



MSU Graduate Theses

Spring 2006

Occupational Nepotism Among Law Firms: A Study of Nepotism Beyond Anecdotal Evidence

Tracy L. Stout
tracystout@missouristate.edu

As with any intellectual project, the content and views expressed in this thesis may be considered objectionable by some readers. However, this student-scholar's work has been judged to have academic value by the student's thesis committee members trained in the discipline. The content and views expressed in this thesis are those of the student-scholar and are not endorsed by Missouri State University, its Graduate College, or its employees.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/theses>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stout, Tracy L., "Occupational Nepotism Among Law Firms: A Study of Nepotism Beyond Anecdotal Evidence" (2006). *MSU Graduate Theses*. 3.
<https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/theses/3>

This article or document was made available through BearWorks, the institutional repository of Missouri State University. The work contained in it may be protected by copyright and require permission of the copyright holder for reuse or redistribution.

For more information, please contact [BearWorks@library.missouristate.edu](mailto: BearWorks@library.missouristate.edu).

**OCCUPATIONAL NEPOTISM AMONG LAW FIRMS: A STUDY OF
NEPOTISM BEYOND ANECDOTAL EVIDENCE**

A Thesis

Presented to

The Graduate College of
Missouri State University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science, Psychology

By

Tracy L. Stout

May 2006

**OCCUPATIONAL NEPOTISM AMONG LAW FIRMS: A STUDY OF
NEPOTISM BEYOND ANECDOTAL EVIDENCE**

Psychology

Missouri State University, May 2006

Master of Science

Tracy L. Stout

ABSTRACT

Although nepotism is not a new subject, there are not many studies addressing the psychological issues associated with the phenomenon, particularly in the workplace. The idea of “new nepotism” has emerged with the notion that some offspring have chosen the same profession as their parents, and have not been forced into a career decision or made an opportunistic decision regardless of their ability to perform. The purpose of this study was to explore workplace nepotism using an empirical research approach. Using a career choice and self-determination theory framework, a survey was devised and sent to 673 practicing attorneys in a Midwestern metropolitan area. Lawyers were chosen for this study due to the findings of prevalence of nepotism within this population. Scales in the survey measured work satisfaction, self-determination in choosing a career, and workplace nepotism. Data from the returned questionnaires was analyzed and correlations among the levels of self-determination, nepotism and satisfaction were determined. Results show that self-determination is positively correlated with work satisfaction regardless of the presence of nepotism in the workplace. Self-determination was negatively correlated with coercive nepotism and positively correlated with self-determined nepotism. These findings support the hypothesis that individuals high in self-determination are more likely to choose a career based on full volition and by doing so will have higher work satisfaction.

KEYWORDS: Nepotism, Self-determination, Satisfaction, Law, Occupation

This abstract is approved as to form and content

Robert G. Jones
Chairperson, Advisory Committee
Missouri State University

**OCCUPATIONAL NEPOTISM AMONG LAW FIRMS: A STUDY OF
NEPOTISM BEYOND ANECDOTAL EVIDENCE**

By

Tracy L. Stout

A Thesis
Submitted to The Graduate College
Of Missouri State University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Science, Psychology

May 2006

Approved:

Chairperson, Robert G. Jones, Ph. D.

Member, Chantal Levesque, Ph.D.

Member, Donald Fischer, Ph.D.

Frank Einhellig, Graduate College Dean

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank Robert (BJ) Cook for all his help in preparing and delivering the survey packets. I also want to thank him for his overall willingness and support throughout the duration of this project.

I would also like to thank and acknowledge Joshua R. Edler for his help in entering the survey data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	vi
Occupational Nepotism Among Law Firms	
Nepotism	1
Occupational Choices.....	4
Self-determination theory.....	5
Method	7
Participants.....	7
Procedures	8
Measures	8
Results	11
Discussion	14
Limitations	15
Future Research.....	16
Conclusion	16
References	18
Appendix A: Questionnaire	20

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1, Internal Reliabilities for Self-Determination subscales	10
Table 2, Rotated Factor Matrix for Nepotism Scale	12
Table 3, Descriptive Statistics	12
Table 4, Correlations Among Study Variables	13

Nepotism

Nepotism is a practice that has been prevalent throughout the world for many generations (Bellow, 2003). Although nepotism is not a new subject, there are not many studies addressing the psychological issues associated with the phenomenon, particularly in the workplace. In fact, Bellow (2003), states in his book *In Praise of Nepotism* that “no social scientist has studied this phenomenon” (p.9). Although he is not quite accurate in his statement, only a select few, reviewed here, have attempted to investigate nepotism. Still, not much social research has been published; therefore, this paper will attempt to explore occupational nepotism using an empirical research approach. This paper will investigate nepotism using a self-determination in career choice approach with theories of self-determination to frame the reasoning behind the research.

