

Determinants of Organizational Politics in Professional Educational Institutes

–Kalpana Agrawal¹

ABSTRACT

Politics in organizations is a fact and we all have to live with. It ranges from the ostensibly harmless gossip in the corridor to the power games in the boardroom. Those who learn how to use it to their advantages are the ones who get ahead. In simple terms, politics is power in action. But power can be used positively as well as negatively. Sometimes politics is using underhand means and other manipulative behaviors like backstabbing, stealing of ideas, and scapegoat to achieve one's own goals. Negative organizational politics hampers creativity, productivity, fairness, motivation and teamwork. whereas healthy organizational politics generates competitive environment in an organization. Pressure to perform well above others, high competition for the rewards and promotions, and a thirst for power are the major causes that lead people to engage in organizational politics. The present study is an empirical attempt to identify the determinants of organizational politics in professional educational institutes. The study is exploratory in nature. The principle component method of factor analysis using varimax rotation was applied to identify the factors that determine the organizational politics in professional educational institutes. Statistical package of social science (SPSS) is used to analyze the primary data of the study. The findings of the study would be helpful for the top management of many professional educational institutes to understand the political dynamics of their institutes. The study would be equally useful for teaching and non-teaching staff of professional educational institutes. The study will also open the new vistas of research in the field of management.

Key Words: Organisational Politics, Personality, Repression

¹ Assistant Professor., Prestige Institute of Management and Research, Indore E-mail: muskan_mangal@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

Politics exists in all organizations, because all organizations are political systems and there are various agendas through out the environment. Pettinger (1996) emphasized that departments and their managers have secondary and hidden agenda, promoting themselves and their advancement while undertaking particular course of action. Hickson (1999) suggested that politics arises sooner or later in every kind of organization. Pfeffer (1981) defined politics as the way in which managers can attempt to control the decision-making process so that the organization pursues goals that support their interests. Pettigrew (1973) defined organizational politics as the activities in which managers are engaged in increasing their power and pursue goals that favour their individual and group interest. Allen et al., (1979) defined organizational politics as intentional acts of influence to enhance or protect the self interests of individuals or group.

Organizational Politics are the efforts of social actors (individual or corporate) to strengthen or defend their power positions and to exercise influence over goals, policies, rules, everyday routines, and events that are internal or external to organizations. When most people are asked their view of politics in the workplace, they think immediately of those who use underhand means, and indulge in other manipulative behaviour—backstabbing, stolen ideas, and scapegoating to achieve their own goals.

Political behavior is *outside* one's specified job requirements. The behavior requires some attempt to use one's *power* bases. Additionally, this definition encompasses -efforts to influence the goals, criteria, or processes used for *decision making* when we state that politics is concerned with distribution of advantages and disadvantages within the organization. The political behaviour is of two types" legitimate and illegitimate" Legitimate political behavior refers to normal everyday politics-complaining to supervisor, by passing the chain of command, forming coalitions, obstructing organizational policies or decisions through inaction or excessive adherence to rules, and developing contacts outside the organization through one's professional activities. However, there are also illegitimate political behaviors that violate extreme political behavior that violates the implied rules of the game. Those who pursue such extreme activities are implied rules of the game, often described as individuals who play hardball. Illegitimate activities include sabotage, whistle-blowing, and symbolic protests such as wearing unorthodox dress or protest buttons and groups of employees (Robbins 1995).

Kreitner (1995) defined organizational politics as intentional acts to influence to enhance or protect the self-interest of individuals or groups. Managers are endlessly challenged to achieve a workable balance between employee's self-interest and organizational interest. Researchers have documented the political tactics of filtering and distorting information flowing up to the boss. The self-surveying practice put the reporting employees in the best possible light. Experts say America's global competitiveness is threatened by unmanaged organizational politics. Field research evidence in the area of organizational politics is slowly accumulating three particulars. A follow-up research report on the sample of Southern California electronics industry managers provided the following insights:-

- Sixty percent of managers reported organizational politics was a frequent occurrence.
- The larger the organization the greater perceived political activity.
- Ambiguous roles and goals increased political activity.
- Marketing staff members of corporate boards of directors were rated as the most political, while production, accounting and finance personnel were viewed as the least political.
- Reorganizations and Personnel changes promoted the most political activities.
- To compete for the scarce resources and increase chance of promotion and their share in organizational resources, people try to increase their power and influence.

