ORGANIZATIONAL CRONYISM LEADERSHIP AND FOLLOWERS' PERFORMANCE

Yasir Hayat Mughal
College of Public Health and Health Informatics, Al-Bukayriyah,
Qassim University, Al-Qassim, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: hbl_rulz@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: *the purpose of this study is to find the level of cronyism, leadership and followers' performance. The survey was used for the collection of cross-sectional data. The population of this study was all the employees working in the administration department of the health sector. 320 questionnaires were distributed. 20 questionnaires were not returned and 14 were incomplete. A total of 286 completed questionnaires were used in the analysis. Results indicated that the level of cronyism was low as compared to leadership styles and performance. Because health is a sensitive sector and deals with the lives of human beings. So there was cronyism that exists but at a low level.*

Keywords: Organizational Cronyism, Leadership Styles, Employee Performance.

INTRODUCTION

Cronyism is a Greek word it means long term friendship and relationship. In 1952 in the USA first time, this word was used in the political field. The administration of Turman was alleged to select their close friends and relatives in official administration. After that word cronyism was linked with favoritism and nepotism and context and meaning of this word are changed [1]. It looks like cronyism is a political word but organizations are not free from favoritism and nepotism. In an organizational setting, it means extensive misuse of power and bestowing benefits to dear ones [2]. in organizational setting cronyism means violation fo merit and decisions are made on the subjective basis, not objective [2].

There are two types of organizational cronyism has been reported. Horizontal and vertical organizational cronyism horizontal cronyism means favoring at the same level while vertical cronyism favoring supervisor, leader, manager and high ups [3].

Vertical cronyism has many types such as favoring employees on a subjective basis and providing undue promotion and flexible working hours in organizations [4].

Nepotism

It's a Latin word it means nephew. When in churches pops used to gave benefits to blood relations and relatives. It is totally misused of power, authority, and resources just to bestow benefits and privileges to family and relatives. Nepotism has a direct effect on human resource management practices when managers having a high level of cronyism and nepotism hire and induct their own family relatives on a subjective basis and in return the performance of employees reduced and its affect on reputation of organization and performance [5].

Patronage and Political Cronyism

This is another form of favoritism in which political leaders have relationships with the bureaucracy of public organizations and provide them a favor for supporting them in a political campaign. Leadership and bureaucracy may have an inclination towards some political leaders and parties and which may affect their decision while the time of hiring and decision making. When there is an imbalance in power and authority of the leader and follower such organizations may have a high level, environment, and culture of cronyism [Zhang, 2015; 6].

Full Range Leadership Theory

Bass and Avoli [7] developed this full-range leadership theory and also developed the instrument to measure the full range of leadership theory. The name of this scale was MLQ multifactor leadership Questionnaire. This scale has 45 items. Basically, this theory has three main attributes. Transformational Leadership style has five facets inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, idealized influence behavior, and attribute and individual consideration. These five constructs have 20 items four items for each. Transactional leadership style has three facets contingent rewards, management by exception active and passive these constructs have 12 items four items for each. And last is laissez-faire consisting of 13 items.

Research conducted by Yukl [8] revealed that leadership style has a direct and positive effect on employee performance as well as organizational performance. Research also indicated that transformational leadership is the more effective style of leadership and mostly used style by leaders, managers, and supervisors. Ins some organizations transactional leadership also plays a significant role in enhancing the performance of followers but laissez-faire is considered the most destructive style of leadership so most of the researchers reluctant to sue this style of leadership [9].

Followers' Performance

Kelly [10] introduced the concept of followership. Leaders without followers are nothing and followers have a direct effect on the policies of leaders and leaders' policies have a direct effect on followers' performance. Busari [11] investigated that researchers have used employees instead of followers so followers need recognition and they must be studied as followers are the most ignored and overlooked area in management literature and organizational settings. So in this study followers performance is investigated with leadership styles and organizational cronyism. What is the effect of cronyism on followers' performance? The research revealed that leadership has a positive relationship with followers' performance [12]. Another study revealed that leadership has a significant relationship with employee performance [13].

Research Methodology

The survey is the most common method of data collection in social sciences research. There are two types of survey one is the quantitative and qualitative or deductive and inductive

approach. This study is quantitative in nature and adopted a deductive approach for data collection. As the researcher is positivist so believes in social reality [14]. It is cost and time effective. Nonprobability sampling is used and a sample of 269 was calculated from formula [13]. Descriptive statistics was used SPSS 25 was used for data analysis. All the questionnaires were adapted from previous studies of Shaheen [15] and for Khan et al., [9].

Analysis of Sector
From the Tale 1, it is revealed that there are 244 males and 42 females participated in this study, further analysis of results revealed that there were 165 participants from private sector organizations and 121 from public sector organizations.