Nepotism is defined as “the bestowal of patronage by reason of relationship regardless of merit” (Simon, Clark & Tifft, 1966). Bellow supplements this traditional definition by suggesting a modern definition of nepotism referring to it as “favoritism based on kinship” (p.11). Nepotism is generally seen as using family influence in order to employ relatives (Jones, 2004). Traditional definitions do not include a distinguishable difference in nepotism as a hiring decision based solely on family ties (kinship) or as a familial occupation choice that leads to hiring based on merit. Bellow (2003) introduces the idea that “new nepotism” has emerged with the notion that some offspring have chosen the same profession as their parents. Emphasis on this idea is placed on choice and not forced occupation decisions or opportunistic decisions regardless of their ability to perform. This idea also includes the

“willingness to take advantage” (Bellow, 2003) of provided opportunities by family members as opposed to being forced in a position based on relationship ties regardless of merit.

The majority of investigations into this nepotism phenomenon relate to two issues. The first issue is anti-nepotism policies which are designed to prevent family members from working in the same organization. The second issue is employees’ perceptions of family members working within the same organization. Werbel and Hames (1996), attempted to examine anti-nepotism policies as related to dual-career couples in which the husband and wife worked in the same organization. They described how anti-nepotism policies were used in order to reduce any issues that could result from having family members work within the same organization. Regarding anti-nepotism policies, Reed and Bruce (1993) emphasized the importance of allowing family members, including spouses to work together, especially when employees have begun to see the workplace as an opportunity to meet potential spouses. Similarly, Nelton (1998) believed there to be a bright side to nepotism. She researched the perceptions and beliefs of nonfamily members within family businesses and found that they do not have negative attitudes toward family members and “actually treat family employees very well (p. 72).” Nelton (1998) believes that there is fear, not reason or fact behind anti-nepotistic practices, and behind employees’ perceptions that encourage organizations to keep anti-nepotism policies.

A few other investigations into nepotism focus more on the favoritism aspect in which a person in a higher position has the authority to offer an occupational opportunity to an individual based solely on who they are, usually a relative, and not

based on the individual's work qualifications. For example, Mutlu (2000) discussed the problems within a police organization in which the police force was comprised of individuals who had been appointed based on favoritism and nepotism. In this specific situation, the environment created due to favoritism was so negatively viewed that it was thought to disturb the very morality of the police force and would carry immorality to the societal level. Another study (Lentz & Laband, 1988) investigated favoritism shown by acceptance into medical schools. This was based on G. S. Becker's (1959) statement about why doctors' sons seem to become doctors more frequently as compared to non-doctors' sons. The study found that doctors' children were admitted into medical school nearly fourteen percent more often than those who were comparable to them except for the fact that neither parent was a doctor (Lentz & Laband, 1988). Their conclusions were that nepotistic explanations for these results could not be ruled out as causal factors for the favoritism shown to the offspring of doctors. This study also introduced the idea of human capital transfer from parents to offspring. This human capital transfer idea states that merely having exposure to their parents' occupation will raise the chances that children will be in that same occupation as compared to children whose parent(s) were not in that occupation.

Many questions dealing with parental influence and occupational choice have arisen from the previous research; few have been answered. For example, how do contextual factors such as parents' occupation affect the occupation decisions of their offspring? What makes a person choose a career path similar to their parents or previous generation? Is it preference, pressure or opportunity that creates the appearance of nepotism? Are job choices in nepotism the result of kinship, knowledge

of the career, skills and abilities developed for the career, or a combination of these and will these choices have an impact on the individual's satisfaction? This study will attempt to explore some of these mechanics of nepotistic career choices.