Without constant vigilance organizational politics can get out of hand and prevent the organization from achieving its goals. For this reason organization must try to manage organizational politics to promote positive effects and prevent destructive effects. To understand how organization can manage politics, we need to know look at the practice the managers used to increase their individual power and power of their divisions (George, 1996).

Greenberg (1999) said that managers often control the punishing others or have coercive power. Subordinates may do what their superior desires because they fear the superior will punish them if they do not. Punishments may include pay-cuts, demotions, suspensions, without pay, formal reprimands, undesirable work assignments and the like.

Thus to escape the above, undesirable work assignments and the like subordinate use some kind of politics. Gandz and Murray found

that the most likely areas of political activity were in interdepartmental coordination, promotions and transfers and delegation of authority.

A survey by Allen and his associates revealed similar findings. They also found that organization was perceived as more political at the higher levels and less political at the lower managerial and non-managerial levels of the organization. Political tactics include:

- Controlling access to information.
- Cultivating a favorable impression.
- Developing a base of support.
- Blaming and attacking others.
- Aligning oneself with more powerful others.
- Creating networks of influential people and take political advantage of making friends.
- Acting like “Organizational Chameleons” -Changing behavior according to the situation.
- Grabbing every opportunity to increase one’s visibility.
- Filtering, hiding and sometimes giving misleading information to others.
- Stealing others’ ideas.
- Taking credit for the work done by others.
- Manipulating people in order to get undue advantage.
- Self-projection - Always projecting oneself in a favorable way in order to secure rewards and other privileges.
- Coalition building - Building influential networks to promote self-interests.
- Turning others against you.
- Denial of organizational support.
- Creating conflict between an employee and his superior.

When making decisions about the hiring and promotions of others people are likely to take in to account not only the effects of these decisions on the organization, but also their impact on their own careers. The conditions leading to political activities are likely to differ as the function of the stage of the organization’s life. When an organization is newly begun, it may have no politics, however, as organization mature and become more complex, they tend to grow and training to departmentalize, creating conditions in which the vested interest of different groups are likely to conflict. Political means may be used to gain an advantage in such a situation.

Hann and Freeman found it is particularly interesting to note that when organization begins to decline, subunits may be quite insecure and the need for political action may be great as people and group compete for the power to control the organization. A period of decline reflects a time of great uncertainty and thus a period in which political activity is likely to intense.

How do Different People Respond to Office Politics?

It is said that one of the abilities of effective managers is political savvy. They accept the inevitability of organizational politics and adjust their attitude and actions so as not to be victimized by unethical politics in the workplace. By assessing behavior in a political framework, they can predict the actions of others and use this information to formulate political strategies that will gain advantages for them and their work units. Political savvy is observed in people with a high emotional intelligence. Thus, those who are more self-aware, have greater self-control, are high on empathy, and have good communication and social skills. They are known to be more politically astute and better able to handle office politics than those who are not. They are more aware of the political terrain than their less astute colleagues, who, being less wary, could be victims of political landmines. They learn the system, and work round it when they can. To be able to determine the requirements of each situation and each person one faces, and to select just the right approach.

FACTORS INFLUENCING POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

Various researches and observations have identified a number of factors that appear to encourage political behavior. Some are individual characteristics, derived from the unique qualities of the people the organization employs; others are a result of the organization's culture or internal environment. The factors given below illustrates which (both individual and organizational factors) are responsible for increasing political behavior in the organization.

Individual factors which affect Organizational Politics are: High self monitors, Internal locus of control, High need for power, Investment in the organization, Expectations of future benefits, Expectations of success in politics. At the individual level, researchers have identified certain personality traits, needs, and other factors that are likely to be related to

political behavior. In terms of traits, we find that employees who are high self-monitors, possess an internal locus of control, and have a high need for power are more likely to engage in political behavior. The high self-monitor is more sensitive to social cues, exhibits higher levels of social conformity, and is more likely to be highly skilled in political behavior than the low self-monitor. Individuals with an internal locus of control, because they believe they can control their environment, are more prone to take a proactive stance and attempt to manipulate situations in their favor. And, not surprisingly, the Machiavellian personality—which is characterized by the will to manipulate and the desire for power—is comfortable using politics as a means to further his or her self-interest.

