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Abstract

This thesis investigates the relationship between organisational politics and innovation in a divisional business unit within an Australian information technology services organisation. It also investigates the use of political tactics within the organisation, the emotional effect of the use of political tactics on individuals, and their rationale for the use of political tactics by supervisors and peers.

A self-administered questionnaire consisting of open and closed questions was used in this study. A total of 169 useable responses from employees at all levels of the divisional business unit were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Six scales were included in the analysis, including dispositional, perceptual and behavioural variables. Demographic data were also included in the analysis.

This study contributes to organisation studies literature by extending existing knowledge about organisational politics. Specifically, the results show that the greater the amount of organisational politics perceived by employees the lower the level of perceived organisational innovation ($r = .520$).

The findings of this study support previously researched relationships between an individual’s locus of control and Machiavellianism and their perception of organisational politics. In addition, locus of control and perception of workplace innovation were found to be related.

This study found that the Perception of Politics Scale (POPS) is a valid operationalisation of the perception of organisational politics concept within the Australian context.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Objective of this chapter

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the thesis and its structure. It also sets out the theoretical background of the study, the justification for the research, the research questions, the methodology adopted, structure of the thesis, definitions, limitations of the study, key assumptions and this study’s contribution to the literature.

1.2 Objectives of this study

The primary objective of this thesis is to investigate the relationship between multi-dimensional psychological constructs, perception of organisational politics and perception of workplace innovation within an Australian I.T. services organisation. A second objective is to examine individual dispositional, individual non-dispositional, and organisational variables as antecedents to both of these multi-dimensional psychological phenomena. Thirdly, an explanation is sought for political behaviour, and emotional response to a specific example of political behaviour, where knowledge is withheld from individuals by supervisors and peers.

1.3 Introduction

Organisations are striving to build the capacity to be innovative in order to remain competitive. A challenge for practitioners is to build systems and processes that encourage behaviours within organisations that promote and demonstrate creativity and innovation. The identification of organisational elements that promote or inhibit innovation efforts is critical. Relatively new areas of organisational study have emerged over the past few decades. One such area in within the field of organisational psychology is the perception of organisational politics. It has been suggested that there is a
relationship between perception of organisational politics and innovation thereby implying that the presence of organisational politics has implications for the performance of organisations in the area of innovation.

1.3 Theoretical Background

Considerable research has been undertaken in the area of organisational politics in the last 40 years. This subject within organisational behaviour studies has its roots in the study of power and power systems within organisations. Politics has been considered to be power in action and two streams of research have developed to dominate research into the view of organisation as political arena. The first, which has concentrated on political behaviours within organisations, has been pursued using positivist and phenomenological approaches and has seen researchers and scholars gather quantitative and qualitative data in surveys, case studies and longitudinal studies in order to identify the nature of organisational politics. The second has been the study of perceptions of organisational politics as a multi-dimensional psychological construct. Using a positivistic approach, researchers have gathered mainly quantitative data from organisations using a perception of organisational politics scale and in the process identified antecedents, moderators and outcomes related to perceptions of organisational politics. A primary objective in this stream of research has been to establish the nature of the relationship between perception of organisational politics and other concepts within organisational studies and to quantify the strength of that relationship. Clearly the primary aim for academic researchers is to gain more knowledge about and understanding of the nature of organisational politics, about which there are diverse views among academics. A fuller understanding of organisational politics has also benefits to practitioners, because by identifying and measuring the perceived presence of organisational politics, its causes and effects, practitioners may take corrective action to minimise factors that inhibit innovation efforts and encourage those behaviours that enhance innovation activity.
1.4 Justification for This Research

There are a number of reasons for this study. First, it brings together two major concepts within organisational studies, perceptions of organisational politics and innovation. Considerable research has been conducted within each of these areas over the last 40 years, however, only one attempt (Parker et al., 1995) has been made to use limited operationalisations of the concepts simultaneously. Second, perception of organisational politics has not been researched within the Australian context. Overwhelmingly, most of the research has been conducted in the USA, with several studies being conducted in Israel, and single studies conducted in Canada, Taiwan and Malaysia. Third, the exploration of the relationship between perception and behaviour within the organisation as a political arena, has been limited to a study including perception of organisational politics, the multi-dimensional psychological phenomenon, and the use of reactive and proactive political tactics.

This study explores the relationship between perception of organisational politics and the use of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics and in doing so seeks to establish a link between perception of organisational politics and behaviour that may be regarded as ‘negative’ from an organisational perspective. Fourthly, this study, using the experience of respondents who have been denied knowledge by their supervisors and peers, seeks to explore relationships between their experience, including emotions, and perception of organisational politics, their use of political tactics and innovation. Lastly, this study replicates previous studies by testing the relationships between perception of organisational politics and antecedents including individual dispositional and non-dispositional antecedents, such as Machiavellianism and locus of control, and the relationship between the two antecedents.
1.5 Questions and hypotheses

The literature review conducted in this study uncovered gaps in organisational politics and innovation research and informed the formulation of three research questions and eight hypotheses which are listed below.

Research question 1

What is the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation within an I.T. company in the Australian private sector?

H1 – Perceptions of organisational politics is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

H2 – The relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation is mediated by the role of actors within the organisation.

Research question 2

Are locus of control and Machiavellianism, which are antecedents to perceptions of organisational politics also antecedents to perceptions of workplace innovation?

H 3 - External locus of control is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

H 4 – Machiavellianism is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

Research question 3

What is the relationship between political behaviour and perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation?
H 5 – The use of non-sanctioned political behaviour is positively related to perceptions of organisational politics.

H 6 – The use of sanctioned political behaviour is unrelated to perceptions of organisational politics.

H 7 – The use of non-sanctioned political behaviour is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation

H 8 – The use of sanctioned political behaviour is positively related to perceptions of workplace innovation

1.6 Methodology

This study is predominantly a positivistic investigation that gathers quantitative and qualitative data through a self-administered survey questionnaire. Data is analysed using univariate, bivariate and multivariate parametric techniques. The more powerful parametric techniques are appropriate for this study because the sample size is large enough, 169 cases were available for analysis, and distribution of the data was normal. Non-parametric techniques are more appropriate with small sample sizes where the data does not meet the stringent assumptions of the parametric techniques.

1.7 Structure of Thesis

The structure of the thesis is as follows:

Chapter two reviews the research literature of the two primary concepts in this study, perception of organisational politics and innovation, and also considers the literature relating to related concepts in this study including, political behaviour, Machiavellianism, locus of control, emotions in organisations. The chapter also identifies gaps in previous research and formulates research questions and hypotheses.
Chapter three explains and justifies the methodology used in this thesis, including the data collection through the use of exploratory studies and pilot studies and data analysis techniques. It further explains how the author dealt with issues such as ethics and data contamination. A description of the sample used in this study is also included.

Chapter four describes the development of the questionnaire used to gather data in this study. The evolution of the questionnaire is explained and the questionnaire used in the final survey of the study is described. There is a brief discussion about field work issues that arose in the pilot testing and final survey stages of this thesis.

Chapter five contains the analysis of the data gathered in this study. The chapter is structured according to the research questions and the hypotheses articulated in chapter two.

Chapter six contains the findings of this study wherein the analysis of chapter four is contextualised with the literature review of chapter two. This chapter explains how this study has added to previous research in management studies by filling existing gaps in the literature or by confirming previous research.

Chapter seven provides a summary of this thesis. It draws conclusions from this research and explains how it has met its objectives and answered the research questions and confirmed or disaffirmed the hypotheses of this thesis. The chapter also sets out recommendations for future research.

1.8 Definitions

Four definitions are of importance to this thesis because they relate to the central concepts of the study. The first three relate to organisational politics and the fourth is a definition of perception of workplace innovation.
**Organisational politics** – an omnipresent system of influence within organisations wherein individuals or groups use their power in pursuit of their own interests or in the interests of others. These interests may or may not be consistent with organisation objectives. This definition is adapted from Pfeffer (1981), Cropanzano et al., (1995).

**Perception of organisational politics** (POPs) - is a multi-dimensional, subjective and context specific psychological phenomenon. It includes how individuals perceive general political behaviour of others within the organisation, how inaction of other members of an organisation are perceived by an individual as going along to get ahead and how pay and promotions policies are perceived to be politically applied by others (Ferris et al., 1989; Kacmar & Ferris, 1991).

**Organisational political behaviour** – consists of influence attempts using sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics. Sanctioned tactics are consistent with organisational norms and are overtly acceptable. Non-sanctioned tactics are not consistent with organisational norms (Zanzi & O’Neill, 2001).

**Perception of workplace innovation** – is a multi-dimensional, subjective and context specific phenomenon and includes the dimensions of organisational innovation, organisational climate for innovation, team and individual innovation. (McMurray & Dorai, 2003).

**1.9 Limitation of scope and Key Assumptions**

The limitations of this thesis include the sample from which data were gathered, the data is predominantly quantitative, the research for this thesis was conducted within one Australian IT services organisation, the nature of the major concepts included in this study is that they are context specific phenomena. For these reasons, the generalisability of the findings in this thesis are limited.
1.10 Contribution to Literature

This predominantly quantitative study brings together for the first time two psychological constructs from within two aspects of management research, perception of organisational politics and perception of workplace innovation, and investigates their relationship. Thus this study makes a contribution to the development of the existing perception of organisational politics model. The relationship between organisational political behaviours and perceptions of politics and perceptions of workplace innovation are explored. Finally, the emotional response to withholding knowledge by supervisors and peers is investigated as further evidence of the organisation as emotional arena.

1.11 Summary

This chapter provided an overview of this thesis and its organisation. It set out the objectives of the research, justified its conduct, articulated the research questions and hypotheses of this study, identified how this study will contribute to the literature and set out the structure of this thesis.
Chapter 2
Literature Review

2.1 Objective

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature relevant to this study, identify gaps in previous research, and formulate research questions and hypotheses that will form the bases for this thesis.

There are three main sections to this chapter following the introduction. The first relates to organisational politics with concentration on perception of organisation politics and political behaviour. The second section reviews the literature on innovation and in particular examines how innovation has been defined and measured. The third section includes a review of literature addressing the subsidiary theme of this thesis, emotions in organisations.

2.2 Introduction

The literature review for this multidisciplinary study was conducted nationally and internationally, across a number of disciplines, including psychology (industrial and social), sociology, anthropology and political science. Computerised searches were supplemented by manual searches with the objectives of defining organisational politics and innovation, and identifying empirical research undertaken within in these areas including any research that combined these concepts. In bringing these literatures together, this chapter demonstrates that there is a relationship between these concepts that furthers the understanding of organisational behaviour. Additionally, it was posited by the author that organisational actors might experience an emotional response to behaviour that could be construed as political and therefore emotions within the organisation was adopted as a secondary theme to be explored in the literature review.
The study of organisational behaviour encompasses a number of disciplines. These include psychology (explaining behaviour at the individual level of analysis), sociology (the study of social systems), anthropology (cross-cultural analysis and comparative values and attitudes), and political science (Robbins et al., 1998). In organisational studies, social psychology, industrial psychology, anthropology and political science are the disciplines that have contributed towards understanding aspects of organisations including group processes, organisational culture, national culture, power, conflict and intra-organisational politics.

Across these disciplines four main perspectives have been used to study politics in organisations. These may be considered on the basis of the sociological paradigms identified by Burrell and Morgan (1979).

The functionalist paradigm contains two main schools of thought. The pluralist focuses on overt stakeholder behaviours, such as coalition formation and bargaining.

The rationalist view focuses on the legitimate authority of top management and the intended rationality of its decision-making activities. As Burrell and Morgan (1979) note, most of the writing about organisations takes place within this paradigm.

The interpretive paradigm assumes that reality is socially constructed and that the parties involved exert influence by constructing the meaning of what others experience. The structural elements of politics are defined through the use of language, information, metaphor, symbols, myths and humour.

The radical perspective holds that people create their social world within the context of, and under the constraints of, practices previously constructed by those who control resources or possess legitimate authority. Power is a social relationship imbedded in a structure of selection rules (the basis of which is in the ownership of the means of production) for dealing with the world system.

**Radical humanism** is still in its embryonic form and represents an amalgam of concepts from the interpretive and radical structuralist paradigms.
This study adopts a perspective from the functional/pluralist paradigm as it is concerned with employee or stakeholder political behaviour and employee perceptions of the organisation but uses a multi-method approach.

2.3 Power and influence

Power is the capacity of an individual to influence another so that the other does something they would not otherwise do (Robbins et al. 1998). Some characteristics of power are worthy of note. For example, goal compatibility between the power holder and the influenced is not necessary; power may be exercised in any direction, and by groups as well as individuals. At the individual level of analysis, there are five sources of power (French & Raven, 1959). Coercive power is dependent on the fear of the subject of influence experiencing negative ramifications of non-compliance. The power holder relies on physical strength, verbal facility or the ability to grant or withhold support. Reward power results from the anticipation that positive benefits will result from compliance with the power holders wishes. The power holder must have the ability to distribute rewards that others see as valuable. Coercive and reward power are counterparts to each other. Legitimate power in organisations comes from the structural position a person occupies. Power in this case is dependent on the acceptance by others in the organisation of the authority of the position. Expert power is the ability to influence others based on expertise, skill or knowledge. This power is dependent on the organisation’s demand for the particular skill or knowledge. Finally, referent power is derived from the attractiveness of a person because of the resources they have or their personal traits and the desire on the part of others to want to please the power holder. Underpinning the concept of power is dependency. The more dependent a person is on another, the greater the power that other has over the individual.

Just as researchers have differentiated between negative and positive organisational politics, they have also identified a number of systems of influence within organisations that may be classified into legitimate and illegitimate categories. Legitimate systems of influence include authority, ideology and expertise, while politics is ‘technically’
illegitimate in its means and sometimes in its ends (Mintzberg, 1985). Politics can arise when the other systems of influence are absent or weak and can even be invoked by them; for example, departmentalism encourages group processes that benefit parochial interests at the expense of the organisation at large. Bacharach and Lawler (1981) have attempted to integrate the social psychology of politics with the structural analysis of organisations. They contend that when politics and conflict captures an organisation it is called a political arena of which they identify four types: the complete political arena wherein conflict is intensive and pervasive, the confrontation where conflict is intensive but contained, the shaky alliance where conflict is moderate and contained and the politicised organisation where conflict is moderate but pervasive.

Adopting a functionalist/pluralist perspective (Burrell & Morgan, 1979) Bacharach and Lawler (1981) believe that an understanding of organisational politics requires an analysis of power, coalitions and bargaining and a new perspective: an image of organisations grounded in social psychological research on power, coalitions, and bargaining. Power in organisations comprises two dimensions, these are authority (stable, formal and normatively sanctioned) and influence (fluid, informal and dynamic).

The relational structures of power in organisations require that actors engage in networks or coalitions in order to compete for resources and influence. Political skills are vital in these processes and are increasingly viewed positively by the literature. Within this view, the manager is seen as a “manipulator trying to compete and co-operate with others in order to pursue his own ends” (Thompson & McHugh, 2002: 120). The internal political system tends to stabilize because of the stake in survival of the organisation held by all participants and the extra power wielded by the senior managers. In organisations where the situational factors include high diversity and interdependence, the use of influence tactics can result in protracted power struggles characterized by bureaucratic infighting and parochial politics (Kotter, 1985). Westheafer (2000), in discussing the “dark side” of organisations, cites Salancik and Pfeffer 1977 as suggesting that raw political power, rather than being a dirty word, is one of the best means of aligning an organisation with its external reality during the establishment of the organisation. In addition they say that
institutionalised power, as exercised by the dominant power elite shields the organisation from reality and the demands of its environment. In organisations the dominant coalition usually consists of a functional group that embodies the mission of the organisation, for example, the engineering department in Mercedes-Benz.

2.4 Organisational Politics

Considerable research has been undertaken in the area of organisational politics during the last thirty or forty years. Interest has resulted in some authors claiming that organisational politics is important enough to be considered a discipline within organisational studies (Butcher & Clarke, 1999). Whilst organisational politics is generally stigmatised as an undesirable and negative aspect of organisational life within the functional and processual approaches, those taking a social constructionist approach to sense-making, have argued that open and legitimate politics can create the conditions necessary for learning space (Coopey & Burgoyne, 2000). Furthermore, an open form of politics can offset difficulties of unlearning existing knowledge and practices within organisations (Coopey & Burgoyne, 2000). Clearly this has implications for the innovation process within organisations because it suggests that if negative politics were minimised and positive politics maximised, the innovation process would be improved.

The literature has developed along three clearly discernable lines. The first, building on work by Pettigrew (1973), Pfeffer (1981), Barcharach and Lawler (1981), has developed from the consideration of power as a system of influence in organisations. This systems approach has largely focused on departmental politics with Pfeffer (1981) for example, moving from what had previously been an area of organisational theory focussed on interpersonal power (largely between supervisor and subordinate), to theorising about power in organisations as a structural phenomenon. The second area of literature has been concerned with a cognitive approach, that is researching and developing theory about the individuals’ perception of organisational politics, its antecedents and consequences (Ferris et al., 1989; Kacmar & Carlson, 1997; Vigoda, 2003). Lastly, there is a growing body of literature about political behaviour in organisations (Arkin, 1981; Vrendenburgh
& Maurer, 1984; Applebaum & Hughes, 1998; Butcher & Clarke, 2001). The behavioural research in organisational politics has primarily been concerned with researching the use of individual political tactics at various levels of the hierarchy within organisations. The development of theory and empirical research of organisational politics has perhaps been due to organisations being fundamentally political entities and so in order to understand organisations, we must understand organisational politics (Pfeffer, 1992; Vigoda, 2003). More specifically, perhaps it is because it holds the secret of who gets what, when and how in a social system (Laswell, 1958, Vigoda, 2003).

Viewing organisations as political entities is not new (Mayes & Allen, 1977); however, this has been conceptualised in different ways by theorists and researchers. For example organisations have been viewed as political coalitions in which decisions are made and goals set through bargaining processes (March, 1962), or as politically negotiated orders wherein survival is a political act. In the latter conceptualisation, organisational life is viewed as being dominated by political interactions wherein the tactical use of power is enacted to retain or obtain control of real or symbolic resources (Bacharach & Lawler 1981).

In their brief review of the literature, Zanzi and O’Neill (2001) note that there are two primary definitions of organisational politics being used in research. The first is a view that politics is a broad and general set of social behaviours that can either be functional or dysfunctional. The second definition focuses on behaviours that are self-serving and not sanctioned by the organisation. Zanzi and O’Neill (2001) contend that awareness and understanding of the role of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics will benefit managers and professionals.

The competitive nature of organisations has led to the use of organisational politics becoming more prevalent (Zanzi & O’Neill, 2001). This is consistent with the views of Pfeffer (1981, 1992) that interdependence, heterogeneous goals and beliefs, scarcity and distribution of power increase the use of politics in an organisation. Noting that in the literature politics is viewed as a normal part of doing business, Zanzi and O’Neill (2001)
remark that there is no common basic definition that captures the complexity of organisational politics. Their position is that there are positive and negative political behaviours that may be considered in terms of the political tactics people use. They offer two categories of tactics first proposed by Mayes and Allen (1977): those that are sanctioned (acceptable because they are part of the organisational norms) and those that are not sanctioned (deviation from organisational norms). Schelling (1960) viewed organisations as politically negotiated orders wherein organisational life is dominated by political interactions involving the tactical use of power to retain or obtain control of real or symbolic resources. Tetlock (2000) found that political ideology and cognitive style emerged as constant predictors of the value spins that managers placed on decisions at micro, meso and macro levels of analysis in organisations. Furthermore, intuitive theories of good judgement apparently cut across levels of analysis and are deeply grounded in personal epistemologies and political ideologies.

Organisational politics is not only a function of the internal culture of an organisation consistent with the bureaucratic politics model, but also in the case of international organisations distinct cultures may develop in segments of an organisation that are located in different geographic locations throughout the world (Barnett & Finnemore, 1999). This is because they develop in response to the local environment, and receive different stimuli from outside the organisation. A consequence is that different constituencies in international organisations representing different normative views will suggest different tasks and goals for the organisation, resulting in “a clash of competing perspectives that generates pathological tendencies (Barnett & Finnemore, 1999: 717). Therefore it is important to consider the cultural context within which the organisation is situated and the cultural background and influences of its employees. In addition, three perspectives of organisational politics may be found in the literature, which include the nature, determinants and consequences (Bradshaw-Camball & Murray, 1991).

Organisational politics is thought by some researchers to have three dimensions:

- structure (who are the parties? What are their interests? How much power do they have? What are the bases of power?),
- process (how is power used in pursuit of each party’s interest?),
• outcomes (Who gets what? What is the impact on the ongoing relationship of the parties and on the others who comprise the organisation and its stakeholders?) (Bradshaw-Camball & Murray, 1991).

Kumar and Ghadially (1989) note Zaleznik’s contention that power and politics in organisations are related to uncertainty, suspiciousness, distrust, jealousies and alienation with a crucial factor underlying the relationships between political behaviours and trust being fear of rivalry. However, many of these conceptualisations are of organisational politics as a negative presence within organisations. A close examination of the definitions of organisational politics that are contained in the literature is necessary to arrive at a definition for the purposes of this study.

2.4.1 Definitions of Organisational Politics

There is no standard definition of organisational politics (Hartel & Berry, 1999) In their research Hartel & Berry (1999) concluded that organisational politics was most often perceived and described as behaviours that the organisation itself (as personified by top management) undertook to influence employee behaviours and attitudes. During the last few decades, organisational theorists and researchers have suggested many definitions of organisational politics and reviews of the literature have concurred with Hartel and Berry (1999) that there is not a single, widely accepted definition (Cropanzano et al., 1995). However, it has been noted that at least two definitions of organisational politics have been used widely (Cropanzano et al., 1997). First, politics is seen as an influence process that includes a general set of social behaviour and can be functional or dysfunctional. Second, politics includes generally dysfunctional behaviour that is strategically designed to serve long-term or short-term self-interest. These definitions of organisational politics appear within the functionalist/pluralist paradigm where much of the conversation about organisational politics takes place.

Some consistent themes have been identified within the literature by researchers. For example, Mayes and Allen (1977) assert that a common thread running through the
literature is the issue of influence and offer the following definition of organisational politics: “Organisational politics is the management of influence to obtain ends not sanctioned by the organisation or to obtain sanctioned ends through non-sanctioned means.” (Mayes & Allen, 1977: 675). They assert that if the influence means and ends are organisationally sanctioned then the behaviour is non-political job behaviour. O’Connor and Morrison (2001), referring to the work of Drory 1993, and Porter et al. 1981, offer the following definition of organisational politics:

“Organizational Politics refers to behaviours that occur on an informal basis within an organization and involve intentional acts of influence that are designed to protect or enhance individuals’ professional careers when conflicting courses of action are possible.”

Valle and Witt (2001) reflect Mintzberg (1983), in defining politics negatively as actions that are – inconsistent with accepted organisational norms; designed to promote self-interest; taken without regard for, and even at the expense of organisational goals.

An example would be withholding bad but important news from decision makers so that one is viewed as a ‘team player’. Many definitions of organisational politics appear in the literature. Some of these are shown in table 2.1, which is an adaptation of a listing by Ferris et al. (2003). Definitions are arranged in chronological order and include a number of authors not included in the Ferris et al. (2003) listing.

An analysis of the definitions of organisational politics contained in table 2.1 reveals some consistent elements, different foci and a trend of expansion of the definition over the last 40 years. Two elements that are common across all definitions are action/inaction and objective. That is, there is demonstrable and purposeful behaviour involved.

The earliest writers on organisational politics formulated definitions based on a behavioural demonstration of power by an individual that was designed to obtain or retain organisational resources (Schelling, 1960; Burns, 1961). Although in the view of some (Frost & Hayes, 1977), the way in which resources were used could constitute political behaviour and not merely be the object of political behaviour. In just over a decade however, the definition had expanded to include groups in addition to individuals.
as capable of engaging in political activity (Pettigrew, 1973), a position that has continued to be held by more recent researchers (Butcher & Clarke, 2001; Vigoda, 2003).

Table 2.1 Definitions of Organisational Politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schelling (1960)</td>
<td>The tactical use of power to retain or obtain control or real or symbolic resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns (1961)</td>
<td>Individuals are made used of as resources in competitive situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettigrew (1973)</td>
<td>Behaviours by individuals or groups that makes a claim against the resource-sharing systems of the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost and Hayes (1977)</td>
<td>The activities of organisational members…when they use resources to enhance or protect their share of an exchange…in ways that could be resisted, or ways in which the impact would be resisted, if recognised by the other party (ies) to the exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayes and Allen (1977)</td>
<td>The management of influence to obtain ends not sanctioned by the organisation or to obtain sanctioned ends through non-sanctioned means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tushman (1977)</td>
<td>The use of authority and power to effect definitions of goals, directions, and other major parameters of the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Intentional acts of influence to enhance or protect the self-interest of individuals or groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfeffer (1981)</td>
<td>Those activities taken within organisations to acquire, develop, and use power and other resources to obtain one’s preferred outcomes in a situation in which there is uncertainty or dissensus about choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter et al. (1981)</td>
<td>Social influence attempts that are discretionary, intended to promote or protect the self-interests of individuals and groups, and threaten the self-interests of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mintzberg (1983)</td>
<td>Individual or group behaviour that is informal, ostensibly parochial, typically divisive, and above all in a technical sense, illegitimate – sanctioned neither by formal authority, accepted ideology, nor certified expertise, although it may exploit one of these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray and Ariss (1985)</td>
<td>Intentional acts of influence undertaken by individuals or groups to enhance or protect their self-interest when conflicting courses of action are possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris et al. (1989)</td>
<td>A social influence process in which behaviour is strategically designed to maximise short-term or long-term self-interest, which is either consistent with or at the expense of others’ interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris et al., (1995)</td>
<td>Associated with behaviour not formally sanctioned by the organisation, which, although it occurs naturally and may be useful, also may have the potential to produce uncertainty, conflict, and disharmony in the work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropanzano et al. (1995)</td>
<td>Social influence attempts directed at those who can provide rewards that will help promote or protect the self-interest of the actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacharach and Lawler (1998)</td>
<td>The efforts of individuals or groups in organisations to mobilise support for or opposition to organisational strategies, policies or practices in which they have a vested stake or interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kacmar and Baron (1999)</td>
<td>Actions by individuals that are directed toward the goal of furthering their own self-interests without regard for the well-being of others within the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Involves an individual’s attribution to behaviours of self-serving intent, and is defined as an individual’s subjective evaluation about the extent to which the work environment is characterised by co-workers and supervisors who demonstrate such self-serving behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher and Clarke (2001)</td>
<td>Deliberate efforts by individuals and groups in organisations to use power in pursuit of their own particular interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris et al. (2003)</td>
<td>The extent to which political behaviours are pervasive in the work, decision-making, and resource allocation processes within the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Phenomena in which organisational members attempt either directly or indirectly to influence other members by means not sanctioned by formal standard operating procedures or informal norms, in an attempt to achieve personal or group objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigoda (2003)</td>
<td>Individual or group, vertical or horizontal influence process. Has formal or informal aspects. Inter organisational or intra-organisational. Includes positive and negative behaviours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author
Although the basic definitions of 40 years ago have served to provide a useful basis for more sophisticated conceptualisation, their utility in empirical research is limited. This is evidenced by the operationalisation of more descriptive definitions in later research that include social influence by groups or individuals (Porter et al., 1981; Ferris et al., 1989, 1995, 2000, 2003; Gray & Ariss, 1985; Vigoda, 2003). There has been a tendency by some researchers to characterise political behaviour as negative (Mayes & Allen, 1977; Mintzberg, 1983; Bacharach & Lawler, 1998; Kacmar & Baron, 1999). More recent definitions, however, are more inclusive and recognise that while political behaviour in organisations can be negative, it may also be positive for the organisation (Ferris et al., 1989; Vigoda, 2003). The inclusion of influence within seven of the definitions of organisational politics until as recently as Vigoda (2003) and Huang et al. (2003) illustrates that it has continued to be a theme within the literature for almost thirty years since first included by Mayes and Allen (1977). As can be seen in table 2.1, there are other definitions that may suggest the use of influence, however they fail to be specific about how power is used (Butcher & Clarke, 2001), or how others in an organisation are mobilised (Bacharach & Lawler, 1998) for example.

One clear and consistent element in all definitions is that organisational politics involves taking action. Some of the definitions include the word ‘action’ or ‘acts’ (Allen et al., 1979; Gray & Ariss, 1985; Kacmar & Baron, 1999), while some include ‘behaviour’ (Pettigrew, 1973; Mintzberg, 1983; Ferris et al., 2003). All researchers seem agreed that organisational politics must involve an action. Many are agreed that political action involves the use of power (Schelling, 1960; Tushman, 1977; Pfeffer, 1981; Butcher & Clarke, 2001). Since power has been defined as the capacity to influence others so that they do something they would not otherwise do (Robbins et al., 1998), there is a commonality between those definitions that include power and those that include an ‘influence’ process or attempt, for example Cropanzano et al. (1995) and Vigoda (2003).

Some discussion has taken place about the levels of organisational analysis in the conduct of research into perception of organisational politics (Ferris et al., 2003). An examination of the definitions of organisational politics suggests that, since seven of the definitions
refer to the individual, eight refer to the individual and group and the remaining six do not specify the level of organisational analysis, research into organisational politics is heavily weighted (70%) toward the individual level of analysis. Another common element across the definitions of organisational politics is that an action is motivated either by self-interest or in the interest of others. Although politics is characterised as negative by the majority of researchers included in table 2.1, some researchers suggest that political action can be motivated by the greater good of a group (Allen et al., 1979; Ferris et al., 1989; Vigoda, 2003) or the organisation (Bacharach & Lawler, 1998). However, in some definitions there is ambiguity about whether the individual or group interest is consistent with organisational objectives (Huang et al., 2003).

The idea that organisational politics can be sanctioned or not sanctioned by an organisation was first articulated by Mayes and Allen (1977) and refers to organisational politics as being consistent or inconsistent with the norms of the organisation. Such an approach has been supported by other researchers and theorists (Mintzberg, 1983; Ferris et al., 1995; Zanzi & O’Neill, 2001; Huang et al., 2003). Although researchers have pointed out that a behaviour not formally sanctioned by the organisation may be useful (Ferris et al., 1995), if the behaviour is characterised as unauthorised and self-interested then it has a negative connotation, which is consistent with the views of Mayes and Allen (1977) and others mentioned above.

In their definition of organisational politics, Gray and Ariss (1985) focussed on the internal systems of power which control the behaviour of organisational members. Their definition includes some key ideas consistent with previous authors: politics is intentional or discretionary (Allen et al., 1979); the objective of political behaviour is promotion or protection of self-interest (Pfeffer, 1981); self-interest has the potential for defensiveness and conflict when change is proposed or adopted (Culbert & McDonagh, 1980).

Three definitions relating to organisational politics are used in this study. They are consistent with the literature, in particular the literature wherein the scales used in this study originated. First, a definition of organisational politics is required, from which
definitions of perceptions of organisation politics and political behaviour may be derived. This is necessary because, as Ferris et al. (2003) have observed, there are two largely independent streams of research into organisational politics that have emerged over the past twenty years. One deals with the nature of political behaviour, the types of tactics and their consequences. The second deals with individuals’ perceptions of organisational politics, their antecedents and consequences. Since this study is concerned to explore both perceptions and behaviour, multiple definitions are required.

**Organisational politics** - an omnipresent system of influence within organisations wherein individuals or groups use their power in pursuit of their own interests or in the interests of others. These interests may or may not be consistent with organisation objectives. This definition is adapted from Pfeffer (1981) and Croppanzano et al. (1995).

**Perception of organisational politics** (POPs) – a multi-dimensional, subjective and context specific psychological phenomenon. It includes how individuals perceive the *general political behaviour* of others within the organisation, how the inaction of other members of an organisation is perceived by an individual as *going along to get ahead*, and how *pay and promotions* are perceived to be politically applied by others. This definition is adapted from Ferris et al., (1989) and Kacmar and Ferris (1991).

**Organisational political behaviour** - influence attempts using sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics. Sanctioned tactics are consistent with organisational norms and are overtly acceptable. Non-sanctioned tactics are not consistent with organisational norms and are used covertly (Zanzi & O’Neill, 2001).

The next sub-section of this chapter explores the literature relating to the perception of organisational politics, which is a central concept in this study.
2.4.2 Perception of organisational politics

Much attention has been paid to the model of the perception of organisational politics (POPs) developed by Ferris et al. (1989), who proposed that an individual’s perception of politics within an organisation is due to a number of factors. These include organisational factors, such as conditions of the organisation, job/work environment factors, including conditions of the job, and personal factors, including dispositional and non-dispositional factors. These researchers also posited that perceptions of organisational politics resulted in individual, group and organisational outcomes. Within this area of literature, researchers have sought to expand the Ferris et al. (1989) model by identifying further antecedents, outcomes and moderators of organisational politics. This has led some researchers to suggest that perceptions of politics may be a central dimension that employees use in sense-making within organisational life (Parker et al., 1995). Figure 2.1 is an adaptation of the revised Ferris et al (1989) model of the perceptions of organisational politics and was proposed based on a critical review of empirical studies undertaken since the original model was formulated (Ferris et al., 2002).

In their review of the literature, Ferris et al. (2002) noted that a 12-item perception of organisational politics scale (POPS) developed by Kacmar and Ferris (1991), or a variation, was empirically used on 25 occasions between 1992 and 2000. The full 12-item POPS has been used empirically on ten occasions. Workplace politics has been characterised by researchers as a ‘subjectively experienced phenomenon’ (Gandz and Murray 1980). Ferris et al. (1989) developed a concept of the perception of organisational politics in which the individual’s perception of events is their view of reality and therefore drives their cognitive and behavioural responses. They defined organisational politics as a “social influence process in which behaviour is strategically designed to maximise short-term or long-term self-interest, which is either consistent with or at the expense of others’ interests” (Ferris et al., 1989: 145). A considerable body of research on perceptions of organisational politics has resulted in the operationalisation of the concept (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Kacmar & Carlson, 1997; Harrell-Cook et al. 1999) developed by Ferris et al. (1989) using the POPS.
Figure 2.1 Model of perceptions of organisational politics

The 12 item POPS developed by Kacmar and Ferris (1991) is composed of three dimensions. The first, *general political behaviour*, is grounded in the development of self-interested coalitions, with such alliances involving a number of political behaviours. These include directing resources to members of the coalition, making favourable policy decisions, controlling information and communication, using outside experts, controlling the agenda, and controlling decision parameters (Pfeffer, 1981; Croppanzano & Kacmar, 1995). The second dimension of POPS is *going along to get ahead*, which relates to unquestioned compliance and a compliant environment wherein sanctions are applied to those who do not comply. Croppanzano and Kacmar (1995) cite the example of an employee asking a CEO an embarrassing question in a public forum only to be subsequently transferred to a remote outpost of the organisation. *Pay and promotion* is the third dimension, which includes rewarding those who involve themselves in impression management in order to gain popularity with those in power. In addition, financial and positional rewards are seen to be provided to those who behave in an underhanded way. The 12-item POPS has been used extensively in empirical research, demonstrating its good internal reliability, for example, Cropanzano et al. (1997), Kacmar et al. (1999), Valle and Perrewe (2000), Vigoda (2000), Valle and Witt (2001). The 12-item scale has therefore been chosen for this study.

While most of the literature about perceptions of organisational politics comes from the USA, some research has been conducted elsewhere, for example in Israel (Vigoda, 2000, 2002), Canada (O’Connor & Morrison, 2001) and Taiwan (Huang et al., 2003). The POPS scale has yet to be tested across a diversity of cultural settings. Furthermore, little research has been carried out examining the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and innovation. However, in one US study, researchers (Parker et al., 1995) found that respondents perceiving a higher level of organisational politics also viewed the organisation as less innovative. The study’s main purpose was the conduct of a climate survey. It was restricted to gathering data within a public sector R&D facility in the USA and the researchers’ operationalisation of the variables differed from that of previous researchers on perceptions of organisational politics. In addition, Parker et al. (1995) used some scales with small numbers of items, for example the four-item
perceptions of innovation scale. Hence, research to date has not established a strong relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation.

The 12-item POPS has been empirically tested in the USA, Canada, Israel, England, Malaysia and Taiwan. Although it has not been used in the Australian cultural context, there are sufficient similarities between the cultural settings of the first four countries mentioned above and Australia to expect that the POPS will be an appropriate measure of perceptions of organisational politics within Australia. The cultural context is further discussed later in this chapter.

### 2.4.3 Antecedents to perception of organisational politics

In order to understand the phenomenon of perceptions of organisational politics, researchers have theorised and conducted empirical research to identify its antecedents. Situational and individual dispositional and non-dispositional categories of antecedents were included in the Ferris et al. (1989) model of the POPs. Situational determinants included job/work environment influences and organisational influences. The job/work antecedents included job autonomy, skill variety, feedback, advancement opportunities and interactions with coworkers and supervisors. Four organisational antecedents were proposed: centralisation (the distribution of power within the organisation), formalisation (the level of explicit rules and procedures within the organisation), hierarchical level (supervisory status) and span of control (the number of direct reports to a supervisor). A fourth category of antecedent, influence tactics, has more recently been proposed by Vigoda (2003), who suggested that the use of influence tactics affects an individual’s perceptions of organisational politics. This is in contrast to other research that has sought to establish political behaviour as a moderator of the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and its outcomes. Many of the antecedents have been tested empirically, some on numerous occasions and with mixed results.
Individual dispositional antecedents to POPs

The following dispositional determinants of POPs have been identified by researchers: gender, locus of control (extent to which individuals perceive themselves as having control over life events), Machiavellianism (cynical beliefs about human nature, morality and the acceptability of using manipulative tactics to satisfy one’s own goals), and the need for power (individual’s desire to influence the behaviour or emotions of someone else). O’Connor and Morrison (2001) found organisational climate to be a predictor of organisational politics but the direction of causality was unknown. Valle et al. (2002), using the 12-item POPS in a population of 501 service employees in the USA, found that perceptions of organisational politics were positively related to negative affectivity and negatively related to positive affectivity. Whilst the results of empirical research involving many of these antecedents have been mixed (Ferris et al., 2003), the factors of work locus of control and Machiavellianism have been found to be significant predictors of perceptions of organisational politics.