Occupational Choices and the Previous Generation

Parents have a fundamental effect on their offspring's occupational development (Guay, Senecal, Gauthier & Fernet, 2003), but what type of effect they have is not altogether clear. According to Whiston and Keller (2004), parents do share a considerable amount of career –relevant knowledge with their children. Some offspring may choose the same occupation as their parents due to occupational lending of relevant knowledge and skills from parent to child (Laband & Lentz, 1992). For example, a lawyer transfers her knowledge of the law to her children, and this transferred knowledge is a significant factor in the child's decision to follow in the lawyer parent's footsteps. One study found that only 5% of sons from nonlawyer parents had an interest in law compared to 35% of lawyers' sons having an interest for law (Laband & Lentz, 1992). This finding suggests that the decision to choose the same occupation as one's parent could be based on this transfer of occupation-specific knowledge and skills from one generation to the next and not necessarily nepotism.

This set of career development explanations for parent-child occupation similarities differs substantially from a more opportunistic explanation. Parents can use their positions within an organization to obtain opportunities for their children. Offspring who have been provided these opportunities then can choose to accept or pass on these opportunities. There are various reasons why children would accept these opportunities. For example, children may choose the same career as their

parent(s) simply for the opportunity of financial gain as shown in a study where men were found to earn five to eight percent more if they chose the same occupation as their father compared to other individuals in the same occupation (Worklife, 2002). Similarly, some may choose the opportunity simply because it was presented to them by a parent and it seems to be an easy career path to follow compared to trying to find a job on their own. Still others may feel pressure from the family to accept the offered job.

Self-determination Theory

One way of distinguishing coercive as well as opportunistic career choices from more interest-related occupational choices comes from self-determination theory (SDT). SDT is a motivational theory. It explains the extent to which a person's behaviors are self-determined, or based on choice, and focuses on the concept of autonomy (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999). This theory also posits environmental factors that have an influence on the development of self-motivation. This motivational tendency, in turn, has been shown to affect social functioning and personal well-being in various domains (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

SDT provides a clear distinction between motivation that is autonomous versus motivation that is based on control (Ryan & Connell, 1989). Self-determination involves autonomous regulation in which there is a feeling of choice and full volition. When a decision is made autonomously, behavior will have more perceived importance and be compatible with the decision maker's values. A non-self-determined, or controlled decision, involves pressure or coercion. A decision based on

control instead of self-determination is made due to such factors as feelings of threat, demand, reward, or even guilt.

A distinction between coercive nepotism and self-determined nepotism could be made based on this difference between decisions. Self-determined nepotism would occur when an individual would accept a job offer by a family member when they strongly believe that the job offered is in their desired and chosen career path.

Coercive nepotism is non-self-determined and occurs when an individual accepts a job offer from a family member when they feel they are coerced into the decision. This coercion could be based on pressure from family members to be in the same occupation thus continuing a sort of “family tradition.” A third type of proposed nepotism is opportunistic nepotism in which an individual accepts a job offer from a family member without feelings of family pressure or coercion or without freely choosing the position. This type of nepotism is based more on only accepting what is being offered due to feelings of ease in finding a good job, not really choosing a certain career path.

SDT is used as the theoretical basis for this research because it suggests that the degree to which people are motivated by autonomous reasons for behaving will predict the reasoning behind their vocational choice. Using SDT as a basis, it is proposed that individuals with more self-determining characteristics (autonomy and self-regulation) will be more inclined to narrow their choices to a more select area based on their personal preferences. For example, a self-determined person having knowledge in the field of psychology might narrow their vocational choices to only that field, whereas a person with the same knowledge but with less self-determination

might accept a job offer outside the field of psychology because of opportunistic reasons. The self-determined person will focus on more specific choices, and thereby narrow their range of acceptance.

Hypothesis 1. People who are more self-determined are more likely to choose nepotistic job opportunities that are not based on coercion or simple opportunity.

Research has indicated that positive consequences such as well-being and better health are highly correlated with goal-directed behavior that is not controlled, but instead is based on a person's own choice (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Self-determination has other positive consequences such as effectiveness (Thomas and Tymon, 1994) and a reduction in job strain (Sutton & Kahn, 1987). Deci and Ryan's research (1985) also lead to the conclusion that self-determination was an important determinant of satisfaction including job satisfaction. This leads to the next hypothesis dealing with self-determined behavior and work satisfaction. It is hypothesized that people who are self-determined will choose an occupation based on their personal preferences and interests thus leading to greater work satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2. People who have greater self-determination will make more self-determining career choices and be more satisfied with their work.

