



Political Dynasties in Democratic Contexts: A Comprehensive Bibliometric Analysis Using Scopus Data

Muhammad Taufiq *, Adilansyah Adilansyah and Rahmad Hidayat

Department of Administrative Science, Universitas Mbojo Bima, Indonesia

Received 1 August 2024; Received in Revised Form 17 March 2025

Accepted 4 April 2025; Available Online 26 June 2025

Abstract

This article examines the phenomenon of political dynasties in the context of democracy through a comprehensive bibliometric analysis using data from Scopus. By reviewing 143 documents published between December 2009 and June 2024, the authors identify trends, key topics, and remarkable contributions to the study of political dynasties. The data includes 116 journal articles, five books, six book chapters, one conference paper, one note, and fourteen reviews. Annual scientific output mapping reveals the influence of prior studies over time, and the geographical research distribution tracking confirms diverse focuses across countries. Popular topics and thematic developments in political dynasty studies are outlined thoroughly, reflecting key issues and changes in political, social, and economic contexts. The analysis offers a complete overview of the political dynasty research landscape, facilitating the identification of trends, key contributions, and areas that require further research. The results are significant for understanding the dynamics of political dynasties in the context of democracy and their implications for the democratization process, political stability, and economic development.

Keywords

Democracy, Dynasty, Evolution, Perpetuation, Trends

Introduction

Political dynasties have become a crucial topic in contemporary political studies because the phenomenon has broad and complex impacts on various aspects of political life. Political dynasties, often associated with monarchies and authoritarian governments, can also be found in democratic countries that vary in their level of political development and modernization (Teehankee et al., 2023), due to political power frequently being passed within the same family, so that different family members can hold significant positions of power from generation to generation. Political dynasties influence the democratization process in complex ways; on the one hand, their existence can provide stability in government, but on the other hand, they can also strengthen inequality and hinder the development of democracy (Rougier et al., 2022).

Although political dynasties can be found in various government systems, there are noteworthy differences between them in democratic, authoritarian, and monarchical countries. These differences are mainly related to the legitimacy of power, control, and power mechanisms, as well as the political dynamics that occur in each system. In democratic countries, the legitimacy of political dynasties comes from a competitive and legitimate electoral process (Chandra, 2016; Smith, 2018). Political family members must follow established election procedures and obtain support from voters to hold political office. A free and fair election process is the basis of the legitimacy of their power. Therefore, although members of political dynasties have the advantage of family names and social networks, they still have to compete fairly in elections to obtain a mandate from the people.

In contrast, in authoritarian countries, political dynasties often maintain power through tight control of the political process. Elections in authoritarian countries are usually neither free nor fair, with restrictions on opposition, manipulation of election results, and the use of violence or intimidation to maintain power (Marquez, 2017). The legitimacy of political dynasties in authoritarian countries is often questioned because they are not based on a legitimate mandate from the people but on control and domination exercised by the ruler (Buzo, 2017). On the other hand, in a monarchy system, political power is inherited from generation to generation according to established succession rules (Mcmillan, 2013). In an absolute monarchy, the king or queen has full power and is not limited by democratic institutions. Their legitimacy came from tradition and the laws governing royal succession, not from election by the people. However, in a constitutional monarchy, the monarch's power is limited by the constitution and democratic institutions, with the role of the king or queen being more symbolic.

Control and power mechanisms also differ between these three systems. In democratic countries, political dynasties operate within a framework of democratic laws and institutions that limit their power (Smith, 2012). There is a checks and balances mechanism that aims to prevent abuse of power and ensure government accountability. Political dynasties must operate within these constraints and seek to maintain their political legitimacy through good performance and responsiveness to the needs of the people.

In authoritarian countries, control and power are more concentrated in the hands of the ruler and his family, with little or no restrictions from democratic institutions (Ezrow & Frantz, 2011). Freedom of the press and political opposition are usually highly restricted, and political dynasties often rely on military, police, and intelligence forces to maintain power. Propaganda and information control are common in preserving regime stability and reducing threats to their power.

In a monarchy, political dynamics depend greatly on the rules of succession and the monarch's role in government. In an absolute monarchy, the king or queen has complete control over the government and can make decisions without needing approval from other institutions (Middleton, 2015). However, the king or queen has a more symbolic role in a constitutional monarchy, and the constitution and existing democratic institutions limit their powers, as can be seen in Denmark, Japan, Norway, Sweden, and the UK (Bogdanor, 1996; Hazell, 2020; Middleton, 2015).

A political dynasty in a democratic country refers to a phenomenon where one family or close relatives control political power for a long period. It can maintain political power through several generations in a certain geographical area. Unlike ordinary political families, political dynasties move in time and control a wide range of power (Teehanke et al., 2023). In a democratic system, family members often occupy strategic positions in the government, legislature, or political parties, alternately or simultaneously. Even though they occur within a democratic framework, where a legitimate electoral process is the main basis, political dynasties utilize the advantages of family names, social influence, and economic resources to maintain and expand their political power (Feinstein, 2010).

Political dynasties often emerge due to several key factors. First, political families' social capital and networks form a strong foundation (Aspinall et al., 2021; Azizah et al., 2021). These social networks include close relationships with constituents, community leaders, and donors whom political families can mobilize to support their political campaigns. With this support, political families can build a solid and broad support base, which is crucial in winning elections. Second, a well-known family name's experience and established political reputation provide an outstanding competitive

advantage. A prominent family name can increase public trust, as the good reputations and political expertise of previous family members give voters confidence that they will receive a stable and experienced government. It automatically increases the chances of success in the election (Batto & Read, 2024; Bayo, 2021; Folke et al., 2021). However, counter-arguments to this assert that the existence of political dynasties will reduce the legitimacy of the government in the eyes of the public where people see the dominance of certain families as a sign that the political system is unfair or not open, which can reduce political participation and trust in democratic institutions (Smith, 2012). Moreover, political dynasties tend to increase the risk of corruption and nepotism. When power is centralized in one family, there is a high likelihood of power abuse for personal or family gain, which can undermine public trust in the government (Dal Bó et al., 2009).

Access to resources is a third factor that is no less notable. Political families often have greater access to financial and media resources, which is crucial in modern political campaigns (David & Legara, 2017; David & San Pascual, 2016; Pitcher & Sanches, 2019; Wardani & Subekti, 2021). Established political families tend to have extensive funding networks—both from personal wealth and strategic donors—that allow them to build more effective campaigns, including advertising in the mass media, holding political events, and financing campaign operations, than non-dynastic political opponents (Dal Bó et al., 2009). In addition, they also leverage their considerable influence over the media to shape more positive public perceptions, emphasizing the family's proven experience and reputation while deflecting criticism and maintaining voter support (Smith, 2018). Furthermore, when family members succeed in public office, access to state resources is often used strategically through infrastructure projects or social assistance in their constituencies, which not only strengthens voter loyalty but also builds long-term dependency on the family (Adilansyah et al., 2024), making politics more exclusive and narrowing opportunities for new candidates outside the dynastic circle.

Higher education and skills also play a principal role in the success of political dynasties (Baturó & Gray, 2018; Daniele et al., 2021). Members of political families usually have a good education and the skills necessary to understand the political system and government administration. They often have educational backgrounds from leading institutions, which gives them a deep understanding of government and politics. These skills and practical experience make them more effective in carrying out government duties and managing political campaigns. Even if the field of study they have studied seems less relevant to politics, such as health sciences, a degree from a prestigious university still serves as a “brand of trust” that strengthens the legitimacy of

dynastic politics, where elite education is more often identified with social status and intellectual prowess than specific technical expertise. The reputation of institutions such as Harvard or Oxford creates a “halo effect” that makes voters perceive the graduate as competent and authoritative, regardless of the specific field studied, thus providing an electoral advantage and strengthening the dynasty's position in political competition.

Overall, political dynasties in democratic states result from complex interactions between social capital, experience and reputation, access to resources, and education and skills. Although they operate within a democratic framework, their existence often raises debates about fairness and equality in the political process. The advantages possessed by certain political families can create obstacles for other candidates who do not have the same access, raising questions about the extent to which the electoral process truly reflects democratic principles of fairness and equality. However, as long as the electoral process remains valid and under the law, political dynasties remain integral to political dynamics in democratic countries.

The implications of political dynasties for power distribution and governance quality are considerable (Dal Bó et al. , 2009; Ramasamy, 2020; Schafferer, 2023; Tusalem & Pe-Aguirre, 2013) . With power concentrated within a single family, the principles of meritocracy were often neglected, and the influence of patronage networks became dominant (Abinales, 2011; Nishizaki, 2013; Purdey, 2016b; Purdey, Tadem, et al., 2016) . This situation affected the government's efficiency and effectiveness and created injustice in political representation. Certain groups felt marginalized and unrepresented in the political process, which could undermine the democratic legitimacy of the government in power (Hidayat, 2025b).

However, such damaging implications cannot be generalized to all contexts, as in certain cases, for example, the Clinton and Kennedy families display the unique dynamics of political dynasties in the United States, where although power is passed between family members, meritocracy remains prominent. Bill and Hillary Clinton built their political influence through a combination of professional experience, charisma and party support. Hillary, besides being known as the wife of a former President, has a strong political track record as a US Senator and Secretary of State. Similarly, the Kennedy family features figures such as John F. Kennedy and Robert F. Kennedy, who built popularity through progressive vision and strong leadership, rather than simply the legacy of a renowned name. However, while meritocracy plays a role, the influence of surnames and networks remains an impressive advantage in American politics. For example, John F. Kennedy appointed his brother, Robert F. Kennedy, as Attorney General, demonstrating how family connections can influence political appointments. In

addition, the American education system often reinforces political dynasties, where access to elite institutions is easier for those with family connections, thus creating challenges to the principle of pure meritocracy. While individual capacity and adaptation to the demands of modern politics are notable, family names and networks still play a significant role in the continuity of political influence in the United States.

Due to their broad impact, political dynasties have attracted the interest of many academics and researchers. Previous studies on political dynasties help understand how power structures can survive and adapt in various political systems in developing and developed countries. In addition, these studies also provide insight into how a political dynasty operates in the context of globalization and rapid political change, where the power dynamics and influence of political families are becoming increasingly complex and diverse.

This article is a bibliometric review of political dynasty studies worldwide by deciphering 143 documents indexed in the Scopus database. This review will produce several crucial findings in the form of (1) an understanding of how academic interest in political dynasty has developed over time, (2) an identification of the primary actors in political dynasty research, both in terms of authors and institutions; (3) insights into the collaborative networks that are forming among researchers in this field; (4) comprehensions of the main themes and subthemes that are the focus of political dynasty research. The review will contribute to a more holistic understanding of political dynasties and encourage further research.

Methodology

The methodology involves several primary steps: data collection, pre-processing, descriptive analysis, citation analysis, keyword analysis, interpretation, and conclusions. The first step was data collection from the Scopus database, one of the foremost sources of global scientific literature. Several searches were conducted using relevant keywords such as "political dynasty," "dynastic politics," and "family politics" to obtain comprehensive data. These keywords were chosen to cover a variety of terms that may appear in related literature. The data included 143 documents published from December 2009 to June 2024. The documents comprised 116 journal articles, five books, six book chapters, one conference paper, one note, and fourteen reviews.

The timeframe 2009-2024 was chosen because the first publication specifically discussing political dynasties in the Scopus database appeared in December 2009. Moreover, limiting the period to June 2024 allows the analysis to remain relevant and up-to-date, integrating the latest findings in the understanding of the evolution of political

dynasties in various democratic contexts. The document selection process involves evaluation to ensure topic relevance and source quality (Firmansyah & Hidayat, 2024; Hidayat, 2024d, 2025a, 2025c; Rifai et al., 2024). Documents not meeting these criteria are filtered to maintain the research focus, and the data used is the most relevant.

After data collection, the next step is pre-processing or data preparation. This process involves cleaning data to remove duplication and ensure consistency. Incomplete or irrelevant data is checked and corrected whenever possible. This step ensures that the data to be disentangled is accurate and reliable. The cleaned data is then organized in a suitable format for further elaboration. The analysis includes the title, author, affiliation, keywords, abstract, year of publication, and citations. A specific bibliometric review tool, such as Bibliometrix RStudio, is used to process the data, making it easier to explore various aspects of the previous research (Aria & Cuccurullo, 2017; Hidayat, 2024a, 2024b; Sauki & Hidayat, 2024).

A descriptive analysis was carried out to provide a general overview of the characteristics of the publication. It includes an analysis of the distribution of publications by year to understand how academic interest in political dynasties has evolved. The resulting time graph helps identify publication trends and high or low research activity periods. Next, the distribution of publications by document type is investigated. It includes journal articles, books, book chapters, conference papers, notes, and reviews to see the contribution of every kind of document to the literature on political dynasties. A journal distribution analysis was also carried out to identify key journals where publications frequently appear and assess journal impact factors and reputation.

Citation analysis is crucial for assessing the impact and relevance of publications. The most frequently cited documents were identified to determine the research with the greatest influence in political dynasties. It helps reveal the main contributions and find the most influential literature in the study. A most-cited author analysis was also conducted to identify individuals who have significantly impacted research on political dynasties. By knowing the authors with the highest number of citations, we can understand the key figures in this research and their contributions to the existing literature. Keyword analysis was used to identify main themes and subthemes in publications about political dynasties. Keyword frequencies are outlined to understand the primary focus of the research conducted. A keyword visualization map was created to illustrate the relationships between the main concepts and themes in the study of political dynasties.

Results from descriptive, citations, and keyword analyses were combined to provide comprehensive conclusions about the political dynasty research landscape,

including trends, key actors, and dominant themes. These conclusions will remarkably contribute to the academic literature in this area and encourage further research in the future.

Results

This results section presents core details of the dataset, annual scientific output and citation statistics, prominent journals and influential papers, renowned authors and institutions, the geographic spread of research, popular topics, and thematic progression in political dynasties research to provide a comprehensive picture of the research landscape and identifying trends, key contributions, and areas for further research.

Core Details of the Dataset

The study of political dynasties has become a topic of interest for many researchers and academics during the period from December 2009 to June 2024. As shown in Table 1, during this period, 90 sources existed, including journals, books, and various other scientific publications. The number of documents reached 143, indicating significant interest and increasing attention to this topic. With an annual growth rate of 14.87 percent, research on political dynasties shows a steady and noteworthy increase. This topic is increasingly relevant and has attracted the interest of more researchers over time. The average age of the documents is 4.76 years, reflecting that despite the many new studies, previous studies are still relevant and continue to be used as valuable references in newer research. The balance between recent contributions and established literature shows that previous foundational findings and theoretical frameworks still provide a foundation for more recent research. It also confirms the intellectual continuity in the field, where researchers not only update data and perspectives but also keep referring to key thoughts from the past. This continued relevance signifies that the topic of political dynasties continues to evolve, with a dynamic academic dialogue between old findings and new analyses, ensuring a more comprehensive and in-depth understanding.

Each document is cited an average of 7.993 times. It means that research on political dynasties has a weighty impact on the academic community. The total number of references used in this study reached 8739, indicating the breadth of the literature base supporting the research and the importance of references from previous studies to strengthen arguments and findings in new studies. In terms of document content, there are 123 Keywords Plus (ID) and 425 Author's Keywords (DE). Keywords Plus are keywords automatically generated by an algorithm based on the title and abstract of the article. At the same time, the Author's Keywords are keywords chosen by the authors to describe the main focus of their research. It shows that research on political dynasties

has a variety of focuses and approaches, with different keywords reflecting the specific topics discussed. Prior studies involved 209 authors, of whom 65 were authors of a single document. There are a large number of authors working independently on this topic. However, collaboration is also a fundamental aspect of this research, with 1.84 co-authors per document.

The percentage of international collaboration reached 20.98 percent, indicating that the study of political dynasties has a global dimension and involves researchers from various countries. There are several broad clusters, with some countries playing a more dominant role as hubs. The United States and the United Kingdom emerged as the primary global hubs, signifying their great influence in shaping academic discussions in this field. In the Southeast Asia region, the Philippines, Indonesia and Singapore stand out as crucial hubs that strengthen regional collaboration and serve as entry points for global connections. Meanwhile, European countries such as France and Spain continue to contribute significantly, albeit in a supporting role to the network rather than as key leaders. There are also countries like India and Denmark that, while not dominant as connectors, are strategically positioned due to their wide and quick access to collaborators around the world.

In summary, research on political dynasties has grown rapidly over the past 15 years. With considerable annual growth rates, a large number of sources and documents used, and a high citation rate, this topic has great relevance and impact in the fields of political science and government studies. Collaboration between authors, both locally and internationally, further enriches the research and opens up opportunities for more in-depth and comprehensive studies in the future. There are also many different focuses and approaches in research on political dynasties, which are reflected in the variety of keywords used. It indicates that political dynasties are a complex and multi-dimensional topic which requires an interdisciplinary approach to understand them fully.