Machiavellianism

The concept was developed by Christie and Geis (1970) based on identified principles from the writings of Machiavelli in the sixteenth century and was operationalised by developing a scale, referred to as Mach IV (Christie & Geis, 1970). “The ‘Machiavellian’ is someone who views and manipulates others for his own purposes” (Christie & Geis, 1970: 1). Machiavellianism has been defined as a strategy for social conduct that involves manipulating others for personal gain, whereby the other’s self-interest is disadvantaged (Wilson et al., 1996). The Mach IV scale includes the dimensions of tactics (the nature of a person’s interpersonal tactics), views of human nature, and abstract morality. Those respondents who scored high on this scale would be more inclined to engage in political behaviour because they would view such behaviour as a means of situational control (Cropanzano & Kacmar, 1995). Machiavellianism has been shown to have a positive relationship to office politics (Biberman, 1985), impression management (Gardner &
job strain, perceived opportunity for formal control, and to be negatively related to job satisfaction (Gemmill & Heisler, 1972). Machiavellianism has also been correlated ($r = .44$) with tough-mindedness, a factor in Eysenck’s two-factor construct of political ideology, which characterises individuals as practical, hard-headed, fact-minded and egotistical in dealing with other people (Stone & Russ, 1976). Indeed, some researchers have suggested that Machiavellianism is advantageous in some circumstances, for instance when a bank is adopting aggressive retail strategies. In this view, Machiavellianism is seen as a constructive way of allocating resources, reaching compromises and integrating new ideas (Siu, 1998). Furthermore, using the Mach V scale (a subsequent development of Mach IV) in a simulated environment, Grams and Rogers (1990) found that high Machs were more flexible in their influencing behaviour than other personality types, used more non-rational than rational tactics, preferred the use of indirect to direct tactics, most frequently used deceit as a tactic, and appealed to emotions and tried to plant ideas in the mind of their target. Researchers claiming to offer a more accurate depiction of the Machiavellian personality assert that Machiavellian personalities first seek to influence others by using charm, friendliness, and tact and, when these attempts fail, resort to influencing behaviours associated with the more widely-held view of Machiavellians (Reimers and Barbuto, 2002). An investigation of the relationship between Machiavellianism and perceptions of politics has been limited to only one study (Valle & Perrewe, 2000). This study, which was conducted in the USA involving 260 respondents across six organisations including two aerospace firms, three manufacturing firms and a university, found a significant and positive relationship between the two concepts.

**Internal/external locus of control**

Locus of control (LOC) beliefs (Rotter, 1966) are important in predicting individual behaviour and are closely related to discussions of key cultural differences in individuals’ experiences of control, harmony, and submission with respect to the environment (Bond & Smith, 1966). Researchers have considered it to be an important concept because it is linked to employee well-being (Spector et al., 2002). The internal/external locus of
control scale was developed (Rotter, 1966) to measure an individual’s general expectancy that his/her life is controlled by internal factors or factors external to the individual. People who have a strong belief that they can control their own destiny, i.e. internal LOC, have four characteristics: they are more alert to those aspects of the environment that provide useful information for their future behaviour; they will take steps to improve their environmental condition; they place greater value on skill or achievement reinforcements and are generally more concerned with their ability, particularly failures; they are resistant to subtle attempts to influence them (Rotter, 1966).

The LOC concept has been applied to occupational behaviour and used as an individual difference variable to examine workplace motivation (Furnham, 2001). It is also an important moderator variable which, together with biographical and job facet variables, determines work-related behaviour (Furnham, 2001). Since this study is concerned with examining both perceptual and behavioural phenomenon, LOC is a relevant variable for inclusion. Within the organisational politics literature, external locus of control has been found to be significantly and positively related to perceptions of organisational politics, so that people with an external locus of control perceive a higher level of organisational politics and those with a general expectancy that they control their lives perceive a lower level of organisational politics (Valle & Perrewe, 2000; O’Connor & Morrison, 2001 – that study used Spector’s 1988 Work Locus of Control Scale and not the Rotter scale). An explanation for the relationship between LOC and POPs is that workers with an external LOC see themselves as unable to manipulate the environment because they see themselves as vulnerable to the political machinations of their co-workers (O’Connor & Morrison, 2001). This is consistent with the view that people with an external LOC do not perceive a reliable contingency between their behaviour and outcomes and that think that rewards and punishments occur as a result of unstable forces, such as luck or chance, or at the whim of other powerful people (Rotter, 1966; Leone & Burns, 2000).

A meta-analysis (Mudrack, 1990) of the relationship between Machiavellianism and locus of control revealed a positive correlation of \( r = .382 \), which was interpreted by Mudrack (1990) as perhaps an attempt by individuals to exert influence over the external
world by Machiavellian interpersonal relations, i.e. the use of manipulation, deception or ingratiation. Although it appears that the findings of O’Connor and Morrison (2001) and Mudrack (1990) may be at odds, the findings of the latter are based on the additional personal propensity to engage in Machiavellian behaviour. The presence of Machiavellianism seems therefore to overcome the tendency of an individual with an external locus of control not to attempt to influence the world in the belief that their life is controlled by external forces. Mudrack (1990) observed that all the studies considered in the meta-analysis were conducted in either North America or Western Europe and suggested that the relationship between these constructs required testing in other cultural contexts. Whilst there have been studies on Machiavellianism in other cultural contexts, Hong Kong for example (Siu, 1998), no study was found in the literature that investigated the relationship between Machiavellianism and locus of control outside the USA. This study therefore seeks to test the relationship between these two variables within the Australian cultural context.

2.4.4 Individual non-dispositional factors

These factors include gender, age, and level of education. Such factors have been investigated as antecedents to perceptions of organisation politics. Results have either found no relationship or have been inconclusive (Ferris et al., 2002).

Organisational antecedents to perceptions of organisational politics

The following have been noted as situational determinants of perceptions of organisational politics: hierarchical level whereby, generally, the lower the level a person is in the organisation the greater the likelihood that he/she will perceive the organisation as political. However, one study (Parker et al., 1995) found that employees at the middle of the organisational hierarchy perceived a higher level of organisational politics than employees at other levels; job autonomy (inversely related to OP); formalization (low formalisation leads to uncertainty and therefore may be conducive to OP); and
organisational climate (although the subjective evaluative process link to OP is unresearched) (O’Connor & Morrison, 2001).

2.4.5 Perceptions of organisational politics and political behaviour

The lack of consensus about how to measure political behaviour within organisations is evident in the literature that attempts to link perceptions of organisational politics and behaviour. This has manifested itself in very different measures being adopted by researchers when gathering empirical evidence and has resulted in inconclusive evidence. Within the perceptions of organisational politics literature there has been an attempt by researchers to show that political behaviour can be a moderator of perceptions of organisational politics on organisational outcomes. For example, Harrell-Cook et al. (1999) used self-promotion and ingratiation political behaviours, whereas Valle and Perrewe (2000) used proactive and reactive political behaviours. While in the first study self-promotion was found to mitigate the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and satisfaction with supervisors and intent to turnover, the coefficients for the effects of ingratiation were found to be the opposite to those hypothesised. In the second study, the researchers hypothesised that reactive political behaviours would exacerbate the negative effects of perceptions of organisational politics on job satisfaction, job stress and intent to turnover, and that the use of proactive behaviours would reduce these negative effects. Significant effects were found for proactive behaviours, whilst the hypotheses for the effects of reactive behaviours were not supported (Harrell-Cook et al., 1999; Valle & Perrewe, 2000). Consequently, there are no definitions of political behaviour that have been used together with POPS in the research literature that have been tested on a number of occasions with consistent results. The literature on the use of political tactics (behaviour) was examined in an effort to identify a satisfactory operationalisation of the use of political tactics for this study in order to test the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and political behaviour.
2.4.6 Political tactics

Political behaviour has been defined broadly as influence attempts at various levels of organisational analysis (Ferris et al., 2003). Some researchers have characterised politics as the playing out of power and influence, which can involve any member of an organisation (Appelbaum & Hughes, 1998). Tactics used by employees at all organisational levels may be helpful or harmful: for example forming coalitions and networks (befriending people because of their position or access to information); impression management (management of an individual’s appearance and style); information management (the type and timing of information sharing); promoting the opposition (helping someone to get promoted to another part of the organisation); pursuing line responsibility (as these positions have more visibility, influence, and upward mobility); and ingratiation (involves paying compliments and giving favours to supervisors or peers). On the other hand there are political tactics that have been characterised as devious: take no prisoners (eliminating all those who may be resentful at past actions by having them fired or transferred); divide and conquer (creating conflict between two others so that they will be unable to attack the third party); and exclude the opposition (excluding individuals from important meetings and events to prevent hindrance to influence attempts) (Appelbaum & Hughes, 1998). Previous reviews of organisational studies literature suggest that there is consensus that political behaviour involves influencing, but there is a lack of consensus about how to measure such behaviour (Valle & Perrewe, 2000).

Table 2.2 shows ways in which researchers have operationalised political behaviour through, firstly, characterising the behaviour as a set of influence tactics and then using these tactics in a variety of scales for gathering and analysing quantitative data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Categories of political tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen et al., (1979)</td>
<td>8 categories of tactics used most frequently by managers and executives – electronics industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkin (1981)</td>
<td>Acquisitive or protective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tedeschi and Melburg (1984) | Assertive = take advantage of an opportunity that presents itself  
Defensive = defend against perceived threat |
| Vredenburgh and Maurer (1984) | Goal-directed tactics |
| Ashforth and Lee (1990) | Proactive and reactive. Reactive = avoiding action, avoiding blame and avoiding change |
| Appelbaum and Hughes, (1998) | Helpful or harmful, and devious. Helpful or harmful tactics are used by anyone in the organisation. Devious tactics are difficult to defend morally. |
| David, (2001) | Tactics used by org. strategists. Equifinality – satisfying generalisation – focus on higher order issues – provision of political access |
| Zanzi and O’Neill (2001) | Sanctioned and non-sanctioned. Tactics are differentiated on the basis that they are either sanctioned or non-sanctioned according to organisational norms |
| Valle and Perrewe (2000) | Reactive and proactive. Reactive = influence tactics that individuals take in response to a perceived threat, in order to manage any personal damage which may come about or to forestall future negative outcomes  
Proactive = influence tactics undertaken by individuals in response to a perceived opportunity, in order to influence an outcome in their behalf |

**Source: Author**

In their brief review of the literature, Zanzi and O’Neill (2001) note that there are two primary definitions of organisational politics used in research. The first is a view that politics is a broad and general set of social behaviours that can either be functional or dysfunctional. The second definition focuses on behaviours that are self-serving and not sanctioned by the organisation. Furthermore, Zani and O’Neill (2001) contend that awareness and understanding of the role of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics will benefit managers and professionals. In their research, Zanzi & O’Neill (2001) developed two self-report scales of political tactics. One of these includes six items that are sanctioned political tactics: persuasion, image building, networking, super-ordinate goal, use of expertise, and coalition building. The other is a seven-item scale, which
contains non-sanctioned political tactics: co-optation, manipulation, organisational placement, intimidation and innuendo, control of information, using surrogates, and blaming or attacking others. Both scales include definitions of the tactics and are anchored to a Likert-type scale. The reliability estimates revealed a Cronbach’s alpha of .77 for sanctioned tactics and .82 for non-sanctioned tactics. The utility of this categorisation of political behaviour is questionable since it uses specific organisational norms as a reference point, i.e. the norms of the organisation within which the research is conducted. Therefore the generalisability of the output of such research is problematic. However, the sample population used in that study comprised 288 American MBA students from different levels and functional areas within unspecified organisations, indicating a consensus interpretation across organisations of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics. In addition, the listing of tactics in both scales is borne out of a more comprehensive listing of 24 political tactics and includes definitions (Appendix 1). The Zanzi and O’Neill (2001) scales of political tactics are useful for two reasons. First, for practitioners, who are able to identify political behaviours present in their organisation and also those political tactics that are not being used. Staff can then be managed accordingly by encouraging the use of those tactics the organisation deems desirable and discourage undesirable behaviours. Second, researchers can use such a set of tactics to facilitate inter- and intra-organisational comparative and trend analyses. The usefulness of the two scales in research within organisations has not been tested; however, as Zanzi and O’Neill (2001) carried out their exploratory study using a population of MBA students within a university in the USA. However, as has been noted (Ferris et al., 2002), for research in organisational politics to advance beyond its current state, respondents should be provided the opportunity to note ‘functional politics’. The author has therefore selected both scales (sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics) for use in this study.

Writers have identified political tactics as being enacted in various aspects of organisational life such as strategy formulation and implementation (David, 2001) and executive management (Thompson & Strickland, 1996) by managers and executives (Allen et al., 1979) and by everyone in the organisation (Zanzi & O’Neill, 2001).
Political tactics used by strategists

The following political tactics may be used by strategists in organisations, in order to gain internal commitment (David, 2001, p.224):

- **Equifinality** – achieving similar results by different means. It may be possible to generate new alternatives that have far greater potential for gaining commitment.
- **Satisfying** – achieving satisfying results with an acceptable strategy rather than optimal results using an unpopular strategy.
- **Generalization** – shifting focus from specific issues to more general ones may increase the strategists’ options for gaining organisational commitment.
- **Focus on the higher-order issues** – by raising an issue to a higher level, short-term interests may be postponed in favour of long-term interests; for example, focusing on the survival of an industry or company in return for concessions on wage increases.
- **Political access on important issues** – providing middle managers with an opportunity for involvement in a political forum to gain support and offset resistance. This can provide strategists with important information regarding implementation issues.

Political tactics used by successful executives

Thompson and Strickland, (1996, citing Quinn, 1980), maintain that successful executives rely on the use of three political tactics. The first is taking action, such as establishing additional hurdles or tests for strongly supported ideas that the manager views as unacceptable but that are best not opposed openly; leading the strategy but not dictating it, i.e. giving few orders, announcing few decisions, depending heavily on informal questioning, and seeking to probe and clarify until a consensus emerges; ensuring that all major power bases within the organisation have representation in or access to top management; injecting new faces and new views into considerations of major changes to preclude those involved from coming to see the world the same way and then acting as systematic screens against other views; minimising political exposure
on issues that are highly controversial and in circumstances where opposition from major power centres can trigger a “shoot out”. The second tactic used by senior executives is taking no action, such as letting weakly-supported ideas and proposals die through inaction; letting most negative decisions come from a group consensus that the manager merely confirms, thereby reserving personal veto for big issues and crucial moments; staying alert to the symbolic impact of one’s actions and statements lest a false signal stimulate proposals and movements in unwanted directions. The third tactic is influencing others to take action on behalf of the influencer (keeping a low political profile on unacceptable proposals by getting subordinate managers to say no).

**Political tactics used by managers and executives**

An empirical study undertaken by Allen et al. (1979) identified eight categories of political tactics most frequently by managers and executives in the electronics industry in Southern California. These included:

- Blaming or attacking others
- Use of information
- Creating and maintaining a favourable image
- Developing a base of support
- Ingratiation
- Developing strong allies
- Forming power coalitions
- Creating obligations/reciprocity

Since this study is concerned with the perception and behaviour of all members of the organisation workforce and not merely a sub-group, the scales developed by Zanzi and O’Neill (2001) were considered most appropriate to use. Although their research sought to explore not only the use of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics by employees at all levels but also the relationship between the social desirability of political tactics with their actual use, neither predictors nor outcomes were investigated by Zanzi.
and O’Neil (2001). Consequently, the authors recommended that further research be carried out to identify predictors and outcomes.

This study seeks to explore the relationships between the use of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics and two dispositional factors: Machiavellianism and locus of control. Machiavellianism is thought to be positively related to office politics (Biberman, 1985) and people scoring high on Machiavellianism are thought more likely to engage in political behaviour as an attempt to gain situational control (Cropanzano & Kacmar, 1995). O’Connor and Morrison (2001) have suggested that people who have an external locus of control see themselves as unable to manipulate the environment, and so it is reasonable to assume that they will make little effort to do so. Therefore individuals with an external locus of control will engage in less political behaviour than those with an internal locus of control.

In the Zanzi and O’Neill (2001) study, the researchers did not include perceptions of organisational politics as a variable, so the relationship between this and the use of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics was not tested. This is a gap in the literature that this study seeks to investigate.

2.5 Innovation

In order to maintain a consistent approach with the preceding section in this chapter, this section will provide an overview of the innovation literature, including research streams and typologies, and then consider the innovation process literature. The section discusses the definitions of innovation and how innovation is measured by researchers. In particular it seeks to identify how the perception of innovation has been measured by researchers.

Innovation is increasingly cited in the literature as a key element of a firm’s competitive capability (Wolfe, 1994; Salaman & Storey, 2002), as key to economic survival in the highly competitive global market-place (West & Altink, 1996), and as fundamental to a firm’s survival (Ulijn et al., 2000). More specifically, innovation can be viewed as
conceptual and perceptual and as a specific function of entrepreneurship, that is, the means by which the entrepreneur builds wealth-creating capability within an organisation (Drucker, 1985). Whilst innovation may be linked to performance conceptually, establishing the relationship empirically is more difficult because of methodological shortcomings or the unpredictability of innovation (Tidd, 2001).

There is a vast literature on the subject of innovation; however our understanding of innovative behaviour requires development because the most consistent theme in the innovation literature is that it is inconsistent (Wolfe, 1994). Such inconsistency is evident in reviews of the innovation literature. Researchers have reviewed the innovation literature and identified research streams (Anderson & King, 1993; Wolfe, 1994; Salamou, 2004), and these are shown in table 2.3.

**Table 2.3 Identification of innovation research streams**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream of research/approach</th>
<th>Research focus</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion of innovation (DI)</td>
<td>Diffusion of innovation over time and space</td>
<td>Wolfe (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational innovativeness (OI)</td>
<td>Determinants of innovativeness of organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process theory (PT)</td>
<td>The organisational process of innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion Process</td>
<td>Pattern and spread of innovation over time amongst members of a social system</td>
<td>Wilson et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational innovation</td>
<td>Nature of the innovation process but research usually focused on one stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative-variance approach</td>
<td>Identifying causal links between variables that conform to the view that “the precursor (X) is a necessary and sufficient condition for the outcome (Y)”</td>
<td>Edwards (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process research</td>
<td>Nature of the innovation process; how and why innovations emerge, develop, grow and terminate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Author**

In an attempt to contribute to a more cumulative knowledge base on innovation, Wolfe (1994) conducted a review of the innovation literature and identified three discernible
streams. The first, using innovation as a unit of analysis, is the diffusion of innovation, or its spread through a population of potential adopters. Research in this stream is trying to establish the pattern of diffusion through a population. The second stream uses the organisation as the unit of analysis and is concerned with identifying the determinants of organisational innovativeness. The third stream uses the innovation process as the unit of analysis to investigate how and why innovations emerge, develop, grow, and terminate.

Salavou (2004) has identified that research into innovation may be considered within either one stream that centres on a firm’s external and/or internal processes, or another stream that is concerned with innovation determinants and/or the impact of innovations on performance. Alternatively, Wilson et al. (1999) concluded that innovation research has taken place within three perspectives. The first of these is one of the most widely researched areas, the diffusion of innovation, which is concerned with predicting the rate and pattern of spread of innovation over time among members of a social system. This stream has identified many determinants of innovation, including environmental characteristics, the organisational communication process, the characteristics of the innovation, the characteristics of the adopter, and the social groups affected or influenced by the innovation. The second stream considers innovation as a multi-stage process. Wilson et al. (1999) maintain that the applicability of the process perspective is limited because of the complex and dynamic nature of organisations and their subunits, thus making it difficult to identify the stages in the process. Within the third perspective, organisational innovation, researchers have been concerned to understand the determinants of innovation adoption within organisations. This applies equally to the three types of innovation, technological, administrative and ancillary, each of which could be product or process oriented. Organisational analysis within this stream of research has been conducted at the environmental, organisational, individual and strategic levels. In their review of the innovation literature, Wilson et al. (1999) found that a majority of research studies had adopted a structural determinist view of innovation by focusing on the structural characteristics of organisations as the antecedents to innovation.
Numerous conceptually-based definitions appear in the literature that refer to three aspects of the organisation in particular. The first is technology, whereby innovativeness is viewed as a willingness to depart from existing technologies or practices. The second is behaviour, which may refer to the early or late adoption of innovation or the ability to generate new ideas using the existing elements in an organisation to create new sources of wealth, or the receptivity to new ideas. The final element is product, which refers to the capacity of the organisation’s inclination to buy new products and services (Salavou, 2004).

**Typologies of innovation**

In their review of the literature, Anderson and King (1993) observed that a range of operational definitions of innovation have been adopted by researchers through proposing a number of innovation typologies. These are shown in table 2.4.

There are three aspects of innovation illustrated within the table. The first is the socio-technical systems approach which categorises innovations according to the systems within which they occur. The second typology focuses on characteristics of the innovations, and the third is to categorise innovations by their source. As Anderson and King (1993) note, whilst a generalist approach to conceptualising innovation is problematic because of differing complexity, reaction from organisational members and sources, research does need to operate at two levels. The first is that research should explore the distinctive characteristics of innovation types within organisational contexts, and the second is that research needs to relate to our wider understanding of the psychology of innovation.
Table 2.4 Typologies of innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Description of typology</th>
<th>Innovation types proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damanpour (1987)</td>
<td>Socio-technical systems</td>
<td>Technical - changes in production methods or products manufactured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damanpour and Evan (1984)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative - changes in social relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ancillary - innovations which cross organisation-environment boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaltman, Duncan and Holbeck (1973)</td>
<td>Interaction typology of innovation characteristics</td>
<td>Programmed-nonprogrammed - innovations vary in the extent of pre-planning, scheduling and organisational programming undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instrument-ultimate – instrumental innovations facilitate larger-scale ultimate innovations which can be self-contained change processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Radicalness - (a) novelty-degree of new of the innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) risk-degree of risk involved in implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters and Waterman (1982)</td>
<td>Radicalness of innovation typology</td>
<td>Evolutionary-revolutionary continuum – evolutionary innovations as minor improvements on existing designs/systems. See also Kirton (1976, 1978) at the individual level of analysis, who proposes an adaption-innovation continuum of creativity styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanter (1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson (1990)</td>
<td>Sources of innovation typology</td>
<td>Emergent innovations – novel, unproven ideas and proposals developed and implemented unique to a particular organisation or organisational subunit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopted innovations – systems/procedures already in use within comparator organisations which are replicated and adopted by other organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imposed innovations – where changes in environmental contingencies force the organisation to develop innovative responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Innovation as process

As Wolfe (1994) indicates, process theory research developed along two clearly discernable lines. *Stage model research* conceptualises innovation as a series of stages that unfold over time. The purpose of this research is to determine if the innovation process involves identifiable stages and their order. *Process research* involves longitudinal in-depth research conducted to fully describe the sequences of and the conditions which determine the innovation process. Process research tends to be inductive, and often involves theory building and qualitative data collection. The stages proposed in stage model research have been variants of a pattern, have varied in terminology, and overlapped but have nonetheless included: a decision-making unit’s awareness of an innovation being matched to a problem or opportunity; a cost benefit appraisal of the innovation; a source of support or opposition attempt to influence the innovation; a decision to adopt or reject the innovation; the implementation of the innovation; the decision is reviewed and either confirmed or rejected; routinisation of the innovation; infusion of the innovation.

Although researchers who adopt the processual view of innovation are agreed that there are a number of stages in the process, the number of stages identified varies. For example, Wheelwright and Clark (1992) identified five stages preceded by trend-opportunity spotting, which is an ongoing activity. Their linear process, with each stage separated by decision gates (go/no go to the next stage), includes *idea description* where participants get a general feel for the idea based on realistic assumptions and provide some justification for proceeding to the next stage. The second stage is *feasibility study*, where the hard data about the idea and assumptions are gathered and analysed together with market data and consideration of the operational consequences and a proof of concept. The third stage is the *business plan* phase, which refines the feasibility study and includes implementation planning. The fourth stage is the *implementation* of the idea or product, which involves a project approach and includes elaborating the marketing strategy and implementing the organisational requirements. The innovation may be tested or piloted. The final stage involves *introducing* the product to market and *evaluating* its
performance. In their illustration of the innovation process, Wheelwright and Clark (1992) include all stages within a narrowing funnel to signify that the number of ideas in the process decreases in the initial stages until the implementation stage. In contrast, Van de Ven and Chu (2000), as part of the Minnesota Innovation Research Program (MIRP), proposed a four stage innovation process based on Pelz and Munson (1982), as a basis for measuring the stage of development of each of the nine innovations that they measured in the study. These were idea stage (problem recognised, search for solution, alternatives diagnosed, no prototype developed), design stage (solution or prototype developed, adapted or adopted with guidelines), implementation stage (innovation put into action and evaluated with decisions to modify), incorporation, or diffusion, routinization, or institutionalization (innovation accepted by the organisation as standard procedure and no longer regarded as an innovation).

The MIRP is perhaps the most extensive empirical study of innovation ever undertaken, and the numerous researchers involved in this project searched through a series of longitudinal studies to empirically verify a process theory of innovation. However, McMurray and Dorai (2003) contend that, overwhelmingly, studies of innovation focus on innovation as an outcome, and so have measured the phenomenon in terms of tangible variables, including products. This is the case irrespective of what type of innovation is being studied, including product, process, service, radical, incremental, sustaining or disruptive innovation. The Minnesota Innovation Survey is examined in more detail in a later part of this section, which discusses the measurement of innovation. The processual view of innovation assumed by the researchers in the Minnesota studies is further reinforced by the methodology, which involved administering the Minnesota Innovation Survey (MIS) on a periodic basis, thus providing an ongoing assessment of nine innovations at all stages in the innovation process.

However, as noted by Anderson and King (1993), Van de Ven et al., (1989) proposed a fluid model of innovation as a result of their studies, which centred on six observations common to seven diverse major innovations: innovation is stimulated by shocks, either internal or external to the organisation; an initial idea tends to proliferate into several
ideas during the innovation process; in managing an innovation effort, unpredictable setbacks and surprises are inevitable and learning occurs whenever the innovation continues to develop; as an innovation develops, the old and the new exist concurrently, and over time are linked together; restructuring of the organisation often occurs during the innovation process; and hands-on top management involvement occurs throughout the innovation period.

Scholars now contend that innovation is best understood from an interactive process perspective, which is a dynamic ongoing process during which institutional structures and action are inextricably linked (Edwards, 2000). However, there are differing views within the processual perspective of innovation. Thomas (2000), who also claims to challenge prior research, which held that the relationship between technology and organisation was static and unidirectional, proposed a view that the relationship is dynamic and interactive. This led him to a power-process theory of technological change. While Thomas (2000) is concerned with the dynamics of technology and organisation, Edwards (2000) defines the structure of the organisation according to Giddens’ structure in social analysis, which refers to rules and resources drawn upon and enacted by agents in the production and reproduction of social systems. Furthermore, Edwards (2000) is concerned to assert that, from a structuration theory perspective, innovation is not seen as the result of freely participating individuals or dependent on some objective characteristic of the organisation, but it reflects the continuity or modification of those rules and resources that mediate and are an outcome of human conduct in an organisational setting.

2.5.1 Definitions of innovation

While many definitions of innovation have been used by researchers, these vary not only depending on the level of analysis (West & Altink, 1996) but also perhaps because innovation is a phenomenon that is complex and context specific (Wolfe, 1994). For example, researchers have sought to demonstrate the existence of empirically distinguishable dimensions of innovation through sub-theories, including administrative and technological, radical and incremental innovations (Damanpour, 1991). Innovation
may be viewed as a diffusion or adoption process, with adoption including the generation, development and implementation of new ideas or behaviours (Damanpour, 1991). Table 2.5 illustrates some of the definitions of innovation found in the literature.

West and Farr (1990) restrict the definition of innovation to intentional attempts and use a broad perspective on benefits, not merely an economic one. Furthermore, they do not specify which group can benefit from the idea. Although the definition requires an application, it does not require absolute novelty and is not restricted to technological change. More directly perhaps than other researchers, Thomas (2000) asserts that the innovation process is a social process wherein contradictory activities take place. On the one hand it is subversive because it undermines or dissolves established practices and, on the other hand, it constitutes or creates new practices that take the place of those practices it subverts. Further, the social process of innovation involves people, with individual motives, interests and world views.

Despite the range of definitions of innovation, there are some common themes. First, the notion that innovation involves novelty is often included (Schumpeter, 1967; Kanter, 1988; Hindle, 2002). This may take the form of a new idea (Clegg, 2002; Hindle, 2002; Martins & Terblanche, 2003) or a process, service or artefact (West & Farr, 1990; Damanpour, 1991; Martins, 2000). Some definitions qualify the novelty of the innovation by restricting it to being perceived by the adopting organisation or unit as new (West & Farr, 1990; Damanpour, 1991; Martins, 2000). Second, the innovation must have some benefit such as being useful (Van de Ven, 1986), leading to economic benefit (Abraham & Knight, 2001; Hindle, 2002), or even solving a problem (Scrica, 2002). Third, there is commonly a reference to the process or part of the process of innovation (Kanter, 1988; Damanpour, 1991; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Amabile, 1996; Pervaiz, 1998; Cozijnsen, 2000; Thomas, 2000; Clegg et al., 2002; Hindle, 2002; Salavou, 2004).
Table 2.5 Definitions of innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schumpeter (1967)</td>
<td>The implementation of new combinations of different resources in the firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaltman, Duncan and Holbeck</td>
<td>Any idea, practice, or material artefact perceived to be new by the relevant unit of adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson (1990)</td>
<td>The emergence, import or imposition of new ideas which are pursued towards implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West and Farr (1990)</td>
<td>The intentional introduction and application within a role, group, or organisation of ideas, processes, products, services, or procedures new to the adopting unit and intended to benefit the group, individual or wider society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damanpour (1991)</td>
<td>Adoption of an internally generated or purchased device, system, policy, program, process, product or service that is new to the adopting organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott and Bruce (1994)</td>
<td>Multi-stage process, with different activities and different individual behaviours necessary at each stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amabile (1996)</td>
<td>Requires creative ideas and the implementation of these ideas and insights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervaiz (1998)</td>
<td>Three-phase process but entire range of activities necessary for customer value and satisfactory return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cozijnsen (2000)</td>
<td>An ambiguous process that is simultaneously a subversive and constitutive activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham and Knight (2001)</td>
<td>Strategic innovation that links resources and overall efforts to business strategy and makes knowledge creation and innovation action a way of life, seeking to create and expand markets and redirecting resources to potentially more profitable lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clegg et al. (2002)</td>
<td>A process involving the generation and implementation of new ideas, practices or artefacts within an organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindle (2002)</td>
<td>‘Big-I’ innovation – the process whereby new ideas are transformed, through economic activity, into a sustainable value-creating outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrica (2002)</td>
<td>The effort to create purposeful, focused change in an enterprise’s economic or social potential. Innovation is also the successful application of ideas and processes to solve current problems and create new opportunities. It requires knowledge, creative thinking, ingenuity and focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martins and Terblanche (2003); Martins (2000)</td>
<td>The implementation of a new and possibly problem-solving idea, practice or material artifact (e.g. a product) which is regarded as new by the relevant unit of adoption and through which change is brought about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMurray and Dorai (2003)</td>
<td>Workplace innovation is a psychological construct that is contextual, multifactoral, and composed of organisation, climate, individual and team factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salavou (2004)</td>
<td>Distinction between innovation (adoption or/and implementation of “new” defined in subjective ways) and innovativeness (embodies some measurement contingent on organisation’s proclivity towards innovation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author
A small number of the definitions are conspicuous by their difference. For example, McMurray and Dorai (2003) define innovation as a context-specific multi-factorial psychological construct. Hindle (2002) distinguishes between new knowledge and the process by which the knowledge is converted into a value-creating outcome. The innovation process is not merely seen as clearly segmented and linear but rather as an iterative and discontinuous process (Van de Ven, 1986; Thomas, 2000).

Confusion over the level of analysis under investigation in innovation research has led to difficulty in definitional specificity and in separating out the innovation process from the organisation change process and individual creativity (Anderson and King 1993). These researchers also note and support the view of Amabile (1983, 1986), who maintains that researchers should adopt definitions of innovation that make sense to the individuals within the organisations where the innovation process is being studied. However, in view of the confusion, some consideration should now be given to the micro, meso and macro levels of analysis as they relate to innovation.

**Individual level innovation**

At the micro level, there is concern in the literature to distinguish between creativity and innovation: however, two principal distinctions exist (Anderson & King, 1993). Creativity involves the generation of ideas novel to the individual, whereas innovation requires that ideas only be novel to the organisation, group or role and not necessarily to the introducing individual. Creativity does not demand the implementation of ideas as does innovation (Anderson & King, 1993). In addition creativity is seen as a cognitive process influenced by social psychological factors, whereas innovation is a social process that attempts to change the status quo. Scott and Bruce (1994) define individual innovation as a multi-stage process, with different activities and behaviours necessary at each but where individuals can be involved in combinations of these at any one time. They identify the stages as problem-recognition and idea-generation, acquisition of sponsorship and formation of coalitions of support, and development of a prototype and its diffusion or institutionalisation. Again, innovation at the individual level is seen as a
social process. While Scott and Bruce (1994) viewed individual innovative behaviour as the outcome of the four interacting systems of individual, leader, work-group and climate for innovation, their findings revealed that only the climate dimension was positively related to innovative behaviour and the resource supply dimension was not related.

At the individual level, human motivation to explore and manipulate their environment in creative ways and the need to be free from threat and to feel safe are two important axioms that have informed the psychological knowledge about innovation (West & Altink, 1996). Many factors influence an individual’s motivation to innovate in the workplace. In addition to feeling safe, these include sanction for making mistakes, intrinsic value of tasks, and autonomy and control over work (West & Altink, 1996). The factors that motivate and support individuals to be creative and generate ideas are important to understand, because creativity at the individual level is the first step in the innovation process (Amabile, 1998; Scott & Bruce, 1994). Citing the work of Amabile et al. (1996), and of Pienaar and Boshoff (1996), McMurray and Dorai (2003) highlight the interactionist perspective, which stresses the importance of the work environment and organisational climate in fostering innovation. Observing the illusiveness of a definition of innovation in the workplace and its measurement, McMurray and Dorai (2003) found that four measurable factors characterise workplace innovation: organisational innovation, innovation climate, individual innovation and team innovation.

**Group level innovation**

One group of researchers who undertook the Minnesota innovation studies (Van de Ven et al., 2000: 11) claimed to challenge conventional wisdom in innovation research, and illustrated this by comparing their definitions, borne out of their research findings, of various concepts associated with innovation to that of previous research. For example, whereas conventional wisdom implicitly assumed an innovation idea to be one invention, operationalised, Van de Ven et al., (2000) saw innovative ideas as reinvention, proliferation, reimplementation, discarding, and termination. They similarly redefined the other related concepts, including people, transactions, context, and outcomes. A key concept they redefined was that of the innovation process, wherein they suggested that
the conventional wisdom of a “simple, cumulative sequence of stages or phases” be redefined as “from simple to multiple progressions of divergent, parallel, and convergent paths, some of which are related and cumulative, others not” (Van de Ven et al., 2000: 11). The notion that innovation is perceived as a positive thing because the new idea must be useful in solving a problem, profitable or constructive, is proffered by Van de Ven et al. (2000) in support of Kimberly (1981). This is in contrast to the predominantly negative view of perceived organisational politics as noted earlier in this chapter. However, innovations that fail to live up to expectations are not seen as innovations but regarded as mistakes.

Innovation may be viewed as the successful implementation of creative ideas about products or processes within an organisation (Amabile, 1988). This definition uses very broad terms such as product and process, which might include new, adapted, amended, improved and so on. However, at an operational level, Amabile (1988: 147) suggests the following definition of innovation:

A product or process is innovative to the extent that appropriate observers independently agree it is innovative. Appropriate observers are those familiar with the domain in which the product or process was introduced.

Amabile contends that this operational definition is appropriate for use in empirical research. However, a more comprehensive definition has recently appeared in the literature (McMurray & Dorai, 2003) as a result of the researchers’ experience that there is no instrument in the literature that simultaneously gathers data at the organisation, climate, individual and team levels. McMurray and Dorai (2003) have drawn on the work of previous researchers to develop their construct of innovation. For example, at an organisational level, Teece (2002) and Edwards, Kumar and Ranjan (2002) assert that an organisation’s culture may impact on an individual’s ability to innovate because innovation related norms, such as commitment and support for ideas, become embedded in an organisation’s culture, thus driving innovation efforts. Secondly, they point to the identification of a factor, support for creativity, within an organisation climate which, amongst other factors such as trust and fairness, describes organisational events. Climate
is also a possible linkage between different levels of organisational analysis. The individual level was considered important by McMurray and Dorai (2003) because individual creativity is the first step within the innovation process. Finally, the team dimension was included within their workplace innovation model as it is a mechanism that organisations have used extensively within the innovation process, independent of formal structure, which contains its own sub-culture and can cause variation in organisational effectiveness.

2.5.2 Antecedents to innovation

This section outlines the antecedents to innovation that have been identified at the organisational, group and individual levels of analysis.

Within the discipline of industrial/organisational psychology the classic approach to identifying facilitators and inhibitors to innovation has been the use of self-completion questionnaires in cross-sectional designs (Anderson & King, 1993). At the organisational level the factors inhibiting or facilitating innovation may be considered within the categories of people, structure, organisation size and resources, strategy, organisational climate and culture and organisational environment.

2.5.3 Measurement of innovation

It is evident from the literature that the measurement of innovation is a complex issue. This may be due in part to the interchangeable use of the terms innovation and innovativeness. For example, some researchers have set out to examine the relationship between innovation and organisational climate but have used a measure of perceived innovativeness in gathering their data (Abbey & Dickson, 1983), thereby rendering their results somewhat confusing. The distinction between innovation (as a process) and innovativeness (proclivity towards innovation) drawn by Salavou (2004) is an important
one because to use these terms interchangeably is to cause a conceptual blurring leading to confusion.

Tidd (2001) maintains that while there is no single best measure of innovation, there are two approaches at the level of the firm. The first utilises indicators available in the public domain, including R&D expenditure, number of patents and new product announcements. The second captures a broader range of indicators through the use of surveys and these include the number of personnel in technical or design functions and the proportion of profit or sales accounted for by recent product launches. However, as Tidd (2001) points out, whilst there are some strengths in each of these measures, there are considerable weaknesses. For example, there is a variable definition used in innovation surveys, and where product announcements are recorded, in-house innovations and incremental product improvements are missed.