Additionally, an individual's investment in the organization, perceived alternatives, and expectations of success will influence the degree to which he or she will pursue illegitimate means of political action. The more a person has invested in the organization in terms of expectations of increased future benefits, the more a person has to lose if forced out and the less likely he or she is to use illegitimate means. The more alternative job opportunities an individual has—due to a favorable job market or the possession of scarce skills or knowledge, a prominent reputation, or influential contacts outside the organization—the more likely he or she is to risk illegitimate political actions. Also, if an individual has a low expectation of success in using illegitimate means, it is unlikely he or she will attempt them. High expectations of success in the use of illegitimate means are most likely to be the province of both experienced and powerful individuals with polished political skills and inexperienced and naive employees who misjudge their chances.

Organizational factors which affect organizational Politics are: Declining resources, Low trust, Role ambiguity, Unclear evaluation system and lack of transparency, Promotion decisions—people compete for limited resources and try to positively influence the decision outcome, Zero-sum reward-allocation practices, High pressures for performance.

Self-serving senior managers. Political activity is probably more a function of the organization's characteristics than of individual difference variables. Why? Because many organizations have a large number of employees with the individual characteristics we listed, yet the extent of political behavior varies widely. While we acknowledge the role that individual differences can play in fostering politicking, the evidence more strongly supports that certain situations and cultures promote politics. More specifically, when an organization's resources are declining, when the existing pattern of resources is changing, and when there is

opportunity for promotions, politics is more likely to surface. In addition, cultures characterized by low trust, role ambiguity, unclear performance evaluations stems zero-sum reward allocations practices, democratic decision making, high pressures performance, and self-serving senior-managers will create breeding grounds for politicking.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Politics is a means of recognizing and, ultimately, reconciling competing interests within the organization. Competing interests can be reconciled by any number of means. For example, resorting to “rule by the manager” might be seen as an example of totalitarian rule. On the other hand, politics may be a means of creating a noncoercive, or a democratic work environment.

As mentioned, organizations need mechanisms whereby they reconcile conflicting interests. Hence, organizations, like governments, tend to “rule” by some sort of “system”. This “system” is employed to create and maintain “order” among the organization’s members. Systems of rule within organizations range from autocratic to democratic at the extremes. Between these extremes we find bureaucratic and technocratic systems. Whatever the system, each represents a political orientation with respect to how power is applied and distributed throughout the organization. Each type of organizational “rule” simply draws on different principles of legitimacy.

According to Aristotle, politics stems from a diversity of interests. To fully understand the politics of the organization, it is necessary to explore the processes by which people engage in politics. Consistent with Aristotle’s conceptualization, it is a given that, within the organization, all employees bring their own interests, wants, desires, and needs to the workplace.

Organizational decision-making and problem- solving, while seemingly a rational process, is also a political process. Organizational actors seek to satisfy not only organizational interests, but also their own wants and needs; driven by self-interest.

Members of a corporation are at one and the same time cooperators in a common enterprise and rivals for the material and intangible rewards of successful competition with each other. (Farrell and Peterson, 1982)

Political behavior has been defined as: The Non-rational influence on decision making .Regardless of the degree to which employees may be committed to the organization’s objectives, there can be little doubt that, at

least occasionally, personal interests will be incongruent with those of the organization. Organizational politics arises when people think differently and want to act differently.

The tension created by this diversity can be resolved by political means. In an autocratic organization, resolution comes through the directive: "We'll do it our way!". The democratic organization seeks to resolve this diversity of interests by asking: "How shall we do it?" By whatever means an organization resolves this diversity, alternative approaches generally hinge on the power relations between the actors involved.

Nahavandi and Malekzadeh (1999) contended that as uncertainty in the organization increases, the usefulness of rational approaches decreases. Information becomes scarce, objectives change often and goals often conflict, making careful analysis and prediction difficult. Under these conditions, political activity increases. The emotion neutral dimension also plays a role on the use of politics. Prerffer (1999) argues that politics are necessary if organization is to function effectively. The concept of two faces of politics i.e. negative and positive handle the two sides of the phenomena in our common experience. Some organization reflects a mostly negative face of politics.

