



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Nepotism**

Burhan, O.K.

### **Citation**

Burhan, O. K. (2020, October 7). *Nepotism*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/137443>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/137443>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/137443> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Burhan, O.K.

**Title:** Nepotism

**Issue Date:** 2020-10-07

# Reference

- Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Rosati, F. (2014). Relatives in the same university faculty: Nepotism or merit? *Scientometrics*, *101*, 737–749. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1273-z>
- Ackerman, J. M., Kenrick, D. T., & Schaller, M. (2007). Is friendship akin to kinship? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *28*, 365–374. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.04.004>
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *2*, 267–299. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best practice recommendations for designing and implementing experimental vignette methodology studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, *17*, 351–371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114547952>
- Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., & Schulz, W. (2012). *ICCS 2009 Asian report: Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower-secondary students in five Asian countries*. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50*, 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Allesina, S. (2011). Measuring nepotism through shared last names: The case of Italian academia. *PLoS ONE*, *6*, e21160. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021160>
- Arasli, 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*, 295–308. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443330610680399>

- Arasli, H., & Tumer, M. (2008). Nepotism, favoritism, and cronyism: A study of their effects on job stress and job satisfaction in the banking industry of North Cyprus. *Social Behavior and Personality, 36*, 1237–1250.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 20–39. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4278999>
- Åslund, O., & Skans, O. N. (2012). Do anonymous job application procedures level the playing field. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 65*, 82–107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001979391206500105>
- Balliet, D., Wu, J., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2014). Ingroup favoritism in cooperation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 140*, 1556–1581. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037737>
- Baskerville, R. F. (2006). A very private matter: Anti-nepotism rules in accounting partnerships. *Oral History in New Zealand, 13*, 13–17.
- Bellow, A. (2003). *In praise of nepotism: A natural history*. Doubleday.
- Bingley, P., Corak, M., & Westergård-Nielsen, N. (2011). *The intergenerational transmission of employers in Canada and Denmark* (No. 5593; IZA Discussion Paper Series). Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit.
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2009). Testing and extending the group engagement model: Linkages between social identity, procedural justice, economic outcomes, and extrarole behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 445–464. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013935>
- Bøggild, T., & Petersen, M. B. (2015). The evolved functions of procedural fairness: An adaptation for politics. In T. K. Shackelford & R. D. Hansen (Eds.), *The Evolution of Morality*. Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19671-8\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19671-8_12)
- Brown, D. J., & Keeping, L. M. (2005). Elaborating the construct of transformational leadership: The role of affect. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 245–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leafqua.2005.01.003>
- Büte, M. (2011). The effects of nepotism and favoritism on employee behaviors and human resources practices: A research on Turkish public banks. *TODAI Review of Public Administration, 5*, 185–208.

- Cambridge Dictionary. (2019). *Nepotism*. Cambridge Dictionary. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/nepotism>
- Carver, R. P. (1983). Is reading rate constant or flexibel. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *18*, 190–215. <https://doi.org/10.2307/747517>
- Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *55*, 543–676. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2010.55.4.543>
- Chen, C. C., Chen, Y.-R., & Xin, K. (2004). Guanxi practices and trust in management: A procedural justice perspective. *Organization Science*, *15*, 200–209. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1030.0047>
- Cirone, A. (2018). *Political Dynasties in the European Parliament*. 28.
- Coffman, D. L., & MacCallum, R. C. (2005). Using parcels to convert path analysis model into latent variable models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *40*, 235–259. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr4002\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr4002_4)
- Dalpia, E., Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. (2014). Succession Narratives in Family Business: The Case of Alessi. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *38*, 1375–1394. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12129>
- Darioly, A., & Riggio, R. E. (2014). Nepotism in the hiring of leaders: Is there a stigmatization of relatives? *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, *73*, 243–248. <https://doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185/a000143>
- De Vreese, C. H., & Semetko, H. A. (2002). Cynical and engaged: Strategic campaign coverage, public opinion, and mobilization in a referendum. *Communication Research*, *29*, 615–641. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365002237829>
- Dobos, N. (2017). Networking, corruption, and subversion. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *144*, 467–478. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2853-4>
- Drew, C. H., Nyerges, T. L., & Leschine, T. M. (2004). Promoting Transparency of Long-Term Environmental Decisions: The Hanford Decision Mapping System Pilot Project. *Risk Analysis*, *24*, 1641–1664. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0272-4332.2004.00556.x>

- Durante, R., Labartino, G., Perotti, R., & Tabellini, G. (2011). *Academic dynasties: Decentralization and familism in the Italian academia* (No. 17572; National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper). <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17572>
- Eckstein, K., Noack, P., & Gniewosz, B. (2013). Predictors of intentions to participate in politics and actual political behaviors in young adulthood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 37*, 428–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025413486419>
- Edelman Trust Barometer. (2017). *Special report: Family business*. <https://www.edelman.com/research/family-business-trust>
- Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., Steen, N., & Vahtera, J. (2004). Job decision latitude, organizational justice and health: Multilevel covariance structure analysis. *Social Science & Medicine, 58*, 1659–1669. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(03\)00366-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00366-6)
- Erber, R., & Lau, R. R. (1990). Political cynicism revisited; An information-processing reconciliation of policy-based and incumbency-based interpretations of changes in trust in government. *American Journal of Political Science, 34*, 236–253.
- Everett, J. A. C., Faber, N. S., & Crockett, M. (2015). Preferences and beliefs in ingroup favoritism. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience, 9*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00015>
- Feather, N. T. (1999). Judgement of deservingness: Studies in the psychology of justice and achievement. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 86–107. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0302\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0302_1)
- Ferlazzo, F., & Sdoia, S. (2012). Measuring Nepotism through Shared Last Names: Are We Really Moving from Opinions to Facts? *PLoS ONE, 7*, e43574. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043574>
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 878–902. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878>

