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Dissertation Abstract

Black Women’s Perceptions of the Relationship among Nepotism, Cronyism, Job Satisfaction, and Job-Focused Self-Efficacy

Corporate America struggles with inclusion of certain groups such as Black women. Although Black women have met or surpassed their Caucasian, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American female counterparts and their Black male counterparts in education, and sit on boards of Fortune 500 companies, too many Black women are stymied in attempts for advancement as a result of nepotism and cronyism. Oftentimes, Black women are left with feelings of incompetence and believing they are undervalued in the workplace.

This study examined Black women’s perceptions of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace. Further, the study was conducted to establish to what extent a relationship existed among nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction, and job-focused self-efficacy (JFSE) in the workplace. Black women shared personal experiences with nepotism and cronyism, perceptions of others in the workplace, and experiences of others with respect to nepotism and cronyism. Social-cognitive theory of self-efficacy served as the theoretical rationale for this study; concepts of diversity and minorities offered additional support to the study.

The study used a quantitative methodology: an online survey consisted of 40 items and demographic information. Using previously tested inventories, data were collected through Survey Monkey and transferred to SPSS and Minitab for further analysis and testing. Results supported the concern that Black women and other
disenfranchised groups or protected classes experience nepotism and cronyism in the workplace. However, no significant relationships existed among nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction, and JFSE. Overall, Black women participants reported being overwhelmingly satisfied with their current jobs and were extremely confident in their abilities to do their jobs and overcome any challenges they faced.

Although there was no positive correlation among nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction, and JFSE or perception thereof among these Black women, the debate over whether nepotism and cronyism help or hinder employers and employees in the workplace continues. Researchers agree on the dearth of empirical data on these practices and what impact nepotism and cronyism have on employees in the workplace. Equally important, Black women have made contributions and created ways of informing employers that they are competent and deserve the opportunity for career development and advancement in the workplace.
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CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

Are nepotism and cronyism still practiced in the workplace? Do the practices of nepotism and cronyism impact Black women’s job satisfaction? Do the practices of nepotism and cronyism impact Black women’s job-focused self-efficacy (JFSE)? Non-merit-based employment practices such as nepotism and cronyism suggest that employers use these practices as subtle forms of racism and/or to surround themselves with those who are identical to or similar in nature to themselves (Basu, 2009). Nepotism, from the Latin word *nepotus*, means nephew or grandchild, and it is the hiring of, or advancing of, employees. Nepotism is not based on merit, but on a familial relationship or kinship, whether by blood or through legalities such as marriage or adoption (Basu, 2009). Parents, children, cousins, siblings, relations by marriage, stepparents, grandparents, uncles, and aunts, are considered family and relations (Arasli, Bavik, & Ekiz, 2006; Hernandez & Page, 2006; Padgett & Morris, 2005).

Cronyism, another non-merit-based employment practice, is grounded in preferential treatment based on friendships rather than kinship (Hernandez, & Page, 2006). Khatri and Tsang (2003) defined cronyism:

Cronyism comes from the word crony, which was originally spelled *chrony*. It is based on the Greek word *Khronios*, meaning long-standing. This translates to meaning friend of long-standing. This originated as a piece of Cambridge University slang around the 1660s. (p. 290)

Such unethical and biased employment practices may be perceived as methods of targeting certain groups of people from culturally and ethnically different backgrounds.
(Jones et al., 2008). The practices of nepotism and cronyism pose great challenges for employees who have invested considerable time and talent in their organization, only to find themselves repeatedly passed over for advancement opportunities and salary increases due to the advancement of someone who might not be as well educated, skilled, or knowledgeable of the company and its products and services. Often employees have clocked out at the end of the day feeling helpless and unworthy as a result of being constantly overlooked for advancement, or being denied opportunities for proper job training. By the time annual reviews are due, they have underperformed. These are the effects of job dissatisfaction and low morale (Arasli et al., 2006; Hernandez & Page, 2006; Padgett & Morris, 2005).

Individuals who are overlooked for promotions, or who are simply denied employment as a result of the practices of nepotism and cronyism are not considered a protected class under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. This U.S. Government legislation, passed in 1964, was established to prohibit discrimination by employers on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, religion, gender, national origin, interracial association, or an association of an individual with others of a particular race or any one of the aforementioned protected classes (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, n.d.). However, nepotism and cronyism may be deemed by some as subtle forms of discrimination and can be held as legal claims if the acts affect racial bias in the workplace. In other words, favoritism does not provide a basis for employees to bring legal action against an employer simply because the employer hired his or her neighbor, best friend, or friend of a friend or relative (Schmidt, 2007). It is incumbent on persons bringing forth a claim to prove they were as qualified as the favored person and that they
would have been hired “but for the hiring of the” favored person (p. 201). Any time one or more of these relationships is used as a method of hiring or advancement in personnel selection, and not through merit-based selections, this gives the perception of favoritism as well.

Although hiring family members was once viewed as beneficial to companies, in that family members were deemed to be more reliable and dedicated, some companies began to shy away from this practice by implementing anti-nepotism policies (Podgers, 1996). In contrast, some companies established language that encourages hiring based on nepotism in their personnel policies (White, 2000). Leaders and those in positions of influence believe they gain from practices of nepotism and cronyism. The assumption is that these practices ensure honesty and trustworthiness; they promote cost-effective measures toward advertising positions and training external new hires, and identify staff that may show a stronger sense of loyalty and commitment to the organization (Khatri & Tsang, 2003; White, 2000). However, those who promote personnel based on nepotism and cronyism may not be aware of the consequences of their actions with regard to these practices—consequences such as (a) low job satisfaction, (b) low self-efficacy; (c) creating a potential breeding ground for discrimination lawsuits, and (d) lack of workplace diversity.

Background and Need for the Study

Are Black women advanced more in their careers today than before? According to Phillips (2012), Black women still face some issues from the past. The American national family is far from being perfectly inclusive. Race remains the biggest problem in this country because American blacks do not feel that this offer of universal kinship really extends to them, and they are correct in seeing
their continued exclusion as the result of a narrow nepotistic preference of whites for other whites. (Bellow, 2004)

However, there are more Black women who have begun dialogue that has served to create a more diverse representation of what and who Black women are. Phillips claimed that 3% of all board seats of Fortune 500 companies between 2010 and 2011 were held by women of color. Moreover, “An astonishing 11.3 percent of board seats held by women were held by African-American women” (Phillips, 2012, p. 140). Phillips maintained that race is still a major barrier for Black women in the workplace and Black women have very little room to make mistakes.

Jones et al. (2008) introduce discrimination as an opportunity deficiency, anchored in social categories such as ethnicity, color, race, gender, and other biases. With respect to the proclivity to disparate certain groups, Black women experience the proverbial double-edged sword from a gender standpoint and the race perspective. Employment practices such as nepotism and cronyism may be perceived as methods of discrimination, thus producing the need for anti-nepotism policies in the workplace. Moreover, research conducted by Caiazza, Shaw, and Werschkul (2004) suggested that Black women have far surpassed their White female counterparts in educational achievement and have contributed to the ascension of Black women into the status of middle class. However, Black people in the workplace, especially women, still experience a lower rate of promotions and make significantly lower salaries than their White counterparts (Caiazza et al., 2004). Moreover, Black people show significantly higher rates of unemployment than do White or Hispanic people. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Household Data Annual Averages for 2009 revealed 17.5% rate of unemployment for Black males, 9.4% for White males, and 12.5% for Hispanic
males. Black women for the same reporting year showed 12.4%, whereas their White and Hispanic counterparts showed rates of 7.3% and 11.5%, respectively (Caiazza et al., 2004). The path to increased salaries, the boardroom, or upper-management level positions is still impassable due to the proverbial glass ceiling. This barrier promotes an unhealthy organization ethos that oftentimes leads to non-merit-based promotions, resulting in high turnover and loss of good employees (Ethnic Majority, 2010).

Jackson and O’Callaghan (2009) conducted a study to ascertain how much research on the glass ceiling had been conducted since the “Federal Glass Ceiling Commission was created through Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1991” (p. 462). Other reasons for the study included, but were not limited to (a) research top emphasis, (b) research methods employed, and (c) what knowledge was gained with respect to the glass ceiling. The researchers further stated that the concept of the glass ceiling was “first coined to describe the experiences of women in corporate America” (2009, p. 462).

Jackson and O’Callaghan, (2009) asserted that the 1980s brought about a national awareness through the federal government that women of color and other ethnic groups were affected by the concept of the glass ceiling. It was concluded that there was a significant amount of research on the glass ceiling, but only a moderate number of empirical studies that specifically identified and examined the effects of the glass ceiling (Jackson & O’Callaghan, 2009). Practices of preferential hiring and advancement such as nepotism and cronyism are elements of the glass ceiling, which act as barriers to Black women realizing career development and advancement opportunities in the workplace.

Some researchers agreed there is still a great need for courageous, open, and honest discourse supported by data and recommendations for methods to circumvent the
widespread use of non-merit-based employment practices of nepotism and cronyism (Arasli et al., 2006; Hernandez & Page, 2006; Laker & Williams, 2003; Padgett & Morris, 2005). More quantitative studies based on actual situations could serve to help decision makers actualize better decisions and improve choices in hiring selections, which could increase team morale, increase productivity, and promote higher retention levels (Kizirian, Leese, & Nissan, 2006; Schmidt, 2007). At the very least, new studies might show that although common practice is to hire family members or cronies, it might not be favored among the majority of employees and may yield negative consequences for job satisfaction and JFSE of certain employees or certain groups of employees.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine Black women’s perceptions of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace. Moreover, the purpose was to examine whether a relationship existed between Black women’s job satisfaction and JFSE due to employment practices of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace.

Research Questions

The following research questions were offered as a guide for this study:

1. To what extent do Black women perceive nepotism exists in the workplace?
2. To what extent do Black women perceive cronyism exists in the workplace?
3. To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and job satisfaction as they relate to Black women in the workplace?
4. To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and JFSE as they relate to Black women in the workplace?
Theoretical Rationale

The theoretical rationale that supported this study is based on Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, and Pastorelli’s (2001) social-cognitive theory of self-efficacy, as well as Bandura’s (1982) theory of the self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. Concepts of diversity and minorities, as put forth by Barbosa and Cabral-Cardoso (2007) and Kundu (2003) were offered to further frame this study. An assumption held by Barbosa and Cabral-Cardoso (2007) was that minorities belong to what they referenced as identity groups. These groups are typically regarded as weaker groups because they lack real power and opportunities. Consequently, identity groups are consistently targeted with acts of employment or employer prejudice in hiring, training, wages, and promotions (Barbosa & Cabral-Cardoso, 2007). Kundu (2003) avowed that diversity should be recognized as a positive development in that it moves away from homogeneity. These organizations recognize and appreciate that customers are diverse and, therefore, have positioned themselves to better compete and succeed in the global market. In contrast, organizations that fall short of embracing diversity will not position themselves to offer the best products, services, and workforce to their customers.

Employees spend a significant amount of their life in the workplace. For this reason, Bandura et al. (2001) deduced that perceived self-efficacy is fundamental to human organization. Bandura et al. (2001) declared, “Perceived self-efficacy is, therefore, posited as a pivotal factor in career choice and development” (p. 187). Moreover, an individual’s career choice and the level to which an individual masters that choice are based on that individual’s confidence or self-efficacy (Bandura et al., 2001). Views on self-efficacy further establish to what extent people will apply strength and
how long they will continue in the face of challenges or setbacks (Bandura, 1982). When
inundated with challenges, those who are plagued with serious doubts about their
capabilities may relax their efforts or abandon their efforts altogether (Bandura, 1982).
Accordingly, the greater the degree of perseverance, the higher the performance
attainment is for those with a strong sense of self-efficacy. Conversely, those who
experience a low sense of self-efficacy experience lower job performance. People avoid
activities they believe they are incapable of performing at high performance levels;
although they accept and perform those tasks, they regard themselves as incompetent in
accomplishing them (Bandura, 1982).

Walker (2009) averred, “When a leader is confident in her abilities and who she is
it is directly related to her overall feeling of competency and self-efficacy” (p. 42).
Walker (2009), whose focus was on women leaders in the military, maintained that self-
efficacy and emotional intelligence are but two of the aspects that determine good leader–
follower relationships. Leaders can accomplish goals through their expectations of their
followers; however, the leader must first “be confident in personal expectations in order
to better understand how best to influence or impact the organization which she leads”

Limitations of the Study

There are inherent limitations to all studies. The researcher has acknowledged the
following limitations for this study:

1. Sampling methodology: A judgmental sampling methodology was employed
for the study. This type of sampling, also known as purposive sampling,
involves the selection of items based on the judgment of an individual and,
although judgmental sampling cannot be used to draw statistically valid inferences about a population, it allows researchers to review an isolated portion of an exact population; researchers may judge the results upon evaluation of the quality of the population studied (Comptroller of the Currency Administrator of National Banks, 1998). Consequently, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to all Black women, working or retired.

2. Sample size: Although the sample population chosen by the researcher should have yielded hundreds of participants, the sample size ($N = 55$) was very small.

3. Data-collection method: A web-based survey, supported by Survey Monkey, was employed to conduct the study. According to Dillman (2002), web-based surveys do not offer researchers autonomy with regard to who does or does not complete the survey. As a result, there is great potential for low response rate and, therefore, the data may not be useful. Participants in this study were e-mailed multiple times to remind them to check their spam folders and to participate before the survey closed. Although one open-ended question was included in the survey, some participants opted to not answer the open-ended question, and some chose to not answer questions related to cronyism. One participant did not complete the survey. Moreover, data from the study relied on self-perceptions of the participants. The risk lies in that participants may be unable to provide impartial responses of actual occurrences or situations, which may limit the analysis of the findings.
4. Operating policies and procedures: Equally important, not all Black organizations invited to participate in the study had the same operating policies and procedures. Some organizations required formal invitations through regional directors or other executive officers. Executive leadership with formal operating policies and procedures disseminated the invitation to the study to their respective organization’s membership and requested the members make direct contact with the researcher to participate in the study. Some organizations requested the survey be posted on the respective chapter’s social-networking site for organization members to gain access, without having to send their individual e-mail addresses. To do so, it the researcher was required to subscribe to the organization’s social-networking site; upon approval of the executive leadership, a username and password were sent to the researcher, which the researcher was allowed to change upon successful login.

5. Researcher bias: The researcher has experienced career opportunities based on cronyism, but has also experienced career losses due to workplace nepotism. The purpose of the study was not to persuade or dissuade participants with regard to any of study’s variables. Therefore, every attempt was made by the researcher to maintain the highest level of integrity, professionalism, and confidentiality in conducting the study.

6. Membership and participants: The researcher is a member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. (DST). Several chapters were invited to participate in the
study; however, the researcher’s chapter was not invited to participate in the study.

Significance of the Study

There is no doubt that researchers debate the advantages and disadvantages of nepotism and cronyism. As evidenced in studies covered in the review of literature chapter, some research suggested that nepotism and cronyism are hiring practices that offer employers the best candidates for their organizations. These candidates bring a sense of loyalty to those who hired them or offered some assistance in their being hired. Moreover, researchers contend the practices of nepotism and cronyism bring about a greater sense of job satisfaction, which yields a higher rate of job performance (Bellow, 2004; Basu, 2009; Hernandez & Page, 2006). In contrast, other research has shown that nepotism and cronyism pose serious barriers to workplace diversity and encourage homogeneity (Basu, 2009; Hernandez & Page, 2006). Moreover, research has shown that nepotism and cronyism show a direct negative correlation to job satisfaction and JFSE or self-esteem (Arasli et al., 2006).

This study contributed to the body of knowledge in various manners such as (a) how the practices of nepotism and cronyism are perceived by Black women; (b) how nepotism and cronyism might or might not impede employees’ job satisfaction and how employees perceive their self-worth or self-efficacy; (c) how nepotism and cronyism practices may be deemed positive forms of networking, thus providing a conduit to strong job satisfaction and JFSE; and (d) a need to further the awareness of the perceptions of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace, as seen through the lenses of Black women. Although this study did not sufficiently address every aspect of nepotism and cronyism
and their impact on job satisfaction, JFSE, and workplace diversity, it attempted to encourage discourse to address a few of the issues and challenges of employment practices bring about as a result of the practices of nepotism and cronyism.

This study provided far-reaching implications for managers or leaders: (a) it highlighted the need for managers and leaders to assume more responsibility and accountability for the work environment; and (b) in cases whereby nepotism or cronyism were not perceived as constructive, the results from the study encouraged managers and leaders to be cognizant of how these non-merit-based employment practices prohibit career advancement, and which literature supports are directly related to low job satisfaction or low JFSE. Moreover, implications from this study encourage employers to draw on more stringent hiring and advancement practices, which are supported by merit-based criterion such as (a) education, (b) skills, (c) experience, (d) training, (e) testing, and (f) multiple intelligences.

Decreased performance levels are sound indicators that something is amiss in the workplace, especially where nepotism, cronyism, or the perception of them is prevalent (Arasli et al., 2006). Those in positions of influence, who take an active role in the development or enhancement of their employee’s self-efficacy or job satisfaction, or in promoting diversity in their workplace, will find that employees will exhibit strong signs of loyalty. In contrast are those employees who perceive the practices of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace. These perceptions are considered by many as unethical practices. Human resource personnel, managers, and leaders must make their top priority the company’s needs, image, and what will increase and maintain high levels of performance (Arasli et al., 2006).
Definition of Key Terms

The following terms were identified in the scope of the literature amassed for and operationalized in this study:

*African-American, Black*. According to the CDC, Black or African American people have origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, n.d.). Both terms and labels are widely used and accepted; however, for the purpose of this study, the preferred term is *Black*.

*Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. (AKA)*. According to its history, “Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated (AKA) is an international service organization that was founded on the campus of Howard University in Washington, D.C. in 1908. AKA is “the oldest Greek-lettered organization established by African-American college-educated women” (AKA, n.d.). Moreover, “Alpha Kappa Alpha is comprised of a nucleus of 260,000 members in graduate and undergraduate chapters in the United States, the U. S. Virgin Islands, the Caribbean, Canada, Japan, Germany, and Korea and on the continent of Africa” (AKA, n.d.). Members from various graduate chapters of this organization were invited to participate in the study.

*Anti-nepotism policies*. Anti-nepotism policies are policies that bar the employment of close relatives and spouses in the same department, facility, or workplace (Coil & Rice, 1995). The study addressed the rationale behind anti-nepotism policies and who it actually benefits in the workplace.

*Association of Pan African Doctoral Scholars, Inc. (APADS)*. “APADS, Inc. is a support organization that fosters and provides mentoring support for Pan African students and scholars” (APADS, 2012) APADS’s membership is comprised of men and women
doctoral scholars; however, only women from the organization were invited to participate in the study.

*Black Women’s Network (BWN).* “Black Women’s Network serves as a communication vehicle linking Black females with each other for the purposes of resource sharing, career advancement, patronage of BWN businesses/services and networking” (BWN, 2012, para 2). BWN is a “Non-profit 501 (c) (3) nonpartisan Business and Professional Women’s Organization” (BWN, 2012, para. 1).

*Business climate.* Loewe, Blume, and Speer (2008) defined business climate as a set of factors that shape the decisions of both local and foreign firms to do business in a country. Moreover, the researchers contended that “A good business climate is characterized by low costs and low risks of doing business as well as low barriers to competition” (p. 260).

*Catalyst.* Founded in 1962, Catalyst is a nonprofit membership organization whose mission is to focus on global issues that concern women in the workplace, addressing issues that are relevant to furthering career opportunities and building inclusive working communities for women (Catalyst, 2012)).

*Cronyism.* Hernandez and Page (2006) defined cronyism as a non-merit-based, personnel practice whereby an individual is hired or advanced, and also enjoys benefits resulting from a friendship with someone in the organization who is usually in an authoritative position.

*Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. (DST).* DST (n.d.) is a Black Greek public-service sorority with a nonprofit 501(c) (7) status. Much like AKA, it was founded in 1913 on the campus of Howard University by 22 Black collegiate women. “The first
public act performed by the Delta Founders involved their participation in the Women’s Suffrage March in Washington D.C., March 1913” (DST, n.d.). It is a predominantly black organization with more than 900 collegiate and graduate chapters and 250,000 members in the United States, England, Japan (Tokyo and Okinawa), Germany, the Virgin Islands, the Republic of Korea, the Bahamas and Bermuda (DST, n.d.). Various DST graduate chapters in the United States were invited to represent the population studied employing a judgmental-sampling approach.

Diversity. According to Kundu (2003) diversity refers to the state in which employees from various Sociocultural backgrounds work in an organization. Diversity embraces (a) race, (b) gender,(c) national origin, (d) religion, (e) ethnicity, (f) disability, (g) sexual orientation, (h) education, (i) language, (j) lifestyle, (k) physical appearance, and (l) economic status (Kundu, 2003).

Glass ceiling. This term refers to barriers that often impede ethnic groups and women from reaching the upper ranks of corporate America (Ethnic Majority, 2010; Jackson & O’Callaghan, 2009). Although Black women have made significant strides in the workplace, the literature in the study drew inference to how nepotism and cronyism help create the glass ceiling by perpetuating the “old boy networks” by fostering homogeneity in the workplace.