There is also the opportunity for manipulation of the data by marketing and public relations functions within companies. Tidd (2001) contends that contingency theory offers the potential to better understand how context affects innovation management and his theoretical conclusions are that the greater the degree of fit between environmental uncertainty and complexity and the degree, type, organisation and management of innovation, the greater the performance of the organisation.

At the group level of analysis, some researchers have suggested that innovation should be measured, using domain-relevant experts, by judging the content of innovations implemented within an organisation on such dimensions as magnitude, radicalness, novelty, and influence on organisation effectiveness (West & Anderson, 1996). Using this approach to operationalising group innovation within a top management group setting, among West and Anderson’s (1996) findings were that - larger teams instituted more radical innovation; and support for innovation (found to be the principle predictor of innovation), participation (predicts the number of innovations introduced by the teams), and task orientation (predicts the administrative effectiveness of the innovations) predicted innovation outcomes.
Researchers have predominantly used two measures for the analysis of innovation adoption (Wilson et al., 1999). The first measure counts the absolute number of innovations adopted in each organisation. The second measure has been the “time” an organisation takes to adopt the innovation, so that an organisation may be classified as an “early”, “late” or “nonadopter”. Salavou (2004) has noted that there have been numerous approaches to the measurement of innovativeness. These have appeared in the disciplines of strategic marketing, and strategic management; for example Damanpour and Evan (1984) measured the rate of innovation adoption at the organisational level of analysis.

The Minnesota studies (Van de Ven et al., 2000) used a multi methodology and involved the gathering of quantitative data through the administration of a questionnaire known as the Minnesota Innovation Survey (MIS). This was based on a framework for innovation that consisted of five basic concepts: ideas, people, transactions, context and outcomes.

These were included within the dimensions of the MIS (Van de Ven & Chu, 2000) and are shown in figure 2.2.

The outcome measure for the MIS was perceived innovation effectiveness; i.e. the degree to which people perceive that an innovation attains their expectations about process and outcomes. More specifically, there were five questions asking respondents to rate progress satisfaction, effectiveness of the innovation, problem-solving effectiveness of the individuals involved, progress meeting expectations and contribution of the innovation in assisting the organisation in meeting its goals.
Figure 2.2 Dimensions of the Minnesota Innovation Survey

- **Internal dimensions**
  - Innovation ideas:
    - Difficulty
    - Variability
  - People:
    - Competence
    - Time invested
    - Decision influence
    - Leadership
  - Internal transactions:
    - Standardisation of procedures
    - Communication frequency
    - Conflict resolution methods
  - Context:
    - Innovation climate
    - Organisation risk taking
    - Freedom to express doubts
    - “Turf guarding”
    - Expectancy of rewards and sanctions
    - Resource scarcity

- **Situational contingency factors**
  - Novelty of innovation
  - Innovation scope/size
  - Innovation stage (age)

- **External innovation dimensions**
  - External transactions
  - Dependence
  - Formalisation
  - Influence
  - Effectiveness
  - Environmental uncertainty
  - Technological
  - Economic
  - Demographic
  - Legal/regulatory

- **Outcomes**
  - Perceived innovation effectiveness

The MIS internal dimensions included innovation uncertainty (the difficulty and variability of the innovative ideas being developed as perceived by the individuals involved in development); resource scarcity (the amount of work undertaken by innovation participants and the perceived competitiveness for obtaining critical resources to develop an innovation); standardisation of procedures (the degree to which work rules, politicise and procedures are formalised and followed to develop an innovation), decision influence (the discretion or authority that innovation members perceive they exercise over the goals, direction, obtaining resources, recruiting, and work to be done); expectations of rewards and sanctions (perception of individual and groups recognition and reward for good work and formal or informal punishment for poor work); innovation group leadership (the degree to which participants perceive that leaders encourage innovative behaviour through encouraging initiative, delegating, providing feedback, trusting, and maintaining a balance between task and human relationships); freedom to express doubts (the degree to which participants feel constrained by group norms so that they do not express their opinions about the innovation), and learning encouragement (participants perceptions about the organisation’s emphasis on learning, risk taking and sanction for mistakes). Referring to the work of Peters and Waterman, 1982, and Schein, 1985, Van de Ven and Chu (2000) maintain that the learning encouragement component of the internal dimension is an indication of an organisational climate or culture often cited as being conducive to innovativeness.

2.6 Innovation and organisational politics

The innovation process itself has been characterised as political (Kanter, 1988) and, more specifically, gaining support for innovations requires forming alliances and power bases, i.e. political activity (Anderson & King, 1993). This is a view consistent with Kelley (1976), who argues that innovation is a social process and necessarily political because it is the power elites in organisations that must be won over to support innovation. Although there are somewhat older, consistent functional and processual views in the literature that organisational politics stifles or impedes innovation efforts (Frost & Egri, 1991; Kanter, 1984; Kotter, 1985), researchers are asserting increasingly through a
critical approach to organisational politics, that political behaviour is a requirement for successful innovation efforts (Hislop et al., 2000), assists in organisational learning (Copey & Burgoyne, 2000) or leads to technological change (Thomas, 2000). In the political process perspective of organisations, innovation is seen as having more chance of success when conducted in networks and, since the building of collaborative networks is a power process, it requires political action (McLoughlin, Koch & Dickson, 2001). The power-process perspective of technological change differs from other perspectives of social and technological determinism in that it offers the possibility for technological change to be triggered by internal political action and does not only rely on explanations involving reactions to exogenous developments, top-level strategic choices or class-based interests (Thomas, 2000).

Within the organisational politics literature only one attempt has been made to investigate the relationship between innovation and perceptions of organisational politics (Parker et al., 1995). The researchers, using data from an organisational climate survey, found that among 1641 employees in a single site government organisation in the USA, those who perceived higher levels of politics tended to see the organisation as less supportive of innovation (Parker et al., 1995). Their analysis was based on a six-item scale to measure perceptions of politics. Whilst these items were not from the POPS scale, the researchers maintained that they were consistent with previous operationalisations of perceptions of politics (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Kacmar & Ferris, 1991). In addition, four items were used to measure perceived innovation. Since there has been only one study, albeit with a sizeable sample, in which limited measures of both perceptions of organisational politics and innovation have been used, the results must be considered indicative only. Certainly a more comprehensive operationalisation of both concepts is required to confirm the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and innovation. This study therefore employs the 12-item POPS (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991) and the 24-item WIS (Dorai & McMurray, 2003) in order to investigate the relationship between organisational politics and innovation. They were chosen because both measures are operationalisations of context-specific multi-dimensional psychological constructs.
2.7 The Australian context

The research for this thesis was conducted within Australia. As most of the literature in management research identified and discussed in this chapter has its origins elsewhere, predominantly in the USA, it is therefore pertinent to briefly consider the implications of conducting research in Australia using concepts and empirical findings from other cultures.

The core of culture is formed by values (Hofstede, 1994). Values have cognitive, affective and behavioural components (Rokeach, 1973) and can be regarded as learned broad tendencies to prefer certain states over others (Hofstede, 1994); what is important (Bond & Smith, 1996), or an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is preferable to their opposites (Rokeach, 1973). Each of us has more than one cultural reference point because there are many layers of culture which are defined by a group or category, for example country, region, gender, generation and organisation within which people work (Hofstede, 1994). Within each of these categories or groups exists a value system, which may be considered as “an enduring organisation of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance” (Rokeach, 1973:5). This is an important consideration when conducting or reviewing organisational research because our behaviour inside and outside the workplace is internally motivated and internally justified by what we believe about the world (Johnson & Duberley, 2003). In other words, our behaviour and our perceptions in organisations are partly a function of the cultures from which we originate and to which we belong. While there is general agreement amongst most social scientists in cross-cultural psychology that culture plays a crucial role in shaping virtually every aspect of human behaviour (Lonner & Adamopoulos, 1997), the study of any aspect of organisational life is complex and value-laden.

Levels of culture other than national culture are thought to influence behaviour, industry and organisation (Groeschl & Doherty, 2000). However, multi-level research comparing the effect of various levels of cultural influence are few, although one study by Pizam et
al. in 1997 concluded that national culture has a stronger influence on managerial behaviour than industry culture (Groeschl & Doherty, 200). In a study that set out to determine the effect of a training session about achieving natural growth goals on perceptions of a university classroom as a learning organisation (Pace et al. 1998), researchers experienced unanticipated and negative, boomerang effects on the perceptions of students when the concept of natural growth goals was introduced in a university classroom. The researchers concluded that the results of their project may have been caused by unrealistically high expectations set by the introduction of the natural growth goals concept, and a perception amongst the students that the concept was antithetical to fraternalism, which is a widely accepted ideology in Australia.

The literature relating to national culture and values was relevant to this study because the study includes the concepts of perception and behaviour within organisations, and as the literature reveals, these are related to individual and organisational values, which are related to cultural values. Socialization and the experience of interacting with others takes place within an overarching cultural framework, and to ignore this risks oversimplification (Lonner & Adamopoulos, 1997, referring to the work of Jahoda, 1994). There are four psychological perspectives from which researchers have focused on human culture as the main factor that shapes and influences thought. The first perspective is cross-cultural psychology, a primary purpose of which is to understand the reasons behind cultural variation. Cultural psychology is the second (where a culture is the primary focus and where researchers seek to understand the “fabric” of the culture). The third is psychological anthropology (where the primary interest is in studying the phenomena within a society to which psychological methods and questions are appropriate). Lastly, indigenous psychology seeks to explain the behaviour (or the mind) that is native, not transported and designed for its people. In describing each of these perspectives, Lonner and Adamopoulos (1997) assert that there is a shared assumption among social psychologists that culture is an antecedent to human thought and behaviour, but note that there are different conceptualisations of culture as antecedent. Within these conceptualisations, culture may be considered an independent variable with direct or indirect influences on the dependent variable (behaviour or mental event) (Lonner &
Adamopoulos, 1997). It may be treated as a contextual variable or an intervening antecedent variable.

The homogeneity of any cultural group is problematic because of the presence of subgroups, such as ethnic groups within a national culture; however, in his seminal research on national cultures, Hofstede (1984) identified that 53 national cultures differed mainly along four dimensions. **Power distance** (PDI) is the equilibrium of inequality established in a society by leaders and followers; **individualism versus collectivism** (IDV), that is, the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups; **masculinity** or assertiveness versus the nurturing characteristic of **femininity** (MAS), and **uncertainty avoidance** (UAI) refers to the extent to which a culture programs its members to feel either comfortable or uncomfortable with unstructured situations. Hofstede and Bond (1988) further identified a uniquely eastern dimension in Chinese culture which they referred to as **Confucian dynamism**, which is to do with a society’s search for virtue. Hofstede and Bond (1988) maintain that cultural differences in these dimensions have consequences for organisations, particularly those managing multicultural workforces. For example, the most effective leader in a low power distance culture would be a resourceful democrat, whereas in a high power distance culture it would be a benevolent autocrat.

To illustrate what differences this study might anticipate between the Australian experience and the experience of those in the USA, table 2.6 shows a comparison of scores across four cultural dimensions as identified by Hofstede (1984).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from table 2.6, within each dimension the two counties are very similar in scores. However, as Hofstede (1984) cautions, care must be taken in interpreting these scores so as not to assert that everyone within a national cultural group can be characterised by the scores at a national level. As discussed above, national cultures are not homogeneous groups because individuals are subject to many levels of cultural influences and the scores within the dimensions, whilst valid and useful, are indications of general tendencies at a national aggregate level.

For the purposes of this study, the work of Hofstede (1984) suggests that the minor differences between the USA and Australia, at a cultural level, would be unlikely to make research results from both counties incomparable.

This study adopts a psychological perspective on the two major themes of organisational politics and innovation by exploring perceptions of these two phenomena and political behaviour. Based on the literature discussed in this section, conceptually the process of interaction between values, perceptions and behaviour may be illustrated, as in figure 2.3.

**Figure 2.3 Relationship between values and behaviour**

![Diagram of values, perception, and behaviour interaction](source: Author)
2.8 Emotions

A review of recent trends and methodological issues concerning emotion noted that research on emotions within the previous five years was almost as vast and diverse as emotional life itself (Cacioppo and Gardner, 1999). While there is support for this observation (Fisher, 2000), others have indicated that research on emotions in the workplace, and in particular affective-related issues, has been neglected (Wright and Doherty, 1998; Muchinsky, 2000). Emotions may be referred to as affect, mood or feelings (Callahan and McCollum, 2002). Dispositional affect is often used to describe a person’s general affective orientation, positive or negative and may be long term. Moods are more likely to be short term, unstable and fluctuate with events. Emotions or feelings tend to have an identifiable cause or object, are short term and more focused and intense. According to Ashforth and Humphrey (1995: 97), “the experience of work is saturated with emotion” and they further argue that emotion and rationality are interpenetrated within organisations. In her review of recent literature, Domagalski (1999) examines the three themes of the relationship between emotion and rationality, emotion in the social domain of the workplace and the control of emotions by those in positions of power and dominance. In discussing shared assumptions in human activity, Schein (1992: 128), referring to cross-cultural studies, notes that one of several orientations whereby a group relates to itself and its environment is the Being-in-Becoming Orientation. This is positioned between the Being and Doing orientations and refers to the idea that individuals must achieve harmony with nature through developing their own capacities, thus achieving a perfect union with the environment. This state involves detachment and control of those things that can be controlled. This is typified in an Apollonian organisation in which people curb their natural impulses and desires through various organisational control mechanisms. The basic assumption here is that human impulses are dangerous and must be controlled. The relevance of this dimension can be most clearly seen, according to Schein (1992), in organisational attitudes and norms about the expression of emotions. For example, in the United States, business relationships tend to be defined as emotionally neutral, with managers who are seen as too emotional are judged to be incompetent. An assumption here is that the presence of emotions can undermine rationality and clear thinking. However, as Ratner (2000) points out, emotions
never exist alone because all thinking entails feelings. Members of organisations try to 
de-emotionalise emotions and make them seem rational (Fineman 1993). Those 
challenging the rationalist approach to managing have often perceived emotions narrowly 
(Hosking & Fineman 1990) and presented people within organisations as emotionally 
anorexic (Fineman 1993), in that they have dissatisfactions, stresses, preferences, 
attitudes and interests rather than express envy, hate, shame, love, fear and joy. 
Furthermore, emotions are found to vary in individualist and collectivist contexts, with 
“ego-focused” emotions (such as anger, frustration, and pride) with the individual’s 
internal attributes as the primary referent found to be more marked among individualists 
(Kagitcibasi, 1997). Drawing on the work of Markus and Kitayama 1991 and Matsumoto 
1989, Kagitcibasi (1997) explains that other focused emotions, such as sympathy and 
shame, and feelings of interpersonal communion, which have the other person as the 
primary referent, are more marked among collectivists. He further asserts that studies 
have shown that emotions are more subdued in hierarchical societies.

2.8.1 A categorisation of emotions

Lazarus and Lazarus (1994) arranged emotions into five categories. The first are the nasty 
emotions, which include anger, envy and jealousy. If not managed, these emotions can 
create serious interpersonal and social problems. The second are the existential emotions 
and include anxiety, guilt and shame. The third category are those emotions provoked by 
unfavourable life conditions, such as relief, hope, sadness and depression. Fourth are 
those emotions provoked by favourable life conditions and they include happiness, pride 
and love. Finally, there are the empathetic emotions, including gratitude and compassion.

Emotions and culture

Emotions that are experienced reflect biological mechanisms inherited from our animal 
ancestors (Triandis, 1994). Culturally compatible rules govern the way in which these 
emotions are displayed (Ekman, 1992). In order to understand emotional display, one
must understand the elements of culture and how they are constructed at a point in time (Triandis, 1994).

2.9 Identification of gaps in research

A number of gaps in research have been identified as a result of the review of literature in this chapter. These gaps are now briefly discussed with research questions and hypotheses set out as a consequence of these gaps.

2.9.1 Perceptions of organisational politics scale (POPS) validity across cultures

There has been very little research conducted into perceptions of organisational politics outside the USA and Israel. One study conducted across Israel and Britain used a reduced (6-item) POPS, one study was conducted within a Canadian police force, a study conducted in Malaysia involved 208 part-time post-graduate students, and one study was conducted in Taiwan. The operationalisation of perceptions of politics has therefore been culturally limited and not uniform (with variations of the POPS used), and its context-specificity to particular organisational types within sectors and industries, all within particular cultural settings, has been reinforced. This study’s review of the literature uncovered only one exploratory study, using two samples of MBA students, which included the POPS within the Australian context (Baxter & McMurray, 2004). Despite the limited use of POPS outside the USA, as discussed in section 2.7, there are a growing number of studies outside the USA (O’Connor & Morrison, 2001; Vigoda, 2000, 2002; Huang et al., 2003; Poon, 2003; Baxter & McMurray, 2004), and a recent cross-cultural study (Vigoda, 2004), the findings of which suggest that the Ferris et al., (1989) model can be applied in other cultures.

2.9.2 POPS and perceived innovation

Whilst much research has been carried out to identify work outcomes as a result of perceptions of organisation politics, there has only been one study that sought to establish a relationship between perceived organisational politics and perceived innovation (Parker
et al., 1995). Although this study did confirm a hypothesis of earlier researchers that there was a negative relationship between organisational politics and innovation, the study used very limited operationalisations of both variables. A shortened version of the POPS, including items adapted from the original scale, was used with a 4-item scale measuring innovation. A search of the literature supported previous findings that no multi-dimensional measure of perceptions of workplace innovation that includes climate, organisational, team and individual dimensions existed prior to the development of the WIS (McMurray & Dorai, 2003). No previous study has tested both the POPS and WIS together to explore their relationship. Since innovation, at all levels of organisational analysis, is an important aspect of sustainable competitive advantage, and organisational politics has been thought of for decades as having a negative effect on innovation, it is surprising that little empirical work has been carried out to support these views. The implications of empirical findings would be significant for managerial practice in organisational innovation efforts since such an investigation would provide a useful and actionable picture of an aspect of the functionality of an organisation.

2.10 Research questions and hypotheses

The following research questions and hypotheses were formulated on the basis of the identified gaps in the review of the literature.

Research question 1

What is the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation within an IT company in the Australian private sector?

H1 – Perceptions of organisational politics are negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

H2 – The relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation is mediated by the role of actors within the organisation.

Research question 2

Are locus of control and Machiavellianism, which are antecedents of perceptions of organisational politics, also antecedents of perceptions of workplace innovation?
H 3 - External locus of control is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

H 4 – Machiavellianism is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

Research question 3

What is the relationship between political behaviour and perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation?

H 5 – The use of non-sanctioned political behaviour is positively related to perceptions of organisational politics.

H 6 – The use of sanctioned political behaviour is unrelated to perceptions of organisational politics.

H 7 – The use of non-sanctioned political behaviour is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

H 8 – The use of sanctioned political behaviour is positively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

This hypothesis is based on the assumption that those in supervisory positions will have a greater capacity for political behaviour because their role includes greater control of resources, i.e. power, than do the roles of non-supervisory staff.

2.11 Theoretical proposition

This section articulates a theoretical proposition based on the research questions and hypotheses contained in the previous section. The proposition is diagrammatically represented in figure 2.4 and suggests relationships among concepts.

First, the individual dispositional attributes of locus of control and Machiavellianism are related to the perceptual concepts of perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation, and to the behavioural concepts of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political behaviour. Second, it is proposed that the two perceptual concepts of organisational politics and workplace innovation are negatively related. Third the behavioural concepts
of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics are related to workplace innovation and perceptions of organisational politics.

**Figure 2.4 Theoretical proposition**
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--- indicates a negative relationship

_____ indicates a positive relationship

**Source: Author**

Fourth, it is proposed that trust of supervisors and peers is negatively related to perceptions of organisational politics but positively related to workplace innovation. Fifth, the individual dispositional variables of locus of control and Machiavellianism are negatively related to trust of supervisors and peers.
2.12 Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to review the literature relevant to this study, identify gaps in previous research, and formulate research questions and hypotheses. The literature was reviewed in relation to the main concepts in this thesis of organisational politics, perceptions of organisational politics, and workplace innovation. Reference was also made to the minor themes of emotion, trust and culture.

The review of the literature undertaken in this chapter has led to a number of conclusions. The relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation as multi-dimensional psychological concepts has not been investigated. Only one empirical study has investigated the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of innovation. That study used limited operationalisations of both concepts. In the literature there is no accepted definition of the major concepts in this thesis, including organisational politics, either perceptually or behaviourally, and workplace innovation. The minor themes of emotion, trust and culture are similarly problematic.

Empirical research of perceptions of organisational politics has largely been confined to the USA, with several studies conducted in Israel and individual studies being conducted in a number of other countries, including Taiwan, Malaysia, Thailand and the UK. The POPS has not been tested in the Australian context.

Little empirical research has been conducted to investigate the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and political behaviour and where this has been conducted, there has been an inconsistent approach because of the use of varied conceptualisations and operationalisations of political behaviour.

Having determined in this chapter what to research, the next chapter sets out the justification and explanation of the research methodology chosen for this thesis.
Chapter 3
Methodology

3.1 Introduction and objective

The previous chapter outlined the research questions for this thesis. The purpose of this chapter is to justify and explain the research methodology used in responding to the research questions/hypotheses.

3.2 Research design

This section articulates the methodological approach and research model used in this study. Underpinning the research approach and research framework of the study is the logic of the six-ideal-typical stage research process shown in figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1 Logic of the research process

According to De Vaus (2002), in order to test a theory, we use theory to guide our observations, moving from the general to the particular. The first stage is to specify the theory to be tested. The second stage is to derive a set of conceptual propositions, i.e. the nature of the relationship between two factors. The third stage involves the process of translating abstract concepts into something more concrete and observable. Operationalising a concept results in clear and measurable indicators so that we have a very clear idea of what data to collect. Once collected (stage four), the data are analysed (stage five) to see if the propositions are supportable, and therefore how much support there is for the theory. Finally, in stage six, an assessment of the results will usually show that the theory is partly supported but that there are results that are conflicting or confusing. Consequently, the initial theory is modified to take account of the observations made, and the modifications are tested rigorously.

3.2.1 Research approach

The predominantly positivistic research approach in this study used a survey questionnaire with open and closed questions to gather quantitative and qualitative data. The theoretical proposition outlined in the previous chapter, revealed subjective, value-laden and context specific phenomena. This suggested a phenomenological paradigm that required a qualitative methodology. However, as the literature review revealed, perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation, although subjective concepts, have been successfully operationalised using the POPS and WIS to collect quantitative data. Since this study was concerned with gathering data to understand individuals’ accounts of their behaviour and perceptions, a questionnaire-based survey was the most appropriate method to use (Ticehurst & Veal, 2000). Both qualitative and quantitative researchers try to see how society works, describe social reality, and answer questions about specific instances of social reality. Although some researchers stress the similarities of the two methodologies, there are two major distinctions that are useful to note (Becker, 1996). The first is that qualitative and quantitative methodologies raise different questions at the level of data, prior to generalising about social life. Survey
research uses a variant of the experimental paradigm, searching for numerical differences between groups of people in their activity or background. Referring to Abbott (1992), Becker (1996) supports the notion that such enquiry includes an argument for an explanation of an act based on the logic of difference between groups with different traits. Fieldworkers engaged in qualitative research, however, seek to describe what they have seen and their arguments rest on the interdependence of a lot of more-or-less proven statements. Becker (1996) maintains that the objective here is not to prove beyond doubt the existence of relationships but to describe a system of relationships. The second difference between the methodologies is the amount of data that researchers gather or are subjected to. In quantitative research, the design of the survey instrument enables the researcher to reasonably predict what data will be collected, although there may be some surprises, whereas the qualitative researcher will be subjected to data, both wanted and unwanted.

In this study, rather than gathering quantitative data only, a more thorough understanding of organisational politics was therefore sought by gathering qualitative data via open-ended questions relating to the identification of power holders within an organisation, to power-in-use, to the withholding of knowledge by supervisors and peers and to respondents’ emotional responses to the withholding of knowledge. The aim of collecting quantitative and qualitative data was not only to gain more breadth and depth but also to control the amount of unpredictable data that would be gathered. In addition, methodological triangulation (Hussey & Hussey, 1997) was used to arrive at a fuller understanding of how people experienced the withholding of knowledge by supervisors and peers. A cross-sectional study design was adopted. The advantages of a cross-sectional study, as opposed to a longitudinal study, were that because it was conducted only once, there was less disruption caused to the participating organisation and the process was less costly and time-consuming (Hussey & Hussey, 1997).

The survey method was chosen for the following factors: as was shown in chapter 2 of this study, it is commonly-used in similar research studies; self-administered questionnaires can eliminate interviewer bias; there were time and cost constraints and
limited access to respondents within organisations. A questionnaire was distributed within a private sector IT services company at their cost. Respondents then mailed their completed questionnaires directly to the author. The survey was conducted this way because it was the least disruptive to the participating organisation. In addition, members of the participating organisation believed that employees would be generally unwilling to discuss such a sensitive issue as organisational politics face to face, particularly with an outsider. The use of a mail survey made it easier to gather data anonymously and in confidence, both nationally and internationally.

3.2.2 Research model

Figure 3.2 illustrates the research framework utilised in this study. It is consistent with the framework in figure 3.1 (de Vaus, 2002:16). The research began with the theory and practice of knowledge management, specifically with the articulation of themes or questions relating to knowledge management and organisational behaviour. First, what was the importance of sharing tacit knowledge within organisations; second, were employees satisfied with the transfer of knowledge from supervisors and peers; third, did employees experience the withholding of knowledge by supervisors and peers; fourth, what were the rational and emotional responses of employees when knowledge was withheld from them by their supervisors and peers. These themes led to the operationalisation of conceptual propositions through the formulation of survey questions that were asked in the context of knowledge management as a social process. An exploratory study was conducted to investigate the variables impacting on knowledge transfer between managerial peer groups (McMurray & Baxter, 2002). It was discovered that knowledge was withheld from respondents by supervisors and peers for reasons that included the need to know, competitiveness, and power and control. A second exploratory study retained themes of withholding knowledge, trust innovation and the emotional response to withholding knowledge (McMurray & Baxter, 2002a). The study found that respondents experienced an emotional response when knowledge was withheld from them by supervisors and peers. Respondents cited power and control, self-interest and need to know/ confidentiality as reasons why knowledge was withheld. In the third
exploratory study (Baxter & McMurray, 2004) the themes of innovation and perceptions of organisational politics were included, with respondents reporting that power and politics were inhibitors of innovation efforts. A Pearson product-moment correlation analysis of the data found that there was a significant negative relationship ($r = -0.367$, $n = 143$, $p = <.010$) between perceptions of organisational politics and the promotion of innovation. This finding led to a search of the innovation literature for an innovation measurement scale that could be statistically analysed with the POPS so that a relationship between organisational politics and innovation could be investigated.

As figure 3.2 shows, there was an iterative process between these three exploratory studies and the review of literature, with the findings of each of the exploratory studies prompting a literature review of a theme identified through the data analyses. For example, in the second exploratory study, the identification of power and politics as reasons for withholding knowledge caused the author to consider how respondents might perceive organisational politics. The organisational politics literature was reviewed to identify a suitable scale so that quantitative data could be gathered. As discussed in chapter two, two streams of literature about organisational politics were evident, the first dealing with perceptions of organisational politics and the second with political behaviour. Since the qualitative data in the exploratory second study was perceptual, the literature was searched for an operationalisation of the psychological construct of perceptions of organisational politics. The 12-item Perceptions of Organisational Politics Scale (POPS) (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991) was identified and included in the third exploratory study. Other versions of the POPS containing 30 and 40 items were also identified in the literature. However because the 12-item scale had been used on 25 occasions between 1992 and 2000 (Ferris et al., 2002) and had proven reliability, and because the survey instrument was to be as small as possible, the Kacmar and Ferris (1991) 12-item scale was chosen for the third exploratory study.
Figure 3.2 Research framework

Source: Author

3.3 Exploratory studies

The function of exploratory studies in research is to look for patterns, ideas or hypotheses, rather than to confirm or test a hypothesis. The focus in exploratory research
is to gain insights into and familiarity with the subject area for more rigorous investigation at a later stage. While it rarely provides conclusive answers to problems, an exploratory study provides guidance on the direction of future research (Hussey & Hussey, 1997). In this study, three exploratory studies were conducted. All subjects in the exploratory studies, pilot study and the main study were from different pools. These are discussed in more detail in chapter 4, which explains the development of the survey instrument used in the research for this thesis.

3.4 Pilot testing

Once a questionnaire has been developed, each question and the questionnaire must be rigorously tested before final administration. Referring to Coverse and Presser, 1986, De Vaus (2002) suggests that there are three stages to pilot-testing questions.

The first stage is question development. The purpose of this stage is to check that the questions are correctly phrased, that they evaluate respondents’ interpretation, and that the range of responses is adequate. New questions have to be extensively tested and previously used questions must be considered in the context of their previous use compared to the anticipated sample. For example, are questions used in one cultural context appropriate in another? It is desirable that feedback from respondents is sought, however, because this is an intensive process, only a limited number of questions can be tested in this way. In this study three exploratory studies were conducted before the pilot test and, with the exception of previously researched and tested scales, no new questions were added to the questionnaire for the pilot study. Furthermore, the exploratory studies were conducted using culturally diverse samples. De Vaus (2002) recommends that the evaluation of individual items should include six points: (1) responses should be varied, as it is of little use in the analysis if all respondents provide the same answer; (2) respondents should demonstrate the intended meaning of the question and their answers should be comprehensible; (3) redundancy, i.e. if two questions ask the same thing, there will be an inter-item correlation of more than 0.8; (4) inter-item coefficient should be above 0.3 and reliability should be above Cronbach alpha 0.7 ensuring that all items in a
scale belong in that scale (De Vaus, 2002); (5) non-response may occur for a variety of reasons, including too much effort to answer, intrusion, or similarity to other questions and can result in difficulties at the analysis stage because of serious reductions in sample size; (6) acquiescent responses mean that a respondent agrees with seemingly contradictory questions. All scales included in the pilot test questionnaire had been used in previous research and had been subjected to rigorous testing indicating acceptable reliability and validity. All questions were checked to ensure that no two questions were asking the same thing.

The second stage is one in which the whole questionnaire is tested. Here not only comments from the respondents are taken into account but also their answers to the questions. This stage is usually undeclared, as respondents are not told that the questionnaire is still under development. De Vaus (2002) recommends that four things should be properly checked. The first is flow; i.e. do the questions fit together and is there a smooth flow between sections or is the transition too quick? In this study each section was separated by a boxed instruction on how to complete the following section. The questionnaire then provided a continuity of assistance and narrative, which ensured flow as well as brief pauses between sections. The second is that where filler questions are used, the skip patterns must be appropriate. The third is that testing should include estimating the time needed to complete the questionnaire, so that respondents are prepared and have realistic expectations of their commitment of time. The fourth is that respondent interest and attention should be noted and questions and/or sections reordered so that interest is maintained and answers are considered and reliable. De Vaus (2002) suggests that a pilot test should be conducted by the designer of the questionnaire and should involve a sample of between 75 to 100 respondents with similar characteristics as the main study sample so that feedback and corrections are relevant. In this study, completion times were estimated for each of the exploratory studies (15 minutes) and the pilot test (20 minutes); this proved useful because each of the participating organisations wanted to know how much time to commit to the survey. Respondents in the pilot study were asked by the sponsoring senior executives, in each of the two organisations, to provide feedback by making comments on the questionnaire or on a separate piece of
paper to be placed inside the questionnaire. Only two respondents in the pilot study provided feedback. One respondent said that the questionnaire was intrusive, but completed all questions, and the other said that the some of the questions were archaic, but didn’t say which ones.

The final stage of a survey involves polishing the questionnaire by revising or shortening questions, ordering the questions and paying attention to the general layout and presentation of the questionnaire to ensure ease of use and clarity. Both the purpose of the questionnaire and the context in which the questions are being asked must be apparent. This can be achieved by providing an introductory or explanatory paragraph or covering letter and precise instructions about how to answer the questions (Hussey & Hussey, 1997). In this study, layout was improved through the use of an explanatory note at the beginning of the questionnaire which set out the aim of the survey and thanked participants. Also, instructions at the start of each section which guided respondents in how to answer questions with an example; alternate questions were shaded to improve readability where the scales consisted of 10 to 24 questions.

3.5 Ethics in conducting a survey

“Ideally, a survey will be technically correct, practically efficient and ethically sound.” (De Vaus, 2002: 58). The principles underlying research ethics are universal and concern issues such as honesty and respect for the rights of the individual (Ticehurst & Veal, 2000). Approval for the conduct of this research was sought from and given by the Ethics Committee of the Swinburne University of Technology.

There are five ethical responsibilities towards survey participants stressed by most professional codes of conduct (De Vaus, 2002): voluntary participation, informed consent, no harm, confidentiality, anonymity and privacy. Voluntary participation means that people should not be required to participate. In this study, emails and letters accompanying the questionnaires, jointly authored by the researcher and the person responsible for distributing the questionnaire within the participating organisations, stated
that participation in the survey was voluntary. Additionally, the wording of the introductory paragraph of the instrument included the words “asking for your help”, further reinforcing that participation was a matter of individual choice.

Informed consent of the participating organisations was sought through a letter formally seeking the organisations’ involvement in this research and through discussion between the researcher and the Managing Director, General Manager, HR Manager or Head of Department of the participating organisations. In addition, the letter set out the background to the study and the benefits to the organisation of participation. The researcher further offered to provide a written report of results and to give presentations in which questions about the research and the results could be asked. Questionnaire recipients were informed of the purpose of the survey both in the questionnaire and in covering letters and emails. The purpose of the survey was stated as “a study that explores workplace behaviours in organisations that are considered to be innovative”. Both the response rate and evidence of unanswered questions within the questionnaires indicate that responses were voluntary and that respondents were discriminating in the questions they answered. The use of signed consent forms is a common way to demonstrate informed consent (De Vaus, 2002); however, this was thought to be unnecessary and to conflict with the confidentiality of the survey. All respondents were supplied with a stamped addressed envelope so that the questionnaire could be completed and then mailed directly to the researcher. This ensured confidentiality and anonymity and guarded against contamination of the data by a third party. Neither questionnaires nor envelopes were coded prior to receipt by the researcher. Further, respondents were instructed in the questionnaire not to write their name or the name of any other person in answer to any of the questions.

Two types of harm to participants were possible in this research. First, was psychological harm through a fellow worker or manager discovering personal information about a participant. Second, since some of the questions related to behaviours of co-workers and supervisors, harm could have been caused to the careers of respondents. Three aspects of this research minimised the risk of either psychological harm or career harm to
participants. First, the survey was confidential and anonymous. Second, permission from the Swinburne University of Technology Ethics Committee was conditional upon any analysis of the data and subsequent communication to the organisation being incapable of identifying any individual or subgroup within the organisation. Third, the researcher decided that no direct quotes from questionnaires would be communicated to the participating organisations, preventing the identification of anyone through language idiosyncrasy. Confidentiality and anonymity were assured to maximise the quality and honesty of responses, maximise participation, and protect participants from harm. No respondents recorded their name on any of the 218 usable responses received. In addition to the measures already outlined in this section, the participation of organisations in this research was conditional on the data remaining the property of the researcher, while approval from the University Ethics Committee was conditional on the data being securely stored. Only the researcher has had access to the completed questionnaires, which have been kept in a locked facility, and no photocopies have been made of any completed questionnaire or part thereof. Privacy of individual participants in this research has further been guaranteed through organisations’ declining permission for follow-up interviews by the researcher.

The ethical standards and practices employed in this study are a result of research, deliberations and discussions between the researcher, academic supervisor, the University Ethics Committee and the representatives of participating organisations. The researcher is unaware of complaints by participants in the research or of any ethical breaches.

3.6 Quantitative analysis

Quantitative data in this study were analysed using statistical procedures. The term statistics refers to a set of methods and rules for organising, summarising, and interpreting information (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000). Four factors affect how the data are analysed, according to De Vaus (2002). Firstly, the number of variables being examined will determine whether a univariate (single variable), bivariate (two variables) or multivariate (three or more variables) method of analysis is used. In practice,
researchers develop and refine research questions in the process of analysis and so move between univariate, bivariate and multivariate techniques. Secondly, the level of measurement of the variables is important in deciding which analytical technique within the categories mentioned above should be used. The levels of measurement include: interval level variable (a variable in which the categories can be ordered in a meaningful way and the difference between the categories can be measured); ordinal level variable (in which categories can be ordered but where the difference between the categories cannot be measured); and nominal variable (a variable within which there is no set rank-order of categories). Whilst more powerful and sophisticated analytical techniques are only appropriate for interval-level variables, considerations of reliability, response rate and need mean that measurement at lower levels is appropriate (De Vaus (2002). Thirdly, the choice of statistics is determined by the purpose of the analysis. If the purpose is to summarise patterns in the response of cases in a sample, then descriptive statistics should be used. However, inferential statistics (including interval estimates and tests of statistical significance) are appropriate when the purpose of the analysis is to generalise the results of the analysis to a wider population. De Vaus (2002) recommends that descriptive statistics should be used first to establish patterns in the data, often which inferential statistics can be used to establish the likely match between the sample and wider population. Fourthly, the ethical responsibility of researchers affects how data are analysed. The ethical principles of full, fair, appropriate and challenging analysis should be applied. Since results can be distorted or falsified, De Vaus (2002) makes a number of recommendations, which include reporting “negative” results and modifying theory accordingly, rather than selectively reporting “positive” or results that support an hypothesis; replicating results in experimental research or at least making data sets publicly available; using appropriate statistical techniques that include the use of multivariate analysis, rigorously testing scales; and evaluating the validity and reliability of variables, or the distortion of graphs.