METHOD

Participants

A total of 275 participants completed the questionnaire. Participants were 210 (76%) males and 65 (24%) females from law offices in a Midwestern metropolitan area. The sample age ranged from 21 to 61 with the majority (78%) working in the

private sector. Lawyers were chosen for this study due to the findings of prevalence of nepotism within this population.

Procedure

This research was approved by the departmental college and university Human Subjects Review Boards. Survey packets were distributed to 673 law offices in a Midwestern metropolitan area. Each packet contained a short introductory letter, a paper and pencil questionnaire and a business reply envelope. All surveys included a statement of informed consent, voluntary participation and anonymity. The paper and pencil questionnaire (Appendix A) included scales to measure work satisfaction, self-determination in choosing a career, and workplace nepotism.

Measures

Demographic Measures. Participants were asked to report such demographics as gender, age, practicing sectors, and salary. An open-ended comment section was also included at the end of the questionnaire in which participants were given the opportunity to provide any additional comments they had about the study.

Work Satisfaction. A section in the questionnaire was used to produce a satisfaction with work score. This scale was comprised of 10 self-assessed questions using a seven-point Likert scale anchored on the low end by “strongly disagree” and on the high end by “strongly agree.” Questions were derived from Hackman & Oldham’s Job Diagnostic Survey (1976), and included items such as “I am proud to tell others about the job that I perform” and “Overall, I am satisfied with my current job” were included. Items were coded (items 1, 3, and 5 were reverse coded) so that

high scores were indicative of greater work satisfaction. In this sample, the alpha coefficient was .71.

Self-determination. An adaptation of the State Academic Motivation Scale (Guay & Vallerand, 1997) was used to measure the amount of self-determination. The scale assesses the six types of motivation using items to measure intrinsic motivation (IM), integrated regulation (INTEG), identified regulation (IDEN), introjected regulation (INTRO), external regulation (ER), and amotivation (AMO). The question “Why did you choose this occupation?” was asked with response items given on a seven-point Likert format using a range of “strongly disagree” at the low end and “strongly agree” at the high end. Sample item responses are “because it allows me to use skills that are important to me (IDEN),” “because I would feel bad if I didn’t (INTRO),” “because I really enjoy it (IM),” “I have the impression I’m wasting my time (AMO),” “because I feel I have to (ER),” and “because it’s a practical way to apply new knowledge in this field (INTEG).” The scores are averaged by creating a self-determination index (SDI). The SDI takes into consideration the level of self-determination underlying each form of motivation. Because intrinsic motivation, integration and identification are self-determined forms of motivation they receive positive weights in the equation. In contrast, because introjection, external regulation and amotivation are non-self-determined forms of motivation, they receive negative weight in the equation. The SDI is calculated in the following way: $SDI = 3(IM) + 2(INTEG) + (IDEN) - (INTRO) - 2(ER) - 3(AMO)$. Higher scores are indicative of greater self-determination. These questions probe into the degree to which the occupational choice made by the participant was based on full volition and feelings of

choice instead of any feelings based on coercion. Previous internal reliability coefficients for each scale varies and ranges from .71 to .90 and .86 to .97 have been reported (Levesque, 2004). The internal reliabilities of our study ranged from .49 to .90 and are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Internal Reliabilities for Self-Determination Subscales

	Previous Findings Time 1	Previous Findings Time 2	Current Findings
Intrinsic Motivation	.86	.97	.90
Integrated Regulation	.86	.87	.78
Identified Regulation	.90	.94	.69
Introjected Regulation	.71	.86	.74
External Regulation	.81	.87	.49
Amotivation	.52	.91	.78

Nepotism. Participants were asked to list parents’ career titles and a portion of the questions consisted of a yes/no format. Items included such questions as “Do your parents or grandparents work in the same firm as you?” and “Were you hired into the same firm as your parents or grandparents?” These items were used to assess the presence of nepotism in participants’ current occupation. An index was formed by combining responses to these questions and creating a dichotomous nepotism variable (nepotism present and no nepotism present).

Occupational Nepotism. The extent to which choice of occupation was a result of different types of nepotism was assessed using a scale developed for this study. The Nepotism in Occupational Choice Scale (NOCS) was developed. This scale is comprised of nine items with three items for each type of nepotistic career

choice (coercive, opportunistic and self-determined). These consisted of items such as “because I felt pressure from my family to obtain this job” for coercive nepotism, “because my parents or family member(s) could help me get a job if I chose this occupation” for opportunistic nepotism and “because I felt this occupation was suited for me” for self-determined nepotism.

