



## Association Between Perception of Organizational Politics and Workplace Friendship

Ofoegbu, O.E.<sup>[a],\*</sup>; Akanbi, Paul Ayobami<sup>[a]</sup>; Akhanolu, Isaac Obiomoano<sup>[b]</sup>

<sup>[a]</sup> Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Social and Management Sciences, Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo, P.M.B. 1066, Oyo State.

<sup>[b]</sup> Faculty of Social and Management Sciences, Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo, P.M.B. 1066, Oyo State.

\*Corresponding author.

Received 7 September 2012; accepted 29 October, 2012

### Abstract

This paper examined the association between perception of organizational politics and workplace friendship among university workers with a particular reference to Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo, Oyo State, Nigeria. The objectives of this study were to determine whether general politics, go along to get ahead, pay and promotion policy were predictors of workplace friendship and also to establish the significant relationship between general politics, go along to get ahead, pay and promotion policy and workplace friendship. The study employed survey research. Primary data was used for the study with questionnaires as research instrument. The subjects of this study were two hundred employees in the service of the university. The hypotheses formulated for the study were tested using correlation analysis and regression analysis. The findings of the study revealed that the joint effect of independent variables (general politics, go along to get ahead, pay and promotion policy) jointly and independently predicted workplace friendship. The research also indicated that there was a strong association between the three variables used in measuring perception of organizational politics and workplace friendship. Based on the findings from this study, it is suggested that efforts be made by the organization to enhance or emphasize the importance of teamwork may be an appropriate managerial approach to reducing politics by increasing employees' understanding and control, particularly in organizations whose strategic objectives call for employees to work in teams. Employees should recognize the consequences and antecedents of perception of politics prevailing in their organization.

**Key words:** Perception of organizational politics; General politics; Go along to get ahead; Pay and promotion policy; Workplace friendship

Ofoegbu, O.E., Akanbi, Paul Ayobami, Akhanolu, Isaac Obiomoano (2012). Association Between Perception of Organizational Politics and Workplace Friendship. *International Business and Management*, 5 (2), 61-70. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/ibm/article/view/j.ibm.1923842820120502.1020>  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.ibm.1923842820120502.1020>

### INTRODUCTION

Organizations are political entities where power and influence play a substantial role in shaping relationships and behaviors among employees and other stakeholders. Organizational politics is a general name that denotes power relations and influence tactics in and around the workplace (Mintzberg, 1983; Pfeffer, 1992). As many studies have shown, politics is actually an inherent part of every organization (Gandz & Murray, 1980; Medison *et al.*, 1980), but there are major differences among organizations in the level and intensity of politics. These differences may generate quite distinctive organizational outcomes such as variations in employees' performance appraisals (Tziner, 1999), a particular atmosphere, climate, reputation, and image in the eyes of internal or multiple stakeholders (Drory, 1993; Sussman *et al.*, 2002; Poon, 2003). The literature of organizational power and politics is extensive, and is broadly divided between macro- and micro-political approaches (Vigoda, 2003). Dominated by a positivist perspective, micro approaches focus on individual behaviour, relationships and perceptions (Burns, 1978; Ferris *et al.*, 1996; Gandz & Murray, 1980; Kacmar & Ferris, 1991).

Workplace friendship has been drawing the attention of, and broadly discussed by scholars (Payne & Hauty, 1955; Nadler, 1979; Kram & Isabella, 1985; Berman, West, & Richter, 2002; Barley & Kunda, 2001; Mao,

2006; Miller, Rutherford, & Kolodinsky, 2008) as it promotes organizational and employee outcomes and helps achieve goals. Employees may need work-related knowledge, information, and skills to accomplish their missions and goals or emotional support to relieve work stress, and workplace friendship can provide both instrumental support (Berman *et al.*, 2002) and emotional support (Kram & Isabella, 1985; Berman *et al.*, 2002).

Employees may also scramble for resources to ensure self-interests, and organizational politics thus arise as resources are limited (Drory & Romm, 1990). Therefore, employees will begin with political behavior in order to seek resources and to ensure self-interests (Ferris *et al.*, 1989; Drory & Romm, 1990), Politics is a social influence process (Ferris *et al.*, 1989), and political behavior is the maximization of short- or long-term interests through strategic planning to seek self-interests by sacrificing that of others (e.g. colleagues). According to Pfeffer (1992), organizational politics is an attempt that individuals exploit to accomplish their expected outcomes by obtaining resources or securing power. In this respect, organizational political behavior is mostly converted and subjected to the differences in perception (Sussman *et al.*, 2002), perceptions of organizational politics (POPs) refers to actions taken by employees who are perceived to be self-interested (Mayes & Allen, 1977; Kacmar *et al.*, 1999); while workplace friendship the voluntary and reciprocal relations within the organization (Wright, 1978; Rawlins, 1992) where collegial support is shared and obtained through interpersonal interaction (Kram & Isabella, 1985; Berman *et al.*, 2002). In a political work environment, POPs influences the work attitude, organizational coherence and collegial relationships of employees (Ferris *et al.*, 1996); and it is the cause of interpersonal or inter-team confrontations and competitions. Therefore, it is worthy of investigating workplace friendship in a highly political work environment.