Table 1 Core Details of the Dataset

Description	Results
Timespan	December 2009–June 2024
Sources (Journals, Books, etc.)	90
Documents	143
Annual Growth Rate %	14.87
Document Average Age	4.76
Average citations per doc	7.993
References	8739
Keywords Plus	123
Author's Keywords	425
Authors	209
Authors of single-authored docs	65
Single-authored docs	74
Co-Authors per Doc	1.84
International co-authorships %	20.98

Source: Biblioshiny using RStudio.

Annual Scientific Output

Research on political dynasties has shown a dynamic and notable development during the period from 2009 to 2024. Figure 1 displays the trend and fluctuation of annual scientific production based on the number of articles published each year. The data provides in-depth insight into the evolution of interest and research intensity in the topic of political dynasties.

2009–2015 reflects a slow and fluctuating start. At the beginning of the period, the number of articles published on political dynasties was relatively low and fluctuating. From 2009 to 2011, only 2 articles were published each year. During this time, political dynasties were not yet a major focus of scientific research. In 2012, there was a significant increase, with 5 articles published. However, this increase did not continue in the following years because, in 2013, there were only 3 articles, and in 2014 and 2015, only 1 article was published each year. This fluctuation reflects that despite the interest in this topic, the resources and attention given are still limited and sporadic.

With 20 articles published, the year 2016 was a crucial turning point in the scholarly output on political dynasties, as this period marked a shift in focus from simply describing the phenomenon to a deeper analysis of structural influences and power dynamics. One of the triggers was the growing interest in the increasingly politicized

patron-client structure in electoral contexts, where local elites began to leverage patronage networks to strengthen their dynastic positions, especially in regions such as Southeast Asia. In addition, the emergence of the global democratic crisis and the rise of populism prompted further study of how political dynasties are adapting to modern technologies and social media, which strengthens their control over public narratives. The period also saw more international collaboration, sparking the birth of cross-country comparative perspectives and expanding the understanding of the durability of political dynasties in increasingly fragile democratic systems.

2017–2021 is a stable period with an upward trend. After the big surge in 2016, scholarly output remained fairly high and stable. In 2017, 10 articles were published, followed by 14 articles in 2018. Although there was a decline in 2019 with 8 articles, the number increased again in 2020 with 9 articles and in 2021 with 14 articles. This period shows stability and consistency in research on political dynasties. The general trend is an increase in the number of articles, indicating that the topic is starting to gain a more solid place on the scientific research agenda.

The years 2022 to 2024 represent a peak of scientific production in political dynasty studies. In 2022, 17 articles were published, followed by 19 articles in 2023. Although this number decreased slightly to 16 articles in 2024, it still indicates strong and sustained interest in the topic. The high scientific production during this period may reflect the impact of relevant global and local political developments, which stimulated more research. In addition, increased international collaboration also contributed to the increase in the number of publications.

Overall, the analysis of annual scientific production in political dynasty studies from 2009 to 2024 shows a memorable evolution from an initially low-interest topic to an essential and productive research focus. The initial fluctuations indicate a period of exploration and direction, while the large spike in 2016 marks a turning point that led to stability and a continued increase in scientific production. The peak production period from 2022 to 2024 reflects the maturity and importance of this topic in the scientific context. The increasing number of published articles shows that political dynasties have become a topic that attracts widespread attention, both from individual researchers and from international collaborations. This trend also shows that political dynasties are a dynamic and relevant issue that continues to attract academic attention, along with political developments in various parts of the world. Thus, research in this field will continue to grow and provide deeper insights into the phenomenon of political dynasties in the future.




Figure 1 Annual Scientific Production (2009–2024).

Source: Biblioshiny using RStudio.

Prominent Journals

Between 2009 and 2024, studies on political dynasties produced many articles that were published in various scientific journals and books. These studies cover multiple aspects of political dynasties, including their impact on political stability, public policy, and economic development. The available literature provides an in-depth view of how political dynasties operate in diverse countries, especially in the Southeast Asian region and Asia in general. Figure 2 below shows only the ten most productive journals in this field.

The journal "South East Asia Research" stands out with nine articles discussing political dynasties. This journal highlights various aspects of political dynasties in the Southeast Asian region, covering case studies from countries such as Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand. Research in this journal examines how political dynasties affect government policies and political stability, and how family influence in politics can create or hinder political and economic reforms. The intensive focus on Southeast Asia confirms the significance of the region in the study of political dynasties.

Furthermore, the "Asian Journal of Comparative Politics," with its eight articles, provides a rich comparative perspective on political dynasties in various Asian countries. This journal not only highlights specific cases but also compares the dynamics of political dynasties across countries, which helps readers comprehend the differences and similarities in the operation of political dynasties across national contexts. Such

comparative studies are essential to understanding how political structures, culture, and history influence the sustainability and influence of political dynasties.

The journals "Asian Survey" and "Philippine Political Science Journal," with six articles each, make significant contributions to understanding the dynamics of dynastic politics in the Philippines and Asia in general. These articles examine the long history of political dynasties in the Philippines, their impact on public policy, and the challenges and opportunities faced in efforts to reduce their dominance in local and national politics.

Equally important are the journals "Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs" and "Studies in Indian Politics," each of which has published four articles on political dynasties. These articles add depth to the understanding of how political dynasties function in developing countries in Southeast Asia and India. These articles explored how political dynasties can consolidate power through patronage and family networks and how they adapt to political and social changes.

The journals "Asian Journal of Women's Studies" and "Global Intellectual History," with three articles each, offer unique perspectives on the study of political dynasties. The articles in these journals examine the role of women in political dynasties and how intellectual perspectives and political theories influence them. The study of the role of women in political dynasties is essential to understanding how gender and power interact in the context of family politics.

Many other journals contributed two articles each to the study of political dynasties. These journals include the Asian Journal of Political Science, Asian Politics and Policy, Building Inclusive Democracies in ASEAN, Cahiers D'etudes Africaines, Comparative Political Studies, and many more. The articles in these journals contribute to a broader and deeper understanding of the various aspects of political dynasties in multiple countries and contexts.

In addition, some journals and books contributed one article each, such as "American Political Science Review," "Anthropology Today," "Asia Maior," and many more. These articles, although few, still make crucial contributions to enriching the literature on political dynasties. For example, the article "Gender and Politics in Post-Reformasi Indonesia: Women Leaders Within Local Oligarchy Networks" examines how women in Indonesian political dynasties play a crucial role in local oligarchic networks, while the article "Democratic Dynasties: State, Party, and Family in Contemporary Indian Politics" shed light on how political dynasties in India adapt to the dynamics of democratic politics.

Overall, the literature published during this timeframe shows how complex and diverse the study of political dynasties is. Each journal and book offers a unique perspective and methodological approach, from historical and comparative analysis to

case studies and policy analysis. The overall literature not only enriches our understanding of political dynasties but also provides crucial insights into how political dynasties influence political and social developments in different countries.




Figure 2 Top Ten Most Productive Journals (2009–2024).

Source: Biblioshiny using RStudio.

Renowned Authors

The study of political dynasties attracted the attention of many researchers from 2009 to 2024, resulting in noteworthy contributions from 209 authors. Figure 3 presents a list of the ten most productive scholars.

R. U. Mendoza is the main contributor, with a total of 11 articles and a fractionalized value of 3.716666667. This shows that Mendoza is highly involved in various studies, both as the main author and as part of the research team. His prominent involvement in many articles reflects his important role in the development of political dynasty studies. With 5 articles and a fractionalized value of 1.133333333, J. K. Yap is also a foremost contributor. The lower fractionalized value compared to the number of his articles indicates that Yap often works in a team, collaborating with other researchers to produce valuable scientific works.

G. A. S. Mendoza has 4 articles with a fractionalized value of 0.933333333, indicating that his contribution is mostly as a co-author in the research team. Mendoza plays a considerable role in enriching the literature on political dynasties through collaboration with other researchers. With 4 articles and a full fractionalized score of 4, it shows that Y. Nishizaki is often the lead author in his research. The high fractionalized

score reflects a great contribution and independence in compiling and completing research on political dynasties.

With four articles and a fractionalized score of 1.833333333, D. M. Smith also shows active involvement in these studies. Like J. K. Yap, the lower fractionalized score indicates that much of his research is conducted in a collaborative context, enriching the discourse through teamwork. Having 3 articles with a fractionalized score of 1.666666667, P. Chambers actively contributes to political dynasty research, both as a lead author and co-author, demonstrating outstanding expertise and insight in this field.

C. C. David is also a significant contributor. With three articles and a fractionalized score of 1.5, his active involvement in various studies shows a strong commitment to developing an understanding of political dynasties. With three articles and a fractionalized value of 2.2, K. H. Dewi often acts as the main author or plays an important role in the research. The high fractionalized value indicates a more dominant contribution to the research team. R. Pano has 3 articles with a full fractionalized value of 3, indicating that he is often the main author. Full involvement in each article shows a strong commitment and remarkable contribution to the study of political dynasties.

Finally, with 3 articles and a fractionalized value of 1.833333333, A. E. Ruud also shows important involvement in this research. Like several other authors, Ruud's contribution to the research team reflects the importance of collaboration in developing insights into political dynasties.

The authors mentioned above have made extraordinary contributions to the development of the study of political dynasties. Their involvement, both as main authors and as part of the research team, shows how important individual collaboration and dedication are in enriching the scientific literature. Each author brings a unique perspective and special expertise that helps deepen our understanding of political dynasties, from historical analysis to contemporary studies of the dynamics of power and family influence in politics. Their contributions not only increase the quality and quantity of research in this field but also stimulate further discussion on the role of political dynasties across countries and contexts.




Figure 3 Top Ten Most Productive Scholars (2009–2024).

Source: Biblioshiny using RStudio.

Popular Topics and Thematic Progression

As Table 2 shows, several key terms appear frequently in the research on political dynasties from 2009 to 2024. These terms reflect the main themes discussed in the study. The term "political family" appears 5 times, with all of its occurrences occurring in 2016. This indicates a special attention to the concept of political family in that year, which may be related to political events or important publications in that year.

The term "Thailand" appeared 6 times, with the first occurrence in 2016, the median in 2017, and the third quartile in 2019. The study of political dynasties in Thailand began to gain attention in 2016 and has been increasing since 2019. The term "political families" appeared 8 times, with the first occurrence in 2016, the median in 2018, and the third quartile in 2021. It shows an increase in interest in the study of political families, which may reflect a trend of deeper research during this period.

The term "political dynasty" appeared 18 times, with the first occurrence in 2018, the median in 2020, and the third quartile in 2023. The study of political dynasties has become increasingly popular in recent years, reflecting a strong trend in contemporary political research. The term "democracy" appeared 7 times, with the first occurrence in 2016, the median in 2020, and the third quartile in 2021. It confirms a close relationship between the study of political dynasties and democracy, with a significant increase in 2020 and 2021.

The term "corruption" appeared 6 times, with the first occurrence occurring in 2018, the median in 2020, and the third quartile in 2020. The issue of corruption in the

context of political dynasties began to receive special attention in 2018 and became a foremost topic in 2020. The term "political dynasties" was the most frequent, with 23 occurrences, the first in 2016, the median in 2021, and the third quartile in 2022. Political dynasties, in general, continue to be a major focus of research, with a remarkable increase in recent years.

The term "dynasty" appears 16 times, with the first occurrence in 2018, the median in 2021, and the third quartile in 2022. It reflects the strong interest in the concept of dynasty in political research, especially in recent years. The term "dynasties" appears 10 times, with the first occurrence in 2020, the median in 2021, and the third quartile in 2023. That shows a steady increase in interest in the topic since 2020.

The term "Philippines" appears 8 times, with the first occurrence in 2018, the median, and the third quartile in 2022. It reflects a consistent focus on the study of political dynasties in the Philippines, especially in 2022. The term "oligarchy" appears seven times, with the first occurrence in 2019 and the median and third quartile in 2022. This shows that the issue of oligarchy in the context of political dynasties began to receive attention in 2019 and became increasingly significant until 2022.

The frequency and distribution of the years of occurrence of these terms reflect the growing research trend in the study of political dynasties. This topic is attracting attention not only in local contexts, such as the Philippines and Thailand but also in global contexts, such as democracy and corruption. This research shows the rich and complex dynamics of how political power is inherited and maintained through families and how this interacts with the wider political system.

Table 2 Trend Topics (2009–2024)

Term	Frequency	Year (Q1)	Year (Median)	Year (Q3)
political family	5	2016	2016	2016
Thailand	6	2016	2017	2019
political families	8	2016	2018	2021
political dynasty	18	2018	2020	2023
democracy	7	2016	2020	2021
corruption	6	2018	2020	2020
political dynasties	23	2016	2021	2022
dynasty	16	2018	2021	2022
dynasties	10	2020	2021	2023
Philippines	8	2018	2022	2022
oligarchy	7	2019	2022	2022

Source: Biblioshiny using RStudio.

Meanwhile, research on political dynasties has undergone a thematic evolution that reflects the changing focus of the study over time, from 2009 to 2024, as shown in Figure 4. In this context, the analysis focuses on how these topics changed and developed during two different periods, namely 2009-2020 and 2021-2024, relying on various metrics such as weighted increase, increase index, occurrence, and stability.



Figure 4 Thematic Evolution (2009–2024).

Source: Biblioshiny using RStudio.

From Dynasty (2009-2020) to Economic Development (2021-2024): This evolution involves a shift in focus from the study of "dynasty" to "economic development". The key term that emerges is "political parties". With an increased index of 0.5 and a stability level of 0.066, there is a relationship between the structure of political dynasties and their impact on economic development, especially through the role of political parties.

From Dynasty (2009-2020) to Indonesia (2021-2024): The study's focus shifts from "dynasty" to "Indonesia," with the key term "Indonesia." An increased index of 0.333 and a stability level of 0.0625 reflect increased attention to the context of political dynasties in Indonesia, indicating the importance of country-specific case studies in understanding the dynamics of political dynasties.

From Dynasty (2009-2020) to Political Dynasty (2021-2024): The key terms that emerge are "dynasty; dynasties; elections; democratization". With an increased index of 0.1 and stability of 0.043, this shift indicates a continued focus on political dynasties but with an added emphasis on elections and the democratization process. It reflects a deeper exploration of how dynasties affect democratic political processes.

From Dynasties (2009-2020) to Political Families (2021-2024): This shift involves a shift in focus from "dynasties" to "political families." The key term is "political families" with an increase index of 1 and a stability of 0.071. That indicates a very strong interest in the structure of political families and how they maintain political power from generation to generation.

From the Philippines (2009-2020) to the Philippines (2021-2024): The term "Philippines" remains consistent as a primary focus, with an increase index of 0.5 and a stability of 0.2. This suggests that research on political dynasties in the Philippines remains relevant and important throughout this period, reflecting the country's continuing political challenges.

From Political Dynasties (2009-2020) to Political Dynasties (2021-2024): The key term is "political dynasties; democracy," with an increased index of 0.25 and stability of 0.076. This shift indicates that while the focus remains on political dynasties, additional attention is paid to their relationship with democracy, emphasizing the importance of understanding their impact on democratic systems.

From Political Dynasties (2009-2020) to Political Dynasties (2021-2024): The key term "oligarchy" appears with an increased index of 0.2 and stability of 0.071. It reflects attention to how political dynasties relate to oligarchies, highlighting the dynamics of power and control in the political context.

From Political Dynasties (2009-2020) to Local Political Dynasties (2021-2024): The key term "political dynasty; local politics" appears with an increased index of 0.25 and stability of 0.125. In addition to political dynasties at the national level, there is significant interest in the influence of political dynasties at the local level, which is important for understanding the full spectrum of dynastic political power. The thematic evolution of political dynasty studies from 2009 to 2024 shows a shift in research focus that reflects changing political dynamics. From the analysis of dynasty structures to their impact on economic development, democracy, and oligarchy, prior studies cover a range of important aspects that shape our understanding of political dynasties across national and local contexts. These studies show the importance of ongoing and adaptive research to understand the complexity and changes in contemporary political dynamics.

Discussion

This section presents a holistic overview of country-based issues, political power perpetuation strategies, criticism and controversy, responses and reforms, and the prospect of political dynasties in democracy. By examining these dimensions, the authors gain insight into how different countries experience and manage the influence of

political dynasties. The strategies used by these dynasties to maintain their power reveal the complexity and nuances of political maneuvering in diverse political landscapes. Furthermore, the criticisms and controversies surrounding political dynasties highlight the inherent challenges and ethical concerns associated with the concentration of political power. The responses and reforms initiated by various governments and civil society demonstrate efforts to address these challenges and promote more equitable political participation. Finally, by exploring the prospects of political dynasties in democracies, we can better understand the possible future trajectories and implications of these powerful entities in shaping political discourse and governance.

