

PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS: A META-ANALYSIS OF THEORETICAL ANTECEDENTS

Guclu Atinc

Doctoral Candidate of Management
Louisiana Tech University

Mahmoud Darrat

Assistant Professor of Marketing
Auburn University at Montgomery

Bryan Fuller

Jack & Peggy Byrd Endowed Professor of Management
Louisiana Tech University

Barry W. Parker

Doctoral Student of Management
Louisiana Tech University
Executive Director

Northeast Louisiana Business & Community Development Center

In the last twenty years, researchers and practitioners alike have become increasingly interested in political behavior within organizations. Although political behavior can have both positive and negative outcomes, most of the research has focused upon “dark side” (Ferris and King, 1991) political behaviors, which are behaviors not sanctioned by the organization (i.e., illegitimate) and characterized by self-interest (e.g., taking credit for others’ work, coalition building, personal attacks upon others competing for the same resources, and decisions based upon favoritism). This type of political behavior tends to create a harmful and divisive work environment, reduces organizational efficiency and effectiveness, and has exceedingly harmful effects upon workers (Kacmar *et al.*, 1999; Mintzberg, 1983).

Research on organizational politics has largely focused upon perceptions of organizational politics because of Lewin’s (1936, *Principles of Topological Psychology*)

suggestion that individuals act upon their perceptions of reality rather than objective reality (Ferris *et al.*, 2002). Indeed, there is empirical evidence suggesting that perceived reality is the most important factor in determining workers' attitudes and behavior (Breux *et al.*, 2009). Perceived organizational politics "involves an individual's attribution of behaviors of self-serving intent and is defined as an individual's subjective evaluation about the extent to which the work environment is characterized by co-workers and supervisors who demonstrate such self-serving behavior" (Ferris *et al.*, 2000: 90). Perceived organizational politics is sometimes cast as a "hindrance" or threatening form of stressor in that it constrains an individual's belief in their ability to achieve personal and professional goals (Chang *et al.*, 2009; Lepine *et al.*, 2005). Recent meta-analytic reviews provide strong evidence supporting the view that perceptions of organizational politics are related to reduced job satisfaction, organizational commitment, citizenship behavior, task performance and increased psychological strain (Chang *et al.*, 2009; Miller *et al.*, 2008).

Given the strong evidence linking perceptions of organizational politics (POP) with a variety of negative outcomes for individuals and their employers, it is critically important for organizations to attend to those factors that contribute to the development of these perceptions (Chang *et al.*, 2009). In their extensive review of the literature examining antecedents of politics perceptions, Ferris *et al.* (2002) conclude that most of the antecedents have been substantiated by research. However, many of the antecedents included in the Ferris *et al.* (2002) review had only been examined a few times and half of the variables examined had only been investigated one time (see Table 3, pp. 196-197). Further, Ferris *et al.*'s (2002) literature review indicates inconsistency in findings in some of the cases where there is more than one study, including: centralization, formalization, hierarchical level, job autonomy, feedback, and a variety of personal influences (i.e., age, gender, organization tenure, minority status, and locus of control). Others also note these inconsistencies (e.g., Adams *et al.*, 2008; Kacmar and Baron, 1999; Miller and Nichols, 2008). These types of inconsistencies may be due to low statistical power or may occur because there truly is no relationship between the antecedents and perceptions of organizational politics (Parker *et al.*, 1995). Therefore, because of the small number of studies available for Ferris *et al.* (2002) to review and because Ferris *et al.* (2002) use a vote counting procedure to integrate the empirical literature (i.e., counting statistically significant and nonsignificant findings), it is likely that Ferris *et al.* (2002) may have reached the wrong conclusions in some cases (Hunter and Schmidt, 2004). Further, Hunter and Schmidt state that even "where the voting method correctly leads to the conclusion that an effect exists, the critical question of the size of the effect is still left unanswered" (2004: 446). Indeed, Vigoda notes that the question of which antecedents of perceived organizational politics "are the most significant remains an open one" (2003: 36).