RESULTS

Out of the 673 surveys delivered, 275 (279 counting the four that were returned blank or incomplete) were returned, providing a response rate of 41%. This is a very good response rate for paper and pencil mailed surveys; however, it is unknown whether there were differences between respondents and non-respondents.

The nepotism in occupation choice scale was submitted to principal axis factor analysis. Squared multiple correlations were used as initial communality estimates and eigenvalues greater than one were used to decide the number of factors. Varimax rotation provided the best simple structure in the final three factor solution. One of the items did not load well on any factor. This item was the opportunistic item “because I could easily find a job.” The remaining eight items were then used to form composites. These composites fell cleanly into the conceptual scheme of opportunistic (two items, $\alpha = .75$), coercive (three items, $\alpha = .78$), and self-determined nepotism (three items, $\alpha = .57$). Table 2 shows the rotated factor matrix for the eight items on the nepotism scale.

Descriptive statistics showing means and standard deviations are shown in Table 3. Correlations were also calculated to test study hypotheses. A correlation

matrix showing the variables related to job nepotism, self-determination and nepotistic occupational choice are presented in Table 4.

Table 2. Rotated Factor Matrix for Nepotism Scale; Questionnaire items and factor loadings

Items	Factors		
	Opportunistic Nepotism	Self-Determined Nepotism	Coercive Nepotism
Parents have similar jobs	.845		
Parents could help me get a job	.658		
Occupation sounded interesting		.446	
Occupation was suited for me		.723	
Is the type of occupation I always wanted		.578	
Felt pressure from my family			.596
Would be treated badly by family			.805
Family would be mad			.875

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics.

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Gender	1.24	.426
Nepotism	.39	.488
Work Satisfaction	58.887	6.206
Self-Determination Index	56.931	26.697
Opportunistic Nepotism	3.287	2.231
Self-Determined Nepotism	16.800	2.625
Coercive Nepotism	4.1018	2.116

N=275

Table 4. Correlations among study variables.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Work Satisfaction	-				
2. Self-Determination	.625**	-			
3. Opportunistic Nepotism	-.075	-.103	-		
4. Self-Determined Nepotism	.222**	.335**	-.031	-	
5. Coercive Nepotism	-.154*	-.330**	.434**	-.217**	-
6. Presence of Nepotism	.004	-.014	.394**	-.056	.135*

*p<.05; **p<.01

The correlations from Table 4 were examined to test Hypothesis 1. Statistical analysis showed a significant positive correlation between self-determination and self-determined nepotism ($r = .33$; $p < .01$). Self-determination was significantly and negatively correlated with coercive nepotism ($r = -.33$; $p < .01$) as expected. These findings partially support Hypothesis 1 in which self-determined individuals are not likely to choose an occupation based on coercion. It was also expected that self-determination would be significantly and negatively correlated with opportunistic nepotism; however, these findings did not support that component of the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2 stated that individuals with greater self-determination should make more self-determining occupational choices and also have greater work satisfaction. Table 4 shows significant and positive correlations between self-determination and work satisfaction ($r = .62$, $p < .01$). Table 4 also shows a significant and positive correlation between self-determining occupational choice and work satisfaction ($r = .22$, $p < .01$) and a negative correlation between coercive occupational choice and work satisfaction ($r = -.15$, $p < .05$). Results of a mediated regression analysis showed that self-determination predicted work satisfaction regardless of the presence of occupational choice variables. Hypothesis 2 was thus supported. A

regression using the presence of nepotism as an initial covariate did not show any differences in the prediction of work satisfaction by self-determination or nepotistic occupational choice scales.

DISCUSSION

Previous research in nepotism has primarily focused on individuals' (negative) perceptions of nepotism and nepotistic practices/policies within organizations. The purpose of this study was to examine a different perception based on an individual's self-determination in their career choice when presented with a nepotistic situation. This study also expands on positive self-determination outcomes, such as greater satisfaction. Study predictions were partly supported by research findings.

Consistent with previous research (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000; Sutton & Kahn 1987; Thomas & Tymon, 1994), the prediction that positive outcomes (work satisfaction in this case) would increase as self-determination levels increase was supported. In our particular study, the presence of nepotism did not negatively effect this relationship. Work satisfaction levels were higher when self-determination levels were higher regardless of the presence of nepotism or occupational choice variables.

