



## Research Journal of Social Sciences

ISSN: 1815-9125 EISSN: 2309-9631

JOURNAL home page: <http://www.aensiweb.com/RJSS>

2015 September; 8(7): pages 160-167.

Published Online 14 September 2015.

Research Article

# Political Behavior and the Consequences of Perceived Organizational Policies

<sup>1</sup>Afshin Ariaei and <sup>2</sup>Malikeh Beheshtifar

<sup>1</sup>Department of Management, Rafsanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Rafsanjan, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Assistant professor, Department of Management, Rafsanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Rafsanjan, Iran

Received: 23 July 2015; Revised: 28 August 2015; Accepted: 1 September 2015

Copyright © 2015 by authors and American-Eurasian Network for Scientific Information.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



### ABSTRACT

Having manpower in addition to tasks assigned in accordance with the job description to voluntarily take steps to increase the performance and is the spiritual of any organization. In this regard, political activity, there are inherent in all transactions, therefore, as one of the component organizations has attracted the attention of management researcher. Although political behavior can have positive or negative consequences, much research has focused on the negative aspects. This type of work environment that is divisive and detrimental threatens the overall organizational efficiency and effectiveness, and increasingly has negative impact on employees. Therefore, awareness of the prevention and limitation of constructing such behavior plays an important role.

*Key words: organizational politics, political behavior, perception, perception of organizational politics*

### INTRODUCTION

During more than three decades of political behavior in organizations is an important research area [1]. Different research results show that this behavior is an inevitable part of each human activity [2]. Employees, when asked about political behavior in the workplace, often it is related to "self-serving behaviors" [3] and to consider as something dirty [4] that the researcher's personal goals at the expense of others And may be harmful to the organization or individual [5] Accordingly, such behavior is considered a potential threat to the effectiveness of organizational efficiency. For example, when an employee improved intotop post, in situations where

there are more qualified people and caused damage to his personal reputation and their position is non-functional implications for numerous organizations if the employee has a pleasant feel deceived her organizational policies may be negative reactions such as frustration, disappointment, anxiety and moving [6]. On the other hand it's important that organizations are social systems that work within them must be aware of the way to work. Conflicts in the workplace are inevitable. Some may have a collision with colleagues and other people from the hands of managers are upset. When people with the policies and strategies organizations cannot reactions and behavior of the organization itself become unacceptable. A significant portion of the research to

identify variables predictive dedicated organizational behavior [7] including the perception of organizational politics. Therefore, in order to anticipate and combat the potential negative consequences of political behavior for organizations and individuals to understand the factors that cause this behavior are important.

*Political behavior:*

Over the past two decades, some researchers have tried to express redefine the political behavior. A review of relevant literature, the proposed definition of political behavior is "intentional influence the position of conflict, to increase or protect their interests in order to acquire, develop and power and other resources to achieve the desired outcomes in a position where there is uncertainty about the value selection There are two general approach to this phenomenon: the micro approach and the macro approach [22,8] macro perspective, the political behavior at the macro level by studying the interaction between power and politics. In contrary, macro view at the individual level by examining the reactions, attitudes, skills and interpersonal dynamics of policy studied [23].

Some researchers macro views have been considered in the study of political behavior both passive and active manually divided. Passive behavior (reaction) behavior that people do in response to a perceived threat to individual losses may manage or prevent the negative consequences in the future. Ashford and Lee [16] stated that the response behavior avoiding action, avoid blame and avoid the changed behavior of politically active, (assertive behavior) behavior that occur in response to the perceived opportunity to affect the outcome in their favor. Study of political behavior based on the researchers examined by category.

*Various definitions of organizational policy:*

Organizational policies that involve activities for the development and exercise of power and other resources takes place to the condition of the work, or there is some uncertainty, the results of individual interest (policy actions) is achieved. Organizational policies involve practices and deliberate activities intrusion to increase or maintain self-interest of individuals or groups. Harold Laswell, defined policy as, the study of what, when and how to earn. Organizational policy is the power to get involved in organizations and activities that contribute to the field on the one hand in the corporate environment. Organizational policies for employees and managers makes it clear what is expected of them, thereby percent or increase likely of successful managers in the implementation of the strategy. Policies provide the basis for the control of management, can thereby co-ordinate the activities of organizational units and the amount of time administrators spend may decision are reduced.