One way to address this shortcoming in the literature is to conduct a comprehensive meta-analytic examination of the relationships proposed in the antecedent model of perceived organizational politics. Because there has been a significant amount of research performed in recent years, a meta-analytic integration of the literature would be based upon substantially more studies than those reviewed by Ferris *et al.* (2002). Furthermore, because a quantitative integration of the extant empirical research would provide an estimate of the true population effect size for each predictor of organizational politics, the results would indicate the relative strength and consistency of the different antecedents and categories of antecedents proposed in the theoretical model (i.e., organizational

influences, job/work environment influences, and personal influences). Additionally, a meta-analytic integration of the extant literature would provide a quantitative review of the new antecedents Ferris *et al.* (2002) added to their Revised Model of Organizational Politics Perceptions (e.g., career development opportunities, participation/involvement, person-organization fit, positive affect, negative affect), as well as other antecedents which had only been examined once or twice at the time of Ferris *et al.*'s (2002) literature review (e.g., job autonomy, skill variety, Machiavellianism, self-monitoring, locus of control, met expectations). In short, a meta-analytic integration of the literature examining antecedents of perceptions of politics would not only update Ferris *et al.*'s (2002) review of the literature, but also provide new insights into those factors that are thought to influence the development of perceptions of organizational politics.

ANTECEDENTS OF PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS

The variables included in this quantitative review of the literature are those antecedents identified in the general theoretical model presented in early POP research efforts as well as variables identified in later research (e.g., Ferris *et al.*, 1989; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Ferris *et al.*, 2002). As noted by Parker *et al.* (1995), the antecedent model is largely based upon theoretical models of conditions thought to contribute to political behavior (e.g., ambiguity, uncertainty, the belief that political behavior is instrumental in gaining advantage or rewards, and workplace norms for political behavior) (Parker *et al.*, 1995).

Organizational Influences

According to early theoretical models (e.g., Ferris *et al.*, 1989; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Parker *et al.*, 1995), there are a variety of organizational influences upon perceptions of organizational politics including centralization, formalization, hierarchical level, and span of control. Centralization, the extent to which power and control is concentrated in the upper echelons of the organization, is thought to influence perceptions of organizational politics because it may foster perceived lack of control and high levels of political behavior aimed at influencing key decision-makers. Research tends to support this view (e.g., Andrews and Kacmar, 2001; Chang, 2008; Muhammad, 2007). Formalization refers to the extent to which instructions, rules, and standards are written and clearly expressed to employees. Organizations with a high degree of formalization tend to have employees who have high role clarity and increased knowledge and control over their environment which should lead to lower perceptions of politics (Ferris and Kacmar, 1992). Research supports this hypothesized negative relationship (e.g., Andrews and Kacmar, 2001; Aryee *et al.*, 2004; Chang, 2008; Liu, 2002; Muhammad, 2007; Vigoda, 2001; Yang, 2009). Hierarchical level within the organization is also thought to influence perceptions of organizational politics because political behavior is traditionally perceived to be an upper management phenomenon, or even part of the job for high level managers (Drory, 1993). Although research has produced mixed results for this hypothesis, with correlation estimates ranging from positive (e.g., Chang, 2008; Miller and Nichols, 2008) to negative (e.g., Valle and Perrewé, 2000), Ferris *et al.* (2002) concluded that hierarchical level should remain in the model as an organizational influence upon politics perceptions. Ferris and Kacmar (1992) also hypothesized that span of control would be positively related to perceptions of organizational politics. The

assumption is that as the number of employees reporting to a supervisor increase, the supervisor will devote less time to each individual, which may increase employees' sense of uncertainty and ambiguity. However, research has found no relationship between span of control and politics perceptions (e.g., Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Valle and Perrewe, 2000).

Procedural justice, or the perceived fairness of the procedures to allocate resources, has also been discussed as an organizational influence upon perceptions of politics (e.g., Doucet *et al.*, 2009). When the procedures used to make decisions are perceived to be "fair" (i.e., consistent, free of bias, correctable, and ethical in nature), individuals tend to believe that there is less room for ad hoc decision-making due to the presence of decision-making guidelines and increased transparency. Consequently, when individuals perceive there to be procedural justice, they tend to feel they have a greater degree of control (Thibaut and Walker, 1975), which should reduce the perception of politics within the organization (Doucet *et al.*, 2009). Research consistently reports a negative relationship between procedural justice and perceptions of organizational politics (e.g., Andrews and Kacmar, 2001; Aryee *et al.*, 2004; Muhammad, 2007).