Organizational politics tend to be associated with the decision making, resource allocation and conflicts resolution processes in the organizations. These are key decision points; these are areas where actors of organization win and lose; these are where the goods are distributed and the goals are decided. Bums (1961) opined that when jobs are scarce organizational politics is high. Jennings (1967) found that with the rise in hierarchy people try to engage more in political behaviour. George and Jones (2002) concluded that without constant vigilance, organizational politics can prevent the organization from achieving its goals. Organizations must try to manage organizational politics to promote positive effects and prevent destructive effects. Eliminating political behaviour is not possible. It has to be managed. Zalenznik (1989) remarked that people can focus their attention on so many things. The more it lands on politics, the less energy both emotional and intellectual is available to attend to the problems that fall under the heading of real work. Farnell and Peterson (1982) referred politics to those activities that are not required as part of one's formal role in the organization, but that influence or attempt to influence the distribution of advantage; and disadvantages within the organization (Dhar and Dhar, 2007)

A research report from Koffev Dirk, published in 2002, found that office politics can reduce organizational productivity, create a lack of trust, increase internal conflict, and lead to greater resistance to change. People who don't get recognized for their performance feel demotivated and have a lower morale. Negative organizational politics hampers creativity, productivity, fairness, motivation, teamwork, and a host of other critical issues that almost everybody knows but is not allowed to speak about in the official hierarchy. Consequently, business politics is driven underground where people are left to fend for themselves.

According to Farrell and Peterson (1982), the successful practice of organizational politics is perceived to lead to a higher level of power, and once a higher level of power is attained, there is more opportunity to engage in political behaviour. As Harry Truman said "Politics is the art of getting things done" and Churchill said, "When you mix people and power, you get politics." Hierarchies are full of power. Organization politics is how power and interests play out in the organization. One thing is certain, they will play out.

One thing does appear to be clear: the political element of the management process is non-rational. Organizations cannot pretend to engage in rational decision-making processes so long as political influences play a role -- and they always will. For purposes of understanding organizational political behavior, Farrell and Peterson (1982) proposed a three-dimensional typology. The dimensions are:

- Where the political activity takes place -- inside or outside the organization,
- The direction of the attempted influence -- vertically or laterally in the organization, and
- The legitimacy of the political action.

Damaging Outcomes of Organizational Politics

Kumar(2004)writes the most damaging aspect of organizational politics is pollution of healthy work culture. The polluted work culture in turn encourages people to engage in organizational politics. Trust gets eroded. As a result, people do not collaborate with one another. Competitive spirit dominates over cooperative spirit, which then leads to hiding of information by the employees. Above all, organizational learning does not occur. The people most affected by the politics are those who score low on Machiavellian scale and those who are highly principled in their behavior.

Unable to cope with politics, they either develop frustration or leave the organization. In general, the negative effects of organizational politics will manifest in the following ways:

- Mistrust among the employees.
- Competitive spirit would dominate over cooperative spirit.
- Lack of coordination.
- Hiding information, giving false or misleading information.
- Employees would look for opportunities to advance their self-interest, thus forgetting organizational goals.
- Employees tend to look at top-management with suspicion.
- Top-performers will be overshadowed due to politics and as a result would leave.
- Organization will become breeding ground for many unethical behaviors.
- Loss of productivity.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To study Organizational Politics.
2. To study the constituent factors of Organizational Politics.

Research Methodology

The study was exploratory in nature. The data was collected through self developed questionnaire of Organizational Politics.

Sampling Plan

Universe: Professional Institutes imparting Higher education.

Sampling Unit: Faculty and Administrator of Professional Institutes.

Sampling Method: The sample for the study was selected using randomized purposive quota sampling method from different hierarchical levels.

SAMPLE SIZE: 225

A Sample of 225 Faculty and Administrator belonging to Professional Institutes imparting Engineering, Systems/IT, and/or Management Education, with at least one completed year of service was selected. The

procedure of selection of Faculty and Administrators as respondents for the study was randomized purposive quota sampling was adopted. The Faculty Positions in any Institute are in the ratio of 1:2:4 in hierarchical order and same proportion was used while selecting the sample.

Tools for Data Collection

After reviewing relevant literature on the subject, certain factors were identified which contribute towards Organizational Politics, keeping these factors as the basis, an instrument of 54 items was developed.

The collected data was analyzed using factor analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The raw data of 54 items were subjected to factor analysis to find out the factors that contribute towards Organizational Politics. In the first order factor analysis, 14 factors were identified. To further consolidate the factors and have a focused insight of the dimensions that contribute towards Organizational Politics, 14 factors were subjected to second order factor analysis wherein 5 dimensions were identified:

Dimension1: Impression Management: This dimension is constituted of seven Factors, Promotion policies(Factor2), Impression Management(Factor1), Backbiting(Factor4), Inaction(Factor5) Unfair Practices(Factor8), Building Coalitions(Factor10), Self-interest(Factor7), with a total factor load of 9.7227 and this dimension has covered 22.089 percent variance. Further it is composition of, People in this organization try to gain confidence of top management(item34), People within organization use whatever influence they can to taint the facts to support their own goals and interests(item36),. Even if an objective is aimed at serving one's own interests, people frame arguments in terms of organizational goals(item35), People pretend to be good to grab all possible advantages(item32), People pose to be close to the top management (item14), People in this organization build relations that will make their career blossom(item13), Some employees obstruct implementation of policies through inaction(item37), People in this organization try to defend their power positions(item42), People in this organization exercise influence over everyday routines(item41), People in this organization exercise influence over policies(item33), People in this organization project themselves than to work(item12), Co-workers offer assistance to get something

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Item Load</i>	<i>Factor Load</i>	<i>Pact of Var.</i>
Impression Management	34, 36, 35, 32, 14, 13, 37, 42, 41, 33, 12, 18, 20, 43, 38, 39	.741, .657, .653, 628, .594, .562, .549, .498,.496,.480,.449,.431,.421,.409,.383,.381	1302.978	26.807
	Promotion policies	.823,.806,.745,.744,.711,.692,.480,.444	0.5445	6.929
	Opportunism	.748,.722,.650,.549	2.669	4.023
	Backbiting	.740,.660,.642,.431,.401	2.874	3.291
	Inaction	.656,.609,.561,.481	2.307	3.046
	Repression	.711,.635,.571,.444	2.361	2.839
Self-interest	4, 40	.655,.444	1.099	2.771
Unfair Practices	31, 30	.715,.510	1.225	2.551
Self-serving senior managers	45, 46	.829,.586	1.415	2.437
Building Coalitions	1, 2	.757,.600	1.357	2.310
Conspiracy	19,21	.585,.426	1.011	2.084
Self-protection	22	.747	.747	2.070

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Item Load</i>	<i>Factor Load</i>	<i>Pact of Var.</i>
Informal channels	11	.785	.785	2.010
Organizational	28	.845	.845	1.908
Total				65.076

<i>Factor Second Order</i>	<i>Factor First Order</i>	<i>Factor Load</i>	<i>Total Factor Load</i>	<i>Pact of Var.</i>
D I	2,1,4,5,7,8,10,7	0.5445, 1302.978, 2.874, 2.307, 0.785, 1.357, 0.747	9.7227	22.089
D II	6,3	2.361, 2.669	5.03	9.099
D III	14,13	0.845, 0.785	1.63	8.476
D IV	12, 11	0.747, 1.011	0.758	7.631
D V	9	1.415	1.415	7.316
Total				54.611

out of it(item18),People do not hesitate in backbiting (item20),People deceive their colleagues for their self interests(item43),Preferential treatment in allocating resources lead to perceived inequity. (item38), Politics in this organization is a fact, all have to live with—from the ostensibly harmless gossip in the corridor to the power games of the boardroom (item39) in the descending order of factor loads. Politics are the efforts of social actors(individual or corporate) to strengthen or defend their power positions and to exercise influence over goals, policies, rules, everyday routines, and events that are internal or external to organizations or using underhand means , and indulge in other manipulative behaviour—backstabbing, stolen ideas, and scapegoating to achieve their own goals. Pressure to perform well above others, high competition for the rewards and promotions, and a thirst for power are the major causes that lead people to engage in organizational politics. The process by which individuals attempt to control the impression others form of them is called impression management.

Dimension 2: Repression: This dimension is constituted of two factors, Repression(factor6), Opportunism(factor 3) with a total factor load of 5.03 and this dimension has covered 9.099 percent variance. Further it is composition of ,Employees are required to speak as per the wish of supervisor(item 48),Employees unite together to resist the demands of the boss(item 49)Supervisor who want employees to follow their directions keep their employees threatened(item47),People in this organization exercise influence over events(item 50)in the descending order of factor loads.

Greenberg (1999) said that managers often control the punishing others or have coercive power. The coercive power base is defined by French and Raven(1995) as being dependent on fear. One reacts to this power out of fear of the negative results that might occur if one failed to comply. in the descending order of factor loads.

Dimension 3:Informal Channels: This dimension is constituted of factors, Organizational Chameleons (factor 14), Informal channels (factor 13) with a total factor load of 1.63 and this dimension has covered 8.476 percent variance. Further it is composition of Supervisor communicates with some employees positively only in the presence of others(item 28),People in this organization believe in developing informal information channels(item 11) in the descending order of factor loads. According to Robbins powerful allies helps to have powerful people in one's camp. Cultivating contacts with potentially influential people above one, at

his own level, and in the lower ranks. They can provide with important information that may not be available through normal channels. Additionally, there will be times when decisions will be made in favor of those with the greatest support. Having powerful allies can provide one with a coalition of support if and when one needs it. Robbins(1995).