Policies as well as the kind of work are done and should do it are specified. Policies cause entrusting employees and increase managers of the enterprise whenever something comes up and they can take action to solve it.

Many organizations have developed guidelines for the policies that determine the behavior of employees. Policies can be applied in all sectors and units of the task. (For example, "We give everyone an equal chance at employment"). Some policies apply only to a single individual. (At the same time, employees must each year, at least, a period of training). Whatever the policy scope, they are used as a mechanism by which strategies are implemented and annual and long-term targets are met. If possible have a written policy. They are considered as the means by which strategic decisions implemented.

*Perceived organizational policy:*

The negative or positive actions that are not part of the job and the organization officially "does not permit (Non-sanctioned behaviors) and it may be detrimental to the objectives or interests of others in the political behavior are known. Essentially political behavior" pursuit gains their personal interests [9]. Perceptions of organizational politics, political commentary product number of members of organized events and working environment is the behavior of others who are also from politics [10].

Knowing that perception is a process in which individuals organize and interpret their environment in order to signify their sensory perceptions [39] and by definition is perceived organizational politics and received other members of the organization of organizational behavior aimed at the interests of others ahead of their personal interests or the interests of the organization [48] The interpretation of environmental stimuli except in the light of schemas is not someone who has a high perceived organizational politics influenced his scheme found and events behaviors and organizational environment facing the very policies that is, the vested interests behind such a person by the members so that each member sought their personal interests.

The origin of any changes in the organization is trying to achieve personal or group interests although the nature is self-interested and self-seeking [12,13,14]. All such thought mainly "face of limited resources and scarce and competition for resources are constantly seeking individuals and groups" in conflict with each other The person who has high perceived organizational policy interests of the limited resources of the organization sees the change in risk because according to the aforementioned definition of perceived organizational politics, political commentary is his interpretation of environmental stimuli and it thinks that the agents of change in their personal or group interests act and that means less of his contribution to the organization's limited resources to why such a person

is reluctant to change and it is reluctant is the result of cognitive strength and has more than anyone will be less understanding of organizational politics.

Political behavior has self-interested nature and therefore members of the organization are involved in political activities try using different tactics to maintain or develop their own political interests. The first batch of the tactics that are employed to protect the interests of the latter response tactics used to increase benefits and tactics are said is active. Organization administrators can be one of the most influential actors of organizational politics. [23] believed that the organization is basically know "the managers responsible for the emergence of political behavior. According to managers' behavior can affect perceptions of organizational politics. [28] an important factor in influencing the behavior of managers' perceptions of organizational politics by the staff. argue to justify the primarily during the process of social learning is shaped perceptions of organizational politics while key people and the importance of the organization, including managers, employees play a critical role in social learning so expect a significant impact on the behavior of managers and employees' perceptions of organizational politics, especially political behavior they accept.

So whatever the political behavior of managers is broader perceptions of organizational politics are more. On the other hand, when managers using political tactics trying to keep their interests at any cost or develop on the political theory of political behavior management staff see their share of limited interest rare and endangered. The organizational changes imposed by the underlying managers for other staff is also questionable benefit to them. It looked doubtful to say the reluctance of employees imposed by the manager organization (cognitive resistance) so far as the political behavior of the managers on the one hand increases the perception of organizational policy followed by staff on the other hand, he provides the cognitive resistance.