Job/Work Environment Influences

Some early research efforts show that job-related factors such as autonomy, feedback, interaction with supervisor/coworkers, and opportunity for advancement are more strongly related to perceptions of organizational politics than either organizational or personal influences (e.g., Ferris and Kacmar, 1992). Ferris and colleagues (e.g., Ferris *et al.*, 1989; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992) originally proposed several job design characteristics as effective ways to reduce uncertainty in the workplace and, consequently, perceptions of politics. A lack of autonomy or skill variety would imply that an employee would be subject to the control of others, leading to feelings of powerlessness and increased perceptions of organizational politics (Ferris and Kacmar, 1992). Most researchers have reported negative relationships between autonomy and perceptions of politics (e.g., Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; O'Connor and Morrison, 2001; Shin and Yuan, 2009; Valle and Perrewe, 2000), although some have reported no relationship between the two variables (e.g., Vigoda, 2001; Vigoda-Gadot *et al.*, 2003). Research examining skill variety has largely reported negative relationships with perceptions of politics (Lin, 2003; Liu, 2002). Similarly, employees who are the recipients of constructive feedback are more likely to experience higher role clarity and increased control over their work environment which ultimately leads to substantially lower politics perceptions. Researchers have reported negative correlations between feedback and politics perceptions across a variety of settings and occupations (e.g., Kacmar *et al.*, 1999; Lin, 2003; Liu, 2002; Yang, 2002), while others have reported no association between the two variables (e.g., Howell, 2005).

Advancement opportunities are also thought to have a negative influence upon perceptions of organizational politics. When opportunities for promotion or advancement are limited, this may foster political behavior aimed at securing this valuable reward. Consequently, employees may perceive that there are limited opportunities due to the political nature of advancement within the organization (Ferris and Kacmar, 1992). Reported research results are largely consistent with this hypothesis (e.g., Harris and Munyon, 2009; Kacmar *et al.*, 1999; Valle and Perrewe, 2000).

Quality of interaction with others in the workplace was also included in Ferris *et al.*'s

(1989) model of antecedents. Employees that have positive trusting relationships with their supervisors and/or co-workers tend to perceive lower levels of political activity in the organization. Interaction with one's supervisor has been assessed by some researchers using the leader-member exchange (LMX) construct (e.g., Kacmar *et al.*, 1999). LMX theory suggests that leaders develop closer relationships with some subordinates (i.e., the "in-group" or cadre) and less close relationships with others (i.e., the "out-group" or hired hands) (Graen, 1976). Subordinates with lower-quality exchange relationships with their supervisor tend to believe that the favoritism shown to in-group members is based upon political factors rather than merit, while in-group members tend to believe they are less subject to political or unfair treatment (Miller and Nichols, 2008). Research has consistently supported the view that LMX has a negative influence upon perceptions of organizational politics (e.g., Collins, 2008; Innes, 2004; Kacmar *et al.*, 2007; Poon, 2003, 2006).

Cooperation is also considered to be an indication of relationship quality within the organization. Cooperation refers to the extent to which co-workers actively support each other (Chatman and Barsade, 1995). To the extent that individuals tend to actively support each other, there is likely to be less competition for scarce resources and less reason to suspect that people are acting in their own self-interest (Parker *et al.*, 1995). Conversely, a lack of cooperation among employees is likely to create competition for scarce resources and promote political behavior in pursuit of said resources. Research findings generally support a negative relationship between cooperation and perceptions of organizational politics (e.g., Andrews and Kacmar, 2001; Harris *et al.*, 2005).

Trust in one's coworkers is another important indicator of the quality of one's relationships at work (Parker *et al.*, 1995). The authors based this assumption upon the idea that people who believe their coworkers are trustworthy are less likely to believe they would act in ways which would be detrimental to others. Conversely, workers who believe their coworkers are untrustworthy are more likely to attribute political (self-interested) motivations to co-worker behavior. Research findings appear to generally support a statistically significant negative relationship between trust and perceptions of organizational politics (e.g., Howell, 2005; LaCost, 2005; Parker *et al.*, 1995; Poon, 2006).

A new antecedent proposed by Ferris *et al.*'s (2002) Revised Model of Organizational Politics is employee participation in decision-making (PDM). The addition of PDM to the antecedent model is based upon the idea that as one's participation in decision-making increases, perceptions of organizational politics should decrease because participation reduces ambiguity and increases one's sense of control and fairness (Ferris *et al.*, 2002; Vigoda and Cohen, 2002).