Heterogeneity. In contrast to homogeneity, heterogeneity is resultant of a diverse workplace. Heterogeneity refers to cultural, social, biological, or other differences in a group (Hernandez & Page, 2006; Barbosa & Cabral-Cardoso, 2007; Keller, n.d.).
*Homogeneity*. Homogeneity refers to the quality of being the same or similar. Homogeneity was found to be the basis of prohibiting workplace diversity (Hernandez & Page, 2006; Keller, n.d.).

*Identity groups*. According to the literature, these groups were identified by their cultural background and, historically, are recurrent targets for organizational prejudices and discrimination (Barbosa & Cabral-Cardoso, 2007).

*Job-focused self-efficacy* (*JFSE*). According to Mathis and Brown (2008), the term is synonymous with self-efficacy. The term was used interchangeably with the term career self-efficacy (Sullivan & Mahalik, 2000). JFSE and career self-efficacy were used interchangeably for contextual purposes in this study.

*Job performance*. Job performance refers to how well a person does in their job. High performance is indicative of high job satisfaction and contributes to positive organizational outcomes. Arasli et al. (2006) held that managers believe happy employees enjoy a greater sense of job satisfaction, which translates into increased job performance.

*Job satisfaction*. Arasli et al. (2006) maintained that an individual’s emotional reaction to a particular job is an indication of one’s satisfaction with that particular job. Job satisfaction encompasses five components: (a) work, (b) supervision, (c) pay, (d) promotion, and (e) coworkers (Mathis & Brown, 2008).

Nepotism. Nepotism is the practice of non-merit-based employment of individuals based on family or kinship; employment not obtained based on a specific set of criterion including, but not limited to experience, education, interpersonal skills, or communication (Padgett & Morris, 2005).

Old boy network. According to Keller (n.d.), the old boy network is an exclusive club occupied by privileged white males, which is rooted in resources such as influence, information, and status. Not being a member of the old boy network prohibits Black women and other minorities from attaining work and career and salary advancement (Keller, n.d).

Self-efficacy. Self-efficacy refers to an individual’s belief about their competency or qualifications to exercise control over their own level of functioning and over events that affect their lives. Self-efficacy correlates to performance, drive, and attainment (Bandura, 1993). It was used interchangeably with job-focused self-efficacy and career self-efficacy throughout the study.

Title VII, Civil Rights Act of 1964. This term refers to legislation passed by the U.S. government to prohibit discrimination by employers on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, religion, gender, national origin, interracial association, or an association of an individual with others of a particular race or any one of the aforementioned protected classes (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, n.d.).

Tokenism. As defined by Reich and Reich (2006), tokenism is the representation of different cultural groups without valuing their input or providing them with voice. Employers may hold their organizations to be promoting workplace diversity, but this
may be only in numbers or on paper. For the purpose of the study, it will be established that tokenism practices may be a prelude to the glass ceiling for Black women.

Wasta. Used in Jordan and parts of the Middle East, *wasta* means relations or connections (Loewe, Blume, and Speer, 2008).

Workplace diversity. Morrison, Titi, Oladunjoye, and Rose (2008) maintained that workplace diversity refers to an organization of employees with differing characteristics such as age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation, values, ethnic culture, education, language, lifestyle, beliefs, physical appearance, and economics.

Summary

In Chapter I, a narrative of the research problem for this study was addressed. Further, this chapter offered the purpose and significance of the study as well as the theoretical framework. Finally, a list of research questions that guided the research methodology and definition of terms operationalized for the study were identified. Immediately following this chapter is the review of literature, Chapter II, which delineates historical background as well as quantitative and qualitative research on (a) nepotism, (b) cronyism, (c) job satisfaction, and (d) self-efficacy and JFSE. Additional chapters include Chapter III (methodology), Chapter IV (results), and Chapter V, which delves into a discussion of the findings, implications for professionals, implications for future research, and concluding thoughts.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Restatement of the Problem

The current body of research on nepotism and cronyism is scant (Jones et al., 2008). Even so, researchers engage in discourse that either supports the benefits of nepotism and cronyism, or the downside to nepotism and cronyism in the workplace and the relationship among employment practices, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction (Coil & Rice, 1995; Elbo, 1998). Elbo (1998) believed that employers can evade nepotism completely, beginning with the hiring process. The job application should inquire as to whether an applicant is related to or connected with others in the company either by blood, marriage, or friendship; this may impede the practices of nepotism and cronyism in the beginning stage of an individual’s employment (Elbo, 1998). Managers and human-resource personnel should always maintain current knowledge of the employing company’s personnel practices and procedures. Periodic review should give rise to whether an organization’s mission and values are followed through ethical and nonbiased employment practices. This study was of significant importance to the current study in that it recommended one method of how employers may circumvent non-merit-based employment practices. If the recommended solution is intently followed, the likelihood of a workplace formed on the basis of homogeneity is greatly diminished, whereas the likelihood of a more diverse workplace expands.

Overview

The aim of this section was to examine the literature related to nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction, and JFSE. Relative research for this study is presented in this
chapter as follows: (a) nepotism, (b) cronyism, and (c) anti-nepotism, (d) job satisfaction, and (e) self-efficacy and JFSE. Further insight into why some leaders fail to promote a heterogeneous or diverse workplace as well as why leaders should promote heterogeneity or enhance workplace diversity was substantiated with empirical data.

Nepotism

Arasli, Bavik, and Ekiz, (2006) investigated the effects of nepotism on human-resource management. The purpose of this empirical study was to examine likely results of nepotism in personnel (human resources) practices through employees in three-, four-, and five-star hotels in Northern Cyprus. One- and two-star hotels were used primarily for gambling and dormitory purposes; therefore, they were not considered for this study. Moreover, the purpose of the study was to prove that “nepotism is still very strong in business organizations, especially within less developed countries” (Arasli et al., 2006, p. 296).

To determine the relationships among nepotism, human-resource management, job satisfaction, quitting intention, and negative word of mouth, a 36-item survey instrument was administered. Arasli et al. (2006) stipulated that to compare across languages, faculty from the Turkish university tested the questionnaire using a “back-translation method” because all items were originally developed in English (p. 299). Of the 36 items, nepotism was measured by 10 items. Coefficient alphas of 0.88 were reported, and participant responses on nepotism were obtained on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “5 = strongly agree” to “1 = strongly disagree.” Human-resource management was measured by 13 items, with coefficient alphas of 0.90. Human-resource management responses were extracted on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from
“5 = strongly agree” to “1 = strongly disagree” (Arasli et al., 2006, p. 300). Job satisfaction, measured by seven items, was reported with coefficient alphas of 0.92 using the same Likert scale and ranges. Variables such as quitting intention and negative word of mouth, each measured through three items, reported coefficient alphas of 0.81 and 0.83, respectively and had responses extracted through a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “5 = strongly agree to “1 = strongly disagree” (Arasli et al., 2006, p. 300).

A random sample of 700 full-time employees, employed at “16 three-star hotels, six four-star hotels, and five five-star hotels within the region” was taken (Arasli et al., 2006, pp. 295–298). Data were then collected by purposive sampling. The researchers accounted for validity as follows:

In order to provide convergent validity, corrected item-total correlations were computed. … The inter-item correlations being equal to or exceeding 0.35 provide a support for the convergent validity of the scale. The results of the corrected item-total correlations exceed 0.35. Overall the results of this assessment support the issues of convergent validity of the scale. (Arasli et al., 2006, p. 300)

Reliability was explained as follows:

After employing corrected item-total correlations, reliability coefficients were computed for each study variable and at the aggregate level. Alpha coefficient was found to be 0.88 at the aggregate level. … All reliability coefficients were deemed acceptable. Specifically, reliability coefficients ranged from 0.81 to 0.92 for the study variables. Overall, these findings virtually show that each coefficient exceeds the minimum acceptable level of a newly developed scale, 0.50. (Arasli et al., 2006, p. 300)

The study deduced that human-resource management exerts a substantial positive effect on job satisfaction (Arasli et al., 2006). The data concluded that nepotism wielded a significant negative influence on job satisfaction and significant positive relationships to quitting intentions and negative word of mouth. It further substantiated that job satisfaction is crucial to the success of an organization, as higher levels of job satisfaction
induce loyalty and commitment to the organization. It also promotes higher job performance. The study was important in that it determined that nepotism not only affected current employees, but future professional managers motivated to seek employment in the hotels will be impacted as well.

The focus was on effects of nepotism in human-resource matters such as job satisfaction, quitting intentions, and negative word of mouth. There were inherent limitations to the study as it did not focus on other variables such as role stress and organizational commitment (Arasli et al., 2006). Additionally, other limitations were as follows: (a) sample size was small and the population was industry specific, (b) probability sampling should be employed to achieve more generalization about the population, and (c) the study focused on the employees’ perspective and not those of employers.

Arasli and Tumer (2008) conducted a similar study to explore the ramifications of nepotism and favoritism, which yielded similar results in that non-merit-based employment practices created job-related stress. Study results deduced that job-related stress had a direct correlation with job commitment. This survey was administered to banking employees in the Northern Cyprus banking industry, whereby 576 respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with their employment, desired to leave, and suffered from job-related stress as a consequence of the practice of workplace nepotism, cronyism, and favoritism (Arasli & Tumer, 2008).

Padgett and Morris (2005) referred to nepotism as the practice of showing favoritism during the employment process. Their argument was that the practice of nepotism had been practiced “for as long as business organizations have been in
existence,” but empirical data remains limited (p. 34). They further contended that empirical studies on the effects of nepotism are even more insufficient, “The limited amount of previous research on nepotism provides little basis for predicting whether those who benefit from nepotism will be helped, hindered, or unaffected” (Padgett & Morris, 2005, p. 35). Their contribution to the body of knowledge was a quantitative study that examined the consequences of being perceived as having benefited from a family connection during the hiring process using a survey design based on the Likert scale. The authors put forth the following three hypotheses:

**H1:** Hiring based on upon a family connection (i.e. nepotism) will be viewed as less fair than hiring based on merit.

**H2:** Subordinates who believe their supervisor was hired because of a family connection (i.e. nepotism) will be view him/her as less competent and effective, offer less intended behavioral support, have lower anticipated liking, and a rate of lower salary as appropriate for the supervisor than the subordinates who believe their supervisor was hired due to his/her merit.

**H3:** Subordinates who believe their supervisor was hired because of family connection (i.e. nepotism) will have lower job satisfaction, lower organizational commitment and less work motivation than subordinates who believe their supervisor was hired due to his/her merit. (Padgett & Morris, 2005, p. 36)

Participants \((N = 197)\) consisted of undergraduate students, 94 males, 101 females, and two participants who did not disclose their gender. Of the 197 participants 180 (91.37%) were Caucasian, 6 (3.04%) were African-American, 5 (2.53%) consisted of Asian students, 2 (1.01%) were Hispanic, and 2.03% (4) did not disclose their racial/ethnic background (Padgett & Morris, 2005). The assumption of the researchers was that junior- and senior-level students were an appropriate sample, as they had experienced part-time employment in a subordinate role. A questionnaire that assessed their perceptions and their attitudes about nepotism was distributed and collected during a regular class session; students were handed a packet containing information on three
candidates being considered for promotion to assistant banking center manager. Participants were asked an open-ended question as to what they deemed to be primary reasons for which an individual was hired for the position of banking manager. With the exception of starting salary, items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale (Padgett & Morris, 2005).

According to Padgett and Morris (2005), data analysis was based on a 2 (target gender) x 2 (selection method; merit vs. nepotism) x 2 (subject gender) analysis of variance for each of the three outcomes that were measured: (a) perceived fairness of the hiring process, (b) subordinate/subject perceptions of and toward the new supervisor, and (c) subordinate/subject job attitudes and work behaviors. Study results yielded much of what the researchers hypothesized in that (a) merit-based hiring was perceived to be more fair than hiring based on nepotism; individuals believed to have benefited from a family connection were viewed less favorably than individuals hired based on merit; a supervisor given preferential treatment due to nepotism was perceived more negatively as being less capable; subordinates were agreeable to providing behavioral support for the supervisor, and subordinates believed the supervisor should have a lower starting salary; (b) It was perceived that subordinates did not strongly anticipate future advancement under supervisors who were hired as a result of nepotism; and (c) It was perceived that subordinates working under someone who was hired due to a family connection would be less likely to show organizational commitment (Padgett & Morris, 2005).

Padgett and Morris (2005) stipulated several limitations to their study. The nepotistic hiring process in the study was simulated, which did not allow for generalizability to an actual occurrence of workplace nepotism. The researchers were
cognizant of other intervening factors that impact the hiring process beyond the resume: factors such as social skills, interpersonal skills, dress and appearance, and personality. Additionally, the use of upper-level undergraduate students with minimal (part-time) work experience further lessened the allowance for generalizability of the study’s outcome. The position taken by Padgett and Morris was that the lack of work experience might have prohibited accurate assessment of the expertise level of the supervisor as well as what an appropriate beginning salary should be for someone in that position. Moreover, the selection-method manipulation was at issue. The candidate hired in the merit-based condition was more qualified than either of the two candidates in the pool; however, the preferential (nepotism) candidate who was hired was more qualified than one of the candidates, but equally qualified with the other.

In conclusion, this study was vital in that it brought attention to a dire need for empirical research on the part of business and psychology communities in examining the negative and positive effects of hiring based on nepotism (Padgett & Morris, 2005). Although the study focused on a simulated experience using undergraduate students, their perceptions led to the realization that nepotism needs to be more comprehensively investigated on a macro-level to determine the impact on organizational commitment, how nepotistic employees fare after they have been employed for awhile, and to better assess the long-term consequences of hiring practices based on nepotism and preferential treatment (Padgett & Morris, 2005).

A wealth of rich data identifying two types of nepotism, functional nepotism and dysfunctional nepotism, are the focus of a study conducted by Hernandez and Page (2006). According to Hernandez and Page, functional nepotism is good when used
appropriately. However, when nepotism causes (a) a conflict of interest, (b) homogeneity, (c) inertia, and (d) legal complications, it is marked as being dysfunctional. In stark contrast to Padgett and Morris’ (2005) study on nepotism, Hernandez and Page argued that nepotistic hiring can have a positive impact in an organization. The rationale was that companies or organizations capitalize on their value and efficiency by circumventing the hiring of undesirable and unfamiliar workers. Hernandez and Page stipulated that “Firm owners maximize utility by being able to avoid undesirable and unfamiliar workers, and by exercising discretion in employee recruitment to select employees who ‘fit’ well with the corporate culture” (2005, p. 4). Moreover, nepotism allows leaders, or those in positions of influence more flexibility in managing workers, often preferred even at the cost of inciting discrimination.

Employers assumed that by practicing nepotism, leaders would realize higher levels of productivity from workers, greater commitment resulting from family loyalty, and lower costs associated with recruitment, training, and development of merit-based employees; managers are advised that merit-based consideration should not be the sole criteria by which employment practices are implemented (Hernandez & Page, 2006). The argument is that education, experience, and skills do not indicate how well an individual will fit into a company’s culture. The argument is supported by the perception that family members are more knowledgeable, more suitable, and will exemplify more organizational commitment and loyalty.

Dysfunctional nepotism lends itself to favoritism, perceived favoritism, and a lack of diversity in the workplace (Hernandez & Page, 2006). It fosters workplace conflict,
waste, and inefficiency. When not adequately addressed and resolved, dysfunctional nepotism elicits low job satisfaction, low JFSE and may preclude workplace diversity.

Hernandez and Page’s (2006) quantitative analysis of nepotism hypothesized the following: “H1: Recruitment nepotism will be positively associated with organizational commitment among those hired or referred via family members who already hold a position in the company” (Hernandez & Page, 2006, p. 9). The researchers used a subset of General Social Surveys (GSS). GSS are representative surveys of the adult population that are conducted almost every year since it began in 1972; a subset of 1991 and 2002 were used for their study (Hernandez & Page, 2006). There were four outcomes measured:

1. Organizational commitment: Five items measuring organizational commitment were derived from the GSS subset, shown in Table 1;

2. Recruitment nepotism: Participants were asked to indicate whether they learned of their current job through a familial relationship; the answers “Yes” or “No” were coded 1 and 2, respectively;

3. Recruitment methods: Also code “Yes = 1” or “No = 2,” participants were given a list of other means by which they might have learned of their current position; and

4. Control variables: Age, sex, and income.
Table 1

Factor Analysis for Organizational Commitmenta Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>GSS 2002 variable name</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to work harder than I have to in order to help this organization succeed.</td>
<td>Helporg</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very little loyalty to this organization. (reverse coded)</td>
<td>Notloyal</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar.</td>
<td>Samevals</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to be working for this organization.</td>
<td>Proudorg</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would turn down another job for more pay in order to stay with this organization.</td>
<td>Stayorg2</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Multiple regression analysis was used for the study, with organizational commitment as the dependent variable; independent variables were based on each method by which respondents were informed of the job (Hernandez & Page, 2006). Table 2 provides this data.

According to Hernandez and Page (2006), “There is a significant positive t-value between the variable ‘Found job through relatives’ and organizational commitment (B = .172; t = 2.5, p < .05),” (p. 11). This supported the hypothesis that job applicants enlisted through familial relationships currently working in the organization showed a higher degree of organizational commitment. Conversely, those job applicants without a family connection did not show as high a degree of organizational commitment. The rationale put forth is that employees hired as a result of nepotism may feel a certain amount of pressure and demand to display higher levels of organizational commitment to protect the reputation of the referring family member.
Table 2

*Multiple Regression of Methods for Finding Job on Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Organizational commitment (t)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>.026*</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone already working</td>
<td>2.742**</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>-.575</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper ad</td>
<td>-2.157*</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>-.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment agency</td>
<td>-1.632</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiter</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-4.560***</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.2710***</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, R² = .069; ** p < .01, **Adjusted R² = .056; *** p < .005, R = .263; Note: The direction of the t-score is positive if respondents found jobs using that method resulting in higher commitment, and negative if respondents found jobs using that method resulting in lower commitment


This study was vital for several reasons: (a) it addressed two types of nepotism—functional and dysfunctional; (b) it unequivocally put forth the debate regarding the negative perspectives on hiring based on nepotism, one being encouraging a homogenous workplace and another being lack of organizational commitment on the part of those not hired based on nepotism; and (c) this study as well as others took issue with the paucity of empirical data on nepotism and the researchers encouraged more research to add to the body of knowledge (Hernandez & Page, 2006).

Researchers agree on the paucity of literature on nepotism. Because much of what is known is deemed anecdotal, a review of a paper focused on workplace conflict and nepotism was significant in that it offered the following steps that may be used as a guide
by leaders and those in positions of influence on how to circumvent the perils of nepotism and cronyism (Kizirian, Leese, & Nissan, 2006, pp. 25–27):

(a) Review your company’s policies on nepotism to maintain your currency. Most companies have employment guidelines specifically stating that employees are not permitted to take part in activities that could be construed as nepotistic;

(b) All subordinates should be required to intermittently examine their organization’s guidelines and resolution procedures to familiarize themselves with activities that involve nepotism;

(c) Direct your human resources department to resolve any issues that arise from acts of nepotism and cronyism (unfair employment practices) in the workplace;

(d) Direct your employees who experience conflicts of interest to explain the circumstance to someone in the personnel office and ask for advice or direction on the matter. Kizirian et al. (2006) posit that “employees should always inform their employees when confronted with any situation real or perceived as a conflict of interest;”

(e) Immediately address, investigate, and resolve issues resulting from nepotism and cronyism whether real or perceived to minimize any ramifications;

(f) Make every attempt to control gossip, as this may have damaging consequences on your organization;

(g) Review your company’s policies on conflict of interest to be sure that you are current on policies governing conflicts of interest involving relatives or friends. Most firms have policies and guidelines which address “relative or friends employed by suppliers or customers” types of conflict of interest. Be sure that disclosure issues are addressed. In many situations, publicizing the family/friend relationship will reduce or eliminate the perception of a conflict of interest. Other preventive options available to an employer should be identified such as transferring an employee, or changing the employee’s responsibilities either temporarily or permanently;

(h) Require all your subordinates to periodically review your firm’s policies, guidelines, and resolution procedures related to conflicts of interest involving relatives or friends;

(i) Direct your human resources department to resolve any such conflict of interest issues which might be unresolved in a timely manner;

(j) Direct your employees who have a conflict of interest concern to describe the situation to a Human Resources Department contact and ask for guidance;
(k) Employees should always inform their employers when confronted with any situation that may be perceived as a conflict of interest, even if the employee doesn’t believe the situation would violate employer guidelines;

(l) Investigate, address, and resolve any conflict of interest concerns (either real or apparent) immediately upon identification to lessen their repercussions; and

(m) Do not allow gossip to flourish and fuel unwarranted perceptions of favoritism that could, if uncontrolled, negatively impact your organization.

Kizirian et al. (2006) asserted that when business and friendship or family intermingle in the employment process or in the workplace, conflict will occur and loyalties will become divided. This leads to an actual conflict of interest as well as a perceived conflict of interest, which promotes low workplace morale. For this reason, it is crucial that employers avoid the appearance of preferential treatment in all employment procedures.