#### *Political attitudes and perceptions of organizational politics:*

Political behavior differences in perceptions and attitudes of the often hidden influence staff and on the nature of the action or understanding of the facts is established [3,6] believe the Judge and Bretz political behavior is objective behavior. Such behavior derives from the perception and reaction to personal interests [25]. From Gandz and Muir rather than objectively consider policy, it is advisable to subjective experience and knowing a "state of mind" [26]. Political attitudes and perceptions of organizational politics are separate structures, which are mutually linked. High levels of perceived organizational politics, political behavior tends to increase, which in turn, reinforce the perception of politics.

Conceptual and empirical linkages between political attitudes and perceptions of organizational politics are rare. Frozen and colleagues believe specific behaviors such opportunistic behavior may occur based on perceived organizational politics. Political behavior means any action that is intended to influence others and achieve personal interests. While perceptions of organizational politics reflects the idea that political behavior is common in a particular organization [27] and documents tend to serve their individual behavior and the extent of the person's mental evaluation and the work by people who service their behavior are characterized [28]. Frozen and Kakmar stated that there is a strong link between political behavior of staff understanding of organizational politics [29]. final efforts to the perception of organizational politics, identify three concepts that include "political behavior of" self-service behavior of people who act in a manner to achieve valuable results " before going to be successful ", including avoiding action by individuals) as silently out (to obtain valuable outcomes, and "pay and promotion policies", which means that the state policy act in the political behavior.

Frazer *et al* suggested that there are at least three potential responses to the perception of the environment in a political organization. Employees may leave the organization, may stay in the organization, but they are not involved in politics, or may remain in the organization and conduct political activities. Based on this distinction, employees perceive the environment as a political organization; it is often stressful, confusing and disappointing to know. Those who have decided to stay and involved in politics, might attempt to gain a measure of control over an enterprise environment. Most researchers have argued that the perception of stress and harmful policies and potential negative effects on a wide scope of business and individual outcomes. Given the strong evidence for the relationship between perceptions of organizational politics with a variety of negative consequences for individuals and managers, organizations need to be factors that cause this perception, attention. Thus, several studies have focused on the future perception of organizational politics. According to theoretical framework, organizational factors job/career and individual effect on organizational policies.

#### *Predictors of organizational politics perception:*

##### *1. Organizational factors:*

To check the first floor, recognize variables, focusing, justice and participation in the decision-making process was considered. The focus, so that decision-making power will be distributed throughout the organization. Thus the top decision-making power in the organization collects; political behavior may be done in order to influence decision-makers. This positive relationship by Chang and

Mohammed confirmed [33]. Officially represents the amount that the guidelines, rules, procedures and written communications are clearly expressed to the staff. By providing appropriate rules and policies, employees have fewer opportunities for understanding organizational politics. Furthermore, research supports the theoretical negative relationship. Procedural justice perceptions of the fairness of current practices in the decision refers to compensation for their services procedural justice when people understand they feel have more control which should reduce the perception of politics in the organization. Research negatively perceived procedural justice and show organizational politics

Participation in decision-making reflects the distribution of power in the organization. Staff participation in decision-making has more influence on decision making, more influence in decisions and processes at work that may lead to a sense of justice and less understanding associated with policy [22] when increased participation in decision-making, understanding organizational policy should be reduced, because it reduces uncertainty and a sense of control and increases equity participation. The impact of this structure on perceptions of organizational politics in organizational policy was examined in 2002 by Vigoda and Cohen.

### 2. Occupational factors:

In this class, independent variables, feedback, skill variety and interaction with the manager were investigated. According to Daft people obtain power as a function of duties. More independence, diversity of skills and feedback, representations of increasing responsibility and importance of respect for the person, and may be interpreted as a personal power. People who do not have such power and control may feel their fate is determined by the political process. Managers, who are opportunistic, behave with others in the organization to increase the perception of policy, while good relations with people to be negatively related with policy perception. According to experimental study and conceptual Frozen *et al* occupational factors such as autonomy, skill variety, feedback negatively associated with organizational policy perception.