- Flap, H., & Boxman, E. (2017). Getting started: The influence of social capital on the start of the occupational career. In N. Lin, K. S. Cook, & R. S. Burt (Eds.), *Social capital: Theory and research* (pp. 159–181). Aldine de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315129457-7>
- Folger, R. (1987). Distributive and procedural justice in the workplace. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 143–159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01048013>
- Freeman, L. C. (1992). Filling in the blanks: A theory of cognitive categories and the structure of social affiliation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 55, 118. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786941>
- Fu, H., Mou, Y., Miller, M. J., & Jalette, G. (2011). Reconsidering political cynicism and political involvement: A test of antecedents. *American Communication Journal*, 13, 44–61.
- Gaertner, L., & Insko, C. A. (2000). Intergroup discrimination in the minimal group paradigm: Categorization, reciprocation, or fear? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.1.77>
- García-Izquierdo, A. L., Moscoso, S., & Ramos-Villagrasa, P. J. (2012). Reaction to the fairness of promotion methods: Procedural justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20, 394–403. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12002>
- Geys, B., & Smith, D. M. (2017). Political dynasties in democracies: Causes, consequences and remaining puzzles. *The Economic Journal*, 127, F446–F454. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eoj.12442>
- Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 694–734. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258595>
- Guo, X. (2001). Dimensions of guanxi in Chinese elite politics. *The China Journal*, 46, 69–90. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3182308>
- Gutman, A. (2012). Nepotism and employment law. In R. G. Jones (Ed.), *Nepotism in organizations*. Routledge.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.

- Hamilton, W. D. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behaviour. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 7, 1–16. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193\(64\)90038-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193(64)90038-4)
- Hampton, J. A. (2016). Categories, prototypes and exemplars. In N. Reimer (Ed.), *Handbook of Semantics* (pp. 125–141). Routledge.
- Haslam, N., Rothschild, L., & Ernst, D. (2000). Essentialist beliefs about social categories. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 113–127. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466600164363>
- Hauenstein, N. M. A., McGonigle, T., & Flinder, S. W. (2001). A meta-analysis of the relationship between procedural justice and distributive justice: Implications for justice research. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 13, 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014482124497>
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Press.
- Heider, F. (1946). Attitudes and cognitive organization. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 21, 107–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1946.9917275>
- Heine, S. J., Proulx, T., & Vohs, K. D. (2006). The Meaning Maintenance Model: On the Coherence of Social Motivations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 88–110. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1002\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_1)
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 61–83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, 9, 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.169>
- Hogg, M. A., Hohman, Z. P., & Rivera, J. E. (2008). Why do people join groups? Three motivational accounts from social psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 1269–1280. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00099.x>



- Holland, M. P. (2012). *Social bonding and nurture kinship: Compatibility between cultural and biological approaches*. Createspace Independent Publishing.
- Holm, E., Westin, K., & Haugen, K. (2018). Place, kinship, and employment. *Population, Space and Place*, 24, e2118. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2118>
- Homa, D., Sterling, S., & Trepel, L. (1981). Limitations of exemplar-based generalization and the abstraction of categorical information. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 7, 418–439. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.7.6.418>
- Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social Identity Theory and Self-categorization Theory: A Historical Review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 204–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00066.x>
- Ilmarinen, V.-J., Lönnqvist, J.-E., & Paunonen, S. (2016). Similarity-attraction effects in friendship formation: Honest platoon-mates prefer each other but dishonest do not. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 92, 153–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.12.040>
- Indonesia Corruption Watch. (2017). *Survei nasional antikorupsi 2017*. Indonesia Corruption Watch. <https://antikorupsi.org/id/news/survei-nasional-antikorupsi-2017>
- Iqbal, M. (2018, June 18). *10 Nama di Dinasti Ratu Atut: Anak, Adik, hingga Mantu*. Detiknews. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4121115/10-nama-di-dinasti-ratu-atut-anak-adik-hingga-mantu>
- Jaskiewicz, P., Uhlenbruck, K., Balkin, D. B., & Reay, T. (2013). Is nepotism good or bad? Types of nepotism and implications for knowledge management. *Family Business Review*, 26, 121–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486512470841>
- Jefferson, T. (2018). *From Thomas Jefferson to George Jefferson, 27 March 1801*. Founders Online. <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-33-02-0406>
- Jones, R. G., & Stout, T. (2015). Policing nepotism and cronysim without loosing the value of social connection. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 2–12. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2014.3>

- Jones, R. G., Stout, T., Harder, B., Levine, E., & Levine, J. (2008). Personnel psychology and nepotism: Should we support anti-nepotism policies? *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, *45*, 17–20.
- Kabashima, I., Marshall, J., Uekami, T., & Hyun, D.-S. (2000). Casual cynics of disillusioned democrats? Political alienation in Japan. *Political Psychology*, *21*, 779–804.
- 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 & Economics Research Journal (IBER)*, *10*, 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.19030/iber.v10i9.5622>
- Keller, J. (2005). In genes we trust: The biological component of psychological essentialism and Its relationship to mechanisms of motivated social cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 686–702. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.4.686>
- Khatri, N., & Tsang, E. W. K. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of cronyism in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *43*, 289–303. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023081629529>
- Khatri, N., Tsang, E. W. K., & Begley, T. M. (2006). Cronyism: A cross-cultural analysis. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *37*, 61–75. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400171>
- Kilani, M., Al Junidi, R., & Al Riziq, R. (2015). The role that nepotism (wasta) plays in conflict and conflict management within groups in private organizations in Jordan and MENA region. *Middle East Journal of Business*, *10*, 59–69. <https://doi.org/10.5742/MEJB.2015.92713>
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *35*, 644–656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2007.09.001>
- Lankester, T. (2008). Conflict of interest: A historical and comparative perspective. In *Managing conflict of interest: Frameworks, tools, and instrument for preventing, detecting, and managing conflict of interest* (pp. 10–36). Asian Development Bank.