Cronyism

Khatri and Tsang (2003) affirmed “it’s not what you know but who you know” that reinforces the effects of personal connections in organizations (p. 290). The following ten propositions were put forth as antecedents of cronyism at the individual level: (Khatri & Tsang, 2003, pp. 292–298)

- Proposition 1: Particularism will be positively associated with ingroup bias in organizations.
- Proposition 2: Paternalism will be positively associated with unreserved personal loyalty in organizations.
- Proposition 3: Strong ingroup bias will be positively associated with cronyism.
- Proposition 4: Unreserved personal loyalty will be positively associated with cronyism.
- Proposition 5: Ingroup members will have greater job satisfaction than outgroup members.
• Proposition 6: Organizational commitment will be negatively associated with cronyism.
• Proposition 7: Ingratiation will be positively associated with cronyism.
• Proposition 8: Organizational performance will be negatively associated with cronyism.
• Proposition 9a: Morale of the ingroup will be higher than that of the outgroup.
• Proposition 9b: Overall morale will be negatively associated with cronyism.
• Proposition 10: Organizational inertia will be positively associated with cronyism.

The researchers emphasized job satisfaction and organizational commitment with the premise being three-fold: (a) if subordinates are members of the in-group, they will develop more gratitude toward their superiors, take pleasure in their work, and experience greater job satisfaction. In contrast, members of the out-group, regardless of their merits, will not bond with their superiors and will experience lower levels of job satisfaction. Moreover, members of the out-group will not advance as quickly as members in the in-group; (b) that cronyism is perceived as an unfair, unmerited, and unethical employment practice. This is especially true for Black women in that it impedes advancement to the point of Black women hitting the glass ceiling; and (c) in-group members are exposed to more challenging assignments, which increases their self-efficacy, whereas out-group members typically are assigned mundane day-to-day tasks, which may translate into these group members experiencing low self-efficacy, poor job performance, and “feelings of being trapped in an organization that commands personal relationships in order to further one’s career” (Khatri & Tsang, 2003, p. 25). Further, in-group members are more cohesive and, therefore, have high group morale and, because of the connectedness to the
superior, these members move up the ladder faster, and obtain better salaries and benefits. Appropriately, out-group members experience low group morale and are extended.

In conclusion, cronyism, or the perception of cronyism, impacts more than compensation, promotion, benefits, and bonuses; it significantly impacts organizational commitment. Commitment is related to organizational dependability or the extent to which an organization is perceived to be looking after the interests of its employees in practices such as job security and career development (Khatri & Tsang, 2003, p. 296).

Gender based, racial, and ethnic disparities are endemic in the United States. This accounts for the fact that women comprise 33.2% of managerial and professional positions (IWPR, 2004); however, Black women are even more underrepresented than White men and White women in managerial positions and professional positions. Black women, “have increased their educational attainment more quickly than white women have” (IWPR, 2004, p. 24). Yet, Black women share a disproportionately low share of earnings, followed only by Native Americans and Hispanic women (IWPR, 2004).

Non-merit-based employment practices pose a special set of circumstances for Black women in the workplace. This may be attributed to what is commonly referred to as the “old boy network” that promotes homogeneity and precludes workplace diversity. Put into context, members of this club are perceived as being in the upper-middle and upper classes. Although these members see cronyism as simply a method of social networking that entitles them to unearned special benefits and perks, members in the lower- and middle class see cronyism as dishonest, biased, and illegal (Begley, Khatri, & Tsang, 2009). The perception is that members of the old boy network exclude protected classes in their hiring and advancement practices; for the purpose of this study, the
protected class of people is Black women. Exclusion of certain classes of people, such as Black women, affects organizational performance in the global market; it encourages discriminatory actions, which are costly, and the excluded class will experience distrust toward the employer. Distrust translates into lack of organizational commitment. Lack of commitment toward an organization that is perceived to devalue its employees is akin to low job satisfaction, poor job performance, low group morale, and low JFSE.

Begley et al. (2009) defined cronyism as a “soft form of criminal conspiracy” (p. 281). Moreover, the argument put forth in the article was that cronyism is a form of social networking with characteristics similar in nature to that of the mafia. Social networking was viewed as powerful, as it might have been intended for purposes of compassion and generosity, or for malicious intent. As cronyism has long been seen as a negative aspect of politics, studies suggested that contemporary organizations experience the downside of cronyism in much the same way (Basu, 2009; Begley et al., 2009; Arasli, et al, 2006; Arasli & Tumer, 2008).

The analysis of cronyism was particularly vital in that it establishes several reasonable recommendations that may mitigate the overarching practice of cronyism in the workplace: (a) implement formalized and transparent reward systems, (b) foster a competitive working environment, and (c) hire and train competent bosses (Begley et al., 2009).

The old boy network was not highly favored by all (Keller, n.d.). The contention was that organizations that aspire to the old boy way of doing business suffer greatly.

A leader of an organization who is a member of the clique must be willing to compromise what is fair for all employees for that which shows favor to the chosen one. … Leadership must be fair and consistent … “a management style
grounded on favoritism is the antithesis of fair and consistent leadership.” (Keller, n.d., pp. 3-4)

Keller (n.d.) affirmed that this type of biased employment practice lent itself to low morale, poor job performance, and low job satisfaction, and dissuaded workplace diversity. As a result, JFSE is impacted. Keller emphasized, “When an organization supports the ‘Good Old Boy’ systems it forces the other employees to ask themselves ‘why should I try and improve myself if I cannot move ahead in this organization?’” (p. 6). Furthermore, the Good Old Boy system does little to promote heterogeneity; instead, it promotes homogeneity in its employment practices. For some, cronyism is a natural impulse to hire or advance friends. However, leaders or those in positions of influence must pay close attention to how they implement hiring and training policies in the workplace. Where cronyism exists, an organization may succumb to weaknesses that can present substantial barriers to transforming ineffective practices into effective practices in the hiring and advancing of its employees.

Loewe et al. (2008) examined favoritism in the business climate of Jordan. While favoritism is more widely referred to as cronyism in the business or corporate world in many Western cultures, it is referred to as “using wasta” in Jordan, meaning “relations” or “connections” (p. 259). It is believed that wasta leads to corruption, unfairness, and inefficiency in Jordan’s business climate (Loewe et al., 2008). Because of the nature by which favoritism is used in the political environment in Jordan, it is considered a form of corruption. Loewe et al. (2008) cited the following as examples of how favoritism is used to corrupt the business climate in Jordan:

1. Granting of licenses and investments: costs and associated risks are too high.

Oftentimes those with wasta are knowledgeable of properties for sale before
the general public and others; therefore, they are in a better position to
purchase the property or gain access to licensing.

2. Those who are said to have wasta can lobby for rules that are beneficial to
their needs, which makes it extremely difficult for those without connections
or relations.

3. Because of its ambiguity, widespread use, and acceptance, wasta forces
business people to invest their time and money in social relations, which
raises the costs of investments.

Loewe et al. (2008) further contended:

Wasta plays a dominate role in the recruitment of public sector employees. An
overwhelming majority (77%) of low- and medium-ranking civil servants are of
the opinion that wasta is an “important” or “very important” factor for getting
employed in the public sector. … You have a problem if you do not employ these
people. It is a matter of security. (p. 268)

Loewe et al. (2008) offered four reasons for the widespread use of wasta:

1. Lack of alternatives: Many claim they are unaware of how to circumvent the
process of wasta and how to maneuver through the administrative processes
without the use of wasta; negative incentives.

2. There are no incentives to stop the use of wasta within the Jordanian business
climate.

3. Social norms: As previously mentioned, wasta is very ambiguous in that some
believe it to be corrupt; while others accept it as legitimate methods of conducting
business and as part of their culture.

4. Political system: This is considered the “most important factor” …”which is
key to understanding the role of wasta” in Jordan’s society (p. 274).

Loewe et al. (2008) emphasized Jordan’s repressive government, where chief
decisions are made by the king. Moreover, the king distributes material benefits and
privileges to the “most influential persons and groups” who, in turn pass on their
influence, and favors to “their respective constituents” (p. 274). Because everyone is
dependent on gains from their superiors, loyalty is owed to that person (Loewe et al., 2008).

Davoli (2008) contended that favoritism leads to the impression that certain employees are treated better and are given more latitude than others simply because they are friends or friends of friends and for no other legitimate reason. Davoli (2008) asserted four factors that determine how employees respond to favoritism in the workplace: (a) visibility of the acts of favoritism, (b) authentication of the practice of favoritism, (c) legality or illegality of the practice of favoritism in the workplace, and (d) employer tolerance of the practice of favoritism in the workplace. In addition, the following questions were offered as suggestions on how individuals may seek to handle favoritism in the workplace:

- Is favoritism holding me back?
- Is the preferential treatment based on ethnicity, gender, or age?
- Is this job worth fighting for?
- Do I really want to work for this company? (Davoli, 2008).

Favoritism is global and is therefore prevalent in any private- or public-sector organization. Size and scope of an organization are not always indicators as to whether favoritism is exercised. When dealing with favoritism, important factors such as a company’s tolerance for favoritism, the legality of the use of favoritism, and to what extent the favoritism is overt must be considered when faced with it.

If the favoritism you are experiencing is preventing you from moving up or damaging your career and you feel that the preferential treatment is unlawful i.e., based on ethnicity, gender, or age etc—you might think about speaking with a human resources person within your organization or company. If you chose this course of action, you will need documentation that can help prove your claim. ... And finally, make sure you are aware of your company’s policies towards
favoritism. The company may have a specific course of action in place that can help you sort through favoritism issues and guide you through next steps. (Davoli, 2008, para. 7)

Anti-nepotism policies were developed in an effort to assist employees and employers with workplace conflicts that resulted from the practice of nepotism. An anti-nepotism policy is one that bars the employment of close relatives and spouses in the same department, facility, or workplace (Coil & Rice, 1995). If followed by the spirit in which anti-nepotism policies were designed, employers and employees may realize greater workplace diversity and the benefits that correspond with it. According to Rabin-Margalioth (2006), “Anti-nepotism rules are self-imposed restrictions on the joint employment of members of the same family,” (p. 239). For more than 2 decades, employers have included policy changes that prohibit acts of nepotism. Previous data showed that more than 40% of companies have adopted anti-nepotism policies to ensure fairness in the human-resource functions and to help circumvent workplace conflict and the appearance of favoritism in the workplace (Rabin-Margalioth, 2006). An example of an anti-nepotism policy is provided as follows:

The Santa Monica Community College District’s standards for employment decisions such as hiring, promoting, reappointing, evaluating, awarding salary, disciplining, and terminating employees are based upon an individual’s qualifications for the position, ability, and performance. The District attempts to avoid favoritism, the appearance of favoritism, and conflicts of interest in employment, and reserves the right to take action in accordance with existing employee collective bargaining agreements when relationships or associations of employees negatively affect the District’s mission and goals. Employees and applicants for employment shall not be denied employment or advancement opportunities because of their status as a family or household member of another employee. However, no person shall be employed, promoted, or transferred to a position in a department where they he/she would be the immediate supervisor of or receive direct supervision from a: (a) spouse, domestic partner, or co-habitant; (b) child, including adopted, in-laws and step- or half-parent; (c) grandchild, including adopted, in-laws and step- or half-grandparent; (d) sibling, including in-
laws and step- or half-; or (e) any other member of the employee’s household whether or not related by blood or marriage; (f) children and family members of siblings and spouses. (Santa Monica Community College District Board of Trustees, 2009, p. 14)

In 2007, Nebraska Labor Department officials reportedly hired their children for summer employment, which was on the Nebraska State payroll, as reported by Boyle (2009). According to the news article, the family members, five daughters of five managers, were hired for clerical positions, but received higher rates of pay than “some regular full-time employees” (Boyle, 2009). Nebraska Governor Dave Heineman and State Auditor Mike Foley, among others, have put forth a bill to tighten restrictions on workplace nepotism and favoritism. State Auditor Foley is credited as declaring that “You can literally hire your own child as long as they did not live in your home. And you can promote them, give them salary increases … that’s not right” (Boyle, 2009, para.7).

Other researchers such as Podgers (1996) suggested that nepotism, though once a reliable method for family members to assist one another through the work world has fallen out of favor. The position taken by the researcher was that policies that now prohibit family members from holding positions too closely related to one another have fostered more fairness in the workplace, while creating new concerns relating to marriage in the workplace.

However, not all researchers advocate anti-nepotism policy, but favor the practice of nepotism in the workplace. Bellow (2004) stood out against anti-nepotism policies, as well as arguments against nepotism in general. The position taken was one that exalts the movement toward nepotism in the workplace as an alternative to equal opportunity. Bellow (2004) opined that nepotism should be openly debated to bring the practice up to “it’s highest standards” (p. 471). According to Bellow (2004), nepotism, when properly
executed, is positive and beneficial; it is akin to a gift exchange, something that is passed on from a parent to child.

In a study conducted to examine anti-nepotism policies, White (2000) delved into the historical milieu of states’ efforts to restrict the practice of nepotism in government. State governments’ are permeated with acts of nepotism. Anti-nepotism is believed to have originated during the Middle Ages and Renaissance in the early Roman Catholic Church. It was a way of purging the high clerical office of an ineffectual relative, the nephew of Pope Calixtus III (White, 2000). Included in this data is White’s (2000) assertion that the State of Texas ratified an anti-nepotism statute in February 1907, making nepotism a misdemeanor that is “punishable by a fine of $100 to $1000” (p. 109).

To gain a thorough understanding of anti-nepotism policy, one must assess the depth of nepotism and the range of classifications.

The study introduces classifications of nepotism as seen through the lenses of the White (2000): (a) Appointment nepotism: the most recognized classification, where government officials appoint or hire a spouse or relative to a governmental position, (b) Supervisory nepotism: the governmental official supervises a spouse or relative within the same agency or office. Some states mandate the spouse or relative be directly supervised to meet this constraint, (c) Situational nepotism: where the relative or spouse and the governmental official work in the same agency, but neither one supervises the other, and (d) Contractual nepotism: When the agency of a governmental official participates in a transaction involving a substantial economic interest or a relative (p. 110). White (2000) asserted that the last is the most extensive of the classifications because of inflexible restraints on the definition.
The underlying principle for anti-nepotism policies is multilayered:

1. **Emotion**: familial relations bring about feelings and emotions, good and bad. When relatives bring their bad feelings and emotions into the workplace, it elicits strife, which may be costly to the others in the workplace;

2. **Low morale**: those who feel that career advancements and rewards are unjustly bestowed on relatives of governmental officials; it lowers team morale, self-efficacy, and drive among others in the workplace; and

3. **Perception**: whether or not favoritism exists between relatives in the workplace, the perceived notion is that the favoritism does exist. Those who contest restrictions on nepotism are often disappointed; however, changes in governmental nepotism policies are slowing taking form, with the private sector not much far behind. This may be attributed to the changing demographic in the workplace. Dual-career couples and domestic partners are challenging nepotism policies as employees argue that these policies are discriminatory against married individuals (White, 2000).

White (2000) asserted that some court decisions have concluded that no-spouse rules indeed violate the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, even though Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not protect individuals “on the basis of marital status” (p. 118). Currently, 40 states have implemented some form of constraint on nepotism; however, it is within states’ scope as to how they define and enforce the restrictions. As companies strive to develop and implement anti-nepotism policies, it is to their advantage to make use of their legal counsel or other appropriate attorneys to avoid the very discrimination actions from which they are trying to shield themselves (Basu, 2009). The
future of anti-nepotism policies is uncertain, but the final outcome will be determined through the courts (White, 2000).

Summary

The dearth of empirical data on nepotism and cronyism is improving with time, as evidenced in the literature. Nepotism and cronyism in the workplace can cause dire consequences in how they are perceived by an individual who believes this practice was instrumental in preventing promotion, adequate training, better pay, or better assignments in the workplace. Further, nepotism and cronyism tend to promote homogeneity in the workplace. What this does is hold back organizational competition on the global stage. Although there is strong support for these non-merit based employment practices, some data substantiates a call to action to prohibit such practices. The research supports the negative perceptions of the widespread use of nepotism and cronyism, and many studies strongly suggest that some employees consider these practices as (a) unethical, (b) unfair, (c) corrupt, and (d) preferential or showing favoritism (Begley et al., 2009; Loewe et al., 2008).

This call to action began with anti-nepotism rules, which are inconsistent or mandated across organization lines. Essentially, anti-nepotism rules are on an organization-by-organization or industry-by-industry basis. The research has well established that acts of nepotism and cronyism are not exclusive to government entities, but are endemic in private-sector organizations as well. Some private-sector organizations thrive on nepotistic and crony relationships to build their workforce. Some leaders feel more comfortable when surrounded by those who look and act similarly, and hold the same belief system. Although only 40% of companies have established anti-
nepotism policies, Rabin-Margalioth (2006) asserted these policies ensure fairness in the human-resource functions and are instrumental in circumventing workplace conflict and the appearance of favoritism in the workplace. Anti-nepotism policies support the fostering of workplace diversity or heterogeneity. The literature supports the concept that without some tools in place to ensure workplace fairness in human-resource functions, the practices of nepotism and cronyism can be too far-reaching, with consequences that are too costly and not readily or easily reversed. In addition, much of the disparity that impacts Black women in the workplace may be significantly eradicated through stronger enforcement of state and federal government policies that prohibit segregation, stronger enforcement of affirmative-action and equal-opportunity policies, and policies that encourage stronger educational programs (IWPR, 2004).

Nepotism, Cronyism, and Job Satisfaction

Arasli et al. (2006) defined job satisfaction as an individual’s positive emotional reactions to a particular job. Job satisfaction also may be defined as “the way in which employees view their work either favorably or unfavorably” (Arasli & Tumer, 2008, p. 1240). Arasli and Tumer (2008) conducted a study to evaluate the impact of nepotism, favoritism, and cronyism and their effects on job stress and job satisfaction in the North Cyprus banking industry. Although Arasli and Tumer put forth 11 hypotheses, only four are applicable to the present study; they are as follows:

H2: nepotism has a significant negative effect on job satisfaction,

H6: cronyism has a significant negative effect on job satisfaction,

H10: job satisfaction has a significant positive effect on word of mouth information, and
H11: job satisfaction has a significant negative effect on employees’ intention to quit.

The researchers chose a judgmental-sampling approach whereby they selected 22 state and private banks in the Northern Cyprus banking industry. To establish validity, several employees were administered a pilot survey. Main questionnaires ($N = 47$) were distributed to bank employees as follows: (a) 20 on nepotism–favoritism, (b) seven on cronyism, and (c) five on job satisfaction. The remaining surveys were distributed based on other study variables unrelated to the present study. A 5-point Likert scale, which ranged from “1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strong agree” was used to measure participants responses (Arasli & Tumer, 2008). A research team was assigned to collect data on respondents’ completion of their questionnaire, and data analysis was conducted using statistical software. To further account for reliability value and validity, Cronbach’s alpha and factor analysis were conducted with a cut-off value of 7.0 for each scale and a coefficient scale value greater than .50 (Arasli & Tumer, 2008). Several techniques were employed in the following manner: (a) mean score descriptive analysis was employed for observation of respondent’s average responses, (b) correlation analysis was conducted to test for strength and the direction between survey items, and (c) some structural model equations were used to examine the effects that some independent items had on some dependent items (Arasli & Tumer, 2008).

It was determined that the practices of nepotism, favoritism, and cronyism have a very high negative effect on job stress, which leads to job dissatisfaction and increases the likelihood of turnover (Arasli & Tumer, 2008). It was further determined that these negative effects have costs directly associated with orientation training and replacing
employees, advertisement, interviews, disintegration of banking services, and loss of loyal customers (Arasli & Tumer, 2008).

The significance of this study was far reaching in that it provided a comprehensive analysis of how nepotism and cronyism negatively impacted employees by increasing stress levels, which led to job dissatisfaction. Arasli and Tumer (2008) and Arasli et al. (2006) have conducted extensive research in the areas of nepotism and cronyism and the impact these practices have on employees who are victims of these non-merit-based practices. Their research further validates that, as a result of these practices, organizations may suffer direct economic losses such as deterioration of services and customers, new hire interviews, orientation and training, and marketing costs.

To facilitate positive job satisfaction and organizational loyalty or commitment, leaders or those in authoritative positions must empower employees. They must envision a future that makes possible development and career opportunities, and an atmosphere that fosters self-sufficiency and recognition for their employees. Stander and Rothmann (2008) investigated the correlation between empowerment of leaders to job satisfaction and company allegiance of subordinates. They took the position that high levels of job satisfaction result from employee empowerment. The following hypotheses were put forth: “H1: There is a significant positive relationship between leader empowering behaviour, job satisfaction and organizational commitment; and (b) H2: Leader empowering behaviour predicts job satisfaction, which, in turn, predicts organisational commitment” (Stander & Rothmann, 2008, p. 8).

A cross-sectional survey was employed to conduct the study. Participants (N = 209) were randomly selected from the chemical and mining industry in South
Africa. Each received a hard copy of the questionnaire, which was collected by fieldworkers immediately after each participant completed the questionnaire. All levels of employment were represented by participants and all participants were assured of confidentiality during the process. A descriptive analysis of the results yielded that 70% of the participants were 30 or older. Females accounted for 8% with the remaining 92% being male participants. “The majority of employees (53%) had tertiary qualifications. Fourteen percent were at management level, while 44% had more than 10 years of service, and 37% had less than five years of service” (Stander & Rothmann, 2008, p. 9).