Dimension 4:Self Protection: This dimension is constituted of two factors, Self-protection (factor 12), Conspiracy(factor 11) with a total factor load of 1.758 and this dimension has covered 7.631 percent variance. Further it is composition of, Mostly the feedback given by the immediate boss appears to be directed at helping employees, is actually intended to protect himself/herself(item 22),Some people are habitual of conspiring against their superiors irrespective of a person in such a position(item 19),People in the organization exercise influence over rules, in the descending order of factor loads.

Organizational politics includes protection of self-interest as well as promotion. Individuals often engage in reactive and protective “defensive” behaviors to avoid action, blame, or change.This kind of common behaviour varieties are defensive behaviors, classified by their objective.(Robbins 1995)

Dimension 5:Self serving Senior Managers: This dimension is constituted of one factor, Self Serving senior managers(factor 9) with a total factor load of 1.415 and this dimension has covered 7.316 percent variance. Further it is composition of, Supervisor in this organization do things with employees off the job in order to improve the relationship at work(item45),Supervisor use all means to keep the subordinates happy(item 46) in the descending order of factor loads.

Suggestions

People engage in politics mainly because they lack knowledge, skills and the right kind of attitude to pursue organizational goal. When straightforward options are closed for them, they find politicking the easiest option to move up in the hierarchy. Hence, training programs should be arranged to increase competency among the employees.

Overcoming Organizational Politics can be done by anyone using the right methods and attitudes. One does not need special skills to excel in an organization, but need to create a win-win situation for the corporation and himself.

Managing Organizational Politics

- After realizing the motives behind politicking and the tactics employed in organizational politics, one needs to behave proactively in order to protect himself/herself from being entangled by the political web.
- Cultivating democratic work culture.
- Integration of personal and organizational goals should be there.
- Organization should be a Learning organization where competency, learning, and knowledge management is given due importance.
- Also OCTAPACE Culture should be cultivated.
- Involving people in the decision-making process helps remove fear and ambiguity or doubts over the organizational actions from the minds of the people.
- One should not believe in all the communication. One should check the source and veracity before acting upon it.
- Whenever one does a great job ensure that the right people's attention is drawn to it. also rewards should be performance based.
- Fair Promotion policies and job description should be an integral part of HR Policies.
- Developing mutually beneficial relationship with everyone.
- Rigorous training programs should be arranged from time to time to increase competency among the employees because it has been observed that most of the time people engage in politics mainly because they lack knowledge, skills and the right kind of attitude to pursue organizational goal. When straightforward options are closed for them, they find politicking the easiest option to move up in the hierarchy.
- Be trustworthy and trust others.
- Those who perpetuate politics should be confronted.
- Many a times, we can measure the level of politicking in an organization by the amount of time people spend on gossiping. Gossiping should be discouraged.
- One should not try to insult or injure others deliberately.
- Misunderstanding others as well as being misunderstood by others is the surest means to fall victim to political game. One should not try to behave like a "black-box"-full of mystery surrounding him rather one should allow others to know more about him by revealing what matters to him. Thus by removing communication gap by

interacting and checking one's perceptions one can improve understanding with others.

- A clear understanding of that is expected of an employee by the employer and linking personal goal with organizational goal will help to work without any ambiguity.
- Show professionalism in every aspect of work life.
- Focusing on improving one's competency and having professional attitude are the strongest weapons that can be used by an individual to combat organizational politics. Politics is not an ugly game as long as it helps organizations to achieve its goals, and thereby personal goals, without negatively affecting any of the stakeholder's interest in the organization.
- The role of top-management is very crucial in nurturing politics-free healthy climate.
- Top executives should act as role-models in this regard. An organization infected with politics could be a haven for the 'opportunists' but not for the competent people. Competent people believe in continuous learning and stretch their goals slightly above their competence level and work earnestly to achieve them. Hence transparency should be maintained in all the personnel related decisions like selection, compensation, promotion. Transparency is possible only when these decisions are taken objectively. The more transparency is maintained in an organization, the more is removed the power to manipulate others from the hands of the politickers.
- Though it is dreamt of creating an organization that is totally free from politics, it is impossible to create one. Wherever resources are scarce, and power imbalances exist, politics is bound to creep in. Everyone at some or the other stage in their organizational life has to cope with organizational politics. Hence, it is wise to manage politics effectively so that one does not fall prey to its evil game of power. Being professional in every aspect of work life is the best way to effectively tackle organizational politics.
- Everyone should try to achieve win-win outcomes in all situations.
- Strict actions should be taken against those involve in spreading rumors.
- There should be strong emphasis on Competency
- One should not upstage one's boss, neither undermine, also not to speak negative of boss.

