	(p)
MARITAL STATUS	FAVORITISM IN PROMOTION	Single	218	2.75	1.13	0.866
		Married	161	2.78	1.19	
		Other	15	2.92	1.56	
		Single	218	2.74	1.13	0.578

	TRANSACTION FAVORITISM	Married	161	2.70	1.14	0.936
		Other	15	3.03	1.55	
	FAVORITISM IN RECRUITMENT PROCESS	Single	218	2.91	1.11	
		Married	161	2.90	1.21	
		Other	15	3.02	1.49	

Table 6 shows the general statistical results concerning the marital status. It was learnt that 218 people are single while 161 people are married. In addition, 15 people fall into the other category. According to the results of the analysis, it was figured out that there was no statistically significant difference in the 95% confidence level among the favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism, and favoritism in the recruitment process factors among the marital status groups. It can be pointed out that there is no difference between nepotism perception and marital status of the employees in the hospitality enterprises where the research was conducted. Kaba (2018), Düz (2012), Karacaoğlu and Yörük (2012) have ended up with similar results in their research. Pelit et al. (2017) stated that there were significant differences between marital status and nepotism in their research and also said that nepotism perceptions of married employees were higher compared to the single employees. Sariboğa (2017) concluded that the marital status has a significant effect on transaction favoritism and favoritism in the recruitment process variables and remarked that the average of the single employees is higher in the transaction favoritism and favoritism in the recruitment process variables.

Table 7: Differences Among Factors by Departments

Variables	Factor	Group	n	\bar{x}	Std.	(p)
DEPARTMENTS	FAVORITISM IN PROMOTION	Front Office	34	2.36	1.04	0.174
		Food & Beverage	198	2.82	1.24	
		Housekeeping	46	2.77	1.11	
		Sales and marketing	22	2.92	1.02	
		Accounting	16	2.65	0.94	
		Human resources	10	3.48	1.02	
		Other	68	2.70	1.15	
	TRANSACTION FAVORITISM	Front Office	34	2.43	1.06	0.235
		Food & Beverage	198	2.79	1.20	
		Housekeeping	46	2.67	1.06	
		Sales and marketing	22	2.70	1.06	
		Accounting	16	2.71	0.80	
		Human resources	10	3.53	0.93	
		Other	68	2.66	1.22	
	Front Office	34	2.53	1.11	0.124	

	FAVORITISM IN RECRUITMENT PROCESS	Food & Beverage	198	3.01	1.21
		Housekeeping	46	2.96	1.07
		Sales and marketing	22	2.66	0.94
		Accounting	16	2.89	0.85
		Human resources	10	3.53	0.94
		Other	68	2.76	1.23

According to Table 7, descriptive statistical results related to the departments have been given, and whether there are any differences among factors such as the favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism, and favoritism in the recruitment process. According to the results, it was obtained there are 34 employees working in the front desk department, 198 employees working in the food and beverage department, 46 people working in the housekeeping department, 22 employees working in the sales and marketing department, 16 employees working in the accounting department, 10 employees working in the human resources department and 68 employees working in the “other” groups. It was found out that there is no statistically significant difference among these 3 factors in terms of the departments. Kaba (2018) and Pelit et al. (2017) found similar results in their research.

Tablo8: Differences Among Factors by the Position

Variables	Factor	Group	n	\bar{x}	Std.	(p)
Position	FAVORITISM IN PROMOTION	Employee	343	2.77	1.16	0.886
		Manager	51	2.79	1.25	
	TRANSACTION FAVORITISM	Employee	343	2.73	1.15	0.853
		Manager	51	2.76	1.22	
	FAVORITISM IN RECRUITMENT PROCESS	Employee	343	2.91	1.16	0.964
		Manager	51	2.90	1.24	

Table 8 presents the statistical information about the positions. According to Table 8, 343 people hold the employee positions and 51 people are in the position of managers. As a result of the statistical analysis, it was discovered that there was no difference among factors such as favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism, and favoritism in the recruitment process. In this context, it can be stated that there is no difference between the perception of nepotism and the position of the employees working in the hospitality establishments in Trabzon.