### 3. Personal factors:

Personal factors affected the perception of politics. The primary mechanism that connects these factors with organizational policy, the dichotomy between rational perspective, fairness and professionalism of the organization, guided by the views of influential people and their power games is service of the organization. In fact, the primary mechanism related to understand discrimination (Valle & Perrewe, 2000, p.367). Machiavelli oriented means pessimistic views about human nature, ethics and acceptance of the use of deceptive tactics to meet personal goals. (Baxter, 2004) Biberman (1985) stated

Machiavellian orientation is positively associated with perceived organizational politics. Self-regulatory (self-monitoring) the willingness and ability of individuals to regulate their behavior refers to the manner in which the perceptions others have of them penetrated [23] and related to management. It could be a sensation, increasing their political behavior will lead to greater understanding. Freeze found that self-monitoring is associated with perceptions of organizational politics. Locus of control is the extent to which people feel that the events of the internal forces is due to external forces beyond the control of the person or persons are created concluded that the locus of control is positively associated with the perception of politics.

So as part of understanding the consequences of deviant behaviors in the workplace can be stated policy. Organizations and members of staff are expected to follow the performance of their duties and responsibilities assigned and harmful behaviors that lead to the detriment of employees or customers (clients), stay away and these behaviors are the bad behaviors, a deviation from the norm are considered. Extensive research has been done in the field of deviant behaviors in the organization, indicating the spread of the most common of these behaviors in different organizations and companies.

Deviant behaviors in the organization, it imposes heavy costs. Although studies have been done in the western countries, it is also a threat to the Iranian organizations. As a result, the prevalence of these behaviors in the organization and costs of these behaviors reveals the importance of careful and systematic study of this phenomenon. Don Be eman & Tom Sharkey (55: 1995) is a two-dimensional study of negative behavior in the work place has to offer:

"Mild" versus "severe" and "individual" versus "enterprise". Thus, diversion of work in one of these four categories is as follows:

- A) Deviation in production or product: small deviation organization that will soon disappear like deliberate destruction did not waste too much
- B) The diversion of funds: institutional bias serious or dangerous, such as demolished parts lying about the theft of the organization of working hours
- C) The political bias: small deviation between individual like gossip about colleagues criticize and blame the workers
- D) Personal aggression, deviation between serious individual like blackguard and endangering partners

### Reduction ways effects of organizational policies:

Don Beeman & Tom Sharkey to minimize the effects of organizational policies, guidelines are provided below:

1. The evaluation process should be clear.
2. The need to differentiate between poor and excellent performance and gave them different rewards.

3. The rewards have a direct relationship with the functions.
4. The competition between managers should minimize in term of benefits.
5. We must strive the resources problem (the managers) will be solved.
6. The need to managers on how their activities are political figures and collaborators, showed great sensitivity to "avoid political tricks" should issue a directive to deal with these people. If they continued their path, they must be removed from organizational posts and, if necessary, the company wanted to excuse them.

Managers and supervisors of other organizations should have in mind if their organizational employee assigned into a political organization this approach will lead to negative consequences for the organization. Managers and supervisors suggested that the organization's rules and procedures are developed in a manner that is clearly and on the implementation of policies and increases decisions policy related to salary as well as promote and increase the degree to show for all employees. The most important dimension of understand the policies related to salary promoted. Managers must be such as to avoid the perception of the organization's reward and the political section and familiar game. For example, the organization shall take appropriate measures to clearly measure performance evaluation and explain how performance measures for staff and in the promotion and increased compensation and express what personal criteria is promote or does not promote.

And to reduce the perception of policy in organization proposed:

- \* It suggested how to improve the organization's managers, staff and staff promotions criteria clearly defined procedures for the public to their employees.
- \* It is proposed system provides that employees can easily and without fear of criticism and suggestions put forward their consequences.
- \* It is proposed to meet the managers and supervisors create the right atmosphere to reduce the amount of political organization among employees.
- \* Management of conflicts between individuals and groups in the organization is completely unbiased and fair can be useful.
- \* Emphasis on transparency and involving employees in decisions of employees understand the changes.
- \* It is proposed that managers and staff of the organization develop a career path system based on meritocracy their members so that each member have a clear picture of their future career in the organization.