Organizational politics refers to a self-servicing behavior threatening the interests of others. A practitioner avoids group activities (Mintzberg, 1985), reduces collegial interaction, withholds information from others and maligns others for prominence (Harris *et al.*, 2007), this will result in poor workplace friendship or even no workplace friendship. Therefore, individuals with stronger POPs have weaker workplace friendship. However, there are plausible arguments resulting in inverse speculation. When POPs is strong, the situation is more uncertain and ambiguous, because employees do not know what will be rewarded, punished or recognized (Harris *et al.*, 2007; Miller *et al.*, 2008). Consequently, employees will seek advice and suggestions from colleagues. As workplace friendship facilitates information sharing and spread among employees (Sias & Cahill, 1998) to help reduce uncertainty and ambiguity with the support of voluntary and reciprocal relations from workplace friendship

(Wright, 1978; Rawlins, 1992), employees can receive more information to avoid what will negate their interests. Based on the above arguments and the viewpoint of reciprocal relation, it is reasonable that the stronger the POPs, the better the workplace friendship. In general, ambivalent speculations indicate that the POPs-workplace friendship correlation is unclear. Existing literature on POPs can neither explain the contradictions nor elucidate the association between them, and their association remains an open case. Hence, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between POPs and workplace friendship and also to identify organizational predictors of workplace friendship.

## 1. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study are in line with the hypotheses formulated which are as follows:

- (1) To determine whether general politics, go along to get ahead, pay and promotion policies can jointly and independently predict workplace friendship.
- (2) To explore the relationship between pay and promotion policies and workplace friendship.
- (3) To investigate the relationship between go along to get ahead and workplace friendship.
- (4) To evaluate the significant relationship between general politics and workplace friendship.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The absence of a common definition of organization politics is a long-standing concern, and commentators continue to note the lack of agreement (Drory & Romm, 1990; Ferris *et al.*, 2002a). Kacmar and Carlson (1997) argue that “Only when consensus is reached about what organizational politics is and how it should be measured will the field be advanced”. Points of contention concern distinguishing “political” from “non-political” actions, the treatment of self-interest as a defining characteristic, and the inevitably damaging nature of politics. Allen *et al.* (1979) define politics as “acts of influence to enhance or protect the self-interest of individuals or groups”. Mintzberg (1983, 1985) defines politics as “individual or group behaviour that is informal, ostensibly parochial, typically divisive, and above all, in the technical sense, illegitimate – sanctioned neither by formal authority, accepted ideology, nor certified expertise”. Valle and Perrewé (2000) regard political behaviour as “the exercise of tactical influence which is strategically goal directed, rational, conscious and intended to promote self-interest, either at the expense of or in support of others’ interests”.

There are problems with the definition of features involving influence, self-interest and damage. An

influence-based definition, therefore, does not readily distinguish political from non-political behaviour. Indeed, attribution theory suggests that it is important for managers to avoid having their actions labelled with political intent, and it may be necessary to create the impression that goals are selfless and non-political. Ferris *et al.* (2000) thus define political skill as “an interpersonal style construct that combines social astuteness with the ability to relate well, and otherwise demonstrate situationally appropriate behaviour in a disarmingly charming and engaging manner that inspires confidence, trust, sincerity, and genuineness”. Ferris *et al.* (2002b) suggest that skilled political actors are those who are able to disguise their self-serving intent. A second problem is that political tactics can be used to promote either or both individual and organizational interests (Buchanan, 1999; Harrison, 1987). If political tactics can generate corporate benefit as well as personal gain, then definitions that regard only overtly self-interested acts as categorically political are unhelpful.

A third related issue concerns the widespread portrayal of organization politics in negative terms. Klein (1988) argues that the claim that organizations are political is “a myth propagated and entertained to address various needs of organizational members”. Accepting this myth makes it self-perpetuating, and political behavior should instead be eliminated. Eisenhardt and Bourgeois (1988) argue that political behavior in a top management team is associated with poor performance, by creating inflexibilities and communication barriers, restricting information flows, and consuming time. Zaleznik (1997) distinguishes between “psycho-politics” and “real work”. Personnel decisions, such as selection and performance evaluation, should be depoliticized, according to Ferris and King (1991). Ferris and Kacmar (1992) discuss “destructive opportunism and dysfunctional game playing”. Voyer’s (1994) study of a computer company concluded that politics were “mostly dysfunctional” and that management should “step in and reduce the level of politics”. According to Stone (1997), eradicating organization politics is a management duty.

Some commentators, however, argue that politics is useful. Mangham (1979) observes that reasonable people often disagree, with regard to both ends and means, and can thus be expected “to fight for what they are convinced is right and, perhaps more significantly, against that which they are convinced is wrong”. Butcher and Clarke (1999) view politics as “battles over just causes”, in which debate sharpens the quality of decisions. Gandz and Murray (1980) found that organization politics was considered functional in terms of careers and power-building. Harrison (1987) argues that political behavior can be used to counter the use of legitimate tactics to achieve undesirable ends, and to help implement decisions reached by legitimate means. Frost and Egri (1991) argue that political struggles play a role in resolving competing perspectives and interests in the context

of organizational changes. McClelland and Burnham (1995) distinguish between institutional (socialized) and personal uses of power, the latter for personal gain, the former in the interests of group and corporate goals, potentially involving self-sacrifice. For Keen (1981) and Hardy (1996), organizational power and politics provide the dynamic for the implementation of strategic change. The history of conflicting interests, alignments and negotiations, argue Bacharach and Lawler (1998) is the history of change.