In this study, the computer software package SPSS v.12 was used according to procedures recommended by Pallant (2002). In addition, Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) and Gravetter and Willnau (2000) were consulted regarding appropriate statistical
procedures, as recommended by Pallant (2002). Descriptive statistical procedures were used to summarise, organise and simplify the data, and to establish patterns. Inferential statistical procedures were used to make generalisations about the populations that were sampled. A detailed summary of the level of measurement, the descriptive and inferential statistics and the variables used in this study is in table 5.1. The computer software package SPSS v.12 was used, and data were coded prior to being entered them into the database according to procedures recommended by Pallant (2002). For the purpose of analysis, continuous variables were converted into categorical variables through the coding process; e.g. the continuous variable of age was converted into a categorical variable by coding age intervals such as 2 = 20–29yrs; 3 = 30–39yrs. Similar procedures were carried out with continuous variables of tenure of organisation and position, and span of control. This was an appropriate procedure in order to carry out a comparative analysis between groups. This study was particularly concerned to conduct a comparative analysis between supervisors and non-supervisors and so span of control was cross-checked with organisation role to ensure that only those cases that were clearly defined were used in the analysis. Cases where this was uncertain were omitted. A detailed explanation of the categorisation of variables and statistical procedures used in the analysis is contained in chapter 5.

The text by, Tabachnick & Fidell (1996:715) implied that the sample size of the present study was inadequate for structural equation modelling; it was therefore decided to use correlation and regression analyses. Advice was sought from the Mathematics Department of Swinburne University of Technology. The researcher was referred to the Director of Research, Lilydale campus, and was advised that structural equation modelling was inappropriate for a cross-sectional study with a sample size of 169, and that more appropriate procedures would include the use of correlation and regression analysis.
3.6.1 Missing values

Missing values were discovered among the scales, qualitative questions and demographic sections. Replacing missing values is desirable in order to maximise cases used in the statistical procedures. A number of options were identified for replacing the missing values, including series mean, mean of nearby points, median of nearby points, linear interpolation, and linear trend at point. However, since the phenomena under study were context specific, the responses from each participating organisation were separated and series means were used to calculate the missing values within scales, thus maintaining the integrity of the context. The data from all organisations were then brought back together within one database to carry out the remaining statistical procedures. Missing values were not replaced in this study as doing so would not alter the validity or reliability of the scales; analysis was conducted using the original data collected.

Where appropriate, variables were coded as categorical variables for more convenient analysis. However, a small number of dichotomous variables were used; for example to the question “Does your supervisor withhold knowledge from you?” required a yes/no answer.

3.6.2 Preparing the data for analysis

Data were screened and cleaned by checking for errors and correcting errors in the data file. This was done by checking each variable for out of range scores, identifying these in the data file, checking the variable parameters, and referring back to the hard copy questionnaires to ensure that the correct values were then added (Pallant, 2002). A preliminary analysis of the data was conducted to assess the variables for normality and check for outliers.
3.7 Qualitative analysis

Qualitative data were collected through the inclusion of open-ended questions; for example, respondents were asked to identify the position/role of power holders in their organisation and report how they demonstrated their power. They were also asked to report their emotional response to the withholding of knowledge by their supervisors and peers. The qualitative data collected from the responses were examined in order to identify themes or categories. Frameworks that assisted in this process were identified from the literature review. For example, the qualitative data relating to how power holders use their power was ordered by frequency of response, and was then coded and entered into the database. A similar procedure was adopted for the emotional response questions. Categories of emotions identified by Lazarus and Lazarus (1994) were coded, and responses to the questionnaire identified accordingly before being entered into the SPSS v.12 database. The qualitative data were then statistically analysed using univariate, bivariate and multivariate techniques.

3.8 Testing and purifying constructs

Measurement error is the degree to which the “observed values” are not representative of the “true” values (Hair et al., 1998). Furthermore, in order to reduce measurement error, researchers must always work to increase reliability and validity of measures. Unless a measure is reliable it cannot be valid (Johnson & Duberley, 2003). Reliability is the extent to which a variable or set of variables is consistent in what it is intended to measure, whilst validity is the extent to which a measure or set of measures represents the concept of study (Hair et al., 1998:3). There are several types of validity that are commonly tested by researchers (De Vaus, 2002). Criterion validity is a comparison between responses to questions in a new measure and well-accepted measures of the same concept. However, content validity (the extent to which the indicators measure different aspects of the concept) and construct validity (how well the measure conforms to theoretical expectations) are also commonly used, so that there is no ideal way to measure validity (De Vaus, 2002). This may be explained by the widespread disagreement about the definition of many social science concepts. Furthermore, it is not
the measure that is valid but the use to which the measure is put, so that validity depends on how we define the concept (De Vaus, 2002).

Churchill (1979) considered construct validity to be at the heart of the scientific process, and observed that the separate issues of reliability and validity are problematic for researchers. This present study followed Sethi and King’s (1991) and Churchill’s (1979) eight-step process to enhance the reliability and validity of construct measures within the cross-sectional study. The steps are as follows:

1) Define the construct in relation to another construct. In this study, the literature review in chapter 2 defined perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation and how they are operationalised. 2) Review the literature and generate a sample of items where more than one item measures the construct. This was conducted within the review of organisational politics literature in chapter 2. 3) Combine fieldwork data with that of the literature review. In this study there was an iterative process between the initial fieldwork, as reflected in the exploratory studies (chapter 4, and appendices 2, 3 and 4) and the literature as discussed in chapter 4. 4) Purify the measure through the calculation of the coefficient alpha. Nunnally (1978) considers a Cronbach coefficient alpha of .70 acceptable. In this study the coefficient alpha was calculated in the third exploratory study (appendix 4), with two samples at $\alpha=.81$ (n=97) and $\alpha=.78$ (n=46), which then informed the pilot study. 5) Collect new data. This was done through the pilot study (chapter 4), and the coefficient alpha was calculated for all measures at above the recommended level of .70 (Nunnally, 1978), although the sample size was not large (51). 6) Assess reliability with new data. In this study, this was done by analysing the data from the pilot study (chapter 4). 7) Assess construct validity through factor analysis. This is done either by conducting two surveys and comparing them through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, or dividing the sample and exploring the construct with one half and conducting confirmatory factor analysis with the other half. Hair et al., (1998) recommend a sample size of more than 100 and to have a ratio of ten-to-one of observations to variables. This ratio is also supported by Nunnally (1978). Tabachnick and Fiddell (1996:640) assert that as a general rule of thumb 300 cases are required for
factor analysis. The sample size of the present study was 169. In order to conduct factor analysis, the data would have to be split resulting in two inadequate sample sizes. The smallest multi-dimensional scale in this study was POPS (12 items), which required 120 cases for factor analysis. Predictive validity is the relationship of the measure to a single antecedent or consequent (Sethi & King, 1991) and requires that the measure behave as expected in relation to other constructs. In this study, predictive validity is commented upon in chapters 5 and 6 in comparing the analysis results to previous research. 8) Develop norms.

Table 3.1 Process steps used for measuring and evaluating constructs in developing the instrument for this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process steps</th>
<th>Recommended techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Define construct in relation to another construct and operationalise it</td>
<td>Literature review (chapter 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review literature and generate a sample of items where more than one item measured the construct</td>
<td>Literature review (chapter 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Combine fieldwork data with that of the literature review</td>
<td>Literature review (chapter 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Purify the constructs and check consistency and accuracy of measurement</td>
<td>Pre-test and feedback (chapter 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collect new data</td>
<td>Pilot study (chapter 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assess reliability with new data</td>
<td>Pilot study (chapter 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assess construct validity</td>
<td>Confirmatory factor analysis (not conducted in this study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Develop norms</td>
<td>Instrument for main study (chapter 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Sethi and King (1991) and Churchill (1979)
The approach taken in this study to measuring and evaluating constructs, as illustrated in table 3.1, is consistent with Sethi and King (1991), who note that while Churchill (1979) recommends all eight steps with construct operationalisation, the execution of at least steps one to four is recommended for one-time, cross-sectional data.

3.9 Sample characteristics

The characteristics of the sample population for this study are shown in table 3.2. All respondents were employed within the Melbourne service division of a multinational IT services company.

Table 3.2 Sample characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total sample (169)</th>
<th>Supervisors (53)</th>
<th>Non-supervisors (101)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 37.1 years, SD = 9.5</td>
<td>M = 40.4 years, SD = 10.1</td>
<td>M = 35.1 years, SD = 8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>129 (80%)</td>
<td>43 (83%)</td>
<td>76 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (17%)</td>
<td>23 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>104 (68%)</td>
<td>36 (71%)</td>
<td>61 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>41 (27%)</td>
<td>10 (19%)</td>
<td>30 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defacto</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>38 (25%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
<td>23 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical qualification</td>
<td>28 (18%)</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
<td>16 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>53 (35%)</td>
<td>19 (37%)</td>
<td>33 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher degree</td>
<td>21 (14%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>10 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unspecified</td>
<td>12 (8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>122 (78%)</td>
<td>43 (83%)</td>
<td>71 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>33 (21%)</td>
<td>9 (17%)</td>
<td>24 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure in organisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 7.5 years, SD = 6.8</td>
<td>M = 8.6 years; SD = 8.0</td>
<td>M = 7.1 years, SD = 6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure in role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 3.8 years, SD = 4.5</td>
<td>M = 2.7 years, SD = 2.5</td>
<td>M = 4.4 years, SD = 5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Span of control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 2.6, SD = 5.7</td>
<td>M = 2.6, SD = 5.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

A total of 169 useable responses were received from 129 males (76 percent) and 33 females (20 percent), with seven respondents (four percent) failing to record their gender. Although this sample is predominantly male, it is reflective of the workplace today in the
IT industry. A majority of respondents (104 or 68 percent) reported that they were married, while 41 were single (27 percent), four in defacto relationships (three percent), three divorced (2 percent), and 17 did not report their marital status (10 percent). The ages of respondents varied between 18 years and 57 years, with a mean age of 37.1 years and a standard deviation of 9.5. Various levels of education were reported by 152 respondents (90 percent). These included 38 educated to high school (25 percent), 28 with technical qualifications (18 percent), 53 with university degrees (35 percent), 21 with higher degrees (14 percent), and 12 with other unspecified levels of education. Respondents included 122 full-time workers (78 percent), 33 contract workers (21 percent), and two part-time or casual employees (two percent). Reported tenure with the organisation was between three months and 33 years, with a mean organisational tenure of 7.5 years and standard deviation of 6.8. Respondents were made up of 53 supervisors (34 percent) and 101 non-supervisory staff (66 percent).

A comparison of supervisors and non-supervisors reveals that supervisors were on average 5.3 years older, fewer of them were females (by six percent), and more were married (by six percent). A slightly higher proportion of supervisors reported higher levels of education, and had shorter tenure in their role than non-supervisors but longer tenure with the organisation. Supervisors were overwhelmingly employed on a full time basis (83 percent) with a minority employed on contract (17 percent). On the other hand, 73 percent of non-supervisors were employed on a full-time basis and 25 percent on contract.

3.10 Summary

This chapter has described the methodology that was used to investigate the research questions and test the hypotheses in this study. It has set out the research framework within the context of the research logic and described the approaches taken in this study to quantitative and qualitative data analyses and the ethics of conducting a survey. The sample characteristics have also been discussed, including a comparison between supervisors and non-supervisors.
The next chapter describes the development of the survey questionnaire used in this study.
Chapter 4
Instrument Development

4.1 Objective

This chapter describes and explains the evolution of the questionnaire used in this thesis. The final survey questionnaire used in this study was informed by the empirical research of three exploratory studies conducted using different pools of subjects, a pilot study conducted within a major hospital and a publishing company, and the review of literature discussed in chapter 2. The main field study was then conducted within a multinational IT services company. The conduct of all studies involved different pools of subjects to eliminate the risk that high reliability scores might be due to familiarity with concepts and to redundancy.

4.2 Exploratory studies

Three multi-method exploratory studies were conducted within Australia. The results of these studies were published in three refereed conference papers (McMurray & Baxter 2002; McMurray & Baxter, 2002a; Baxter & McMurray, 2004) and are attached to this thesis as appendices 2, 3, and 4.

4.2.1 Study 1

This multi-method study adopted a social constructionist approach to investigate the variables that impact on knowledge transfer between managerial peer groups. A survey questionnaire containing 13 items, a section of demographic questions, and six questions anchored to a 5-point satisfaction scale which asked respondents to register their satisfaction with the quality and quantity of knowledge transfer from supervisors and peers and their trust of supervisors and peers in maintaining confidentiality. Five open questions asked respondents to report if knowledge was withheld by supervisors and
peers, the reasons for this, and the respondents’ emotional reaction. The sample included 46 Asian and 50 non-Asian MBA students, 50 of whom were managers and directors in companies from a wide range of industries. All questions were designed by the authors (McMurray & Baxter, 2002) and the data were analysed using descriptive statistics and category theme analysis. The findings of this study were that there were differences across cultures in the respondents’ experiences of knowledge transfer from supervisors and peers, in the levels of trust of supervisors and peers, and in emotional responses to the withholding of knowledge (see appendix 2). The theme of withholding of knowledge/control of information by supervisors and peers was further examined in a second exploratory study, in which more data were sought about the reasons why knowledge was withheld and the emotional reaction of respondents.

4.2.2 Study 2

A second multi-method exploratory study conducted in 2002 (McMurray & Baxter, 2002a) investigated the emotional response to the withholding of knowledge by peer groups and supervisors in organisations. A survey questionnaire was administered to 147 MBA students of various ages and cultural backgrounds, including over 70 managers and directors of service and manufacturing companies. The study found that there were differences across cultures in how respondents reacted to knowledge being withheld by supervisors and peers (see appendix 3). Furthermore, the degree of trust of supervisors and peers reported by respondents was consistent with aspects of the national cultures; for example, those from cultures with high power distance were less trusting of peers and supervisors. Both Asians and non-Asians reported that knowledge was withheld by peers and supervisors; the former attributed this to competitiveness, while the latter group was more inclined to say that it was due to “need to know” or confidentiality.

The first two studies included questions about how respondents defined innovation and also asked respondents to report how their organisations encouraged or discouraged innovation efforts. Whilst the qualitative data were wide-ranging, with some responses appearing to be culturally based, what became clear was that organisational politics was
in evidence in many organisations, and there appeared to be a relationship between organisational support for innovation efforts and the perceived level of organisational politics. The researcher therefore decided to use the 12-item POPS, which measured the respondents’ perceptions of organisation politics, in order to investigate the relationship between organisational support for innovation and the perceived presence of organisational politics.

4.2.3 Study 3

This study (Baxter & McMurray, 2004) was conducted by surveying two samples of 97 and 78 MBA students with the objective of exploring the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and organisations’ efforts to support or inhibit innovation. Quantitative data were gathered through the use of the 12-item Perceptions of Organisational Politics Scale (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991), and qualitative data relating to innovation were gathered through the use of open-ended questions about how organisations supported or inhibited innovation efforts. The qualitative data were analysed using category theme analysis. Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation tests were used to analyse the individual samples, conduct a comparative analysis of the two groups, and finally to compare two culturally based groups within both samples, i.e. Asians and non-Asians. It was found that the POPS demonstrated good internal reliability across both samples (α = .80); however it fell below the acceptable level within the Asian group (α = .63). In addition, analysis of the qualitative data also revealed that culturally-based assumptions appeared to underlie responses to questions about innovation. However, the POPS was found to negatively correlate with the promotion of innovation within organisations (r = −.367, p<0.01).

On the basis of the findings of this study, it was decided to search the literature for an appropriate measure of organisational innovation that could be used with the POPS for analytical purposes. The 24-item Workplace Innovation Scale (WIS) (McMurray & Dorai, 2003) was identified as a suitable operationalisation of organisational innovation, because, like the POPS, it is a multi-dimensional, context-sensitive, psychological
construct. The questionnaire was reviewed and, in addition to the inclusion of the WIS, consideration was given to the inclusion of appropriate scales to measure possible antecedents to both perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation. The questionnaire was thus redeveloped for a pilot study.

4.3 Pilot study and pre-testing the questionnaire

The questionnaire for the proposed pilot study now included two psychological multi-dimensional constructs operationalised through the POPS and WIS to further explore the relationship between organisational politics and innovation. Questions relating to the withholding of knowledge were retained to further investigate the control of knowledge transfer as a political tactic, the reasons for this and the emotional response of those from whom knowledge was withheld.

Since the incidence of withholding knowledge by supervisors and peers was commonly reported by those surveyed irrespective of cultural background, type of organisation or level in the organisation, and there were reports of knowledge being withheld for reasons of power maintenance and politics, the author developed a questionnaire for a pilot study that included not only withholding knowledge but also self-report scales about the respondents’ political behaviour and a scale measuring perceptions of organisational politics. Further reading of the literature resulting in the identification of dispositional antecedents to perceptions of politics led to the inclusion of the internal/external locus of control and the Mach IV scales.

A pilot study was conducted to test the reliability and validity of the survey instrument within a major hospital and a publishing company within Australia. Seventy-five questionnaires were supplied to the Director of a major Melbourne hospital undergoing substantial organisational change. Questionnaires and envelopes were distributed within the organisation by the director so that respondents could mail the responses directly to the researcher in complete confidence. Similarly, in the publishing company, the questionnaires were distributed to all 98 members of staff, with stamped envelopes
addressed to the author. The questionnaire included open and closed questions. Six scales were utilised, together with open questions about power, withholding of knowledge by supervisors and peers, emotional response to withholding of knowledge, trust of supervisor and peers and a demographic section.

Six scales were included in the questionnaire and each of the items within the scales was recorded as a variable within the database. The forced choice items within the Internal/External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966) were coded ‘0’ for internal and ‘1’ for external. The remaining five scales, including the Sanctioned Political Tactics and the Non-Sanctioned Political Tactics scales (Zanzi & O’Neil, 2001), Mach IV (Christie & Geis, 1970), Perceptions of Organisational Politics (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991), and the Workplace Innovation Scale (WIS) (McMurray & Dorai, 2003) were administered using a five-point Likert-type scale, and data were entered accordingly. The values of reverse scored items within the Mach IV and POPS were corrected at the time of data entry rather than relying on computerised reversal of scoring. Neither the Political Tactics scale nor the Workplace Innovation Scale contained reverse scored items. All data entry was double and triple checked for data entry errors. The five scales were chosen because of their relevance to this study and their robustness in previous research.

4.3.1 Results of the pilot study

The pilot study was conducted within a management group in a Melbourne hospital and a Sydney publishing company, resulting in a sample size of 51 with a response rate of 29 per cent. Respondents included 46 females (92%) and 4 males (8%); 21 (44%) were married; 39 (78%) were educated at tertiary level; 23 (47%) reported an organisational tenure of less than five years and 33 (67%) a positional tenure of less than five years; 44 (88%) were full time employees, with 27 (55%) reporting that they were employed in a supervisory role with between one and 50 direct reports. Scales demonstrated acceptable reliability: Mach IV (α=.74); political tactics (α=.85); POPS (α=.86) and WIS (α=.79).
Since no further problems were identified with the questionnaire in the pilot study, it was decided to use the questionnaire in the main study.

4.4 Scales used in the main study

This section details the scales included in the questionnaire administered in the main study.

4.4.1 Perceptions of Politics Scale

The purpose of this scale is to measure the degree to which respondents feel that their workplace environment is political and therefore unjust and unfair. The 12-item POP scale developed by Kacmar and Ferris (1991) was used in this pilot study. This scale contains the most parsimonious set of items of the 40 item scale originally developed by Kacmar and Ferris (1991). The version used in this study, comprising three dimensions, has been used by other researchers, including Kacmar and Carlson (1994), Parker et al. (1995), Croppanzano et al. (1997), Kacmar et al. (1999) and Vigoda (2000a and 2000b), Valle and Witt (2001), and Huang et al. (2003). The Cronbach alpha internal reliability of the scale was reported by previous research as between .71 and .90.

4.4.2 Political tactics scales

These scales are called the Non-Sanctioned Political Tactics scale and the Sanctioned Political Tactics scale and were developed by Zanzi and O’Neill (2001). The scales comprise seven items and six items respectively and are scored on a scale (1 = very little to 5 = extensively), and ask respondents to report on the frequency of their use of political tactics.
4.4.3 Locus of Control Scale

Also referred to as the I-E scale, the purpose of the Locus of Control scale (Rotter, 1966) is to measure the degree to which individuals and groups believe that they are controlled by internal or external forces. There are 29 items, including six filler items used to make the purpose of the scale more ambiguous. Respondents are provided with two statements in each item (a) and (b), from which they must choose the one with which they most agree.

4.4.4 Mach IV Scale

This scale measuring the dispositional characteristic of Machiavellianism (Christie & Geis, 1970) comprises 20 items anchored to a five-point Likert-type scale. Nine items deal with political tactics, nine with views of human nature, and two with abstract morality.

4.4.5 Workplace Innovation Scale

The WIS (McMurray & Dorai, 2003) comprises 24 items anchored to a five-point Likert-type scale and measures perceptions of innovation across four dimensions: organisation climate, organisational innovation, team innovation, and individual innovation.

4.5 Fieldwork Issues

The research for this thesis was conducted within Australia. Three multi-method exploratory studies included populations at a public university; a pilot study included populations from a public hospital and publishing company; and the main study was conducted within the service division of a multi-national private-sector IT company. A number of difficulties were experienced in conducting the surveys. With the exception of the MBA students, there were three common concerns voiced by management and staff in the organisations surveyed. First, management and staff are being asked with increasing frequency by their organisation, industry bodies and academic institutions to
participate in many types of surveys and this is leading to “survey fatigue”, which manifests itself in the form of disinterest and non-participation. Second, the subject of organisational politics was problematic. Managers and staff were not used to discussing this aspect of their work environment, and even though participation by all the organisations was voluntary and anonymous, people expressed concern at divulging their private views about a very sensitive issue. In particular, respondents were fearful that reporting on the political behaviour of supervisors and fellow workers might result in retribution of some kind. Third, managers in the public sector organisation expressed concern that the survey would create “other agendas” within the organisation. This might lead to a shift in focus of management and staff from the strategies they were trying to implement to political issues that were “too difficult”, “time consuming”, and not as important as the business plans already in place. The anxiety of these managers was heightened because they believed that, consistent with previous staff surveys, staff would expect action to be taken by management to address any concerns they included in their survey responses. These were matters of great concern to the researcher, who was heavily reliant on the support and encouragement of managers and their staff in order to achieve a high response rate. Considerable time and effort was expended by key players within participating organisations in assuring staff of the confidentiality of their responses, highlighting the importance of providing honest and comprehensive responses to all questions, and managing the expectations of staff by reinforcing that their participation in the research was not intended as an input to business strategy.

The feedback on fieldwork issues provided by the key players of participating organisations in the exploratory and pilot studies informed the discussions between the author and the IT service organisation that participated in the main study. The senior managers used this discussion as an input into a communication strategy aimed at encouraging participation of staff on a voluntary and confidential basis.
4.6 Description of questionnaire used in the main study

The four-page survey questionnaire entitled “Innovation and Organisational Politics Questionnaire” comprised 107 questions and a final section to collect demographic data. The questionnaire was designed so that it was contained within an A3 sheet of paper that when folded in the middle, contained the equivalent of two A4 pages with no blank spaces. It was prefaced with an introductory preamble at the top of page one asking for voluntary and anonymous participation and signed by the author. In order to make the questionnaire as easy as possible to read it was broken up into five sections and alternate items within scales were shaded. In addition, all scales were preceded by instructions on how to answer the questions, with examples. Maximum use was made of the space on all four pages and scales were ordered so that each scale was included on a page, i.e. no scale was broken across two pages. The scales appeared thematically in the instrument so that self-report behaviour was followed by dispositional questions, perceptual questions, and lastly demographics. The scales were interspersed with other questions, as explained below.

The first section contained a 15-item political tactics scale anchored to a 5-point Likert-type scale. This scale required respondents to self-report on their political behaviour. The 15 items contained a six-item sanctioned political tactics scale and a seven-item non-sanctioned political tactics scale (Zanzi & O’Neill, 2001). There were two filler items, which were also political tactics identified by the same researchers but not included in the final scales. These items were included to use space on the page so that the questionnaire looked complete and were also a result of feedback from respondents during the pilot study: “Why is there a space at the bottom of the page?” Two further questions asked respondents to identify the power holders in their organisation (respondents were instructed to use position titles only and not include names of individuals), and explain how these power holders demonstrated their power. These questions completed the first section and the first page.
Section 2 was on the second page and contained the 29-item internal/external locus of control scale (Rotter, 1966), including six filler items. This forced-choice scale required a full page, and the author decided to include this on page two so that respondents would not be adversely affected by the appearance of a full page of questions on the first page, and also so that this full page of questions was flanked by pages one and three, which contained variation in the layout and included both open and closed questions.

Page three section 3 comprised the 20-item Mach IV scale (Christie & Geis, 1970) anchored to a five-point Likert-scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. This was followed by questions asking respondents to report withholding of knowledge from them by their supervisors and peers using yes/no answers. Respondents were also asked open-ended questions on why they believed supervisors and peers withheld knowledge from them and their emotional response if knowledge was withheld. Page three concluded with two items asking respondents if they trusted managers and peers to keep a confidence. These two items were anchored to a five point Likert scale with 1 = always and 5 = never, and were reverse scored. The qualitative questions were placed to provide breaks between the scales in an effort to provide some relief to respondents from reading lists of questions.

Section 4 on the last page included the 12-item POPS (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991) and the 24-item WIS (McMurray & Dorai, 2003). These scales were anchored to a five-point Likert-scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The final section (5) of the questionnaire was the demographic section, which included 14 items capturing data relating to gender, age, marital status, country of birth, parents’ country of birth, length of time spent outside country of birth, nature and length of employment, organisational role and tenure in the role, level of education, organisation type and department and span of control. A statement of thanks was placed at the end of the questionnaire at the bottom of page four.
4.7 Summary

This chapter described the evolution of the questionnaire used in this study. It described how the questionnaire was developed using three exploratory studies and pilot-testing the questionnaire within two organisations. Fieldwork issues experienced in the pilot-study phase were elaborated, highlighting some of the difficulties in researching such a sensitive topic as organisational politics. Finally this chapter described the questionnaire that was administered in a major IT services company within Australia to gather the data which is analysed in the next chapter of this thesis.
5.1 Objective

The objectives of this chapter are to describe the procedures used in this study, report the results of testing the reliability and validity of measures used and present the analysis and interpretation of the data collected in the survey. The analysis uses descriptive statistics of variables and scale items, including mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. Correlation analyses of all the hypothesised relationships between variables are presented and regression analyses conducted to further uncover these relationships.

In this chapter, an overview of the variables included in the analysis is followed by the tests of measures used. Results are then presented so that they correspond with the research questions and hypotheses. The data are analysed first in total and then split so that data from supervisors and non-supervisory staff can be compared.

5.2 Variables and levels of measurement

The analyses undertaken in this study were primarily determined by two factors. First, the purpose of the study was to investigate relationships among two or more variables using univariate, bivariate and multivariate methods. For example, the level of perceptions of organisational politics present within the organisation under study was determined through univariate analysis, whereas the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation was undertaken through bivariate analysis. Multivariate analyses were employed to explore the relationships between perceptions of organisational politics and predicted antecedents. Second, the measurement of the variables required particular statistical procedures for each part of the analysis. This is shown in table 5.1, which also includes the variables analysed in this study.
Table 5.1 is a framework for the approach to statistical analysis in this chapter. However, not all the continuous variables were subjected to regression analysis. The justification for the inclusion of selected variables in the multiple regression analyses and hierarchical multiple regression analysis is provided within the sections of this chapter that describe these procedures.
### Table 5.1 List of variables by levels of measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of measurement</th>
<th>Interval (continuous)</th>
<th>Ordinal</th>
<th>Nominal (categorical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Rank-order categories are separated by numerically equal distances)</td>
<td>(Categories can be ranked but there is no meaningful numeric interval between categories)</td>
<td>(Categories cannot be ranked or the intervals between quantified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate descriptive statistics</strong></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mode – central tendency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance and standard deviation – level of dispersion</td>
<td>Variation – interquartile range</td>
<td>Variation ratio (v) – percentage of people not in the modal category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symmetry and skewness</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson’s correlation r and r squared (direction and strength of linear relationship between two variables)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Significance testing &lt;.05 - (correct interpretation – sampling error or real difference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression analyses (predicts scores on dependent variable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variables in this study</strong></td>
<td>POPS (Perceptions of Organisational Politics Scale)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Emotional response to knowledge withheld by supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIS (Workplace Innovation Scale)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Emotional response to knowledge withheld by peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I/ELOCS (Internal/External Locus of Control Scale)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Knowledge withheld by supervisors (dichotomous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MACH IV (Machiavellianism)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Knowledge withheld by peers (dichotomous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSPTS (Non-Sanctioned Political Tactics Scale)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Why knowledge withheld by supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPTS (Sanctioned Political Tactics Scale)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Why knowledge withheld by peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust of supervisor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identification of power holders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust of peer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>How power holders demonstrate power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author adapted from De Vaus (2002) and Pallant (2002).
5.3 Tests of measures

Testing the reliability and validity of scales used in this study is necessary because they can influence the quality of data (Pallant, 2002). This section sets out the results of the tests of all scales used in this study. A detailed output from SPSS v.12 is contained in appendix 5.

5.3.1 Reliability

The reliability of a scale, which indicates how free the scale is from random error, can be illustrated using the most frequently used methods (Pallant, 2002), i.e. either a test-retest reliability or an internal consistency score. Since the test-retest method requires administering the questionnaire to the same group of people on two different occasions, it was deemed inappropriate for this study. The reasons were twofold. Firstly, the POPS and WIS are measures of perceptions of organisations at a point in time and events can change perceptions over time; also the identity of respondents in the study was unknown and, therefore, the same people could not be asked to participate further for comparison purposes. Secondly, feedback from organisations participating in this study made it unlikely that they would be willing to participate further.

Internal consistency is the degree to which the items of a scale are measuring the same underlying attribute. The techniques employed in this study require only a single test administration and provide a reliable estimation of Cronbach’s coefficient alpha, which has a value between 0 and 1 (positive or minus). The higher the Cronbach alpha, the greater the reliability of the scale. A scale has high internal consistency when the items are highly correlated and result in a Cronbach alpha of greater than .70 (Nunnally, 1978). This measure is widely used in research, and provides an indication of the average correlation among all the items that make up the scale (Nunnally, 1978; Pallant, 2002). The coefficient alphas for each of the scales used in this research were calculated using SPSS v.12 and are shown in table 5.2, together with details of the scales.
Table 5.2 Reliability of scales in this study compared to original research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th># of cases</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
<th>Original alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of organisational politics</td>
<td>Perceptions of Organisational Politics Scale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.87 (Kacmar &amp; Ferris, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace innovation</td>
<td>Workplace Innovation Scale</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89 (McMurray &amp; Dorai, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctioned political behaviour</td>
<td>Sanctioned Tactics Scale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.77 (Zanzi &amp; O’Neill, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sanctioned political behaviour</td>
<td>Non-sanctioned Tactics Scale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82 (Zanzi &amp; O’Neill, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>Internal/External Locus of Control Scale</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.81 (Rotter, 1966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>Mach IV Scale</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.79 (Christie &amp; Geis, 1970)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

For comparison purposes the reliability reported by the researchers in the original research literature is included in table 5.2. All Cronbach alpha coefficients in this study are at the desirable level of .70 or above (De Vaus, 2002). In the cases of the WIS, Sanctioned Political Tactics and Non-Sanctioned Political Tactics scales, the reliability of the scales in this study were equal to or above the values originally reported. The reliabilities for POPS, Locus of Control and Mach IV were all slightly lower (by between .07 and .09) than the reliabilities of the scales reported by their originators. The lowest internal reliability was for the Mach IV scale ($\alpha = .70$) and the highest was for the WIS ($\alpha = .89$). In this study between 149 and 168 respondents completed all questions in the scales. Therefore, the calculable responses varied slightly between the scales as shown in table 5.2. It is unknown why the response rate to questions within scales varied, as the researcher was unable to obtain feedback from respondents. The questionnaires were completed on the bases of anonymity and confidentiality. There were no comments.
recorded on the completed questionnaires that would explain the variation in response between scales.

5.3.2. Validity

Validity refers to the accuracy of measurement of a construct or the degree to which a scale measures what it is supposed to measure (Pallant, 2002). In this study, all scales have been tested previously, and so their theoretical bases were established. For example, for POPS see the review of research in Ferris et al., (2002) and Vigoda (2003) for multiple studies across cultures, also Huang et al., (2003) and Poon (2003). For LOC and Machiavellianism see the meta analysis by Mudrack (1990). Also, for their relationship to POPS see Cropanzano and Kacmar (1995), Valle and Perrewe (2000), O’Connor and Morrison (2001). For WIS see McMurray and Dorai (2003), who developed this scale in Australia. For Political Tactics see Zanzi and O’Neill (2001). The approach of this study was to assess the performance of the scales against already established theory and empirical evidence, i.e. predictive validity (Sethi & King, 1991). Steps taken, consistent with recommendations by Churchill (1979) and Sethi and King (1991), to test validity are discussed in chapter 3, section 3.8.

5.4 Analysis of perceptions of politics and workplace innovation

Perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation are the two central concepts in this study, and the data gathered through the two measurements, POPS and WIS, are presented in this section. The descriptive statistics are presented first for each concept, including the overall sample results, and then data from supervisory and non-supervisory staff are compared. A bivariate analysis was then undertaken using parametric statistical procedures, including Pearson’s product moment correlation r, r squared, followed by regression analysis to explore the relationship between the two concepts. According to De Vaus (2002), these are the most appropriate statistical procedures to measure both the strength and direction of the relationship between these two interval level variables (POPS and WIS) and the predictability of WIS (dependent
variable) scores with POPS (independent variable). Prior to calculating Pearson’s $r$ in all sections of this chapter, preliminary analyses were conducted by examining the histograms, scatterplots and kurtosis and skewness statistics, to ensure there were no violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity.

The first research question posed in this study is “What is the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation within an IT company in the Australian private sector?” There are two supporting hypotheses:

H1 – *Perceptions of organisational politics are negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.*

H2 – *The relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation is mediated by the role of respondents within the organisation.*

The analysis in this section seeks to test these hypotheses.

### 5.4.1 Perceptions of politics

The POPS was fully completed by 155 respondents, although a higher number of respondents completed each of the three dimensions of the POPS. Details of the descriptive statistics are shown in table 5.3.

The POPS and all dimensions of the POPS scored just below the scale mid-point, indicating that respondents perceived a moderate level of organisational politics. The highest average score was for the dimension of pay and promotion ($m = 5.7$, std. dev. = 1.7; mid-point = 6).
Table 5.3 Descriptive statistics for POPS and dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale dimension</th>
<th>N</th>
<th># Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Mid point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POPS</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General political behaviour</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go along to get ahead</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotion</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

A further examination of the descriptive statistics comparing responses from supervisors with those of non-supervisory staff is shown in table 5.4.

Table 5.4 Supervisor and non-supervisor perceptions of organisational politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale dimension (m.p.)</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Non-supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS (36)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General political behaviour (18)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go along to get ahead (12)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotion (6)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

Scores for non-supervisors appear higher than for supervisors for the POPS and all three dimensions, suggesting that those at the lower levels of the organisational hierarchy perceive a higher level of organisational politics than do those in the upper levels. The apparent variance in mean scores was therefore tested.
Analysis of variance of non-supervisor and supervisor means for POPS and dimensions

Analysis of variance is used in this study to compare the mean scores of non-supervisors and supervisors to see if there are any reliable differences among them (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). One-way between groups ANOVA is used when there is one independent grouping variable (in this case role) and one dependent continuous variable (POPS). All ANOVAs in this study were carried out consistent with the procedures set out in Pallant (2002) using the computer software package SPSS v.12. Where a statistically significant difference in means was found (at the p<.05 level), the effect size (strength of association) was calculated to assess the amount of total variance in the dependent variable that was predictable from knowledge of the levels of the independent variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996: 53).

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of role on levels of perceptions of organizational politics as measured by POPS. Respondents were divided into two groups according to their supervisory status (non-supervisors and supervisors)

There was a statistically significant difference at the p<.05 level in the POPS dimension of ‘go along to get ahead’ scores for non-supervisors and supervisors [F(1,146 = 4.38, p=.038]. Despite reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was quite small. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .03, which in Cohen’s (1988) terms is a small effect. Cohen (1988) classifies .01 as a small effect, .06 as a medium effect and .14 as a large effect.

5.4.2 Workplace innovation

The WIS was fully completed by 156 respondents. A higher number of respondents completed each of the three dimensions of the WIS, as shown in table 5.5.
Table 5.5 Descriptive statistics for WIS and dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale dimension</th>
<th>N</th>
<th># Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Mid point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIS</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77.26</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation innovation</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation climate</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team innovation</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual innovation</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

The WIS score indicated that respondents perceived a moderate level of workplace innovation above the mid-point (M = 77.26, SD = 12.5). Scores for each of the dimensions similarly indicated that respondents perceived moderate levels of innovation, except at the team level, where the score was below the mid-point (M = 15.55, SD = 3.09) indicating that respondents perceived that the lowest level of innovation was at the team level. The highest levels of perceived innovation were at the individual (M = 27.43, SD = 4.68) and climate (M = 18.50, SD = 4.08) levels of the organisation.

Analysis of variance of non-supervisor and supervisor means for WIS and dimensions

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of role on perceived workplace innovation as measured by the WIS. Respondents were divided into two groups, non-supervisors and supervisors. There was a statistically significant difference at the p<.05 level in WIS [F(1,140) = 9.2, p=.003]. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .06.

At the dimensional level of WIS, statistically significant differences were found between the groups at the p<.05 level although the effect sizes were small: organisation innovation – [F(1,148) = 4.0, p=.048] with eta squared = .03; innovation climate – [F(1,150) = 3.90,
p = .050] with eta squared = .03; team innovation – [F(1,148 = 4.23, p = .041] with eta squared = .03; individual innovation – [F(1,144 = 7.80, p = .006] with eta squared = .05.

5.4.3 Perceptions of politics and workplace innovation

To test hypothesis H1 – *Perceptions of organisational politics are negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation*, this section begins with a Pearson correlation analysis (two-tailed), which was performed to uncover the relationship between the operationalisation of the concept of perceptions of organisational politics and the perceptions of workplace innovation, POPS and WIS respectively, and their dimensions. The scores for POPS and WIS and their dimensions were calculated using the total scale calculation procedure within SPSS v.12. Those cases with missing values were excluded from the total score calculation and therefore excluded from the correlation analysis. In order to calculate a more meaningful measure of the strength of the association between two variables (De Vaus, 2002), r squared values (coefficients of determination) were calculated. The coefficient of determination is calculated by multiplying the Pearson’s r value by itself. The percentage of variance is then calculated by multiplying it by 100 (Pallant, 2002). The resulting value indicates what percentage of the score of one variable is explained by the score of the other.