According to Stander and Rothmann (2008), to measure responses, three inventories were used: (a) The Leader Empowering Behaviour Questionnaire, which was used to gauge behavior significant to employee empowerment. This included 17 items that measured responses using a 7-point Likert scale. It was determined that the construct validity was regarded as acceptable with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient range of 0.82 to 0.93. In addition, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to further substantiate the questionnaire’s construct validity; (b) A modified version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was employed to reveal how satisfied or dissatisfied respondents were with their jobs. With 20 items on the instrument, a 5-point Likert scale was used to measure how respondents rated themselves; and (c) the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire measured employees’ organizational commitment. Eighteen items were included on the instrument, which measured three dimensions of commitment: continuing, affective, and normative. Factor analysis, an analysis of eigenvalues, and a scree plot were developed that identified two factors of commitment: attitudinal and continuing. Attitudinal commitment consists of affective and normative commitment,
which points to an employee’s attitudinal temperament, whereas continuance commitment is more a behavioral point of reference (Stander & Rothmann, 2008).

The descriptive analysis used to analyze data and the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients used to account for reliability of the instrument were further facilitated by use of the Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients to identify variable correlations. Value was set at a 99% confidence interval level \( (p \leq 0.01) \) and effect size was used to further establish statistical significance to determine correlation coefficient significance (Stander & Rothmann, 2008).

Findings from the study supported that leaders’ actions positively influenced employees’ attitudes toward their jobs (Stander & Rothmann, 2008). This influence led to an employee’s wish to sustain the employee’s relationship with the employer. Moreover, it was determined that employees with high levels of job satisfaction hold positive feelings toward their jobs; conversely, employees who exert negative attitudes toward their jobs experience job dissatisfaction and negative attitudes regarding organizational commitment. What this means is that employees who feel empowered have a high sense of self-efficacy. When employees are allowed to develop, explore other career opportunities, and have access to training and information, their JFSE is heightened. This heightened sense of JFSE translates into organizational commitment.

As with any study, this study exhibited certain limitations: (a) small sample size and lack of industry diversity, which limited generalizability of the results; and (b) self-reports, and use of a cross-sectional design possibly limited the study’s conclusions (Stander & Rothmann, 2008, p. 12). The researchers’ reasoning was that a longitudinal study would have better assessed the extent of the relationship between leader-
empowering behavior and employee attitudes. They proposed that leaders play a pivotal role in fostering and sustaining organizational environments that will allow employees to realize their full potential. In doing so, employees will become more of an asset and will experience higher levels of job satisfaction and greater organizational commitment.

Nepotism, Cronyism, and Job-Focused Self-Efficacy

According to Mathis and Brown (2008), JFSE is synonymous with self-efficacy. The researchers conducted an examination of the mediating effects of JFSE on the relationships between work–family conflict (WFC) and the facts of job satisfaction (Mathis & Brown, 2008, p. 93). WFC in their study was defined as the conflict between an individual’s work and family domains (Mathis & Brown, 2008). The researchers put forth the following hypothesis: “JFSE will mediate the relationship between WFC and the job satisfaction facets. Specifically, the relationship between WFC and satisfaction with (a) work, (b) pay, (c) promotion, (d) supervision, and (e) co-workers will be mediated by JFSE” (Mathis & Brown, 2008, p. 95).

Surveys were electronically distributed to 914 participants, which yielded 298 responses. Of the 298 responses, 260 surveys were deemed useable (28% response rate). Moreover, the study used the 30-item instrument Job Satisfaction Scale (Mathis & Brown, 2008, p. 96). There were five dimensions of job satisfaction, measured using a Likert scale: (a) work, (b) pay, (c) supervision, (d) promotion, and (e) coworkers; higher scores correlated to higher degrees of job satisfaction (Mathis & Brown, 2008). Examples of the items measured are “My work is boring” and “I am underpaid” (Mathis & Brown, 2008, p. 96). Additionally, JFSE was measured using the Personal Efficacy Belief scale comprised of 10-items. Mathis and Brown (2008) shared the following examples: “I
doubt my ability to do my job” and “I have all the skills needed to perform my job very well” (p. 97). Again, higher scores correlated with greater JFSE.

The results of the study indicated that only promotion and supervision facets mediated the WFC-job-satisfaction relationship (Mathis & Brown, 2008, p. 103). Moreover, WFC was a significant predictor of both the promotion and supervision facets of job satisfaction (Mathis & Brown, 2008), whereas WFC was not a significant predictor of the work, pay, and coworkers facets of job satisfaction (p. 103). Additionally, Mathis and Brown (2008) emphasized that job satisfaction-supervision, job satisfaction-coworkers, and WFC were significantly correlated with JFSE (p. 102). Lastly, it was surmised from the results that for African American workers with higher levels of JFSE, WFC showed no signs of manipulation toward job-satisfaction facets of work, pay, or coworkers (Mathis & Brown, 2008, p. 102). This was attributed to the observable fact that African American employees are more likely to work in intimidating settings, which may lead to their experience of lower job-satisfaction expectations regardless of the other aspects (Mathis & Brown, 2008).

JFSE is not only synonymous with self-efficacy, but may also be referred to as career self-efficacy (Sullivan & Mahalik, 2000). Sullivan and Mahalik’s (2000) study assessed whether women participating in a career group designed to increase career-related self-efficacy would make gains on career decision-making self-efficacy and vocational exploration and commitment compared with women in a control group (Sullivan & Mahalik, 2000, p. 78). To address this issue, expectations were deemed to have four requisite sources for modifying self-efficacy: (a) performance accomplishments, (b) verbal persuasion, (c) vicarious learning, and (d) emotional arousal.
It was maintained by Sullivan and Mahalik (2000) that “low career self-efficacy expectations constitute an important psychological barrier to women’s choice, performance, and persistence in career decision making” (p. 55).

The results of the Sullivan and Mahalik (2000) study were important in that the women in the career-counseling group integrated the four requisite sources for modifying self-efficacy and raised their levels of career decision-making self-efficacy as well as their vocational exploration and commitment (p. 59). The study concluded with the recommendation for counselor intervention, which may prove valuable in enhancing or increasing career self-efficacy or JFSE in women. Sullivan and Mahalik (2000) maintained discussion about socialization factors as they relate to self-esteem issues, the presence or lack of female role models, and social support as they affect women’s assessment of skills and abilities, may help women anticipate gender-related constraints to their career exploration, decision making and success experience. (p. 60)

Summary

It is imperative for leaders or those in positions of influence to develop an awareness of how job satisfaction and JFSE correlate with nepotism and cronyism. As ascertained through research, results have established that employees who exhibit a high degree of deference enjoy high JFSE. Kundu and Rani (2007) contended that an individual’s belief in self may be considered as one aspect for retaining the best and laying off the worst employees. The researchers further asserted that employees with a greater degree of self-esteem realize a more sanguine association with job satisfaction, self-perceived competence or self-efficacy, and success expectancy (Kundu & Rani, 2007). This translates into positive job satisfaction. In addition, Arasli and Tumer (2008) maintained “favoritism has a significant negative effect on job satisfaction” and
“cronyism has a significant negative effect on job satisfaction” (p. 1239). Acts of nepotism and cronyism showed significant relationships to JFSE, especially as the acts of nepotism and cronyism related to the degree of job satisfaction.

The body of knowledge supported that high levels of JFSE may be achieved through opportunities that further training and career development, more substantial job assignments, supervisor support, and pay and promotions based on merit of all employees. As stated in Chapter I, Black women need to experience opportunities for growth as they add organizational value to the workplace and typically obtain at least as much academic success as their White female counterparts (Caiazza et al., 2004).

Moreover, it is imperative that organizations become aware of the need for Black women to experience social support and role models in the workplace. According to Sullivan and Mahalik (2000), this may serve to “help women anticipate gender-related constraints to their career exploration, decision making and success experience” (p. 60). The effects of this type of organizational or human-resources facilitation will create a more diverse workforce and catapult an organization’s position on the global stage.

Promoting a Heterogeneous Workplace

Companies and organizations from all sectors lay claim to having developed and implemented diversity programs as a way of declaring their commitment to workplace diversity. A diverse workplace lends itself to one of heterogeneity. Morrison, Titi Oladunjoye, and Rose (2008) maintained that “organizations with a diverse workforce can provide higher quality products, because their leaders are more capable of better understanding their customer’s needs” (p. 81). Homogeneity, in stark contrast to heterogeneity, is the result of little or no workplace diversity. Employers lay claim to
promoting workplace diversity, but for some this may only be in numbers (Reich & Reich, 2006).

To support this rationale, and to foster a thorough understanding of nepotism and cronyism, one must realize that managing diversity is a critical factor that requires attention to job satisfaction and JFSE, and the impact of these non-merit-based employment practices as it relates to workplace diversity. The labor force is unremitting on the path to global change, and workplace diversity is vital to the success of any company that values its place on the global stage. Barbosa and Cabral-Cardoso (2007) emphasized, “Managing increasing workforce diversity has become a strategic issue that organizations can no longer neglect” (p. 274).

Catalyst (1999) completed a 3-year study from 1997 to 1999 on women of color in management. Women of color were the focal point of this study as early research focused on workplace issues and experiences from a White women’s perspective. There were five goals set forth in this comprehensive study: (a) to identify factors in the workplace that contribute to or create barriers to the development, advancement, or retention of women of color in management in professional or managerial positions; (b) to investigate the perceptions, expectations, and experiences of women of color with regard to issues in the workplace that affect their job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intentions to leave or remain with their companies; (c) to examine the perceptions of women of color with regard to how successful the corporate diversity initiatives are in their companies and to elicit their recommendations for developing constructive change; (d) to investigate divergent perceptions, expectations, and experiences that may exist among subgroups of women; and (e) to describe corporate
initiatives that are successful in reducing turnover and enhancing advancement opportunities for women of color.

According to a report by Catalyst (1999), a study was conducted that employed a mixed methodology including the following: (a) a mail survey of women of color from 30 companies (29 Fortune 500 companies) with 1,735 respondents. Of the 1,735 respondents, 54% were African American, 24% were Asian American, and 21% were Hispanic; 37% held graduate degrees; (b) 59 focus groups with more than 300 women participating, (c) 82 individual interviews with women from 16 participating Fortune 500 companies; (d) an examination of the diversity policy of 15 major companies in the Fortune 500 company group; and (e) 800 women of color eager to participate in ensuing studies to investigate long-term outcomes related to their career advancement and career development.

During the time period of the study, only 11% of respondents reported advancement in their company; White women reportedly advanced more rapidly with an average of 2.6 years between promotions and women of color with an average of 3.6 years between promotions. In addition, data from the study substantiated that 75% of women of color were aware of their company’s diversity programs, which were implemented to bring about awareness of racial and gender-based issues; however, only 22% of the respondents made claim to their managers of having received adequate training in managing a diverse workforce. Moreover, 53% of respondents asserted that their company’s corporate-diversity program does not effectively deal with issues of subtle racism, and only 26% of respondents believed their career development was a priority issue of their company’s diversity program. Only 17% believed their managers
were held accountable for advancement of women in their own racial/ethnic groups (Catalyst, 1999). This brings to bear a unique set of challenges for Black women in the workplace, as these findings reveal that some diversity programs are not perceived as being effective, or are not as effective as they could be or were intended to be. White women have long claimed the glass-ceiling-barrier phenomenon; data supports that Black women experience more of a concrete-ceiling phenomenon (Catalyst, 1999).

Catalyst (2002) conducted a longitudinal study to track (a) career movement and successes, (b) what factors most influenced their career movement, (c) to what extent the participants’ attitudes had changed, and (d) the perceptions of the future of respondents from their previous study. Although the 1999 study reported 800 respondents who were willing to participate in this study, 734 were mailed the announcement letter, a 12-page survey, and a postcard. The initial data collection yielded a 37% return rate \( n = 268 \) respondents) and an additional 100 responses were collected as a result of supplemental data-collection efforts that employed both an e-mail and telephone survey. Demographics for the 2001 study were analogous to those of the 1998 study: (a) 59.3% African American, (b) 21.3% Asian American, and (c) 19.4% Hispanic. Further demographic responses showed that 46.4% held graduate or professional degrees and more than 50% worked at both midlevel management and department-head levels (Catalyst, 2002). The following findings were reported by Catalyst (2002) as significant:

1. Between 1998 and 2001 57% of women of color were promoted and 40% received salary increases; only 9% moved downward. At least 33% reported a lateral career move, and 9% were demoted or downgraded. African-American women reportedly experienced “out-spiraling waves” in which the women
changed employers or functions as a key strategy for moving up in their careers (p. 8); With regard to dismissals or lay-offs, only 4% of the sample reported having experienced involuntary separation; however, African American women were considered most likely to experience lay-offs;

2. Women of color experienced mentorship at 58% in 2001 as compared to 35% in 1998. Additionally, 49% of respondents cited informal networking with influential coworkers as being beneficial to their success; only 29% reported the same in 1998. According to Catalyst (2002), a requisite to the career success of women of color is multiple-mentorship; the more mentors the greater chance for upward mobility. Many women of color felt that they were underrepresented and did not have enough women in their ethnic group that resembled them in the workplace. Furthermore, women of color did not experience the influential networking that White men and White women experienced. Catalyst (2002) found that this barrier makes it challenging for women of color to advance up the corporate ladder;

3. Women of color reported no change in the barriers to career success from 1998 to 2001. Respondents believed that opportunities for career advancement decreased during this time period. This was most strongly believed and reported by African American women at a rate of 37% for 2001, up from 24% from 1998;

4. Women of color believed that to move upward they needed to leave their current employers and seek employment in companies that advocated workplace diversity. Respondents who changed employers reported having
experienced better salaries of $17,000 or more, better working environments, and advancement to senior-level positions. Women who did not leave reported knowing other women of color who experienced these changes when gaining employment in organizations where diversity is valued. Some respondents reported that although their companies may value diversity, diversity is translated as White women versus White men;

5. It is perceived by women of color that managers and organizations that support them and their career goals are more open and inclusive work environments. Research supports that African American women change employers when career-advancement opportunities are hindered by what they typically perceive to be racism or sexism on the part of their immediate superior.

Companies that experience turnover as a result of dissatisfied women of color should strive to create work environments and career opportunities that will appeal to and encourage these women to apply and remain in the company’s employ. Catalyst (2002) offered the following recommendations: (a) investigate employee perceptions of the organization’s culture, employee career expectations, work–personal life conflict, what drives employee intentions to resign or remain, perceptions of management’s inclusiveness, and if management values diversity; (b) institute human-resources benchmarks that measure employee satisfaction, conduct annual surveys, and create and implement priorities based on employee needs; (c) develop a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats analysis of current programs and policies; (d) become culturally competent by instituting internal research and training relating to difference in employee
subgroups; (e) raise awareness of cultural differences, and communicate commitment to
diversity from all levels of leadership; and (f) ensure that company diversity is a core
concern of the organization.

Catalyst (2002) is relevant to the present study in that it affirmed the need for
organizations to regularly assess employee evaluations to ensure that disparities do not
result from subtle forms of racism, sexism, or stereotyping. Companies should develop
ongoing training for managers of women of color, which will make them accountable for
retention of the talent that women of color bring to the workplace. Finally, women of
color should be identified and included on lists for key assignments and projects
(Catalyst, 2002).

Barbosa and Cabral-Cardoso (2007) conducted a qualitative study to examine the
way higher education institutions responded to the increased diversity of the academic
workforce. The setting for the study was in a Portuguese university, with data collected
from 45 interviews. Participants were faculty members of varying backgrounds and
affiliations (Barbosa & Cabral-Cardoso, 2007). The researchers concluded that the
university was permissive in not promoting equal-opportunity polices and failed to
encourage workplace diversity. Moreover, results yielded that the advancement or
incorporation of foreign academics was left to the individuals concerned, and inadequate
attempts were made to take advantage of the inimitable contributions of the talented
faculty and their diverse cultures in the university. The position taken in the study was
consistent with that of other studies: organizations tend to attract and retain employees
from similar backgrounds and discriminate against individuals who do not share the same
social, demographic, or physical features as they do (Barbosa & Cabral-Cardoso, 2007).
This practice was prevalent in the recruitment, selection, and hiring process (Barbosa & Cabral-Cardoso, 2007). These processes should have been interconnected to promoting diversity in the workplace.

Barbosa and Cabral-Cardoso (2007) was important to the current research as it reinforced the veracity of the claim that organizations that defend against change or fail to promote heterogeneity in the workplace realize poor performance and organizational outcomes. It is through channeling the plethora of ideas, work experiences, and knowledge of a diverse workforce that an organization can successfully compete on the global stage.

“We live in the most multicultural, multi-racial, multi-ethnic America ever” (T. Smiley, personal communication, February 27, 2007). Reich and Reich (2006) maintained that diversity in the workplace is inevitable. However, opportunity deficiency in the workplace as a result of nepotism and cronyism practices will only serve to diminish the individual’s capacity to appropriately develop the requisite skills and training to advance in the workplace. Reich and Reich (2006) offered the following scenario:

Imagine that a project staffed entirely by white men hires an African American man and a Latina woman; such additions may not ensure cultural diversity. The mere presence of members of a different cultural group is insufficient if they do not have power in the interaction. If the boundaries of the dominant group (discipline) are only permeable enough to allow the presence, but not full participation of a person outside of the group, the situation is one of tokenism… As such, the individuals who occupy these token positions tend to experience substantial performance pressure, heightened awareness of boundaries, and perception of entrapment in this role. (p. 57)

The absence of power or autonomy over an individual’s career will lead to self-doubt in one’s ability to make positive assessments and choices, low job satisfaction, and poor job performance (Reich & Reich, 2006). Literature has established that nepotism
and cronyism, or the perceptions thereof, promote discrimination in the workplace.

Further, widespread practices of nepotism and cronyism have significantly negative ramifications on performance at the organization level, as well as the individual level. When leaders or persons of influence continue the use of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace, they foster an environment of homogeneity. Reich and Reich (2006) affirmed,

> By using subtle and consistent measures to create and protect a secure space where all members feel safe, a leader enables greater willingness from the members to brainstorm, share ideas, present new proposals, and challenge existing orthodoxies. … Working towards culturally competent practices can help avoid power hierarchies that prohibit effective interdisciplinary collaboration. (p. 58)

Reich and Reich (2006) further contended,

> This requires sensitivity, acknowledgement of differences, and an appreciation of the diversity in training, experience, and perspective. Throughout, it also requires a sustained commitment to strive for self-awareness and a willingness to continually learn about the practices, beliefs, and strengths of other disciplines. (p. 59)

Kundu (2003) conducted an empirical study to examine the responses and perceptions of male and female employees about workforce diversity in Indian organizations. Categories assessed were general, minority, disabled, and socially disadvantaged. The researcher averred that diversity includes factors such as (a) race, (b) gender, (c) age, (d) color, (e) physical ability, (f) religion, (g) language, (h) physical appearance, (i) education, (j) sexual orientation, (k) lifestyle, (l) economic status, and (m) ethnicity. Kundu (2003) maintained that all employees should be able to pursue their career objectives, not held back due to these factors or any other factors unrelated to job performance.

Employees from 80 companies were selected for Kundu’s (2003) study, whereby participants received a questionnaire. Twelve hundred questionnaires were distributed,
with only 1,083 fully usable questionnaires returned. The questionnaire was measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (a) 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree for items relating to diversity and development opportunities), (b) six items regarding competence and productivity were measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 = much lower to 5 = much higher, and (c) 12 items were measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 = least chance to 5= very great chance. Factor analysis was employed to broaden dimensions, while a correlational design was used to examine the relationship across a range of factors. A two-way ANOVA was employed to show significant differences in reactions and perceptions between male and female and other categories of employees (Kundu, 2003). To expound on the strength and magnitude of the significant differences, mean, grand means, and Cronbach’s alphas were employed to analyze data (Kundu, 2003). Reliability ranged from 0.834 to 0.621.

With regard to organizational support, socially disadvantaged females (\(M = 2.94\)) reported that they received less organizational support than all other category employees regardless of gender. Female employees (\(M = 3.15\)) believed that they have less chance of receiving organizational support; conversely, male respondents (\(M = 3.02\)) revealed that they have less chance of receiving organizational support. Male employees (\(M= 2.90\)) and female employees (\(M = 2.94\)) ranked minority employee competence and productivity lower than males (\(M =3.18\)) and females (\(M = 3.40\)) did from their respective minorities.

Further relevant conclusions revealed that male employees regarded female employees as less productive, less qualified, and less competent. In addition, general category employees “perceived that minority and socially disadvantaged were less competent and productive” (Kundu, 2003, p. 24). Equally important, almost all
employees reported their belief that minorities, socially disadvantaged, and disabled employees were less likely to receive promotions, salary increases, and organizational support than general-category males receive (Kundu, 2003).

Research supports that a diverse workforce is replete with different talents and a range of vision. Kundu (2003) offered several factors that are extremely significant in building a diverse workplace: (a) workforce diversity is growing exponentially, and if organizations do not embrace this growth, it will impact their productivity, competitive advantage, and global economic impact; (b) rethinking and redefining organization missions, strategies, management practices, cultures, markets, and products to meet the diverse demands of all stakeholders; and (c) suggestions as to how organizations may connect with the diversity of their employees: recognize employee differences, respect employee differences, and provide an equitable work environment.

