

Reviewing Organizational Politics' Positive and Negative Aspects

Ms. Heta Dave¹, Dr. Alpesh Nasit²

¹Research Scholar, School of Management, R K University

²Professor, School of Management, R K University

Abstract

Almost all types of organizations, including public organization, Privet Organization, and volunteer groups, are impacted by politics. But the workplace is where people are most directly impacted by politics on a daily basis. Historically, the literature on organizational politics has emphasized a negative perception of politics. However, more recently, researcher have found that workplace politics can also have good aspects and is not always bad. In an effort to broaden the viewpoint, researchers contended that organizational politics may also be advantageous. This research looks at organizational politics and the opinions and experiences of government employees in Gujarat. Participants in the study held differing opinions on workplace gossip and organizational politics, including whether the terms are positive, neutral, or negative.

Keywords: Organizational Politics, Ethical Behavior, Negative Politics

1. Introduction

Members of organizations generally, and the intellectual community in particular, are aware that their members participate in political activities. These political actions take on various shapes and manifest at various organizational levels. Believing that one's company has no politics is self-deception, according to Bolander (2011). Politics is, in fact, the grease that keeps the internal workings of any organization comprising more than one person running smoothly. Everything will operate smoothly if the right lubricant is used. The company will come to a standstill if we neglect to lubricate it. Therefore, according to Thompson (2008), political action in an organization centers on how individuals utilize authority to influence decisions.

According to Ferrell and Peterson (2006), these actions are a part of political behavior in organizations. Activities carried out by organization personnel that aren't genuinely necessary for them to fulfill their official roles in the arrangement. Nonetheless, these actions affect or make an effort to affect how advantages and disadvantages are distributed inside the company. MSG (2012) claims that organization politics have been known to change once-easygoing people into lifelong enemies, to turn friends into foes, and to really generate dissatisfaction between teams.

However, political behavior has also been shown to benefit organizational teams and to have aided in the expansion and success of organizations.

Members of an organization may find it easier to forward a plan that would normally have been rejected but is extremely advantageous to the organization when they have connections with influential managers, such as those at The Clute Institute (George & Jones, 2009). It makes sense, according to Alagse (2012),

that organizational politics is so deeply entwined with the management system, that it has a significant impact on relationships, norms, procedures, performance, and results. Therefore, in order to improve organizational outcomes and employee happiness, Alagse (2012) indicated that it is crucial for leaders to comprehend, take advantage of, and manage the political atmosphere in the workplace.

Those activities that have taken place within organizations to acquire, develop, and use power and other resources to obtain one's preferred outcomes in a situation in which there is uncertainty or dissension about choices" is how Lasswell (1936, p. 8) defines politics. This concept makes it clear why political behavior exists, which is to overcome opposition in order to achieve one's goals. One of the potential causes of uncertainty surrounding the attainment of desired outcomes from the organization could be attributed to resource constraints. In addition to these two explanations, Lencioni (2006) identified two more antecedents, or backgrounds, of political behavior in an organization. These are referred to as organizational and personal antecedents.

2. Literature Review

This section establishes the study's theories by reviewing previous research and literature that is relevant to the current investigation. The hypotheses are developed in light of divergent viewpoints from other researchers. Politics are "the activities of the government, members of law-making organizations, or people who try to influence the way a country is governed," according to the online Cambridge Dictionary. It is defined as "the actions or activities concerned with achieving and using power in a country or society" by the online Collins Dictionary. From these several definitions, what can we infer? What emerges is the lack of a consensus on what constitutes politics. Regarding how various authorities describe politics, this is also accurate. Authorities in political science have given distinct definitions of politics.

Different political scientists have defined politics in different ways. Politics has its roots in Aristotle's work "Politika," which translates to "the affair of the city" (Buhler, 1961) and may allude to the functioning of government. According to Aristotle, politics—which combines elements of democracy and aristocracy—is the ideal form of government. Politics is also described as "the activity by which differing interests within a given unit of the rule are conciliated by giving them a share in power in proportion to their importance to the welfare and the survival of the whole community" by Crick (1962, 2000).

According to Landells and Albrecht (2017), people have four different perspectives on organizational politics: reactive, reluctant, strategic, or integrated. Based on their interpretation of these perspectives, people's perceptions of workplace politics and the degree to which they personally participate in politics are shaped. "Building relationships was variously perceived as 'sucking up' (reactive), 'pandering' (reluctant), 'building relationships so they can be called upon in the future' (strategic), and 'working through other people' (integrated)," according to research by Landells and Albrecht (2017) (p. 53).