- Lans, T., Blok, V., & Gulikers, J. (2015). Show me your network and I'll tell you who you are: Social competence and social capital of early-stage entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 27, 458–473. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2015.1070537>
- Lee, S. C. (1964). The primary group as Cooley defines it. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 5, 23–34.
- Lentz, B. F., & Laband, D. N. (1989). Why so many children of doctors become doctors: Nepotism vs. Human capital transfers. *Journal of Human Resources*, 24, 296–413. <https://doi.org/10.2307/145820>
- Leshner, G., & Thorson, E. (2000). Overreporting voting: Campaign media, public mood, and the vote. *Political Communication*, 17, 263–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/105846000414278>
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to study of fairness in social relationship. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social Exchange* (pp. 27–55). Springer.
- Lewin, K. (1943). Psychology and the process of group living. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 17, 113–131.
- Lind, E. A. (2001). Fairness heuristic theory: Justice judgements as pivotal cognitions in organizational relations. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organization justice* (pp. 56–88). Stanford University Press.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). Two models of procedural justice. In E. A. Lind & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *The social psychology of procedural justice, critical issues in social justice* (pp. 221–242). Springer.
- Litt, E. (1963). Political cynicism and political futility. *Journal of Politics*, 25, 312–323.
- Loi, R., Hang-Yue, N., & Foley, S. (2006). Linking employees' justice perceptions to organizational commitment and intention to leave: The mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317905X39657>

- Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & De Vader, C. L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34, 343–378. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(84\)90043-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(84)90043-6)
- Luna, J. P., & Zechmeister, E. J. (2005). Political representation in Latin America a study of elite-mass congruence in nine countries. *Comparative Political Studies*, 38, 388–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414004273205>
- Madestam, A., Shoag, D., Veuger, S., & Yanagizawa-Drott, D. (2013). Do political protests matter? Evidence from the tea party movement. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128, 1633–1685. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjt021>
- Matsunaga, M. (2008). Item parceling in structural equation modeling: A primer. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 2, 260–293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312450802458935>
- Medin, D., & Ortony, A. (1989). Psychological essentialism. In S. Vosniadou & A. Ortony (Eds.), *Similarity and analogical reasoning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Melano, S. (2017). *ICW Rilis hasil survey, hasilnya warga pesimis dengan korupsi*. Tribun Pontianak. <http://pontianak.tribunnews.com/2017/08/15/icw-rilis-hasil-survey-hasilnya-warga-pesimis-dengan-korupsi>
- Merica, D., Borger, G., & Klein, B. (2017, March 30). *Ivanka Trump is making her White House job official*. CNN Politics. <https://www.cnn.com/2017/03/29/politics/ivanka-trump-white-house-job/index.html>
- Mhatre, K. H., Riggio, R. E., & Riggio, H. R. (2012). Nepotism and leadership. In R. G. Jones (Ed.), *Nepotism in organizations*. Routledge.
- Miles, M. R. (2015). Turnout as Consent: How Fair Governance Encourages Voter Participation. *Political Research Quarterly*, 68, 363–376. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912915573282>

- Mohamed, A. A., & Mohamad, M. S. (2011). The effect of *wasta* on perceived competence and morality in Egypt. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 18, 412–425. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13527601111179492>
- Mulder, B. K. (2012). A model of organizational nepotism. In *Nepotism in organizations*. Routledge.
- Muller, E. N. (1970). The representation of citizens by political authorities: Consequences for regime support. *American Political Science Review*, 64, 1149–1166. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1958363>
- Nadeau, R., & Blais, A. (1993). Accepting the Election Outcome: The Effect of Participation on Losers' Consent. *British Journal of Political Science*, 23, 553–563. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123400006736>
- Nahemow, L., & Lawton, M. P. (1975). Similarity and propinquity in Friendship formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 205–213. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.32.2.205>
- Nicholson, N. (2008). Evolutionary psychology, organizational culture, and the family firm. *Family Business Review*, 21, 103–118. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2008.32739760>
- Nye, J. L., & Forsyth, D. R. (1991). The effects of prototype-based biases on leadership appraisals: A test of leadership categorization theory. *Small Group Research*, 22, 260–379. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496491223005>
- Nyhan, R. C., & Marlowe, H. A. (1997). Development and psychometric properties of the organizational trust inventory. *Evaluation Review*, 21(5), 614–635. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X9702100505>
- Olsen, M. E. (1969). Two categories of political alienation. *Social Forces*, 47, 288–299.
- Padgett, M. Y., & Morris, K. A. (2005). Keeping it “all in the family:” Does nepotism in the hiring process really benefit the beneficiary? *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11, 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190501100205>
- Padgett, M. Y., Padgett, R. J., & Morris, K. A. (2015). Perceptions of nepotism beneficiaries: The hidden price of using a family connection

- to obtain a job. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30, 283–298. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-014-9354-9>
- Pandey, G. (2019, May 24). Is this the end of the Gandhi dynasty? *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-48391041>
- Parvin, P. (2018). Democracy without participation: A new politics for a disengaged era. *Res Publica*, 24, 31–52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11158-017-9382-1>
- Pelit, E., Dincer, F. I., & Kilic, I. (2015). The effect of nepotism on organizational silence, alienation and commitment: A study on hotel employees in Turkey. *Journal of Management Research*, 7, 82–110. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v7i4.7806>
- Pinkleton, B. E., & Weintraub Austin, E. (2004). Media perceptions and public affairs apathy in the politically inexperienced. *Mass Communication and Society*, 7, 319–337. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327825mcs0703\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327825mcs0703_4)
- Popczyk, W. (2017). Family social capital versus nepotism in family businesses. *RSEP International Conferences on Social Issues and Economic Studies*. 5th RSEP Social Sciences Conferences, Barcelona.
- R Core Team. (2019). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing* (Version 3.6.1) [Computer software]. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Ramirez, M. D. (2008). Procedural perceptions and support for the U.S. supreme court. *Political Psychology*, 29, 675–698. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00660.x>
- Rasinski, K. A. (1988). Economic justice, political behavior, and American political values. *Social Justice Research*, 2, 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01052300>
- Riggio, R. E., & Saggi, K. (2015). If we do our job correctly, nobody gets hurt by nepotism. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 19–21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2014.5>
- Rijkhoff, S. A. M. (2018). Still Questioning Cynicism. *Society*, 55, 333–340. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-018-0264-8>