Summary

In light of companies promoting workplace diversity and maintaining their assertion to diversity and sensitivity training, a truly diverse workforce is one that is comprised of culturally competent leaders, ones that value the diversity of the workforce by promoting nonbiased employment practices, and ones that eschew nepotism and cronyism. A truly diverse company will implement policies and procedures ensuring that non-merit-based employment practices such as nepotism and cronyism do not become unearthed in their day-to-day operations. Moreover, should these practices become infused in the organization, leaders and those in positions of influence should feel compelled to investigate the issues and concerns of these practices. It is their obligation to control, recognize, and impede such acts and to ensure that proper sanctions have been
employed to properly address situations resulting from the practices of nepotism and cronism (Barbosa & Cabral-Cardoso, 2007; Reich & Reich, 2006).

The timing of the current study was crucial for several reasons. First, Black women, although still faced with certain barriers, have progressed to the top; however, there is still room for growth and improvement for Black women in the workplace. Moreover, with so many companies downsizing, Black people, especially Black women, are seemingly the first persons laid-off instead of the boss’s relative or friend, who might or might not have the requisite experience, education, or time in service. Next, for Black women who have excelled in their career development and have reached the pinnacle in their fields, it is of dire importance for these Black women to mentor other Black women in the workplace; to make certain that other Black women are aware of their successes, thus enabling them to realize their potential. This realization will help strengthen self-efficacy, which in turn will promote greater job satisfaction.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Restatement of the Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine Black women’s perceptions of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace. Moreover, the purpose was to examine whether a relationship existed between Black women’s job satisfaction and JFSE due to employment practices of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace.

Research Design

The study employed a correlational research design using a cross-sectional survey with an open-ended question. Fink (2009) asserted, “With this design, data are collected at a single shot” (p. 67). Fink (2009) stated that cross-sectional surveys are directly reported by the respondents. The study included two independent variables—nepotism and cronyism—and two dependent variables—job satisfaction and JFSE. Further, the study included the following control variables: (a) age, (b) profession, (c) career level, (d) length of employment, (e) annual salary, and (f) education level. The researcher controlled for race and gender as variables, by including only Black women, working or retired, who were members of the targeted organizations.

Population and Sample

The population for the study consisted of Black women who were either currently employed, or retired. Decisive factors for sampling were as follows:

1. All participants were Black women who were members of various graduate chapters of Black Greek sororities or other Black women’s organization in the United States. Although these organizations do not discriminate against race,
color, ethnicity, or any of the classes protected by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, for the purpose of this study, responses only from Black women were considered in the collection and analysis of data.

2. Participants were self-employed, but previously worked for another company or organization.

3. Participants had a minimum of 5 years employment.

4. All participants had some college education.

5. All participants were at least 25 years of age.

Arasli et al. (2006) and Arasli and Tumer (2008) employed a judgmental-sampling approach in their research on nepotism, studying the relationship to self-efficacy, job performance, and career advancement. Given the similarities between their research and the current study, the researcher preferred to use the judgmental-sampling method as well. Judgmental sampling is sometimes referenced as purposive sampling or non-statistical sampling, and involves the selection of items based on the judgment of an individual; although judgmental sampling cannot be used to draw statistically valid inferences about a population, it allows researchers to review an isolated portion of an exact population; researchers may judge or regard the results upon evaluation of the quality of the population studied (Comptroller of the Currency Administrator of National Banks, 1998).

For the main study, the researcher invited more than 500 Black women from various chapters of the targeted organizations: AKA and DST. Collectively, there are more than 2,000 Black Greek sorority chapters in these organizations. Membership in these organizations is predominantly black, and all women must have attended a 4-year
college or university in order to obtain membership. The women typically work in the fields of social service, healthcare, education, engineering and technology, or government and politics. As previously stated, the researcher was a member of a Farwest Region chapter of DST at the time of the study. The researcher had discussed the study on various occasions with many chapter members, so in an effort to maintain the study’s integrity and minimize researcher bias, the chapter in which the researcher was a member was not invited to participate in the study.

AKA (n.d.), the oldest black Greek-letter organization, was founded in 1908 on the campus of Howard University in Washington, D. C. AKA celebrates a membership of approximately 260,000 college-educated women. The organization’s membership spans the globe from all 50 United States to the U.S. Virgin Islands, Canada, and the Caribbean, the continent of Africa, Germany, Korea, and Japan (AKA, n.d.). AKA’s mission has been

to cultivate and encourage high scholastic and ethical standards, to promote unity and friendship among college women, to study and help alleviate problems concerning girls and women in order to improve their social stature, to maintain a progressive interest in college life, and to be of "Service to All Mankind"
(emphasis in original, AKA, n.d.).

DST was founded on January 13, 1913 by 22 collegiate women at Howard University (DST, n.d.). These students wanted to use their collective strength to promote academic excellence and to provide assistance to persons in need. DST has a history of serving the community and striving for justice and equality for Black people and all humankind. The first public act performed by DST founders involved their participation in the Women’s Suffrage March in Washington DC, March 1913. DST (n.d.) was incorporated in 1930. DST has a membership of more than 250,000 members in more than 900 collegiate and graduate chapters. The chapters are located in the United States
and parts of Japan, England, Germany, the Virgin Islands, Bermuda, the Bahamas, and the Republic of Korea (DST, n.d.).

Women from other Black organizations were invited to participate in the study: “APADS, Inc. is a support organization that fosters and provides mentoring support for Pan African students and scholars” (APADS, n.d.). APADS’s membership is comprised of men and women doctoral scholars; however, only women from the organization were invited to participate in the study. Also invited to participate was the BWN: “Black Women’s Network serves as a communication vehicle linking Black females with each other for the purposes of resource sharing, career advancement, patronage of BWN businesses/services and networking” (BWN, 2012, para. 2).

The Black women of AKA, DST, APADS, and the BWN personify a diversity of careers, from the classroom to the U.S. Congress, where they continually strive to a make a positive impact on issues that are of profound importance to local and global communities, in their efforts to achieve equality and growth for all humankind through involvement in political, social, mental, and physical education (AKA, n.d.; DST, n.d.).

Human-Subjects Approval

Guidelines for the use of human subjects dictate approval was obtained through the University of San Francisco Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects and the letter must be made part of the study’s appendices. Approval to conduct this research was granted on January 24, 2011(see Appendix H) and a copy may be found in the Dean’s Office at the School of Education.
Instrumentation

The instrumentation included a self-administered, web-based questionnaire supported by Survey Monkey. The instrument, Harrison Nepotism–Cronyism Survey, was comprised of a nepotism and cronyism inventory developed by and used with permission from Senior Lecturer Ekiz and co-author Bavik (Arasli et al., 2006; see Appendices A, B, and C). Job-satisfaction items were taken from and used with permission of the Wellness Councils of America (2004; see Appendices D and E). The remaining items related to JFSE were derived from the following inventories, which were posted electronically on their respective websites: (a) Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) developed The Generalized Self-Efficacy scale (GSE), and (b) self-efficacy items that were free and available through the public domain (My Therapy Session, n.d.; see Appendices F and G).

The survey instrument consisted of 40 items. Each of the four variables (a) nepotism, (b) cronyism, (c) nepotism, cronyism, and job satisfaction, and (d) nepotism, cronyism, and JFSE had 10 items. Additional items included definitions of nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction, and JFSE as operationalized for the study and demographic items. Lastly, one open-ended question allowed an opportunity for participants to share a more in-depth account of their perception of, or experience with nepotism or cronyism in the workplace; participants were allowed to share their perception of the experience of other Black women in the workplace who might have experienced a situation involving nepotism or cronyism, in the event the participant had no such experience.
The following tables detail the items compiled from various inventories; certain items were modified or duplicated throughout the survey as dictated by the respective variable. Table 3 provides items related to nepotism taken from Arasli et al. (2006).

Table 3

*Items Relating to Nepotism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nepotism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The topic of nepotism is the basis of frequent discussion within my workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nepotism or the perception of nepotism causes conflict and impacts employee morale within my employing organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There have been advancement opportunities within my employing organization in which I have experience and I am skilled in, but I was overlooked for due to nepotism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I watch what I say in the presence of employees who are related to those in management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is my perception that certain individuals within my employing organization were hired because of a family connection within the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My employing organization values employee relationships built on nepotism rather than relationships built on mutual trust, hard work, skills and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My future in this job is limited because of relationships in the workplace that are based on nepotism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>There is a perception that my employer promotes the practice of nepotism in its hiring and advancement practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Within my employing organization, those employed as a result of nepotism are difficult to dismiss or demote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>There is a perception within my employing organization that those who are hired as a result of nepotism are not as qualified as those employees who are not related to management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* With permission from co-authors Bavik and Ekiz, items were used or adapted from the Nepotism Questionnaire.


Table 4 provides items related to cronyism taken from Arasli et al. (2006).
The topic of cronyism is the basis of frequent discussion within my workplace.

2. Cronyism or the perception of cronyism causes conflict or impacts employee moral within my employing organization.

3. I watch what I say in the presence of employees who are friends of those in management.

4. There have been advancement opportunities for other experienced black women within my employing organization, but they were overlooked for due to cronyism.

5. It is my perception that certain individuals within my employing organization were hired based on their friendship or as a favor to someone within the company or organization.

6. My employing organization values employee relationships built on cronyism rather than relationships built on mutual trust, hard work, skills and education.

7. Within my employing organization, those employed as a result of cronyism are difficult to dismiss or demote.

8. My future in this job is limited because of relationships in the workplace that are based on cronyism.

9. There is a perception that my employer promotes the practice of cronyism in its hiring, advancement practices.

10. There is a perception within my employing organization that those who are hired as a result of cronyism are not as qualified as those employees who are not related to management.

Note. With permission from co-authors Bavik and Ekiz, items were used or adapted from the Nepotism Questionnaire.


Table 5 provides items related to job satisfaction taken from the WELCOA Job Satisfaction survey.
Table 5

Items Relating to Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I look forward to going to work on Monday morning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Most of the time, I have to force myself to go to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I always talk positively about my organization to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I trust our leadership team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am disappointed I ever took this job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am fairly compensated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is highly possible that I will be looking for a new job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have energy at the end of each work day do to engage in personal interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have the equipment and materials I need in order to do my work right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Items used or adapted with permission from the WELCOA Job Satisfaction Survey (www.welcoa.org).

Table 6 provides items related to JFSE taken from Schwarzer and Jerusalem, (1995) and the GSE scale; and Self-Efficacy Therapy Session, n.d.).

Table 6

Items Relating to Job-Focused Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job-focused self-efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have confidence in my ability to do my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am very proud of my job skills and abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If I can’t do a job the first time, I keep trying until I get it right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations on my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My position requires certain tasks that I am not well trained in or I am incapable of performing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I find it difficult to apply my strengths at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Individuals hired or advanced within my employing organization can perform my job better than I can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I lack confidence in my ability to use my strengths to succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey responses were reported on a four-point Likert scale ranging from “4 = strongly agree” to “1 = strongly disagree” (Arasli et al., 2006) or “Yes”, “No”, or “Not Sure.”

Pilot Study

Prior to electronic dissemination of the main study, the researcher conducted a pilot study to test for (a) survey-link accessibility, (b) potential issues with instrument design, which included ambiguous language, complex survey instructions, and survey formatting, and (c) to determine if participants in the sample could understand the survey items and were able to complete the survey (Creswell, 2009; Fink, 2009). The pilot study consisted of 40 survey items in addition to demographic questions and definitions of the variables (a) nepotism, (b) cronyism, (c) job satisfaction, and (d) JFSE, as operationalized for the study. A blind-copy format was used to e-mail the pilot study web-link to participants who were former coworkers, current colleagues, and associates of the researcher. There were 40 Black women invited to participate in the pilot study. Precautions were taken to ensure confidentiality of participants’ identification as well as their responses; I maintained all contact information, records, and data in a locked file; any e-mail accounts pertaining to the study were password protected.

The results from the pilot study were fairly consistent with the results from the main study, which are discussed in Chapter IV. With respect to nepotism, 97.5% ($n = 39$) and 2.5% ($n = 1$) were familiar with the term as it was operationalized in the current study; only 91.7% ($n = 33$) were familiar with the term cronyism. When asked about familiarity with the term job-satisfaction, 100% ($n = 40$) were familiar. JFSE yielded a response rate of 85.3 ($n = 29$) of those familiar with the term as it was operationalized in the current study. Of the respondents, 42.5% ($n = 17$) strongly
disagreed that nepotism was frequently discussed in the workplace. In contrast, 58% of respondents ($n = 21$) agreed that cronyism was a frequently discussed topic in the workplace (see Tables 7 and 8).

Table 7

**Sample Item on Nepotism from Pilot Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response percent</th>
<th>Response count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 40  skipped question 0*

Table 8

**Sample Item on Cronyism from Pilot Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response percent</th>
<th>Response count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 36  skipped question 4*

With respect to demographic data on the respondents, 33.3% ($n = 11$) reported being employed in the field of education. Further data showed that of the 33 respondents,
54.5% held positions in management and 27.3% of respondents had more than 20 years of employment. Data analysis also showed that 45.4% of respondents held a master’s degree, 27.3% held bachelor’s degrees, and 18.2% held doctorate degrees, with annual salaries greater than $60,000.00 for a response rate of 72.2% (n = 24).

The researcher requested feedback from participants regarding the pilot survey items and found only one issue from one participant. The issue entailed a demographic item whereby the participant suggested an item be included to identify and distinguish those participants who were small-business owners or top-level executives with authority to hire or dismiss employees. As suggested, the item was incorporated into the final questionnaire for the main study.

Validity and Reliability

Shavelson (1996) defined validity as, “the extent to which the interpretation of the results of the study follows from the study itself and the extent to which the results may be generalized to other situations with other people,” (p. 19). With respect to nepotism and cronyism, items were validated through multiple studies conducted by Arasli et al. (2006) and Arasli and Tumer (2008). The instrument used to determine reliability for the current study for items on nepotism and cronyism was the questionnaire used by Arasli et al. (2006). The following was offered:

In assessing the psychometric properties of the instrument, issues of reliability, dimensionality, convergent, and discriminant validity are considered. … After employing corrected item-total correlations, reliability coefficients were computed for each study variable and at the aggregate level. Alpha coefficient was found to be 0.88 at the aggregate level and … all reliability coefficients were deemed acceptable. Specifically, reliability coefficients ranged from 0.81 to 0.92 for the study variables. Overall, these findings virtually show that each coefficient exceeds the minimum acceptable level of a newly developed scale, 0.50 (Arasli et al., 2006, p. 300).
Validation for items corresponding to the job-satisfaction variable was established by WELCOA, as the instrument has been published and made accessible to the general population for a number of years through the WELCOA website (Wellness Councils of America, 2004). The GSE scale was developed to evaluate the universal significance of perceived self-efficacy with the intent of predicting how individuals cope with daily hassles, as well as how they adapt after experiencing a wide range of stressful life events (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). The final variable, JFSE was validated as follows:

Criterion-related validity is documented in numerous correlation studies where positive coefficients were found with favorable emotions, dispositional optimism, and work satisfaction. Negative coefficients were found with depression, anxiety, stress, burnout, and health complaints. In studies with cardiac patients, their recovery over a half-year time period could be predicted by pre-surgery self-efficacy. (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995, pp. 35–37)

To account for reliability, prior research asserted that “In samples from 23 nations, Cronbach’s alphas ranged from .76 to .90, with the majority in the high .80s. The scale is unidimensional” (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995, pp. 35–37).

Data Collection

The researcher invited participants by e-mailing executive leadership of various organizations: APADS, AKA, BWN, and two chapters of DST (see Appendices I through M). Executive leadership from each organization received an invitation to personally participate in the study and was asked to forward the invitation to the study, along with the following items, to other Black women in their respective organization: (a) consent letter for individual participants, (b) Research Subjects’ Bill of Rights, and (c) information regarding the researcher. The consent letter explained the purpose of the study, the risks of participating in the study, and the benefits of participating in the study. Individuals who desired to participate were asked to contact the researcher by e-mail to
indicate their understanding of the information received regarding the study and as a method of signifying their voluntary willingness to participate. Once contact was made with the participant, they were sent a link that granted access to the web-based survey. Research Subjects’ Bill of Rights explicated the rights of participants and that participation was solely voluntary. The Research Subjects’ Bill of Rights further explained that participants had a right to withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason at their discretion.

Various steps were taken to ensure confidentiality: (a) invitations were sent using a blind copy e-mail feature; (b) participants were assured that all e-mail addresses and other contact information were confidentially maintained by the researcher in a password-protected file; (c) the researcher was the only individual with access to the password; and (d) recorded data are in a secured storage area maintained and accessible only to the researcher; IP addresses were not collected and stored. Moreover, participants were made aware that no monetary compensation or material incentive was being offered in exchange for their participation; the study was an opportunity for participants to help add to the body of knowledge about perceptions of Black women regarding the relationships between nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction and JFSE.

Finally, in an effort to minimize researcher bias, members from the chapter of DST of which the researcher was a member were not invited to participate in the actual study. The researcher appreciated the sensitivity of the study’s topic, especially with respect to nepotism and cronyism; therefore, the researcher incorporated as many confidentiality measures as possible. All rights of the participants involved in the study were respected and protected as prescribed by Creswell (2009). Ethical consideration was
of immense significance, as it was expected that some participants might have strong opinions on nepotism and cronyism; some participants may have been employed by or advanced by their respective company under these practices. Equally expected was the probability that some participants might show deference to the practices of nepotism and cronyism as they may have used those practices in their human-resource operations.

Data Analysis

The time frame for completion of the survey was 10 weeks. Data collection was achieved using the web-based survey tool, Survey Monkey, and data were monitored twice daily, utilizing Survey Monkey’s collector feature. This feature allowed the researcher to monitor data in real time. Further, the analysis feature allowed for inferential statistical analysis and descriptive statistical analysis during the collection process. Inferential sampling was used as each section of the survey was designed to capture the core of participants’ perceptions of the variables to answer the four research questions mentioned in Chapter II. The first section spoke specifically to whether respondents understood the terms nepotism, cronyism, job-satisfaction, and JFSE. A set of 10 questions was determined for each of the variables and data were collected on an ordinal scale of measurement, generally referenced as a Likert scale. The Likert scale represented responses ranging from 1 = Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree. These measurement terms were essential in examining the research questions for this study:

1. To what extent do Black women perceive nepotism exists in the workplace?
2. To what extent do Black women perceive cronyism exists in the workplace?
3. To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and job satisfaction as they relate to Black women in the workplace?
4. To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and JFSE as they relate to Black women in the workplace?

Descriptive analysis was employed as a means of performing a cross-tabulation between nepotism and job satisfaction, nepotism and JFSE, cronyism and job satisfaction, and cronyism and JFSE in answering Research Questions 3 and 4.

Data were further analyzed through use of (a) Minitab version 16 and (b) Predictive Analytics Software (PAWS Statistics 18) also referenced as SPSS. Minitab version 16 was employed to produce grouped frequencies for variables included in the demographic section of the survey. SPSS was employed as a means of transferring data from Survey Monkey.

Researcher’s Profile

The researcher was born and raised in Birmingham, Alabama and has a diverse background that includes, but is not limited to having a mother (now deceased) who lived with multiple sclerosis for more than 40 years, a grandmother who suffered with severe dementia, and an aunt who was one of three African-American women who became what was then termed the first “colored” stewardesses of a major airline. The researcher became the first Black employee of a major physician-liability company in 1989. The researcher has lived in several states as well as Fulda, West Germany. From a faith-based perspective, the researcher was raised in a Catholic and Church of God in Christ home. The researcher’s musical repertoire consists mainly of country music, but spans other genres such as Black gospel, bluegrass, classical, rhythm and blues, and hip hop.

The researcher’s educational background includes Catholic and public elementary and high schools; the researcher received an undergraduate degree from Samford...
University (a Southern Baptist Conference university) in Birmingham and a Master of Arts in Health Care Management from Birmingham-Southern College (a United Methodist college) also in Birmingham, Alabama. In addition, the researcher received an Associate in Arts in Applied Science and an Associate in Accounting and Business Administration from Lawson State Community College in Birmingham, Alabama. The researcher completed two years of law school at the Birmingham School of Law.

Educational accomplishments have included the Bruno’s Scholarship, a Graduate Merit Scholarship from the University of San Francisco, as well as the Gwendolyn Williams Memorial Scholarship from the Phi Delta Kappa International, Chapter #1484, and the 2011 Pan African Association of Doctoral Scholars Scholarship. In 1997, the researcher received the Magic City Bar Association Scholarship from Birmingham School of Law.

The researcher has spent more than years in health care with health maintenance organizations and preferred provider organizations. The researcher also has extensive manufacturing-accounting experience with an international steel manufacturer and banking experience in the home-mortgage area. Although her academic and scholarly accomplishments are very much important, it is the researcher’s role as mother of one daughter and grandmother of two girls that are the researcher’s most treasured accomplishments.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

Chapter IV expounds on the findings resulting from the data analysis of the current study. The purpose of this research study was to examine the relationship among nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction, and JFSE as perceived by Black women in the workplace. Based on data attained in the current study, responses to the four research questions are addressed:

1. To what extent do Black women perceive nepotism exists in the workplace?
2. To what extent do Black women perceive cronyism exists in the workplace?
3. To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and job satisfaction as they relate to Black women in the workplace?
4. To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and JFSE as they relate to Black women in the workplace?