Political Dynasties' Power Perpetuation Strategies

Political power perpetuation is a phenomenon in which individuals or groups in power use various strategies to maintain their dominance in the political system. It not only occurs in authoritarian or semi-authoritarian regimes but also prevails in democratic countries. By utilizing a combination of subtle and legal tactics, political dynasties can maintain their power while remaining within the existing legal framework. There are six prominent strategies commonly applied by political families to preserve their power, as summarized in Figure 5 below.




Figure 5 Political Dynasties' Power Perpetuation Strategies.

Source: Authors' Work.

Ruling leaders often appoint family members or close allies to strategic positions in government or the military to ensure their continued power and influence. Prominent examples include the Bush and Kennedy families in the United States and the Aquino and Marcos families in the Philippines. Placing family members in these key positions ensures that power remains in the hands of loyal and trusted individuals (Hutchcroft, 2002).

Electoral manipulation can take various forms, including rigging election results, voter suppression, and gerrymandering. In democracies, it is often more subtle, such as gerrymandering or using state resources for election campaigns (Levitsky & Way, 2010). An example of this is the Nehru-Gandhi family in India, which managed to maintain its political influence through these methods (Vaishnav, 2017).

The mass media play a vital role in shaping public opinion. Rulers who want to maintain power often seek to control the media to ensure that only information favorable to them is published. This control can be done through ownership of the media by political allies or by leveraging close relationships with media owners to ensure favorable coverage (Puddington, 2017). A prominent example is the control of the media by the Duterte family in the Philippines (Espia, 2023).

The use of security forces or vigilante groups to intimidate or remove opposition is a common tactic in maintaining power. Political violence and intimidation can prevent political opponents and opposition groups from organizing or challenging existing power. These actions are often seen in authoritarian regimes but can also occur in democracies, where civil liberties are restricted and opponents of the government are persecuted (Bellin, 2004).

Corruption and patronage remain effective tools for political dynasties in democratic countries. By providing jobs, contracts, and other resources to loyal supporters, political dynasties can build powerful patronage networks (Chandra, 2004). In Mexico, for example, the PRI (Institutional Revolutionary Party) family used patronage to maintain their power for more than 70 years before the full democratic transition (Marchetti, 2003).

Finally, rulers who want to maintain power often change the constitution or laws to extend their terms or remove certain limitations on power. It can include eliminating presidential term limits or changing electoral laws to benefit the ruling party (Korzi, 2011). Famous examples of this have occurred in several Latin American countries, such as Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Venezuela, where constitutional changes were made to allow for presidential term extensions with strong support from the ruling political dynasty (Marcano & Tyszka, 2007; Pereira, 2005).

In summary, the phenomenon of self-perpetuation of political power is not only limited to authoritarian regimes but also occurs in the context of democracy through political dynasties. By using more subtle and legal strategies, political dynasties in democratic countries can effectively maintain and extend their power. Although wrapped in a democratic legal framework, the ultimate goal of this strategy remains the same: maintaining political dominance and securing power for future generations.

Country-Based Issues

Political dynasties are a phenomenon that has taken root in countries worldwide, influencing local and national policies, representation, and political dynamics. From the 143 documents, 34 identified countries are from four continents, namely America (Brazil, Canada, Mexico, United States), Europe (Austria, Czech Republic, France, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, Asia (Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Lebanon, North Korea, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Syria, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey), and Africa (Angola, Gabon, Kenya). Each country faces unique issues related to political dynasties, depending on its history, culture, and socio-political structure.

Brazil is one of the countries in the Americas that has had a significant impact on its local economy due to political dynasties. Research by Rougier et al. (2022) in the state of Ceará revealed that political dynasty control has a positive effect on political stability and public investment, which in turn drives local economic growth in the medium term. Political dynasties are considered capable of providing the foundation of stability needed to attract and retain investment. However, there is a dark side to the dominance of political dynasties. The potential for corruption is a major long-term concern. When a dynasty's control lasts too long without effective checks and balances, the opportunities for corrupt practices increase, which can ultimately damage the economic and social order. There is an urgent need for stricter oversight and institutional reform to ensure that the negative impacts of corruption do not overshadow the benefits of political stability and public investment.

In Canada, Rivard et al. (2024) provide in-depth insights into the influence of political dynasties on legislators' careers. Political dynasties are more common in provincial legislatures than in the federal Parliament. Family influence in politics is stronger at the local level than at the national level. Interestingly, no causal relationship was found between the length of a legislator's tenure and the existence of a political dynasty. Historical and structural factors play a more crucial role in the formation of political dynasties than the length of an individual's term in office.

Mexico has a long history of political dynasties playing a key role in national development. Buchenau (2011) examines the Sonoran Dynasty, which combined co-optation and repression to achieve the goals of economic development and political centralization. Political dynasties can be an effective tool for achieving stability and economic growth, albeit at high social costs. Meanwhile, research by Behrend (2021) confirms that political dynasties remain influential even after the democratization process began in the late 1980s. Political dynasties are more prominent at the subnational level,

with many governors having blood or marital ties to other politicians. They have had remarkable resilience and adaptability in Mexican politics, influencing policy and governance at multiple levels of government. Behrend & Whitehead (2023) further discuss the process of subnational democratization in Mexico as a complex interaction between formal institutions and informal practices. There are three primary domains in which formal democratic institutions interact with local traditions and practices: political dynasties, dual dealing, and democratic violations.

The United States, despite its anti-aristocratic founding, remains home to influential political dynasties. A study by Dal Bó et al. (2009) found that political power in the US is self-maintaining, with legislators who hold office longer than others tending to have relatives in Congress. Political dynasties in the US solidify power through hereditary lines. Feinstein (2010) revealed that dynastic politicians have a "brand advantage" in open House seat elections, giving them a significant advantage over non-dynastic opponents. The long history of political dynasties in the US is also discussed by Hess (2016), who covers families such as the Adams, Roosevelts, Kennedys, Bushes, and Clintons. The book also highlights how women and ethnic and racial minorities have begun to join political dynasties in the US, reflecting changes in power dynamics. Recent research by Ternullo et al. (2024) in Chicago suggests that political dynasties can contribute to spatial inequality. From 2011 to 2018, areas dominated by dynasties experienced a decrease in crime rates and an increase in public services such as road paving. However, blocks removed from dynasty areas experienced increases in crime, suggesting that while political dynasties can improve living conditions in their areas, this often occurs at the expense of other areas, creating complex patterns of inequality in the urban context.

The various studies above clearly show that political dynasties in the Americas have a noteworthy and complex impact on the political, economic, and social dynamics of these countries. Although political dynasties can bring stability and investment, the potential risks of corruption and inequality must also be addressed through institutional reform and effective oversight.

Meanwhile, the phenomenon of political dynasties in Europe shows wide variations in how power is inherited and maintained through family lines. Each country has its own unique dynamics and historical context in the formation and maintenance of political dynasties. A study by Lutter (2024) explores the gender dimension in dynastic politics during the reign of Maximilian I in Austria. The study highlights the importance of personal networks and family ties in supporting Maximilian's power. Maximilian's wives, daughters, and granddaughters played key roles in maintaining and expanding dynastic power. The

social networks they formed show how the social and political rise of kinship at the court was closely related to the power structure of the dynasty. Dynastic power in Austria was supported not only by blood ties but also by extensive and dynamic social networks.

In the Czech Republic, the relationship between the political system and the family, particularly in the context of the Roma community, exhibits unique complexities. Uherek (2018) highlights the challenges that Roma politicians face in aligning family interests with broader political demands. The study emphasizes the significance of understanding the interplay between political culture, family values, and legitimization processes in the study of political power and participation. In a society heavily tied to family ties, these dynamics reflect how personal and family interests can clash or collaborate with larger political agendas.

Lacroix et al. (2023) explore whether political dynasties can prevent authoritarian backsliding. Political dynasties with pro-democratic ideological origins express stronger support for democracy. An analysis of the 1940 French parliamentary vote to grant full powers to Marshall Philippe Pétain shows that members of pro-democratic dynasties were more likely to oppose the measure than other members of Parliament. The ideologies and values inherited in political dynasties can play a crucial role in maintaining or challenging democratic systems.

Smith & Martin (2017) examine whether politicians with a family history of cabinet office enjoy an advantage in cabinet selection in Ireland. Politicians with a dynastic background do indeed have an advantage that is not simply due to greater electoral popularity. Data from Irish parliamentary and cabinet elections from 1944 to 2016 suggest that family factors play a significant role in political selection, reinforcing the power of dynasties at the government level.

In Italy, Geys (2017) investigates whether political dynasties have lower levels of education than their non-dynastic counterparts. An analysis of almost 540,000 local politicians over the period 1985–2012 shows that the political selection process controlled by politicians tends to select dynastic individuals with lower levels of education. Daniele et al. (2021) find that dynastic mayors increase spending and receive higher transfers in the year before an election, suggesting an inherited political strategy to maintain power. Dynastic mayors may have better political skills and a higher interest in remaining in office despite their lower levels of education.

Van Coppenolle (2022) explores the impact of direct elections on political dynasties in the Netherlands after a change in the selection rules in 1848. Dynasty perpetuation decreased in the directly elected assembly but increased in the Senate. The direct election reform resulted in fewer political dynasties in the elected assembly, but

some dynasties persisted in the Senate. Changes in the selection system can affect the sustainability of political dynasties at different levels of government. Fiva & Smith (2018) find that in Norway, incumbency advantages exist even in a party-centric environment. However, there is no evidence that incumbency advantages are significant for dynasty formation. These results suggest that internal party organizational networks play a larger role in the perpetuation of political dynasties than incumbency advantages themselves. Political dynasties in Norway are maintained through party structures rather than individuals.

Folke et al. (2021) develop a theory that integrates political selection with information inequality across social groups to explain dynasty bias in women's representation. Data from a range of democracies confirms that dynastic ties help women more than men in politics. Dynasty bias declines as the number of women entering politics increases and the differential effects of gender quotas help reduce inequality in representation.

Van Coppenolle (2017) considers whether members of the British House of Commons with longer legislative careers after 1832 are more likely to establish political dynasties. The study finds no evidence of a causal effect of length of service on the formation or sustainability of political dynasties. Established families may limit further dynasty development, explaining the null results of the length of service.

Overall, political dynasties in Europe exhibit a complex and diverse pattern. Each country has a unique historical and political context that influences how political dynasties form, persist, and evolve. While some dynasties can leverage social networks and political strategies to maintain power, others must adapt to changing sociopolitical conditions to remain relevant. This phenomenon underscores the importance of understanding local dynamics and historical context in the study of political dynasties.

In Asia, the phenomenon of political dynasties reflects the unique historical backgrounds, cultures and diverse political systems across the continent. These family-based power dynamics involve the inheritance of political positions and show how social values and patronage networks are deeply rooted in governance structures. The presence of political dynasties often influences democratic processes and political participation, shaping patterns of power that prioritize family continuity in public roles and maintaining a status quo that benefits certain groups. The phenomenon poses challenges in creating a political system that is more inclusive and open to potential new figures.

The existence of political dynasties in East Asian countries reflects the complexity and dynamics of politics, characterized by cultural heritage and the demands

of modernity. The locus of prior studies has only targeted Japan, North Korea, and Taiwan (one of the particular administrative regions of the People's Republic of China), with each country showing how political dynasties develop and maintain power in various socio-political contexts.

In Japan, dynasty candidates use specific strategies to maintain power by distributing particularistic goods in their political campaigns, especially for those with short political careers (Muraoka, 2018). Although many people disliked dynasty candidates, they still appreciated the political networks and potential ministerial appointments that these candidates had. Despite the rejection of dynasty politics, there is also an appreciation for their pragmatic benefits (Miwa et al., 2023). North Korea presents a different example, with the Kim dynasty combining militarism and ideology to maintain power. This dynasty has created and consolidated power through a highly structured and controlled approach since 1945, including the development of nuclear capabilities (Buzo, 2017).

Taiwan offers an interesting dynamic in the context of political dynasties in East Asia. Candidates with political legacies tend to be more successful when competition is low, avoiding close competition (Batto, 2018). Inherited ethical standards and cultural norms can curb the particularistic potential of dynasties, but political modernization is necessary to prevent predatory political capitalism (Schafferer, 2023). Dynastic status remains a strong predictor of electoral success, even though the individual characteristics of dynastic candidates differ from those of non-dynastic candidates (Batto & Read, 2024).

The prevalence of political dynasties in East Asia depicts a unique dynamic in which traditional and modern forces converge to form sustainable political institutions. Examples from Japan, North Korea, and Taiwan reveal how political dynasties have developed and maintained power in various socio-political contexts, reflecting the complexity of cultural heritage and the demands of modernity. Although political dynasties are often criticized for preserving inherited privileges, they have demonstrated the ability to adapt to political and social changes, offering pragmatic benefits recognized by some societies.

While historical and cultural legacies provide a strong foundation for the survival of dynasties, political dynasties in West Asia also face noteworthy challenges from modernity and democratic aspirations. With their extensive networks of power and influence, political dynasties can adapt to changing socio-political conditions and maintain their power through various strategies, including nepotism and institutional manipulation. However, their existence often hinders democratization and creates

inequality in political representation. Studies covering cases from Azerbaijan, Syria, Lebanon, and Iran to Turkey demonstrate the complexity and dynamics of dynastic power that are constantly changing, reflecting the tension between tradition and modernity.

In Azerbaijan, the Kojajani family, from the 7th to the 16th centuries, exploited social and political instability to consolidate their power, moving from mystical positions to political and religious positions such as chief judge and vizier. Their adaptation from Sunni to Shia reflects the flexibility of the dynasty in adjusting to changing socio-political conditions. Political dynasties have a remarkable ability to survive and adapt to changing environments, ensuring their continued rule over the centuries (Hassanzadeh & Hazrati, 2022).

Iran also has a long history of failed attempts to establish a constitutional democracy. Since the Constitutional Revolution of 1906, Iran's attempts to establish a constitutional democracy have consistently failed due to foreign intervention, internal instability, and the failure of parliamentary politics (Kerman & Wood, 2012). Authoritarian rule has continued to dominate despite the desire for democracy among various segments of Iranian society. Lebanon faces different challenges related to political dynasties. There are prominent tactics of political dynasties to survive by affecting fair representation and creating unfair business competition (Ghoul & Abou-Jaoude, 2010).

In Lebanon, the Hariri dynasty, which held power for two decades, faces challenges from political rivals, financial problems, and the Syrian crisis. It confirms how regional instability and internal challenges can threaten the survival of political dynasties (Vloeberghs, 2012). In Syria, the Atassi family could return to political prominence by adapting to the changing basis of authority in the 20th century. Several members continue to play essential roles in Syria's private and professional sectors. Some have had to go into exile because they are considered political threats. The family struggled to maintain its position in government during the Assad era, and some of its members eventually became opponents of Bashar al-Assad in 2011 (Parker, 2016). The Assad family tended to ruthlessly build their power by practicing nepotism and destroying republican institutions through dynastic succession. However, sibling rivalry emerged as a potential threat to the continuity of the dynasty, adding complexity to the management of power and political stability in both countries (Yates, 2022).

In Turkey, personal religiosity and membership in a political family significantly impact party leadership selection. Religiosity reduces support for democratic leadership selection practices, especially among politicians from political families. Social and

cultural factors can strengthen political dynasty structures, hindering the democratization process in political parties (Yadav & Fidalgo, 2022).

Meanwhile, the operation of political dynasties in South Asian countries portrays complex political dynamics influenced by a long history, socioeconomic context, and modern political changes. The situation of countries such as Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka is characterized by how political dynasties develop, survive, and adapt to different challenges. Female leaders in these countries are often the daughters or widows of prominent nationalist politicians, reflecting progressive nationalism that advocates national integration and social justice. Political dynasties can function as mechanisms to fight for social and political change, although they are often still within the framework of inherited power (Amirell, 2012).

Intra-party democracy in Bangladesh is ineffective due to weak party organization, centralization of power, and decision-making controlled by a small number of party elites. These conditions have created dynastic parties that dominate Bangladeshi politics and hamper the prospects for democratization in the country (Amundsen, 2016). The success of the heir apparent in building informal trust is a critical factor in the survival of political dynasties, making it more of a coincidence than a strategic outcome (Ruud & Islam, 2016). The Osman dynasty, as an example, could combine legitimate mobilization politics with money business and “godfather” tactics (Ruud, 2018).