- Ritter, B. A., & Lord, R. G. (2007). The impact of previous leaders on the evaluation of new leaders: An alternative to prototype matching. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 1683–1695. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1683>
- Robertson-Snape, F. (1999). Corruption, collusion and nepotism in Indonesia. *Third World Quarterly*, *20*, 589–602. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436599913703>
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48*. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02>
- Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *16*, 265–273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0029841>
- Scheepers, D., Spears, R., Doosje, B., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2006). The social functions of ingroup bias: Creating, confirming, or changing social reality. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *17*(1), 359–396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280601088773>
- Schiebinger, L. L., Henderson, A. D., & Gilmartin, S. K. (2008). *Dual-career academic couples: What universities need to know*. Michelle R. Clayman Institute for Gender Research, Stanford University.
- Schmidt, A. (2008). *Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale*. University of Maryland.
- Schreiber, J. B., Nora, A., Stage, F. K., Barlow, E. A., King, J., Nora, A., & Barlow, E. A. (2006). Reporting structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis results: A review. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *99*, 232–338. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.99.6.323-338>
- Scoppa, V. (2009). Intergenerational transfers of public sector jobs: A shred of evidence on nepotism. *Public Choice*, *141*, 167–188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-009-9444-9>
- Scully, M. A. (1997). Meritocracy. In P. H. Werhane & R. E. Freeman (Eds.), *Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Business Ethics* (pp. 413–414). Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317.weom020075>

- Shatiri, A. S. (2013). *Dinasti politik Ratu Atut setelah delapan tahun berkuasa*. Kompas. <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2013/12/18/0729208/Dinasti.Politik.Ratu.Atut.Setelah.Delapan.Tahun.Berkuasa?page=all>
- Son Hing, L. S., Bobocel, D. R., Zanna, M. P., Garcia, D. M., Gee, S. S., & Oraziotti, K. (2011). The merit of meritocracy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*, 433–450. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024618>
- Spencer-Rodgers, J., Williams, M. J., Hamilton, D. L., Peng, K., & Wang, L. (2007). Culture and group perception: Dispositional and stereotypic inferences about novel and national groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 525–543. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.4.525>
- Spranger, J. L., Colarelli, S. M., Dimotakis, N., Jacob, A. C., & Arvey, R. D. (2012). Effects of kin density within family-owned businesses. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *119*, 151–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2012.07.001>
- Stinson, M., & Wignall, C. (2018). *Fathers, children, and the intergenerational transmission of employers* (Working Paper No. 265). Center for Economic Studies, U.S. Census Bureau. <https://ideas.repec.org/p/cen/wpaper/18-12.html>
- Stroebe, K., Lodewijckx, H. F. M., & Spears, R. (2005). Do unto others as they do unto you: Reciprocity and social identification as determinants of ingroup favoritism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*, 831–845. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271659>
- Sundell, A. (2014). *Nepotism and meritocracy* (2014:16; QoG Working Paper Series, p. 29). The Quality of Government Institute.
- Syatiri, A. S. (2013). *Dinasti politik Ratu Atut setelah delapan tahun berkuasa*. Kompas.Com. <http://nasional.kompas.com/read/2013/12/18/0729208/Dinasti.Politik.Ratu.Atut.Setelah.Delapan.Tahun.Berkuasa>
- Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American*, *223*, 96–102. <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican1170-96>



- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole Pub. Co.
- Taylor, S. E. (1965). Eye movements in reading: Facts and fallacies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 2, 187–202. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312002004187>
- Tidwell, M. V. (2005). A social identity model of prosocial behaviors within nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 15, 449–467. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.82>
- Tinsley, C. H., Howell, T. M., & Amanatullah, E. T. (2015). Who should bring home the bacon? How deterministic views of gender constrain spousal wage preferences. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 126, 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.09.003>
- Trask, B. S. (2010). Approaches to Understanding Families. In *Globalization and Families* (pp. 21–38). Springer New York. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-88285-7\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-88285-7_2)
- Tyler, T. R. (1987). Condition leading to value-expressive effects in judgements of procedural justice: A test of four models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 333–344.
- Tyler, T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group-value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 830–838. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.5.830>
- Tyler, T. R. (1994). Psychological models of the justice motive: Antecedents of distributive and procedural justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 850–863. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.5.850>
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 349–361. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0704\\_07](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0704_07)
- Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 115–191. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60283-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60283-X)

- van den Bos, K., Lind, E. A., Vermunt, R., & Wilke, H. A. M. (1997). How do I judge my outcome when I do not know the outcome of others? The psychology of the fair process effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 1034–1046. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.5.1034>
- van den Bos, K., Lind, E. A., & Wilke, H. A. M. (2001). The psychology of procedural and distributive justice viewed from the perspective of fairness heuristic theory. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice* (pp. 49–66). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- van den Bos, K., Wilke, H. A. M., Lind, E. A., & Vermunt, R. (1998). Evaluating outcomes by means of the fair process effect: Evidence for different processes in fairness and satisfaction judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1493–1503. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1493>
- van der Toorn, J., Tyler, T. R., & Jost, J. T. (2011). More than fair: Outcome dependence, system justification, and the perceived legitimacy of authority figures. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*, 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.09.003>
- van Deth, J. W. (2016). What is Political Participation? In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.68>
- van Knippenberg, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2005). Leader self-sacrifice and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of leader prototypicality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*, 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.25>
- Vaughan, G. M., Tajfel, H., & Williams, J. (1981). Bias in reward allocation in an intergroup and interpersonal context. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *44*, 37. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3033861>
- Vera, C. F., & Dean, M. A. (2005). An examination of the challenges daughters face in family business succession. *Family Business Review*, *18*, 321–345. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2005.00051.x>
- Vermunt, R., Wit, A., Van Den Bos, K., & Lind, E. A. (1996). The effects of unfair procedure on negative affect and protest. *Social Justice Research*, *9*, 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02198075>