For the most part, Hypothesis 1 was supported. Although opportunistic nepotism was not significantly correlated with self-determination, coercive nepotism was. When self-determination levels were higher, coercive nepotism levels were lower. This finding supports the premise that if an individual is highly self-determined, then they are less likely to report being forced by family members to choose a career that they do not wish to pursue. Self-determination also had a strong positive relationship with self-determined nepotism, meaning that participants who

were highly self-determined tended to choose their occupation independently of family pressures. This occurred regardless of whether people were employed in a nepotistic environment. This finding relates to the original idea of “new nepotism” in which family members take a personal interest in a previous generation’s occupation, possibly experience a transfer of occupation-specific knowledge and then base their career decision based on this knowledge, rather than on the basis of coercion.

Unanticipated findings occurred with regard to workplace nepotism and opportunistic occupational choice. First, an unexpected finding was that opportunistic nepotism was not associated with self-determination, but was associated with workplace nepotism. The latter (workplace nepotism) was not related to self-determination or the other two types of nepotistic choice.

Limitations

Various limitations arose during this study. The main limitation related to our sample. Lawyers were used for this study because nepotism appeared to be prevalent within this specific population. In spite of previous findings, within our sample the prevalence of nepotism was lower than anticipated. More relevant findings might emerge given a larger sample containing more cases of nepotism.

Second, the occupational nepotism scale was developed for this study and has not yet undergone further analyses such as confirmatory factor analysis. Reliability of the opportunistic scale could be increased and possibly impact future results.

Future Research

Other future research would include a study conducted on a larger nepotistic sample as well as duplicate studies to adequately test results. Future nepotism studies

using the variables in this study should be conducted to evaluate gender, age and salary differences. Also, data should be reviewed to determine which family members had a greater influence on participants career choice, to what extent do participants feel that the transfer of knowledge helped them choose their career or helped them perform well in their career and how much would they themselves encourage their children to enter law school to the extent that they would be very coercive or offer the opportunity for a position in their firm. More in depth research should be conducted to explore this novel idea of “new nepotism” and the factors that influence offspring to make nepotistic choices. Further research should also be conducted on the occupational nepotism scale and into the issue of opportunism in career choice. Based on our findings pertaining to opportunistic career choice into a nepotistic environment, it seems that there are other factors that lead to deciding to choose an occupation simply based on opportunity.

CONCLUSION

Although our findings were not exactly as hypothesized, this research is a beneficial step in the study of nepotism. As previously stated, there have not been many studies pertaining to nepotism other than negative perceptions associated with its occurrence or existence within organizations. In fact, Bellow (2003) currently having the only published book on nepotism, opened the door for more positive research which we have taken advantage of in our study. With this study, we suggest that self-determined individuals are not as likely to enter a nepotistic environment when coerced and also more likely to enter this environment when it is volitionally chosen. Our findings did suggest a relationship between self-determination and two

types of nepotism (self-determined and coercive); however, we did not demonstrate that self-determination plays a role with nepotistic occupational choices based on opportunity.

While this study supports the benefits of self-determination (e.g. work satisfaction) we could not adequately prove that self-determined individuals will refrain from entering into a nepotistic environment simply when provided the opportunity. One possibility according to Bellow (2003), is that parents want to be generous to their children and children want to show their gratitude by accepting the provided opportunity. He believes that this relationship between parent and child creates a cycle that binds together our society. This may shed some light on our unexpected finding that some individuals working within a nepotistic environment seemed to have done so based on opportunity and despite their level of self-determination. Even though this was an unexpected finding, it suggests that there are more factors involved that relate to nepotistic career choices. With this notion comes the push for further research and subsequent studies.