The debates concerning terminology and the functional or dysfunctional properties of organization politics arise in a positivist perspective, concerned with operationalizing core concepts, developing valid and stable measures, establishing co-variation and building generalizable models. From a constructivist perspective, the definitions and assessments that matter are those of organizational members. Ferris and Kacmar (1992) argue that organization politics is a relatively under-theorized field. Bacharach and Lawler (1998) note that the literature is fragmented, with commentators adopting unique perspectives, and no core set of problems to form the basis for theoretical debate. Consequently, there is no cumulative tradition leading to the development of a “political theory of organizations”. Perhaps the most influential perspective in this regard has been the model of perceptions of organization politics developed by Ferris *et al.* (2002a), hypothesizing how a range of outcomes, such as satisfaction, withdrawal, trust, performance and citizenship, depend on perceptions of politics that in turn depend on arrangement of organizational, environmental, demographic and personality factors. That model, and commentary reviewed here, reflects an “antecedents-behaviors-consequences” framework, linking triggering or precipitating conditions, with political tactics or strategies, to a range of individual and organizational outcomes. Conceptualizing this approach in a simplified three-step framework facilitates comparisons between positivist studies of perceptions of politics and the constructivist perspective. Thus, while the model of Ferris *et al.* (2002a) seeks to identify a generalizable set of causal links, the framework developed through the study reported here seeks instead to codify how the links between antecedents, political behaviors and consequences are understood by organization managers. While most perspectives attribute political behaviour to the pursuit of self-interest, Chanlat (1997) argues that triggers also lie with personal ambition, the prevalence of unstructured problems (which cannot be resolved through simple decision rules), and structural differentiation (generating competition for resources).

The contingency model of Kumar and Thibodeaux (1990) locates the triggers of political behavior with the significance of organizational change. First-level change in this model involves improving effectiveness.

Second-level change involves the introduction of new perspectives. Third-level change concerns organization-

wide shifts in values and working practices. The more significant the change and its implications, the greater the political involvement required by the change agent. Kumar and Thibodeaux thus argue that, while first- and second-level changes require political awareness and facilitation respectively, third-level change entails political intervention, which may involve stimulating debate, gaining support from key groups, and covert manipulation (tactics which they accept may be “ethically objectionable” but which reflect the “distasteful reality” of organization politics).

Workplace friendship is a relationship established in a workplace that goes beyond normal, work-related interaction. In her study of the formation of workplace friendships, Dotan (2007) identified six main reasons as to why individuals form friendships at work; namely: 1) Work Safety/Trust; 2) Missing Role; 3) Sanity Check; and 4) Work-values/Life-interests Similarity (WVLI); 5) Proximity, and 6) Instrumentality. Generally, Work Safety/Trust is a factor of friendship formation that is affective or emotional in nature. It is based on an internal feeling of safety and trust with regard to work-related issues/experiences and motivates an individual to pursue a friendship relationship with the given coworker for this reason. Missing Role is a factor of workplace friendship formation that is also affective in nature and suggests that “individuals are likely to form friendships with others who are potential substitutes or resemble some important person or role-model in their life: a mother or father figure, a son, a sister or even themselves at some past stage” (Dotan, 2007).

While friendship relationships for men and women are similar in many respects (Wright, 1988) and there are large variations within the genders in terms of their behaviour in same-sex friendships (Walker, 1994), there have been consistent findings in both the social psychology and organizational psychology literature of gender differences in friendships. Women’s friendships have been described as communal, and tend to involve more self-disclosure, supportiveness and complexity than do friendships between men (Markiewicz, Devine, & Kausilas, 2000; Winstead, 1986; Wright, 1988, 1991). Men’s friendships may be described as instrumental; they tend to be organised around shared interests and activities and be action-oriented rather than person-oriented (Markiewicz *et al.*, 2000; Messner, 1992; Winstead, 1986; Wright, 1988, 1991).

Men’s relationships with other men are often competitive (Bird, 2003; Messner, 1992) and are somewhat less likely to involve the sharing of personal feelings (Odden & Sias, 1997; Wood & Inman, 1993). On the other hand, both men and women have been found to derive emotional support and therapeutic value from their relationships with women (Sapadin, 1988; Veniegas & Peplau, 1997), possibly as a result of women’s greater

comfort with intimacy and their emphasis on successful relationships as part of their self-concept (Markiewicz *et al.*, 2000). Thus, findings generally indicate that friendships with women are rated (by both women and men) as more enjoyable, nurturing and of an overall higher quality (Sapadin, 1988).