Participant Profile

As stated in Chapter III, the sample for the study consisted exclusively of Black women who were working, retired, or self-employed. Of the 45 participants who completed the survey, 14 respondents, or 31.1%, were in the field of education followed by 15.6% of those who completed the study working in the healthcare industry. Notwithstanding five unreported participants, at least nine of those who completed the study worked in fields or industries other than the specific areas included in the current study (see Table 9).
Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting/Finance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Law Enforcement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism/Hospitality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, with respect to number of years of employment, 31.1% \((N = 45)\) reported being employed at least 5, but not more than 9 years, whereas 20% were employed for at least 20 years or more and 4.4% were retired. A total of 43 responses were valid from participants who were business owners or in top-level executives; 16.3% of the participants reported being business owners or top-level executives, whereas the majority, or 83.7%, reported not being business owners or top-level executives.

There were 45 valid responses to each variable with fewer than half (35.56%) reporting they were in non-management positions. Only 6.7% reported salaries in the $20,000 to $29,000 range and $50,000 to $59,000 range; 23 Black women or 51.1% of the respondents revealed their salary range was in at the $60,000 range or higher. Of the
45 participants who completed the study, 51.1% hold master’s degrees, 22.2% have obtained an undergraduate degree, and 13.3% hold degrees at the doctorate level. Those holding a law degree responded at a rate of 4.4% and 6.7% of the respondents had some college. One respondent reported Other in the education-level category.

Table 10 reveals the tally for discrete variables with respect to participants’
(a) career level, (b) annual salary, and (c) education level.

Table 10

| Tally for Discrete Variables: Career Level, Annual Salary, and Education Level |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Career level                  | $f$            | %              |
| Management                    | 16             | 35.56          |
| Nonmanagement                 | 29             | 64.44          |
| $N = 45$                      |                | 100.00         |
| Annual Salary                 |                |                |
| $20,000–29,999$               | 3              | 6.7            |
| $30,000–39,999$               | 7              | 15.5           |
| $40,000–49,999$               | 9              | 20.0           |
| $50,000–59,999$               | 3              | 6.7            |
| $60,000+$                     | 23             | 51.1           |
| $N = 45$                      |                | 100.0          |
| Education level               |                |                |
| Some college                  | 3              | 6.7            |
| Bachelors’ degree             | 10             | 22.2           |
| Law degree                    | 2              | 4.4            |
| Masters’ degree               | 23             | 51.1           |
| Doctorate degree              | 6              | 13.3           |
| Other                         | 1              | 2.2            |
| $N = 45$                      |                | 100.0          |

Finally, as depicted in the Figure, the majority, or 26.7% of Black women who participated in the study ($N = 45$), were 60 years of age or older, whereas 22.2% of
82 respondents reported their age as being in either the 30–39 year range or 50–59 year range. The survey yielded an initial return of 50 respondents; however, un-reports or incomplete surveys ranged from one to seven; a total of 23 respondents, or 46%, did not respond to the open-ended question.

Report of Findings

As stated in the methodology section, various Black women’s organizations and chapters were contacted inviting the Black women members to participate in the study. Although 500 Black women were invited to participate, only a small sample agreed to participate in the study ($N = 50$), which yielded a 90% return rate of those completing the survey. Findings show that (a) 49 ($N = 50$) respondents were familiar with the term nepotism; (b) a 2% variance was present in the respondents’ understanding of the term cronyism as it was operationalized in the study, (c) 2% of the respondents were
unfamiliar with the definition of job satisfaction, and (d) participants’ responses to understanding the variable JFSE were varied, with 85.7% \( (N = 49) \) comprehended the term, 6.1% did not understand or were unfamiliar with the term, and four participants (8.2%) were not sure.

Findings: Research Question 1

In order to address Research Question 1, “To what extent do Black women perceive nepotism exists in the workplace?” as well as the Research Question 2, “To what extent do Black women perceive cronyism exists in the workplace?” the 10 items related to nepotism and cronyism were stacked into variables called “Nepotism” and “Cronyism.” The levels for each of the 10 questions—“Strongly Agree,” “Agree,” “Strongly Disagree,” and “Disagree” were collapsed into two levels called “Agree” and “Disagree,” which made the variables tenable for a binomial test. Moreover, a simulation of 10,000 samples of size 50 using integer probability distribution with a minimum of 0 (Disagree) and a maximum of 1 (Agree) resulted to an average of proportion of 1’s of about 0.5; this is the mean of the sampling distribution of the sample proportion. A cut off of 0.5 was used for the binomial test (see Table 11).
Table 11

NPar Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Observed prop.</th>
<th>Test prop.</th>
<th>Asymp. sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepotism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronyism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Based on Z Approximation.

Hypothesis being tested here was:

\[ H_0 : \text{proportion} (\text{Group 1/ Disagree}) = \text{proportion} (\text{Group 2/ Agree}) = 0.5 \]

\[ H_a : \text{proportion} (\text{Group 2/ Agree}) > 0.5 \]

The \( p \)-values for Nepotism and Cronyism were 0.074 and 0.000, respectively; therefore the null hypothesis is rejected at the 10% level of significance. It was concluded that although 65% (\( N = 30 \)) of Black women disagreed that nepotism is frequently discussed in the workplace, there is the perception that nepotism is present and those hired as a result of nepotism are not perceived as being as experienced as those who were not hired as a result of a familial relationship.

Other findings from the study, which are parallel to Research Question 1, “To what extent do Black women perceive nepotism exists in the workplace?” indicated that Black women are evenly divided (\( N = 46 \)) on the issue of whether nepotism or the perception of nepotism causes conflict or impacts the morale of others in the workplace; the split response rate of 50% was also shared on the issue of whether those hired due to
nepotism were as qualified as those who were not related to someone in management. Interestingly, more than half (63.1%) of those who responded stated they do, however, watch what they say in the presence of colleagues who are related to those in management. While 56.5% of the Black women who responded to the survey perceived that certain employees were hired because of a family connection, only 39% ($N = 46$) stated their employer promoted based on the practice of nepotism. Overall, 71.8% of the Black women who participated in the survey felt they had not been overlooked for advancement, whereas only 23.9% believed their future in their respective organizations was limited as a result of nepotistic practices in the workplace (see Table 12).
Table 12

Frequency Distribution of Responses to Nepotism Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nepotism</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The topic of nepotism is the basis of frequent discussion within my workplace.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nepotism or the perception of nepotism causes conflict and impacts employee morale within my employing organization.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There have been advancement opportunities within my employing organization in which I have experience and I am skilled in, but I was overlooked for due to nepotism.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I watch what I say in the presence of employees who are related to those in management.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is my perception that certain individuals within my employing organization were hired because of a family connection within the organization.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My employing organization values employee relationships built on nepotism rather than relationships built on mutual trust, hard work, skills and education.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My future in this job is limited because of relationships in the workplace that are based on nepotism.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There is a perception that my employer promotes the practice of nepotism in its hiring and advancement practices.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Within my employing organization, those employed as a result of nepotism are difficult to dismiss or demote.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. There is a perception within my employing organization that those who are hired as a result of nepotism are not as qualified as those employees who are not related to management.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings: Research Question 2

Research Question 2, “To what extent do Black women perceive cronyism exists in the workplace?” yielded a response rate of 63% (N = 46) of Black women who agreed the topic of cronyism is frequently discussed. Further, the data revealed that more than
56% perceived that those hired because of cronyism were not as experienced as merit-based hired employees. With respect to data from the current research study, 56.5% (N = 46) of respondents perceived their employers as more highly valuing relationships based on cronyism than relationships built on mutual trust, hard work, skills, and education. Only 37% of respondents shared the same perception on the issue of nepotism previously shown in Table 10. When asked whether respondents had a perception of individuals being hired as a result of cronyism, 89.1% (N = 46) “Agreed” and 65.2% believed there was an overall perception that their employer practiced cronyism in human-resources operations. Only 39.1% and 56.5%, respectively, shared the same perceptions or beliefs with respect to nepotism. Moreover, an overwhelming response of 82.6% (N = 46) reported that they watch what they say when in the presence of employees who are friends of those in management and, 58.7% believed they had been denied advancement opportunities due to cronyism (see Table 13).

Findings: Research Question 3

Nepotism aside, respondents overwhelming expressed high levels of job satisfaction. To address Research Question 3, “To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and job satisfaction as they relate to Black women in the workplace?” a cross tabulation revealed there was no relationship between nepotism and job satisfaction, as revealed in the data analysis shown in Tables 14 and 15. The same test was run on cronyism and job satisfaction, which yielded the same results: no significant relationship existed between these two variables (see Tables 16 and 17).
### Table 13

*Frequency Distribution of Responses to Cronyism Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronyism</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The topic of cronyism is the basis of frequent discussion within my workplace.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cronyism or the perception of cronyism causes conflict or impacts employee moral within my employing organization.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I watch what I say in the presence of employees who are friends of those in management.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There have been advancement opportunities for other experienced Black women within my employing organization, but they were overlooked for due to cronyism.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is my perception that certain individuals within my employing organization were hired based on their friendship or as a favor to someone within the company or organization.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My employing organization values employee relationships built on cronyism rather than relationships built on mutual trust, hard work, skills and education.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Within my employing organization, those employed as a result of cronyism are difficult to dismiss or demote.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My future in this job is limited because of relationships in the workplace that are based on cronyism.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There is a perception that my employer promotes the practice of cronyism in its hiring, advancement practices.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. There is a perception within my employing organization that those who are hired due to cronyism are not as qualified as those employees who are not related to management.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

**Cross Tabulation between Nepotism and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nepotism</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

**Symmetric Measures for Nepotism and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symmetric measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by nominal</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>-.004 .939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.004 .939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency coefficient</td>
<td>.004 .939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of valid cases: 448

Output of the phi-coefficient test; p-value = 0.939 > 0.1.

Table 16

**Cross Tabulation between Cronyism and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronyism</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

**Symmetric Measures for Cronyism and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symmetric Measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by nominal Phi</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency coefficient</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output of the phi-coefficient test; *p*-value = 0.017 < 0.1.

With respect to Research Question 3, the number of respondents varied between 44 and 45. According to data from the current study, 66.7% (*N* = 45) “Disagreed” with having to force themselves to go to work. More than half of the respondents, 57.8% looked forward to going to work on a Monday morning. Although 65.9 (% *N* = 44) felt they were fairly well satisfied with their current job, 51.1% (*N* = 5) responded to “Disagree” when asked about their satisfaction with their current compensation. The data support that, of the 45 participants, almost all (88.9%) revealed they had no intention of seeking other employment. Data further supported that respondents were provided with the requisite equipment and materials to perform their work adequately (see Table 18).
Table 18

*Frequency Distribution of Responses to Job Satisfaction Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I look forward to going to work on Monday morning.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Most of the time, I have to force myself to go to work.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I always talk positively about my organization to others.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I trust our leadership team.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am disappointed I ever took this job.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am fairly compensated.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is highly possible that I will be looking for a new job.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have energy at the end of each work day do to engage in personal interests.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have the equipment and materials I need in order to do my work right.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings: Research Question 4**

To examine Research Question 4, “To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and JFSE as they relate to Black women in the workplace?” the same test and cross tabulation applied to address Research Question 3, were applied to cronyism and job satisfaction, and cronyism and JFSE. The *p*-values were 0.618 and 0.519, respectively. As with Research Question 3, there was no significant relationship between cronyism and job satisfaction. This data are depicted in Tables 19 and 20.
Table 19

**Cross Tabulation between Nepotism and Job-Focused Self-Efficacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross tabulation count</th>
<th>Job-focused self-efficacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepotism</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

**Symmetric Measures for Nepotism and Job-Focused Self-Efficacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symmetric measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by nominal</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td></td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data supported, however, that a negative relationship did exist between cronyism and JFSE among the Black women who participated in this study (see Tables 21 and 22).

Table 21

**Cross Tabulation between Cronyism and Job-Focused Self-Efficacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross tabulation count</th>
<th>Job-focused self-efficacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronyism</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symmetric measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by nominal</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td></td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of respondents ranged from 43 to 45. This could be directly related to the fact that 6.1% reported not having an understanding or being familiar with the terms self-efficacy or JFSE, and four participants (8.2%) reported they were not sure if they had an understanding or were familiar with the terms self-efficacy or JFSE, as shown in the Figure at the beginning of this chapter. Based on the data, it is quite evident that Black women in the current study maintain a strong sense of confidence in their abilities to perform their tasks in their chosen career fields. Of the 45 respondents, 100% reported (a) they were confident in their ability to do their job, (b) if they cannot do a certain task the first time, they continue to persevere until they succeed, and (c) they rely on their resourcefulness to handle any unanticipated circumstances that may arise on the job (\( N = 45 \)). Data also revealed small percentages of Black women respondents who exhibited high levels of low self-efficacy related to their careers. Only 2.3% (\( N = 44 \)) of the respondents expressed they “Agreed” they quickly give up if they are initially unsuccessful when learning something new. Moreover, only 6.7% (\( N = 45 \)) “Agreed” that “Individuals hired or advanced within my employing organization can perform my job better than I can.” Finally, 88.8% (\( N = 45 \)) “Disagreed” that their position required certain tasks they were not well trained in or were incapable of performing, and 86.0%
(\(N = 43\)) “Disagreed” that they found it difficult to apply their strengths at work. Table 23 provides the frequency distribution of responses to the 10 items that made-up the JFSE section of the survey for the study.

Table 23

*Frequency Distribution of Responses to Job-Focused Self-Efficacy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job-focused self-efficacy</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I have confidence in my ability to do my job.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am very proud of my job skills and abilities.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If I can’t do a job the first time, I keep trying until I get it right</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations on my job.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My position requires certain tasks that I am not well trained in or I am incapable of performing.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I lack confidence in my ability to use my strengths to succeed.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Individuals hired or advanced within my employing organization can perform my job better than I can.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ Share Perceptions, Stories, and Experiences of Nepotism and Cronyism in the Workplace

In addition to the 10 items on nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction, and JFSE, respondents were asked to share perceptions, stories, and experiences of nepotism and cronyism in their respective organizations. The responses below represent 52% (\(N = 50\))
of those respondents who felt comfortable enough to share their perceptions, stories and experiences of the practices of nepotism and cronyism in their organizations:

Cronyism—There is one vice president in the organization who is known for “hiring her friends”. The interesting thing is that it isn’t known they are friends until after they are hired. When this particular vice president was hired there were several Black women and people of color in positions within the division and she has successfully fired, laid-off, or made their lives miserable, so they quit—99% of them. There was an instance when the president gave a raise and a promotion to one of his white female friends and when I asked about the same consideration, he explained that my salary was commensurate with my peers and hers wasn’t. When I explained that I produced and excelled in my work, he agreed, but that was not the basis for the salary increase. I left the organization at the time.

( Participant 2)

There have been several positions for which I was more than experienced in, had the required education, and the service time, but was passed over for either a relative or a best friend of one of the hiring managers. Several times, some of the managers’ children came in right out of high school with no experience and got the positions I bided on, but I was told there was no justification for advancing me at the time. I was the only African-American female in my department and one of only three African-Americans employed within this company. It made me feel stupid and inadequate often times and I hated going into that office, especially after a weekend. I finally left because there was no chance for advancement, only lateral moves with no extra pay and little chance for learning new skills.

( Participant 9)

There are at least four people on staff who are friends from high school. Two came in at the same time and the others came in under the one who is a supervisor. (Participant 10)

My employer is a family owned business. It is privately held and we keep this business and positions and one other business and the positions owned and staffed with family members only. Participant 11

Most of my experience is based on what I have heard not what I personally know. (Participant 13)

Cronyism has hindered the advancement of black women in the workplace. Since the hiring personnel are white men, they tend to hire those that look like them. (Participant 14)

It helps to know somebody. (Participant 15)

There was an instance in which the new District Manager brought a woman with him from his prior assignment and gave her one of the top assignments in the
She was his mistress and she later brought charges against him for abuse, resulting in his being re-assigned. (Participant 16)

I worked for the local school system. There were no incidences of either nepotism or cronyism in the school directly. There were stories of nepotism/cronyism in the administration of the school system. Positions supposedly created for wives of the superintendent and close friends. I have no personal knowledge of such, but I believe it is possibly true. (Participant 17)

Aunts, uncles, spouses are all employed at my agency, this makes work very difficult. (Participant 21)

Cronyism in the workplace affects sexual orientation more than race. My organization gives preference to the gay or lesbians despite the race. I have witnessed less competent people hired. Participant 23

Folks hired based on perceptions addressed in this study are generally perceived as qualified however, when I was hired based on cronyism, it was perceived that I was less qualified; I had to work harder than my counterparts to establish my credibility. (Participant 24)

I worked for an organization that truly believes in cronyism. A person I worked with was overlooked for a position in Human Resources; in-fact a position that she had applied for was given to a person she had trained only because the hiring manager was the other person’s friend. The person, who did not get the position, soon after left that company and went to another company. (Participant 27)

Neither of these are a huge problem in my workplace because I work in Education at a school. Ed Code and the teacher’s union require seniority over nepotism or cronyism. However, an assistant principal was let go so that the principal/superintendent could hire his friend for the position. (Participant 28)

Cronyism was practiced, but not a very big problem when it can to Black women. It was a problem for white men who were not Jewish. (Participant 33)

I am now self-employed, but I related my experience from a previous situation. Cronyism was particularly felt in my office because there was also a racial barrier. The decision-makers did not have a racially diverse group of friends that were hired, so the cronyism felt especially strong. (Participant 34)

Nepotism in my employment workplace is very common. As a 14 year employee, I have seen individuals hired in off the street because they have a relative or close friend who can pull rank for them. It is very unfair for employees who have worked for years and gained the experience hands on not to be considered or even notified that a new position is available for them to apply for. (Participant 36)
I believe nepotism and cronyism only work when Black women ‘really’ know other Black women but they also use it for evil (charging a cost) and they don’t do it enough. (Participant 41)

There are periodic occurrences of nepotism/cronyism in my organization; however, there are enough checks and balances in place to limit it. (Participant 42)

I work in the media. I’ve seen someone’s relative (a white woman) on maternity leave be promoted to department head, when the opening was never mentioned to the two Black women in the department who would have been her competition. It was said that the white woman was the only one who applied, when it was never communicated to anyone BUT her that the job would become open. (Participant 43)

Cronyism is very prevalent in my high tech workplace. Many of the director level positions or higher positions are filled by cronies of individuals hired. Minorities are moved out of the business to make way for the new individuals. (Participant 45)

My experience has been with nepotism and too painful to discuss; however, cronyism did not affect me personally, but I do see that it can affect the quality of work and the level of communication within the company. (Participant 47)

Cronyism in my workplace seems to be the only way to get ahead. I was employed as a result of my current supervisor knowing my husband’s supervisor. I’m not sure if this is cronyism or networking. I do not know my husband’s supervisor and he doesn’t know mine. The position came up in a conversation during an after-hours work event. Either way, once I joined this organization, my exposure to the widespread cronyism in this place blew me away. I am always fearful that someone’s best friend is going to get a bigger bonus or a promotion based on their friendship. I am not necessarily friends with anyone here, just hired as a result of somebody knowing somebody who knows somebody. Again, networking, I think. (Participant 48)

There are several people within my organization who were promoted/advanced due to nepotism. They were clearly not qualified to do the job. (Participant 49)

Cronyism is sometimes noticed because when some do not do their job as expected, nothing is done. (Participant 50)

Summary

This study examined how Black women perceived the practice of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace. Further, the study gleaned insight into the impact of nepotism and cronyism on Black women’s job satisfaction and their JFSE. This chapter specifically
addressed the data analysis and results of the current study. First, data on Research Question 1, “To what extent do Black women perceive nepotism exists in the workplace?” supported that, of the valid responses, the majority of Black women “Disagreed” that nepotism is frequently discussed in the workplace. It was reported that nepotism in employment practices in their respective workplaces did exist and it was perceived that those hired or advanced due to the practice of nepotism were not as qualified as those who were hired based on merit; finally, employees hired due to nepotism were perceived as being more difficult to discharge or demote than other employees.

As for Research Question 2, “To what extent do Black women perceive cronyism exists in the workplace?” represented a slightly different set of analyses for the variable cronyism. Data showed that Black women perceived cronyism as a more prevalent occurrence in the workplace than nepotism. When asked to respond to “There is a perception that my employer promotes the practice of nepotism in its hiring and advancement practices,” and “There is a perception that my employer promotes the practice of cronyism in its hiring, advancement practices,” only 39% “Agreed” that nepotism was perceived as an employment practice in their organizations, whereas 65.2% “Agreed” that cronyism was perceived as an existing employment practice in the workplace.

Data analysis with regard to Research Question 3, “To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and job satisfaction as they relate to Black women in the workplace?” revealed that Black women did not perceive a relationship existed between nepotism, cronyism, and job satisfaction. Overall, Black women who
participated in the study were overwhelmingly satisfied with their jobs and felt they were provided with the requisite equipment and materials to adequately perform their tasks. In contrast, respondents did express some discontent with their salaries: 51.1% (N = 45) reported being unsatisfied with their current pay, while 48.9% reported they were fairly compensated. However, data that addressed Research Question 4, “To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and JFSE as they relate to Black women in the workplace?” yielded a negative relationship between nepotism and JFSE among the Black women who participated in the study. Data substantiated that regardless of the practices of nepotism and cronyism or the perceived practices of nepotism and cronyism, Black women are resourceful and possess a strong sense of self-efficacy to accomplish whatever job-related tasks they are presented.