Interpretation of the strength of all correlations in this study was guided by Cohen (1988), who suggests that correlations within the ranges \( r = .10 \) to \( .29 \) or \( r = -.10 \) to \( -.29 \) may be classified as small, correlations within the range of \( r = .30 \) to \( .49 \) or \( r = -.30 \) to \( -.49 \) may be classified as medium, and correlations within the ranges of \( r = .50 \) to 1.0 or \( r = -.50 \) to 1.0 may be classified as large. These values are equally strong, whether positive or negative. The sign indicates the direction of the relationship.

Table 5.6 sets out the results of the correlation analysis between the POPS and the WIS, including all dimensions of both scales. The purpose first was to analyse the relationship between the two scales and then second to investigate the relationships between the
underlying dimensions, in order to explain the overall relationship between the two constructs and provide some insight into levels of analysis other than the organisational level. This was particularly important because the POPS has previously been viewed as a measure of organisational politics at the organisation level of analysis.

To test H1 - *There is a negative relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation*, the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics (as measured by the POPS) and workplace innovation (measured by the WIS) was investigated using a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.

**Table 5.6 Correlations of POPS and WIS including dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPS</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.930**</td>
<td>.853**</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>-.520**</td>
<td>-.569**</td>
<td>-.274**</td>
<td>-.495**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General political behaviour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.930**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.675**</td>
<td>.188*</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Go along to get ahead</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.853**</td>
<td>.675**</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>.188*</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pay and promotion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>.188*</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>.188*</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIS</strong></td>
<td>-.520**</td>
<td>-.441**</td>
<td>-.493**</td>
<td>-.493**</td>
<td>-.248**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation innovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.569**</td>
<td>-.497**</td>
<td>-.515**</td>
<td>-.515**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation climate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.274**</td>
<td>-.225**</td>
<td>-.286**</td>
<td>-.286**</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team innovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.495**</td>
<td>-.438**</td>
<td>-.422**</td>
<td>-.422**</td>
<td>-.210**</td>
<td>-.210**</td>
<td>-.210**</td>
<td>-.210**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indi vidual innovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.401**</td>
<td>-.309**</td>
<td>-.427**</td>
<td>-.427**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Author**
The Pearson’s product-moment correlation analysis showed that there was a negative correlation between the two variables \( r = -0.520, n = 147, p < 0.0005; r^2 = 0.2704 \), with high levels of perceived organisational politics associated with lower levels of workplace innovation. The POPS helped to explain 27.04% of the variance in WIS scores, and whilst this is not a large figure, it is meaningful and suggests that additional variables connect the two constructs. H1 was supported, as the analysis showed that there is a negative relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation.

**POPS and WIS dimensions**

Data in table 5.6 show a negative correlation between the POPS and the WIS dimension of organisation innovation \( r = -0.569, n = 153, p < 0.0005; r^2 = 0.3238 \). Also the POPS helps to explain almost a third of the variance in organizational innovation; negative correlations between the POPS and the WIS dimensions of team innovation \( r = -0.495, n = 153, p = < 0.0005; r^2 = 0.2450 \) and individual innovation \( r = -0.401, n = 151, p = < 0.0005; r^2 = 0.1608 \); small negative correlation between the POPS and the WIS dimension of innovation climate \( r = -0.274, n = 154, p = < 0.001; r^2 = 0.7507 \) with high levels of organisational politics associated with lower levels of innovation at organisational, climate, team and individual levels.

**POPS dimensions and WIS dimensions**

Data in table 5.6 show that, of the 12 inter-dimensional relationships examined, only that between the POPS dimension of pay and promotion and the WIS dimension of innovation climate did not correlate.
General political behaviour and WIS dimensions

Data in table 5.6 show there were medium negative relationships between general political behaviour and organisational innovation \( r = -0.497, n = 158, p = <.0005 \), and team innovation \( r = -0.438, n = 158, p = < .0005 \) and individual innovation \( r = -0.309, n = 154, p = <.0005 \), with a small negative correlation between general political behaviour and innovation climate \( r = -0.225, n = 160, p = <.004 \). High levels of perceived political behaviour were associated with lower levels of perceived innovation at the organisation, climate, team and individual levels. The largest amount of shared variance was between general political behaviour and the WIS dimensions of organizational innovation \( r^2=0.247 \) and team innovation \( r^2=0.192 \).

Go along to get ahead and WIS dimensions

Data in table 5.6 show a strong negative correlation between ‘go along to get ahead’ and organisation innovation \( r = -0.515 (r^2=0.265), n = 159, p = <.0005 \); a medium negative correlation between ‘go along to get ahead’ and team innovation \( r = -0.422 (r^2=0.178), n = 161, p = <.0005 \) individual innovation \( r = -0.427 (r^2=0.182), n = 157, p = <.0005 \) and a small negative correlation between ‘go along to get ahead’ and innovation climate \( r = -0.286 (r^2=0.082), n = 162, p = <.0005 \). High levels of political inaction were associated with lower levels of innovation at the organisational, climate, team and individual levels.

Pay and promotion and WIS dimensions

Data in table 5.6 show small negative correlations between pay and promotion and organisation innovation \( r = -0.229 (r^2=0.052), n = 163, p = <.003 \), and team innovation \( r = -0.210 (r^2=0.044), n = 163, p = <.007 \) and individual innovation \( r^2=0.052) -0.229 (r, n = 161, p = <.004 \). Higher levels of politically-applied pay and promotion policies were associated with lower levels of innovation at the organisation, team and individual levels.
POPS dimensions and WIS

Data shown in table 5.6 reveal that there were medium negative correlations between general political behaviour and the WIS \([r = -0.441 \ (r^2=0.194), \ n = 150, \ p = <.0005]\) and between ‘go along to get ahead’ and the WIS \([r = -0.493 \ (r^2=0.243), \ n = 152, \ p = <.0005]\). There was a small negative correlation between pay and promotion and the WIS \([r = -0.248 \ (r^2=0.062), \ n = 156, \ p = <.002]\), with lower levels of perceived workplace innovation associated with higher levels of perceived political behaviour, political inaction and politically applied pay and promotion policies.

5.4.4 Differences between supervisors and non-supervisors

This section of the analysis was undertaken to test the hypothesis H2 – The relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation is mediated by the role of respondents within the organisation.

An analysis was conducted to test the statistical significance of the differences in correlation coefficients between supervisors and non-supervisors regarding the POPS and the WIS. The \(r\) values from the two groups were obtained from random samples, the two groups were independent, their distribution was normal, and there were at least twenty cases in both groups. Therefore the assumptions necessary for this calculation were met (Pallant, 2002).

There are three steps to this procedure (Pallant, 2002). First, the \(r\) values were converted into \(Z\) values (standard scores) for use in the equation to calculate the \(Z_{obs}\) value. This was done using a conversion table available in Pallant (2002). Second, because SPSS does not calculate the \(Z_{obs}\) value, the \(Z\) values and the \(N\) values (number of cases) were entered into the equation:

\[
Z_{obs} = Z_1 - Z_2 \sqrt{1/N_1 - 1/N_2}
\]
Third, the decision rule

If $-1.96 < \text{Z}_{\text{obs}} < 1.96$: correlation coefficients are not statistically significantly different

If $\text{Z}_{\text{obs}} \leq -1.96$ or $\text{Z}_{\text{obs}} \geq 1.96$: coefficients are statistically significantly different

Was used to determine what was statistically significant.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between the POPS and the WIS for supervisors ($r = -.519$) and non-supervisors ($r = -.502$) were entered into the equation resulting in a coefficient of $-.14$.

Analysis shows that $\text{Z}_{\text{obs}} = -.14$. Since this was between $-1.96$ and $+1.96$, there was no statistically significant difference in the correlation coefficients of supervisors ($r = -.519$, $n = 46$, $p<.0005$) and non-supervisors ($r = -.502$, $n = 87$, $p<.0005$) in the relationship between the POPS and the WIS.

Hypothesis H2 – *The relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation is mediated by the role of respondents within the organisation* was not supported.

5.5 Analysis of antecedents to perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation

Research question 2

Are Locus of Control and Machiavellianism, which are antecedents to perceptions of organisational politics, also antecedents to perceptions of workplace innovation?

H 3 - *External Locus of Control is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.*
H 4 – *Machiavellianism is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.*

Two categories of antecedents to the POPS are included in this analysis. Dispositional antecedents include Locus of Control and Machiavellianism. Non-dispositional antecedents include age. The relationship between the dispositional antecedents of Locus of Control and Machiavellianism, with perceptions of organisational politics, were first tested to see if the data replicated the findings of previous studies and conformed to the theoretical model proposed at the end of chapter 2. Data were then analysed to test the hypotheses H3 and H4.

### 5.5.1 Internal/External Locus of Control and perceptions of organisational politics

Of the total sample in this study, 146 (86%) completed the I/ELOCS with 105 (72%) having a general tendency towards an internal locus of control and 41 (28%) having a general tendency towards an external locus of control. The responses of these two groups to the POPS were examined and revealed that those with an internal LOC perceived a level of organisational politics (m = 32.45, std. dev. = 7.60) below the POPS mid-point of 36, whereas those with an external LOC perceived a level of organisational politics (m = 36.21, std. dev. = 5.06) slightly over the POPS mid-point. The five percent trimmed mean for both groups showed no significant difference (32.39 and 36.36 respectively), indicating that more extreme scores were not significantly affecting the means.

The next stage in the analysis was to explore the relationship between I/ELOCS and the POPS. Table 5.7 reports the relationships between locus of control and perception of organisational politics and its three dimensions. Within scale correlations are not reported for the POPS as they were reported previously in table 5.6. The relationship between locus of control (measured by I/ELOCS) and perceptions of organisational politics (as measured by the POPS) was investigated using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.
Table 5.7 Correlation coefficients for locus of control and POPS and dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of control</th>
<th>POPS</th>
<th>General political behaviour</th>
<th>Go along to get ahead</th>
<th>Pay and promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal/External</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.324**</td>
<td>.177*</td>
<td>.182*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Author

The analysis shows that there was a medium level correlation between locus of control and perceptions of organisational politics \([r = .394, n = 143, p = <.0005]\) with 15.5% of shared variance. Respondents who tended towards an external locus of control perceived a higher level of organisational politics. There was also a medium level correlation between locus of control and the POPS dimension of general political behaviour \([r = .324, n = 152, p = <.0005]\) with 10.5% of shared variance, indicating that respondents who tended towards an external locus of control perceived a higher level of general political behaviour within the organisation. Small correlations were also uncovered between locus of control and the POPS dimensions of ‘go along to get ahead’ (political inaction) and pay and promotions (the degree to which pay and promotions are politicised). It would appear that the medium level correlation between locus of control and the POPS is more a function of the relationship between the antecedent and the dimension of general political behaviour than of an equally strong relationship between the antecedent and all dimensions of the POPS. The results of the correlation analysis indicate that people within this organisation who have a general tendency to believe that the world external to them controls their lives also perceive a higher level of organisational politics and that, in particular, they perceive a higher level of political action to be occurring.
5.5.2 Machiavellianism and perceptions of organisational politics

The Mach IV scale was completed by 137 (81%) of respondents. Table 5.8 contains the correlation coefficients between the Mach IV scale and the POPS and includes all dimensions of both scales. The POPS and its dimensions are on the horizontal axis and Mach IV and its dimensions are on the vertical axis. Within-scale correlations of the POPS are omitted from this table, as they were reported in table 5.6. The relationship between Machiavellianism (measured by the Mach IV scale) and perceptions of organisational politics (measured by the POPS) was investigated using a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analysis was conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POPS (r²)</th>
<th>General political behaviour (r²)</th>
<th>Go along to get ahead (r²)</th>
<th>Pay and promotion (r²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mach IV</td>
<td>.291** (0.085)</td>
<td>.326** (0.106)</td>
<td>.212* (0.045)</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach Tactics</td>
<td>.215** (0.046)</td>
<td>.257** (0.066)</td>
<td>.165* (0.027)</td>
<td>–.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach Views</td>
<td>.387** (0.150)</td>
<td>.406** (0.165)</td>
<td>.276** (0.076)</td>
<td>.181* (0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach Morality</td>
<td>–.073</td>
<td>–.060</td>
<td>–.047</td>
<td>–.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Author

The analysis shows a small positive correlation between the two variables [r = .291, n = 140, p = .0005], with high levels of Machiavellianism associated with high levels of perceived organisational politics. Whilst each scale correlates with two of the three dimensions of the other, no correlational relationship was uncovered either between the POPS and the Mach IV dimension of morality or between Mach IV and the POPS.
dimension of pay and promotion. Furthermore, the POPS dimension of pay and promotion only demonstrated a small correlation with Machiavellian views \( [r = .181, n = 158, p = .028] \). High levels of perception that pay and promotions within the organisation are politically applied were associated with high levels of Machiavellian views. In addition, there were medium level correlations between the POPS dimension of general political behaviour and Machiavellianism \( [r = .326, n = 144, p = .0005] \) and between general political behaviour and the Mach IV dimension of Machiavellian views \( [r = .406, n = 155, p = .0005] \). High levels of perception of political behaviour were associated with high levels of Machiavellian views, the latter relationship being the strongest correlation between the dimensions of both scales. The strength of the correlations was low, however, as the r squared values show, with the strongest correlation being between general political behaviour and Machiavellian views \( (r^2=0.165) \). The shared variance of 16.5% suggests that the relationship between these variables was common to only a portion of respondents.

**5.5.3. Locus of Control and workplace innovation**

Table 5.9 contains a correlation analysis of the relationship between I/E LOC and the WIS. The table includes the dimensions of the WIS and within scale correlations, but between dimensions have been omitted as they have previously been reported. The relationship between internal/external locus of control (as measured by the I/E LOCS) and perceptions of workplace innovation (as measured by the WIS) was investigated using a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I/E LOC</th>
<th>WIS</th>
<th>Org. innovation</th>
<th>Innovation climate</th>
<th>Team innovation</th>
<th>Individual innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.174*</td>
<td>-.202*</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Analysis shows that there was a small negative correlation between the two variables \( r = -0.174, n = 147, p < 0.035 \), indicating that respondents who tend towards an internal locus of control perceive higher levels of workplace innovation. This appeared to be a function of the underlying negative correlation between I/ELOC and organisation level innovation \( r = -0.202, n = 154, p = 0.012 \). Hypothesis H3 was therefore supported.

5.5.4. Machiavellianism and workplace innovation

Table 5.10 sets out the results of the correlation analysis between Machiavellianism and the WIS, including all dimensions of both scales. Within scale correlations have been excluded as they appear elsewhere. The relationship between Machiavellianism (as measured by the Mach IV scale) and workplace innovation (as measured by the WIS) was investigated using a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.

**Table 5.10 Correlation coefficients between Machiavellianism and WIS (all dimensions excluding within scale correlations)**

| Source: Author |

Analysis shows that there was a small negative correlation between the two variables \( r = -0.174, n = 147, p < 0.035 \), indicating that respondents who tend towards an internal locus of control perceive higher levels of workplace innovation. This appeared to be a function of the underlying negative correlation between I/ELOC and organisation level innovation \( r = -0.202, n = 154, p = 0.012 \). Hypothesis H3 was therefore supported.

5.5.4. Machiavellianism and workplace innovation
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**Table 5.10 Correlation coefficients between Machiavellianism and WIS (all dimensions excluding within scale correlations)**

| Source: Author |
The analysis shows no significant correlation between the two variables. H4 was therefore not supported. However, there were four small negative correlations at the dimensional level of analysis. The first was between Machiavellianism and the team innovation dimension of the WIS \([r = –.188, n = 147, p < .022]\), indicating that those respondents who were low on Machiavellianism perceived a higher level of innovation at the team level. The second was between the WIS dimension of team innovation and the Mach IV dimension of tactics \([r = –.224, n = 153, p < .005]\), with respondents scoring lower on the use of Machiavellian tactics perceiving a higher level of workplace innovation at a team level. The third and fourth correlations were between the Mach IV dimension of Machiavellian views and the WIS \([r = –.167, n = 149, p < .042]\) and the innovation climate dimension of the WIS \([r = –.164, n = 159, p < .043]\); lower levels of Machiavellian views were associated with higher levels of perceived workplace innovation and higher levels of perceived innovation climate. The shared variances between these four pairs of variables at the dimension level were small, between 2.6 and five percent.

5.5.5. Antecedent differences between supervisors and non-supervisors

Table 5.11 is a comparison of the results of the I/ELOCS between supervisors and non-supervisors.

**Table 5.11 Comparison of antecedent frequencies between supervisors and non-supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-supervisors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total sample</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal LOC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External LOC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author
The analysis shows that respondents with an internal LOC are more highly represented within the supervisory group (83.7%) compared to the non-supervisory group (66%). Consequently, the proportion of non-supervisors who have an external LOC (34%) is more than twice that of the supervisory group (16.3%).

5.6 Analysis of political behaviour, perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation

This section of the analysis answers research question 3: – What is the relationship between political behaviour and perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation. This section tests the following hypotheses:

H5 – The use of non-sanctioned political behaviour is positively related to perceptions of organisational politics
H6 – The use of sanctioned political behaviour is unrelated to perceptions of organisational politics
H7 – The use of non-sanctioned political behaviour is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation
H8 – The use of sanctioned political behaviour is positively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

The section explains the analysis that was undertaken to investigate the relationships between political behaviour as measured by the non-sanctioned and sanctioned political tactics scales, the POPS and the WIS.

5.6.1 Political behaviour

Political behaviour was self-reported in this study through the use of two scales. The first, a seven-item scale, measured non-sanctioned political tactics and the second, a six-item scale, recorded the use of sanctioned political tactics. Respondents reported their use of
these tactics on a scale numbered 1 = very little to 5 = extensively. Tables 5.12 and 5.13 contain the average use of each political tactic.

Not unexpectedly, although there was a high completion rate of the two scales measuring political behaviour, respondents reported a below mid-point rate of use of each of the non-sanctioned tactics. The tactic which was reportedly least used was Intimidation and Innuendo (m = 1.66, std. dev. = 1.01), the non-sanctioned tactic with the highest reported usage was Control of Information (m = 2.38, std. dev. = 1.14)

**Table 5.12 Use of non-sanctioned political tactics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of tactic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th># cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-optation</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational placements</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation and innuendo</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of information</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of surrogates</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaming or attacking others</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

There was a higher reported use of sanctioned political tactics, as shown in table 5.13

Respondents reported that they used their expertise as a means of enhancing their organisational position more frequently than they used other tactics (m = 3.05, std. dev. = 1.15). Respondents also reported that they made less use of Persuasion, i.e. seeking to win another party over to one’s own point of view through selective use of rational argument (m = 2.95, std. dev. = 1.19).

**Table 5.13 Use of sanctioned political tactics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of tactic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th># cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image building</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super-ordinate goal</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of expertise</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition building</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Least use was reportedly made of Image Building (m = 2.55, std. dev. = 1.23).

An overview of the means of both political behaviour scales is provided in table 5.14

**Table 5.14 Comparison of reported levels of use of political tactics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Scale mid-point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-sanctioned political behavior</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctioned political behaviour</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents reported that their non-sanctioned and sanctioned political behaviour was below the mid-point of each scale. As table 5.14 illustrates, the reported level of use of non-sanctioned behaviour was much lower than that of sanctioned behaviour.

A comparative analysis of the political behaviour of supervisory and non-supervisory staff is provided in table 5.15. Results appear to show that supervisors reported higher use of both categories of political tactics compared to non-supervisory staff.

**Table 5.15 Comparative analysis of political behaviour of supervisors and non-supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-supervisors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of cases</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>Number of cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sanctioned Tactics (mid-point = 21)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctioned tactics (mid-point = 18)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author
However, the analysis shows that both supervisors and non-supervisors use of political tactics fell short of the mid-point of both scales. The highest reported use of tactics was by supervisors whose use of sanctioned tactics just fell short of the mid-point of 18 (m = 17.77, std. dev. = 5.09).

**One-way between groups ANOVA for sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics**

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of role on the use of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics. Subjects were divided into two groups, non-supervisors and supervisors. There was no statically significant difference in the use of non-sanctioned political tactics at the p<.05 level [F(1,139) = 2.84, p=.094]; however, there was a statistically significant difference at the p<.05 level in the scores for the use of sanctioned political tactics [F(1,151) = 3.65, p=.58]. Despite reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores was quite small. The effect size calculated using eta squared was .02.

**5.6.2 Political behaviour and perceptions of organisational politics**

This section explains the analysis of the data that was undertaken to address research question three: What is the relationship between political behaviour and perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation?

Table 5.16 includes an analysis of the relationships between political behaviour and perceptions of organisational politics. Within scale correlations for the POPS have been excluded as they were reported earlier in this chapter. In order to test hypotheses H5 – H8, the relationship between political behaviour (as measured by the non-sanctioned political tactics scale and the sanctioned political tactics scale) and perceived organisational politics (as measured by the POPS) was investigated using a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.
Table 5.16 shows a small positive correlation between non-sanctioned political behaviour and perceived organisational politics \([r = .175, n = 152, p = 0.031]\), with high levels of non-sanctioned political behaviour associated with higher levels of perceived organisational politics. There was a small positive correlation between non-sanctioned political behaviour and the POPS dimension of general political behaviour \([r = .220, n = 158, p = 0.005]\), with higher levels of non-sanctioned political behaviour associated with higher perceived general political behaviour in the organisation.

Table 5.16 Correlation coefficients between non-sanctioned political tactics, sanctioned political tactics and the POPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-sanctioned tactics</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctioned tactics</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General political</td>
<td>.220**</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go along to get ahead</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotion</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Source: Author**

Hypotheses H5 – *The use of non-sanctioned political behaviour is positively related to perceptions of organisational politics* was supported, although the strength of this relationship was small.

Table 5.16 shows that no correlation was found between the use of sanctioned political behaviour and the POPS \((r = .030, n = 154, p = 0.711)\).
Hypothesis H6 – *The use of sanctioned political behaviour is unrelated to perceptions of organisational politics* was supported.

Analysis in table 5.16 shows that there was a medium positive correlation between non-sanctioned and sanctioned political behaviour \[r = .496, n = 165, p < .0005\] with high levels of non-sanctioned political behaviour were associated with high levels of sanctioned political behaviour.

### 5.6.3. Political behaviour and workplace innovation

To test hypotheses H7 and H8, the relationship between political behaviour (as measured by the non-sanctioned political tactics scale and the sanctioned political tactics scale) and perceived workplace innovation (as measured by the WIS) was analysed using a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient.

Analysis showed that non-sanctioned political tactics and the WIS \[r = .006, n = 153, p = 0.945\] were unrelated. Therefore hypothesis H7 – *The use of non-sanctioned political behaviour is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation* was not supported.

Analysis showed that sanctioned political tactics and WIS \[r = .124, n = 155, p = 0.124\] were found to be unrelated. Therefore, hypothesis H8 – *The use of sanctioned political behaviour is positively related to perceptions of workplace innovation* was also not supported.

### 5.6.4 Political behaviour and antecedents

The relationship between the dispositional antecedents to the POPS of I/ELOC and Machiavellianism and political behaviour were investigated to see whether these were merely antecedents to perceptions of organisational politics or if they were also
antecedents to political behaviour. Table 5.17 sets out the correlation coefficients results from this analysis. Pearson product-moment correlation was used and a preliminary analysis revealed no violations of assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.

Table 5.17 Correlation coefficients between I/ELOCS, Mach IV, non-sanctioned and sanctioned political behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-sanctioned political tactics</th>
<th>Sanctioned political tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/ELOCS</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>-.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach IV</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.175*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Author

The analysis shows a small positive correlation between I/ELOCS and NSPT \( r = .173, n = 155, p = 0.031 \), indicating that respondents who tended towards an external locus of control were more inclined to use non-sanctioned political tactics. There were also small positive correlations between Machiavellianism and NSPT \( r = .287, n = 146, p = <.0005 \) and between Machiavellianism and SPT \( r = .175, n = 149, p = 0.033 \), indicating that higher levels of Machiavellianism were associated with higher use of both NSPT and SPT, although the correlation strength and significance levels were stronger for the relationship between Machiavellianism and the use of NSPT.

5.7 Analysis of other variables

In addition to the variables relating to the main concepts of this study, a number of other variables were included in the analysis and are presented in this section. They contain mainly qualitative data that were arranged into themes or categories, coded, and then entered into the SPSS v.12 database.
5.7.1 Power holders and demonstration of power

Respondents were asked to identify the power holders in their organisation (roles, not names of individuals) and how those power holders demonstrated their power. Table 5.18 shows who respondents reported as having the power within the organisation.

### Table 5.18 Power holders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior manager/s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle manager/s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional manager/s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/s – all levels</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and functions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/s and individual staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/s, function and individual staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

A total of 94 respondents provided multiple responses to this question, indicating that they believed that power was not held in one place within the organisation. There were three categories of power holders identified by respondents: managers, functional areas, and individuals. Results show that 91 respondents (97% of those answering this question) reported that managers at various levels and across functional areas were the power holders in the organisation. Senior managers were identified as power holders by 25 (27%) respondents, while middle managers were reported by four (4%), functional managers by four (4%) and unspecified managers by 58 (62%). Functional areas were reported as the holders of power within the organisation by five (5%) respondents, while nine (10%) respondents reported that individual staff members held power (these included the personal assistants or secretaries of senior managers).
How power is demonstrated

The responses from the 87 respondents were collapsed into categories that included management functions, management practices or style, control of information, and use of language. Table 5.19 shows the categories of responses relating to the use of power.

Table 5.19 How power is demonstrated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management functions</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation, direction setting, communication, decision making, change management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate management practices or style</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic/dictatorial/arbitrary decision making, intimidation and innuendo, silo mentality, politics, use of language, image building, bending the rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate management style</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being persuasive, consistency, presence, use of language, frequent communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of information, use of language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

The analysis shows that power is demonstrated in various ways: through carrying out management functions (n = 50, 57%) such as direction setting, communicating to staff, managing change, resource allocation; through inappropriate management practices or style (n = 27, 31%), including the use of intimidation and innuendo, image building, not consulting/arbitrary decision making, silo mentality, bending the rules and playing politics; through appropriate management style or practices (n = 4, 5%); and through consistency in decision making, maintaining a presence in the workplace, and communicating frequently. Three respondents reported that power was demonstrated through controlling information and three reported that power was demonstrated through the language used by managers (7%). Unfortunately respondents were not specific about these last two categories.
5.7.2 Withholding knowledge, reasons and emotional response

Respondents were asked if their supervisors and peers withheld knowledge from them. They were further asked in an open-ended question to report why they thought knowledge was withheld from them and their emotional response to this. Results show that 119 (71%) respondents reported that their supervisor withheld knowledge from them and 49 (29%) that their supervisor did not withhold knowledge.

Table 5.20 shows the reasons why supervisors withheld knowledge, as reported by respondents.

Table 5.20 Why supervisors withhold knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to know/ confidentiality</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power and control</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-interest</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The character of the supervisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor hasn’t got the time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition or power struggle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor didn’t think</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

The analysis shows that 109 respondents offered reasons why supervisors withheld knowledge from them. These included ‘need to know’ or confidentiality (n = 57, 52%); power and control (n = 22, 20%); self-interest (n = 9, 8%); the character of the supervisor (n = 8, 7%); politics (n = 5, 5%); the supervisor lacked the time to pass on the knowledge (n = 4, 4%); competition or power struggle (n = 3, 3%); and the supervisor was unthinking (n = 1, 1%).

Emotional response to supervisors’ withholding of knowledge

The analysis shows that 133 respondents reported an emotional response to the withholding of knowledge by supervisors. Responses were categorised through the
identification of key words that corresponded to the emotions contained within categories formulated by Lazarus and Lazarus (1994). These were coded and entered into the SPSS v.12 database. Frequency statistics were then generated, as shown in table 5.21.

**Table 5.21 Emotional response to withholding knowledge by supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasty (anger, envy, jealousy)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential (anxiety, guilt, shame)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable life conditions (sadness, depression, relief, hope)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright/ ambivalent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on the circumstances (did not elaborate)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Author

The analysis shows that 41 (31%) respondents experienced a ‘nasty’ emotion (anger, envy jealousy), 39 (30%) experienced an existential emotion (anxiety, guilt or shame), 36 (27%) were either ambivalent or said it was all right, eight (6%) reported an unfavourable life emotion (sadness or depression), seven (5%) said that it would depend on the circumstances, and the remaining two (2%) were curious as to why the supervisor had withheld the knowledge.

**Why peers withhold knowledge**

Slightly more than half of respondents (n = 87; 53%) reported that their peers withheld knowledge from them and 77 (47%) reported that they did not. Respondents were asked to report why they thought their peers did this. The qualitative data provided in answer to this question were categorised according to the frequency of key words and phrases. The data were then coded and entered into SPSS v.12. Frequency statistics were generated and are shown in table 5.22.
Table 5.22 Why peers withhold knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to know/ confidentiality</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-interest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power and control</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition/ power struggle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers don’t think about it</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The character of the peers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers don’t have sufficient time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

The analysis shows that 82 respondents reported that peers withheld knowledge for reasons of need to know/confidentiality (n = 23, 28%), self-interest (n = 18, 22%), power and control (n = 12, 15%), competition/power struggle (n = 9, 11%), politics (n = 8, 10%), lack of thought (n = 5, 6%), the character of the peers (n = 4, 5%), insufficient time (n = 2, 2%), and jealousy (n = 1, 1%).

Emotional response to peers withholding knowledge

Analysis revealed that 106 respondents reported an emotional response to their peers withholding knowledge from them, while to only 87 respondents reported that their peers withheld knowledge. Survey forms were rechecked to ensure that these data were correct. In analyzing the qualitative data about emotional responses to withholding knowledge by peers, the same procedure used for emotional response to supervisors’ withholding knowledge was used. Table 5.23 shows the frequency statistics.

Table 5.23 Emotional response to withholding knowledge by peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasty (anger, envy, jealousy)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential (anxiety, guilt, shame)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable life conditions (sadness, depression, relief, hope)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright/ ambivalent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on the circumstances (did not elaborate)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author
Respondents reported experiencing existential emotions such as anxiety, guilt or shame (n = 30, 28%); ‘nasty’ emotions such as anger, envy, jealousy (n = 29, 27%); ambivalence (n = 26, 25%); unfavourable life conditions such as sadness, depression (n = 10, 9%). Nine (8%) said that it would depend on the circumstances, and two (2%) reported that they were curious as to why this had occurred.

5.7.3 Trust of supervisors and peers

The relationships between withholding knowledge and trust of peers and supervisors were investigated using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.

Table 5.24 Correlation coefficients between withholding knowledge by peers and supervisors and trust of peers and supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (r²)</th>
<th>2 (r²)</th>
<th>3 (r²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withholding knowledge by peers</td>
<td>.197* (0.039)</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust of peers</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withholding knowledge by supervisors</td>
<td>.268** (0.072)</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.208** (0.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.366** (0.134)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust of supervisors</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.208** (0.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Author

The analysis shows that small correlations existed between trust of supervisor and withholding of knowledge by supervisors (r = .208, n = 168, p = 0.007). Higher levels of trust were associated with knowledge not being withheld. Similarly, there was a small correlation between trust of peers and withholding of knowledge by peers (r = .197, n =
with higher levels of trust of peers associated with non-withholding of knowledge by peers (note: withholding knowledge was score (1=yes and 2=no). There was a medium correlation between trust of supervisors and trust of peers ($r = .366$, $n = 168$, $p = 0.0005$), with higher levels of trust of peers associated with higher levels of trust of supervisors. The $r$ squared values were small, with the largest (13.4%) shared variance between trust of supervisors and trust of peers.

Analysis shows that respondents were more trusting of their peers than of their supervisors; whereby 59 (35%) respondents trusted their supervisor to keep something confidential whereas 109 (65%) reported that they did not. However, 102 (61%) respondents reported that they trusted their peers to keep something confidential and 66 (39%) reported the opposite.

**One-way between-groups ANOVA for trust of supervisors and trust of peers**

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of role on levels of trust of supervisors and trust of peers. Respondents were divided according to non-supervisory and supervisory roles. There were no statistically significant differences between the groups in their levels of trust of supervisors [$F(1,151) = .104, p=.748$] or their trust of peers [$F(1,151) = .576, p=.449$].

**Trust of peers, organisational politics and innovation**

The relationships between trust of peers, trust of supervisors, perception of organisational politics (as measured by POPS), and workplace innovation (as measured by WIS) were investigated using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.
Table 5.25 Correlation coefficients between trust of peers, trust of supervisors, POPS, and WIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (r²)</th>
<th>2 (r²)</th>
<th>3 (r²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust of peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust of supervisors</td>
<td>.366** (0.134)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS</td>
<td>−.224** (0.050)</td>
<td>−.392** (0.154)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIS</td>
<td>.199* (0.040)</td>
<td>.388** (0.151)</td>
<td>−.520** (0.270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Author

Results show a small negative correlation between trust of peers and perceptions of organisational politics \[r = −.224 (r²=0.050), n = 155, p = 0.005\], with higher levels of trust of peers associated with lower levels of perceived organisational politics. There was a small positive correlation between trust of peers and workplace innovation \[r = .199 (r²=0.040), n = 156, p = 0.013\], indicating that higher levels of trust of peers were associated with higher levels of workplace innovation. There was a negative correlation between trust of supervisors and perceptions of organisational politics \[r = −.392 (r²=0.154), n = 155, p = 0.005\], with higher levels of trust of supervisors associated with lower levels of perceived organisational politics, and a shared variance of 15.4%. There was a positive correlation between trust of supervisors and workplace innovation \[r = .388 (r²=0.151), n = 156, p = <.0005\], with higher levels of trust of supervisors associated with higher levels of workplace innovation, and a shared variance of 15.1%.

Trust, I/E Locus of control, and Machiavellianism

The relationships between trust of peers, trust of supervisors, and locus of control (as measured by the I/ELOCS) and Machiavellianism (as measured by the Mach IV scale), were investigated using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary
analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.

**Table 5.26 Correlation coefficients between trust of peers, trust of supervisors, locus of control, and Machiavellianism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust of peers</th>
<th>1 (r²)</th>
<th>2 (r²)</th>
<th>3 (r²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust of supervisors</td>
<td>.366** (0.134)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>−.109</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>−.216** (0.047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>−.219** (0.048)</td>
<td>−.160</td>
<td>.394** (0.155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Source: Author**

The analysis shows a small and negative correlation between trust of supervisors and locus of control (r = −.216, n = 158, p = <.006), indicating that higher levels of trust of supervisors are associated with an internal locus of control. No relationship was found between trust of peers and locus of control (r = −.109, n = 158, p = .173). There was a small negative correlation between trust of peers and Machiavellianism (r = −.219, n = 158, p = .007), with higher levels of trust of peers associated with lower levels of Machiavellianism. Although not significant at the 95% level, there was a negative correlation between trust of supervisors and Machiavellianism (r=−.160, n = 149, p = .051), with lower levels of trust associated with higher levels of Machiavellianism. Relationships between the antecedents of locus of control and Machiavellianism on the one hand, and trust of supervisors and peers on the other, demonstrated small shared variances, with the largest being between Machiavellianism and trust of peers (4.8%).
5.8 Model testing and regression analyses

Two standard multiple regression analyses and one hierarchical multiple regression analysis were conducted to further test relationships among variables. Multiple regression analysis is a statistical technique, the objective of which is to use independent variables whose values are known to predict the single dependent variable selected by the researcher. In this study there were three stages to the regression analyses. The first stage considered perceptions of organisational politics as the dependent variable. The second stage considered perceptions of workplace innovation as the dependent variable, and the third stage included perceptions of workplace innovation as the dependent variable with perceptions of organisational politics as an independent variable. Each of these analyses was consistent with the theoretical proposition in chapter two.

5.8.1 Checking for violations of assumptions in multiple regression analysis

This section describes the procedures that were undertaken to check that there were no violations of the assumptions of multiple regression analysis.

Multicollinearity and singularity

This refers to the relationship among the independent variables. The SPSS software package provides collinearity diagnostics as part of the regression output. Two statistics are provided. The first is the Tolerance statistic, which indicates how much of the variability of the specified independent is not explained by the other independent variables in the model and is calculated using the formula 1-R² for each variable. The second is the variance inflation factor (VIF) calculated by 1/Tolerance. Whilst Mason and Perrault (1991) caution against focusing on extreme values when considering collinearity, values of Tolerance = <.10 or VIF >10 are commonly used cut off points for determining the presence of multicollinearity (Pallant, 2002:150) and were used in this study. Tolerance and VIF statistics were examined and since they were above .10 (Tolerance) and below 10 (VIF), the assumption of multicollinearity appeared not to be violated. A
check for autocorrelation was also made by examining the Durbin-Watson statistic in the output from SPSS v.12 and was found to be close to 2.0. Bivariate correlations between all variables and residual plots were checked. There were no correlations between independent variables greater than .520 and the patterns in the residual plots appeared random.

**Outliers**

Tabachnik and Fidell (1996) define outliers as observations that have a standard residual value of above 3.3 or less than –3.3 and can further be identified by a case’s Mahalanobis distance from the centroid (point created by the means of all the variables) of the remaining cases. Standard residual values were checked by examining the scatterplots which were part of the output from SPSS v.12, and the Mahalanobis distances were checked by comparing the casewise output from SPSS v.12 against a table in Tabachnik and Fidell (1996). No outliers were identified.

**Normality**

Each variable and all linear combinations of the variables should be normally distributed. Normality can be assessed by examining the residual plots and the skewness and kurtosis statistics. (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996). In this study, the Normal Probability Plots and scatterplots were checked and appeared to be normal, the skewness and kurtosis values were generally close to zero, indicating that the assumption of normality was not violated.

**Linearity**

An assumption underlying regression analysis is that the relationship between independent and dependent variables is linear. Pearson’s r only captures the linear association between variables; therefore, in this study, SPSS was used to plot standardised residuals against predicted values. Most of the residuals were scattered
around zero points and had an oval shape, which suggested that the assumption was not violated (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996).