- One should not jump the channels of communication.
- One should consider the subordinates well and one should avoid making enemies.
- One should try to be positively popular i.e. is one should not talk ill of any person, always talk good of others specially when they are not present.
- Learn to be persuasive without being arrogant: One should develop a friendly persuasive technique. Forceful arguments when stated eloquently are often highly effective in influencing others as well as gaining respect for intelligence and ability.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

A research report from Koffev Dirk, published in 2002, found that office politics can reduce organizational productivity, create a lack of trust, increase internal conflict, and lead to greater resistance to change. People who don't get recognized for their performance feel demotivated and have a lower morale.

Negative organizational politics hampers creativity, productivity, fairness, motivation, teamwork, and a host other critical issues that almost everybody knows but is not allowed to speak about in the official hierarchy. Consequently, business politics is driven underground where people are left to fend for themselves. Organizational politics tend to be associated with the decision making, resource allocation and conflicts resolution processes in the organizations. These are key decision points; these are areas where actors of organization win and lose; these are where the goods are distributed and the goals are decided.

Without constant vigilance organizational politics can get out of hand and prevent the organization from achieving its goals. For this reason organization must try to manage organizational politics to promote positive effects and prevent destructive effects. To understand how organization can manage politics, we need to know look at the practice the managers used to increase their individual power and power of their divisions.(George,1996). Prerffer (1999) argues that politics are necessary if organization is to function effectively. The concept of two faces of politics i.e. negative and positive handle the two sides of the phenomena in our common experience. Some organization reflects a mostly negative face of politics.

Eliminating political behaviour is not possible. It has to be managed. Zalenznik (1989) remarked that people can focus their attention on so

many things. The more it lands on politics, the less energy both emotional and intellectual is available to attend to the problems that fall under the heading of real work. Farnell and Peterson (1982) referred politics to those activities that are not required as part of one's formal role in the organization, but that influence or attempt to influence the distribution of advantage; and disadvantages within the organization (Dhar and Dhar, 2007)

What is the best way to fight the pernicious influence of negative politics given the fact that one cannot wish away its existence? According to Mark Holden, the best way is to build a positive political climate. Competence, confidence, credibility and trust are the important pillars of building a positive political climate in an organization. They provide the necessary inputs to ensure that deserving employees get the recognition and reward that are legitimately due to them. Competence implies having the right academic qualification and an ability to perform a given task. An employee needs to build a reputation for his competence by excelling in by giving the desired output to the organization. It could be meeting the sales target, analyzing the complex set financial statements or meeting the production schedules. A job well done always speaks for itself, not withstanding the fact that negative politics might be in operation. Once an individual is able to establish his/her job competence through actual job performance, others will begin to trust his/her judgment and rely on his/her ideas. An atmosphere of credibility and trust is generated in which the individual is able to exercise positive influence on others. The degree to which a person will be able to exert positive influence on others will significantly hinge on the actual competence as well as the degree of credibility and trust. The degree of positive influence over others is the lubricant that ensures the smooth functioning and free movement of the wheel of positive politics.

REFERENCES

- Biberman, G. (1985). Personality and Characteristic Work Attitudes of Persons with High, Moderate, and Low Political Tendencies. *Psychological Reports*, October, pp. 1303-1310.
- Dewan, P. & Agrawal, L. N. (1998). *Organizational Behaviour*. New Delhi: Excel Printers.
- Fincham, & Rhodes. (1999). *Principles of Organizational Behaviour*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- GreenBerg & Baron (1999). *Behaviour in Organization*, New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.
- Hellrigel, S. & Woodman. (1999). *Organization Behaviour*, Canada: South Western College.
- Holden, M. (2003). *The Use and Abuse of Office Politics*. New Delhi: Viva Books Private Limited.
- Jhones, G. (1996). *Organization Behaviour*, U.S.: Harper Collins College.
- Kreitner. & Kincichi. (1995). *Organization Behaviour*, London: Richard and Irwin Inc.
- Kumar, S. S. (2004). Effective Management of Organizational Politics. *HRM Review*, 4(10).
- Luthans, F. (1995). *Organizational Behaviour*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Mathur, V. P. (2007). Office Politics the Biggest Contributor to Workplace Stress. *Business Manager*, June.
- Newstrom, J. W. & Davis, K. (2002). *Human Behaviour at Work: Organisational Behaviour*. Singapore: McGraw Hill.
- Raju P. V. L. (2004). Coping with Office Politics. *HRM Review*, 4(10).
- Robbins, P. (2002). *Organizational Behavior*. Prentice-Hall.
- Wagen. & Hollenbeck. (1992). *Management of Organization Behaviour*. London: Prentice Hall International.
- Weiss, J. (2001). *Organization Behaviour and Change*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