- Vinton, K. L. (1998). Nepotism: An interdisciplinary model. *Family Business Review*, *11*, 297–303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.1998.00297.x>
- Vreese, C. H. De. (2005). The spiral of cynicism reconsidered. *European Journal of Communication*, *20*, 283–301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323105055259>
- Wated, G., & Sanchez, J. I. (2012). The cultural boundary of managing nepotism. In R. G. Jones (Ed.), *Nepotism in organizations*. Routledge.
- Wated, G., & Sanchez, J. I. (2015). Managerial tolerance of nepotism: The effects of individualism collectivism in a Latin American context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *130*, 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2195-7>
- Werbel, J. D., & Hames, D. S. (1996). Anti-nepotism reconsidered: The case of husband and wife employment. *Group & Organization Management*, *21*, 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601196213006>
- Wong, Y.-T., Ngo, H.-Y., & Wong, C.-S. (2006). Perceived organizational justice, trust, and OCB: A study of Chinese workers in joint ventures and state-owned enterprises. *Journal of World Business*, *41*, 344–355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2006.08.003>
- Wu, H. D., & Coleman, R. (2014). The affective effect on political judgement: Comparing the influences of candidate attributes and issue congruence. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, *9*, 530–543. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699014538825>
- Ybema, J. F., & van den Bos, K. (2010). Effects of organizational justice on depressive symptoms and sickness absence: A longitudinal perspective. *Social Science & Medicine*, *70*, 1609–1617. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.01.027>
- Zajac, E. J., & Westphal, J. D. (1996). Who shall succeed? How COE/board preferences and power affect the choice of new CEOs. *Academy of Management Journal*, *39*, 64–90. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256631>



# Appendix A

## Supplementary materials for Chapter 2

### Scales' items

#### *Perceived competence*

To what extent do you think about X as:

1. Competent
2. Intelligent
3. Confident
4. Competitive
5. Independent

#### *Perceived nepotism*

In your opinion, to what extent do these statements apply to X?

1. X parents uses their connections and social status to get X to his job.
2. X got his job through nepotism.
3. X owe his job in part to the influence exerted by his parents.
4. Without his parents' connections, it is unlikely that X would have obtained his current job.

Note: Item 1 and 2 were used in Study 1. All items were used in Study 2.

#### *Deservingness*

In your opinion, to what extent do these statements apply to X?

1. I think X deserve his job.
2. I think X attained his job through personal endeavor and hard work.

#### *Check items*

1. What is the name of the character in description?
2. What was X grade for his Bachelor?
3. Where does X work?
4. Where does X's father work?

5. What is X's grandfather occupation?

Note: These manipulation check items were only used in Study 2.

*Distributive fairness*

In your opinion, to what extent do these statements apply to X?

1. I think the recruitment of X is fair, because X deserve the job.
2. I think the employment of X is fair, because X attained the job through personal endeavor.
3. Considering the qualification, it is not fair that X obtained the job.
4. The employment of X is unfair, because X does not possess the right qualification for it.

Note: Items 3 and 4 were reverse-coded so that higher score indicates fairer outcome.

*Procedural fairness*

1. In terms of recruitment procedure, X was treated equally to other applicants.
2. X benefited with a head start from information regarding the recruitment process.
3. In the recruitment process, X was treated favorably compared to other applicants.
4. It seems that someone who is close to X was exerting influence on the evaluation of X in the recruitment process.
5. The decision to employ someone should be based on as much valuable information as possible (CV, previous job performance, test results, academic attainment) but this premise was not necessary for X.
6. There might be a fabrication concerning the personal data of X in order to make X qualified the job.
7. The recruitment of X followed an ethical procedure.
8. The organization's human resources department showed a real interest in trying to be fair when hiring, including when they decided to hire X.

Note: Item 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were reversed coded so that higher score indicates fairer procedure.

## Effects of Company (JP Morgan vs. Internal Revenue Service [IRS]) in Study 2

All scales were analyzed in separate ANOVA's with Kinship, Competence, and Company as independent variables.

	JP Morgan	IRS	$F(1,159), p, \eta^2$
<b>Nepotism</b>	2.82 (1.53) [2.48, 3.15]	2.55 (1.44) [2.24, 2.86]	$F = 4.45$ $p = .036$ $\eta^2 = .017$
<b>Family ties</b>	3.22 (1.54) [2.88, 3.56]	2.88 (1.48) [2.56, 3.20]	$F = 6.15$ $p = .014$ $\eta^2 = .023$
<b>Effort</b>	3.22 (1.14) [2.97, 3.47]	3.52 (1.14) [3.27, 3.76]	$F = 4.38$ $p = .038$ $\eta^2 = .02$
<b>Ability</b>	3.17 (1.11) [2.93, 3.41]	3.45 (1.13) [3.20, 3.69]	$F = 3.87$ $p = .051$ $\eta^2 = .017$
<b>Luck</b>	2.72 (1.21) [2.45, 2.99]	2.46 (1.16) [2.21, 2.71]	$F = 1.54$ $p = .216$ $\eta^2 = .009$
<b>Discrimination based on physical disabilities</b>	1.32 (0.65) [1.18, 1.46]	1.36 (0.78) [1.2, 1.53]	$F = .32$ $p = .571$ $\eta^2 = .002$
<b>Discrimination based on age</b>	1.45 (0.80) [1.27, 1.63]	1.36 (0.63) [1.23, 1.5]	$F = 0.40$ $p = .528$ $\eta^2 = .002$
<b>Racism</b>	1.59 (0.93) [1.38, 1.79]	1.45 (0.88) [1.26, 1.64]	$F = 0.95$ $p = .331$ $\eta^2 = .006$
<b>Ethnocentrism</b>	1.59 (0.97) [1.37, 1.8]	1.51 (0.80) [1.33, 1.68]	$F = .32$ $p = .572$ $\eta^2 = .002$
<b>Sexism</b>	1.73 (1.08) [1.49, 1.97]	1.48 (0.91) [1.29, 1.68]	$F = 2.51$ $p = .115$ $\eta^2 = .015$
<b>Sexual prejudice (e.g., homophobic)</b>	1.34 (0.74) [1.18, 1.50]	1.22 (0.59) [1.10, 1.35]	$F = 1.23$ $p = .269$ $\eta^2 = .007$

Note: Standard deviations in parentheses, 95% confidence intervals in square brackets. For "attribution based on participants' ranking-order, lower number indicates higher ranking.