Study participants provided personal and sensitive responses to the open-ended item of the questionnaire, which spoke to the purpose of the study and brought to bear the background and need, as well as the overarching significance of the study. Responses regarding respondents’ knowledge of or perceptions of nepotism and cronyism of others who were affected by nepotism and cronyism in their organizations were profound and insightful. There were two significant assertions related to cronyism that were not addressed as variables in the current study; however, Participants 23 and 33 brought the variables into the study and to the attention of the researcher: (a) sexual orientation and (b) Non-White men. These variables are discussed further in Chapter V with respect to recommendations for future research.

Twenty-seven valid responses to the open-ended item revealed a more personal perspective on how nepotism and cronyism relate to job satisfaction and, to some degree,
the self-efficacy of at least one respondent. Further, as with the quantitative analysis of
this study, nepotism or the perception of nepotism was not as prevalent in the workplace
as was cronyism. A significant number of responses to the open-ended item provided
detailed accounts of nepotism and cronyism. These stories perpetuate assertions of prior
research that supported the premise of these employment practices promoting racism,
prohibiting workplace diversity, preventing advancement, and contributing to low morale
in the workplace.

Finally, data revealed that the majority of respondents were not top-level
employees or business owners. This verity was reflected in the stories shared in the open-
ended item whereby some respondents provided personal accounts of workplace
nepotism and cronyism. Further, demographic data was not cross tabulated and therefore
did not provide any statistical relevance to the relational effects of nepotism and
cronyism. Data regarding the demographic variable of salary validates the responses to
Item 7 on the Job Satisfaction section of the survey whereby more than 50% of
respondents asserted their contentment with their pay. Chapter V provides a more
comprehensive discussion of what the data suggested for Black women and their
perceptions of the relationships among nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction, and JFSE.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine how Black women perceived the practices of nepotism and cronyism, as well as to ascertain insight into experiences that Black women face with nepotism and cronyism in the workplace. Moreover, the purpose was to gauge to what end relationships existed among nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction, and JFSE among Black women in the workplace. As previously discussed in Chapter II, current research on nepotism and cronyism is scant (Jones et al., 2008). Further, based on research discussed in Chapter III, nepotism and cronyism have been regarded as both destructive and constructive employment practices. Moreover, Chapter III provided literature that supported nepotism and cronyism as harmful to workplace morale; these employment practices were thought to prohibit workplace diversity, and contribute to negative effects on job satisfaction and self-efficacy. Other research in the same chapter spoke of a dissimilar set of perceptions. Literature that supported data in favor of nepotism and cronyism held that employees hired or advanced through these employment practices present higher levels of job satisfaction, thereby yielding a better return on company investment with regard to training and retention, or company loyalty (Coil & Rice, 1995; Elbo, 1998).

This chapter describes the findings presented in Chapter IV as well as their implications. It will conclude with a discussion of recommendations for future research and concluding comments.
Discussion of Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine Black women’s perceptions of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace. Moreover, the purpose was to examine whether relationships existed between Black women’s job satisfaction and JFSE due to employment practices such as nepotism and cronyism. Data were used to answer the four research questions put forth in Chapters I, II and IV:

1. To what extent do Black women perceive nepotism exists in the workplace?
2. To what extent do Black women perceive cronyism exists in the workplace?
3. To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and job satisfaction as they relate to Black women in the workplace?
4. To what extent does a relationship exist among nepotism, cronyism, and JFSE as they relate to Black women in the workplace?

In addressing Research Questions 1 and 2, data suggested that overall, Black women believed that nepotism was not discussed as often in the workplace as was cronyism. It was further reported that nepotism in employment practices in their respective workplaces did exist; women perceived that those hired or advanced as a result of nepotism were not as qualified as employees who were hired based on merit is their (a) level of education, (b) experience, and (c) skill set. Moreover, data suggested that respondents deemed it challenging for employers to dismiss or demote employees who were hired based on nepotism and cronyism. Interestingly, nepotism and cronyism were practiced in the workplace, yet respondents did not speak negatively about their employer.

Respondents, however, felt compelled to practice caution when speaking in the presence of colleagues who were connected to or perceived to be connected to
management or persons of influence in the workplace. The conjecture from this is that exercising caution helps to combat office gossip, and lessens the opportunity for workplace conflict and low morale. Other speculation is that Black women who participated in the study exhibited a strong sense of self-efficacy relevant to their careers, as discussed in Research Question 4. Therefore, it was not necessary to engage in such negative activity.

With respect to Research Questions 3 and 4, data showed that Black women did not exhibit low levels of job satisfaction and exhibited high levels of JFSE. However, salary was almost even, as 51.1% ($N = 45$) agreed they were not fairly compensated, 48.9% agreed they were fairly compensated. Data substantiated that regardless of the practices of nepotism and cronyism or the perceived practices of nepotism and cronyism, Black women are resourcful and possess a strong sense of self-efficacy to accomplish whatever job-related tasks they are presented. This is discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

Data collected from the open-ended item, whereby respondents were asked to share their realities of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace, or their perceptions about experiences of others who were affected by nepotism and cronyism in their organizations, were profound and insightful. There were two significant assertions related to cronyism that were not addressed as variables in the current study: Participants 23 and 33 brought to the attention of the researcher: (a) sexual orientation and (b) non-White men. These variables are discussed further in this chapter with respect to recommendations for further research. Twenty-seven valid responses to the open-ended item revealed a more personal perspective on how nepotism and cronyism related to job satisfaction and, to some
degree, the self-efficacy of at least one respondent. Further, findings from this study suggested that nepotism was not as prevalent in the workplace as is cronyism. A significant number of responses to the open-ended item provided detailed accounts of nepotism and cronyism. These accounts lend credence to assertions of other researchers that these employment practices promote racism, prohibit workplace diversity, prevent advancement, and contribute to low morale in the workplace.

Finally, data indicated that the majority of respondents were not top-level employees or business owners. As mentioned in Chapter IV, this verity was reflected in the stories shared in the open-ended item whereby some respondents provided personal accounts of workplace nepotism and cronyism. Further, demographic data was not cross tabulated and therefore, did not provide any statistical relevance to the relational effects of nepotism or cronyism. Data regarding the demographic variable, salary, validated the responses to Item 7 on the Job Satisfaction section of the survey, whereby almost 50% of respondents asserted their contentment with their pay.

Conclusion

Prior data outlined in Chapter II as well as supporting data from the current study are evidence that nepotism and cronyism are prevalent on the global stage in the workplace. It is endemic in almost every career field, as shown in the demographic output in prior studies and the current study; it affects not just Black women, but other races, ethnicities, and genders in hiring and career-advancement opportunities as well. One reason the researcher felt compelled to conduct this study was to provide research that further engages others in dialogue regarding nepotism and cronyism in the workplace. Moreover, the researcher believed it was necessary to engage others in conversation on
how or if these employment practices correlate to job satisfaction and JFSE among Black women, whether from a positive or negative perspective. The conversation is undoubtedly taking place and Black women have made and are making great progress in the workplace. Women indeed have come a long way, but there is still much work to be done, especially for Black women in the workplace.

The theoretical rationale for this study was based on the social-cognitive theory of self-efficacy by Bandura et al. (2001) as well as Bandura’s (1982) theory of the self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. The concept that a strong JFSE or self-efficacy in general correlates to high levels of job satisfaction is grounded in theory espoused in prior research (Bandura, 1982; Bandura et al., 2001). The assumption was that individuals career choices and the level to which individuals do extremely well in their career choices was based on those individuals’ self-efficacy.

Equally important is the belief that self-efficacy establishes to what extent people will apply strength and tend to persevere in the face of challenges and set-backs (Bandura, 1982). Data from this study were compelling, as 100% of the respondents “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed” they had complete confidence in their abilities to do their jobs. Moreover, the same percentage of valid responses supported the concepts of self-efficacy by which this study was grounded, as mentioned in Chapter I. Given the nature of the most prevalent career field of the respondents, education, it is quite understandable why the level of job satisfaction and JFSE are positive.

Implications

As outlined in this chapter under Recommendations for Future Research, additional research on various aspects related to nepotism and cronyism can provide more
in-depth insights into what employers can do to circumvent these practices. Further, it can provide better insights to their employees as to why and how these practices serve the organizations in a positive manner. Given the history of the practices of nepotism and cronyism, it is reasonable to conclude there will always be some degree of nepotism and cronyism exercised in the workplace. What does this mean for employers? As discussed in Chapter II, Hernandez and Page (2006) ascribed six challenges employers may be faced with when biased employment practices such as nepotism or cronyism are practiced irresponsibly: (a) conflict of interest, (b) homogeneity, (c) inertia, and (d) legal complications. Any one or more of these challenges can facilitate low morale. Moreover, any one or more of the challenges can result in other factors such as (a) high retention, (b) work-related stress of employees, and (c) unfavorable word of mouth that can lead to damaging a company’s reputation or that of a particular leader or manager. Equally important is the glass ceiling. With the workforce growing more diverse, it is important to remain focused on the importance of allowing, not just Black women, but other disenfranchised groups opportunities to attain their career aspirations as well.

Recommendations for Future Research

As previously mentioned, the dearth of empirical data on nepotism and cronyism leaves way for much needed research, especially given the data from the current study that substantiates the frequency with which cronyism is practiced in the workplace. This study is significant in that it examined the perceptions of how practices of nepotism and cronyism correlate with job satisfaction and JFSE among Black women.

This study met with various challenges that can provide several areas for future research. First, the use of judgmental sampling, as discussed in Chapter III, involved the
selection of items based on the judgment of an individual; although judgmental sampling cannot be used to draw statistically valid inferences about a population, it allows the researcher to review an isolated portion of an exact population; the researcher was allowed to judge or regard the results upon evaluation of the quality of the population studied (Comptroller of the Currency Administrator of National Banks, 1998). In other words, judgmental sampling limited the generalizability of the study’s findings. Methods including diversity samples and stratified samples might yield better statistical results than judgmental sampling.

Another challenge was the sample population. Further research should be done across ethnicities, races, and genders, as data from the current study described two scenarios where cronyism proved to bring about discrimination against non-heterosexual employees and Jewish men. Other ethnicities as well as the lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgendered community and African American males may provide a wealth of data for studies on how nepotism and cronyism impact the job satisfaction and JFSE in these two groups. It could prove beneficial to conduct studies in other areas that are industry specific: (a) education, (b) health care, specifically in the areas of Health Maintenance Organizations and Preferred Provider Organizations, (c) banking in the United States, (d) hospitality in the United States, and (e) government entities (federal, state, and local).

The theoretical framework for the current study was based on self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982; Bandura et al., 2001). Additional theoretical framework was rooted in workplace diversity (Barbosa & Cabral-Cardoso, 2007; Kundu, 2003). Prior research as well as data from the current study indicates that, more often than not, managers, leaders,
or those in positions of influence have a propensity to promote homogeneity in the workplace rather than heterogeneity. As a result, the researcher firmly contends that additional lenses through which nepotism and cronyism should be examined are (a) critical race theory, (b) Whiteness or White privilege, and (c) unearned privilege or race-based advantage. A growing body of knowledge regarding these concepts—how these concepts impact salary, advancement in the workplace, human-resource development and training—will further speak to the relationships among nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction, and JFSE.

With respect to the methodology, further research is suggested in employing a qualitative methodology, especially using a focus group or round-table forum. The challenges met with the quantitative approach included the electronic dissemination of the survey and the lack of participation on the part of those invited to the study. Although electronic dissemination of the instrument was inexpensive and made it readily available, it also proved to be time consuming. The researcher made many attempts to remind invitees to take the survey and to remind them of the time frame. When possible, it is suggested that a paper instrument be distributed and collected.

Finally, it is important to examine the positive aspects of nepotism and cronyism described by Bellow (2004). It is apparent that employers are resolute in their continued practice of nepotism and cronyism; therefore, it is highly recommended that future research embrace managers’ and leaders’ perspectives on what these practices provide them and their organizations. It should be interesting to know if those who practice nepotism and cronyism exhibit high levels of job satisfaction and JFSE; other variables
such as work-related stress, intentions to quit, and in-group versus out-group are suggested for further research.

The following issues are suggested as research questions to be addressed in further research. Is it safe to suppose that those who benefit from the practice of nepotism and cronyism will further the practice as they advance in the workplace? Do managers and leaders expect something in return from family and friends whom they hire and promote? Are managers aware of the impact that nepotism and cronyism have on employees and workplace morale?

Recommendations for Future Practice

Employers have to balance biased human-resource practices and, in doing so, could alleviate the negative aspects of nepotism and cronyism discussed throughout the study, as well as in the Implications section of this chapter. The 21st-century workplace is global and, in today’s economy, competition is more serious and important than ever. Employees and those seeking employment want to be treated fairly and want opportunities for advancement and compensation distributed based on their merits such as educational achievements, skill set, experience (paid and unpaid in some instances), and leadership qualities. When nepotism and cronyism are placed above the aforementioned merit-based qualities, it can prove detrimental to both the employee and the employer.

Although the data from the current does not support some of the studies described in Chapter II, it does lend itself to understanding how, when practiced from a functional aspect, nepotism or cronyism may not bring about the negative impact discussed throughout Chapters I, II, and III. Hernandez and Page (2006) maintained that loyalty and
high levels of productivity can be achieved in the workplace, as well as commitment and superior knowledge of an organization, from those who are related to managers or those in positions of influence.

If nepotism and cronyism are to remain common practices in any organizational structure, those who perpetuate these practices should be cognizant of the implications and impacts these practices could have on the organization overall; employers should maintain a specific set of procedural guidelines and policies that include managers, leaders, or those in positions of influence to annually review current company policy on nepotism and cronyism. All employees should maintain familiarization with the company’s policy and guidelines governing nepotism and cronyism. Further, human-resource officers, first and foremost, should be required to maintain current laws and policies on nepotism and cronyism from a legal perspective; they should also maintain current training in employee sensitivity. Human-resource officers should have an open-door policy that includes the highest level of confidentiality for employees who believe they or others have been denied career-development opportunities and advancement or salary increases due to nepotism and cronyism in the workplace. Kizirian et al. (2006) maintained that office gossip should be immobilized and immediately addressed to mitigate any negative impact to a department’s or organization’s image.

Nepotism and cronyism or the perceptions of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace should be taken seriously, as these practices directly impact organizational commitment, which correlates to job satisfaction, quitting intentions, discrimination, and legal action. It is in the best interest of all stakeholders to address these issues directly and to resolve them in the interest of not just the company, but that of skilled employees.
who have otherwise exhibited (a) loyalty, (b) high productivity, (c) good attendance and punctuality, and (d) an overall positive image and representation for the company.

Concluding Thoughts

Based on the data from the study, Black women have made great strides in the workplace and have not allowed certain biases such as nepotism and cronyism to deter them from succeeding in the workplace. The level of JFSE is a strong indicator as to what has allowed respondents to succeed in their respective career choices and exhibit high levels of job satisfaction in the face of certain workplace adversities. As stated in Chapter I, the premise of an individual’s career choice and the level to which an individual masters that choice is based on that individual’s confidence or self-efficacy (Bandura et al., 2001). It is has been well established that views on self-efficacy describe the extent to which people will apply strength and the length of time and effort they will continue to work in the face of challenges or setbacks (Bandura, 1982). Results from the current study supported that, when inundated with challenges, those who were plagued with serious doubts about their capabilities relaxed their efforts or abandoned their efforts altogether. This substantiated Bandura’s (1982) line of reasoning that the greater the degree of perseverance, the higher the performance attainment for those with a strong sense of self-efficacy; perseverance is key.

Equally important to the roles of education and career choice in indicating high levels of self-efficacy in Black women is the presence of other Black women in the workplace. Mentorship or being able to see other Black women who have been successful in the workplace is another factor that strengthens not only JFSE, but job satisfaction as well. Finally, as mentioned in Chapter II, as Black women begin to see more Black
women advance in the workplace, self-efficacy and JFSE will increase among Black women.

The number of participants was particularly disappointing in the current study, especially given the large membership of the organizations invited to participate. Although timing was a factor, as previously mentioned, another factor was the sensitive and controversial nature of the topics of nepotism and cronyism. Further, some invitees expressed some trepidation regarding confidentiality with respect to the information not being shared in any manner that might cause a participant detriment in employment. This is particularly understandable given the current economic and employment status in the United States and, given the data from the study, which indicated respondents were satisfied with their current positions. Moreover, the career fields, education levels, and salary levels obtained by the respondents give rise to the supposition that nepotism and cronyism are not as important today as they once were. Again, ongoing research using other methodologies, statistical testing, and other populations need to be conducted in an effort to address the relationships among nepotism, cronyism, job satisfaction, and JFSE, as well as other variables.

Globalization is a way of life in the 21st century; therefore, workplace diversity must be of great importance to human-resource officers, managers, and those in positions of influence. Nepotism and cronyism are sensitive and controversial topics; hence, all aspects of an employees’ workplace—(a) low morale, (b) job satisfaction, (c) JFSE, (d) retention, and (e) organizational image—are mechanisms by which all employers and employees should remain cognizant in hiring and advocating advancement in the workplace.
Finally, it is imperative for Black women, as well as others, to openly engage in dialogue with other Black women or women of color to bring about a more complete and positive diverse workforce. It is their place to ensure that practices of nepotism and cronyism are practiced in moderation and that it is brought to forefront when it violates the ability to further one’s career development or advancement, or that of another person.
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APPENDICES
LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE NORTHERN CYPRUS STUDY INVENTORY

July 22, 2010

Erdogan H. Ekiz
Department of Hotel and Tourism Management
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
Kowloon, Hong Kong

RE: Request to Use Survey Instrument

Dear Dr. Ekiz:

My name is Johnson L. Chandler and I am a doctoral student in the School of Education, Leadership Studies Department at the University of San Francisco. Moreover, I am in the preliminary stage of developing my proposal. The focus of my study is to examine perceptions toward nepotism and cronyism in the workplace and the relationship to job performance, self-efficacy, and career advancement.

In researching my topic, I came across your article on, “The effects of nepotism on human resource management: The case of three, four and five star hotels in Northern Cyprus”. As a result, I would like to have your permission to use your instrument, but with some latitude to make modifications to certain questions as they relate to my study. Moreover, I am requesting permission to include your figures and tables to explain your findings within my proposal and final dissertation. Should you find this acceptable, will you please provide me with a copy of your instrument? The instruments and any figures or tables will be used strictly for the purpose of academic research with respect to my proposal and dissertation.

If you have questions about the research study, you may contact me at jlchandler@usfca.edu, or (916) 263-XXXX or (916) 647-XXXX.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter, and thank you for your scholarly contributions to the areas of nepotism and cronyism in the workplace.

Sincerely,

Johnson L. Chandler, MPPM
Graduate Student
University of San Francisco
APPENDIX B

LETTER GRANTING PERMISSION TO USE AN INVENTORY FROM THE STUDY CONDUCTED ON THE EFFECTS OF NEPOTISM IN NORTHERN CYPRUS

Re: The effects of nepotism on human resource management: The case of three, four...

Tuesday, July 27, 2010 3:31 AM

From: Erdogan Ekiz, <erdogan.xxxx@gmail.com>
Add sender to Contacts

To: "Johnson Chandler" <jlchandl1@yahoo.com>, "Ali Bavik" <abxxxx@business.otago.ac.nz>

Dear Johnson,

Sorry for the late reply, I contacted with my co-author and got his blessing about your request. You are welcome to adopt and if necessary modify the instrument. Moreover, since our research interests are overlapping, my colleague and I would be happy to collaborate on any projects you may like. We can compare our findings and even write a cross-cultural research proposal. Just let us know if you are interested.

Look forward to hearing from you. Until then cheers from Malaysia and NZ.

Erdogan

-------------------------------
Erdogan H. EKIZ,
CHE, Senior Lecturer,
Taylor’s Graduate School of Hospitality and Tourism
Taylor’s University College,
Lakeside Campus, No. 1, Jalan Taylor’s,
47500 Subang Jaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan,
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Office: + 60 (3) XXX9 X000 Ext. (soon)
Mobile: + 60 (10) 27X 4XXX
Fax: + 60 (3) 5629 XXXX

Emails: erdogan.xxxx@xxxxs.edu.my
erdogan.xxxx@gmail.com

Web pages: www.xxxxs.edu.my
www.ib-ts.org

On Fri, Jul 23, 2010 at 8:38 AM, Johnson Chandler <jlchandl1@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hello Dr. Erdogan,

Please read the attached letter and respond at your earliest convenience. The letter will provide information regarding my need to contact you.

Thank you.

Johnson L. Chandler
Dear Surveyor,

This research has been designed to measure the effects of friendship and kinship on the institution’s overall operation and performance. The target respondents of the research is TRNC Hoteliers, more specifically those personnel who has direct contact with the guests.

This questionnaire will approximately take 15-20 minutes to answer so please do not skip any of the questions in answering the questions.

Each of the questions at this questionnaire is actually a statement. Therefore, these questions do not have a right or a wrong answer. The aim with this questionnaire is that to measure your participation level as a worker with the five-point scale.

One of the main aims of this research is to keep your identity confidential. The data collected from this research will be analyzed collectively and by using a computer.