India is one of the countries with the most prominent phenomenon of political dynasties in Asia. Party politics in India are dynastic due to the lack of party organizations, independent civil society associations, and centralized financing of elections. These factors make the political system less representative and more volatile (Chhibber, 2013; Ghosh, 2023). Families who successfully elect their children to local political bodies become powerful political dynasties over time, aided by political parties and caste associations (Kumar, 2018). For instance, dynastic candidates had a higher chance of winning and garnering more votes than non-dynastic candidates in the 2014 Lok Sabha elections. Factors such as the relative wealth of dynasties and voter dissatisfaction influenced the preference of voters and political parties for dynastic candidates (Panda, 2022).

Political families are also typical in Pakistan. Politicians from political families (PPFs) tend to make decisions to prioritize the political prospects of the entire family, as opposed to non-PPFs, who maximize their political interests. PPFs are associated with poor development outcomes and governance (Yadav, 2020). Despite the prevalence of political dynasties in Pakistan, voters tend to have negative views of dynastic politicians, perceiving them as less qualified and less supportive of universal policies than non-

dynastic candidates. Voters preferred non-dynastic candidates perceived as more qualified to overcome the high barriers created by dynasties (Ascencio & Malik, 2024).

Sri Lanka faced three crises in 2019: constitutional deadlock, Easter bombings, fiscal shortfalls, and debt burden. The presidential election was won by Gotabaya Rajapaksa, the heir to the Rajapaksa dynasty, with a landslide victory (Klem, 2020). Its governance or administrative system is a mixture of paternalism and alliance developed through political dynasties, kinship, ethnicity, caste, religion, and elitism. Political and administrative commitment and quality of governance are essential factors for rapid development and combating administrative malpractices. Sustainable development will be easier with administrative and policy reforms supported by strong political and bureaucratic commitment (Ramasamy, 2020).

While these dynasties have been able to adapt and survive significant political and social changes, their existence has often hampered the process of democratization and created inequalities in political representation in South Asia. The complexity of politics in the region is influenced by long histories and diverse socioeconomic contexts. From female leaders who are members of prominent nationalist families to subnational and regional dynasties, these dynasties use strong power networks to maintain their influence. However, they need help with considerable challenges, such as weak party organization, centralization of power, and negative perceptions from voters. Studies have shown that while political dynasties can serve as mechanisms for social change, they often perpetuate inherited privileges and hinder the development of more inclusive and equitable politics.

Southeast Asia, as a region rich in history and cultural diversity, has unique political dynamics, especially related to the formation and operation of political dynasties (Hidayat, 2024 c). Although the region consists of 11 countries, the primary focus of previous studies lies in only five countries: Cambodia, the Philippines, Indonesia, Singapore, and Thailand.

In Cambodia, Bennett (2023) examines the transition of power from Hun Sen to Hun Manet after elections that were considered neither free nor fair. The study shows how Cambodia's transformation into a dynastic autocracy was influenced by economic recovery following the COVID-19 pandemic, human rights restrictions, and regional political relations. The future of Hun Manet's government remains uncertain, but it is expected to follow the pattern set by his father.

Indonesia has a long history of political dynasties that have influenced various aspects of political and social life in the country. Fauzanafi (2016) highlights how digital technology and social media in Indonesia have shifted citizenship practices to informal

digital spaces, where citizens use online platforms to challenge corrupt political dynasty regimes. Mietzner (2016) examines the resilience of the Sukarno dynasty and shows how it faced a series of succession crises that could have threatened its long-term position in Indonesian politics. Purdey, Aspinall, et al. (2016) investigate the phenomenon of political dynasties in Central Kalimantan. Although many regents have attempted to build political dynasties, only a few have succeeded. The structure of political opportunities and the weaknesses of the state and parties play a role in the formation of dynasties, but intergenerational stability still needs to be discovered. Purdey (2016a) inspects the Djojohadikusumo political dynasty in Indonesia, which has held positions of power for four generations. The study seeks to understand how this dynasty has adapted to changing political structures and how external factors, as well as internal, historical, psychological, and cultural characteristics of the family, influence its sustainability as a major player. A study by Savirani (2016) demonstrates that decentralization and electoral democracy in Indonesia have facilitated the emergence of new elites and their families as political dynasties. She specifically examines political families in Pekalongan, Central Java, which show high adaptability to external opportunities and threats as well as internal family dynamics. This adaptability allows local political dynasties to remain relevant in local and national politics.

According to Marwiyah et al. (2017), political dynasties in Indonesia represent vested interests. There are elite needs in power or politics that demand the fulfilment of unlimited political rights. However, other community interests require the protection of their human rights. Constitutional democracy implements people's rights in governing based on the Constitution. Dewi (2017) analyses the rise of Muslim women in local Indonesian politics, influenced by the third wave of Islamization and globalization in the 21st century. She explores the stories of four Javanese Muslim female political leaders, focusing on the use of Islamic piety and sexuality in political strategies. The use of the hijab as a sign of Islamic modernity and heterosexual norms that dominate political campaigns indicates a change in gender normative standards in Javanese society, supporting greater participation of Muslim women in the public sphere.

Muslikhah et al. (2019) found that political dynasties in several regions have a direct impact on society and government bureaucracy, often ending in acts of corruption, collusion, and nepotism. Guritno et al. (2019) showed that political dynasties have an impact on reducing poverty in the era of regional autonomy, although income distribution is uneven. Purwaningsih & Widodo (2020) elaborated the relationship between incumbents, political dynasties, and corruption from a good governance perspective. Direct regional head elections provide greater opportunities for incumbents to build

political dynasties and strengthen their power. Political dynasties are often considered the cause of corruption, but non-dynasty regional heads also carry out corruption. Strong supervision of the government is needed through political recruitment, bureaucratic neutrality, budget transparency and accountability, and supervision of local policies to minimize corruption.

Yuliadi et al. (2021) examined the practice of political dynasties in Bima Regency over the past 20 years, where the royal family controls the leadership. Political dynasties in Bima involve the use of the sultan's image as a source of cultural legitimacy, with the community still at a superstitious level of consciousness, making it easier for them to gain votes. Political dynasties are supported by opposition elites who are trapped at a naive level of consciousness and are unable to gather resources to defeat strong political dynasties. Azizah et al. (2021) highlighted the phenomenon of the involvement of Islamic boarding school communities in politics, which hinders the process of democracy and progress. Islamic boarding school families use state facilities and are involved in dynasty politics, which weakens the democratic process. A revision of the election process is needed to ensure fair elections by strengthening election supervision and educating voters.

Aspinall et al. (2021) investigate the barriers to women's political representation in Indonesia and how women overcome them. Patriarchal attitudes and structural disadvantages are the main barriers. Women candidates overcome these barriers by mobilizing women's networks or relying on political and financial resources from male relatives. They also highlight the role of political Islam in facilitating and hindering women's representation. Wardani & Subekti (2021) found that 44 per cent of female candidates elected to the Indonesian National Parliament in 2019 were members of political dynasties. Factors such as financial resources and local political networks contributed to their success. However, the rise in female dynasty candidates has not eliminated gender bias within parties but rather marginalized qualified female candidates.

Bayo (2021) highlights the increase in the number of women elected in East Nusa Tenggara province in 2019. Contributing factors include the persistence of female candidates, the positive effects of female role models, and cooperation between female candidates. Although male dominance and dynastic power are still strong, women from the grassroots still have a path to power. Kabullah & Fajri (2021) analyze the victory of the wives of regional heads in West Sumatra in the 2019 elections, developing the concept of "neo-Ibuisim". Neo-Ibuisim allows women to play an active role in the public sphere while emphasizing their traditional roles in the family. The wives of regional heads

use their husbands' political resources and political networks to achieve victory, demonstrating a mix of traditional gender roles and political agency.

Dewi (2022) reveals the political role of female leaders in local government in Indonesia from a gender perspective. Based on the experiences of two women who successfully won local elections in Indramayu and South Tangerang, she discusses the challenges faced by female leaders in promoting local democracy. She also highlights the importance of women's participation and leadership in the democratization process in post-reform Indonesia. A study by Tyson & Nawawi (2022) reveals the recovery strategy of the dynasty regime in Indonesia. After a rapid transition from an authoritarian to a democratic system, the old elite tried to regain power through various strategies. This study shows how positive narratives about past leadership, such as Suharto, are used as part of the regime's recovery strategy. In addition, the phenomenon of single candidates in the 2020 regional head elections showed an increase in the number of single candidates who were considered an easy and cheap way to win the election, especially for incumbents (Safa'at, 2022).

Kenawas (2023) studied why politicians engage in dynastic politics in democratic institutions and how they resist institutional changes that could limit their ability to pass on political power to family members. Political dynasties in Indonesia more than tripled between 2010 and 2018, which is closely related to gradual institutional changes after Indonesia's democratic transition in 1998. Prihatini & Halimatusa'diyah (2024) examined the representation of female dynasties in the Indonesian Parliament. They found that the placement of dynastic women on committees was influenced by political parties and their internal party structures, indicating the important role of dynasties in Indonesian politics. Noak (2024) scrutinized political dynasties in village head elections in Indonesia, finding that dynasties were influenced by unclear legal rules, undemocratic village institutions, and the strength of formal and informal social networks. Lastly, Kimura & Anugrah (2024) analyzed Indonesian politics in the run-up to the 2024 national elections, highlighting the continuation of political dynasties with the nomination of President Jokowi's son as vice president. Economic, environmental, and foreign policy issues were the focus of the study, demonstrating the dynamics of dynasties in Indonesian national politics.

The Philippines also exhibits a strong and enduring pattern of political dynasties. Solon et al. (2009) found that incumbent governors who increased economic development spending were more likely to be re-elected. Governors from political clans tended to increase spending when facing competition, suggesting that political competition is more effective than simply banning political dynasties. Abinales (2011)

noted that the 10-year administration of Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo stabilized the economy but also exacerbated the patronage-driven political process and violence by political dynasties and warlords. Mendoza et al. (2012) studied the size of political dynasties in the 15th Congress of the Philippines and explored the relationship between political dynasties and socioeconomic outcomes. Political dynasties dominated 70 percent of legislators by jurisdiction, had higher net worth, and won elections with larger margins. Political dynasty areas exhibited lower living standards, lower levels of human development, and higher levels of deprivation and inequality.

Research by Tusalem & Pe-Aguirre (2013) shows that political dynasties in the Philippine House of Representatives have a detrimental effect on good governance, with provinces dominated by political dynasties tending to experience less effective governance in terms of infrastructure development, health spending, crime prevalence, full employment, and overall quality of government. Although political dynasties may increase congressional appropriations, their impact on good governance is negative. Panao (2014) examines the legislative process in the Philippines and finds that bills deemed urgent by the president are more likely to be enacted, although this effect changes over time. Panao (2016) analyses legislative success in the Philippine House of Representatives, finding that new legislators are more proactive in introducing legislation. However, over time, as legislative districts become familial, incumbents stop investing in legislative activities, suggesting a negative effect of political continuity on accountability. Purdey, Tadem, et al. (2016) highlight the dominance of political dynasties in the 2013 Philippine midterm elections, where 74 percent of elected members of the House of Representatives came from dynastic groups, leading to patronage politics and corruption.

The Philippines is a country with a high prevalence of political dynasties, with a study by Querubin (2016) demonstrating the continuity of political dynasties. Candidates who narrowly won their first election were five times more likely to have relatives who held office in the future compared to those who narrowly lost. Access to public office and resources is considered a key driver of dynasty continuity. Mendoza et al. (2016) examined the impact of political dynasties on poverty in the Philippines, finding that political dynasties exacerbate poverty in provinces outside Luzon. David & San Pascual (2016) scrutinized voter behaviour in senatorial elections in the Philippines, showing that wealthier and more educated voters were less likely to vote for media celebrities, while more educated voters were more likely to vote for dynasty candidates. High abstention rates were associated with voting for media celebrities and dynasty candidates.

David & Legara (2017) support the hypothesis that less informed voters are more likely to vote for media celebrities and members of political dynasties. Voters with low education and low income living in rural areas tend to vote for these candidates, and high abstention rates are also associated with voting for these candidates. David & San Pascual (2018) assert that many believe that political dynasties are endemic to the Philippine political system, rooted in a history of feudalism and patronage. Most literature views political dynasties as a problem to be solved. Political dynasties dominate local and national positions despite the 1987 Philippine constitution prohibiting political dynasties. More than 60 percent of legislators since 1986 have been members of political clans. Reyes et al. (2018) explore the effects of campaign spending, incumbency, political party affiliation, and political dynasty on the vote share of senatorial candidates in the 2010, 2013, and 2016 Philippine elections. The results show that campaign spending shows a highly significant correlation with vote share, demonstrating the importance of money in Philippine politics.

Consistent with the findings of Mendoza et al. (2018), the 2013 Philippine midterm elections provide important insights into the 2016 national elections. Their research highlights information and advocacy campaigns against political dynasties, as well as reports of widespread vote buying despite the computerization of elections since 2010. Teehankee (2018) investigates the adaptability and resilience of political dynasties in Philippine congressional politics. Various political dynasties employ adaptive strategies to maintain their dominance in congressional politics. His article outlines the mechanisms of power acquisition, maintenance, and reproduction through the House of Representatives. Despite economic progress in the Philippines, income inequality and social exclusion remain high. Political dynasties and family conglomerates hamper the capacity of non-elites to implement more progressive policies, leading to inequality and low social mobility (Tuaño & Cruz, 2019).

Tamiki (2019) investigates the case of Siquijor Province, where an established political dynasty was defeated by candidates supported by the Liberal Party and its allies in the 2013 and 2016 elections. Tadem (2019) discusses how the US's anti-communist modernization campaign shaped the Marcos technocrats in the Philippines. Her book also focuses on the education of technocrats to ensure that the vulnerable state follows a liberal capitalist line. Mendoza et al. (2020) show how political dynasties find ways to overcome term limits by bringing more family members into power. Mendoza & Banaag (2020) develop an index of political inequality based on the concentration of elective positions among political dynasties in the Philippines. In the Philippines, political dynasties have a profound influence on various aspects of politics and society. Research

by Panao (2020) suggests that electoral competition has a disciplining effect on the legislative performance of members of the House of Representatives. In a competitive environment, incumbents are more likely to enact legislative proposals into law, highlighting the importance of competition for improving legislative performance despite political and institutional uncertainty.

Garces et al. (2021) explored the economic effects of the presence of political dynasties in cities and municipalities in the Philippines using nighttime lighting data as a proxy for economic activity. The results show a weak relationship between political dynasties and overall economic performance. However, higher economic spending is associated with lower economic development in areas where mayors, governors, and congress members come from the same clan. Hara (2021) highlighted that some local politicians have begun to challenge political dynasties by implementing programmatic governance, as was the case in Dinagat Island. A new dynamic in Philippine politics has the potential to change the political landscape in the future. Buendia (2021) assessed the development of Philippine politics over the three decades since the fall of the authoritarian Marcos regime. There are three primary challenges: uniting different ethnic, religious, and national groups, combining political stability with political liberalization and democratization, and changing the political culture towards more egalitarian relations. To modernize politics, the Philippines must move beyond the control of political dynasties and strengthen national identity.

Labonne et al. (2021) investigated the effects of term limits on women's political representation in the Philippines. Term limits increase the number of women running for and winning mayoral elections, but this increase is driven entirely by female relatives of term-limited incumbents. Wataru (2021) explains why reform-oriented local politics are increasingly emerging in the Philippines. The interconnectedness of the global neoliberal economy and local policy entrepreneurs facilitates the emergence of reform-oriented and business-friendly local politics. Local elites who are successful as policy entrepreneurs tend to solidify their dynasties by leveraging private capital investments, as was the case with the Valdez family in San Nicolas, Ilocos Norte. Dulay & Go (2022) identified horizontal dynasties, where multiple members of a political family hold different political offices simultaneously, as a factor influencing policymaking in the Philippines. Horizontal dynasty mayors had higher levels of government spending, but this did not lead to higher economic growth or poverty reduction.

Heydarian (2022) examines the state of democracy in the Philippines through the prism of dynastic politics. Ferdinand Marcos Jr.'s electoral victory in the 2022 presidential election demonstrated the structural vulnerabilities of Philippine democracy,

with the return of the old regime exploiting the weaknesses of the post-revolutionary regime. Mendoza et al. (2022) found that the concentration of power of political dynasties in the Philippines is associated with political violence through regression analysis. Concentrated power leads to weak governance, poor development outcomes, and exclusion of important sectors, which ultimately provoke political violence. Another study by Mendoza, Yap, Mendoza, Jaminola III, et al. (2022) confirms that the concentration of political dynasties exacerbated poverty in resource-rich provinces outside Luzon. However, Luzon, which has a more competitive business environment, was not affected. Mendoza (2023) highlights the dual nature of inequality by exploring oligarchy and dynasties as elements of inequality in the Philippines. Inequality is analyzed through its impact on leadership patterns and the country's economic structure.