## Attribution of James' Employment Based on Participants Ranking-order in Study 2

Ranks were analyzed in separate ANOVA's with Kinship and Competence, as independent variables.

	Kinship		Competence			
	No kin	Kin	$F(1,159), p, \eta^2$	Low	High	$F(1,159), p, \eta^2$
<b>Nepotism</b>						
5.88	2.80	$F = 78.7$	4.08	4.61	$F = 2.83$	
(2.6)	(1.87)	$p < .001$	(2.85)	(2.62)	$p = .095$	
[5.32, 6.45]	[2.39, 3.2]	$\eta^2 = .320$	[3.47, 4.7]	[4.04, 5.19]	$\eta^2 = .012$	
<b>Family ties</b>						
5.64	2.55	$F = 60.34$	3.93	4.29	$F = 1.09$	
(3.03)	(2.03)	$p < .001$	(3.15)	(2.86)	$p = .298$	
[4.99, 6.3]	[2.11, 3]	$\eta^2 = .267$	[3.25, 4.61]	[3.67, 4.91]	$\eta^2 = .005$	
<b>Effort</b>						
2.77	4.24	$F = 14.85$	4.18	2.82	$F = 12.82$	
(2.65)	(2.51)	$p < .001$	(2.97)	(2.15)	$p < .001$	
[2.2, 3.35]	[3.69, 4.79]	$\eta^2 = .078$	[3.53, 4.82]	[2.35, 3.29]	$\eta^2 = .067$	
<b>Ability</b>						
3.00	3.98	$F = 9.07$	4.27	2.69	$F = 56.2$	
(2.45)	(2.32)	$p = .003$	(2.59)	(1.97)	$p < .001$	
[2.47, 3.53]	[3.47, 4.48]	$\eta^2 = .040$	[3.71, 4.84]	[2.26, 3.12]	$\eta^2 = .246$	
<b>Luck</b>						
3.73	5.47	$F = 20.33$	4.04	5.16	$F = 8.12$	
(2.16)	(2.86)	$p < .001$	(2.38)	(2.84)	$p = .005$	
[3.26, 4.19]	[4.85, 6.09]	$\eta^2 = .105$	[3.52, 4.55]	[4.54, 5.78]	$\eta^2 = .042$	
<b>Discrimination based on physical disabilities</b>						
8.76	8.65	$F = 0.16$	8.60	8.82	$F = 0.62$	
(1.7)	(1.98)	$p = .688$	(1.79)	(1.89)	$p = .432$	
[8.39, 9.13]	[8.22, 9.08]	$\eta^2 = .001$	[8.21, 8.98]	[8.41, 9.23]	$\eta^2 = .004$	
<b>Discrimination based on age</b>						
5.95	6.36	$F = 1.91$	6.27	6.04	$F = 0.67$	
(1.89)	(1.96)	$p = .169$	(2.04)	(1.82)	$p = .414$	
[5.54, 6.36]	[5.93, 6.79]	$\eta^2 = .012$	[5.83, 6.72]	[5.64, 6.43]	$\eta^2 = .004$	
<b>Racism</b>						
6.76	7.55	$F = 3.50$	6.96	7.35	$F = 0.78$	
(2.86)	(2.59)	$p = .063$	(2.79)	(2.71)	$p = .378$	
[6.14, 7.38]	[6.99, 8.12]	$\eta^2 = .021$	[6.36, 7.57]	[6.76, 7.94]	$\eta^2 = .005$	
<b>Ethnocentrism</b>						
7.57	7.64	$F = 0.03$	7.38	7.83	$F = 1.6$	
(2.4)	(2.2)	$p = .868$	(2.4)	(2.17)	$p = .208$	
[7.05, 8.09]	[7.16, 8.12]	$\eta^2 = .000$	[6.86, 7.9]	[7.36, 8.3]	$\eta^2 = .01$	
<b>Sexism</b>						
6.43	7.10	$F = 3.43$	6.55	6.98	$F = 1.36$	
(2.36)	(2.27)	$p = .066$	(2.52)	(2.11)	$p = .245$	
[5.92, 6.94]	[6.6, 7.59]	$\eta^2 = .020$	[6, 7.1]	[6.52, 7.44]	$\eta^2 = .008$	
<b>Sexual prejudice (e.g., homophobic)</b>						
9.50	9.66	$F = 0.43$	9.74	9.42	$F = 1.54$	
(1.81)	(1.51)	$p = .514$	(1.5)	(1.82)	$p = .217$	
[9.11, 9.89]	[9.33, 9.99]	$\eta^2 = .003$	[9.41, 10.06]	[9.03, 9.82]	$\eta^2 = .009$	

Note: Lower number indicates higher ranking. Standard deviations in parentheses, 95% confidence intervals in square brackets.



## Perception and Expectation toward the Three Universities in Study 5

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Perceived nepotism	University A	3.00	1.01	1.54, 24.16	2.51	0.097
	University B	2.91	0.95			
	University C	2.88	0.88			
Secretive	University A	2.68	0.69	2, 310	0.80	0.452
	University B	2.65	0.65			
	University C	2.71	0.67			
Organizational citizenship behaviors	University A	2.57	0.81	1.87, 290.06	1.02	0.357
	University B	2.61	0.79			
	University C	2.56	0.81			
Counterproductive work behaviors	University A	1.64	0.66	2, 310	0.85	0.426
	University B	1.64	0.66			
	University C	1.67	0.70			
Trust toward organization	University A	3.35	0.73	1.89, 293.14	1.35	0.259
	University B	3.39	0.67			
	University C	3.32	0.70			
Perceived own competence	University A	3.83	0.81	1.94, 296.72	0.93	0.376
	University B	3.87	0.85			
	University C	3.91	0.83			



# Appendix B

## Supplementary materials for Chapter 3

### Scales' items

#### *Nepotism*

1. In your opinion, how significant are family memberships in the U.S. politics?
2. In your opinion, to what extent does nepotism play a role in U.S. politics?
3. "U.S. politics is often a family affair." To what extent do you agree with this statement?