Table 9: Differences Among Factors by Working Year at Business

Variables	Factor	Group	n	\bar{x}	Std.	(p)
Working Year at Business	FAVORITISM IN PROMOTION	Less than 1 year	122	2.59	1.31	0.238
		Between 1 – 5 years	198	2.84	1.07	
		Between 6 – 10 years	47	2.86	1.16	
		More than 10 years	27	2.89	1.20	
	TRANSACTION FAVORITISM	Less than 1 year	122	2.50	1.23	0.053
		Between 1 – 5 years	198	2.82	1.08	
		Between 6 – 10 years	47	3.01	1.10	
		More than 10 years	27	2.66	1.28	
	FAVORITISM IN RECRUITMENT PROCESS	Less than 1 year	122	2.71	1.24	0.152
		Between 1 – 5 years	198	3.01	1.08	
		Between 6 – 10 years	47	3.00	1.19	
		More than 10 years	27	2.97	1.33	

Table 9 provides information concerning the number of working years of the participants in their current businesses. It also supplies information about whether there are any statistical differences among the working year groups and the factors such as the favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism, and favoritism in the recruitment process. According to these results, 122 people have been working for the business for less than 1 year, 198 people have been working for the business between 1 - 5 years, 47 people have been working for the business between 6 - 10 years and lastly 27 people have been working for the business for more than 10 years. Moreover, there was no statistically significant difference in the 95% confidence level among the number of working years. Kaba (2018) and Pelit et al. (2017) obtained similar results in their research. The results of the study conducted by Düz (2012) found that the participants who worked for the business for 1 to 4 years had higher nepotism perceptions than the participants who worked for the business for 11 years and more. The study by Özüren (2017) stated that those who have longer working years have a higher nepotism perception compared to the others.

Table 10: Differences Among Factors by Total Working Year

Variables	Factor	Group	n	\bar{x}	Std.	(p)
Total Working Year	FAVORITISM IN PROMOTION	Less than 1 year	63	2.68	1.33	0.649
		Between 1 – 5 years	163	2.74	1.11	
		Between 6 – 10 years	91	2.90	1.17	
		More than 10 years	77	2.75	1.17	

	TRANSACTION FAVORITISM	Less than 1 year	63	2.64	1.19	0.364
		Between 1 – 5 years	163	2.70	1.12	
		Between 6 – 10 years	91	2.92	1.15	
		More than 10 years	77	2.67	1.20	
	FAVORITISM IN RECRUITMENT PROCESS	Less than 1 year	63	2.83	1.23	0.653
		Between 1 – 5 years	163	2.87	1.10	
		Between 6 – 10 years	91	3.04	1.17	
		More than 10 years	77	2.92	1.26	

According to Table 10, it was noticed there are 63 people who have been working for less than 1 year, 163 people have been working between 1 to 5 years, 91 people have been working between 6 and 10 years and 77 people have been working more than 10 years. According to statistical analysis, there was no difference between the total working years in terms of the factors such as favoritism in promotion, transaction favoritism and favoritism in the recruitment process. In this context, it can be expressed that there is no difference between the total working year and the nepotism perceptions of the employees of hospitality establishments in Trabzon. These results are similar to those found in the research by Karacaoğlu and Yörük (2012) and Kaba (2018).

Table 11: Mean and Standard Deviations by the Participants' Responses to the Scale Questions

	Mean	Std.
The knowledge, skills and abilities of the employees in this business are of secondary importance.	2,68	1,35
No matter how successful I am in this business, I cannot get ahead of the acquaintances of business managers.	2,88	1,41
The relationship of kinship and intimacy is primarily taken into consideration in promotions of employees in this business.	2,72	1,40
In this business, it is easier for acquaintances of business managers to be promoted.	2,78	1,33
In this enterprise, the factors required other than the job qualifications in the promotion of employees are prioritized.	2,78	1,32
The employees who have acquaintances in the management of this business are respected by other employees.	2,85	1,34
The managers at the lower and middle level in this business behave differently to the employees they know.	2,78	1,38
I abstain from the employees who are acquaintances to the managers in this business.	2,53	1,43
It is quite difficult for the managers to make their acquaintances redundant or to impose penalties on them.	2,72	1,38
The employees who are recognized by the managers in this business benefit from the resources of the business more easily.	2,74	1,42
The authority in this business is primarily warranted to the acquaintances.	2,80	1,38

Priority is given to acquaintances in recruitment of personnel in this business.	2,81	1,39
Those who have acquaintances in the management are not forced in the selection process in the recruitment to this business.	2,88	1,33
The reference of the people who hold a managerial position is very important in the recruitment to this business.	3,04	1,38

Table 11 shows the general mean and standard deviations of the 14 problems used in the nepotism scale. The first 5 questions in the table form the favoritism in promotion dimension while the last 3 questions constitute the dimension of favoritism in the recruitment process. The remaining 6 questions constitute the dimension of transaction favoritism.