Mendoza et al. (2023) accentuate the divergent effects of political dynasties on poverty in the Philippines. The authors develop a typology of political dynasties based on local business ownership and initial provincial capacity. Local dynasties can follow different development paths, depending on their motivations and the existing political opportunity structure, as well as the importance of political and economic competition in creating the necessary conditions for change. Espia (2023) outlines the rise of the Marcos dynasty after the Duterte administration, influenced by the weakening of civil society elements and liberal democratic order through Duterte's authoritarian populism. Duterte's policies paved the way for the return of the Marcos dynasty to the presidency, underscoring the power of dynasty influence in Philippine politics. Zialcita (2024) analyses the tensions between the Marcos-Romualdez dynasty coalition and Duterte in 2023, emphasizing that social and economic issues will play a considerable role in determining the outcome of future political contests. These tensions demonstrate the complexity of dynastic politics and power dynamics in the Philippines.

Bulaong et al. (2024) reveal the impact of Martial Law on economic and political crises, highlighting the evolution of oligarchy and cronyism. The research outlines the importance of reforms to support inclusive development, underscoring the impact of the dynasty system on economic and political resilience. Davis et al. (2024) use public procurement contracts to measure corruption risk in the Philippines. They found a positive relationship between the concentration of political power among dynasties and the risk of corruption, highlighting the governance challenges in countries dominated by political dynasties. Lastly, Tan (2024) examines politics under Marcos Jr.'s leadership, covering diplomatic maneuvers, government reforms, economic challenges, and commitment to an independent foreign policy. The study reveals the complexity of

Marcos Jr.'s leadership and the challenges faced in maintaining political balance amidst global power dynamics.

Political dynasties also play a notable role in Singapore. Barr (2016) discusses the Lee dynasty in Singapore, showing how Lee Kuan Yew was at the centre of a significant power network from the early 1980s until his son, Lee Hsien Loong, consolidated power in 2011. Although official rhetoric stated that the best talents ran the country, the reality was that a group of family and relatives ruled it.

Thailand has also experienced a unique political dynasty phenomenon. Nishizaki (2013) describes Duncan McCargo's 'network monarchy' model, in which, according to McCargo, King Bhumibol Adulyadej supposedly mobilized a national patronage network to shape contemporary Thai politics. Nishizaki's study focused on the emergence of the political dynasty of Banharn Silpa-Archa, a rural politician and subsequently prime minister, in the context of this supposed network of influence. Purdey & Kongkirati (2016) trace the historical development and patterns of wealth and power accumulation of political dynasties in Thailand, showing that many political dynasties lasted only two legislative terms due to frequent military coups that disrupted parliamentary institutions and electoral processes. Ideological conflicts and mass movements following the 2006 military coup further weakened the power of old political dynasties. Thananithichot & Satidporn (2016) found that being part of a political dynasty can provide electoral advantages. However, the most influential factor is being a member of the Pheu Thai Party or the Democrat Party. One of the best ways to avoid the monopoly of political families in Thailand is to empower and support eligible party members and voters to engage in party affairs and activities.

Sriwimon & Zilli (2017) investigated gender stereotypes in Thai media using the example of former Prime Minister Yingluck Shinawatra. Transitivity and referential choice analyses revealed patterns of linguistic choices that reinforce gender stereotypes against female politicians in Thai media, with data from 190 news articles from May to August 2011. Thailand has seen an increase in the number of women elected to Parliament in the past decade. Nishizaki (2018) found that most female members of Parliament are related to previous male members, either through blood or marriage, reinforcing family-based power and hampering political pluralism. Institutional reforms of the 1997 Thai Constitution that were expected to support political reforms have allowed political families to maintain or strengthen their hold on Parliament, reducing the chances of reform. Chambers (2023) and Chambers et al. (2023) highlight the influence of political families on parliamentary politics in Thailand and the conflict between the military-backed royalist elite and the mainstream political families. The study uses elite theory to describe dynastic

democracy in Thailand as a subtype of democracy in which the ruling elite comes from political families.

Furthermore, the historical evolution of provincial dynasties in Thai electoral politics shows how provincial clans and strategies for dynastic dominance influence the future of democracy in Thailand. Nethipo et al. (2023) examine the victory of the Move Forward Party (MFP) in the 2023 Thai general election, which marked a significant shift from traditional voter mobilization by provincial dynasties. The MFP victory demonstrates the challenges faced by newcomers unaffiliated with established power structures, reflecting the dynamic changes in Thailand's political landscape. Nishizaki (2024) examines female parliamentarians in Thailand who come from political families, showing that electoral dynasties remain a structural barrier for female candidates who lack strong family connections.

Political dynasties in Southeast Asia, especially in the Philippines, Indonesia, Singapore, and Thailand, depict the deep complexities and dynamics in the power structures of the region. Despite variations in the forms and operations of political dynasties, all of these countries face similar challenges stemming from the influence of dynasties on governance, economic development, and social welfare. In the Philippines, political dynasties play a crucial role in creating challenges for democracy, with certain families dominating positions of power and using patronage networks to maintain their dominance, which results in inequality and corruption and hinders more inclusive development. In Indonesia, despite the adaptability of political dynasties, similar challenges arise where power is often concentrated in the hands of certain elites, affecting the quality of public services and governance. In Singapore, the dominance of the Lee dynasty shows that power is not only held by talented individuals but also by robust family networks, which hinder the access of others to positions of power. Furthermore, Thailand portrays a different dynamic, where military intervention and internal conflict often affect the sustainability of political dynasties. Despite progress in terms of women's participation, challenges remain in the form of gender stereotypes and strong family dominance.

In summary, the phenomenon of political dynasties in Asia reflects the challenges faced by countries on the continent in building and maintaining democratic and representative political systems. Political dynasties are often associated with corruption, collusion, and nepotism, which can hinder the development of democracy and good governance. However, there are also examples where political dynasties have successfully adapted to political and social changes and played an important role in local and national political dynamics.

The phenomenon of political dynasties in the African continent demonstrates the unique complexities and challenges in the political context of each country. From Angola to Kenya, these studies provide insights into how political dynasties can affect democracy, governance, and the social and economic aspects of society. In Angola, the phenomenon of political dynasties is seen through the figure of Isabel dos Santos, the daughter of former president José Eduardo dos Santos. According to Pitcher & Sanches (2019), the changing depiction of Isabel dos Santos from 2010 to 2018 reflects the dynamics of dynastic politics under authoritarian regimes. Isabel dos Santos's downfall ultimately demonstrated the limitations of hereditary politics in Angola, revealing that despite the strong influence of dynasties, there are limits to their power that internal and external pressures may influence.

Gabon, on the other hand, has witnessed the emergence of what is referred to as a quasi-hereditary "dynastic republic." Yates (2019) examines how the former colonial power supported the establishment of a dynastic regime in Gabon. Political dynasties in this country have reduced democracy and government accountability and increased nepotism and corruption. With the help of the former colonial powers, kinship groups managed to form regimes that maintained their power within a modern republican structure, creating major challenges for democratization and political reform in Gabon. In Kenya, William Ruto's victory in the 2022 presidential election through the 'Hustler Nation' campaign demonstrated a reaction to the dominance of political and economic dynasties, especially the Kenyatta family. According to Lockwood (2023), the campaign succeeded in gaining attention because it capitalized on the public's dissatisfaction with the supremacy of the Kenyatta dynasty, calling for economic justice and opposing modern patrimonial capitalism. The victory reflected the moral dissatisfaction of the public. It indicated a new dynamic in Kenyan politics, where people are beginning to reject the dominance of political dynasties and seek change through democratic processes.

The phenomenon of political dynasties in Africa reflects the major challenges that countries on the continent face in their efforts to strengthen democracy and good governance. Political dynasties are often associated with corruption, nepotism, and decreased government accountability. However, the public response to the dominance of political dynasties, as seen in Kenya, suggests hope for change and reform. With internal and external pressures and increasing public awareness, there is potential to limit the power of political dynasties and promote more democratic and equitable political systems in Africa.

The above discussion of country-based issues in the Americas, Europe, Asia, and Africa confirms that the phenomenon of political dynasties affects countries in unique ways, depending on their political, social, and economic contexts. Political dynasties can strengthen or weaken democratic institutions, depending on how they manage power and respond to internal and external challenges. Each country has its unique dynamics related to dynastic politics, influenced by its history, culture, and political structure. The phenomenon of political dynasties often significantly impacts state policies, political representation, and social stability. Further study and policy reforms are needed to address the negative impacts of dynastic politics and to promote more inclusive and democratic political systems. Prior studies show that political dynasties have complex, often negative, impacts on government performance, democracy, and economic development.

A key similarity in the patterns of political dynasties in democratic countries is the use of social capital and economic wealth to maintain power. All of these dynasties leveraged strong social networks, access to financial resources, and well-known family names to build and expand their political influence. Higher education and political experience were also important factors that gave members of these dynasties a competitive advantage. In addition, political dynasties in all of these countries demonstrated the ability to adapt to political and social changes. They often used flexible strategies, such as building political alliances, using the media to shape public opinion, and adapting their political platforms to suit the current context.

However, there were differences in how these political dynasties operated and developed. For example, in India, the Nehru-Gandhi dynasty used historical legacies and nationalist symbolism to build their political legitimacy. In contrast, in the Philippines, the Marcos dynasty used authoritarianism and political patronage, while the Aquino dynasty gained support through the symbolism of democratic resistance. In Japan, the Hatoyama dynasty operated in a more structured political context with a strong tradition of political parties, while in the United States, political dynasties had to operate in a highly competitive and decentralized political system. The United States also exhibits greater pluralism, with multiple political dynasties competing simultaneously within a strong two-party system.

While democratic principles aim to provide a level playing field for all citizens, political realities often show that certain families can dominate the political arena through a combination of social capital, economic wealth, and political networks. Similarities in resource use and adaptive strategies suggest common patterns in how political dynasties maintain their power. However, differences in historical context, culture, and

political system suggest that each political dynasty develops in unique ways according to the political and social environment in which it operates.

Criticism and Controversy in the Context of Democracy

The existence of political dynasties in democratic systems is often the target of sharp criticism related to fairness and equality. The basic principle of democracy is to provide equal opportunities for all citizens to participate in the political process and ensure that political decisions fairly reflect the will of the people. However, political dynasties can undermine these principles by creating inequalities in political access and opportunities.

One of the main criticisms is that political dynasties hinder social and political mobility (Dal Bó et al. , 2009; Mendoza, Yap, Mendoza, Jaminola III, et al. , 2022; Teehankee et al., 2023; Tuaño & Cruz, 2019). Families that are already established in politics often have greater access to resources and networks that allow them to maintain power (Querubin, 2016; Wardani & Subekti, 2021) . These factors prevent new candidates, especially from economically or socially disadvantaged backgrounds, from facing significant barriers to entry into the political arena (Ascencio & Malik, 2024). Thus, political dynasties reinforce inequality and hinder equal opportunities for all citizens.

In addition, political dynasties can create a system that is not inclusive. When political power is concentrated in the hands of a few families, the voices and needs of the wider community are often ignored. Political dynasties can ignore important issues that are not in line with their family's interests, resulting in public policies that do not reflect the will of the people as a whole (Fernandez, 1 9 9 5 ; Noak, 2 0 2 4). This criticism underlines that the existence of political dynasties can undermine democratic representation that should reflect the diversity of voices and interests of society. The legitimacy of political dynasties in a democratic system is often a controversial topic. Legitimacy in a democratic context is usually related to the principles of transparency, accountability, and fairness. Political dynasties are often questioned in terms of how legitimate they are in gaining and maintaining power through democratic mechanisms (Uherek, 2018), especially when they cunningly apply power perpetuation strategies, as in Figure 5 above.

In the meantime, one of the main controversies is whether political dynasties truly reflect the will of the people or are merely the result of manipulation of power and influence. Although political dynasties operate within the framework of democratic elections and processes, these processes are often influenced by uneven economic and social forces. Political dynasties often leverage established power and resources to

maintain influence, potentially distorting the democratic process. Dynastic politics can obscure true democratic representation by perpetuating inequality and the concentration of power (Dal Bó et al., 2009). Furthermore, the role of manipulation in politics further complicates the legitimacy of such dynasties. Influence ranging from media control to psychological tactics can undermine voter autonomy, raising ethical concerns about the true democratic nature of elections dominated by these families (Paulo & Bublitz, 2019). In other words, there are concerns that political dynasties can undermine the integrity of the democratic process itself. When certain families have significant control over politics, they can influence political institutions, the media, and the electoral system to strengthen their position. This controversy revolves around the extent to which political dynasties have the power to influence political outcomes and whether the democratic system can withstand the unhealthy influence of such dynasties.

Supporters of political dynasties often argue that they bring stability and experience to a political system. Long-standing political families often have deep experience in government and politics, as well as extensive networks that can be used to implement effective policies. They also argue that political dynasties can ensure continuity in government policies and strategies, which can be beneficial in the context of long-term challenges (Geys & Smith, 2017). In addition, some advocates argue that political dynasties can serve as effective checks and balances. In some cases, political dynasties can play a role in maintaining a balance of power between the different branches of government and ensuring that power is not concentrated in the hands of a single individual or group. They argue that the presence of a strong political dynasty can provide a stable alternative to governments that may be disrupted by rapid and frequent political change (Garces et al., 2021).

Opponents of political dynasties, on the other hand, stress that their existence often contributes to injustice and inequality in politics. They argue that political dynasties create a closed system and discourage broader political participation. Established political families can use their wealth and influence to block new candidates and control access to positions of power, thereby limiting the opportunity for other citizens to participate fairly in politics (Geys & Smith, 2017; Mendoza & Banaag, 2020). Opponents also argue that political dynasties can reduce accountability and transparency in government. When power is concentrated in the hands of a few families, they may feel less compelled to be held accountable for their actions and may be more likely to engage in corrupt practices or nepotism. This lack of transparency can undermine public trust in political institutions and undermine the integrity of the democratic system (Davis et al., 2024; Hidayat, 2019).

Criticism and controversy surrounding political dynasties in the context of democracies illustrate the tension between stability and fairness. Political dynasties can provide the benefits of experience and continuity in government, but they also have the potential to undermine principles of fairness, equality, accountability, and transparency. The debate over the legitimacy of political dynasties emphasizes the need for monitoring and reform of democratic systems to ensure that power is not concentrated in the hands of a few families or individuals and that all citizens have an equal opportunity to participate in the political process.

Responses and Reforms to Political Dynasties in Democratic Countries

In democratic countries, responses to the existence of political dynasties vary depending on the political, social, and cultural context of each country. Societies and institutions often have different views on the impact of political dynasties and how to deal with them. Societies often have mixed reactions to political dynasties. In some countries, dissatisfaction with the dominance of a particular political family can trigger protests and reform movements (Bulaong et al., 2024; Tyson & Nawawi, 2022; van Coppenolle, 2022; Wataru, 2021).

For instance, Dal Bó et al. (2009) examine how political dynasties in the US Congress demonstrate that political power tends to be perpetual, raising concerns about democratic representation. This perpetuation of power often leads to calls for greater transparency and reform to ensure more equitable political participation. Similarly, in the Philippines, dissatisfaction with political dynasties such as the Marcos family has historically led to significant public protests and demands for political reform. A study by Mendoza & Banaag (2020) illuminates how the concentration of political power among dynasties exacerbates economic and social inequality, fueling discontent and calls for greater inclusiveness in the political process. However, there is also a tendency in some countries to accept or even support political dynasties because of the experience and stability they offer. In the case of the Nehru-Gandhi dynasty in India, there was a strong base of support among voters who felt that the family provided political continuity and stability (Ghosh, 2023; Panda, 2022). When political dynasties have a good track record or are well-connected with the community, they often enjoy significant public support despite criticism.

Meanwhile, political institutions and governments usually play an essential role in regulating and monitoring political dynasties (Da Silva, 2022). Some institutions may respond to their dominance by implementing reforms or restrictions to ensure that the political system remains fair and inclusive. In countries experiencing popular

dissatisfaction with political dynasties, government institutions, and political parties frequently engage in discussions about the need for reforms to address their influence. However, these institutions are only sometimes united in their views on how to address political dynasties. Sometimes, they may have overlapping political interests with the ruling political family or be influenced by the dynasties' influence and pressures. That can hinder reform efforts or make the process more complex.