APPENDIX 1

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am working on the study of interpersonal relationship in organizations, I therefore, request you to spare few minutes to provide your opinion on various aspects of relationships in your organization. The present exercise is for academic purpose only and the information provided by you will not be disclosed to anyone. For your opinion there are some statements with five choices ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Please give your rating for each statement according to the strength of your agreement or disagreement with the statement.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree
5	4	3	2
Strongly Disagree			
1			

1. People in this organization try to improve their bargaining positions by building coalitions.
2. People bend rules to their advantage.
3. Rewards come only to those who work hard in this organization.
4. People deliberately distort requests by others for purposes of personal gain either by withholding them or by selectively reporting them.
5. The rules and policies concerning promotion are fair.
6. Fair evaluation is normal practice in this organization.
7. People enjoy exercising authority over colleagues.
8. People here live with a double face.
9. Employees criticize for the sake of criticism.
10. Manipulation is an acceptable way of functioning here.
11. People in this organization believe in developing informal information channels.
12. People in this organization project themselves than to work.
13. People in this organization build relations that will make their career blossom.
14. People pose to be close to the top management.
15. Rumors are spreaded in this organization.
16. People often withhold key information from decision makers.

17. Some people cannot help but to crack jokes targeted at their own colleagues.
18. Co-workers offer assistance to get something out of it.
19. Some people are habitual of conspiring against their superiors irrespective of a person in such a position.
20. People do not hesitate in backbiting.
21. People in the organization try to break rules
22. Mostly the feedback given by the immediate boss appears to be directed at helping employees, is actually intended to protect himself/herself.
23. Pay policies are generally communicated in this organization.
24. The rules and policies concerning promotion are specific and well defined.
25. Promotion policies are generally communicated in this organization.
26. Promotion always go to best performers.
27. Policies concerning pay are specific and well defined.
28. Supervisor communicates with some employees positively only in the presence of others
29. People who don't speak against wrong seem to do "better" here than those who speak.
30. Employees are discouraged to speak frankly when they are critical of well established ideas
31. Supervisors stimulate unfair competition among ambitious subordinates.
32. People pretend to be good to grab all possible advantages.
33. People in this organization exercise influence over policies.
34. People in this organization try to gain confidence of top management.
35. Even if an objective is aimed at serving one's own interests, people frame arguments in terms of organizational goals.
36. People within organization use whatever influence they can to taint the facts to support their own goals and interests.
37. Some employees obstruct implementation of policies through inaction.
38. Preferential treatment in allocating resources lead to perceived inequity.
39. Politics in this organization is a fact, all have to live with-from the ostensibly harmless gossip in the corridor to the power games of the boardroom.

40. People in this organization exercise influence over goals.
41. People in this organization exercise influence over everyday routines
42. People in this organization try to defend their power positions.
43. People deceive their colleagues for their self interests.
44. People in this organization criticize other employee's good performance.
45. Supervisor in this organization do things with employees off the job in order to improve the relationship at work.
46. Supervisor use all means to keep the subordinates happy.
47. Supervisor who want employees to follow their directions keep their employees threatened by developing coalitions.
48. Employees who are required to speak as per the wish of supervisor develop coalitions.
49. Employees unite together to resist the demands of the boss.
50. People in this organization exercise influence over events.
51. The performance appraisal ratings people receive from their supervisors reflect more of the supervisors' own agenda.
52. Preferential treatment in allocating resources lead to consequent political behaviour.
53. People interfere in the matters of other departments for personal gains.
54. People in this organization are opportunistic.

Kindly Provide The Following Information

1. Public/Private organization: _____
2. Designation: _____
3. Gender: _____
4. Age: _____
5. Married/Unmarried: _____
6. Total Experience in Management Institutes: _____
7. Experience with Current Institute: _____