REFERENCES

- Becker, Gary. (1959). Union Restrictions on Entry. In Bradley, Philip D. *The Public Stake in Union Power*. VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Bellow, Adam. (2003). *In Praise of Nepotism: A Natural History*. NY: Doubleday.
- Deci, Edward L., Koestner, Richard, & Ryan, Richard M. (1999). A Meta-Analytic Review of Experiments Examining the Effects of Extrinsic Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 627-668.
- Deci, Edward L. & Ryan, Richard M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, Edward L. & Ryan, Richard M. (2000). The “What” and “Why” of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268
- Guay, Frederick, Senecal, Caroline, Gauthier, Lysanne, & Fernet, Claude. (2003). Predicting Career Indecision: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 165-177.
- Guay, Frederick & Vallerand, Robert J. (1997). On the assessment of state intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The Situation Motivation Scale (SIMS). Unpublished manuscript, Universite du Quebec a Montreal.
- Hackman, Richard J. & Oldham, Greg R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Jones, Robert G. (2004). Review of the book *In Praise of Nepotism: A Natural History*. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 550-553.
- Laband, David N. & Lentz, Bernard F. (1992). Self-Recruitment in the Legal Profession. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 10, 182-201.
- Lentz, Bernard F. & Laband, David N. (1988). Why So Many Children of Doctors Become Doctors: Nepotism vs. Human Capital Transfers. *Journal of Human Resources*, 24, 396-413.
- Levesque, Chantal. (2004). Enhancing intrinsic motivation for research through service-learning. Report of a 2003 project in the SMSU Teaching Fellowship Program.

- Mutlu, K. (2000). Problems of nepotism and favouritism in the police organization in Turkey. *International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 23, 381-389.
- Nelton, Sharon. (1998). The Bright Side of Nepotism. *Nation's Business*, 86, 72.
- Reed, C.M. & Bruce, W.M. (1993). Dual-career couples in the public sector: A survey of personnel policies and practices. *Public Personnel Management*, 22, 187-198.
- Ryan, R.M. & Connell, J.P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 749-761.
- Simon, R.J., Clark, S.M. & Tift, L.L. (1966). Of nepotism, marriage, and the pursuit of an academic career. *Sociology of Education*, 39, 344-358.
- Sutton, R.I. & Kahn, R.L. (1987). Prediction, understanding, and control as antidotes to organizational stress. In J.W. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs (272-285). NJ:Prentice-Hall.
- Thomas, K.W. & Tymon, W.G. Jr. (1994). Does Empowerment Always Work: Understanding the Role of Intrinsic Motivation and Personal Interpretation. *Journal of Management Systems*, 6, 1-13.
- Werbel, J.D. & Hames, D.S. (1996). Anti-nepotism reconsidered: The case of husband and wife employment. *Group & Organization Management*, 21, 365-379.
- Whiston, Susan C. & Keller, Briana, K. (2004). The Influences of the Family of Origin on Career Development: A Review and Analysis. *Counseling Psychologist*, 32, 493-568.
- Worklife. (2002). In their fathers' footsteps, 14, 12.

APPENDIX A
Questionnaire

Career Choice Survey

Created by Dr. Robert Jones and
Tracy Stout
In Cooperation with
Missouri State University

Career Choice Survey

This survey is part of a research project being undertaken at Missouri State University and should take no more than 10 minutes of your time. These questions are being used to help researchers gather information about career choice. Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary and there are no consequences for deciding not to participate. Your responses to these questions are completely confidential. Do not put your name anywhere on this survey. All surveys will be destroyed once information is entered in to a computer database. If you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact Dr. Robert Jones (417-836-6528) or Tracy Stout (417-836-6099). Thank you for participating.

After you complete the survey, please place it in the enclosed business reply envelope and mail it. No postage is necessary.

By responding to these questions, you are giving your consent to participate in this study.

Instructions

Please indicate how you feel by either circling your response or filling in blanks. Follow the instructions for each section. Answer as honestly as you can and please try to answer all questions.

We welcome your comments and suggestions. Please feel free to write any comments or suggestions you may have in the space provided at the end of the survey.

PLEASE TELL US ABOUT YOU

Please answer the following statements about yourself and the firm you are employed in. Keep in mind that NO attempt will be made to identify you by your responses. We ask for this information for statistical analyses only.