Political reform efforts are often necessary to reduce the influence of political dynasties and ensure that the democratic system functions fairly. Some reform approaches that have been implemented or proposed include anti-nepotism laws, term limits, and improved transparency mechanisms. Several countries have introduced anti-nepotism laws to mitigate the negative impacts of political dynasties. These laws are designed to prevent the appointment or promotion of family members to positions of power or government (Burhan, 2020; Fernandez, 1995). Some countries have implemented rules that prohibit family members of elected officials from holding strategic positions in government or public institutions. The goal is to reduce conflicts of interest and ensure that family ties do not influence political decisions (Mendoza, Yap, Mendoza, Pizarro, et al., 2022).

Term limits are another reform often proposed to reduce the influence of political dynasties. By setting limits on the length of time an individual can serve in a position, term limits aim to prevent prolonged concentrations of power and provide opportunities for new candidates to participate in politics (Labonne et al., 2021; Mendoza et al., 2020). Several countries have implemented term limits for presidents, members of parliament, and local officials as a way to prevent power from becoming too concentrated in one family or individual.

Increasing transparency and accountability in the political process is also a crucial step in reform. Implementing policies that ensure the openness of information about campaign financing and government decisions can help reduce the influence of political dynasties. Independent oversight bodies and anti-corruption bodies often play a role in ensuring that political influence is not abused and that the political system remains free from nepotism and corruption (Fauzanafi, 2016; Ramasamy, 2020).

The media and civil society play a key role in monitoring and criticizing political dynasties, as well as in promoting political reform. Both actors serve as watchdogs and promoters of transparency in the political system. The media plays a vital role in exposing nepotism and corruption that may be associated with political dynasties. Media investigations can reveal political connections, corrupt practices, and conflicts of interest involving certain political families. In addition, the media also serves as a platform for public discussion about the influence of political dynasties and their impact on

democracy. By providing accurate and comprehensive information, the media can help raise public awareness and encourage demands for reform (Fauzanafi, 2016; Pitcher & Sanches, 2019; Ufen, 2017).

Civil society, including non-governmental organizations, advocacy groups, and individuals, plays a critical role in promoting political justice and monitoring political dynasties. These groups often engage in campaigns for political reform, draft petitions, and organize protests to demand change. They can also provide public education about political rights and democratic processes and support candidates and initiatives aimed at increasing political competition and reducing the influence of dynasties. In many countries, civil society serves as a guardian of democratic principles by highlighting flaws in the political system and holding officials in power accountable. They often collaborate with the media to expose issues related to political dynasties and advocate for reforms needed to improve the political system (Chhibber, 2013; Mlambo et al., 2020).

Responses to political dynasties in democratic countries reflect the tension between political stability and principles of justice and equality. Societies and institutions often react in various ways, whether through criticism, demands for reform, or support for established dynasties. Political reform efforts, such as anti-nepotism laws and term limits, are designed to reduce the influence of political dynasties and ensure that the democratic system functions fairly. The media and civil society play a key role in monitoring, criticizing, and promoting reforms to ensure that political power is not concentrated in the hands of a few families or individuals and to maintain the integrity and fairness of the political system.

The Future of Political Dynasties in Democracy

Projecting the future of political dynasties in democracies involves analyzing the various factors that influence the dynamics of political power. These developments will depend largely on how democracies adapt to social change, technology, and globalization. Political dynasties will continue to exist and even thrive in some democracies, especially where social and cultural structures favor the maintenance of power within families. In countries with strong political traditions and closed social networks, political dynasties may still wield significant power, and in countries with more stable-centralized political systems, existing political dynasties can continue to maintain their power by leveraging their family names and networks (Querubin, 2016).

However, in many democracies, trends may point to a decline in the influence of political dynasties. These include the growth of political reform movements that advocate for transparency, accountability, and greater political opportunity. In countries where

societies increasingly demand more inclusive and equitable representation, political dynasties may face consequential challenges (Lockwood, 2023; Rodan, 2021). A new generation of more educated and digitally connected voters, such as in Indonesia, is fighting wholeheartedly to shift power away from existing political dynasties, favoring candidates from outside established political families (Fauzanafi, 2016; Purdey, Aspinall, et al., 2016). However, the Philippines shows the opposite reality, where wealthier voters and more educated people are less likely to vote for media celebrities, and more highly educated voters are more likely to vote for dynasty candidates (David & San Pascual, 2016).

Rapid social change often presents challenges for political dynasties. Increasingly pluralistic and diversified societies may demand broader representation than political dynasties can provide. Political dynasties also face pressure to adapt to new values that may conflict with their traditional practices. For example, issues such as gender equality, minority rights, and social justice are becoming increasingly significant, and political dynasties that fail to adapt to these changes may lose public support (Amirell, 2012; Dewi, 2022; Krook & O'Brien, 2012; Labonne et al., 2021). On the other hand, technology offers new opportunities for political dynasties to expand their influence. Social media and digital platforms allow political families to reach voters directly and build stronger relationships with their constituents. Technology also makes political campaigning and voter mobilization easier (Lilleker, 2018), allowing political dynasties to manage their campaigns and political communications more efficiently. However, technology also brings its challenges. Easily accessible information and the spread of fake news can considerably influence public opinion. Political dynasties must be prepared for faster and broader criticism, as well as increase their efforts to maintain their public image and withstand information attacks (Allcott & Gentzkow, 2017).

Globalization has had a major impact on political dynasties in democratic countries. With increasing connectivity between countries and global economic integration, political dynasties may face challenges from international economic and political forces. Global influence can diminish the power of local political dynasties that are unable to compete in the international arena (Rodrik, 2011). For example, economic and foreign policy decisions influenced by global forces can weaken the position of political dynasties that do not have strong international networks. On the other hand, globalization can provide opportunities for political dynasties to expand their influence beyond national borders. Political families with international connections and global investments can use these connections to strengthen their positions at the domestic level

(Fukuyama, 2014). Globalization also opens up access to technology and resources that can strengthen political dynasties' campaigns and communication capabilities.

Modernization, with its focus on improving infrastructure, education, and technology, also affects political dynasties. Modernization often triggers changes in social and economic structures, which can diminish the power of political dynasties that do not adapt to these changes (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). Political families that fail to keep up with modernization trends or that do not support innovation may experience a decline in support and relevance. However, political dynasties that adapt to modernization changes and take advantage of new technologies may strengthen their positions. For example, data analytics and digital marketing techniques can help political dynasties better understand their voters and direct their campaigns more effectively (Howard, 2006).

The future of political dynasties in democratic countries will be heavily influenced by factors such as social change, technology, globalization, and modernization. Political dynasties may face challenges from a society that increasingly demands justice and inclusion and from technology that brings transparency and rapid changes in political communication. On the other hand, globalization and modernization offer opportunities to expand the influence of political dynasties if they can adapt to these changes. These developments will determine whether political dynasties will continue to play a dominant role in democratic politics or whether their influence will decline over time.

Future Research Directions

To determine future research directions, the authors adopted specific steps from Bahoo (2020), Bahoo et al. (2020), and Bahoo et al. (2021). First, the authors reviewed the 20 most-cited articles. These articles were selected because of their significant contributions and helped identify emerging research trends and relationships between studies in the context of political dynasties. Second, the authors reviewed influential and trending articles over the past seven years (2017-2024) to ensure that their research reflected the latest developments and innovations in the field. Third, the authors peeled all articles in the study sample to avoid top-citation bias. In this way, lesser-known but still relevant and meaningful studies were also considered, providing a more comprehensive view. Finally, potential research agendas discovered during the literature review process were transformed into specific research questions. These questions were then refined to exclude those already studied by other researchers, thus

identifying gaps that still require further research. This systematic process resulted in 64 future research questions from 30 articles, as presented in Table 3.

Conclusion

The political, social, and economic contexts of each country greatly influence the complexity of political dynasties in various countries around the world. This phenomenon has a serious impact on democratic institutions, state policies, social stability, economic development, and political representation. Each country has unique dynamics influenced by history, culture, and political structures. Further studies and policy reforms are needed to address the negative impacts of dynastic politics, as well as to promote more inclusive and democratic political systems. Political dynasties can strengthen or weaken democratic institutions, depending on how they manage power and respond to internal and external challenges. Awareness of the local context and socio-cultural factors is essential in understanding and addressing the challenges faced by countries under the control of political dynasties.

Table 3 Future Research Directions

Paper	Research Questions
Dal Bó et al. (2009)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How can political power become de facto inheritable in a democratic context despite the absence of permanent differences in family characteristics? What are the mechanisms behind the dynastic transmission of political power? 2. Can similar results be obtained using data from other countries and political systems? 3. Does the formation of preferences or the development of skills valued by voters influence self-perpetuation, or do local assets such as contacts or name recognition play a more significant role?
Feinstein (2010)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. How can the influence of dynasty politicians on congressional elections be accurately explored, given the data limitations of only covering the population of dynasty politicians and not all close relatives of elected officials? 5. How can appropriate treatment effects models be developed to address this selection problem and improve the accuracy of inferences in future research?
Mendoza et al. (2012)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. What is the direction of causality between the prevalence of political dynasties and poverty in the Philippines, and how can effective instrumental variables be developed to address the identification problem in the estimation procedure? 7. To what extent do term limits in the 1987 Philippine Constitution have the unintended effect of encouraging senior politicians to transfer power to their relatives to circumvent term limits, and how can the extent of this negative impact be empirically verified? 8. What factors contribute to the emergence and sustainability of political dynasties and their consequences, and how can the political performance and policies produced by political dynasties be more fully understood? 9. How do political dynasties influence the development of weak political parties in the Philippines, and to what extent can clear political platforms and the development of strong political parties provide a viable alternative to traditional dynasty politics?
Panao (2014)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. How does the definition of a legislative agenda limited to administrative bills and those certified as urgent by the president affect the analysis of presidential and legislative preferences in the Philippines and the extent to which the legislative program outlined in the president's State of the Union Address is translated into concrete legislation? 11. How does the reciprocal relationship between the president and Congress centred on the pork barrel affect the president's ability to control the legislative agenda, and how can variables related to pork barrel allocations and their distribution enrich research

Paper	Research Questions
	findings?
Mendoza et al. (2016)	12. How do executive-legislative dynamics in the Philippines, particularly the crucial role of inter-chamber bargaining in the legislative process, and how can the more detailed effects of bicameral control provide a complete picture of executive-legislative relations in the Philippines?
	13. How do political dynasties exacerbate poverty in provinces outside Luzon, and what are the social, political, and institutional differences that influence this phenomenon in the Philippines?
	14. How can these findings provide preliminary guidance for other researchers studying the relationship between political and socioeconomic inequality in other countries?
Smith & Martin (2017)	15. How are legacy advantages in ministerial selection affected by the strength of party leaders and seniority norms in promotion, as well as other institutional and contextual variations across countries?
	16. Are cabinet ministers from political dynasties more likely to obtain more remarkable and faster portfolios than their non-dynastic counterparts?
	17. Does the presence of dynasties in cabinets affect the quality of public policy and governance?
	18. How do biases in ministerial selection affect government outcomes, and what are the implications for democratic political systems?
van Coppenolle (2017)	19. How do differences in the development of competing party politics, the nature of electoral campaigns, local interests, and political machines affect the informal influence of newcomers and the prospects for political dynasties in Britain compared with the United States?
	20. Why did the expansion of the franchise not immediately increase the chances of political dynasties for non-elite winners in Britain, and how did the effects of tenure in this context differ between the two countries?
Geys (2017)	21. Do the educational implications found in this study also apply to policymaking, and how does the job-specific human capital possessed by dynasty politicians, compared to more educated non-dynastic politicians, affect their performance in identifying constituent priorities, designing legislation, and negotiating policy trade-offs?
Geys & Smith (2017)	22. How do institutional factors influence the perpetuation of dynastic political power and the role of voter preferences and individual motivations in selecting dynastic candidates, particularly through comparative research and experimental survey techniques?

Paper	Research Questions
Reyes et al. (2018)	23. How do the interactions between money, incumbency, political dynasty, and political party membership affect political candidates' access to campaign resources in national senatorial elections in the Philippines?
Fiva & Smith (2018)	24. How do incumbency and the inherited advantages of incumbency affect the formation of political dynasties in party-based electoral systems, especially in closed-list PR environments such as Norway?
Baturo & Gray (2018)	25. How might specific domestic political institutions help voters become more open to female candidates? 26. How do modes of thinking entrenched in women's early political participation affect their need for additional networks and support, and how do those needs diminish as female politicians become more prominent in their nation's political life?
Inguanzo (2020)	27. How do political parties evaluate gender-related assets when selecting candidates, particularly in terms of the validity of gender stereotypes in candidate selection? 28. How do intersectionality and different types of women's leadership influence policy choices? 29. Under what conditions do women resign prematurely or are dismissed from office, and what are the reasons why women often do not complete their terms?
Panao (2020)	30. How does the interaction between electoral persistence and competition affect election outcomes? 31. How does the Senate play a role in a bicameral legislature as a deliberative mechanism that shifts legislative priorities from particularistic to substantive? 32. How do competitive elections affect incumbent quality, especially in the context of elite dominance and the assumed homogeneity of Philippine politicians' behavior? 33. How can competitive elections act as a mechanism for the negative selection of voters, even when competition occurs among members of equally powerful political families?
Folke et al. (2021)	34. How can dynastic ties as a signaling mechanism for candidate quality explain dynastic bias in women's representation and dynastic recruitment in modern democracies more generally? 35. How do contextual differences, such as party-based and candidate-based PR systems, affect the relationships documented in the analysis? 36. What are the patterns of dynastic recruitment for other political minority groups, such as youth and LGBTQ+ individuals, and how do

Paper	Research Questions
	these impact barriers to women's political participation?
	37. How do dynastic women compare to dynastic men, and do dynastic ties help parties select more qualified women?
	38. How might institutional reforms such as quotas, new candidate selection procedures, or new electoral rules change parties' recruitment behavior and candidates' ability to demonstrate their qualifications to voters?
Daniele et al. (2021)	39. How do different definitions of political dynasties affect the results of research on Political Budget Cycles (PBCs)?
	40. Does the dynasty effect only apply when relatives hold office at the same level of government, and how can this be further explored in future studies?
	41. Given the endogeneity of observing higher PBCs and their association with electoral performance, how do PBCs affect the probability of re-election?
Yadav & Fidalgo (2022)	42. How do politicians prefer democratic or undemocratic methods of selection for party leadership positions?
	43. How do differences in religious regulations and traditions across countries affect the theoretical relationship between religiosity, political family membership, and party leadership selection practices?
	44. How does religion regulation affect the effectiveness of religious social networks for political mobilization? How does it make religious politicians more dependent on party organizations and support democratic party leadership selection practices?
Rougier et al. (2022)	45. How does the size of public employment affect public investment in areas controlled by political dynasties, and how does policy continuity in these areas impact local economic growth in the medium term? The long-term effects of positive stabilization and possible negative effects related to corruption need to be further investigated.
Mendoza, Yap, Mendoza, Jaminola III, et al. (2022)	46. How is the relationship between political dynasties and poverty influenced by regional context, particularly differences in economic activity and institutions between Luzon and non-Luzon?
	47. How do the opportunity structures available to political dynasties, such as types of industries, investment opportunities, benefits from political power, and political stability, influence these differences?
Lacroix et al. (2023)	48. What role do pro-democracy dynasties play in the success or failure of autocratic overturns and authoritarian backsliding, as occurred in Spain in the 1930s and 1980s and in contemporary Eastern Europe?
Mendoza et al. (2023)	49. How do business and government relationships interact at the local level? Moreover, how do political and economic forces influence

Paper	Research Questions
	each other in different country contexts? Future research should expand the data on business-government relationships and explore how incumbency advantages translate into business ownership.
Kenawas (2023)	50. Why are some regions more “dynastic” than others, or why are some families more successful than others in building political dynasties in Indonesia?
Miwa et al. (2023)	51. How do Japanese voters form stereotypes about legacy politicians separately from their party stereotypes, and what are the gaps between voter preferences and Japanese political realities, including preferences for young politicians and female candidates?
Chambers et al. (2023)	52. How does the ability of prominent families in the provinces to dominate provincial politics depend on their ability to control financial resources to build influence, political machines, and alliances and maintain good relations with more powerful national elites?
Lee (2023)	53. How did the extraordinary circumstances of Park’s impeachment reveal deep-seated beliefs in society, such as gender stereotypes, providing an opportunity to examine how sexism persists even after the highest barriers for women have been breached? Future comparative studies should examine whether the findings from this study can be applied to other cases.
Rivard et al. (2024)	54. How does the noteworthy influence of political dynasties in the Senate and cabinet appointments indicate the importance of other institutional factors in sustaining family influence in politics?
Batto & Read (2024)	55. How does the type of relationship with a dynastic predecessor affect the success of dynastic candidates? Are children more successful than nephews? Are spouses more successful than siblings?
	56. How does the experience of dynastic candidates affect their careers in office and future electoral prospects?
	57. Are the political legacies that enable dynastic candidates to win office enough to prepare them to perform well on the board or when running for higher office?
Prihatini &	58. How do gender and the existence of political dynasties affect committee assignments in the Indonesian <i>DPR</i> ?
Halimatusa’diyah (2024)	59. What factors play a role in the placement of female DPR members from political dynasties, especially in the context of political party dominance?
	60. What is the relationship between women’s representation in parliament, political dynasties, and committee assignments in other countries?
Ascencio & Malik (2024)	61. How do differences in urban and rural contexts, as well as historical factors, influence voters’ relationships with politicians in

Paper	Research Questions
Ternullo et al. (2024)	Pakistan? How can such research be expanded to include more heterogeneous regional groups?
	62. How might the effects of political dynasties take longer to emerge than can be observed in the 4-year post-treatment period?
	63. How do grassroots organizations respond to new opportunities and challenges after redistricting, and how do incumbent politicians use nonprofits to influence crime and city services in their areas?
	64. What relationships between political structure and urban inequality can be revealed through in-depth research on elected officials and intergenerational political processes?
Source: Authors' Work.	