Relationship building, decision observation and interpretation, manipulating others, influencing decisions and resources, and enhancing one's own reputation are the five main areas into which organizational politics can be divided (Landells & Albrecht, 2017). Because they can lead to counterproductive work behavior (CWB) like low employee attendance and careless performance, elevated workplace stress, and diminished job satisfaction, negative perceptions of politics (POPs) are alarming (Wiltshire, Bourdage, & Lee, 2014).

Since organizations can be seen as dynamic power structures where almost all members frequently use influence techniques to effectively accomplish their goals or preserve, secure, and improve their

privileges, benefits, and individual advantages, political considerations can play a crucial role in organizational life.

perceptions of politics were investigated by Maslyn, Farmer, and Bettenhausen (2017). "Rather than focusing on rather futile attempts to eliminate political behavior, our results suggest managers ought to focus instead on shaping it toward goals that are beneficial for the organization as well as the individual," they propose, acknowledging that workplace politics are inevitable .

3. Problem Statement

In practically every organization, politics are a factor. The majority of Americans acknowledge that politics exists within the government, but they either downplay or disregard it outside of it. Any kind of organization, including government sector and private sector, is subject to politics. But the workplace is one setting where politics may affect people's daily lives directly.

This research focuses on the effects internal office politics has on people and organizations because of the enormous influence politics may have on decisions of all sorts and sizes, as well as organizational health and employee engagement. What is the perception of organizational politics among workers, how does it affect work environment, and how can leaders promote constructive politics in their organizations? These are the questions this study seeks to address.

4. Research Methodology

Its investigation must adhere to the established research methodology in order to be considered scientific research. It uses specific techniques to identify, pick, and evaluate the information relevant to the subject at hand (Wilkinson, 2000, Leedy, 1974). As a result, the present study makes use of a particular research design, a method for obtaining data using equipment, a population under investigation, a study location, data collection techniques, and statistical analysis of the data.

Research Design

The study's descriptive assessment and descriptive correlational research designs are used. A descriptive correlation research, according to Ariola (2006, referenced by Abun et al., 2021), aims to characterize the association between variables without attempting to establish a causative relationship. However, the purpose of descriptive study is to merely characterize a population, circumstance, or phenomena. Additionally, it can be used to characterize frequency distributions, profiles, and traits of individuals, events, or phenomena. To put it briefly, it provides a solution to the questions of what, when, how, and where—rather than why (McCombes, 2020).

Objectives

To investigate effect of Organizational politics in terms of Positive and Negative.

Population and Sample Size

Employees of Government of Gujarat is considered as Population. For this study, data of 50 employees were taken from various departments including Energy Department, Education Department, Cooperative Department, General Administrative Department, Forest Department.

Research Question

- RQ1 :- I am satisfied with working environment of Department.
- RQ2 :- Head of the departments are not promoting office politics.
- RQ3:- Head of the departments are taking strict actions against promoter of politics.
- RQ4:- Department employees are investing time in gossip.
- RQ5:- My department is politics free.

Research Method

For this research, Descriptive research – Cross tabulation method has been used.

Data Analysis

Demographic Analysis
Table 1: Demographic Details

		Frequency	Percent
Department	Education	10	20.0
	Cooperative	10	20.0
	Energy	10	20.0
	Gen Administration	10	20.0
	Forest	10	20.0
	Total	50	100.0

Age	25 Y - 30 Y	6	12.0
	31 Y - 35 Y	26	52.0
	36 Y - 40 Y	13	26.0
	41Y - 45 Y	5	10.0
	Total	50	100.0

Education	12 Pass	7	14.0
	Graduate	23	46.0
	Post Graduate	10	20.0
	Doctrate	10	20.0
	Total	50	100.0

Descriptive Analysis
Table 2: Crosstab Analysis for RQ1 with Department

Crosstab						
Count						
		I am satisfied with working environment of Department.				Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	
Department	Education	0	5	5	0	10
	Cooperative	1	1	8	0	10

	Energy	0	0	0	10	10
	Gen Administration	0	0	6	4	10
	Forest	0	0	4	6	10
Total		1	6	23	20	50

Table 2: Crosstab Analysis for RQ2 with Department

Crosstab						
Count						
		Head of the departments are not promoting office politics.				Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	
Department	Education	0	0	8	2	10
	Cooperative	0	0	5	5	10
	Energy	2	4	3	1	10
	Gen Administration	2	0	4	4	10
	Forest	0	9	0	1	10
Total		4	13	20	13	50