Another variable added to Ferris *et al.*'s (2002) model reflects one aspect of person-organization fit: met expectations (Vigoda, 2001). Met expectations reflects the incongruence between employee job expectations and what they have actually encountered in the workplace. Employees with high met expectations tend to feel more positively about their organization and are more likely to attribute their success within the organization to be based upon their own performance or qualifications rather than political influence (Vigoda and Cohen, 2002). Accordingly, empirical research supports the view that met expectations are negatively related to perceptions of politics (e.g., Vigoda, 2001; Vigoda and Cohen, 2002, 2003)

Ferris *et al.* (2002) also added career development opportunities as another job/work environmental influence upon perceptions of organizational politics. This addition

to the model is based upon the idea that the lack of opportunities for growth and development would increase politics perceptions because the perceived linkage between skill development and success within the organization would be weak (Parker *et al.*, 1995). Kacmar *et al.* (1999) report development opportunities to be much more strongly related to organizational politics than promotion opportunities.

Personal Influences

Most of the research examining personal influences upon political perceptions has focused upon demographic variables (Adams *et al.*, 2008). Early theoretical models propose that women, older individuals, minorities, and those with longer tenure tend to experience the negative impacts of political behavior and, therefore, are more likely to perceive the environment as more political (Ferris *et al.*, 1989; Parker *et al.*, 1995). Conversely, individuals with higher education are thought to experience lower job ambiguity and higher control, and consequently, perceive lower levels of political activity (Parker *et al.*, 1995). More recent research suggests that demographics such as age, gender, and race may also contribute to the creation of political sub-climates within organizations (Treadway *et al.*, 2005b). However, results have been mixed and a variety of competing hypotheses have been developed to explain the different results (Ferris *et al.*, 1996a). Consequently, some researchers refuse to even offer any directional hypotheses (e.g., Ferris *et al.*, 1996b) while others continue to suggest that strong linkages exist between demographic variables and perceptions of organizational politics (e.g., Rosen *et al.*, 2009b). Therefore, one of the goals of the present study is to resolve these inconsistencies.

In general, personality characteristics have been ignored as antecedents of perceptions of organizational politics (Adams *et al.*, 2008). However, research has shown that personality characteristics may account for substantially more variance in perceptions of organizational politics than demographic variables (Adams *et al.*, 2008). In general, personality characteristics are thought to be important because they influence how individuals perceive and interpret organizational politics (Adams *et al.*, 2008). *Machiavellianism*, for example, has long been thought to be related to perceptions of organizational politics because high Machs tend to be cynical about human nature and are willing to do virtually anything to enhance their self-interests (O'Connor and Morrison, 2001; Valle and Perrew, 2000). Research in both the United States (e.g., O'Connor and Morrison, 2001; Valle and Perrew, 2000) and Asia (e.g., Chang, 2003; Chang, 2008; Lin, 2003; Tseng, 2002; Yang, 2002; Yang, 2003) has consistently found positive relationships between Machiavellianism and perceptions of politics. *Self-monitoring* was also predicted by Ferris *et al.* (1989) to be related to perceptions of organizational politics since high self-monitors are skilled in political behavior and very sensitive to social cues. However, research has not supported this hypothesis (e.g., Howell, 2005; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Valle and Perrew, 2000). Locus of control has also received some attention in the perceptions of politics literature. Individuals with an external locus of control believe their fate is dependent on forces outside of their control, while individuals with an internal locus of control believe that they are in control of their environment. Locus of control has a significant impact on POP because those with a higher sense of control over their workplace are not as likely to feel as helpless as those with less control, and therefore should experience lower levels of perceived organizational politics (Ferris *et al.*, 1993). Research has generally reported a statistically significant relationship between

locus of control and perceptions of politics (e.g., Andrews and Kacmar, 2001; Miller and Nichols, 2008; O'Connor and Morrison, 2001).