With respect to the function of friendships, literature with a focus on interpersonal relationships indicates that while men achieve and define closeness through the sharing of activities, women define and achieve closeness through the sharing of feelings and emotions (Odden & Sias, 1997; Wood & Inman, 1993). Similarly, Ashton and Fuerhrer (1993) found that males are generally less likely than females to seek emotional support when stressed or anxious. Flaherty and Richman (1989) also state that the provision of social and emotional support was more likely to be a function of women’s relationships, with women both receiving and providing more emotional social support than men in time of distress.

Dotan (2007) suggested that when employees have trustful friends at work, they can get help or advice from their friend coworkers and, therefore, gain feelings of security, comfort, and satisfaction with their job at work. Also, employees in friendship tend to engage in altruistic behaviors by providing co-workers with help, guide, advice, feedback, recommendation, or information on various work-related matters (Hamilton, 2007).

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Research Design

The design for this study is a survey research design which measured two variables which is the independent variable and the dependent variable. The independent variables were general politics, go along to get ahead, pay and promotion policies and the dependent variable is workplace friendship.

#### 3.2 Sample

A sample size of two hundred and twenty was drawn from a private university located in Oyo, Oyo Town which included academic and non-academic staff of the university using stratified sampling method. The samples comprised 98 (54.4%) males and 82 (45.6%) females.

#### 3.3 Data Collection

The type of data that was used for the study was primary data. The primary data was collected using questionnaires so as to enable the researcher obtain accurate and adequate information relating to the research work. The questionnaire was administered to the academic and non-academic staff of the university under study. One hundred and eighty questionnaires were retrieved and found usable for analysis out of the two hundred and twenty questionnaires administered. This gave a response rate of 82%.

### 3.4 Research Instruments

The study employed a questionnaire as an instrument for data collection. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. Section A measured the demographics of the respondents which includes age, sex, marital status, educational qualification, etc., while section B measured perceptions of organizational politics in terms of general political behaviour, going along to get ahead, and pay and promotion policy. We measured perceptions of organizational politics with the research instrument that was developed by Kacmar and Carlson (1997) Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS). This scale identifies three dimensions, including: *General Political Behavior* (2 items), *Go Along To Get Ahead* (7 items), *Pay and Promotion Policies* (6 items). The Cronbach alpha for general political behavior subscale is  $\alpha = 0.77$ ; go along to get ahead is  $\alpha = 0.78$ ; and pay and promotion policies is  $\alpha = 0.73$ . The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). Section C measured workplace friendship. This study measured workplace friendship using the 6-item scale of Nielsen *et al.* (2000) on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from “strongly agree” (5) to “strongly disagree” (1). The instruments were revalidated, and the cronbach alpha reliability coefficients gave the following results: general political behaviour -.86, going along to get ahead -.67, pay and promotion policies -.76 and workplace friendship -.65.

### 3.5 Hypotheses of the Study

(1) General politics, go along to get ahead, pay and promotion policies will jointly and independently predict workplace friendship.

(2) There will be a significant relationship between pay and promotion policies and workplace friendship.

(3) There will be a significant relationship between go along to get ahead and workplace friendship.

(4) There will be a significant relationship between general politics and workplace friendship.

### 3.6 Data Analysis Techniques

The demographic information was analyzed using frequency counts and simple percentages. Hypotheses for this research were analyzed with multiple regression analysis and Pearson’s correlation. Hypothesis 1 was tested with multiple regression analysis while hypotheses 2 to 4 were analysed with Pearson’s correlation.

## 4. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATIONS

### 4.1 Analyses of Demographic Information

Table 1 shows that there are 98 (54.4%) male respondents and 82 (45.6%) female respondents. It also shows that 32

(17.8%) of the respondents are between 18 to 25 years, 53 (29.4%) of the respondents are between the age of 26 to 35 years, 44 (24.5%) of the respondents are between the age of 36 to 45 years, 44 (24.5%) of the respondents are between the age of 46 to 55 years while 33 (18.3%) of the respondents are aged of 56 years and above. The marital status of the respondents also show that 63 (35.0%) of the respondents are single, 107 (59.4%) are married, 9 (5.0%) of the respondents are divorced while 1 (35.0%) respondent is separated. The Educational Background of the respondents shows that 5 (2.8%) of the respondents have SSCE, GCE, NECO certificates, 13 (7.2%) of them have OND, NCE certificates, 63 (35.0%) of them have B.Sc/HND certificates, while 99 (53.0%) respectively. The table also showed the respondents working cadre. 107 (59.4%) of the respondents are academic staff while 73 (40.6%) of them are non-academic staff.

**Table 1**  
**Table Showing the Descriptive Statistics of Demographics**

| Sex                    | Frequency  | Percentage (%) |
|------------------------|------------|----------------|
| Male                   | 98         | 54.4           |
| Female                 | 82         | 45.6           |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>180</b> | <b>100.0</b>   |
| Age                    | Frequency  | Percentage (%) |
| 18-25years             | 32         | 17.8           |
| 26-35years             | 53         | 29.4           |
| 36-45years             | 44         | 24.5           |
| 46-55years             | 44         | 24.5           |
| 56years and above      | 33         | 18.3           |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>180</b> | <b>100</b>     |
| Marital Status         | Frequency  | Percentage (%) |
| Single                 | 63         | 35.0           |
| Married                | 107        | 59.4           |
| Divorced               | 9          | 5.0            |
| Separated              | 1          | 0.6            |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>180</b> | <b>100</b>     |
| Educational Background | Frequency  | Percentage (%) |
| Postgraduate           | 99         | 53.0           |
| B.Sc/HND               | 63         | 35.0           |
| OND/NCE                | 13         | 7.2            |
| SSCE                   | 5          | 2.8            |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>180</b> | <b>100.0</b>   |
| Working Cadre          | Frequency  | Percentage (%) |
| Academic               | 107        | 59.4           |
| Non-Academic           | 73         | 40.6           |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>180</b> | <b>100.0</b>   |

Source: Field Survey, (2012)

## 5. TESTING OF RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

**Hypothesis 1:** General politics, go along to get ahead, pay and promotion policies will jointly and independently predict workplace friendship.