**Homoscedasticity**

The assumption of homoscedasticity is that the variance of the residuals from predicted dependent variable scores should be the same for all predicted scores (Pallant, 2002). An examination of the scatterplots produced by the SPSS v.12 regression procedure revealed that the residuals were normally distributed around the mean and therefore the assumption was supported.

**5.8.2 Standard multiple regression results for antecedents to perceptions of organisational politics**

A standard multiple regression was performed between perceptions of organisational politics (as measured by the POPS) as the dependent variable and locus of control (as measured by the I/ELOCS), Machiavellianism (as measured by the Mach IV scale) and trust of supervisors as the independent variables. Analysis was performed using SPSS v.12 REGRESSION and FREQUENCIES to evaluate assumptions. Results of the evaluation meant that no transformation of variables was necessary, and the use of a $p<.001$ criterion for Mahalanobis distance identified no outliers among the cases. Table 5.27 displays the correlations among the variables, the unstandardised regression coefficients (B), the standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$), and R squared.

The analysis shows that the model is significant [$F (3, 421) = 14.043, p<.0005$] and altogether, 24% (R square = .237) of the variability in perceptions of organisational politics was predicted by the scores on the three independent variables. All three independent variables contributed significantly to the prediction of perceptions of organisational politics scores.
Table 5.27 Standard multiple regression of I/ELOCS, MACH IV, and trust of supervisors variables on the POPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>POPS</th>
<th>I/ELOCS</th>
<th>MACH IV</th>
<th>Trust of supervisor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/ELOCS</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACH IV</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust of supervisor</td>
<td>−.392</td>
<td>−.216</td>
<td>−.160</td>
<td>−.325 **</td>
<td>−2.023**</td>
<td>−.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>33.73</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>51.81</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R squared = .237</td>
<td>Adjusted R squared = .220</td>
<td>R = .486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01

Note: n = 140-168 because of missing values.

Source: Author

The most significant unique contribution was made by trust of supervisor (β = −.325, p = <.0005), followed by locus of control (β = .189, p = .024). The smallest contribution was made by Machiavellianism (β = .165, p = .046).

5.8.3 Standard multiple regression results for antecedents to workplace innovation

To further examine the relationship between the POPS and the WIS, a standard multiple regression was performed between workplace innovation (as measured by the WIS) as the dependent variable, and perceptions of organisational politics (as measured by the POPS) and role [a dichotomous variable = non supervisor (scored 1)/supervisor (scored 2) ] as the independent variables. Analysis was performed using SPSS v.12 REGRESSION and FREQUENCIES to evaluate assumptions. Results of this evaluation meant that no transformation of variables was necessary and with the use of a p<.001 criterion for Mahalanobis distance identified no outliers among the cases. Table 5.28 displays the correlations between the variables, the unstandardised regression coefficients (B), the standardized regression coefficients (β), and R squared.
Table 5.28 Standard multiple regression of perceptions of organisational politics and role variables on WIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>WIS</th>
<th>POPS</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POPS</td>
<td>–.520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–.869</td>
<td>–.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>–.142</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.674</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>77.26</td>
<td>33.74</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R squared</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R squared</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01

Note: n = 141–156 because of missing values.

Source: Author

The results show that the model is significant [F (2, 138) = 29.748, p<.0005] and that altogether, 30% (R square = .301) of the variability in perceptions of organisational politics was predicted by the scores on the two independent variables. Both independent variables contributed significantly to the prediction of workplace innovation scores. The most significant unique contribution was made by the POPS (β = –.495, p = <.0005), while role made a smaller contribution (β = .178, p = .015).

5.8.4 Hierarchical multiple regression analysis – testing the theoretical model

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted, using SPSS v.12, to further test the theoretical model shown in figure 5.1. Analysis in this chapter has confirmed correlative relationships between the variables in figure 5.1. The hierarchical regression analysis was conducted first to evaluate the ability of the model to predict the WIS scores and second to distinguish the contribution of each group of independent variables to the predictability of the model. The number of cases required for hierarchical multiple regression analysis is N ≥ 50+8m (where m = number of independent variables) or N ≥ 100 + m, whichever is the greater (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996: 132). The number of variables linked to the WIS in the proposed theoretical model (figure 2.5: 64) is 7; role (supervisor/non-supervisor) was found to correlate with the WIS (r = .248, n = 142, p =
Age was included as a control variable, making a total of 10 independent variables used in this analysis. The number of cases required for the hierarchical multiple regression analysis (using the first equation recommended above because it results in the greatest number) is \( N = (50 + 80) = 130 \). The number of cases available for analysis in this study was between 142 and 156 (calculated from correlations between the WIS and independent variables of interest). Therefore there were enough cases to conduct the analysis.

Ten independent variables in five groups were used in the hierarchical multiple regression analysis. The dependent variable WIS was entered into the computer first, followed by groups of independent variables. The author determined the order of entry of the independent variables to prevent the computer from conducting a stepwise regression analysis. The first block of independent variables (tenure in the organisation, role, age) was entered to statistically control those variables. The remaining blocks of independent variables were entered in the following order:

- Trust of supervisors and trust of peers
- Machiavellianism and locus of control
- Use of sanctioned tactics and use of non-sanctioned tactics
- Perceptions of organisational politics

Results of the analysis are shown in table 5.29. Tests for assumptions were made, no outliers were discovered, and no transformation of variables was necessary to improve normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity.

Table 5.29 displays the unstandardised coefficients (B), the standardized regression coefficients (\( \beta \)) and the significance; R, R squared, adjusted R squared and R squared change after all five groups of variables were entered. R was progressively different from zero at the end of each step. After step 5, \( R = .604, F(10, 118) = 6.788, p < .01 \).
Table 5.29 Hierarchical multiple regression analysis with workplace innovation as dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model summary</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R squared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 1</strong> Tenure Role Age</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 2</strong> Trust of supervisors Trust of peers</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 3</strong> Machiavellianism Locus of control</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 4</strong> Sanctioned tactics Non-Sanctioned tactics</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 5</strong> Perceptions of organisational politics</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01

Note: n = 141-156 because of missing values.

Source: Author

Results show that the model is significant and that, altogether, 37% (R square = .365) of the variability in perceptions of workplace innovation was predicted by knowing scores on three of the independent variables: role (β = .173, p = .034), trust of supervisors (β = .231, p = .008) and perceptions of organisational politics (β = -.428, p = .0005). The largest contribution to the model was made by perceptions of organisational politics. The remaining variables did not make a significant contribution to the model.

5.9 Theoretical proposition and empirical results

This section brings together the analyses of this chapter and the theoretical model that was proposed in chapter two at the end of the literature review. The theoretical proposition supported by regression results is illustrated in figure 5.1.
Workplace innovation as the dependent variable

The two central concepts of the model are perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis has shown that the scores on two independent variables in the model (perceptions of organisational politics and trust of supervisor) and one other independent variable not included in the model, i.e. role (supervisor/non-supervisor), predicted 37 percent of the scores on perceptions of workplace innovation. The largest contribution to the model was by perceptions of organisational politics (β=.428). However, proposed relationships among tenure, age, Machiavellianism, locus of control, and political behaviour with workplace innovation were unsupported.

Figure 5.1 Theoretical proposition supported by regression analyses

Source: Author
Perceptions of organisational politics as dependent variable

Standard multiple regression analysis showed that scores on trust of supervisor, locus of control and Machiavellianism predicted 24 percent of the perceptions of organisational politics scores. The largest contribution to the model was by trust of supervisor ($\beta=-.325$).

Relationships among independent variables

Trust of supervisors and trust of peers were found to be positively related ($r = .366$). Locus of control was found to be negatively related to trust of supervisor ($r = -.216$). Machiavellianism was found to be negatively related to trust of peers ($r = -.219$), unrelated to trust of supervisors, and positively related to locus of control ($r = .394$).

5.9. Summary

This chapter presented the empirical results of this study and tested the hypotheses. It described the procedures used in the analysis of data, presented the results of testing the reliability and validity of measures used, and reported univariate, bivariate and multivariate analyses of the data using descriptive and inferential statistics. The analyses were structured consistent with the research questions posed in this study. The analysis in this chapter uncovered the following:

1) Perceptions of organisational politics, trust of supervisor and role (supervisor/non-supervisor) predicted 37 percent of workplace innovation. Locus of control, Machiavellianism and trust of supervisor predicted 34 percent of perceptions of organisational politics.

2) The use of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political behaviour was reported as low and no relationship was established between the use of political tactics and workplace innovation.
3) Occupiers of managerial positions were viewed as the power holders in the organisation and they mainly demonstrated their power through the exercise of formal authority.

4) Withholding of knowledge by supervisors and peers was widely reported by respondents, who rationalised it as a function of “need to know”. However, many respondents reported a “nasty” emotional response when knowledge was withheld from them by supervisors and peers.

The next chapter discusses the findings of this study.
Chapter 6

Findings

6.1 Objective
The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the findings generated by the data analysis and the review of literature. It will examine how the analysis relates to existing knowledge through the testing of new hypotheses and to the replication of previous studies in this thesis. The chapter is structured into sections corresponding to the major concepts and themes of the thesis, and within each section the relevant hypotheses are listed and discussed.

6.2 Perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation

This study, for the first time, brought together two context specific multi dimensional psychological constructs to investigate the relationship between organisational politics and innovation. The first hypothesis tested in this study was $H1$ – Perceptions of organisational politics are negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

To test the hypothesis, correlation ($r = -.520$, $n = 147$, $p<.0005$) and regression analyses ($R$ square change = .137; $\beta = -.428$) were conducted, and which showed that the hypothesis was supported and that perceptions of organisational politics were negatively related to workplace innovation.

The findings in this study have extended the perceptions of organisational politics model (Ferris et al., 1989) by establishing the nature and strength of the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics, workplace innovation, and their dimensions.

This study used the Ferris et al., (1989) model of perceptions of organisational politics as a theoretical underpinning. It employed the 12-item operationalisation of the perceptions of organisational politics concept (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991) and more recent work that
developed the workplace innovation scale (WIS) as an operationalisation of workplace innovation (McMurray & Dorai, 2003).

Only one previous attempt (Parker et al., 1995) has been made to investigate the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and innovation, despite the view among some researchers that organisational politics impedes innovation efforts (Frost & Egri, 1991; Kanter, 1984; Kotter, 1985). While the Parker et al., (1995) study was the first to investigate the relationship between organisational politics and perceived innovation, their study is problematic. There are methodological issues; for example, the concept of innovation is undefined, and the instrument was not pretested. In addition, the items used were from a completed climate survey; half of the data were factor analysed, then the researchers formulated hypotheses and tested them on the second half of the climate survey data. Furthermore, in their quantitative study, Parker et al. (1995), used unidimensional operationalisations of perceptions of both organisational politics (six items that were ‘quite similar’ to previous operationalisations) and perceived innovation (four items e.g. “Innovation in the organisation is perceived as too risky and is resisted”). The findings of the Parker et al., (1995) study are ambiguous because innovation is not defined and details of all the items used are not disclosed, with the result that we do not know what type of innovation was being measured.

The findings of this study have extended the work of Parker et al. (1995). The analysis in this study uncovered a stronger relationship between organisational politics and innovation than was previously identified (Parker et al., 1995). Furthermore, because this study used multi-dimensional measures, it identified relationships between dimensions of the concepts that add to knowledge about perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation at the climate ($r = –.274$), organisation ($r = –.569$), team ($r = –.495$) and individual ($r = –.401$) levels of analysis.

Despite the using operationalisations of perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of innovation that were different to the Parker et al. (1995) study, this study has confirmed the relationship between the two concepts in a different cultural setting.
(Australia vs. US), different industry sector (private vs. public), and different organisation type (IT services vs. R&D project management).

The second hypothesis tested was H2 – *The relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation is mediated by the role of respondents within the organisation.*

Analysis showed that the correlation between the POPS and the WIS for supervisors (r = −.519) and non-supervisors (r = −.502) was similar. A test of the statistical significance of the differences between the correlations found no statistically significant difference (Z_{obs} = −.14); therefore the hypothesis was unsupported. This hypothesis was previously been untested. The Parker et al. (1995) study used hierarchy as an antecedent to both perceptions of organisational politics and innovation, but did not examine the effect of hierarchy on the relationship between the two constructs.

6.3 Antecedents to perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation

This section discusses the findings relating to internal/external locus of control and Machiavellianism as antecedents to perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation.

6.3.1 Internal/external locus of control

H3 – *External locus of control is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.*

This study investigated, for the first time, the relationship between locus of control and perceptions of workplace innovation. Analysis found a small negative correlation between locus of control and perceptions of workplace innovation (r = −.174), indicating that respondents with an internal locus of control tended to view the workplace as more innovative. The hypothesis was therefore supported. This finding appeared to be a
function of the correlation found between locus of control and the organisational innovation dimension of the WIS ($r = -0.202$). There were no relationships found between locus of control and the other dimensions of the WIS.

This study added to knowledge about workplace innovation as no previous study was found in the literature that investigated the relationship between locus of control and perceptions of workplace innovation.

Analysis in this study uncovered a stronger positive relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and external locus of control ($r = 0.394$) than did previous research (Valle & Perrewe, 2000, $r = 0.32$). This study has extended knowledge about the relationship between these two constructs by analysing the relationship between locus of control and the dimensions of the perceptions of organisational politics scale and finding that the strongest relationship was with *general political behaviour* ($r = 0.324$).

Valle and Perrewe (2000) used a locus of control scale developed by Levenson (1972), whereas the present study used the 29-item internal/external locus of control scale developed by Rotter (1966). Although different scales were used, a similar relationship was uncovered by both studies. In addition, the relationship between perception of organisational politics and locus of control has now been confirmed within two cultural settings.

### 6.3.2 Machiavellianism

**H4 – Machiavellianism is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.**

This is the first study to investigate the relationship between the dispositional factor of Machiavellianism and perceptions of workplace innovation. Analysis found that Machiavellianism (as measured by Mach IV) was unrelated to perceptions of workplace innovation (as measured by the WIS); therefore the hypothesis was not supported. However, analysis of the relationships between dimensions of Machiavellianism and the
WIS found that there was a small negative correlation between the Mach IV dimension of Machiavellian tactics and the WIS dimension of team innovation \((r = -0.224)\), with higher levels of use of Machiavellian behaviour associated with lower levels of team innovation. The Mach IV tactics dimension reflects the nature of the respondents’ interpersonal behaviour (Christie & Geis, 1970). This negative relationship appears logical. The team innovation dimension of the WIS includes elements such as membership, support, and working together in a group environment; in other words, those elements that meet the needs of the individuals within the team. It would therefore be reasonable to assume that if the needs of the individuals are being met (higher level scores on the team innovation dimension) people would be less likely to feel the need to manipulate the environment by engaging in Machiavellian behaviour.

This study has added to knowledge about workplace innovation and Machiavellianism because no previous study of the relationship between these two variables was found in the literature. However, the literature review showed that a positive relationship \((r = 0.28)\) existed between Machiavellianism and perceptions of organisational politics (Valle & Perrewe, 2000). Since perceptions of organisational politics appears in the literature as a negative concept and workplace innovation appears as a positive concept, it would therefore be logical to assume that, if both concepts have common antecedents, the relationships with the antecedents would be reversed. This led to the third research question and the hypothesis that Machiavellianism is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

Analysis also found that Machiavellianism was positively related to perceptions of organisational politics \((r = 0.291)\). This was consistent with the Ferris et al., (1989) model, and confirmed previous empirical findings (Valle & Perrewe, 2000) of an almost identical relationship \((r = 0.28)\). This study has added to the literature by achieving a similar finding but in a different cultural setting (Australia vs. US) and in a different organisation type (IT vs. aerospace, manufacturing and higher education).
6.3.3 Relationship between Machiavellianism and locus of control

The analysis of the relationship between machiavellianism and locus of control revealed a positive relationship ($r = .394$) consistent with the existing somewhat scant literature on the subject (Mudrack, 1990, in a meta-analysis revealed $r = .382$). The relationship between these two individual dispositional constructs may indicate that those with a Machiavellian tendency engage in manipulative and self-serving behaviour because they have a general tendency towards an external locus of control. In other words the Machiavellian behaviour is an effort to control a world governed by external forces.

6.4 Political behaviour, perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation

This section discusses the findings of this study that are concerned with the relationships between political behaviour, perceptions of organisational politics and workplace innovation.

6.4.1 Political behaviour and perceptions of organisational politics

Two hypotheses were proposed in this study regarding the relationship between the use of political tactics and perceptions of organisational politics:

H 5 – *The use of non-sanctioned political behaviour is positively related to perceptions of organisational politics.*

As was found in the review of the literature, a significant difficulty in researching political behaviour and its relationship with perceptions of organisational politics is the use of different conceptualisations and operationalisations of political behaviour (see for example Harrell-Cook et al, 1999; Valle and Perrewe, 2000; Zanzi and O’Neill, 2001).
Analysis in this study showed a small positive correlation \( (r = 0.175) \) between the use of non-sanctioned political tactics and perceptions of organisational politics. However, the results were inconclusive and hypothesis H5 was therefore not supported. A slightly stronger relationship was uncovered between the use of non-sanctioned political tactics and the POPS dimension of general political behaviour \( (r = 0.220) \), with greater use of non-sanctioned political tactics associated with higher levels of perceptions of organisational politics, in particular perceptions of general political behaviour. The use of non-sanctioned political tactics was unrelated to the other two dimensions of the POPS. The relationship between the POPS and the Zanzi and O’Neill (2001) conceptualisation of political behaviour has not been previously investigated. However, Valle and Perrewe (2000) found that reactive behaviours (those avoiding action) were correlated \( (r = -0.29) \) with the POPS but that there was no relationship between proactive behaviours (e.g. assertiveness, ingratiation, rationality) and the POPS. Based on the findings of Valle and Perrewe (2000), it would be expected that this study would have uncovered a relationship between non-sanctioned political behaviour and the ‘go along to get ahead’ (inaction) dimension of perception of organisational politics. However, no such relationship was found.

Harrell-Cook et al. (1999) found a small correlation \( (r = -0.28) \) between ingratiation and perceptions of organisational politics at a subordinate level but no relationships between ingratiation and the POPS at a supervisor level, or self-promotion and the POPS at either the subordinate or supervisor level. The findings of this study in investigating the relationship between perceptions and behaviour are consistent with previous studies and are inconclusive.

H 6 – *The use of sanctioned political behaviour is unrelated to perceptions of organisational politics.*

Analysis found no relationship \( (r = 0.030) \) between the use of sanctioned political tactics and the POPS or any of its dimensions. The hypothesis was therefore supported. These
findings suggest that the use of what are termed sanctioned political tactics may not be viewed as political by respondents but as merely acceptable organisational behaviour.

6.4.2 Political behaviour and workplace innovation

In this study, the research questions informed the following hypotheses regarding the relationship between the use of political tactics and perceptions of workplace innovation:

H 7 – The use of non-sanctioned political behaviour is negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

H 8 – The use of sanctioned political behaviour is positively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

No previous study was found in the literature that quantitatively investigated the relationship between the use of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics and perceptions of workplace innovation. In this study, the analysis found no relationship (either at the non-supervisor or supervisor level) between non-sanctioned political behaviour or sanctioned political behaviour and perceptions of workplace innovation. The empirical findings of this study seem at odds with two views articulated by researchers regarding the relationship between organisational politics and innovation. The first is that politics impedes innovation efforts (Frost & Egri, 1991; Kanter, 1984; Kotter, 1985); the second is that sanctioned political activity is required for successful innovation efforts (Hislop et al., 2000; McLoughlin et al., 2001). Another view also suggests that the innovation process is inherently political (Kanter, 1988). This study did not uncover any evidence to support any of these views.
6.5 Additional findings

This section presents findings that are additional to those related to testing the eight hypotheses.

6.5.1 Hierarchy

In this study, analysis showed that there was no correlation between hierarchical level and perceptions of organisational politics ($r = -.162, n = 141, p < .055$) and no significant difference in the level of organisational politics perceived by supervisors and non-supervisors [$t (139) = -1.69, p = .094$; $\eta^2 = .020$].

The findings of this study are consistent with Valle and Perrewe (2000), who also used the 12-item POPS and found no significant relationship ($r = -.19$) between hierarchy and perceptions of organisational politics. Other studies, which have used a different operationalisation of perceptions of organisational politics, have reported conflicting findings. Ferris and Kacmar (1992) and Ferris et al. (1996) used an extended POPS (31 and 40 items respectively), and found that non-supervisory personnel perceived a higher level of organisational politics. A study by Parker et al. (1995), used a six item scale similar to perceptions of organisational politics and found that perceptions of organisational politics were at a higher level in the middle of the organisational hierarchy. It would appear that more consistent results are obtained from research when the same operationalisation of the POPS is used.

The analysis in this study showed that little of the variance in the use of sanctioned (2.5 %) and non-sanctioned (2 %) political tactics between supervisors and non-supervisors was due to their roles. It would be expected that non-sanctioned political behaviour involving the use of positional power (e.g. organisational placements, control of information) would be much higher for supervisors who have power and positional authority.
In a study that developed the sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics scales (Zanzi and O’Neill 2001), the relationship between organisational role and the use of tactics was not investigated. The sample in that study comprised 288 MBA students in a US university.

No previous study was uncovered in the literature that used sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics in an organisational setting.

6.5.2 Span of control

The analysis of the data in this study suggests a relationship between span of control and perceptions of organisational politics. Amongst supervisory staff, there was a negative relationship ($r = -0.306, n = 47, p = <0.036$) between span of control and perceptions of organisational politics. The findings of this study are contrary to the prediction of the original model and subsequent empirical findings. In the original Ferris et al. (1989) model of perceptions of organisational politics, the authors suggested that increased span of control would lead to increased ambiguity and therefore an increase in the perceived level of politics. That proposition was not supported by the findings of Ferris and Kacmar (1992) or Valle and Perrewé (2000), who found no significant relationship between the two variables.

A possible explanation for the apparent contradiction between the original perceptions of organisational politics model (Ferris et al., 1989) and the findings of this study may be that a higher level of political behaviour occurs as span of control increases, and whilst this higher level of politics is perceived by those with a smaller span of control, it may not be regarded as political behaviour by the individuals with the larger span of control. This is a similar argument to that proposed by Parker et al. (1995), who found that senior executives perceived a lower level of organisational politics than middle managers. They argued that senior executives may not view their own behaviour as political.
6.5.3 Withholding knowledge and emotional response

The analysis revealed that many respondents experience an emotional response when knowledge is withheld from them by their supervisors and peers. However, a significant percentage of respondents (52%) believed that the reason why knowledge was withheld by supervisors was ‘need to know’ or ‘confidentiality’. This reasoning may be an acceptance of a recognized organisational business rule whereby knowledge is only shared on the basis of relevancy to the recipient; in this case, it is at the discretion of the supervisor. Another possible explanation is that the respondent may be denying any wrongdoing by the supervisor so as to better accept withholding of knowledge whenever it occurs and thereby maintain a working relationship with the supervisor. The rationalisation by employees of the withholding of knowledge by supervisors is problematic because, despite the normative explanation by respondents, many experience an emotional response to the occurrence. This is an area that requires further research perhaps using a qualitative methodology whereby in-depth interviews may reveal an authoritative explanation for the phenomenon.

6.5.4 Power holders and how they demonstrate power

In this study, qualitative data were gathered in an attempt to uncover who respondents believed power-holders to be and how they demonstrated that power. The dominant view of respondents was that power-holders are the occupants of positions of authority, i.e. managers; this was consistent with French and Raven’s (1959) category of legitimate organisational power. This rationalist view of the power structure within the organisation (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Bradshaw-Camball & Murray, 1991) was further supported in the qualitative data, where respondents reported that power was demonstrated through making decisions consistent with a position of legitimate authority within the organisation. It appears that the identification of managers as those who hold the power is a surrogate or catch-all term for those who control the resources of the organisation.
It is apparent from the qualitative data that staff at all levels in the organisation identified power-holders in the organisation on the basis of their position of authority. Furthermore, they identified mostly legitimate managerial activities as the way in which those power-holders demonstrated their power. This appears to be consistent with a rationalist view of power distribution in the organisation.

6.5.5 Trust

No previous study was uncovered in the literature that investigated the relationships among trust of supervisor, perceptions of organisational politics, and workplace innovation. In this study, the analysis uncovered statistically significant relationships among trust of supervisors and perceptions of organisational politics \((r = -0.392)\), workplace innovation \((r = 0.388)\), and withholding of knowledge by supervisors \((r = 0.208)\). More significantly, trust of supervisors was identified in this study as a predictor of perceptions of both organisational politics \((\beta = -0.325)\) and workplace innovation \((\beta = 0.231)\). Analysis results also suggest that those individuals with an internal locus of control are more likely to trust their supervisor \((r = -0.216)\).

Nor were studies found in the literature that investigated the relationships among trust of peers, perceptions of workplace innovation, and the withholding of knowledge by peers. Analysis in this study found that trust of peers was related to perception of workplace innovation \((r = 0.199)\), perceptions of organisational politics \((r = -0.224)\), and withholding of knowledge by peers \((r = 0.197)\). Although statistically significant, these relationships were small. One previous study (Parker et al., 1995) investigated the relationship between trust of co-workers, perceptions of organisational politics \((r = -0.35)\), and perceptions of innovation \((r = 0.33)\). The data in that study did not support the hypothesis of the researchers that trust of co-workers was a moderator of the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and outcomes, including perceived innovation. Parker et al. (1995) used a three-item scale to measure trust of co-workers and short unidimensional operationalisations of perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of innovation. This study used single items as surrogates for the operationalisation of
trust of supervisors and trust of peers, but multi-dimensional operationalisations of perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation.

6.7 Summary

This chapter, structured according to the concepts, themes and hypotheses of this thesis, discussed the findings of this study generated by the data analysis and the review of literature. The discussion identified how this study has uncovered previously unresearched relationships among variables in the areas of perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation. These gaps in the literature were then addressed by formulating hypotheses. Data were collected and analysed to test these hypotheses and fill the gaps identified in the literature.

The next chapter provides an overview of the key empirical findings of this research and identifies limitations of this study, methodological issues, and makes recommendation for future research.
Chapter 7
Conclusions

7.1 Objective

The aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of the key empirical findings and the additional findings of this research on perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of organisational innovation. Implications of methodological issues for researchers conducting studies in the area of organisational politics are detailed. This chapter also articulates how this study has contributed to theory. It notes the limitations of this study and makes recommendations for future research.

7.2 Overview of conclusions from key findings and hypotheses

This section sets out the conclusions from the key findings of this study. It is organised into four subsections. The first three, present an overview of the key findings of this study in relation to the three research questions and eight supporting hypotheses. The fourth presents the key additional empirical findings. Key findings are shown in figure 7.1, including correlations and beta values.

7.2.1 The relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perception of innovation

This study filled a gap in the organisational politics literature by measuring the relationship between two psychological, multi-dimensional constructs: perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation. It extended previous research by demonstrating that perceptions of organisational politics were significantly and negatively related to perceptions of workplace innovation. Furthermore, perceptions of organisational politics has some predictive power in relation to perceptions of
workplace innovation. Further insight was provided by this study into the relationship between the dimensions of these two constructs.

**Figure 7.1 Perceptions of organisational politics and perception of innovation – key findings**

From the results of this study it may be concluded that, in the Australian IT industry, there is a negative relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and

**Source: Author**
perceptions of workplace innovation. In addition, perceptions of organisational politics, together with role and trust of supervisor, can assist in predicting perceptions of workplace innovation. This has implications for research method theory and managerial practice.

7.2.2 Antecedents to perceptions of organisational politics and perception of innovation

This study filled a gap in the literature by establishing that locus of control, which is an antecedent to perceptions of organisational politics (confirmed in this study), is also related to perceptions of workplace innovation, in particular at the organisational level. It further added to the literature by demonstrating a relationship between Machiavellianism and perceptions of workplace innovation at a team level, and confirmed that Machiavellianism is an antecedent to perceptions of organisational politics. Furthermore, this study for the first time provided insight into the relationship between these variables at a dimensional level. It may be concluded that locus of control is an antecedent to perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation, and that Machiavellianism is an antecedent to perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation at a team level. Contrary to the literature, this study found that span of control among supervisory staff is negatively related to perceptions of organisational politics. In this study, the largest spans of control were reported by supervisor-level staff but smaller spans of control were reported by senior managers. The implication is that the occupants of senior supervisory positions may have a narrower view of what constitutes political behaviour than their more junior colleagues. The literature is ambiguous and would benefit from more empirical research exploring the relationship between span of control and perceptions of organisational politics. Clearly, since the regression analysis in this study revealed that three variables predicted 37 per cent of the scores of perceptions of workplace innovation, there is an opportunity for research to uncover other antecedent variables.
7.2.3. The relationship between political behaviour and perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of innovation

This study contributed to the literature by investigating the relationship between the use of sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics, perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation. Relationships were found between the use of non-sanctioned political tactics and perceptions of organisational politics and its general political behaviour dimension. No relationships were found between the use of political tactics and perceptions of workplace innovation. It may be concluded that the use of non-sanctioned political tactics is positively related to perceptions of organisational politics but is unrelated to perceptions of workplace innovation. Also sanctioned political behaviour is unrelated to perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation.

7.2.4 Key additional empirical findings

This study sought to enrich the literature by demonstrating that supervisor/non-supervisor roles explained variances in scores of both perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation, and were a predictor of perceptions of workplace innovation.

The original model of perceptions of organisational politics has been augmented by the finding in this study that span of control is negatively related to perceptions of organisational politics.

This study also informed the literature by demonstrating that individuals experience an emotional response when knowledge is withheld from them by their peers and supervisors. Additional insight was provided by the finding that withholding of knowledge was generally excused on the basis of “need to know”.
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The findings of this study also showed that individuals in the organisation held a rationalist view that the power-holders in the organisation were those in positions of authority who demonstrated their power through the discharge of their managerial duties.

This study filled a gap in the literature by demonstrating that trust of supervisor is negatively related to perceptions of organisational politics but positively related to perceptions of workplace innovation. Furthermore, trust of supervisor was found to be a predictor of both perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation. In addition, trust of peers was found to be negatively related to perceptions of organisational politics but positively related to perceptions of workplace innovation.

It may be concluded from its key empirical findings this study filled certain gaps in the literature: a relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation, and identified predictors of perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation.

7.3 Methodological issues and implications for future research

A significant obstacle to completing this research was that members of organisations perceive organisational politics as a negative presence in the workplace. It has been the experience of the author that organisational politics is essentially a private and hidden aspect of organisational life. This was evident in discussions between the author and the senior managers within the participating organisation, who expressed concern that a study of organisational politics would bring hidden agendas to the surface to be actioned. The phenomenon is not openly discussed, especially with outsiders, which had implications for the gathering of data. The findings of this study are all the more valuable as a result.

7.4 Limitations

Whilst this research revealed significant findings on the relationships between perceptions of organisational politics, workplace innovation and other variables, it had limitations.
First, this study was cross-sectional. A longitudinal study could extend the significant findings of this study about the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation.

Also, this study was conducted within an Australian IT services organisation. The findings and hence the conclusions might have been different had the study had been conducted in a clothing manufacturing organisation predominantly staffed by women, for example.

7.5 Future research

This study suggests several directions for future research.

To test the generalisability of the findings of this study, the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation might be replicated using a different sample population, perhaps within another industry sector, manufacturing for example. Such a sample would preferably have a greater percentage of female respondents than did this study.

Investigation of the relationships between trust of supervisors, peers and subordinates, and perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation would extend the findings of this study, perhaps by using a more extensive operationalisation of trust.

A consolidation of the organisational politics and innovation literature, through refining concepts, building consensus and conducting more collaborative research within disciplines, might also lead to a greater extension of knowledge through cross-disciplinary research.
This study could be further extended by investigating emotions, organisational politics, and workplace innovation.

7.6 Implications for organisational politics and innovation theories

This study has filled gaps in and extended the literature of both organisational politics and innovation. Furthermore it found a convergence between disciplines where greater dialogue and collaboration between researchers may take place.

7.7 Implications for managerial practice

At least two aspects of this study have implications for managerial practice.

First, the negative relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation suggests that practitioners must give attention to minimising the effects of those elements of an organisation’s life that foster perceptions of organisational politics.

Second, practitioners could pay attention to those variables that are predictors of both perceptions of organizational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation, so that the former may be minimised and the latter maximised.

7.7 Summary

This study achieved its objectives by examining the relationship between two multi-dimensional psychological constructs, and their relationship to dispositional, non-dispositional and organisational variables. Further it investigated the relationships among perceptions of organisational politics, perceptions of workplace innovation, and the use of political tactics.
In achieving its objectives, this study has shed new light on perceptions of organisational politics and perceptions of workplace innovation, and highlighted the complexity of these phenomena.

This research has added new knowledge by building on theory, thereby contributing to the existing body of literature.
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Appendix 1 – Sanctioned and Non-Sanctioned Political Tactics
Sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics

1. EXCHANGE OF FAVOURS: Trading present or future favours or obligations with another party according to one’s vested interests (Quid Pro Quo: I will do it, but you owe me one.)

2. CO-OPTATION: Merging or incorporating another power group or individual for the purpose of controlling or silencing a counterpart (for example, incorporating a quality control function into a power line).

3. RITUALS AND SYMBOLS: Using formal ceremonies (nominations, awards presentations, sales meetings, etc) and symbols of power (office location and furniture, reserved parking, executive dining room, etc) to enhance or consolidate one’s position.

4. MANIPULATION: Seeking to win another party over to your point of view through distortion of reality or misrepresentation of intentions (including selective disclosure and “objective” speculation about individuals or situations).

5. MENTOR: Being the junior member of a membership relation (looking up to a senior member of the organization for advice/support/inspiration).

6. MENTOR: Being the senior member of a membership relation (passing on the benefit your expertise, guiding and supporting a junior member of the organization).

7. ORGANISATIONAL PLACEMENTS: Controlling or supporting the promotion of agreeable people into strategic positions or isolating/removing potential opponents.

8. PERSUASION: Seeking to win another party over to one’s own point of view through selective use of rational argumentation.

9. COPING WITH UNCERTAINTY: Taking it upon oneself to eliminate or absorb another party’s uncertainty (for example, building up extra inventory to prevent interruptions).

10. INTIMIDATION AND INNUENDOES: Using language, situations, or oblique allusions to make a counterpart timid or fearful of one’s power.
11. CONTROL OF INFORMATION: Selective use of what information is distributed and who are the recipients of it.

12. RULE-ORIENTED TACTICS: Resorting to the selective use of formally documented organisational rules, guidelines, and procedures to support one’s position or oppose another party (“Sorry, but the operating procedure says…”)

13. USING SURROGATES: Having an intermediary secure compliance in others (for example, sending your assistant to enforce a new unpopular procedure).

14. IMAGE BUILDING: To promote self-interests through creating and maintaining a favourable image with the power holders (drawing attention to success, creating an impression of being on the inside of important events, developing a reputation of possessing the attributes considered desirable by the influential members of the organization).

15. RULE-EVADING TACTICS: Avoiding or reinterpreting formally documented organisational rules, guidelines, and procedures to support one’s position or to oppose another party (“for you, I will make an exception to the procedure”).

16. NETWORKING: Taking advantage of one’s access to a network of organisational and/or occupational incumbents, specialists or power holders (special ties with professional, social, or family groups).

17. INGRATIATION: Praising, establishing a good rapport with or otherwise “buttering up the boss.”

18. SUPER-ORDINATE GOAL: Attempting to generate support by linking one’s argument to the greater good of the organization (our production target requires that…).

19. PROVIDING RESOURCES: Using discretion resources under one’s control (money, services, people, etc.) by conditionally allocating them to others.

20. USE OF EXPERTISE: Providing particular skills, unique knowledge, or solutions to enhance one’s position.

21. PIGGYBACKING: Establishing a mutually supportive relationship with an individual from an existing or incumbent power group and moving along with him or her (becoming the assistant to…following your boss to another division).
22. BLAMING OR ATTACKING OTHERS: Blaming other parties for one’s failure or minimising their accomplishments (“We would have made it through if the sales people had reacted faster…”).

23. OUTSIDE EXPERTS: Involving external consultants or experts who may be expected to recommend a certain course of action supporting one’s position.

24. COALITION BUILDING: A temporary or permanent alliance with other individuals or groups to increase the support of one’s position or to achieve a particular objective.

(Zanzi & O’Neill, 2001)
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This abstract reports findings from an exploratory study that attempted to investigate the variables that impact on knowledge transfer between supervisors and managerial peer groups in organisations. Organisations rely on the dissemination of knowledge in order to drive their strategies, products and operations. This study suggests that cultural implications may impact on the transfer of knowledge in organisations.

This study adopted a social constructionist approach to the transfer of knowledge by using the social process of sharing knowledge and its effect on respondents’ perceived innovation in organisations. The sample consisted of 106 MBA students. The response rate was 100% of which 96 were useable. Both public and private sector organizations were represented across a wide variety of industries with over 50 respondents being directors or managers.

A questionnaire comprising of 20 items consisting of open and closed questions was used; six were anchored to a 5 point Likert type scale, five were open, and two were closed requiring a yes or no answer.

Seven items were included to collect demographic data. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics and qualitative data utilized category theme analysis.

All respondents reported a low level of trust in peers (m=3.1) but a slightly higher level in supervisors (m=2.9). The Asian group reported less trust of their peers (m=3.3). Respondents reported that supervisors (64%) and peers (67%) withheld knowledge and reported satisfaction with the quantity (47%) and quality (43%) of knowledge disseminated by supervisors and quantity (45%) and quality (37%) of knowledge disseminated by peers. Sorting the data by country of origin into non-Asian and Asian groups revealed differences in reported levels of satisfaction with the quantity and quality of knowledge disseminated by supervisors and peers. The non-Asian group reported a 50% rate of satisfaction with the quality of knowledge from supervisors, whereas the Asian respondents reported a 35% rate of satisfaction.