Ferris *et al.* (2002) also added *positive and negative affect* to their revised antecedent model because a tendency to view the work environment positively or negatively is likely to influence perceptions of politics. Researchers suggest that individuals with high positive affect tend to be enthusiastic, upbeat, and view their environments positively (e.g., experience high job satisfaction, Connolly and Viswesvaran, 2000) while individuals with high negative affect tend to be more anxious, angry, and view their environments negatively. Because positive affect may serve as a coping mechanism or reduce political attributions as explanations for behavior in organizations, positive affect should be negatively related to perceptions of organizational politics (Adams *et al.*, 2008). On the other hand, negative affect tends to make individuals more attuned to inequities and inflate negative attributions about events in organizations, which suggests negative affect should be positively related to perceptions of organizational politics (Adams *et al.*, 2008). Research has generally supported these hypotheses (e.g., Breaux *et al.*, 2009; Byrne *et al.*, 2005; Kiewitz *et al.*, 2009).

METHODS

Study Sources

First, a search of refereed journal articles reporting POPS relationships was conducted using computerized sources (ABI/Inform, Business Source Premier, Google Scholar, PsychInfo). Next, key journals in the organizational sciences were investigated such as *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Public Personnel Management*, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Organizational Analysis*, *Human Relations*, *Policy and Politics*, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *Journal of Managerial Issues*, and *Organizational Analysis*. In addition, references cited in recent POP meta-analyses (Chang *et al.*, 2009; Miller *et al.*, 2008) were also checked for any missing studies in our analysis. A total of 93 independent samples from 82 individual studies were included in the analyses.

Initially, 29 variables were chosen for analysis based on constructs assessed in the correlation tables of the collected articles. For the sake of a more robust and generalizable study, the variable list was subsequently reduced to 25 variables based on the number of articles assessing each variable. Consequent deliberations with researchers in the area ensured that the inclusion of the assigned variables to the model were inter-subjectively certifiable.

Meta-analytic Procedures

The methodological procedures used in the current study are based upon meta-analytic techniques proposed by Hunter and Schmidt (1990, 2004). The authors suggest that the superiority of meta-analysis over individual studies lies in the fact that no individual study is capable of fully addressing a scientific question. Each individual study serves as a data point which contributes to an integration of research findings. Generally, researchers tend to discount or discard the results of individual studies which have inadequate statistical power. However, meta-analytic research overcomes this obstacle by obtaining point estimates of effect sizes and confidence intervals which leads to more precise results due to an integration of research findings across studies. Moreover, meta-

analysis has proven to be a highly effective tool in the development of theory in the behavioral and social sciences (Hunter and Schmidt, 2004).

Hunter and Schmidt's (1990, 2004) random effects model was utilized to conduct the meta-analysis and corrected studies individually for artifacts because of its predominance in the literature and research supporting its accuracy (e.g., Hall and Brannick, 2002). This method corrects for sampling error and attenuation due to unreliability in both the predictor and criterion and generates sample-weighted estimates of the population correlation. When no reliability estimate was provided, average reliability of the other studies in the overall sample was used. With regard to maintaining the statistical independence of studies, strict adherence to the guidelines provided by Hunter and Schmidt (1990, 2004) was maintained. Inputs into the meta-analyses included reliability estimates for independent and dependent (POP) variables, correlations between the variables obtained from correlation tables, and sample sizes. For studies that reported identical variables that were assessed with multiple measures (e.g., cross-cultural studies in which subjects from each country were measured separately), the correlations were averaged and one composite correlation was used. This technique has been shown to improve both reliability and construct validity (Hunter and Schmidt, 1990, 2004).

The two-step procedure discussed by Hunter and Schmidt (1990) and Whitener (1990) was utilized. First, a decision was made on whether the group of studies in the meta-analysis represented one population (i.e., homogeneous group of studies) or more than one population (i.e., heterogeneous group of studies). The proportion of variance accounted for by sampling and measurement error was used to assess sample homogeneity. The generally accepted rule of thumb is that when sampling and measurement error accounts for more than 75% of observed variance, then the remaining variance should be accounted for by other artifacts and the sample population should be considered homogeneous. This provides a better indication of homogeneity than significance tests (Hunter and Schmidt, 2004). Ninety-five percent credibility intervals were calculated to provide another indication of sample population homogeneity, as suggested by Whitener (1990). Credibility intervals indicate sample heterogeneity (i.e., the presence of moderators) when they either include zero or display wide intervals.