**Table 2**  
**A Table Showing Multiple Regression of General Politics, Go Along to Get Ahead and Pay and Promotion Policy on Workplace Friendship**

| Variables                | F-ratio | Significance of P | R    | R <sup>2</sup> | Adj. R <sup>2</sup> | B    | T     | P |
|--------------------------|---------|-------------------|------|----------------|---------------------|------|-------|---|
| General politics         | 6.999   | .000              | .326 | .107           | .091                | .063 | .505  |   |
| Go along to get ahead    |         |                   |      |                |                     | .125 | 1.716 |   |
| Pay and promotion policy |         |                   |      |                |                     | .156 | 2.378 |   |

Table 2 shows that the linear combination effects of general politics, go along to get ahead and pay and promotion policy jointly predicted workplace friendship and was significant with  $F(3,176) = 6.999$ ;  $R = .326$ ;  $R^2 = .107$ ;  $Adj. R^2 = .091$ ;  $P < 0.05$ . The result indicates that it is significant at 15%. The independent predictor variables

jointly accounted for a variation of about 11 per cent. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted.

Based on the independent result, the results obtained are presented below.

**H<sub>1</sub>**: general politics will independently predict workplace friendship

**Table 3**  
**Showing Independent Prediction of General Politics on Workplace Friendship**

| Variable         | F-Ratio | Significant of P | R    | R <sup>2</sup> | Adj. R <sup>2</sup> | B    | T     | P    |
|------------------|---------|------------------|------|----------------|---------------------|------|-------|------|
| General politics | 8.660   | .004             | .215 | .046           | .041                | .307 | 2.943 | .004 |

Table 3 shows that the independent prediction of general politics on workplace friendship was significant with  $F(1,179) = 8.660$ ;  $R = .215$ ;  $R^2 = .046$ ;  $Adj. R^2 = .041$ ;  $P < 0.01$ . The result indicates that it is significant at 1%.

The independent predictor variables jointly accounted for a variation of about 5 percent. This however, shows a low prediction of general politics on workplace friendship.

**H<sub>2</sub>**: go along to get ahead will independently predict workplace friendship

**Table 4**  
**Showing Independent Prediction of Go Along to Get Ahead on Workplace Friendship**

| Variable              | F-Ratio | Significant of P | R    | R <sup>2</sup> | Adj. R <sup>2</sup> | B    | T     | P    |
|-----------------------|---------|------------------|------|----------------|---------------------|------|-------|------|
| Go along to get ahead | 11.937  | .001             | .251 | .063           | .058                | .223 | 3.455 | .001 |

Table 4 shows that the independent prediction of go along to get ahead on workplace friendship was significant with  $F(1,179) = 11.937$ ;  $R = .251$ ;  $R^2 = .063$ ;  $Adj. R^2 = .058$ ;  $P < 0.05$ . The result indicates that it is significant at 5%. The independent predictor variable accounted for a variation of about 3 percent. This however, shows

a low prediction of go along to get ahead on workplace friendship. However, with  $P < 0.05$ , we conclude that go along to get ahead independently predicted workplace friendship.

**H<sub>3</sub>**: pay and promotion policy will independently predict workplace friendship.

**Table 5**  
**Showing Independent Prediction of Pay and Promotion Policy on Workplace Friendship**

| Variable                 | F-Ratio | Significant of P | R    | R <sup>2</sup> | Adj. R <sup>2</sup> | B    | T     | P    |
|--------------------------|---------|------------------|------|----------------|---------------------|------|-------|------|
| Pay and promotion policy | 17.012  | .000             | .295 | .087           | .082                | .219 | 4.125 | .000 |

Table 5 shows that the independent prediction of pay and promotion policy on workplace friendship was significant with  $F(1,179) = 17.012$ ;  $R = .295$ ;  $R^2 = .087$ ;  $Adj. R^2 = .082$ ;  $P < 0.05$ . The result indicates that it is significant at 9%. The independent predictor variable accounted for a variation of about 1 percent. This however, shows a low prediction pay and promotion

policy on workplace friendship. However, with  $P < 0.05$ , we conclude that pay and promotion policy independently predicted workplace friendship.