The Asian population reported a high level of withholding knowledge by peers (74%), while non-Asians reported a high level of withholding knowledge by supervisors (66%). Qualitative data was collected to show why supervisors and peers withheld knowledge and the respondent’s emotional response. The category theme analysis revealed the following themes: anger, annoyance, alienation, frustration, lack of trust, and jealousy. The qualitative data showed that organisations promoted innovation (68%) through recognition, rewards and autonomy but that perceptions of innovation were culture specific.
The combination of high levels of withholding knowledge, low levels of dissatisfaction and mid levels of satisfaction by the Asian population, appears contradictory and raises a question – could these seemingly contradictory elements be a reflection of cultural values? A possible explanation of lower levels of trust in peers could be that respondents may be more willing to excuse supervisors for withholding knowledge than their peers consistent with belief perseverance phenomenon, or the respondents may be more accepting of the occurrence consistent with high power distance.

The possible implications for the transfer of knowledge in organisations with multi-cultural workforces are discussed. Further study of country of origin as a means of identifying values in the social process of knowledge transfer may prove useful in greater understanding of management behaviour.

Key words: Knowledge Transfer, Country of Origin, Trust, Innovation
Introduction
This multi-method study reports findings from an exploratory study that attempted to investigate the variables that impact on knowledge transfer between supervisors and managerial peer groups in organisations. Organisations rely on the dissemination of knowledge in order to drive their strategies, products and operations. This study suggests that cultural implications may impact on the transfer of knowledge in organisations. This study adopted a social constructionist approach to the transfer of knowledge by using the social process of sharing knowledge and its effect on perceived innovation in organisations. The sample consisted of 106 MBA students. With a 100% response rate, the data collected covered 19 Countries of Origin (COO) in a population of 106 respondents of which 96 were useable. Of the respondents, 50 were non-Asian, including Australian (38), European (13) and South African (1), and 46 were Asian, the largest representations being from India (18), China (9), Thailand (6) and Malaysia (6). Both public and private sector organizations were represented across a wide variety of industries.

Knowledge Management
Knowledge management (KM) literature has proliferated over recent years and has involved many disciplines (Wiig, 2000). ‘Knowledge’ has been taken out of the hands of the philosophers and placed in the safer keeping of a variety of other experts according to Hull (1999), who also cautions against the use of knowledge as a unit of analysis for the dynamics of companies, organizations, economies and societies. While interest in KM is increasing and organizations are becoming more focused on managing their knowledge assets, Murray (2000) says it is relatively early in the development of KM to judge the merits of KM programs. In their brief critique of the KM literature, McAdam & McCreedy (1999) have noted three types of KM model in use. These include knowledge as categorised in discrete elements (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995); knowledge represented as intellectual capital (Chase, 1997; Roos & Roos, 1997); knowledge and the KM process as a socially constructed phenomenon (Demerest, 1997). Knowledge is better understood as a social process rather than a functional resource (Alvesson, 1998). The definition of knowledge used in organisations has been shown to include a social constructionist element that recognises the social elements in knowledge creation, embodiment and use (McAdam & McCreedy, 1999; Clegg et al., 1996; Alvesson & Wilmott, 1996). Furthermore, Grover & Davenport (2001) draw attention to the importance of social interaction in converting tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge as part of the innovation process. Nonaka et al. (2000, p. 9) assert that “tacit knowledge can be acquired only through shared experience, such as spending time together...” and this is irrespective of whether or not the tacit knowledge is then converted into explicit knowledge or remains tacit.
It has been suggested by Maula (2000), that the conventional definition of knowledge, based on the writings of Polanyi (1967) and Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), is insufficient. A firm’s knowledge can be more usefully classified into highly structured explicit knowledge, less-structured explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge. A scientific
definition of knowledge, comprising of facts or information, has been shown to be an inaccurate reflection of the use of the term in practice. Demerest (1997) draws a distinction between the goals of philosophical and scientific knowledge (truth or what is right) and commercial knowledge (effective performance or what works). He goes on to offer a definition of knowledge that includes “actionable information embodied in the set of work practices, theories-in-action, skills, equipment, processes and heuristics of the firm’s employees” (Demerest, 1997, p.374).

**Trust**

Within the social processes that facilitate knowledge transfer (KT), trust has been seen to be “the single most important precondition for knowledge exchange.” (Snowden, 2000, p.239) and is a KM issue both at the individual and group levels (Murray, 2000). Kramer (1999), referring to recent research by Coleman 1990, Fukuyama 1995, Kramer & Tyler 1996 and others, have observed that within the field of organizational behaviour there has been a resurgence of interest in the role of trust as a determinant of intra-organizational cooperation, coordination and control. Interest in trust as a factor in the social processes of KT becomes more important then, when we consider the value of KT in innovating to create competitive advantage. Srica (2002) sets out seven principles for the effective management of innovation including monitoring various sources of knowledge.

**Innovation**

Abraham and Knight (2001) maintain that the strategic innovation cycle in an organization helps to create knowledge, transform knowledge from tacit to explicit, and enables knowledge, as an output from the cycle, to be shared so that it can be used in future innovation cycles. They contend that a top-down, bottom-up structure best promotes systematic knowledge creation and recommend a leveraging condition they call ‘spreading resources’ as a condition that includes technological and social processes to make knowledge widely available. KM is emerging as a subset of the larger emerging paradigm of post-capitalist deregulated organizations (McAdam and McCreedy, 1999) and is viewed as a way to increase organizational competitiveness (DeTienne & Jackson, 2001) because there is an opportunity to leverage the accumulated knowledge in an organization. Furthermore, the competitive advantage of firms is becoming increasingly viewed as dependent on the management of knowledge assets that must be exploited within firms so that full value may be realised (Teece, 2000). Invisible assets that create knowledge and help position a firm to exploit new opportunities, enhance continuous innovation (Johannessen et al. 1997). They propose that invisible assets, in particular, tacit knowledge, which is skill-based and people intensive, enhance innovation and limit imitation and thus are the most important factors in explaining sustained competitive advantage. Lengnick-Hall (1992) notes that in order to achieve and maintain competitive advantage, firms formulate innovation strategies. However, innovation often means that knowledge, skills and abilities needed for organizational effectiveness, will have to change. In their research, Johannessen et al. (1997) concluded that industrial organization theory and resource-based theory may complement each other in determining how firms can innovate for competitive advantage. Central to their consideration of both approaches is the presence of interactive learning, knowledge creation and knowledge integration that lead to continuous innovation.
Country of Origin
An understanding of the international dimensions of management is vital to effective management in the 21st century (Punnett & Shenkar, 1996). This is true because organizations are increasingly integrating across national borders and organizations within countries such as Australia comprise multicultural workforces. This requires the ability of managers to see the relativity of their own cultural frameworks to others in an organization and improve their intercultural management skills (Hofstede, 1996). Recent research in the area of cross-cultural management may be helpful in this regard. For example, four attributes have been identified that may be the universal dimensions of the constructs of individualism and collectivism, which are characteristic of western and eastern cultures respectively (Triandis, 1999). Firstly, there is definition of the self, wherein collectivists view the self as interdependent with others and individualists view the self as autonomous and independent. Secondly, structure of goals in collectivist cultures is compatibility between individual and in-group goals whereas individualists’ goals do not often correlate with in-group goals. The third attribute is emphasis on norms versus attitudes. Here the determinants for the social behaviour among individualists are attitudes, personal needs, perceived rights and contracts while collectivists’ behaviour is determined equally by a) norms, duties and obligations and b) attitudes and personal needs. Finally, individualists emphasise rationality, cost benefit analysis of relationships, while collectivists emphasise unconditional relatedness. In his seminal research on national cultures, Hofstede (1984) identified that 53 cultures differed mainly along four dimensions. Power distance is the equilibrium of inequality established in a society by leaders and followers. Individualism versus collectivism, that is, the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups. The third dimension is masculinity or assertiveness versus the nurturing characteristic of femininity. Lastly, uncertainty avoidance refers to the extent to which a culture programs its members to feel either comfortable or uncomfortable with unstructured situations. Hofstede and Bond (1988) further identified a uniquely eastern dimension in Chinese culture they referred to as Confucian Dynamism, which is to do with a society’s search for virtue. Hofstede and Bond (1988) maintain that cultural differences in these dimensions have consequences for organizations particularly those managing multicultural workforces. For example, the most effective leader in a low power distance culture would be a resourceful democrat, whereas in a high power distance culture it would be a benevolent autocrat.

Research questions
Within the context of a multicultural workforce, the authors believe that if, as has been suggested, KM is a social process, and its success is dependent upon the trust relationships between people in an organization so that they willingly transfer their tacit knowledge to each other, then it would be useful to explore the following questions. Do people have different expectations of their supervisors and peers regarding knowledge transfer, depending on their cultural backgrounds? How much do people from different cultural backgrounds and working in organizations trust their supervisors and peers? Does the withholding of knowledge by supervisors and peers have different effects on people because of their cultural background?
Methodology
A sample of 106 MBA students, including over 50 managers and directors, of various ages and cultural backgrounds participated in the study.

Instrument Development
A survey instrument, administered in English, consisted of 20 items including open and closed questions to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. Four questions relating to the quantity and quality of disseminated tacit knowledge were anchored to a Likert type scale from 1 = highly dissatisfied to 5 = highly satisfied. Two questions relating to trust were anchored to a Likert type scale from 1= Always to 5 = never. Two questions relating to withholding knowledge required a yes or no answer and five open ended questions required responses relating to reasons for withholding knowledge, emotional responses and the promotion of innovative behaviour by the respondent’s organisation. Seven items were included to collect demographic data including gender, age, country of origin and country of origin of parents, type of organisation and industry and tenure in reported organisational role. Some of the questions were based on the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday et al., 1979), Allen and Meyer’s organisational commitment scale (1990) and others, were developed by the authors using KT as a theme. The instrument was administered to the respondents in two groups with the authors present to provide explanation and assistance as required. An introductory explanation of the survey and its purpose was provided. Quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistical procedures and qualitative data was analysed using a category theme analysis by defining the words and then collapsing them into categories. Responses to the questions about innovation were categorized using Srica’s (2002) seven principles of effective innovation management.

Analysis
Of the 96 useable responses, 50 of the respondents reported as being born in non-Asian countries and 46 born in Asian countries. A descriptive statistical analysis was undertaken combining the responses to questions within the categories of KT, trust and withholding knowledge and comparing the data from Asian and non-Asian students.

Figure 1: Trust of supervisors and peers
Respondents were asked if they trusted supervisors and peers to keep something in confidence. The responses to the questions were combined to provide an overall analysis. As with the KT questions, there was a high report of ambivalence from Asians (42%). This group also reported a low trust level (21%) and just over one third reporting trust of supervisors and peers. In contrast, 44% of non-Asians (more than double the reporting level of the Asian group) reported trust of supervisors and peers with less than 30% reporting ambivalence and distrust. Figure 1 represents reporting of trust by Asians and non-Asians.

**Results**

The data shows both Asians and non-Asians report higher levels of trust of supervisors than peers. The level of trust of peers reported by non-Asians is significantly higher than the Asian group who also report higher levels of ambivalence and distrust of peers compared to the non-Asians. The analysis in figure 1 shows that respondents reported that supervisors could be trusted more to keep something confidential than peers. Trust of supervisors was reported by twice as many non-Asians compared to Asians and the disparity in levels of trust of peers was even greater with three times as many non-Asians compared to Asians reporting that they trusted their peers. Lower levels of distrust of supervisors and peers were reported by non-Asians compared to Asians. As with the questions related to KT, a much higher level of ambivalence towards peers was reported. Distrust of supervisors (33%) was slightly higher than that for peers (31%).

Respondents were asked how satisfied they were with the quantity and quality of KT from supervisors and peers. Overall, 41% of Asians reported ambivalence, 40% satisfied and 19% dissatisfied, whereas 46% of non-Asians were satisfied, 33% ambivalent and 21% dissatisfied. The data was analysed in Figure 2 by examining the responses to each of the four questions dealing with KT from supervisors and peers and shows the level of satisfaction among Asians and non-Asians with quantity and quality of KT from supervisors and peers.

**Figure 2: Satisfaction with KT**
The combined data from both groups revealed that the highest levels of satisfaction (45 respondents), dissatisfaction (25) and the lowest level of ambivalence (26) were with the quantity of KT from supervisors. The highest levels of reporting by non-Asians, related to satisfaction with the quality of KT from supervisors (25) and quantity of KT from peers (25). The highest level of reporting from Asians was ambivalence towards the quality of KT from peers. There were higher levels of satisfaction with quantity rather than quality reported and the highest levels of ambivalence were related to KT from peers. Both Asian and non-Asians report similar levels of dissatisfaction with peers. However, non-Asians report higher levels of satisfaction while Asians report higher ambivalence. Dissatisfaction was higher with supervisors than peers in the combined data and in the data from each group.

A higher proportion of Asian (67%) compared to non-Asians (63%) reported that supervisors and peers withheld knowledge. Figure 3 was used to analyse the data regarding belief that supervisors and peers withhold knowledge and the differences in responses from the Asian and non-Asian groups.

**Figure 3: Belief that knowledge is withheld**
As illustrated in figure 3, reporting that supervisors withheld knowledge was higher amongst non-Asians, whereas a greater number of Asians reported that peers withheld knowledge. The highest level of reporting by either group was by Asians who reported that their peers withheld knowledge. The lowest level of reporting was from Asians believing that peers did not withhold knowledge. Qualitative data was collected from the open questions to show why respondents believed supervisors and peers withheld knowledge and the respondents’ emotional responses. Responses to four open questions were analysed and are represented in the table below.

Table 1: Reasons why supervisors and peers withhold knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons why supervisors withhold knowledge</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Non-Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition (19%)</td>
<td>Need to know/ confidentiality (24%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (14%)</td>
<td>Power/ control (24%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unthinking/ uncertainty (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21 responses = 46% of Asians)</td>
<td>(34 responses = 68% of non-Asians)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the respondents felt when supervisors withheld knowledge</td>
<td>Frustrated (45%)</td>
<td>Annoyed (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurt (29%)</td>
<td>Frustrated (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31 responses = 67% of Asians)</td>
<td>(45 responses = 90% of non-Asians)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons why peers withhold knowledge</td>
<td>Competition (27%)</td>
<td>Self-interest (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealously (15%)</td>
<td>Need to know (13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26 responses = 57% of Asians)</td>
<td>(31 responses = 62% of non-Asians)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the respondents felt when peers withheld knowledge</td>
<td>Frustrated (29%)</td>
<td>Angry (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoyed (25%)</td>
<td>Frustrated (23%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28 responses = 61% of Asians)</td>
<td>(39 responses = 78% of non-Asians)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors

Table 1 shows the most frequent responses by Asians and non-Asians to each question and the percentage of all responses to that question in brackets. In addition, the number of responses to each question is included with the percentage of the Asian and non-Asian group. The highest level of response was from Asians (67%) and non-Asians (90%) reporting their emotions when supervisors withheld knowledge. Asians reported that supervisors withheld knowledge for reasons of competition and power and peers withheld
knowledge for reasons including competition and jealousy. Non-Asians reported that supervisors withheld knowledge for reasons of ‘need to know’ and power and control and peers withheld knowledge for reasons of self-interest and ‘need to know’. Asians reported frustration (45%) and hurt (29%) when supervisors withheld knowledge, whereas non-Asians reported annoyance (27%) and frustration (22%). When peers withheld knowledge, Asians reported feelings of frustration (29%) and annoyance (25%) whereas non-Asians felt angry (31%) and frustrated (23%). Significant levels of reporting of frustration and annoyance were common to both groups, however, hurt (which is related to humiliation and loss of face) was peculiar to the Asian group and anger was peculiar to the non-Asian group.

Of the Asians (80) who responded to the questions about how their organization promotes innovation, 35% reported that their organization used rewards and recognition and 16% reported flexible organizational arrangements with only 3% reporting that their organization does not promote innovation. In contrast, 32% of the non-Asians (98% response rate to the questions) reported that their organization does not promote innovation, 14% reported their organization sought new opportunities and more innovative approaches and 10% used recognition and rewards.

The data was further analysed to compare levels of trust, withholding knowledge and knowledge transfer between organizations that were reported to promote innovation and those that did not. Within the non-Asian group the comparison was significant wherein those who reported belonging to organizations that did not promote innovation (32% of non-Asians) also reported a higher level of withholding knowledge by supervisors but lower level of withholding knowledge by peers. There was also a lower level trust of supervisors, higher distrust of supervisors, higher trust of peers and lower distrust of peers. Dissatisfaction with the quality of KT from supervisors was higher by a factor of nine and with quantity of KT, higher by a factor of five. Dissatisfaction was also higher with KT from peers. There was significantly less satisfaction with both quantity of KT from supervisors and peers and quality of KT from supervisors. Interestingly, there was higher satisfaction with the quality of KT by peers.

**Findings**

We began this study by asking three questions related to KT, trust, and withholding knowledge by supervisors and peers, and we were interested in identifying cultural differences in the respondents’ answers.

This exploratory study has indicated some differences that appear to be culturally based and consistent with Hofstede’s (1984) identification of Asian cultures generally characterized by high Power Distance whereby Asian respondents are less trusting of supervisors and peers than non-Asians. The non-Asians report higher levels of withholding knowledge by supervisors (not peers), but appear to be more ready to see this in a positive way than the Asians who report competitiveness as a reason for the occurrence.

Asians seem to have a very broad definition of what constitutes innovative behaviour. The study has demonstrated that people have emotional responses when knowledge is withheld by their supervisors and peers. When asked a question requiring a rational answer and a question about emotions, in relation to withholding knowledge, those surveyed responded with greater frequency to the emotional question. This is an
inconsistency and the qualitative data collection would have been enhanced through interview rather then survey. The dominant methodology in the literature was the use of surveys.

Conclusions
The literature suggests that KM is a social process whose success is dependent on trust relationships. We have used KT as a theme and attempted to establish a relationship between trust, the respondents’ satisfaction with KT, the withholding of knowledge and innovative organisations. The data suggests that expectations and responses across these dimensions differ, depending on cultural background.
This exploratory study has found lower levels of trust and higher levels of distrust of supervisors and peers among Asians compared to non-Asians. This is consistent with the literature where previous research shows that in countries with high power distance, one’s power is seen as potentially under threat from others and so that they can rarely be trusted. Whereas in low power distance countries people are more likely to trust others as they feel less threatened. The consistency is further reinforced because Asians reported competition, power and jealousy as reasons why knowledge was withheld by supervisors and peers, compared to non-Asians who reported “need to know”, power and self-interest as reasons why supervisors and peers withheld knowledge. The “need to know” response from non-Asians maybe a more positive response as it indicates an understanding and acceptance that knowledge may be withheld for a legitimate business reason.
The concept of innovation may be problematic across cultures as some responses from the Asian group included a six-monthly meeting, meetings and one hour per day coaching staff as means by which organizations promote innovation. Further investigation of this issue should include constructing meanings of innovation across cultures.
Finally, in answering all three research questions the implication from this exploratory study for managers appears to be that the height of the trust hurdle they have to straddle varies across cultures.

Limitations
This study is limited by virtue of the small sample size. It is therefore recommended that future research in this area should involve a multi-methodology study on a larger sample. All questionnaires were administered in English. Whilst it was presumed that the standard of comprehension and articulation of English was sufficient for the conduct of the research, because the survey population comprised MBA students, the use of English demonstrated in the responses in Table 1 indicate that the transportability of concepts across cultures may be problematic.
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The “Nasty” Business of Emotions: Responses across cultures to withholding knowledge

Abstract

The dissemination of knowledge is a key element of a firm’s capacity to innovate.

This exploratory multi-method study investigated the emotional response to withholding knowledge by peer groups and supervisors in organisations.

A questionnaire was administered to 147 MBA students employed in the service and manufacturing industries.

Asian respondents reported a high level of withholding knowledge by peers (72%), while non-Asians reported a high level of withholding knowledge by supervisors (76%). Qualitative data revealed themes of anger, annoyance, alienation, frustration, lack of trust, and jealousy.

This study suggests that country of origin may impact on the transfer of knowledge in organisations and discusses the possible implications of this in today’s business practices.
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The “Nasty” Business of Emotions: Responses across cultures to withholding knowledge

Introduction
Organisations rely on the dissemination of knowledge to build capability in order to drive their strategies, products and operations. This multimethod study adopted a social constructionist approach to the transfer of knowledge by using the social process of sharing knowledge and its effect on those working in organisations. The sample consisted of 147 MBA students. With a 100% response rate, the data collected covered 20 Countries of Origin (COO). Of the respondents, 90 were non-Asian, including Australian, European, and South African, and 57 were Asian, the largest representations being from India, China, Thailand and Malaysia. Both public and private sector organisations were represented across a wide variety of industries.

Knowledge Management
Knowledge management (KM) literature has proliferated over recent years and has involved many disciplines (Wiig, 2000). In their brief critique of the KM literature, McAdam & McCready (1999) noted three types of KM models in use. These include knowledge as categorised in discrete elements (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995); knowledge represented as intellectual capital; knowledge and the KM process as a socially constructed phenomenon (Demerest, 1997) that is better understood as a social process rather than a functional resource (Alvesson, 1998). The definition of knowledge used in organisations has been shown to include a social constructionist element that recognises the social elements in knowledge creation, embodiment and use (McAdam and McCready, 1999). Furthermore, Grover and Davenport (2001) draw attention to the importance of social interaction in converting tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge as part of the innovation process. Nonaka et al. (2000: 9) assert that “tacit knowledge can be acquired only through shared experience, such as spending time together…” and this is irrespective of whether or not the tacit knowledge is then converted into explicit knowledge or remains tacit.

Trust
Within the social processes that facilitate knowledge transfer (KT), trust has been seen to be “the single most important precondition for knowledge exchange.” (Snowden, 2000: 239) and is a KM issue both at the individual and group levels (Murray, 2000). Kramer (1999), referring to recent research by Coleman 1990, Fukuyama 1995, Kramer & Tyler 1996 and others, have observed that within the field of organisational behaviour there has been a resurgence of interest in the role of trust as a determinant of intra-organisational cooperation, coordination and control. Interest in trust as a factor in the social processes of KT becomes more important then, when we consider the value of KT in innovating to create competitive advantage. Srica (2002) asserts that monitoring knowledge is one of seven principles for the effective management of innovation.

Innovation
Abraham and Knight (2001) maintain that the strategic innovation cycle in an organisation helps to create knowledge, transform knowledge from tacit to explicit, and enables knowledge, as an output from the cycle, to be shared so that it can be used in future innovation cycles. They
content that a top-down, bottom-up structure best promotes systematic knowledge creation and recommend a leveraging condition they call ‘spreading resources’ as a condition that includes technological and social processes to make knowledge widely available. Invisible assets that create knowledge and help position a firm to exploit new opportunities, enhance continuous innovation (Johannessen et al. 1997).

**Country of Origin**

If we are to effectively manage an organisation’s capability in the 21st century, an understanding of the national dimensions of management is vital (Punnett and Shenkar, 1996). This is true because organisations are increasingly integrating across national borders and organisations within countries such as Australia comprise multicultural workforces. This requires the ability of managers to see the relativity of their own cultural frameworks to others in an organisation and improve their intercultural management skills (Hofstede, 1996). Recent research in the area of cross-cultural management may be helpful in this regard. For example, four attributes have been identified that may be the universal dimensions of the constructs of individualism and collectivism, which are characteristic of western and eastern cultures respectively (Triandis, 1999). Firstly, there is definition of the self, wherein collectivists view the self as interdependent with others and individualists view the self as autonomous and independent. Secondly, structure of goals in collectivist cultures is compatibility between individual and in-group goals whereas individualists’ goals do not often correlate with in-group goals. The third attribute is emphasis on norms versus attitudes. Here the determinants for the social behaviour among individualists are attitudes, personal needs, perceived rights and contracts while collectivists’ behaviour is determined equally by a) norms, duties and obligations and b) attitudes and personal needs. Finally, individualists emphasise rationality, cost benefit analysis of relationships, while collectivists emphasise unconditional relatedness. In his seminal research on national cultures, Hofstede (1984) identified that 53 cultures differed mainly along four dimensions. Power distance is the equilibrium of inequality established in a society by leaders and followers. Individualism versus collectivism, that is, the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups. The third dimension is masculinity or assertiveness versus the nurturing characteristic of femininity. Lastly, uncertainty avoidance refers to the extent to which a culture programs its members to feel either comfortable or uncomfortable with unstructured situations. Hofstede and Bond (1988) further identified a uniquely eastern dimension in Chinese culture they referred to as Confucian Dynamism, which is to do with a society’s search for virtue. Hofstede and Bond (1988) maintain that cultural differences in these dimensions have consequences for organisations particularly those managing multicultural workforces. For example, the most effective leader in a low power distance culture would be a resourceful democrat, whereas in a high power distance culture it would be a benevolent autocrat.

**Emotion**

A review of recent trends and methodological issues concerning emotion noted that research on emotions within the previous five years was almost as vast and diverse as emotional life itself (Cacioppo and Gardner, 1999). While there is support for this observation (Fisher, 2000), others have indicated that research on emotions in the workplace and in particular affective-related issues, has been neglected (Wright and Doherty, 1998; Muchinsky, 2000). Emotions may be referred to as affect, mood or feelings (Callahan and McCollum, 2002). Dispositional affect is often used to describe a person’s general affective orientation, positive or negative and may be a long term. Moods are more likely to be short term, unstable and fluctuate with events. Emotions or feelings tend to have an identifiable cause or object, are short term and more focused and intense. According to Ashforth and Humphrey (1995: 97), “the experience of work is saturated with emotion” and they further argue that emotion and rationality are interpenetrated within organisations. In her review of recent literature, Domagalski (1999) examines the three themes of the relationship between emotion and rationality, emotion in the social domain of the workplace and the control of emotions by those in positions of power and dominance. In discussing shared
assumptions in human activity, Schein (1992: 128), referring to cross-cultural studies, notes that one of several orientations whereby a group relates to itself and its environment is the Being-in-Becoming Orientation. This is positioned between the Being and Doing orientations and refers to the idea that individuals must achieve harmony with nature through developing their own capacities and thereby achieve a perfect union with the environment. This state involves detachment and control of those things that can be controlled. This is typified in an Apollonian organisation wherein people curb their natural impulses and desires through various organisational control mechanisms. The basic assumption here is that human impulses are dangerous and must be controlled. The relevance of this dimension can be most clearly seen, according to Schein (1992), in organisational attitudes and norms about the expression of emotions. For example, in the United States business relationships tend to be defined as emotionally neutral with managers who are seen as too emotional judged to be incompetent. An assumption here is that the presence of emotions can undermine rationality and clear thinking. However, as Ratner (2000) points out, emotions never exist alone because all thinking entails feelings. Members of organisations try to de-emotionalise emotions and make them seem rational (Fineman 1993). Those challenging the rationalist approach to managing have often perceived emotions narrowly (Hosking and Fineman 1990) and people within organisations presented as emotionally anorexic (Fineman 1993) whereby they have dissatisfactions, stresses, preferences, attitudes and interests rather than expressing envy, hate shame, love, fear and joy. Furthermore, emotions are found to vary in individualist and collectivist contexts whereby “ego focused” emotions (such as anger, frustration, and pride) with the individual’s internal attributes as the primary referent are found to be more marked among individualists (Kagitcibasi, 1997). Drawing on the work of Markus and Kitayama 1991, and Matsumoto 1989, Kagitcibasi (1997) explains that other focused emotions, such as sympathy, shame, and feelings of interpersonal communion, that have the other person as the primary referent, are more marked among collectivists and also studies have shown that emotions are more subdued in hierarchical societies. Lazarus and Lazarus (1994) arranged emotions into five categories. The first are the nasty emotions, which include anger, envy and jealousy. These emotions, if not managed can create tremendous interpersonal and social problems. The second are the existential emotions and include anxiety, guilt and shame. The third category are those emotions provoked by unfavourable life conditions such as relief, hope sadness and depression. Fourth are those emotions provoked by favourable life conditions and they include happiness, pride and love. Finally, there are the empathetic emotions including gratitude and compassion.

Research questions

Within the context of a multicultural workforce, the authors believe that if, as has been suggested, KM is a social process, and its success is dependent upon the trust relationships between people in an organisation so that they willingly transfer their knowledge to each other, then it would be useful to explore the following questions. Do people from different cultural backgrounds experience emotional responses to the withholding of knowledge by supervisors and peers? Do people from different cultural backgrounds have different emotional responses to withholding of knowledge by supervisors and peers?

Methodology

A sample of 147 MBA students, including over 70 managers and directors, of various ages and cultural backgrounds were surveyed. The survey instrument consisted of 20 items including open and closed questions to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. Four questions relating to the quantity and quality of disseminated tacit knowledge were anchored to a Likert type scale from 1 = highly dissatisfied to 5 = highly satisfied. Two questions relating to trust were anchored to a Likert type scale from 1= Always to 5 = never. Two questions relating to withholding knowledge required a yes or no answer and five open ended questions required responses relating to reasons for withholding knowledge, emotional responses and the promotion of innovative behaviour by the respondent’s organisation. Seven items were included to collect demographic
data including gender, age, country of origin and country of origin of parents, type of organisation and industry and tenure in reported organisational role. Some of the questions were based on the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday et al., 1979), Allen and Meyer’s organisational commitment scale (1990) and others, were developed by the authors using KT as a theme. The instrument was administered to the respondents in two groups with the authors present to provide explanation and assistance as required. An introductory explanation of the survey and its purpose was provided.

Quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistical procedures and qualitative data relating to emotions was analysed using a category theme analysis by defining the words and then collapsing them into five categories of emotions (Lazarus & Lazarus, 1994). Responses to the questions about innovation were categorized using Srica’s (2002) seven principles of effective innovation management.

Analysis

Of the 147 useable responses, 90 of the respondents reported as being born in non-Asian countries and 57 born in Asian countries. A descriptive statistical analysis was undertaken combining the responses to questions within the categories of KT, trust and withholding knowledge and comparing the data from Asian and non-Asian students.

Respondents were asked if they trusted supervisors and peers to keep something in confidence. The responses to the questions were combined to provide an overall analysis. As with the KT questions, there was a high report of ambivalence from Asians (40%). This group also reported a low overall trust level (26%) and just over one third reporting trust of supervisors and 19% reporting trust of peers. In contrast, 23% of non-Asians reported ambivalence with 51% of non-Asians (18% higher than the reporting level of the Asian group) reporting trust of supervisors and 41% reporting trust of peers.

Table 1 About Here

Table 1 shows the most frequent responses by Asians and non-Asians to each question and the percentage of all responses to that question in brackets. The data shows both Asians and non-Asians report higher levels of trust of supervisors than peers although this difference is more pronounced in the Asian group. The level of trust of peers reported by non-Asians is significantly higher than the Asian group who also report higher levels of ambivalence and distrust of peers compared to the non-Asians. The analysis in table 1 shows that respondents reported that supervisors could be trusted more to keep something confidential than peers. Trust of supervisors was reported by 18% more non-Asians compared to Asians and the disparity in levels of trust of peers was even greater with 21% more non-Asians compared to Asians reporting that they trusted their peers. Lower levels of distrust of peers, was reported by non-Asians compared to Asians with the same percentage (32%) of both groups reporting distrust of supervisors. Both groups reported a higher level of ambivalence towards peers.

Respondents were asked how satisfied they were with the quantity and quality of KT from supervisors and peers. Overall, 41% of Asians reported ambivalence, 40% satisfied and 19% dissatisfied, whereas 46% of non-Asians were satisfied, 33% ambivalent and 21% dissatisfied. The data was analysed by examining the responses to each of the four questions dealing with quantity and quality of KT from supervisors (questions 1-2) and peers (questions 3-4) and shows the level of satisfaction among Asians and non-Asians.

The combined data from both groups revealed that the highest levels of satisfaction (45 respondents), dissatisfaction (25) and the lowest level of ambivalence (26) were with the quantity of KT from supervisors. The highest levels of reporting by non-Asians, related to satisfaction with the quality of KT from supervisors (25) and quantity of KT from peers (25). The highest level of reporting from Asians was ambivalence towards the
quality of KT from peers. There were higher levels of satisfaction with quantity rather than quality reported and the highest levels of ambivalence were related to KT from peers. Both Asian and non-Asians report similar levels of dissatisfaction with peers. However, non-Asians report higher levels of satisfaction while Asians report higher ambivalence. Dissatisfaction was higher with supervisors than peers in the combined data and in the data from each group.

A higher proportion of non-Asians (76%) compared to Asians (65%) reported that supervisors withheld knowledge. Whereas a higher proportion of Asians (72%) compared to non-Asians reported that peers withheld knowledge.

As illustrated in table 1, a greater proportion of both groups reported they believed that supervisors and peers withheld knowledge. A higher proportion of non-Asians reported that supervisors withheld knowledge whereas a greater proportion of Asians reported that peers withheld knowledge. The lowest level of reporting was from non-Asians believing that supervisors did not withhold knowledge.

Qualitative data was collected from the open questions to show why respondents believed supervisors and peers withheld knowledge and the respondents’ emotional responses. Responses relating to emotions were analysed and categorized consistent with Lazarus & Lazarus (1994). The overall results are provided in table 1 and the results relating to withholding of knowledge by supervisors is analysed in Figure 1.

A high proportion of all respondents reported experiencing an emotional response to withholding of knowledge by supervisors (80%) and peers (69%). There was less than 2% difference in the overall reporting level of both groups. Non-Asians reported a much higher level of experiencing “nasty” emotions as a result of knowledge being withheld by both supervisors (48%) and peers (43%) than the Asian group (33% and 24% respectively). Non-Asians also reported higher levels of empathy, supported by qualitative data that included legitimate business need for “confidentiality” and “need to know” as the reasons why supervisors and peers withheld knowledge. Asians reported all categories of emotions including those consistent with favourable life conditions as a result of both supervisors (12%) and peers (14%) withholding knowledge whereas the non-Asian group reported no such emotional response. Asians reported higher levels of emotional responses consistent with unfavourable life conditions than did non-Asian respondents. No emotional response to knowledge being withheld by supervisors and peers was reported by similar proportions of Asian and non-Asian respondents.

Asians reported that supervisors withheld knowledge for reasons of competition and power and peers withheld knowledge for reasons including competition and jealousy. Non-Asians reported that supervisors withheld knowledge for reasons of ‘need to know’ and power and control and peers withheld knowledge for reasons of self-interest and ‘need to know’. Asians reported frustration (45%) and hurt (29%) when supervisors withheld knowledge, whereas non-Asians reported annoyance (27%) and frustration (22%). When peers withheld knowledge, Asians reported feelings of frustration (29%) and annoyance (25%) whereas non-Asians felt angry (31%) and frustrated (23%). Significant levels of reporting of frustration and annoyance were common to both groups, however, hurt (which is related to humiliation and loss of face) was peculiar to the Asian group and anger was peculiar to the non-Asian group.

Findings

The study findings indicated differences in the respondent’s emotions relating to withholding knowledge by supervisors and peers. These appear to be culturally based and consistent with Hofstede’s (1984) identification of Asian cultures generally characterised by high Power Distance whereby Asian respondents are less trusting of supervisors and peers than non-Asians. The non-
Asians report higher levels of withholding knowledge by supervisors (not peers), but appear to be more ready to see this in a positive way than the Asians who report competitiveness as a reason for the occurrence.

The study has demonstrated that a significant proportion of people have emotional responses when their supervisors and peers withhold knowledge. These responses appear to differ across cultures. This appears to be consistent with the literature (Lazarus & Lazarus, 1994; Kitayama and Markus, 1995; Triandis, 1995). It may be that different emotional responses reflect reaction to a departure from a cultural norm. For example, in the lower power distance (non-Asian) culture workers might expect knowledge to be shared, whereas in the higher power distance culture (Asian) little anger is expressed because what has occurred is part of a cultural norm. When asked a question requiring a rational answer and a question about emotions, in relation to withholding knowledge, those surveyed responded with greater frequency to the emotional question. This is an inconsistency and the qualitative data collection would have been enhanced through interview rather than survey. The dominant methodology in the literature was the use of surveys.

**Conclusion**

KT is a social process whose success is dependent on trust relationships. The data suggests that when knowledge is withheld, there is an emotional response that differs across cultures. We have used KT as a theme and attempted to establish a relationship between trust, the respondents’ satisfaction with KT, the withholding of knowledge and emotions in organisations. This exploratory study has found lower levels of trust and higher levels of distrust of supervisors and peers among Asians compared to non-Asians. This is consistent with the literature where previous research shows that in countries with high power distance, one’s power is seen as potentially under threat from others and so that they can rarely be trusted. Whereas in low power distance countries people are more likely to trust others as they feel less threatened. The consistency is further reinforced because Asians reported competition, power and jealousy as reasons why knowledge was withheld by supervisors and peers, compared to non-Asians who reported, “need to know”, power and self-interest as reasons why supervisors and peers withheld knowledge. The “need to know” response from non-Asians maybe a more positive response as it indicates an understanding and acceptance that knowledge may be withheld for a legitimate business reason.

The concept of innovation may be problematic across cultures as some responses from the Asian group included a six-monthly meeting, meetings and one hour per day coaching staff as means by which organisations promote innovation. Further investigation of this issue should include constructing meanings of innovation across cultures. Future studies would also benefit by utilising a larger sample population.

Finally, in answering both research questions the implication from this study for managers and business practice appears to be that understanding emotional responses in organisations is made more complex through the cultural dimension.
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Table 1: Asian and non-Asian comparative data (% responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge transfer from</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Non-Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Satisfaction</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers Satisfaction</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust of</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Trust</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrust</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers Trust</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrust</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge withheld by</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers Yes</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional response to K withheld by</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor No response</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable Life conditions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable life conditions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers No response</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable life conditions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable life conditions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors
Figure 1: Emotional responses to K withheld by supervisor
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ABSTRACT
This exploratory study investigated the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and organisational efforts to support innovation. The sample comprised of non-Asians (62%) and Asians (38%), mean age 34 years, with males (62%) and females (38%) representing public and private sectors. 69% respondents reported their organisations promoted innovation. Small correlations were uncovered between Country of Origin (COO) and promotion of innovation (.153). Perception of Politics Scale (\(a=0.80\)) was negatively correlated (-.367) with promotion of innovation. Both non-Asians and Asians reported bureaucracy, power and politics, and lack of support inhibited innovation efforts. Variations in responses from non-Asians and Asians suggest culturally based interpretations of innovation.