I appreciate your cooperation and taking the time to fill this questionnaire before hand.

Kind regards.

Section I: Please answer the questions below as suits you best.

(1) Totally disagree
(2) Disagree
(3) Not decided
(4) Agree
(5) Totally agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hr1</th>
<th>My company while employing a new person often uses “employment tests” (i.e., Foreign language tests, personality tests, knowledge tests, etc.)</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hr2</td>
<td>During the employment process the company explains both the positive and the negative aspects of the job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr3</td>
<td>My company uses standardized interview methods during employment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr4</td>
<td>Personnel for this firm will go under educational programmes at least once a year</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr5</td>
<td>Does the company give proper and official courses in preparation of the employees at their jobs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr6</td>
<td>My firm does systematic analysis to identify what is missing in the educational programmes for the employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr7</td>
<td>My firm takes service behavior, and its development as basis for the educational programmes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr8</td>
<td>My firm uses the results from the education programmes to reach educational targets.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr9</td>
<td>Promotions are based on number of years of experience</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr10</td>
<td>The workers learn the performance evaluation results with an official notification</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr11</td>
<td>Performance evaluation reflect common aims for the firm which has been studied and agreed upon</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr12</td>
<td>My firm takes job-related criteria for promotions &amp; appointments</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II: Please answer the questions below as suits you best.

(1) Totally disagree
(2) Disagree
(3) Not decided
(4) Agree
(5) Totally agree
| N1 | Workers at this institution always depend on a high ranking relative | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| N2 | Department heads are scarred off workers who have relations in upper-administration | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| N3 | Workers who get promoted due to kinship or relatives damage the company | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| N4 | I watch what I say when I talk to colleagues who are relatives of upper-administration | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| N5 | Workers who have relations with the upper-administration in this company can not realize the reasons for their success as whether it is for their relations or for their performance | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| N6 | Workers try to meet the demands of other workers who have relatives in the upper administration | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| N7 | Workers value family members’ benefits rather than the company’s benefits in general | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| N8 | Nepotism and cronyism causes internal conflicts in the firm | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| N9 | This firm has to keep personnel who has not any relatives for long term | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| N10 | It is very difficult to remove or to demote people who have relatives in the upper administration | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Section III: Please answer the questions below as with a holistic view of the company you work at.

(1) Totally disagree
(2) Disagree
(3) Not decided
(4) Agree
(5) Totally agree

| Com1 | My values match with the values of the company | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Com2 | My firm’s future is important for me | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Com3 | I am proud to be a member of this company | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Com4 | I wish to work more than the normal level for the success of my firm | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Com5 | In my opinion, this is the best firm to work at | 1 2 3 4 5 |

| Wom1 | I always talk positively about this firm to others | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Wom2 | I always recommend this firm to everyone | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Wom3 | I always encourage my friends to work for my firm | 1 2 3 4 5 |
Section VI: Please check whichever suits you best

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Int1</th>
<th>I often think of leaving my job</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Int2</td>
<td>I will not loose much if I were to leave this job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int3</td>
<td>It is highly possible that I will be looking for a new job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Your age:**
- 18 - 27 ( )
- 28 - 37 ( )
- 38 – 47 ( )
- 48 – 57 ( )
- 58 – above ( )

**Gender**
- Female ( )
- Male ( )

**Professional Experience**
- 1 – 4 years ( )
- 5 – 8 years ( )
- 9– 12 years ( )
- 13 years and more ( )

**Last educational degree achieved**
- Primary school ( )
- Secondary school/ High school ( )
- Technical school (2 years) ( )
- Four year Bachelors Degree/ School ( )
- Post graduate studies (Masters and PhD) ( )

**Your designation at your company**
……………………………………...

**Hotel Name:**
……………………………………...
..
LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE WELCOA INVENTORY

July 21, 2010

Wellness Councils of America (WELCOA)
9802 Nicholas Street, STE 315
Omaha, NE 68114

RE: Permission Request

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Johnson L. Chandler and I am a doctoral student in the School of Education, Leadership Studies department at the University of San Francisco. Moreover, I am in the preliminary stage of developing my proposal for. The focus of my study is examining perceptions toward nepotism and cronyism in the workplace and the relationship to job performance, self-efficacy, and career advancement.

In researching my topic, I came across your Job Satisfaction Survey. As a result, I would like to have your permission to use some of or all the questions in this instrument. Should you deem this acceptable, will you please provide me with a copy of the instrument? The instrument will be used strictly for the purpose of academic research with respect to my proposal and dissertation.

If you have questions about the research study, you may contact me at jlchandler@usfca.edu, or (916) 263-XXXX or (916) 64X-XXXX.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter, and thank you for your contributions to worksite wellness.

Sincerely,

Johnson L. Chandler, MPPM
Graduate Student
University of San Francisco
APPENDIX E

WELCOA JOB SATISFACTION INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I look forward to going to work on Monday morning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel positive and up most of the time I am working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have energy at the end of each work day to attend to the people I care about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have energy at the end of each work day to engage in personal interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have the time and energy in my life to read books that interest me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Most interactions at work are positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have good friends at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel valued and affirmed at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel recognized and appreciated at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Work is a real plus in my life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I’m engaged in meaningful work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I feel free to be who I am at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel free to do things the way I like at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My values fit with the organizational values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am aligned with the organizational mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I trust our leadership team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I respect the work of my peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I have opportunities to learn what I want to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel involved in decisions that affect our organizational community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Creativity and innovation are supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I feel informed about what’s going on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I know what is expected of me at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I have the materials and equipment that I need in order to do my work right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My manager cares about me as a person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I know someone at work who encourages my development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My opinions count.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My coworkers are committed to doing quality work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My manager reviews my progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am fairly compensated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give yourself two points for each statement you answered positively. Use the following scale to evaluate your job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50-69 points:</th>
<th>Great Job</th>
<th>60-69 points:</th>
<th>Good Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-49 points:</td>
<td>OK Job</td>
<td>26-28 points:</td>
<td>Bad Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-19 points:</td>
<td>Depressing Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

THE GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY SCALE (GSE)

1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.
2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.
3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.
5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.
6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.
10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.

APPENDIX G

SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

Instructions: This questionnaire is a series of statements about your personal attitudes and traits.
Each statement represents a commonly held belief. Read each statement and decide to what extent it describes you. There are no right or wrong answers. You will probably agree with some of the statements and disagree with others. Please indicate your own personal feelings about each statement below by marking the letter that best describes your attitude or feeling. Please be very truthful and describe yourself as you really are, not as you would like to be (http://www.mytherapysession.com/PDFs/SelfEfficacyScale.pdf).

Mark: A If you **Disagree Strongly** with the statement
B If you **Disagree Moderately** with the statement
C If you **Neither Agree nor Disagree** with the statement
D If you **Agree Moderately** with the statement
E If you **Agree Strongly** with the statement

1. I like to grow house plants.
2. When I make plans, I am certain I can make them work.
3. One of my problems is that I cannot get down to work when I should.
4. If I can’t do a job the first time, I keep trying until I can.
5. Heredity plays the major role in determining one’s personality.
6. It is difficult for me to make new friends.
7. When I set important goals for myself, I rarely achieve them.
8. I give up on things before completing them.
9. I like to cook.
10. If I see someone I would like to meet, I go to that person instead of waiting for him or her to come to me.
11. I avoid facing difficulties.
12. If something looks too complicated, I will not even bother to try it.
13. There is some good in everybody.
14. If I meet someone interesting who is hard to make friends with, I’ll soon stop trying to makes friends with that person.
15. When I have something unpleasant to do, I stick with it until I finish it.
16. When I decide to do something, I go right to work on it.
17. I like science.
18. When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful.
19. When I’m trying to become friends with someone who seems uninterested at first, I don’t give up easily.
20. When unexpected problems occur, I don’t handle them well.
21. If I were an artist, I would like to draw children.
22. I avoid trying to learn new things when they look too difficult to me.
23. Failure just makes me try harder.
24. I do not handle myself well in social gatherings.
25. I very much like to ride horses.
26. I feel insecure about my ability to do things.
27. I am a self-reliant person.
28. I have acquired my friends through my personal abilities at making friends.
29. I give up easily.
30. I do not seem capable of dealing with most problems that come up in my life.
APPENDIX H

IRBPHS FULL APPROVAL LETTER

04 - IRB Application #10-107 - Full Approval

FROM:

USF IRBPHS
TO:

Johnson Chandler

Message flagged

Monday, January 24, 2011 11:28 AM

----- Forwarded Message ----- 

Dear Ms. Chandler:

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS) at the University of San Francisco (USF) has reviewed your request for human subjects approval regarding your study.

Your application is now fully approved by the committee (IRBPHS #10-107). Please note the following:

1. Approval expires twelve (12) months from the dated noted above. At that time, if you are still in collecting data from human subjects, you must file a renewal application.

2. Any modifications to the research protocol or changes in instrumentation (including wording of items) must be communicated to the IRBPHS. Re-submission of an application may be required at that time.

3. Any adverse reactions or complications on the part of participants must be reported (in writing) to the IRBPHS within ten (10) working days.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRBPHS at (415) 422-6091.
On behalf of the IRBPHS committee, I wish you much success in your research.

Sincerely,

Terence Patterson, EdD, ABPP
Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

IRBPHS – University of San Francisco
Counseling Psychology Department
Education Building – Room 017
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1080
(415) 422-6091 (Message)
(415) 422-5528 (Fax)
irbphs@usfca.edu

http://www.usfca.edu/soe/students/irbphs/
APPENDIX I

E-MAIL COMMUNICATION REQUESTING AND RECEIVING APPROVAL TO INVITE BLACK WOMEN OF APADS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY.

Re: My Pilot Study Survey
TO: You + 1 More
CC: recipients
BCC: recipients

FROM:
Dr. Sharma Henderson, Ed.D.

TO:
Johnson Chandler
Ewxxxx@aol.com

Message flagged
Thursday, March 3, 2011 5:50 PM

Hi Johnson,

If you could send me a pre-drafted email that includes your link and the instructions, that would be great! This way I could simply forward the message to our female members and just include a brief note identifying you as a new APADS member.

Thanks!
Dr. Sharma

Δρ. Σήκιρμα Ηνδέρσον, Εδ.Δ.
ΑΠΑΔΣ Γραδνατς Σπονσορ/
Ωζεμωιτρεςσ
ωωω.απαδςοργ.οργ

From: Johnson Chandler <jlchandl1@yahoo.com>
To: shxxxxxx@apadsorg.org; Ewxxxx@aol.com
Sent: Wed, March 2, 2011 7:09:28 PM
Subject: My Pilot Study Survey
Hello Dr’s Evelyn and Henderson:

My survey is on Survey Monkey and I will forward you the link. It’s free, voluntary, and participants may withdraw from the survey at their discretion. The survey is for Black women only; no men. Also, if any APADS members are members of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., please ask them to NOT participate in the pilot when disseminating the survey link, but to contact me via e-mail. I am a member of DST and the sorority
members will participate in the main study. Therefore, only black women who are not members of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. are eligible to participate in the pilot study.

If this okay with you, please let me know and I will forward the survey link for you to disseminate to the female members of APADS. If they prefer to contact me for the survey link, they may do so at this e-mail address. Upon your response, I will forward the purpose of the study along with the survey link.

You will never know how much I appreciate this. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you.

Johnson
APPENDIX J

E-MAIL COMMUNICATION REQUESTING AND RECEIVING APPROVAL TO INVITE MEMBERS FROM AKA TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY.

04 - Re: Fw: S.O.S. /  
1 recipients  
CC: recipientsYou More  
BCC: recipientsYou  
Hide Details  
FROM:  
Xxxxx Xxxxxxx  
TO:  
Johnson Chandler  
Message flagged  
Monday, December 6, 2010 6:34 PM  
----- Forwarded Message -----  

Waitlist reason Xxxxx Xxxxxxx (xxxxxxx@att.net) is not on your Guest List | Approve sender | Approve domain | boxbe  

All right,  

Good luck  

--- On Mon, 12/6/10, Johnson Chandler <jlchandl1@yahoo.com> wrote:  

From: Johnson Chandler <jlchandl1@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Fw: S.O.S.  
To: “xxxxxxx@att.net”  
Date: Monday, December 6, 2010, 9:30 PM  

I will send all the information to you later on when I get to my room. You are too special and too good to me. Thanks a million.  

jlc  

--- On Mon, 12/6/10, xxxxx xxxx <xxxxx@att.net> wrote:  

From: xxxxx xxxx <txxxxxx@att.net>  
Subject: Re: Fw: S.O.S.  
To: “Johnson Chandler” <jlchandl1@yahoo.com>  
Date: Monday, December 6, 2010, 12:25 AM
Hi Johnson,

I am in the XXXX chapter of AKA. Our president’s name is Xxxx Xxxxx. I have chapter meeting on Dec. the 10th. If you send me the information, I can ask for their assistance. Send me what you can.

Tracy
xxx-xxx-xxxx

--- On Fri, 12/3/10, Johnson Chandler <jlchandl1@yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Johnson Chandler <jlchandl1@yahoo.com>
Subject: Fw: S.O.S.
To: “xxxx xxxx”<txxxxx@att.net>
Date: Friday, December 3, 2010, 10:26 PM
1 Attached files| 12KB
1.

Re: Fw: S.O.S..eml

Download
APPENDIX K

LETTER TO DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY, INC. REQUESTING PERMISSION TO INVITE MEMBERS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE RESEARCHERS STUDY.

August 27, 2010

LaVerne Gray Davis, Ed.D
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.
Regional Director
Farwest Region
Los Angeles, CA

RE: Permission Request

Dear Dr. Davis:

My name is Johnson L. Chandler and I am a doctoral student in the School of Education, Leadership Studies department at the University of San Francisco. Moreover, I am in the process of developing my proposal, which I hope to present before the end of 2010. Upon successful completion of this stage, I will move forward with my study in preparation for my final dissertation defense. The focus of my study is examining perceptions toward nepotism and cronyism in the workplace and the relationship of these practices to job performance, self-efficacy, and career advancement. My interest lies in what impact, if any, these variables have on black women in the workplace.

I am requesting permission to invite Southern California Chapters of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. to participate in this research study. The reason I have selected Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. is three-fold: (a) women of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. are college educated, possess emotional and social intelligence, and are culturally competent; (b) Delta women are the perfect source of expertise as they are employed within the work areas of social services, education, health care, and government where a great deal of nepotism and cronyism is prevalent; and (c) as an active member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., I know first-hand that women of Delta have always made and continue to make a strong, positive impact in the world.

While there will be no monetary incentive or any other incentive to those who participate in this study, it is my contention that a rich wealth of data can be collected from the women of this organization. These results may have positive implications for supervisors and those in positions of influence within the workplace, especially with regard to workplace diversity.

If permission is granted to conduct the research with the requested area chapter(s), members will be asked to complete a self-administered, web-based survey supported by Survey Monkey. An e-mail account will be created in Survey Monkey. After this, e-mail invitations will be forwarded to the appropriate chapter presidents with a request for them to disseminate
the necessary information to the chapter members regarding the study. In an effort to
maintain the highest level of confidentiality, no identifying information such as individual
names or the participant’s chapter will be requested. They will be asked to provide their
educational background, ethnicity, career field, years of service in their respective fields, and
other demographic information germane to the study. Results will be shared only with study
personnel at the university. No results will be shared with members of the participating
chapters, or their employing organizations.

There will be no costs to the individuals who participate in the study. **Additionally,**
*participation in this study is strictly voluntary.* Participants will be free to decline
participation in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point.

If you agree to grant permission to contact your members, please contact me by e-mail or by
letter at the following address:

Ms. Johnson L. Chandler  
P. O. Box XX  
West Sacramento, CA XXXXX

Thank you for your attention and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Johnson L. Chandler, MPPM  
Graduate Student  
University of San Francisco  
(916) 263-XXXX (Day/evening)  
jlchandler@usfca.edu
APPENDIX L

RESPONSE FROM FARWEST REGIONAL DIRECTOR OF DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY, INC.

04 - Permission Letter 2
1 recipients
CC: recipients You More
BCC: recipients You

FROM:
LaVerne Davis
TO:
Johnson Chandler
Message flagged

Monday, December 6, 2010 9:17 PM
----- Forwarded Message -----

Waitlist reason: LaVerne Davis (farwestrd27@yahoo.com) is not on your Guest List | Approve sender | Approve domain | boxbe

Soror Chandler,

Please see my permission letter for your study in the region. Good luck on tomorrow.

LaVerne Gray Davis, EdD
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.
Farwest Regional Director
(323)XXX-XXXX
(323)XXX-XXXX Fax
www.thedstfarwestregion.org

“Our deepest fear is not that we are inadequate. Our deepest fear is that we are powerful beyond measure.” - Williamson

--- On Tue, 12/7/10, Johnson Chandler <jlchandl1@yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Johnson Chandler <jlchandl1@yahoo.com>
Subject: 
To: farwestrdXX@yahoo.com
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2010, 2:51 AM
Hello Soror Davis,

It was really nice speaking with you and I appreciate you taking time out to do so. Please find attached a copy of the sample letter I need you to write acknowledging your awareness of my study and granting me permission to invite
graduate chapter members of our sorority to participate in the study. A separate e-mail will follow this, which will include the consent form and other materials regarding the study. If you have any questions, please call me at (916) 647-XXXX.

Again, thanks and have a nice night.

Sisterly,
Johnson L. Chandler
XXX XXXX Alumnae
USF Graduate Student

2 Attached files| 2.2MB
Permission Letter.eml
chandlerltr.pdf
Download All
Permission Letter.emlchandlerltr.pdf
APPENDIX M

PERMISSION LETTER TO IRBPHS GRANTING PERMISSION FOR RESEARCHER TO INVITE MEMBERS OF DST TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY, INCORPORATED
A Service Sorority Founded in 1913

DR. LAVERNE GRAY DAVIS
Director, Farwest Region
XXXXX XXXX Place
Los Angeles, CA 90008
323-303-XXXX
323-292-XXXX Telefax

Email: farwesrdrdXX@yahoo.com
XXXXX XXXX
Representative, Farwest Region
XXX XXXX XXXX
El Segundo, CA 90245
323-XXX-XXXX
323- XXX-XXXX Telefax
Email: xxxxxxxxxxx@yahoo.com

December 6, 2010

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
University of San Francisco
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Dear Members of the Committee:

On behalf of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. Farwest Region, I am writing to formally indicate my personal knowledge of the research proposed by Ms. Johnson Chandler, a student at USF. I am also personally knowledgeable that Ms. Chandler intends to conduct her research by administering a written survey to those sorority members who voluntarily agree to participate.

I am the Farwest Regional Director of the Sorority and give Ms. Chandler permission to conduct her research in the region.

Please feel free to contact me should you have questions at (323)303-XXXX.

Sincerely,
La Verne Gray Davis, Ed.D

E-MAIL CHAIN REQUESTING AND RECEIVING APPROVAL TO INVITE MEMBERS OF DELTA SIGMA THETA TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY.

04 - Your Metro Detroit Deltas membership has been approved /
1 recipients
CC: recipientsYou More
BCC: recipientsYou
Hide Details
FROM:
Metro Detroit Deltas
TO:
Johnson LaVoria Chandler
Message flagged
Saturday, December 11, 2010 6:45 AM
----- Forwarded Message ----- 

Congratulations! Your Metro Detroit Deltas membership has been approved. There are 4 simple things you can do to get started:

1. Invite your friends to join you:

2. Add Content:
   http://detroitdeltas.ning.com/main/index/addContent?xg_source=msg_wel_network

3. Add a profile photo:

4. Tell your Twitter followers:

Thanks!
Metro Detroit Deltas
A social networking site for members of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority in Detroit and Metro Detroit to connect, share and stay in touch.
Verify Your Email on Metro Detroit Deltas
1 recipients
CC: recipientsYou More
BCC: recipientsYou
Hide Details
FROM:
Metro Detroit Deltas
TO:
jlchandl1@yahoo.com
Message flagged
Friday, December 10, 2010 8:14 PM

Hello,

We need to verify your email address before you can sign in to Metro Detroit Deltas. Please click on the link below to verify your email address:

http://detroitdeltas.ning.com/?vkey=MjA1NjA2NzpFVjoxMjgwNTc2MDY_x&xg_source=msg_verify_email

Metro Detroit Deltas
Re: Sister in dire need of assistance
1 recipients
CC: recipientsYou More
BCC: recipientsYou
Hide Details
FROM:
XXX XXXX
TO:
Johnson Chandler
Message flagged
Tuesday, December 7, 2010 7:58 AM

----- Forwarded Message -----  

******** (m*******7@yahoo.com) was added to your Guest List by their request | Delete this guest
Hi Soror, thank you for your email. I will try to review the documents before our chapter meeting on Saturday. Please give me a call on Friday in case I have questions. Thank you!!

XXX XXXX
President
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.
XXXXXXXXXXXXX
xxx-xxx-xxxx

From: Johnson Chandler <jlchandl1@yahoo.com>
To: xxxxxxx07@yahoo.com
Sent: Mon, December 6, 2010 6:08:04 PM  
Subject: Fw: Sister in dire need of assistance

Note: Forwarded message is attached.
Johnson Chandler (jlchandl1@yahoo.com) was added to your Guest List by their request | Delete this guest

1. Re: Sister in dire need of assistance.eml