#### *Conclusions:*

Political behavior as a source of tension and conflict in the workplace is known. Perception is

influenced by age, gender and racial bias, geographical and cultural factors.

Internal factors which are understanding phenomena, experiences, values, motivation and personality. Therefore, it due to other factors in the formation of political perception is more effective. The only personality trait that affects the perception of politics is Machiavellian realism.

In an organization where Machiavellian ideas, the ruling power by any means, to institutionalize their personal vested interests and people seeking benefits go further. Employees who receive constructive feedback are more transparency and have more control over the work environment that ultimately, perception leads to lower policy. People with more job autonomy and diversity of skills, freedom and more control over their work environment, therefore, politics as an opportunity is not understand threat. Managers, who are opportunistic behavior toward others, increase the perception of politics in the organization [24].

Positive staff relations based on trust with their managers, they feel less political approach is unfair. The organizational factors, procedural justice has negative effect on the perception of politics.

When the decision-making process is fair, there is little space for authority decision-making with respect to transparency guidelines increasingly understood. As a result, when people understand the justice process, feel more in control of their environment [52]. High levels of concentration, reduces the amount of control over the work. So when people lose control over their environment, increase understanding of politics [56] with the increasing recognition, perception of organizational politics is reduced. Recognize causes treatment and description of duties (monitoring intensity) is determined. Thus, transparency is the role of the employee in his political action will be faced with more restrictions. When uncertain decision-making processes grows organizational policy.

In general, people who participate in decision making, experience less job strain as a result of perceived organizational politics. Therefore, individual factors, job and organizational factors influence on policy perceptions, and understanding of the policy also affects political behavior.

People based on their perceptions of political work in the workplace act and possible behavioral reactions shape based on these perceptions. High levels of perceived policies indicating threaten workplace. Because of perceived uncertainty and confusion in the workplace, employees are turning to political behavior to meet their self-interest and the uncertainty of organizational and institutional policies reduce the negative consequences of perception. The perception of organizational policies is an important variable in the development of deviant behaviors. The perception of the organization's policies on cognitive and mental

aspects of organizational politics and perceptions of organizational politics measure political organization and considers a significant positive impact on behavior is tilted. What is a mail forwarding of status that must executives ethical, cultural, political, economic and social organization individuals have sufficient information to effectively manage and effective practices, and with collaborate and penetration reduce the policy of the organization.