Table 3: Crosstab Analysis for RQ3 with Department

Crosstab							
Count							
		Department employees are investing time in gossip.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
De-partment	Education	2	2	1	4	1	10
	Cooperative	0	2	5	3	0	10
	Energy	3	5	2	0	0	10
	Gen Administration	10	0	0	0	0	10
	Forest	6	0	0	4	0	10
Total		21	9	8	11	1	50

Table 4: Crosstab Analysis for RQ4 with Department

Department * My department is politics free. Cross tabulation							
		My department is politics free.					Total
		S. Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Department	Education	0	0	0	5	5	10
	Cooperative	0	0	1	9	0	10

	Energy	0	0	7	0	3	10
	Gen Administration	0	0	4	4	2	10
	Forest	0	0	10	0	0	10
Total		0	0	22	18	10	50

Table 5: Crosstab Analysis for RQ5 with Department

Department * Head of the departments are taking strict actions against promoter of politics.							
Count							
		Head of the departments are taking strict actions against promoter of politics.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Department	Education	0	3	0	4	3	10
	Cooperative	2	2	0	5	1	10
	Energy	0	0	0	10	0	10
	Gen Administration	1	2	3	4	0	10
	Forest	0	0	10	0	0	10
Total		3	7	13	23	4	50

DATA INTERPRETATION AND FINDING

From Respondent majority of samples are male , 35 are male and 15 are female. Respondent from all department are neutral with positive work environment. Respondent from all department are neutral with statement that department are promoting organizational politics. Respondents are agree with Department employees are investing time in gossip. Respondents are neutral to disagree with the statement My department is politics free. Respondents are neutral to disagree with the statement Head of the departments are taking strict actions against promoter of politics.

Result indicate that employees have mix perception regarding effect of organizational politics and majority of respondents have neutral perception or may be respondent don't want to share their views. Results also indicate that Head of the Department are directly or indirectly involves with political activity.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Combine result of all table shows that more than 80% of respondents are neutral to disagree with the research question. Which can be interpreted as negative effect of organizational politics. According to Thompson (2008), exhibiting appropriate political behavior can assist one get a promotion that is well-deserved or persuade management of the value of a proposal that could increase one's responsibility and lead to eventual advancement within the company. Such actions can improve cooperation with other members of the group and help one become more visible. The organization, and does not pose a threat to other group members (Newstrom, 2007). Thus, ethical behavior in politics advances both the organizational and professional development of the individual. But for present study positive effect of organizational politics is not in effect.

REFERENCE

1. Thompson, A.A., Jr., Strickland, A.J. & Gamble, J.E. (2010). *Crafting and executing strategy: The quest for competitive advantage* (17th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
2. Thompson, L.L. (2008). *Organizational behavior today*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall
3. George, J.M. and Jones, G.R. (1996). *Understanding and managing organizational behavior*. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
4. Moyer, D. (2005). Give to get. *Harvard Business Review*, October, p. 160.
5. Landells, E. M., & Albrecht, S. L. (2017). Positive politics, negative politics, and engagement: Psychological safety, meaningfulness, and availability as "black box" explanatory mechanisms. In C. C. Rosen & P. L. Perrewé (Eds.), *Power, politics, and political skill in job stress* (pp. 33–49). Emerald Group Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-355520170000015004>
6. Wiltshire, J., Bourdage, J. S., & Lee, K. (2014). Honesty-humility and perceptions of organizational politics in predicting workplace outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29(2), 235–251.
7. Maslyn, J. M., Farmer, S. M., & Bettenhausen, K. L. (2017). When organizational politics matters: The effects of the perceived frequency and distance of experienced politics. *Human Relations*, 70(12), 1486–1513.
8. Abun, D., Magallanes, T., Basilio, G.J.Q., Encarnacion, M.J. & Sallong, M. (2021). Examining the link between organizational citizenship behavior and work performance of employees in the private schools, mediated by the workplace environment. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 10(4), 85-98.
9. McCombes, S. (2020). *Descriptive Research*. Scribbr.
10. Ashkenas, R., Ulrich, D., Jick, T., & Kerr, S. (2002). *The boundaryless organization* (2nd ed.). CA: JosseyBass.
11. Bryman, A. (1996). *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*. London: Sage.
12. Cooper, D.R., & Schindler, P.S. (2008). *Business research methods* (10th ed.). New York: NY: McGrawHill/Irwin.
13. Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
14. Fiske, S.T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power in stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 48, pp. 621-628.
15. French, J.R.P. and Raven, B.H. (1968). *The basis of social power*. Group Dynamics, New York: Harper and Row.
16. Gandz, J. and Murray, V. (1980). The experience of workplace politics. *Academy of Management Journal*, June, p. 244.