**Hypothesis 2:** There will be a significant relationship between pay and promotion policies and workplace friendship.

**Table 6**  
**Summary of Pearson Correlation Showing the Relationship Between Pay and Promotion Policy and Workplace Friendship**

| Variable                 | Mean    | Standard deviation | N   | R      | P    | Remark |
|--------------------------|---------|--------------------|-----|--------|------|--------|
| Pay and promotion policy | 16.8444 | 4.17605            | 180 | .295** | .000 | Sig.   |
| Workplace friendship     | 15.6444 | 3.09374            |     |        |      |        |

Table 6 shows that the mean value of 16.8444 for Pay and promotion policy and 15.6444 for workplace friendship falls within the minimum and maximum values of 8.00 and 30.00 and 6.00 and 20.00. The result also shows a low standard deviation of 2.70304 and 10.34783.

However, based on the result from the correlation table, it indicates that correlation is significant at the 0.01

level with a 2 tailed test. This result indicates  $P < 0.1$  since  $P = 0.00$ . Hence, it is significant at 1%. Based on the outcome therefore, we conclude that there is a significant relationship between pay and promotion policy and workplace friendship. The hypothesis is accepted.

**Hypothesis 3:** There will be a significant relationship between go along to get ahead and workplace friendship.

**Table 7**  
**Summary of Pearson Correlation Showing the Relationship Between Go Along to Get Ahead and Workplace Friendship**

| Variable              | Mean    | Standard deviation | N   | R      | P    | Remark |
|-----------------------|---------|--------------------|-----|--------|------|--------|
| Go along to get ahead | 19.4778 | 3.47610            | 180 | .251** | .001 | Sig.   |
| Workplace friendship  | 15.6444 | 3.09374            |     |        |      |        |

Table 7 shows that the mean value of 19.4778 for go along to get ahead and 15.6444 for workplace friendship falls within the minimum and maximum values of 8.00 and 30.00 and 9.00 and 29.00. The result also shows a low standard deviation of 3.47610 and 3.09374. However, based on the result from the correlation table, it indicates that correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

with a 2 tailed test. This result indicates  $P < 0.1$  since  $P = 0.001$ . Hence, it is significant at 1%. Based on the outcome therefore, we conclude that there is a significant relationship between go along to get ahead and workplace friendship. The hypothesis is accepted.

**Hypothesis 4:** There will be a significant relationship between general politics and workplace friendship.

**Table 8**  
**Summary of Pearson Correlation Showing the Relationship Between General Politics and Workplace Friendship**

| Variable             | Mean    | Standard deviation | N   | R         | P    | Remark |
|----------------------|---------|--------------------|-----|-----------|------|--------|
| General politics     | 5.4333  | 2.16911            | 180 | .215 (**) | .001 | Sig.   |
| Workplace friendship | 15.6444 | 3.09374            |     |           |      |        |

The result from Table 8 shows that the mean value of 5.4333 for general politics and 15.6444 for workplace friendship falls within the minimum and maximum values of 2.00 and 10.00 and 9.00 and 29.00. The result also shows a low standard deviation of 2.16911 and 3.09374.

However, based on the result from the correlation table, it indicates that correlation is significant at the 0.01 level with a 2 tailed test. This result indicates  $P < 0.1$  since  $P = 0.001$ . Hence, it is significant at 1%. Based on the outcome therefore, we conclude that there is a significant relationship between general politics and workplace friendship. The hypothesis is accepted.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

The results of this study generally support the hypotheses formulated in terms of the association between the

perception of organizational politics and workplace friendship. The result of hypothesis one revealed that general politics, go along to get ahead, pay and promotion policies jointly and independently predicted workplace friendship. This means that the three dimensions of perception of organizational politics were predictors of workplace friendship. The findings supported the works of Dotan (2007) and Hamilton (2007) who suggested that when employees have trustful friends at work, they can get help or advice from their friend coworkers and, therefore, gain feelings of security, comfort, and satisfaction with their job at work. Also, employees in friendship tend to engage in altruistic behaviors by providing co-workers with help, guide, advice, feedback, recommendation, or information on various work-related matters. The result of hypothesis two indicated that there was a significant relationship or association between pay and

promotion policies and workplace friendship. Pragmatic, realistic and fair pay and promotion policies can promote workplace friendship.

Furthermore, the study showed that there was a significant relationship between go along to get ahead and workplace friendship. This finding corroborates the conclusion by Ferris *et al.* (1996) who stated that in a political work environment, POPs influences the work attitude, organizational coherence and collegial relationships of employees. Hypothesis four revealed a significant relationship between general politics and workplace friendship. This means that general political behaviour is a correlate of workplace friendship.