Conclusion

In the work life, instead of their own gains and efforts at work, employees' using family members or kinship relations to gain of success in the business life without some personal characteristics may result in negative consequences. It is inevitable to face with such negative results due to the mentioned applications in the hospitality business. It is extremely important for the managers to consider features as such educational status of the employees to be hired, their suitability for the job, their success, their personal characteristics, their suitability for team work. When some employees acquire new positions in the businesses with the effect of kinship relations, it may direct the nepotism perception positively on the other employees over time or later in the future.

This study has been carried out on 394 employees working in Certified Hospitality Facilities by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in Trabzon. The participants are consisted of 162 women and 232 men. It was detected that among the participants, there are 39 employees who are 20 years and under, 144 employees are between 21 and 25, 99 employees are between 26 and 30 years, and 112 employees are 31 and over. Of the participants, 81 are primary school graduates, 190 are high school graduates, 112 are university graduates and 11 hold post-graduate degree. Of the 394 participants, 218 were single, 161 were married, while 15 were in the other group. 34 of the participants work in front office, 198 in food & beverage, 46 in housekeeping, 22 in sales and marketing, 16 in accounting, 10 in human resources and 68 in departments defined as other. 122 of the employees have been working in the business for less than 1 year, 198 of the employees have been working in the business for 1 to 5 years, 47 of the employees have been working in the business for 6 to 10 years, and 27 of the employees have been working in the business for more than 10 years. 63 of the employees have been working in this sector less than 1 year, 163 of the employees have been working in this sector for 1 to 5 years, 91 of the employees have been working in this sector for 6 to 10 years and 77 of the employees have been working in this sector for more than 10 years.

In the study, it was aimed to determine whether there is any difference between nepotism perceptions and demographic characteristics of the employees as a result of the analysis of the collected data. With the analyzes carried out in this direction, it was concluded that there is no significant differences between the participants' gender, age groups, educational status, marital status, the department they worked, the positions they hold, the working year at the business and the total working year in the sector and their nepotism perceptions.

Finally, that there is no significant difference between the demographic characteristics of the employees of hospitality businesses in Trabzon and their nepotism perceptions does not mean that the employees in the hospitality businesses in different destinations will be in the same situation. It should be kept in mind that not only demographic characteristics but also many organizational behaviors are effective on nepotism perception. As one of their routine, hospitality business managers should concentrate on human resources carefully. Therefore, if the perception of nepotism within the businesses is perceived negatively by the employees, this will increase their productivity in the business. In this respect, hospitality business managers should be aware of the nepotism perception concept as mentioned in the research and should also act fairly to the employees in terms of factors affecting nepotism, such as career plans, pay system and performance evaluation. These situations can make significant contributions to the businesses in achieving their targeted goals.

REFERENCES

- Ağaoğlu, O. K. (1992). İşgücünü verimli kullanma tekniklerinin turizm sektörüne uygulanması, *Verimlilik Dergisi*, 1, 110-121.
- Arslaner, E. Erol, G. and Boylu, Y. (2014). Konaklama işletmelerinde nepotizm ve örgütsel adalet algısı üzerine bir araştırma, *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 32, 62-77
- Asunakutlu, T. Avcı, U. (2010). Aile işletmelerinde nepotizm algısı ve iş tatmini ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(2), 93-109.
- Bellow, A., (2003). *In Praise Of Nepotism*, (08.09.18), <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2003/07/in-praise-of-nepotism/302753/>
- Bierman, L. and Fisher, C. D. (1984). Antinepotism rules applied to spouses: business and legal viewpoints, *Labor Law Journal*, 634-642.
- Büte, M. (2011). Nepotizmin iş stresi, iş tatmini, olumsuz söz söyleme ve işten ayrılma niyeti üzerine etkileri: aile işletmeleri üzerinde bir araştırma, *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20(1), 177-194.
- Büte, M. and Tekarslan, E. (2010). Nepotizm ’in çalışanlar üzerine etkileri: aile işletmelerine yönelik bir saha araştırması , *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(6), 1-21.
- Çalışal, S. (2015). *Türk Siyasal Hayatı Demokrat Parti Dönemi Politik Patronaj İlişkileri*, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tezsiz Yüksek Lisans Projesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Programı, Denizli.
- Dailey, R. C., and Reuschling, L. T. (1980). “Managing continuity in the familyowned company”, *Journal of General Management*, Vol. 5, pp. 49-56.
- Safina, D. (2015). Favouritism and Nepotism in an Organization: Causes and Effects, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23 630 – 634.
- Düz, S. (2012). *Konaklama İşletmelerinde Nepotizm İle Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi*, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Turizm İşletmeciliği ve Otelcilik Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Afyonkarahisar.