References

- Abinales, P. N. (2011). The Philippines in 2010: Blood, ballots, and beyond. *Asian Survey*, 51(1), 163–172. <https://doi.org/10.1525/as.2011.51.1.163>
- Adilansyah, A., Firmansyah, F., Kamaluddin, K., Sauki, M., & Hidayat, R. (2024). The evolution and current state of research on pork-barrel politics (1970–2024). *Thammasat Review*, 27(2), 351–405. <https://doi.org/10.14456/tureview.2024.28>
- Allcott, H., & Gentzkow, M. (2017). Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(2), 211–236. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.2.211>
- Amirell, S. E. (2012). Progressive nationalism and female rule in post-colonial South and Southeast Asia. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 18(2), 35–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12259276.2012.11666126>
- Amundsen, I. (2016). Democratic dynasties? Internal party democracy in Bangladesh. *Party Politics*, 22(1), 49–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068813511378>
- Aria, M., & Cuccurullo, C. (2017). Bibliometrix: An R-tool for comprehensive science mapping analysis. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(4), 959–975. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.08.007>
- Ascencio, S. J., & Malik, R. (2024). Do voters (dis)like dynastic politicians? Experimental evidence from Pakistan. *Electoral Studies*, 89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2024.102786>
- Aspinall, E., White, S., & Savirani, A. (2021). Women's political representation in Indonesia: Who wins and how? *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 40(1), 3–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1868103421989720>
- Azizah, N., Nkwede, J. O., & Armoyu, M. (2021). The octopus-like power of Pesantren dynasty in the dynamics of local politics. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 7(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2021.1962056>
- Bahoo, S. (2020). Corruption in banks: A bibliometric review and agenda. *Finance Research Letters*, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2020.101499>
- Bahoo, S., Alon, I., & Floreani, J. (2021). Corruption in economics: A bibliometric analysis and research agenda. *Applied Economics Letters*, 28(7), 565–578. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504851.2020.1764476>
- Bahoo, S., Alon, I., & Paltrinieri, A. (2020). Corruption in international business: A review and research agenda. *International Business Review*, 29(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2019.101660>
- Barr, M. D. (2016). The Lees of Singapore: A quality brand. *South East Asia Research*, 24(3), 341–354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967828X16659727>

- Batto, N. F. (2018). Legacy candidates in Taiwan elections, 2001–2016. *Asian Survey*, 58(3), 486–510. <https://doi.org/10.1525/AS.2018.58.3.486>
- Batto, N. F., & Read, B. L. (2024). Some head starts are bigger than others: Dynastic legacies and variation in candidate quality in Taiwan's local elections. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109924000033>
- Baturo, A., & Gray, J. (2018). When do family ties matter? The duration of female suffrage and women's path to high political office. *Political Research Quarterly*, 71(3), 695–709. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912918759438>
- Bayo, L. N. (2021). Women who persist: Pathways to power in Eastern Indonesia. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 40(1), 93–115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1868103421989712>
- Behrend, J. (2021). Political dynasties and democracy in contemporary Mexico. *Latin American Policy*, 12(2), 385–404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lamp.12237>
- Behrend, J., & Whitehead, L. (2023). *Dynasties, double-dealings, and delinquencies: Some entangled features of subnational politics in Mexico*. In M. Llanos & L. Marsteintredet (Eds.), *Latin America in times of turbulence: Presidentialism under stress* (pp. 167–187). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003324249-9>
- Bellin, E. (2004). The robustness of authoritarianism in the Middle East: Exceptionalism in comparative perspective. *Comparative Politics*, 36(2), 139–157. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4150140>
- Bennett, C. (2023). Cambodia 2022-2023: Securing dynastic autocracy. *Asia Maior*, 34, 217–234.
- Bogdanor, V. (1996). *The monarchy and the constitution*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Buchenau, J. (2011). *The Sonoran dynasty and the reconstruction of the Mexican state*. In W. H. Beezley (Ed.), *A companion to Mexican history and culture* (pp. 405–419). Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444340600.ch23>
- Buendia, R. G. (2021). Examining Philippine political development over three decades after 'democratic' rule: Is change yet to come? *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 29(2), 169–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02185377.2021.1916970>
- Bulaong, O., Mendoza, G. A. S., & Mendoza, R. U. U. (2024). Cronyism, oligarchy and governance in the Philippines: 1970s vs. 2020s. *Public Integrity*, 26(2), 174–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2022.2139656>
- Burhan, O. K. (2020). *Nepotism (Doctoral Dissertation, Leiden University)*. <https://scholarlypublications.universiteitleiden.nl/handle/1887/137443>
- Buzo, A. (2017). *Politics and leadership in North Korea: The guerilla dynasty. Second Edition*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315643090>

- Chambers, P. (2023). Dynastic democracy: Political families in Thailand. *Asian Affairs*, 50(2), 138–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927678.2022.2138221>
- Chambers, P., Jitpiromsri, S., & Takahashi, K. (2023). The persevering power of provincial dynasties in Thai electoral politics. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 8(3), 787–807. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20578911221142132>
- Chandra, K. (2004). *Why ethnic parties succeed: Patronage and ethnic head counts in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chandra, K. (2016). *Democratic dynasties: State, party, and family in contemporary Indian politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316402221>
- Chhibber, P. (2013). Dynastic parties: Organization, finance and impact. *Party Politics*, 19(2), 277–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068811406995>
- Da Silva, V. R. (2022). *The family connection: Political dynasties and government transparency in Brazilian municipalities (Doctoral Dissertation, Universidade Federal De Pernambuco)*. <https://repositorio.ufpe.br/bitstream/123456789/48817/1/TESE%20Virginia%20Rocha%20da%20Silva.pdf#page=6.08>
- Dal Bó, E., Dal Bó, P., & Snyder, J. (2009). Political dynasties. *Review of Economic Studies*, 76(1), 115–142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-937X.2008.00519.x>
- Daniele, G., Romarri, A., & Vertier, P. (2021). Dynasties and policymaking. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 190, 89–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2021.07.023>
- David, C. C., & Legara, E. F. T. (2017). How voters combine candidates on the ballot: The case of the Philippine senatorial elections. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 29(1), 70–94. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edv041>
- David, C. C., & San Pascual, M. R. S. (2016). Predicting vote choice for celebrity and political dynasty candidates in Philippine national elections. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 37(2), 82–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01154451.2016.1198076>
- David, C. C., & San Pascual, M. R. S. (2018). *Who votes for dynastic candidates? Philippine senatorial elections*. In R. U. Mendoza, E. L. Beja Jr, J. C. Teehankee, A. G. La Vina, & M. F. Villamejor-Mendoza (Eds.), *Building inclusive democracies in ASEAN* (pp. 102–118). World Scientific Publishing Co.
- Davis, D. B., Mendoza, R. U., & Yap, J. K. (2024). Corruption risk and political dynasties: Exploring the links using public procurement data in the Philippines. *Economics of Governance*, 25(1), 81–109. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10101-023-00306-4>

- Dewi, K. H. (2017). Piety and sexuality in a public sphere: Experiences of Javanese Muslim women's political leadership. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 23(3), 340–362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12259276.2017.1352250>
- Dewi, K. H. (2022). *Gender and politics in post-Reformasi Indonesia: Women leaders within local oligarchy networks*. Jakarta: Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-1734-9>
- Dulay, D., & Go, L. (2022). When running for office runs in the family: Horizontal dynasties, policy, and development in the Philippines. *Comparative Political Studies*, 55(4), 588–627. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00104140211024292>
- Espia, J. C. P. (2023). Populist authoritarianism, oligarchic democracy and the 2022 Philippine elections: A state–civil society relations perspective on the role of Duterte in the Marcos restoration. *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies*, 25(2), 91–112.
- Ezrow, N. M., & Frantz, E. (2011). *Dictators and dictatorships: Understanding authoritarian regimes and their leaders*. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Fauzanafi, M. Z. (2016). Searching for digital citizenship: Fighting corruption in Banten, Indonesia. *Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies*, 9(2), 289–294. <https://doi.org/10.14764/10.ASEAS-2016.2-7>
- Feinstein, B. D. (2010). The dynasty advantage: Family ties in congressional elections. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 35(4), 571–598. <https://doi.org/10.3162/036298010793322366>
- Fernandez, J. L. (1995). Family relationship as basis for disqualification to hold public office: A framework for a law prohibiting political dynasties. *Ateneo Law Journal*, 40(1), 96–161.
- Firmansyah, F., & Hidayat, R. (2024). Bibliometric and critical review of the empirical research on political deception. *Thammasat Review*, 27(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.14456/tureview.2024.1>
- Fiva, J. H., & Smith, D. M. (2018). Political dynasties and the incumbency advantage in party-centered environments. *American Political Science Review*, 112(3), 706–712. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055418000047>
- Folke, O., Rickne, J., & Smith, D. M. (2021). Gender and dynastic political selection. *Comparative Political Studies*, 54(2), 339–371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414020938089>
- Fukuyama, F. (2014). *Political order and political decay: From the industrial revolution to the globalization of democracy*. London: Profile Books.

- Garces, L., Jandoc, K., & Lu, M. G. (2021). Political dynasties and economic development: Evidence using nighttime light in the Philippines. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 41(3), 215–261. <https://doi.org/10.1163/2165025X-BJA10010>
- Geys, B. (2017). Political dynasties, electoral institutions and politicians' human capital. *Economic Journal*, 127(605), F474–F494. <https://doi.org/10.1111/econj.12444>
- Geys, B., & Smith, D. M. (2017). Political dynasties in democracies: Causes, consequences and remaining puzzles. *Economic Journal*, 127(605), F446–F454. <https://doi.org/10.1111/econj.12442>
- Ghosh, A. K. (2023). Understanding layered dominance of political dynasties in India: A de-hyphenated reading of dynastic representation and dynasty-led parties. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 8(3), 727–747. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20578911221147657>
- Ghoul, W., & Abou-Jaoude, B. (2010). Leadership as a family affair: Case of Lebanon. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, 5(4), 451–474. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBG.2010.035478>
- Guritno, D. C., Samudro, B. R., & Soesilo, A. M. (2019). The paradox of political dynasties of regeneration type and poverty in regional autonomy era. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*, 35(2), 179–194. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOES-05-2018-0069>
- Hara, T. (2021). Beyond personalistic politics: A progressive congresswoman's challenge to a political dynasty in Dinagat Islands, Philippines. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 42(1), 30–55. <https://doi.org/10.1163/2165025X-bja10014>
- Hassanzadeh, E., & Hazrati, H. (2022). The Kojajani family and Iran's political developments (13-16th Century). *Türk Kulturu ve Hacı Bektas Veli - Arastirma Dergisi*, 103, 171–185. <https://doi.org/10.34189/hbv.103.008>
- Hazell, R. (2020). Introduction. In R. Hazell & B. Morris (Eds.), *The role of monarchy in modern democracy: European monarchies compared* (pp. 19–21). Hart Publishing.
- Hess, S. (2016). *America's political dynasties: From Adams to Clinton*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Heydarian, R. J. (2022). The return of the Marcos dynasty. *Journal of Democracy*, 33(3), 62–76. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2022.0040>
- Hidayat, R. (2019). Public distrust and environmental citizenship: Primary impetuses of radical protest in Bima District, 2011-2012. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 22(3), 187–200. <https://doi.org/10.22146/JSP.35981>
- Hidayat, R. (2024a). A bibliometric review of global research on constituency service (1975–2024). *Thammasat Review*, 27(1), 248–285. <https://doi.org/10.14456/tureview.2024.11>

- Hidayat, R. (2024b). Mapping patterns and trends in uncontested elections research (1965–2024). *Interdisciplinary Political Studies*, 10(2), 145–173. <https://doi.org/10.1285/i20398573v10n2p145>
- Hidayat, R. (2024c). Power networks of political families in Southeast Asia: The enduring dynastic influence in democratic contexts. *Journal of ASEAN Studies*, 12(2), 413–438. <https://doi.org/10.21512/jas.v12i2.12013>
- Hidayat, R. (2024d). The fusion of the Bologna Process, Liberal Arts Education, and Indonesian educational transformation ideas in the MBKM policy. *Journal of Governance and Local Politics*, 6(1), 11–24.
- Hidayat, R. (2025a). A systematic literature review of prior studies on the Indonesian Independent Campus Policy (2020-2023). *Higher Education Forum*, 22, 69–97. <https://doi.org/10.15027/0002040521>
- Hidayat, R. (2025b). Book review: Marginalisation and human rights in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Social Sciences*, 21(1). <https://so03.tcithaijo.org/index.php/sduhs/article/view/277521>
- Hidayat, R. (2025c). Prior studies on Indonesian populism: Historical context, core elements, and blind spots. *Journal of Governance and Local Politics*, 7(1), 64–94. <https://doi.org/10.47650/jglp.v7i1.1763>
- Howard, P. N. (2006). *New media campaigns and political culture in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchcroft, P. D. (2002). Centralization and decentralization in administration and politics: Assessing territorial dimensions of authority and power. *Governance*, 14(1), 23–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0952-1895.00150>
- Inglehart, Ronald., & Welzel, Christian. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Inguanzo, I. (2020). Asian women's paths to office: A qualitative comparative analysis approach. *Contemporary Politics*, 26(2), 186–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569775.2020.1712005>
- Kabullah, M. I., & Fajri, M. N. (2021). Neo-Ibuism in Indonesian politics: Election campaigns of wives of regional heads in West Sumatra in 2019. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 40(1), 136–155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1868103421989069>
- Kenawas, Y. C. (2023). The irony of Indonesia's democracy: The rise of dynastic politics in the post-Suharto era. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 8(3), 748–764. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20578911231195970>

- Kerman, J. M., & Wood, K. L. (2012). The failure of democracy building in modern Iran: The hundred-year struggle. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 23(4), 24–42. <https://doi.org/10.1215/10474552-1895376>
- Kimura, E., & Anugrah, I. (2024). Indonesia in 2023 between democracy and dynasty. *Asian Survey*, 64(2), 267–277. <https://doi.org/10.1525/as.2024.64.2.267>
- Klem, B. (2020). Sri Lanka in 2019: The return of the Rajapaksas. *Asian Survey*, 60(1), 207–212. <https://doi.org/10.1525/AS.2020.60.1.207>
- Korzi, M. J. (2011). *Presidential term limits in American History*. Texas: Texas A&M University Press Consortium.
- Krook, M. L., & O'Brien, D. Z. (2012). All the president's men? The appointment of female cabinet ministers worldwide. *Journal of Politics*, 74(3), 840–855. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381612000382>
- Kumar, S. (2018). The family way: Manhood and Dabangai in the making of a dynasty in Uttar Pradesh. *Studies in Indian Politics*, 6(2), 180–195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2321023018797414>
- Labonne, J., Parsa, S., & Querubin, P. (2021). Political dynasties, term limits and female political representation: Evidence from the Philippines. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 182, 212–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2020.12.001>
- Lacroix, J., Méon, P.-G., & Oosterlinck, K. (2023). Political dynasties in defense of democracy: The case of France's 1940 Enabling Act. *Journal of Economic History*, 122(3). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050723000104>
- Lee, Y.-I. (2023). A trailblazer or a barrier? Dynastic politics and symbolic representation of the first female President of South Korea, Park Geun-hye. *Politics and Gender*, 19(3), 756–780. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X22000538>
- Levitsky, S., & Way, L. A. (2010). *Competitive authoritarianism: Hybrid regimes after the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lilleker, D. G. (2018). Prototype politics: Technology-intensive campaigning and the data of democracy. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 15(4), 402–403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2018.1451424>
- Lockwood, P. (2023). 'Hustlers vs dynasties': Confronting patrimonial capitalism in Kenya's 2022 elections. *Anthropology Today*, 39(5), 7–10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8322.12836>
- Lutter, C. (2024). Gendering late medieval Habsburg dynastic politics: Maximilian I and his social networks. *Austrian History Yearbook*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0067237824000274>