BACKGROUND
Economic prosperity and advances in various areas within society, such as health, education and science, are associated with innovation and creativity (West and Altink, 1996). In addition, social problems, such as the inequalities that exist in society (such as resource distribution and opportunities) become institutionalised and require innovation to effect change (West and Altink, 1996). Successful innovation efforts in organisations across the public and private sectors, result in growth and added complexity for organisations, including changes in organisational structure. Such events generate changes in the power structure and cause conflict with existing culture and values (Lengnick-Hall, 1992). This raises issues for researchers and practitioners in considering not only the consequences of implementing innovation-generating strategy but also what must be done to support innovation efforts and minimise those factors that inhibit creativity and innovation. Researchers have argued that politics in organisations are often responsible for innovation failures in organisations (Frost and Egri, 1991; Parker et al., 1995). This exploratory study investigated the relationship between employees’ perceptions of organisational politics and organisational innovation and employees’ perceptions of how organisations support and/or inhibit innovation efforts across cultures.

PERCEPTIONS OF POLITICS
Workplace politics has been characterised by researchers as a ‘subjectively experienced phenomenon’ (Gandz and Murray 1980). Ferris et al., (1989) developed a concept of perception of organisational politics wherein the individual’s perception of events is their view of reality and therefore drives their cognitive and behavioural responses. They defined organisational politics as “A social influence process in which behaviour is strategically designed to maximise short-term or long-term self-interest, which is either consistent with or at the expense of others’ interests” (Ferris et al., 1989; 145). A considerable body of research on perceptions of organisational politics has resulted in the operationalisation of the concept (Kacmar and Ferris, 1991; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Kacmar and Carlson, 1997; Harrell-Cook et al., 1999) developed by Ferris et al., (1989) using the Perception of Organisational Politics Scale (POPS). The 12 item scale, developed by Kacmar and Ferris (1991) is composed of three dimensions (General Political Behaviour, Going Along to get Ahead and Pay and Promotion) and has been used extensively in empirical research demonstrating good internal reliability, for
example, Cropanzano et al., 1997; Kaemar et al., 1999; Valle and Perrewe, 2000; Vigoda, 2000; Valle and Witt, 2001. The 12-item scale has been chosen for this study. Although most of the literature about perceptions of politics derives from the USA, some research has been conducted elsewhere, for example in Israel (Vigoda, 2000, 2002) and Canada (O’Connor and Morrison, 2001). The POPS has yet to be tested across a diversity of cultural settings. Furthermore, little research has been carried out examining the relationship between perceptions of organisational politics and innovation. However, in one US study, researchers (Parker et al., 1995) found that respondents perceiving a higher level of organisational politics also viewed the organization as less innovative. This study’s main purpose was the conduct of a climate survey it was restricted to gathering data within a public sector R&D facility in the USA and the researchers’ operationalisation of the variables differed from those of previous research on perceptions of organisational politics whereby reduced scales were used. This study sought to test the POPS in an Australian context and identify any differences between culturally based groups. Taking an interpretative orientation, this study sought to identify factors that influence innovation efforts across a wide range of industries in different cultural settings.

INNOVATION

There is a vast literature on innovation, however, our understanding of innovative behaviour requires development (Wolfe, 1994). Many definitions of innovation have been used and these vary not only depending on the level of analysis (West and Altink, 1996) but also perhaps because innovation is a phenomenon that is complex and context specific (Wolfe, 1994). For example, researchers have sought to demonstrate the existence of empirically distinguishable dimensions of innovation through sub-theories, including administrative and technological, radical and incremental innovations (Damanpour, 1991). In addition, innovation may be viewed as a diffusion or adoption process with adoption including the generation, development and implementation of new ideas or behaviours (Damanpour, 1991).

At the individual level, human motivation to explore and manipulate their environment in creative ways and the need to be free from threat and feel safe, are two important axioms that have informed the psychological knowledge about innovation (West and Altink, 1996). Many factors influence an individual’s motivation to innovate in the workplace. In addition to feeling safe, these include sanction for making mistakes, intrinsic value of tasks, and autonomy and control over work (West and Altink, 1996). However, these may not be universal. There is evidence to illustrate that the meaning of concepts may differ across cultures. For example, Asians have been shown to have a much broader conceptualisation of innovation compared to non-Asians (McMurray and Baxter, 2002).

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN

Australian immigration policy prior to 1975 shows that admissions were mainly restricted to people of European decent as part of the then ‘White Australia Policy’. Once this policy was expunged, there was an increased level of migration from Asia and other countries (McMurray, 2003). Ethnicity is a multi-dimensional concept. The 1986 census was the first to ask for self-identification, Aborigines aside. Scarborough (1998) asserts that values are culturally derived and influence an individual’s attitudes, beliefs and
actions. To expand, culture is a learned set of core attitudes, values and beliefs, which dictate acceptable behaviour within a specific group (Schein, 1985). These core values, attitudes and beliefs differ from one cultural group to another. It is a logical step, then, to assume that cultural background, and hence countries of origin, will reflect different perceptions of organisational politics. This is supported by the seminal work of Hofstede (1984) who defines culture as the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes one group from another. As a result of his survey of IBM employees worldwide, Hofstede (1984) identified four dimensions of national culture – power distance, masculinity versus femininity, uncertainty avoidance and individualism versus collectivism. Further, he elaborated on what these dimensions across cultures (66 in all) meant for various aspects of organisational life. The different programming of the mind across cultures suggests differences in perceptions of organisational politics and innovation. For example ‘gift-giving’, an acceptable practice in some Asian countries, might be construed as an inappropriate influencing tactic in western countries. Recently, Hofstede’s research findings have been used to explain some differences in responses to organizational politics between samples of British and Israeli workforces (Vigoda, 2003).

**METHODOLOGY**

This multi-method exploratory study comprised two samples. Survey 1 (97 respondents) and survey 2 (46 respondents) both involved culturally diverse samples of MBA students from Australia and overseas representing public and private sector organisations. The researchers, who were available to answer any queries regarding the questionnaires and collect feedback about the clarity of questions and layout of the instrument, administered both surveys.

Quantitative data was collected using the 12-item Perception of Politics Scale (POPS) ($\alpha = .80$) anchored to a five point Likert type scale; a four item scale developed by the authors measuring satisfaction with the quality and quantity of knowledge transfer from peers and supervisors anchored to a five point Likert type scale; and demographic questions. Qualitative data was collected by asking respondents to report about how their organisations promote or inhibit innovation efforts; their meaning of knowledge in their organisations; why supervisors and peers withheld knowledge and the respondents’ emotional response to knowledge being withheld from them. Responses were analysed using SPSS v.10. Relationships between demographic variables, POPS and factors inhibiting or promoting innovation were explored. Qualitative data were analysed using category theme analysis. The categories and themes identified were coded and data were then entered into the SPSS database.

**RESULTS**

The 143 respondents of both samples included 55 Asians (38%) and 88 non-Asians (62%). Ages ranged from 20 years to 55 years ($m = 34$). Respondents included 88 (62%) males and 54 (38%) females and occupied positions in the public and private sectors across manufacturing and service industries.
Sample 1
The 97 respondents came from Asian (43%) and non-Asian (57%) countries and included 57 (59%) males and 39 (40%) females (gender not reported in one case) with ages ranging from 20 years to 55 years (M = 33; SD = 7.9).

Perception of Politics
The overall score for the POPS was M = 36.2 (SD = 7.2), slightly above a mid point of 36. This was a function of the scoring on the POPS dimension of General Political Behaviour which was slightly above a mid point of 18 (M = 18.7; SD = 4.0). Scoring of the other two dimensions were below mid point. Go Along To Get Ahead with a mid point of 12 scored M = 11.5 (SD = 3.0) and Pay and Promotion with a mid point of 6 scored M = 5.8 (SD = 1.6). Internal reliability was satisfactory with a Cronbach Alpha of .81.

Innovation
Respondents (74%) reported that their organizations supported innovation whilst 25 (26%) reported that their organisations did not. In answer to a question about how organisations demonstrated their support for innovative behaviour by staff, 69 (71%) respondents reported training and development, innovation process in place, personal and organisational support mechanisms such as bonuses, promotions, communicating success and combinations.

Sample 2
Sample 2 comprised 46 respondents from Asian (28%) and non-Asian (72%) and countries and included 31 (67%) males and 15 (33%) females aged between 24 years and 49 years (M = 35; SD = 6.2).

Perception of Politics
Total score for the POPS was above the mid point of 36 (M = 37.8; SD = 7.1). Scoring for each of the three dimensions of the scale were at or slightly above the mid points - General political behaviour M = 19.0, SD = 4.2; Go Along To Get Ahead M = 12.1, SD = 3.1; Pay and Promotion M = 6.5, SD = 1.8. The scale demonstrated satisfactory internal reliability with a Cronbach Alpha of .78.

Innovation
Of the 46 respondents, 18 (39%) reported that their organisations did nothing to promote innovative behaviour by their staff. The remainder reported that organisations promoted innovative behaviour by staff through having an innovation process or part thereof in place (9%); having support mechanisms in place such as a remuneration and reward system (39%); training and development, interpersonal support and reward system (4%) and an innovation process or part thereof reinforced by a remuneration and reward system (9%).

Eight categories of inhibitors to innovation efforts were reported by 89% of respondents. These included bureaucracy (30%), lack of support (13%), power and politics (11%),
resistance to change (11%), the disposition of individuals (6%), internal turbulence (6%),
time constraints (6%) and risk aversion (4%).

SURVEY 1 AND SURVEY 2 – OVERALL RESULTS AND COMPARISON

A comparative analysis of both samples was undertaken and then all data were combined
to provide a comparative analysis between the Asian and non-Asian groups as shown in
table 1. (See Table 1)
Sample I, the larger sample of the two (68% of both samples combined), had a more even
representation of Asian and non-Asian respondents. Asians were 28% of sample 2.
Gender representation was also more even in sample 1 compared with sample 2 in which
females made up only one third of the population. Both samples had an average age of
around the mid thirties. When both samples were combined, Asian respondents made up
38% of the population and females were also 38% of the total. A Pearson correlation test
was carried out and it was found that POPS was negatively correlated (-.367, p< 0.01)
with the promotion of innovation. A small correlation was uncovered between Country of
Origin (COO) and the promotion of innovation (.153 – not significant).

POPS results
As shown in table 2, internal reliability of the POPS was within acceptable limits across
both samples with an overall Cronbach alpha value of .80. Sample 2 scored a slightly
above mid points for the POPS and each of the three dimensions, whereas sample 1
scored at the mid point for the POPS and slightly below mid point on two of the three
dimensions. Combining the data from both samples, the overall POPS score was slightly
above mid point (m = 36.8) and scores for the dimensions similarly above mid point
except Go Along To Get Ahead, which was slightly below. (See Table 2)

Promotion of Innovation
Qualitative data was gathered by asking respondents to specify how their organisations
promoted innovative behaviour within the organization. The data were collapsed using
category theme analysis. The categories that emerged were – providing support, having
an innovation process (or part of it) in place, and training and development.
Combinations of these themes were included in the table to reflect the questionnaire
responses. The results are shown in table 3 wherein data from each sample is illustrated
for comparison and then combined. Responses are listed in descending order of response
frequency. Sample populations are indicated in the column headings. (See Table 3)
Overall, 68% of respondents specified how their organisations promoted innovative
behaviour. The most frequently reported way in which organisations promote innovative
behaviour was in providing support (40%). This support took the form of empowerment
to take risks, providing rewards, including recognition promotion and remuneration, and
interpersonal support from supervisors and senior more senior managers. 13% of
respondents reported that their organisations supported innovative behaviour by having
an innovation process or part of the process in place and this included elements such as
brainstorming meetings, idea generation schemes, and cross-functional implementation
teams. Training and development was reported by 3% of respondents and combinations
of the themes were reported by a further 11%. Respondents in sample 2 did not report
training and development as a way their organizations promoted innovative behaviour. Approximately one third of all respondents (32%) reported that their organisations did nothing to promote innovative behaviour by staff.

Inhibiting innovation
Respondents were asked to specify how their organisations prevented people in their organisations from being innovative. This qualitative data was analysed using category theme analysis as shown in table 4. Both Asians and non-Asians reported that bureaucracy, power and politics, and lack of support were inhibitors of innovation efforts. A higher perception of organisational politics was reported by all of the 38 respondents who reported that their organisations did nothing to promote innovation. The 12 Asian respondents reported a level of \( m = 38 \), slightly above the mid point of 36, whereas the 26 non-Asians reported a high level of organisational politics \( (m = 42) \). (See Table 4)

CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON
The data from both samples were combined and then split by COO (Asian and non-Asian) and POPS was retested for internal reliability revealing a significant contrast between the two groups. For Asian respondents, the Cronbach value was .63 while the non-Asian group value was .85. Small correlations were uncovered between Country of Origin (COO) and the promotion of innovation \( (.153 \text{ – not significant}) \). POPS was negatively correlated \( (-.367, \text{ } p< 0.01) \) with the promotion of innovation. As shown in Table 4, mean scores for the POPS and its dimensions, internal reliability of the POPS and responses to the innovation questions were compared across Asian and non-Asian respondents
The POPS mean scores for both groups was slightly above the mid point score indicating a moderate level of organisational politics. Asians and non-Asians scored above the mid point in the general political behaviour dimension (Asians slightly higher). However, Asians scored below the mid point on the other dimensions whereas the non-Asian group scored above the mid point on these dimensions. The mean POPS score for non-Asian respondents was considerably higher amongst those who reported that their organisations did nothing to promote innovation \( (m = 42) \), indicating a high level of organisational politics, whilst Asians reporting similarly regarding innovation scored marginally higher than the overall Asian POPS score \( (m = 38) \). A much higher proportion of Asians (78%) reported that their organization promotes innovation compared to non-Asians (64%). Both groups reported that bureaucracy, resistance to change and internal turbulence as ways in which their organisations inhibited innovation. Non-Asians additionally reported that lack of support, power and politics, and the disposition of leaders, were ways in which their organisations inhibited innovation.

FINDINGS
Whilst Asian respondents reported a moderate level of organisational politics, they did not report this aspect of their organisations as inhibiting innovation, whereas, power and politics was reported by some non-Asians as inhibiting innovation.
The results from the internal reliability tests of the POPS suggest that the perception of organisational politics concept may be value laden and culture specific as reflected in the low internal reliability of the POPS completed by Asian respondents. This appears to be
consistent with the findings of Vigoda, (2003) who discovered that culture is a possible moderator of various reactions to organizational politics and noted that “it seems that Israelis and Britons have different attitudes to power and politics in their work environment” (Vigoda, 2003: 154)

Variations in responses from non-Asian and Asian respondents suggest culturally based interpretations of the concept of innovation. There arise two main questions that have implications for future research and managerial practice. Firstly, if there are different interpretations of the innovation and perceptions of politics concepts across cultures, then how do Asian cultures define these concepts? An emic approach together with the etic approach would assist in answering this question. Secondly, if concepts are operationalised according to culturally based interpretations, how can comparisons be made? For example how would we compare perceptions of innovation and organisational politics in organisations across Asian and non-Asian countries? Is it possible to arrive at a common operationalisation?

The negative relationship between perception of politics and innovation is consistent with previous research (Parker et al., 1995) whereby a higher level of perception of politics is associated with lower levels of perception of innovation.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGERIAL PRACTICE**

Australian managers must not only deal with cultural diversity at home but also when taking up positions overseas. An understanding of cultural effects on perceptions of politics and innovation are therefore a prerequisite for effective management of staff and enterprises. Consider the implementation of an innovation process for example:- one of the challenges of managers would be achieving a shared understanding of a definition of innovation in order for all staff to be focussed on a common outcome i.e. the innovation process. The perception of organisational politics is based on a subjective assessment of self-serving behaviours within an organisation infused with the observer’s cultural values. So for example the reluctance of some workers to speak up and voice opinions in meetings may be a function of their cultural background. However, others at the same meeting with a different cultural background may interpret this behaviour as a function of an organisational environment wherein staff are not encouraged to speak out and therefore they may perceive a higher level of organisational politics. Managers of multi-cultural workforces must at least be aware that such events are possible and manage accordingly. Those who are travelling overseas to work within a cultural setting different to their own, would benefit from a prior understanding of the implications of the new cultural setting for organisational life. They might also consider how their personal management technique and style may have to be adapted to that they are most effective with supervisors, peers and subordinates of a different culture.

**CONCLUSION**

This study shows that the Perceptions of Politics Scale has acceptable internal validity when used in an Australian population. However, its use with an Asian population revealed a lower than acceptable cronbach alpha (.63) and indicates that some adaption of the scale is require for use in Asian populations. The relationship between POPS and innovation in this study supports previous research. The internal validity of the POPS suggests that the concept of organisational politics may differ across cultures.
LIMITATIONS
Respondents in this study comprised two small culturally diverse convenience samples of MBA students. The classification of Asian versus non-Asian is problematic because of cultural diversity that exists within these groupings. For example there are significant differences in the cultural dimensions of China and India (included within the Asian grouping) and Australia and Germany (included within the non-Asian grouping). As was noted earlier, the phenomenon of organisational politics is subjective. Results may also have been affected by the differing nature of subjectivity across the Asian and non-Asian groups.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH
Future research would benefit from the use of larger samples across industries and cultures. Large sample sizes should be used within particular countries and then compared. To better understand the travel of concepts across cultures, a translation/back translation technique should be used to eliminate skewing of results because of language difficulties. In addition, specific questions should be asked across cultures regarding the definitions of concepts such as innovation and organisational politics. This may help better understand differences in internal reliability of scales such as POPS. It may also be useful to test the antecedents of POPS, such as Machiavellianism and Locus of Control across cultures to investigate any variance in their relationships with the POPS in different cultural settings.
REFERENCES


Table 1: Comparative demographics sample 1 and sample 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
<th>Sample 1 and sample 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Asian</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (m)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors. *gender not reported in one questionnaire

Table 2: Perceptions of politics – sample comparison and overall result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
<th>Sample 1 and sample 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal reliability of POPS</td>
<td>α = .81</td>
<td>α = .78</td>
<td>α = .80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS (m) (mid point = 36)</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General political behaviour (m) (mid point = 18)</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go along to get ahead (m) (mid point = 12)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotion (m) (mid point = 6)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors

Table 3: How organisations promote innovation – comparison between samples and overall result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample 1 (97)</th>
<th>Sample 2 (46)</th>
<th>Sample 1 and sample 2 (143)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing support (e.g empowerment to take risks, rewards, personal support)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By having an innovation process in</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation process and support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development and support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation process, training and development and support</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does nothing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors

Table 4: Summary comparative table showing results by COO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Non-Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS internal reliability</td>
<td>$\alpha = .63$</td>
<td>$\alpha = .85$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPS (mid point = 36)</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General political behaviour (mid point = 18)</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go along to get ahead (mid point = 12)</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotion (mid point = 6)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents reporting their organisations promote innovation</td>
<td>43 (78%)</td>
<td>56 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents saying that their organization does nothing to promote innovation</td>
<td>12 (22%)</td>
<td>32 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways in which organisations inhibit innovation (in order of frequency of reporting)</td>
<td>Bureaucracy; resistance to change; internal turbulence</td>
<td>Bureaucracy and lack of support; power and politics; disposition of leaders; resistance to change and internal turbulence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors
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Appendix 5 - Leaders and Knowledge Questionnaire
Confidential

Leaders and Knowledge Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to establish how well you believe knowledge is transferred to you from your manager and peers. The term knowledge usually includes documented facts, figures, policies and things that are known about the workplace but not documented, for example, who to influence in order to get support for a project. Please PRINT CLEARLY and DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME on this form.

1. Please enter in the spaces below, ten words that describe knowledge in your organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(e.g. who to ask for help)</th>
<th>(e.g. online policy manual)</th>
<th>(e.g. in your head)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the following? Please indicate by placing a circle around the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Highly satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) the amount of knowledge your supervisor passes on to you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) the quality of knowledge your supervisor passes on to you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) the amount of knowledge your peers pass on to you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) the quality of knowledge your peers pass on to you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In answering the following questions, please provide the fullest explanation possible

3 Do you think your manager/supervisor ever withholds knowledge from you? (Place a circle around yes or no)  Yes (if yes, then go to Q3a)  No (if no, go to Q4)

3a If yes, why do you think this happens? (Please describe all reasons)

3b How do you feel when knowledge is withheld from you by your supervisor? Please describe all your thoughts and emotions.
4. In answering the following questions, please provide the fullest explanation possible.

Do you think your peers ever withhold knowledge from you? Place a circle around yes or no.
Yes (if yes, go to Q4a)  No (if no, go to Q5)

4a If yes, why do you think this happens? (Please describe all reasons)

4b How do you feel when knowledge is withheld from you by your peers? Please describe all your thoughts and emotions.

5. In answering the following question please give all details.

5a In what ways does your organisation promote innovative behaviour by its staff?

6. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements by placing a circle around the appropriate number.

In my organisation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I can count on my supervisor/manager to keep things I tell him/her confidential</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I can count on my peers to keep things I tell them confidential</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my organisation:</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favouritism not merit gets people ahead</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no place for “yes” men/women</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People get along by being a good guy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are encouraged to speak out</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In-groups” hinder effectiveness of the organisation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It takes a while to learn who not to cross</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can get what you want if you ask the right person</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People define their own standards if not specified</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an Influential group no one crosses</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People left because hard work was not enough to get ahead</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t speak up for fear of retaliation/ retribution</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who come through a crisis get ahead</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor communicates with others to make himself/herself look good</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Squeaky wheel gets the grease” around here</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards come to hard workers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who voice opinions do better</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions go to top performers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers help themselves not others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People distort or selective report information</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers use the selection system to further their careers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people build themselves up by tearing others down</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy changes help only a few</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotions rules are well defined</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors carry out pay and promotions unfairly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdepartmental connections help when calling in a favour</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor only looks like he/she helps others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisals reflect managers “own agenda”</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers lend a hand if they get something out of it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotion policies are communicated</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never witnessed a justified pay increase or promotion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers are there when you need them</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One group always get their way</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotion decisions are consistent with policies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if asked by a supervisor, co-workers wouldn’t help</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People know things before they happen</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotion policies are not politically applied</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A co-worker would help so I didn’t have to stay late</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities are determined by those not in a position to do so</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Please complete the following section as required

Male……………Female………..
Age:……………yrs

In which country were you born?…………………………………
In which country were your parents born?
Mother:………………………Father:……………………….

In what type of organisation do you work?………………………………………………………………………..
In which industry do you work?………………………………………………………………………..
Please specify the sector in which your organisation exists (public/private/not for profit)……………….
How long have you worked in your organisation?……………yrs…………..mths
Please specify your role in the organisation:………………………………………………………………………..

Thank you for completing this questionnaire
Appendix 6 – Innovation and organisational politics
questionnaire
In Confidence

Innovation and Organisational Politics Questionnaire

I am seeking your help in carrying out a study that explores workplace behaviours in organisations that are considered to be innovative. Your opinion is highly valued so please answer all questions and print clearly. You cannot be identified in any way and the information you provide will be held in the strictest confidence, therefore do not write your name on this questionnaire.

Thank you for your help.

David Baxter

Section 1

What does innovation mean in your organisation?

What is the process for introducing innovation in your organisation?

In what ways does your organisation promote innovation by its staff?

In what ways does your organisation inhibit innovation by its staff?

Section 2

How would you define politics in your organisation?

Please provide at least three examples of political actions in your organisation.
Section 3

Please answer the following questions by placing a circle around the appropriate number

Example
Mentoree: Being the junior member of a membership relation (looking up to a senior member of the organisation for advice/support/inspiration).

This shows that you quite often seek advice/support/inspiration from a senior member of the organisation.

In your organisation, how often do you engage in the following activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Extensively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MENTOREE: Being a junior member of a membership relation (looking up to a senior member of the organisation for advice/support/inspiration).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCHANGE OF FAVOURS – trading present or future favours or obligations with another party according to one’s vested interests (I will do it but you owe me one)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-OPTATION: Merging or incorporating another power group or individual for the purpose of controlling or silencing a counterpart (for example, incorporating a quality control function into a power line).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENTOR: Being a senior member of a membership relation (passing on the benefit your expertise, guiding and supporting a junior member of the organisation).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMBOLS: Using formal ceremonies (nominations, awards presentations, sales meetings, etc) and symbols of power (office location and furniture, reserved parking, executive dining room, etc) to enhance or consolidate one’s position.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANIPULATION: Seeking to win another party over to your point of view through distortion of reality or misrepresentation of intentions (including selective disclosure and “objective” speculation about individuals or situations).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATIONAL PLACEMENTS: Controlling or supporting the promotion of agreeable people into strategic positions or isolating/removing potential opponents.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSUASION: Seeking to win another party over to one’s own point of view through selective use of rational argumentation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPING WITH UNCERTAINTY: Taking it upon oneself to eliminate or absorb another party’s uncertainty (for example, building up extra inventory to prevent interruptions).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIMIDATION AND INNUENDOS: Using language, situations, or oblique allusions to make a counterpart timid or fearful of one’s power.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL OF INFORMATION: Selective use of what information is distributed and who are the recipients of it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULE-ORIENTED TACTICS: Resorting to the selective use of formally documented organisational rules, guidelines, and procedures to support one’s position or oppose another party (“Sorry, but the operating procedure says…”).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USING SURROGATES: Having an intermediary secure compliance in others (for example, sending your assistant to enforce a new unpopular procedure).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAGE BUILDING: To promote self-interests through creating and maintaining a favourable image with the power holders (drawing attention to success, creating an impression of being on the inside of important events, developing a reputation of possessing the attributes considered desirable by the influential members of the organisation).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULE-EVADING TACTICS: Avoiding or reinterpreting formally documented organisational rules, guidelines, and procedures to support one’s position or to oppose another party (“for you, I will make an exception to the procedure”).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETWORKING: Taking advantage of one’s access to a network of organisational and/or occupational incumbents, specialists or power holders (special ties with professional, social, or family groups).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGREDIENTATION: Praising, establishing a good rapport with or otherwise “buttering up the boss.”</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPER-ORDINATE GOAL: Attempting to generate support by linking one’s argument to the greater good of the organisation (our production target requires that…).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDING RESOURCES: Using discretionary resources under one’s control (money, services, people, etc.) by conditionally allocating them to others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE OF EXPERTISE: Providing particular skills, unique knowledge, or solutions to enhance one’s position.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIGGYBACKING: Establishing a mutually supportive relationship with an individual from an existing or incumbent power group and moving along with him or her (becoming the assistant to…following your boss to another division).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAMING OR ATTACKING OTHERS: Blaming other parties for one’s failure or minimising their accomplishments (“We would have made it through if the sales people had reacted faster…”).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE EXPERTS: Involving external consultants or experts who may be expected to recommend a certain course of action supporting one’s position.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COALITION BUILDING: A temporary or permanent alliance with other individuals or groups to increase the support of one’s position or to achieve a particular objective.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Section 4

Indicate if you disagree or agree with the following statements by placing a circle around the appropriate number.

Example: There is an influential group that no one crosses 1 2 3 4 5

This shows that you agree with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In my organisation:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favouritism not merit gets people ahead</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no place for “yes” men/women</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are encouraged to speak out</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people build themselves up by tearing others down</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an Influential group no one crosses</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t speak up for fear of retaliation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards come to hard workers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions go to top performers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy changes help only a few</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One group always gets their way</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotion decisions are consistent with policies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotion policies are not politically applied</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our workplace has a vision that is made very clear to the employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vision of my workplace often helps the employees in setting their goals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation in my workplace is linked to its business goals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace opportunities to learn are created through systems and procedures</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our workplace rewards innovative ideas regularly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measurement of an individual is related to one’s initiative to solve problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my workplace performance measurement of an individual is related to his or her creativity</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We work in teams to solve problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace teams have freedom to make decisions and act on them without needing to ask for permission</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my work I sometimes demonstrate originality</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among my colleagues I am the first one to try new ideas or methods</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work requires me to make innovative decisions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make time to pursue my own ideas or projects</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am constantly thinking of new ideas to improve my workplace</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I discuss with my boss regularly, on how to get ahead</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always given opportunities to try new ideas and approaches to problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss gives me useful feedback regarding my creative ideas</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss gives me an opportunity to learn from my mistakes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I express myself frankly in staff meetings</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work in teams to solve complex problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace teams have adequate freedom to make decisions and act on them without needing to ask for permission</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues welcome uncertainty and unusual circumstances related to our work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amongst my colleagues, I am the first one to try new ideas and methods</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss and my colleagues perceive me to be a creative problem solver</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5

What does power mean in your organisation?

Who are the power holders in your organisation? (List positions or roles; do not use names of persons)

How do these holders of power demonstrate that they have power? (Provide examples)

Do you consider that you have power? Yes ☐ No ☐

If Yes, what have you the power to do?

If No, why not?

When and how do you try and influence the following people in your organisation:
Your superiors

Your peers

Your subordinates

In what ways do you think your self-interest at work differs from the interests of the organisation?
Section 6
Please complete the following demographic section

Male…………..Female…………..(please tick appropriate response)
Age:…………..yrs
Marital status:……………………………………………………………
In which country were you born?……………………………
In which country were your parents born?
Mother:………………………Father:…………………………
Completed level of education (high school; technical qualification; degree; higher degree; other):
…………………………………………………………………………………………….
How long have you worked in your organisation?………….yrs
Please specify your role in the organisation:……………………………………………………………
(If manager, please indicate level)
How long have you occupied your present role?………………
How many people report to you directly?…………………………

Thank you for completing this questionnaire
Appendix 7 – Innovation and organisational politics
questionnaire – main study
In Confidence

Innovation and Organisational Politics Questionnaire

I am seeking your help in carrying out a study that explores workplace behaviours in organisations that are considered to be innovative. Your opinion is highly valued so please answer all questions and print clearly. You cannot be identified in any way and the information you provide will be held in the strictest confidence, therefore do not write your name on this questionnaire.

Thank you for your help.

David Baxter

Section 1

Please answer the following questions by placing a circle around the appropriate number

Example
Mentoree: Being the junior member of a membership relation (looking up to a senior member of the organisation for advice/support/inspiration).

This shows that you quite often seek advice/support/inspiration from a senior member of the organisation.

In your organisation, how often do you engage in the following activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Extensively</th>
<th>Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-OPTATION: Merging or incorporating another power group or individual for the purpose of controlling or silencing a counterpart (for example, incorporating a quality control function into a power line).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANIPULATION: Seeking to win another party over to your point of view through distortion of reality or misrepresentation of intentions (including selective disclosure and “objective” speculation about individuals or situations).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATIONAL PLACEMENTS: Controlling or supporting the promotion of agreeable people into strategic positions or isolating/removing potential opponents.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSUASION: Seeking to win another party over to one’s own point of view through selective use of rational argumentation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIMIDATION AND INNUENDOES: Using language, situations, or oblique allusions to make a counterpart timid or fearful of one’s power.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL OF INFORMATION: Selective use of what information is distributed and who are the recipients of it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USING SURrogATES: Having an intermediary secure compliance in others (for example, sending your assistant to enforce a new unpopular procedure).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAGE BUILDING: To promote self-interests through creating and maintaining a favourable image with the power holders (drawing attention to success, creating an impression of being on the inside of important events, developing a reputation of possessing the attributes considered desirable by the influential members of the organisation).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETWORKING: Taking advantage of one’s access to a network of organisational and/or occupational incumbents, specialists or power holders (special ties with professional, social, or family groups).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGRATIATION: Praising, establishing a good rapport with or otherwise “buttering up the boss.”</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPER-ORDINATE GOAL: Attempting to generate support by linking one’s argument to the greater good of the organisation (our production target requires that…).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDING RESOURCES: Using discreional resources under one’s control (money, services, people, etc.) by conditionally allocating them to others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE OF EXPERTISE: Providing particular skills, unique knowledge, or solutions to enhance one’s position.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAMING OR ATTACKING OTHERS: Blaming other parties for one’s failure or minimising their accomplishments (“We would have made it through if the sales people had reacted faster…”).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COALITION BUILDING: A temporary or permanent alliance with other individuals or groups to increase the support of one’s position or to achieve a particular objective.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who are the power holders in your organisation? (list positions or roles, do not use names of persons)
How do these power holders demonstrate that they have power? (provide examples)

Section 2

Each item in this section contains two statements. Please select only one statement in each pair with which you most agree and indicate your choice by placing a circle around the appropriate number.

Example:

1a Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much
(b) The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them

This indicates that you most agree with statement 1b

1a Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much
1b The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them

2a Many of the unhappy things in people’s lives are partly due to bad luck
2b People’s misfortunes result from the mistakes they make

3a One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don’t take enough interest in politics
3b There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them

4a In the long run, people get the respect they deserve in this world
4b Unfortunately, an individual’s worth often passes unrecognised no matter how hard he/she tries

5a The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense
5b Most students don’t realise the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings

6a Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader
6b Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities

7a No matter how hard you try some people just don’t like you
7b People who can’t get others to like them don’t understand how to get along with others

8a Heredity plays the major role in determining one’s personality
8b It is one’s experiences in life which determine what they are like

9a I have often found that what is going to happen will happen
9b Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action

10a In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test
10b Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to coursework that studying is really useless

11a Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it
11b Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time

12a The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions
12b This world is run by the few people in power, and there’s not much the little guy can do about it

13a When I make plans, I am almost certain I can make them work
13b It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune

14a There are certain people who are just no good
14b There is some good in everybody

15a In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck
15b Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin

16a Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it
16b Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first

17a As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand nor control
17b By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events

18a Most people don’t realise the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings
18b There is really no such thing as “luck”

19a One should always be willing to admit mistakes
19b It is usually best to cover up one’s mistakes

20a It is hard to know whether or not a person likes you
20b How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>In the long run, bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21b</td>
<td>Most misfortunes are the result of a lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22a</td>
<td>With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22b</td>
<td>It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23a</td>
<td>Sometimes I can’t understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23b</td>
<td>There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a</td>
<td>A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24b</td>
<td>A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a</td>
<td>Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25b</td>
<td>It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26a</td>
<td>People are lonely because they don’t try to be friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26b</td>
<td>There’s not much use in trying hard to please people, if they like you they like you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27a</td>
<td>There is too much emphasis on athletics at high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27b</td>
<td>Team sports are an excellent way to build character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28a</td>
<td>What happens to me is my own doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28b</td>
<td>Sometimes I feel as though I don’t have enough control over the direction my life is taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29a</td>
<td>Most of the time I can’t understand why politicians behave the way they do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29b</td>
<td>In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3

Indicate if you disagree or agree with the following statements by placing a circle around the appropriate number

Example: There is an influential group that no one crosses

This shows that you agree with the statement.

### In my organisation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One should take action only when sure it is morally right</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people are basically good and kind</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty is the best policy in all cases</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no excuse for lying to someone else</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally speaking, men won’t work hard unless they are forced to do so</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than important and dishonest</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which might carry more weight</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean moral lives</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that criminals are stupid enough to get caught</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most men are brave</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is wise to flatter important people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is possible to be good in all respects</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnum was very wrong when he said there is a sucker born every minute</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In answering the following questions, please provide the fullest explanation possible

Do you think your manager/supervisor withholds knowledge from you? Yes No
If yes, why do you think this happens?

How do you feel when knowledge is withheld from you?
Do you think your peers withhold knowledge from you? Yes    No
If yes, why do you think this happens?

How do you feel when knowledge is withheld from you?

Answer the following questions by placing a circle around the appropriate number

I can count on my supervisor/manager to keep things I tell him/her confidential
Always  1  2  3  4  5  Never

I can count on my peers to keep things I tell them confidential
Always  1  2  3  4  5  Never
Section 4

Indicate if you disagree or agree with the following statements by placing a circle around the appropriate number

Example: There is an influential group that no one crosses 1 2 3 (4) 5
This shows that you agree with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In my organisation:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favouritism rather than merit determines who gets ahead</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no place for &quot;yes&quot; men/women; good ideas are desired even when it means disagreeing with superiors</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are encouraged to speak out frankly even when they are critical of well-established ideas</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has always been an influential group in this department that no one ever crosses</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t speak up for fear of retaliation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards come only to those who work hard</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions in this department generally go to top performers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people build themselves up by tearing others down</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have seen changes made here that only serve the purposes of a few individuals, not the whole work unit/department</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a group of people in my department who always get things their way because no one wants to challenge them</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t remember when a person received a pay increase or a promotion that was inconsistent with the published policies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since I have worked in this department I have never seen the pay and promotion policies applied politically</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our workplace has a vision that is made very clear to the employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vision of my workplace often helps the employees in setting their goals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation in my workplace is linked to its business goals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace opportunities to learn are created through systems and procedures</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our workplace rewards innovative ideas regularly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measurement of an individual is related to one’s initiative to solve problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measurement of an individual is related to his or her own creativity</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We work in teams to solve problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace teams have freedom to make decisions and act on them without needing to ask for permission</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my work I sometimes demonstrate originality</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss is our role model in creative thinking</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work requires me to make innovative decisions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make time to pursue my own ideas or projects</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am constantly thinking of new ideas to improve my workplace</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I discuss with my boss regularly, on how to get ahead</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always given opportunities to try new ideas and approaches to problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss gives me useful feedback regarding my creative ideas</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss gives me an opportunity to learn from my mistakes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I express myself frankly in staff meetings</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work in teams to solve complex problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People feel a strong sense of membership and support</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues welcome uncertainty and unusual circumstances related to our work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amongst my colleagues, I am the first one to try new ideas and methods</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss and my colleagues perceive me to be a creative problem solver</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5

Please complete the following demographic section

Male……………..Female……………..(please tick appropriate response)  Age:…………………yrs
Marital status:………………………………………………………………………
In which country were you born?:………………………………………………
If you were born outside Australia, how long have you lived in Australia:…………………yrs
How long have you lived outside your country of birth:…………………yrs
In which country were your parents born? Mother: ………………………. Father: ………………………..
Completed level of education (high school; technical qualification; degree; higher degree; other: ………………………………………………….
How long have you worked in your organisation? ………………………yrs
Full time/ Part time/ Casual/ Contract employee (please circle appropriate response)
In which department do you work? …………………………………………..
Please specify your role in the organisation: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..(If manager, please indicate level)
How long have you occupied your present role? ………………………yrs
How many people report to you directly? ……………………………………..

Thank you for completing this questionnaire