#### *Political cynicism*

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

1. To get nominated, most candidates for political office in the U.S. have to make necessary compromises and undesirable commitments.
2. U.S. politicians spend most of their time getting re-elected or re-appointed
3. These days politicians try to do too many things, including some activities that I do not think they have the right to do.
4. For the most part, politicians serve the interests of a few organized groups, such as business or labor, and aren't very concerned about the needs of people like me.
5. It seems that politicians often fail to take necessary actions on essential matters, even when most people favor such actions.
6. The way the politicians currently operate, I think they are hopelessly incapable of dealing with all the crucial problems facing the country today.
7. Elected politicians stop thinking about the public's interest immediately after taking office.
8. Politics are run to benefit the interests of a few big organizations.

9. Political parties are neglecting the interests of the people because of competition between political coalition and corruption problems.
10. Current U.S. politicians are not thinking about our problems very much.

*Procedural fairness*

1. Overall, how fair do you think U.S. politicians have treated you?
2. How respectful do you think U.S. politicians have treated you?
3. How much concern do U.S. politicians show for your individual rights?
4. To what extent do U.S. politicians get all the information needed to make right decisions about how to handle issues in this country?
5. How hard do you think U.S. politicians try to bring the problems in this nation into the open so that they could be resolved?
6. How honest are politicians in what they say to the people?
7. How much opportunity do U.S. politicians give to the people to describe relevant issues before any decisions are made about how to handle them?
8. How much consideration do U.S. politicians give to the people when making decisions about how to handle problems faced by this country?
9. Overall, how fair do you think the procedures are that are used by U.S. politicians to handle problems in this country?
10. How hard do U.S. politicians try to do the right thing for the people?
11. How dignified do U.S. politicians treat the people of this country?
12. How hard do U.S. politicians try to explain the reasons behind their decisions to the people?
13. How hard do U.S. politicians try to take account of the people's needs in making political decisions?
14. U.S. Politicians use methods that are equally fair to everyone

### *Attitudes toward political participation*

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

1. There are too many, but few people politically active in this country
2. Somebody who complains about political parties should join a party to change it
3. We should take the chance to participate in politics
4. We should participate more in politics to influence political decisions.

How much do you value the following?

5. Working for political party.
6. Supporting a political candidate.
7. Visiting political debate or campaign.
8. Contacting politicians (for example, via post-mail, e-mail, or social media).

Note: Item 1 to 5 were used in Studies 1 and 2, but not in Studies 3 and 4. Item 5 to 10 were used in Studies 3 and 4, but not in Studies 1 and 2.

### *Intention to participate in politics*

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

1. I would work for a political party.
2. I would support a political candidate during an election campaign.
3. I would visit political debates or campaign events.
4. I would contact politicians (for example via post-mail, e-mail, social media).

### *Political protest*

How likely would you engage in the following behaviors?

1. Sign a petition as means of protest
2. Joining in boycott
3. Participate in peaceful demonstration

## **The interaction of the prominence of family ties and national identification on perceived nepotism in Study 2**

We conducted a regression analysis in which Condition (coded 0 = control, 1 = prominent family ties), national identification (mean centered) and the Interaction (Condition x national identification) were entered as predictors of perceived nepotism. The main effect of Condition on perceived nepotism was significant,  $B = 0.47$ ,  $SE = 0.09$ ,  $t = 3.86$ ,  $p < .001$ , while the main effect of national identification,  $B = -0.14$ ,  $SE = 0.12$ ,  $t = -1.51$ ,  $p = .133$ , and the Interaction were not significant,  $B = -0.02$ ,  $SE = 0.12$ ,  $t = -0.18$ ,  $p = .855$ .







# Appendix C

## Supplementary materials for Chapter 4

### Scales' items

#### *Belief in the merit of nepotism*

To what extent do you believe in the following?

1. Because “an apple would not fall away from its tree”, a son of a good person will become a good person too.
2. A child of an effective leader will most likely become an effective leader too.
3. It makes sense to trust a person who comes from a trustworthy family than to trust a person from an untrustworthy family.
4. Children of people with high integrity will have high integrity too because parents with high integrity will pass down their values and integrity to their children.
5. We should support children of intelligent people to leadership position because intelligent people are more likely to have intelligent offspring.
6. “Like father, like son”, a charismatic father will make a charismatic son.
7. We should support children of effective leaders because they can rely on their parents and family members for trustworthy advises.
8. Children of knowledgeable and competent people are more likely to become knowledgeable and competent too because their parents would ensure to pass down these traits to them.

#### *Liking for the leader (and the target)*

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

1. I think that (this person) is very well adjusted.
2. I would highly recommend (this person) for a responsible job.
3. In my opinion, (this person) is an exceptionally mature person.
4. I have great confidence in (this person)'s good judgment.

5. Most people would react very favorably to (this person) after a brief acquaintance.
6. I would vote for (this person) for a leadership position.
7. I think that (this person) is one of those people who quickly wins respect.
8. I feel that (this person) is an extremely intelligent person.
9. (This person) can be a very likeable person.
10. (This person) is the sort of person whom I myself would like to be.
11. It seems to me that it is very easy for (this person) to gain admiration.

Note: In Study 2, the words in brackets were substituted with the child or stranger, depending on the target that participants had to evaluate. Liking for the target was not assessed in Study 1.

### *Leadership effectiveness*

Based on the personality profile, if this person is your leader, to what extent do agree with the following statements?

1. I would trust (this person).
2. (This person) is an excellent leader.
3. (The person) is an enthusing leader.
4. (The person) would awaken my feelings of commitment to do my job well.
5. (The person) would exert himself for the benefit of my organization.

Note: The words in brackets were substituted with the child or stranger, depending on the target that participants had to evaluate.

### *Target-leader similarity*

How similar (or different) would you think about the personality of the child (or stranger, friend) of the person?

1. Openness to experience.
2. Conscientiousness.
3. Extroversion.
4. Agreeableness.
5. Emotional stability.

How similar (or different) would you think about the leadership profile of the son of the person?

1. Persuasion skills
2. Ability to provide intellectual stimulation to others.
3. Concern towards others' well-being.
4. Ability to inspire and motivate others.
5. Ability to become a role model.