This study therefore concluded that the three measures of perception of organizational politics were predictors of workplace friendship. Also, the study concluded that the three dimensions of perceptions of organizational politics were strongly related to workplace friendship. Based on the findings from this study, it is suggested that efforts to enhance or emphasize the importance of teamwork may be an appropriate managerial approach to reducing politics by increasing employees' understanding and control, particularly in organizations whose strategic objectives call for employees to work in teams. Employees should recognize the consequences and antecedents of perception of politics prevailing in their organization.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, R. W., Madison, D. L., Porter, L. W., Renwick, P. A., & Mayes, B. T. (1979). Organizational Politics: Tactics and Characteristics of Its Actors. *California Management Review*, 22, 77-83.
- Ashton, W. A., & Fuerhrer, A. (1993). Effects of Gender and Gender Role Identification of Participant and Type of Social Support Resource on Support Seeking. *Sex Roles*, 28(7-8), 461-476.
- Astley, W. G., & Sachdeva, P. S. (1984). Structural Sources of Intraorganizational Power: A Theoretical Synthesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(1), 104-113.
- Bacharach, S. B., & Lawler, E. J. (1981). *Power and Politics in Organizations: The Social Psychology of Conflict, Coalitions, and Bargaining*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bacharach, S. B., & Lawler, E. J. (1998). Political Alignments in Organizations: Contextualization, Mobilization, and Coordination. In R. M. Kramer & M. A. Neale (Eds.), *Power and Influence in Organizations* (pp. 67-88). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barley, S., & kunda, G. (2001). Bringing Work back in. *Organization Science*, 12(1), 76-95.
- Berman, E. M., West, J. P., & Richter, M. N. (2002). Workplace Relationships: Friendship Patterns and Consequences (According to Managers). *Public Administration Review*, 62, 217-30.
- Bird, S. R. (2003). Sex Composition, Masculinity Stereotype Dissimilarity and the Quality of Men's Workplace Social Relations. *Gender Work and Organization*, 10(5), 579-604.
- Buchanan, D. A. (1999). The Logic of Political Action: An Experiment with the Epistemology of the Particular. *British Journal of Management*, 10(special conference issue), 73-88.
- Burns, T. (1961). Micropolitics: Mechanisms of Institutional Change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55, 257-281.
- Butcher, D., & Clarke M. (1999). Organizational Politics: the Missing Discipline of Management? *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 31(1), 9-12.
- Drory, A. (1993). Perceived Political Climate and Job Attitudes. *Organization Studies*, 14(1), 59-71.
- Chanlat, J. F. (1997). Conflict and Politics. In A. Sorge & M. Warner (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational Behaviour* (pp. 472-480). London: International Thomson.
- Dotan, H. (2007). *Friendship Ties at Work: Origins, Evolution and Consequences for Managerial*.
- Drory, A., & Romm, T. (1990). The Definition of Organizational Politics: A Review. *Human Relations*, 43, 1133-1154.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bourgeois, L. T. (1988). Politics of Strategic Decision Making in Velocity Environments: Towards a Mid-Range Theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 737-770.
- Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Perceptions of Organizational Politics. *Journal of Management*, 18, 93-116.
- Ferris, G. R., Russ, G. S., & Fandt, P. M. (1989). Politics in Organizations. In Giacalone, R. A. & Rosenfeld P. (Eds.), *Impression Management in the Organization* (pp. 143-170). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ferris, G. R., & King, T. R. (1991). Politics in Human Resources Decisions: A Walk on the Dark Side. *Organizational Dynamics*, 20, 59-71.
- Ferris, G. R., Adams, G., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., & Ammeter, A. P. (2002a). Perceptions of Organizational Politics: Theory and Research Directions. *Research in Multi-Level Issues*, 1, 179-254.
- Ferris, G. R., Harrell-Cook, G., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2000). Organizational Politics: The Nature of the Relationship Between Politics Perceptions and Political Behavior. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 17, 89-130.
- Ferris, G. R., Hochwarter, W. A., Douglas, C., Blass, F. R., Kolodinsky, R. W., & Treadway, D. C. (2002b). Social Influence Processes in Organizations and Human Resources Systems. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 21, 65-127.
- Ferris, G. R., Russ, G. S., & Fandt, P. M. (1996). *Politics in Organizations*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawewnce Elbaum.
- Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Perception of Organizational Politics. *Journal of Management*, 18, 93-116.
- Flaherty, J., & Richman, J. (1989). Gender Differences in the Perception and Utilization of Social Support: Theoretical