- Marcano, C., & Tyszka, A. B. (2007). *Hugo Chavez: The definitive biography of Venezuela's controversial President*. New York: Random House.
- Marchetti, M. (2003). Rising from the ashes? Reorganizing and unifying the PRI's state party organizations after electoral defeat. *Comparative Political Studies*, 36(3), 293–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414002250673>
- Marquez, X. (2017). *Non-democratic politics: Authoritarianism, dictatorship and democratization*. London: Palgrave.
- Marwiyah, S., Boman, S., & Wahid, A. (2017). Impact of the culture of political dynasty on earthing the constitutional democracy. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 8(12), 1121–1127.
- Mcmillan, M. E. (2013). *The rise and fall of political dynasty in the Middle East*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mendoza, R. U. (2023). Inequality, oligarchy, and dynasty. *DLSU Business and Economics Review*, 32(2), 200–215.
- Mendoza, R. U., & Banaag, M. S. (2020). Political and economic inequality: Insights from Philippine data on political dynasties. *Journal of Global South Studies*, 37(2), 294–319. <https://doi.org/10.1353/GSS.2020.0029>
- Mendoza, R. U., Banaag, M. S., Hiwatig, J. D., Yusingco, M. H. L., & Yap, J. K. (2020). Term limits and political dynasties in the Philippines: Unpacking the links. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, 20(4), 88–99. <https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/apssr/vol20/iss4/8>
- Mendoza, R. U., Beja Jr., E. L., Venida, V. S., & Yap, D. B. (2012). Inequality in democracy: Insights from an empirical analysis of political dynasties in the 15th Philippine Congress. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 33(2), 132–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01154451.2012.734094>
- Mendoza, R. U., Beja Jr., E. L., Venida, V. S., & Yap, D. B. (2016). Political dynasties and poverty: Measurement and evidence of linkages in the Philippines. *Oxford Development Studies*, 44(2), 189–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2016.1169264>
- Mendoza, R. U., Lopez, M. A. G., Yap, D. B., & Canare, T. A. (2018). *The 2013 Philippine mid-term election: An empirical analysis of dynasties, vote-buying and the correlates of Senate votes*. In R. U. Mendoza, E. L. Beja Jr, J. C. Teehankee, A. G. La Vina, & M. F. Villamejor-Mendoza (Eds.), *Building inclusive democracies in ASEAN* (pp. 119–128). World Scientific Publishing Co.
- Mendoza, R. U., Mendoza, G. A. S., Teehankee Julio C. and Tuano, P. A. P., & Yap, J. K. (2023). Interrogating the links between dynasties and development in the

- Philippines. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 8(3), 765–786. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20578911231182490>
- Mendoza, R. U., Yap, J. K., Mendoza, G. A. S., Jaminola III, L., & Yu, E. C. (2022). Political dynasties, business, and poverty in the Philippines. *Journal of Government and Economics*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jge.2022.100051>
- Mendoza, R. U., Yap, J. K., Mendoza, G. A. S., Pizarro, A. L. J., & Engelbrecht, G. (2022). Political dynasties and terrorism: An empirical analysis using data on the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Peacebuilding*, 10(2), 435–459. <https://doi.org/10.18588/202210.00a266>
- Middleton, J. (2015). *World monarchies and dynasties*. New York: Routledge.
- Mietzner, M. (2016). The Sukarno dynasty in Indonesia: Between institutionalisation, ideological continuity and crises of succession. *South East Asia Research*, 24(3), 355–368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967828X16659028>
- Miwa, H., Kasuya, Y., & Ono, Y. (2023). Voters' perceptions and evaluations of dynastic politics in Japan. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 8(3), 671–688. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20578911221144101>
- Mlambo, V. H., Zubane, S. P., & Mlambo, D. N. (2020). Promoting good governance in Africa: The role of the civil society as a watchdog. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.1989>
- Muraoka, T. (2018). Political dynasties and particularistic campaigns. *Political Research Quarterly*, 71(2), 453–466. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912917745163>
- Muslikhah, U., Hajri, W. A., & Santoso, D. (2019). Political dynasty and its implications for people's welfare. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 10(2), 246–252.
- Nethipo, V., Phon-Amnuai, N., & Vongsayan, H. (2023). Disrupting the grip: Political dynasties and Thailand's 2023 general elections. *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs*, 45(3).
- Nishizaki, Y. (2013). The King and Banharn: Towards an elaboration of network monarchy in Thailand. *South East Asia Research*, 21(1), 69–103. <https://doi.org/10.5367/sear.2013.0140>
- Nishizaki, Y. (2018). New wine in an old bottle: Female politicians, family rule, and democratization in Thailand. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 77(2), 375–403. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002191181700136X>
- Nishizaki, Y. (2024). Dynastic female politicians and family rule in Thailand: Evidence from the 2019 and 2023 general elections. *Critical Asian Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2024.2370031>

- Noak, P. A. (2024). Analysis of the existence of political dynasties in village head elections in Indonesia. *International Journal of Religion*, 5(10), 1135–1145. <https://doi.org/10.61707/4bnbga38>
- Panao, R. A. L. (2014). Beyond roll call: Executive-legislative relations and lawmaking in the Philippine House of Representatives. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 35(1), 59–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01154451.2014.903554>
- Panao, R. A. L. (2016). Tried and tested? Dynastic persistence and legislative productivity at the Philippine House of Representatives. *Asian Politics & Policy*, 8(3), 394–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aspp.12262>
- Panao, R. A. L. (2020). Electoral persistence and the quality of public policies: Evidence from the dynamics of lawmaking in the Philippine House of Representatives, 1992–2016. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 13(3), 295–318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2019.1571731>
- Panda, S. (2022). Political dynasties and electoral outcomes in India. *India Review*, 21(4–5), 465–492. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14736489.2022.2131119>
- Parker, J. D. (2016). The Atassis of homs: The rise and decline of one of Syria's founding families. *Journal of the Middle East and Africa*, 7(4), 369–385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21520844.2016.1239056>
- Paulo, N., & Bublitz, C. (2019). Pow(d)er to the people? Voter manipulation, legitimacy, and the relevance of moral psychology for democratic theory. *Neuroethics*, 12(1), 55–71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12152-016-9266-7>
- Pereira, A. W. (2005). *Political (in)justice: Authoritarianism and the rule of law in Brazil, Chile, and Argentina*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Pitcher, A., & Sanches, E. R. (2019). The paradox of Isabel dos Santos state capitalism, dynastic politics, and gender hostility in a resource-rich, authoritarian country. *Cahiers d' Etudes Africaines*, 234, 597–624. <https://doi.org/10.4000/etudesafricaines.26276>
- Prihatini, E., & Halimatusa'diyah, I. (2024). Gender, political dynasties, and committee assignments: Evidence from Indonesia. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 77(1), 196–214. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsac019>
- Puddington, A. (2017). *Breaking down democracy: Goals, strategies, and methods of modern authoritarians*. Washington, DC: Freedom House. www.freedomhouse.org
- Purdey, J. (2016a). Narratives to power: The case of the Djojohadikusumo family dynasty over four generations. *South East Asia Research*, 24(3), 369–385. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967828X16659728>

- Purdey, J. (2016b). Political families in Southeast Asia. *South East Asia Research*, 24(3), 319–327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967828X16659027>
- Purdey, J., Aspinall, E., & As'ad, M. U. (2016). Understanding family politics: Successes and failures of political dynasties in regional Indonesia. *South East Asia Research*, 24(3), 420–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967828X16659571>
- Purdey, J., & Kongkirati, P. (2016). Evolving power of provincial political families in Thailand: Dynastic power, party machine and ideological politics. *South East Asia Research*, 24(3), 386–406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967828X16659570>
- Purdey, J., Tadem, T. S. E., & Tadem, E. C. (2016). Political dynasties in the Philippines: Persistent patterns, perennial problems. *South East Asia Research*, 24(3), 328–340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967828X16659730>
- Purwaningsih, T., & Widodo, B. E. C. (2020). The interplay of incumbency, political dynasty and corruption in Indonesia: Are political dynasties the cause of corruption in Indonesia? *Revista UNISCI*, 2020(53), 157–176. <https://doi.org/10.31439/UNISCI-89>
- Querubin, P. (2016). Family and politics: Dynastic persistence in the Philippines. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 11(2), 151–181. <https://doi.org/10.1561/100.00014182>
- Ramasamy, R. (2020). Governance and administration in Sri Lanka: Trends, tensions, and prospects. *Public Administration and Policy*, 23(2), 187–198. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PAP-03-2020-0020>
- Reyes, J. A. L., Arce, B. G. C., & Madrid, N. B. N. (2018). Do money, power, family and connections really matter in politics? Analysing factors of success in the 2010, 2013 and 2016 Philippine senatorial elections. *Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies*, 36(2), 28–51. <https://doi.org/10.22439/cjas.v36i2.5648>
- Rifai, R., Kamaluddin, K., & Hidayat, R. (2024). Exploring the roots and solutions of maladministration, power abuse, or corruption in contemporary Indonesian villages. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 32(3), 1115–1140. <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.32.3.15>
- Rivard, A. B., Godbout, J.-F., & Bodet, M. A. (2024). Political dynasties in Canada. *Government and Opposition*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2024.11>
- Rodan, G. (2021). Inequality and political representation in the Philippines and Singapore. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 51(2), 233–261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2019.1607531>
- Rodrik, D. (2011). *The globalization paradox: Democracy and the future of the world economy*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Rougier, E., Combarnous, F., & Fauré, Y.-A. (2022). Political turnover, public employment, and local economic development: New empirical evidence on the

- impact of local political dynasties in the Brazilian “Nordeste.” *European Journal of Development Research*, 34(4), 2069–2097. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-021-00453-6>
- Ruud, A. E. (2018). The Osman dynasty: The making and unmaking of a political family. *Studies in Indian Politics*, 6(2), 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2321023018797453>
- Ruud, A. E., & Islam, M. M. (2016). Political dynasty formation in Bangladesh. *South Asia: Journal of South Asia Studies*, 39(2), 401–414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00856401.2016.1164107>
- Safa’at, M. A. (2022). Single candidates: Ensuring a path to victory in local elections. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 7(4), 1163–1176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20578911211062485>
- Sauki, M., & Hidayat, R. (2024). Trends in political professionalisation research: Bibliometric mapping of published articles in the Scopus database. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 28(2), 202–231. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.98098>
- Savirani, A. (2016). Survival against the odds: The Djunaid family of Pekalongan, Central Java. *South East Asia Research*, 24(3), 407–419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967828X16659731>
- Schafferer, C. (2023). Political dynasties and democratization: A case study of Taiwan. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 8(3), 708–726. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20578911221148830>
- Smith, D. M. (2012). *Succeeding in politics: Dynasties in democracies (Doctoral dissertation, University of California)*. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1dv7f7bb>
- Smith, D. M. (2018). *Dynasties and democracy: The inherited incumbency advantage in Japan*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Smith, D. M., & Martin, S. (2017). Political dynasties and the selection of Cabinet Ministers. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 42(1), 131–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsq.12146>
- Solon, J., Fabella, R., & Capuno, J. (2009). Is local development good politics? Local development expenditures and the re-election of governors in the Philippines in the 1990s. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 17(3), 265–284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02185370903403475>
- Sriwimon, L., & Zilli, P. J. (2017). The sister, the puppet and the first female PM: How gender stereotypes in Thai politics are generated in the press. *SEARCH: The Journal of the South East Asia Research Centre for Communications and Humanities*, 9(1), 1–24.

- Tadem, T. S. E. (2019). *Philippine politics and the Marcos technocrats: The emergence and evolution of a power elite*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University.
- Tamiki, H. (2019). Defeating a political dynasty: Local progressive politics through people power volunteers for reform and bottom-up budgeting projects in Siquijor, Philippines. *Southeast Asian Studies*, 8(3), 413–439. https://doi.org/10.20495/seas.8.3_413
- Tan, A. C. (2024). The Philippines in 2023: Politics, economy, and foreign affairs under Marcos Jr. *Asian Survey*, 64(2), 299–307. <https://doi.org/10.1525/as.2024.64.2.299>
- Teehankee, J. C. (2018). *House of clans: Political dynasties in the legislature*. In M. R. Thompson & E. C. Batalla (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of the contemporary Philippines* (pp. 85–96). Routledge.
- Teehankee, J. C., Chambers, P., & Echle, C. (2023). Introduction: Political dynasties in Asia. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 8(3), 661–670. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20578911231185786>
- Ternullo, S., Zorro-Medina, Á., & Vargas, R. (2024). How political dynasties concentrate advantage within cities: Evidence from crime and city services in Chicago. *Social Forces*, 102(4), 1310–1331. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soae029>
- Thananithichot, S., & Satidporn, W. (2016). Political dynasties in Thailand: The recent picture after the 2011 general election. *Asian Studies Review*, 40(3), 340–359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.2016.1193473>
- Tuaño, P. A., & Cruz, J. (2019). Structural inequality in the Philippines: Oligarchy, (im)mobility and economic transformation. *Journal of Southeast Asian Economies*, 36(3), 304–328.
- Tusalem, R. F., & Pe-Aguirre, J. J. (2013). The effect of political dynasties on effective democratic governance: Evidence from the Philippines. *Asian Politics and Policy*, 5(3), 359–386. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aspp.12037>
- Tyson, A., & Nawawi. (2022). Dictators never die: Political transition, dynastic regime recovery and the 2021 Suharto commemoration in Indonesia. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 44(3), 421–452. <https://doi.org/10.1355/cs44-3i>
- Ufen, A. (2017). *Political finance and corruption in Southeast Asia: Causes and challenges*. In C. Rowley & M. D. Rama (Eds.), *The changing face of corruption in the Asia Pacific: Current perspectives and future challenges* (pp. 23–33). Elsevier Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-101109-6.00002-2>
- Uherek, Z. (2018). Political participation and legitimization of power. The state and the family: A Romani case. *Urbanities*, 8, 74–78.

- Vaishnav, M. (2017). *When crime pays: Money and muscle in Indian politics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- van Coppenolle, B. (2017). Political dynasties in the UK House of Commons: The null effect of narrow electoral selection. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 42(3), 449–475. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsq.12164>
- van Coppenolle, B. (2022). Political dynasties and direct elections in bicameralism: Democratisation in the Netherlands. *Electoral Studies*, 76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2022.102454>
- Vloeberghs, W. (2012). The Hariri political dynasty after the Arab Spring. *Mediterranean Politics*, 17(2), 241–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13629395.2012.694046>
- Wardani, S. B. E., & Subekti, V. S. (2021). Political dynasties and women candidates in Indonesia's 2019 election. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 40(1), 28–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1868103421991144>
- Wataru, K. (2021). Rise of “business-friendly” local elite rule in the Philippines: How the Valdezes developed San Nicolas, Ilocos Norte. *Southeast Asian Studies*, 10(2), 223–253. https://doi.org/10.20495/seas.10.2_223
- Yadav, V. (2020). Political families and support for democracy in Pakistan. *Asian Survey*, 60(6), 1044–1071. <https://doi.org/10.1525/AS.2020.60.6.1044>
- Yadav, V., & Fidalgo, A. (2022). The face of the party: Party leadership selection, and the role of family and faith. *Political Research Quarterly*, 75(2), 379–393. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10659129211011538>
- Yates, D. A. (2019). The dynastic republic of Gabon. *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines*, 234, 483–513. <https://doi.org/10.4000/etudesafricaines.25961>
- Yates, D. A. (2022). Dynastic rule in Syria and North Korea: Nepotism, succession, and sibling rivalry. *International Political Science Review*, 43(3), 450–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512120978562>
- Yuliadi, I., Sumitro, Anwar, Umanailo, M. C. B., Kurniawansyah, E., Rusli, M., & Ibrahim, Z. (2021). Political dynasty in eye of the community (Sociological study of political awareness in Bima regency election 2020). *11th Annual International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, 3884–3890.
- Zialcita, J. P. L. (2024). The Philippines in 2023: The UniTeam unravels. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 45(1), 82–103. <https://doi.org/10.1163/2165025X-bja10061>