### *Liking for the target*

If the child (or stranger) become your leader in the future, to what extent do you agree with the following statements?

1. I would trust the son.
2. The son would make an excellent leader.
3. The son would be enthusing leader.
4. The son would awaken my feelings of commitment to do my job well.
5. The son would exert himself for the benefit of my organization.

### *Beliefs in biological determinism*

To what extent do you believe in the followings?

1. I think the chief reason why parents and children are so alike in behavior and character is that they possess a shared genetic inheritance.
2. In my opinion, alcoholism is caused primarily by genetic factors.
3. I think that differences between men and women in behavior and personality are largely determined by genetic predisposition.
4. I believe that children inherit many of their personal traits from their parents.
5. In my view, the development of homosexuality in a person can be attributed to genetic causes.
6. I am convinced that very few behavioral traits of human can be traced back to their genes.
7. I believe that many talents that individuals possess can be attributed to genetic causes.
8. I think that the upbringing by parents and the social environment have far greater significance for the development of abilities and personal traits than genetic predisposition.

9. I believe that many differences between humans of different skin color can be attributed to differences in genetic predispositions.
10. I think that genetic predispositions have little influence on a person's personality characteristics.
11. In my view, many forms of human behavior are biologically determined and can therefore be seen as instinctual.
12. The fate of each person lies in his or her genes.
13. I am of the opinion that intelligence is a trait that is strongly determined by genetic predispositions.
14. I believe that genetic predispositions have no influence whatsoever on the development of intellectual abilities.
15. I am convinced that the analysis of the genetic predispositions of an embryo allows good predictions as to which characteristic and abilities the child will develop.
16. I think the genetic differences between Asians and Europeans are an important cause for the differences in abilities between individuals from these groups.
17. I think that twins, because of the identical genetic predispositions, will be very similar in their behavior even if they were adopted and raised in different families.
18. I believe that an analysis of my genetic predispositions will allow a trained scientist to predict many of my abilities and traits without having any personal knowledge of me.

*Perceived entitativity of a family*

Please indicate your opinion concerning the following questions about a family as a social group:

1. How cohesive (i.e., united) do you expect a family would be?
2. How important would a family be for its members?
3. How organized would you expect a family would be?
4. How similar would you expect members of a family to each other (e.g., appearance, intellectual, personality, etc.)?
5. To what extent do you think that members of a family would feel that they are part of their family?
6. Some groups have the characteristics of a "group" more than others do. To what extent would a family qualify as a group?

7. Some groups possess a core personality; although there may be differences and similarities in their behaviors, underneath they are basically the same. To what extent do you expect a family possess a core personality?
8. How variable would you expect the behaviors of a family?
9. Some group possess basic or fundamental qualities that do not seem to change much over time. Other groups possess qualities or characteristics that do change. How *changeable* do you expect the characteristics of a family?
10. Some groups are conflicted; they are uncertain or unsure of their attitudes, values, and goals. Other group's attitudes, values and goals are definite and firm. How conflicted would you expect a family?
11. To what extent would a family be able to achieve its goals and make things happen (e.g., produce specific outcomes)?
12. Some groups are coherent; their attitudes, values, and goals seem to be harmonious and compatible. Other groups' attitudes, values, and goals seem to be incompatible or in disagreement. How coherent would you expect a family be?
13. Some groups' attitude, values, and behaviors depend very much on where they are or who they are with. Other groups' attitudes, values, and behaviors are pretty much the same regardless of where they are or who they are with. How much do the attitudes, values, and behaviors of a family depend on where they are or who they are with?
14. Some groups have the characteristic of being distinctive or unique. That is, they do not share many qualities or characteristics with other groups. How distinctive would a family be compared to other families?

### **The effect of leader's Gender on Target-leader Similarity in Study 1**

We conducted a regression analysis in which we entered stranger condition (0 = Child, 1 = stranger) and friend condition (0 = Child, 1 = stranger), belief in the merit of nepotism (centered), and leader's gender (0 = man, 1 = woman) as predictors of target-leader similarity. The results showed non-significant effect of leader's gender,  $B = 0.07$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $t = 0.85$ ,  $p = .392$ .

## **The Effect of Leader's Gender on Target's Effectiveness in Study 1**

We repeated the previous analysis substituting target-leaders similarity with target's effectiveness as the dependent variable. The results showed non-significant effect of leader's gender,  $B = 0.09$ ,  $SE = 0.10$ ,  $t = 0.88$ ,  $p = .377$ .







# Acknowledgement

There is a saying in Indonesia “*Berat sama dipikul, ringan sama dijinjing.*” Loosely translated, it means heavyweight should be shouldered together with others, while lightweight should be held together with others. Although there is only one name on the cover page of this thesis, I would not be able to complete this thesis without the ‘shoulder’ of others.

I would like to express my gratitude to my mentors. Eleven years have passed since the first time I collaborate with Esther when she was supervising my master’s thesis. Since then, she patiently guided me to become a good researcher. I cannot name any other person that has made a more meaningful impact on my development as a researcher than her. Esther was also the bridge that made it possible for me to meet Daan, who also lent me a ‘shoulder’, that I could never repay. Daan’s natural patience, guidance, and encouragement have been a significant ‘motor’ for me to complete this thesis. I owe this thesis to these two magnificent people.

I would also like to thank my office mate, Hilmar for his tolerance on my random babbling at the office as well as his warm company outside the office. I am also grateful to have met fellow Indonesian in Leiden: Arfiansyah, Julia, mba’ Mega, Dian, Renzy, Rio, Mas Tio, Kang Deny, and Dito. These people provided me with the essential social-emotional support while I was far away from home.

I dedicate this thesis to my family. Like parents, like children: I would probably have never thought about taking a career path in academia if they had not introduced me to their ‘world’. My deepest gratitude to my wife, Yunita. This thesis could not have been realized without her love, understanding, and support. Finally, when they are old enough to understand this, I would like my two little ‘monsters’, Raesa and Chayra, to know that they are the ultimate reason for me to complete this thesis.

Omar