## REFERENCES

1. Azizinejad, B., M.M. Seied Abbaszade, M. Hassani, 2011. Organizational political tactics in universities. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 1(2): 65-72.
2. Ulkeryildiz, R.E., 2009. *Political tactics in building construction industry from the architect,s perspective*. Master of science, Izmir institute of technology. school of engineering and science.
3. Poon, J.M.L., 2003. Situational Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Politics Perceptions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(2): 138-155.
4. Pio, R.J., 2000. *The Management of Political Behavior in Organizations*. Paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master's Diploma in Technology: Management Practice at the Port Elizabeth Technikon.
5. Sowmya, K.R., N. Panchanatham, 2008. Organizational Politics-Behavioural Intention of Bank Employees. *The Journal of Commerce*, 3(1): 2220-6043.
6. Kacmar, K., M. Bozeman, P. Dennis, S. Anthony, P. William, 1999. An examination of the Perceptions of Organizational Politics Model: Replication and Extension. *Human Relation*, 52(3): 383-416.
7. Organ D.W., K. Ryan, 1995. "A meta-analytic of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior"; *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 48(4).
8. Buchanan, D.A., 2008. You stab my back, L, I stab yours: Management experience and Perceptions of organization political behavior. *British Journal of management*, 19(1): 49-64.
9. Ferris, G.R., K.M. Kacmar, 1992. "Perceptions of organizational politics"; *Journal of Management*, 8.
10. Ferris G.R., D.D. Frink, M.C. Galang, J. Zhou, K.M. Kacmar, J.L. Howard, 1996b. "Perceptions of organizational politics: Predictors, stress-related implications, and outcomes", *Human Relations*, 49.
11. Robbins, S.P., T.A. Judge, 2007. *Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
12. Burke, W.W., 1976. Organization development in transition *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 12: 80-84.
13. Beer, M., 1976. On gaining influence and power for O.D. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 12: 45-51.
14. Bowen, D.D., 1977. Value dilemmas in OD, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 13: 453-455.
15. Morgan, G., 1997. *Images of organization*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
16. Ashforth, B.E., R.T. Lee, 1990. Defensive behavior in organizations: A preliminary model. *Human Relations*, 43: 621-648.
17. Drory, A., 1993. Perceived psychological climate and job attitudes. *Organization Studies*, 14: 59-71.
18. Madison, D.L., R.W. Allen, L.W. Porter, P.A. Renwick, B.T. Mayes, 1980. Organizational politics: An exploration of manager's perceptions. *Human Relations*, 33: 79-100.
19. Porter, L.W., R.W. Allen, H.L. Angle, 1981. The politics of upward influence in organizations. In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 3: 109-149. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
20. Ulkeryildiz, R.E., 2009. *Political tactics in building construction industry from the architect,s perspective*. Master of science, Izmir institute of technology. school of engineering and science.
21. Buchanan, D.A., 2008. You stab my back, L, I stab yours: Management experience and Perceptions of organization political behavior. *British Journal of management*, 19(1): 49-64.
22. Vigoda-Gadot, E., H. Vinarski-Peretz, E. Ben-Zion, 2003. Politics and Image in The Organizational Landscape: An Empirical Examination Among Public Sector Employess. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(8): 764-787.
23. Doldor, E., 2011. Examining political will, political skill and their maturation among male and female managers, [dspace.lib.cranfield.ac.uk](http://dspace.lib.cranfield.ac.uk).
24. Valle, M., P. Perrewe, 2000. Do Politics Perceptions Relate to Political Behaviors? Tests of an Implicit Assumption and Expanded Model. *Human Relations*, 53(3): 359-386.
25. Cheong, J.O., 2010. *An empirical analysis of the relationships between politics, conflicts and performance in government organizations*, PhD dissertation, The State University of New Jersey
26. Danaeefard, H., A. Ebrahimi Balutbازه, K. Haji Abootorab Kashi, 2010. Good Soldiers Perceptions of Organizational Politics Understanding the Relation between Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Perceptions of Organizational politics: Evidence from Iran. *European Journal of Economics*,

- Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 18: 147-162.
27. Ferris, G.R., G. Adams, R.W. Kolodinsky, W.A. Hochwarter, A.P. Ammeter, 2002. Perceptions of organizational politics: Theory and research directions. *Research in Multi Level Issues*, 1, 179-254.
  28. Adams, G., D.C. Treadway, L.P. Stepina, 2008. The Role of Dispositions in Politics Perception Formation: The Predictive Capacity of Negative and Positive Affectivity, Equity Sensitivity, and Self-efficacy. *Journal of Management Issues*, 4: 545-563.
  29. Vigoda-Gadot, E., A. Cohen, 2002. Influence Tactics and Perceptions of Organizational Politics: A Longitudinal Study. *Business Research*, 55: 311-324.
  30. Jafariani, H., S. Mortazavi, S. Nazemi, P. Bull, 2012. Political behavior in organizational context: Nature, research and paradigm. *Management Science Letters*, 2: 2987-3000.
  31. Hodgkinson, G.P., J. Ford, 2008. International review of industrial and organizational psychology, 23: 322-384.
  32. Ullah, S., A.R. Jafri, M.K. Bindost, 2011. A Synthesis of Literature on Organizational Politics. *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business*, 3(3): 36-49.
  33. Atinc, G., M. Darrat, B. Fuller, B.W. Parker, 2010. Perceptions of organizational politics: A meta analysis of theoretical antecedents. *Journal of Management Issues*, 4: 494-513.
  34. Muhammad, A.H., 2007. Antecedents of Organizational Politics Perceptions in Kuwait Business Organizations. *Competitiveness Review*, 17(4): 234-247.
  35. Andrews, M.C., K.M. Kacmar, 2001. Discriminating among organizational politics. Justice, and support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22: 347-66.
  36. Aryee, S., Z.X. Chen, P.S. Budhwar, 2004. Exchange fairness and employee performance: An examination of the relationship between organizational politics and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 94: 1-14.
  37. Baxer, D., 2004. Perception of Organizational Politics and Workplace Innovation: an Investigation of the Perceptions and Behavior of Staff in an Australian IT Services Organization (online), Available at Ph.D. <http://reserchbank.swinbme.edu.au/vital/access/manager/repository/swin>.
  38. Moore, C., J.R. Detert, L.K. Trevino, V.L. Baker, D.M. Mayer, 2012. *Why employees unethical organizational behavior*. *Personnel Psychology*, 65: 1-48.
  39. Robinson, S.L., R.J. Bennett, 1995. "A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study", *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 55-72.
  40. Lim, V.K.G., 2002. "The IT Way of Loafing on the Job: Cyber-Loafing, Neutralizing and Organizational Justice", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23: 75-94.
  41. Neuman, J.H., R.A. Baron, 1998. "Workplace Violence and Workplace Aggression: Evidence Concerning Specific Forms, Potential Causes, and Preferred Targets", *Journal of Management*, 24: 391-419.
  42. Jelinek, R., M. Ahearn, 2006. "The ABC's of ACB: Unveiling a Clear and Present Danger in the Sales Force", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35: 457-467.
  43. Barsky, A., 2011. Investigating the effects of moral disengagement and participation on unethical work behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 104: 59-75.
  44. Burris, E.R., J.R. Detert, D.S. Chiaburu, 2008. *Quitting before leaving: The mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 912-922.
  45. Pfeffer, J., 1992. *Management with Power*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
  46. Mintzberg, H., 1983. *Power in and Around Organizations*, Prentice Hall, EaglewoodCliffs, N.J.
  47. Robbins, S.P., T.A. Judge, 2007. *Organizational Behavior (12th edition)*, Prentice-Hall of India, New Delhi.
  48. Kacmar, K.M., R.A. Baron, 1999. "Organizational politics: The state of the field, links to related processes, and an agenda for future research", In Ferris, G. R. (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
  49. Kipnis, D., S.M. Schmidt, I. Wilkinson, 1980. "Intraorganizational Influence Tactics: Exploration in Getting One's Way", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65: 440-452.
  50. Lewin, K., 1936. *Principles of Topological Psychology*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
  51. Gandz, J., V.V. Murray, 1980. "The Experience of Workplace Politics", *Academy of Management Journal*, 23: 237-251.
  52. Vigoda, E., H. Vinarski, E. Ben, 2003. "Politics and Image in the Organizational Landscape: An Empirical Examination Among Public Sector Employees", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(8): 764-787.
  53. Kacmar, K.M., D.S. Carlson, 1997. "Further Validation of the Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS): A Multiple Sample Investigation", *Journal of Management*, 23(5): 627-658.
  54. Gilmore, D.C., G.R. Ferris, J.H. Dulebohn, G. Harrell-Cook, 1996. Organizational politics and

- employee attendance. *Group & Organization Management*, 21(4): 481-494.
55. Rosen, C.C., P.E. Levy, R.J. Hall, 2006. Placing perceptions of politics in the context of the feedback environment, employee attitudes, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1): 211-220.
56. Tatarka, C.J., 2009. *The Perceptions of Organizational Politics in the National Guard*. PhD dissertation, Northcentral university, Faculty of the School of Business and Technology Management.
57. Gotsis, G., Z. Kortezi, 2011. Bounded self-interest: a basis for constructive organizational politics. *Management Research Review*, 34(4): 450-476.
58. Ferd, R., David, 1999. Strategic Management.