- Perspectives and an Empirical Test. *Social Science and Medicine*, 28, 1221-1228.
- Gandz, J., & Murray, V. V. (1980). The Experience of Workplace Politics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, 237-251.
- Hamilton, E. A. (2007). *Firm Friendship: Examining Functions and Outcomes of Workplace Friendship Among Law Firm Associates* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Boston College, Boston, MA.
- Hardy, C. (1996). Some Dare Call It Power. In Clegg, S., Hardy, C., Nord, W. (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Studies*. Sage: London.
- Harris, R. B., Harris, K. J., Harvey, P. (2007). A Test of Competing Models of the Relationships Among Perceptions of Organizational Politics, Perceived Organizational Support, and Individual Outcomes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 147(6), 631-655.
- Harrison, E. F. (1987). *The Management Decision-Making Process*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., Lee, C. A., Schneck, R. E., & Pennings J. M. (1971). A Strategic Contingencies Theory of Intra-Organizational Power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(2), 216-219.
- Kacmar, K. M., & Baron, R. A. (1999). Organizational Politics: The State of the Field, Links to Related Processes, and an Agenda for Future Research. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 17, 1-39.
- Kacmar, K. M., & Carlson, D. S. (1997). Further Validation of the Perceptions of Politics Scale (POPS): A Multiple Sample Investigation. *Journal of Management*, 23, 627-658.
- Kacmar, K. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1991). Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS): Development and Construct Validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51, 193-205.
- Keen, P. G. W. (1981). Information Systems and Organizational Change. *Communications of the ACM*, 24(1), 24-33.
- Klein, J. I. (1988). The Myth of the Corporate Political Jungle: Politicization as a Political Strategy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 25, 1-12.
- Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring Alternatives: The Role of Peer Relationships in Career Development. *Academy Management Journal*, 28, 110-132.
- Kumar, K., & M. Thibodeaux (1990). Organizational Politics and Planned Organizational Change. *Group and Organizational Studies*, 15(4), 357-365.
- Mangham, I. (1979). *The Politics of Organizational Change*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Mao, H. Y. (2006). The Relationship Between Organizational Level and Workplace Friendship. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(10), 1819-1833.
- Markiewicz, D., Devine, I., & Kausilas, D. (2000). Friendships of Women and Men at Work: Job Satisfaction and Resource Implications. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1-2).
- Mayes, B. T., & Allen, R. W. (1977). Toward a Definition of Organizational Politics. *Academy of Management Review*, 2, 672-678.
- McClelland, D. C. & Burnham, D. H. (1995). Power is the Great Motivator. *Harvard Business Review*, 73(1), 126-139.
- Medison, L. M., Allen, R. W., Renwick, P. A., & Mayes, B. T. (1980). Organizational Politics: An Exploration of Manager's Perceptions. *Human Relations*, 33, 79-100.
- Messner, M. A. (1992). *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem on Masculinity*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Miller, B. K., Rutherford, M. A., & Kolodinsky, R. W. (2008). Perceptions of Organizational Politics: A Meta-Analysis of Outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22, 209-222.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and Around Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mintzberg, H. (1985). The Organization as Political Arena. *Journal of Management Studies*, 22(2), 133-154.
- Nadler, D. A. (1979). The Effects of Feedback on Task Group Behavior: A Review of the Experimental Research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 23(June), 309-38.
- Nielsen, I. K., Jex, S. M., & Adams, G. A. (2000). Development and Validation of Scores on a Two Dimensional Workplace Friendship Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(4), 628-643.
- Odden, C. M., & Sias, P. M. (1997). Peer Communication Relationships, Psychological Climate, and Gender. *Communication Quarterly*, 45, 153-166.
- Payne, R. B., & Hauty, G. T. (1955). The Effect of Psychological Feedback Upon Work Decrement. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 50, 343-351.
- Perrewé, P. L., Ferris G. R., Frink, D. D., & Anthony, W. P. (2000). Political Skill: An Antidote for Workplace Stressors. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(3), 115-123.
- Pettigrew, A. M., & McNulty T. (1995). Power and Influence in and Around the Boardroom. *Human Relations*, 48(8), 845-873.
- Poon, J. (2003). Situational Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Politics Perceptions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18, 138-155.
- Rawlins, W. K. (1992). *Friendship Matters: Communication, Dialectics, and the Life Course*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Sapadin, L. A. (1988). Friendship and Gender: Perspectives of Professional Men and Women. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 387-403.
- Sias, P. M., & Cahill, D. J. (1998). From Coworkers to Friends: The Development of Peer Friendships in the Workplace. *Western Journal of Commerce*, 62, 273-299.
- Stone, B. (1997). *Confronting Company Politics*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Business.
- Sussman, L., Adams, A. J., Kuzmits, F. E., & Raho, L. E. (2002). Organizational Politics: Tactics, Channels, and Hierarchical Roles. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 40, 313-329.
- Tziner, A. (1999). The Relationship Between Distal and Proximal Factors and the Use of Political Considerations in Performance Appraisal. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 14, 217-231.

- Valle, M., & Perrewe, P. L. (2000). Do Politics Perceptions Relate to Political Behaviors? Tests of an Implicit Assumption and Expanded Model. *Human Relations, 53*, 359-386.
- Veniegas, R. C., & Peplau, L. A. (1997). Power and the Quality of Same-Sex Friendships. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*(2), 279-297.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2003). *Developments in Organizational Politics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Voyer, J. J. (1994). Coercive Organizational Politics and Organizational Outcomes: An Interpretive Study. *Organization Science, 5*(1), 72-85.
- Walker, K. (1994). Men, Women, and Friendship - What They Say, What They Do. *Gender and Society, 8*(2), 246-265.
- Winstead, B. A. (1986). Sex Differences in Same Sex Friendships. In Derlelga, J. & Winstead, B. A. (Eds.), *Friendship and Social Interaction*. (pp. 81-99). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Wood, J. T., & Inman, C. C. (1993). In a Different Mode: Masculine Styles of Communicating Closeness. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 21*, 279-295.
- Wright, P. H. (1988). Interpreting Research on Gender Differences in Friendship: A Case for Moderation and a Plea for Caution. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5*, 367-373.
- Wright, P. H., & Scanlon, M. B. (1991). Gender Role Orientations and Friendship: Some Attenuation, But Gender Differences Abound. *Sex Roles, 14*, 551-566.
- Wright, P. H. (1978). Toward a Theory of Friendship Based on the Conception of Self. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 196-207.
- Zaleznik, A. (1997). Real Work. *Harvard Business Review, 75*(6), 53-63.