- Erdem, B. Ceylan, U. And Saylan, U. (2013). Aile işletmelerinde nepotizm ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi: kütahya'da faaliyet gösteren otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma, *Uludağ Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32(2), 171-197.
- Ford, R. and McLaughlin, F. (1985). Nepotism, *Personnel Journal(pre-1986)*, September, 64, 57-61.
- Gjinovci, A. (2016). The impact of nepotism and corruption on the economy and HR, *Economic and Environmental Studies* Vol. 16, No. 3, 421-434.
- Hornby, A. S., (1985). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. England: Oxford University Press.
- İyışleroğlu, S.C., (2006). *Aile şirketleri: adana ve çevresinde faaliyet gösteren aile şirketlerinde nepotizm uygulamasının tespitine yönelik bir araştırma*, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Adana.
- Jones, R. G., Stout, T., Harder, B., Levine, E., Levine, J., Sanchez, J. I. (2008). Personnel psychology and nepotism: should we support anti-nepotism policies. *The Industrial- Organizational Psychologist*, 45(3), 17-20.
- Kaba, A. (2018). *Bireylerin Nepotizm ve Örgütsel Adalet Algılarının Bireysel Performanslarına Etkisi: Türkiye'de Özel Okul Zinciri Çalışanları Üzerinde Bir Araştırma*, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi, İstanbul.
- Karacaoğlu, K. and Yörük, D. (2012). Çalışanların nepotizm ve örgütsel adalet algılamaları: orta anadolu bölgesinde bir aile işletmesi uygulaması, "İş Güç" *Endüstri İlişkileri Ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 14(3), 46-64
- Karakaş, M. and Çak, M. (2007). Yolsuzlukla mücadelede uluslararası kuruluşların rolü, *Maliye Dergisi*, 153, 74-101 .
- Lakshminarasimhan, S., (2011). *Nepotism: is it a boon or bane for the organization*, (08.09.18), <https://www.brighthub.com/office/human-resources/articles/119324.aspx>
- Linda, C.Wong and Brian Kleiner H. (1994). Nepotism, *Work Study*, 43 (5), pp 10-12.
- Özdamar, K. (2001). *Paket programlar ve istatistiksel veri analizi (Çok değişkenli analizler)*, Eskişehir: Kaan Yayınları.
- Özler, H., Özler, D.E. and Gümüştekin, G.E. (2007). Aile işletmelerinde nepotizmin gelişim evreleri ve kurumsallaşma, *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17, 437.
- Özsemerci, K.(2003). *Türk kamu yönetiminde yolsuzluklar, nedenleri, zararları ve çözüm önerileri, sayıstay araştırma sayıstay araştırma dizisi*, (10.10.2018), https://www.sayistay.gov.tr/tr/Upload/95906369/files/yayinlar/TurkKamuYonetiminde_Yolsuzluklar.pdf
- Özüren, Ü. (2017). *Tekstil işletmelerinde nepotizm uygulamalarına bağlı olarak üretkenlik karşıtı davranışlar ve sonuçları*, İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı, İstanbul.
- Pelit, E., Baytok, A., Soybalı, H.H., Kılıç, İ. (2017). Nepotizm algısında demografik özelliklerin rolü: otel işletmeleri işgörenleri üzerinde bir araştırma, *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2),45-63.
- Sarıboğa, M. (2017). *Nepotizmin Örgütsel Bağlılık ve İş Doyumuna Etkisi ve Otel Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma*, Doğu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı İşletme Programı, İstanbul.

Strasbourg Convention (1999). Criminal responsibility in the fight against corruption.

TDK (Türk Dil Kurumu), Türkçe Sözlük, www.tdk.gov.tr, (06.09.18)
http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_gts&arama=gts&guid=TDK.GTS.5b90fd25bb7c89.11324901

Trabzon İl Kültür ve Turizm Müdürlüğü (2018) <http://www.trabzonkulturturizm.gov.tr/>

Tunçbilek, M.M., and Akkuş, A. (2017). Nepotizm (akraba kayırmacılığı) ve iş tatmini arasındaki ilişki ve safranbolu konaklama işletmelerinde bir araştırma, *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3, 169-197.

Turizm Bakanlığı (1989). *Otelcilik ve Turizm Endüstrisinde İşgücü Araştırması*, Ankara: Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Ural, A. ve Kılıç, İ. (2006). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve spss ile veri analizi*, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.