Further mean scores on the basis of sector and gender are calculated in SPSS 25. It is indicated that for public sector followers highest mean score is recorded for transformational leadership style i.e. M=3.718, S.D=0.464, followed by laissez-faire M=3.658, S.D=0.546. while for private sector followers highest mean score is recorded for transformational leadership styles followed by transactional leadership and then laissez-faire style M=3.833, S.D=0.427, M=3.78, S.D=0.471, M=3.73, S.D=0.566.

Table 1: Demographic profile of the respondents

Variable	Characteristics	N	Transformational Leadership		Transactional Leadership		Laissez Faire	
			Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D
Sector	Public	121	3.718	0.464	3.595	0.475	3.658	0.546
	Private	165	3.833	0.427	3.780	0.471	3.732	0.566
Gender	Male	244	3.761	0.437	3.697	0.471	3.687	0.570
	Female	42	4.050	0.434	3.840	0.557	3.886	0.380

Table 2: Results of Organizational Cronyism

Variable	Characteristics	N	Organizational Cronyism	
			Mean	S.D
Sector	Public	121	2.959	0.7588
	Private	165	2.750	0.7911
Gender	Male	244	2.860	0.7867
	Female	42	2.445	0.649

Analysis Gender
Table 1 indicated the results of gender that for followers in organizations males' highest score is recorded for TFL M=3.761, S.D=0.437, followed by TRL M=3.69, S.D=0.471, and Laissez-faire M=3.68, S.D=0.570.Similarly for females highest score is recorded for TFL M=4.050,S.D=0.434, followed by laissez-faire M=3.886, S.D=0.380 and TRL M=3.840, S.D=0.557.
Table 2 indicated results or organizational cronyism. Results indicated that for public sector followers highest mean score is recorded M=2.959, while for private sector followers M=2.750, S.D=0.7911. for male followers, highest score is recorded for organizational cronyism i.e. M=2.860, S.D=0.786, for females it is M=2.445, S.D=0.649.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
The purpose of this study is to find the level of favoritism, nepotism and bestowing benefits and privileges by leaders to their blood relations and relatives and friends. The purpose of this study is to find the level of cronyism, leadership and followers' performance. The survey was used for the collection of cross-sectional data. The population of this study was all the employees working in the administration department of the health sector. 320 questionnaires were distributed. 20 questionnaires were not returned and 14 were incomplete. A total of 286 completed questionnaires were used in the analysis. Results indicated that the level of cronyism was low as compared to leadership styles and

performance. Because health is a sensitive sector and deals with the lives of human beings. So there was cronyism that exists but at a low level.

REFERENCES:
[1] Turan, A. Does the Perception of Organizational Cronyism Leads to Career Satisfaction or Frustration with Work? The Mitigating Role of Organizationall Commitment. Research in Applied Economics, 7(3), 14-30. (2015).
[2] Bankston, C. L. Punishing Immigrants: Policy, Politics, and Injustice. Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews, 43(4), 547-548. (2014).
[3] Riccucci, N. M. The pursuit of social equity in the federal government: A road less traveled?. PublicAdministration Review, 69(3), 373-382. (2009).
[4] Khatri, N., & Tsang, E. W. Antecedents and consequences of cronyism in organizations. Journal of Business Ethics, 43(4), 289-303. (2003).
[5] Pearce, J. L. Cronyism and nepotism are bad for everyone: The research evidence. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 8(01), 41-44. (2015).
[6] Zhang, Z. (2015). Crowding Out Meritocracy?-Cultural Constraints in Chinese Public Human Resource Management. Australian Journal of Public Admin-istration, 74(3), 270-282.

[7] Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. *MLQ Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Mind Garden, Redwood City. (1997).

[8] Yukl, G. A. *Leadership in organizations, 5th edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ:Prentice Hall. (2002).

[9] Sajjad, N.K., Busari, Y.H., Siti,M.A., Mughal, Y.H (2018) Followership Moderation Between the relationship of Transactioanl leadership style and Employees Reaction towards Organizational Change, Polish Journal of Management Studies. Vol 17 No 1, pp 131-143.

[10] Kelley, R. E. *The power of followership: How to create leaders people want to follow and followers who lead themselves*. New York: Currency and Doubleday. (1992).

[11] Busari, A.H. Leadership Effectiveness and cognitive style: Government linked companies GLCs Thesis Bradford University UK. (2011).

[12] Khan, M.J., Mughal, Y.H., Khattak, Z,Z, Inspirational motivation and employees performance: Moderating role of Cognitive Style Indicator, International Journal of Business Review, Viol 2 Issue 1. Pp78-87. (2017).

[13] Saeed. M., Mughal. Y.H Role of Transactional Leadership Style upon Performance: Mediating Role of Culture, Journal of Managerial Science, Vol. 12, No. 3. (2019)

[14] Saunders, M, Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. *Research methods for Business students, 3rd edition*. Harlow: Prentice Hall. (2003).

[15] Shaheen, S. Using Organizational Cronyism as an Explanatory Mechanism in the Relationship between Leader Member Exchange, Psychological Contracts and Outcomes: Moderating Role of Culture. Thesis Capital University Islamabad. (2017)