1. What is (are) your area(s) of law?

2. What is your gender?

- Male
 Female

3. What is your age?

- Under 20
 21-30
 31-40
 41-50
 51-60
 61 +

4. What is your political affiliation?

- Republican
 Democrat
 Independent
 Undecided
 Other _____

5. In which of the following sectors do you do the most work?

- Public
 Private
 Not-for-profit

6. Approximately how many employees work in the same firm as you?

- Under 15
- 16- 25
- 26- 50
- 51-75
- 76- 100
- more than 100

7. What is your annual salary?

- under \$35,000
- \$35,001 - \$55,000
- \$55,001 - \$75,000
- \$75,001 - \$95,000
- \$95,001 - \$115,000
- \$115,001 - \$135,000
- \$135,001 - \$155,000
- over \$155,000

8. Please list your parents' career titles (and specialty area if applicable).

Mother _____

Father _____

9. Is any member of your family in the same occupation as you? Yes No

If yes, please specify which family member(s). _____

10. Do your parents or grandparents work in the same firm as you? Yes No

11. At any time in your career did you work in the same firm as
your parents or grandparents? Yes No

12. Do (Did) any other family members work in the same firm as you? Yes No

If yes, please specify which family member(s).

13. Were you hired into the same firm by your parents or grandparents? Yes No
14. Do you consider the firm you are employed in to be a family business? Yes No
15. If you work in a family business, to what extent do you feel you would be more satisfied in a position in another firm.

Not Sure	Not at all	Very Little	Somewhat	For the Most Part	To a great extent
0	1	2	3	4	5

16. To what extent do you feel the following family members had an influence on your occupation choice?

	Not Sure	Not at all	Very Little	Somewhat	For the Most Part	To a great extent
Mother	0	1	2	3	4	5
Father	0	1	2	3	4	5
Grandmother	0	1	2	3	4	5
Grandfather	0	1	2	3	4	5
Aunt	0	1	2	3	4	5
Uncle	0	1	2	3	4	5
Siblings	0	1	2	3	4	5

17. To what extent do you feel the knowledge and skills you learned from your parents

and/or grandparents while growing up helped you to perform well in your chosen career?

Not Sure	Not at all	Very Little	Somewhat	For the Most Part	To a great extent
0	1	2	3	4	5

18. To what extent would you encourage your children to go to law school?

Not Sure	Not at all	Very Little	Somewhat	For the Most Part	To a great extent
0	1	2	3	4	5

Why Did You Choose This Occupation/Career?

The next items concern your decisions for choosing your current occupation. Please indicate how much you AGREE or DISAGREE with each statement by circling the appropriate corresponding number. Try to answer every question as honestly as possible.

Why did you choose this occupation?	Strongly Disagree ▼	Disagree ▼	Slightly Disagree ▼	Neither Agree Or Disagree ▼	Slightly Agree ▼	Agree ▼	Strongly Agree ▼
1. Because it allows me to use skills that are important to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Because I would feel bad if I didn't.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Because using what I have learned is really essential for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I don't know. I have the impression I'm wasting my time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Because using gained knowledge in my field is fundamental for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Because I feel I have to.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I'm not sure anymore. I think that maybe I should change my occupation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Because I really enjoy it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Because it's a sensible way to get meaningful experience.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Because I would feel guilty if I didn't.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Because it's a practical way to apply new Knowledge in this field.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Because I really like it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Because experiencing new things that are interesting to me is a part of who I am	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Because I feel that's what I was supposed to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Because I would feel awful about myself if I Didn't.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Why did you choose this occupation?	Strongly Disagree ▼	Disagree ▼	Slightly Disagree ▼	Neither Agree Or Disagree ▼	Slightly Agree ▼	Agree ▼	Strongly Agree ▼
16. Because it's really fun.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Because that's what I was told to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Because I could easily find a job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Because my parents have jobs similar to my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Because this occupation sounded interesting.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Because I felt pressure from my family to obtain this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Because I felt this occupation was suited for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Because my parents or family member(s) could help me get a job if I chose this occupation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Because I would be treated badly by family members if I did not take this occupation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Because this is the type of occupation I always wanted.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Because my family would be mad if I did not take this occupation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Work Satisfaction

The next items are in relation to the specific job that you currently perform. Please indicate how much you AGREE or DISAGREE with each statement by circling the appropriate corresponding number. Try to answer every question as honestly as possible.

	Strongly Disagree ▼	Disagree ▼	Slightly Disagree ▼	Neither Agree Or Disagree ▼	Slightly Agree ▼	Agree ▼	Strongly Agree ▼
1. It is hard on this job for me to care very much about whether the work gets done right	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The work I do on this job is very meaningful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Most of the things I do on this job seem useless or trivial.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. The job itself is not very significant or important in the broader scheme of things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I am willing to put forth a great deal of effort in the job I perform.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I am proud to tell others about the job that I perform.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I really care about the work I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Overall, I am satisfied with my current job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