Based upon the indication of sample homogeneity/heterogeneity provided by the proportion of variance accounted for by artifacts and the 95% credibility interval, a 95% confidence interval was calculated (Whitener, 1990). Given the observed data, confidence intervals provide an indication of the "range within which the population is likely to be" (Lipsey and Wilson, 2001: 114). If the 95% confidence interval does not include zero, the population mean effect size is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Avoiding Publication Bias. In addition to seeking out unpublished studies, a "fail-safe N" statistic was generated to address the "file drawer problem" often encountered in meta-analytic studies (Hunter and Schmidt, 1990). The fail-safe N provides an estimate of the number of studies hidden in a file drawer (i.e., missing from the literature search) with a null effect size that would be required to reduce the estimated population correlation to a non-significant statistical level.

Main Effects Coding. Coding for variables was completed and cross-verified by team members, then verified by an independent evaluator. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion and consensual agreement by the research team. When dichotomous variable coding was not clearly detailed in the original research, an attempt was made through analysis of the sample mean and sample size/composition to define the coding. When no definitive agreement could be reached, the sample was excluded for evaluation of the variable in question.

RESULTS

Internal consistency is an important aspect of the construct validation process (Netemeyer *et al.*, 2003); therefore, an investigation of the reliability estimates of the POP scale was conducted. Internal consistency estimates were used to measure perceptions of organizational politics. Kacmar and Ferris (1991) originally developed 40 items to assess perceptions of organizational politics, but ultimately created a 12-item scale to measure. A variety of other measures have been developed, largely based upon the original 40 items. For example, Ferris and Kacmar (1992) used both a five-item scale ($\alpha = 0.74$) and a 31-item scale ($\alpha = 0.91$). More recently, Kacmar and Carlson (1997) developed a 15-item measure with a reported reliability of 0.87 and Parker *et al.* (1995) used a six-item measure with a reliability score of 0.76. However, the literature review revealed that the most commonly used scale for assessing perceptions of organizational politics is the 12-item scale originally developed by Kacmar and Ferris (1991). In the studies included in this meta-analysis, the reliability scores for this scale ranged from 0.77 to 0.93 with an average score of 0.88. Since the 12-item measure appears to meet the benchmark for established scale reliability suggested by Nunnally (1978), this scale appears to be an acceptable alternative to longer scales and can be used with some degree of confidence.

Twenty-four variables were extracted with four or more studies available for the meta-analysis, although span of control ($K = 3$) was also included because of its prominence in early theoretical models. Based on the seminal early theoretical studies (e.g., Ferris *et al.*, 1989; Parker *et al.*, 1995) and more recent literature reviews (e.g., Ferris *et al.*, 2002), each variable was placed under different antecedent categories. Out of these 25 variables, five were organizational antecedents, ten were job/work environment antecedents, and ten were personal antecedents.

Table 1 includes the results for the antecedents of perceptions of organizational politics. With regard to organizational antecedents, the results do not indicate any statistically significant relationship between hierarchical level and POP ($p = 0.05$) or span of control and POP ($p = 0.07$). On the other hand, centralization ($p = 0.53$) and formalization ($p = -0.18$) are related as hypothesized by the original model. In addition, procedural justice ($p = -0.59$) also exhibits a statistically significant negative relationship with perceptions of politics.

The results of the analyses examining job/work environment antecedents show that all ten variables exhibit statistically significant relationships. Although autonomy ($p = -0.27$), feedback ($p = -0.32$), skill variety ($p = -0.18$), and cooperation ($p = -0.32$) exhibit low to moderate magnitude relationships with POP, the remaining job/work environment antecedents exhibit substantially stronger relationships with POP (i.e., opportunity for advancement, $p = -0.50$; trust, $p = -0.64$; leader-member exchange, $p = -0.58$; participation in decision-making, $p = -0.57$; met expectations, $p = -0.61$; and opportunities for career development, $p = -0.65$).

With regard to the results for the final group of antecedents, namely personal influences, none of the demographic variables — age ($p = -0.03$), gender ($p = 0.00$), education ($p = -0.02$), and minority status ($p = 0.01$) — show any significant relationships with POP other than tenure ($p = 0.05$). However, the study finds moderately strong to strong relationships between Machiavellianism ($p = -0.42$), external locus of control ($p = 0.31$), positive affect ($p = -0.31$), negative affect ($p = 0.41$), and POP. The results show no statistically significant relationship between self-monitoring and perceptions of politics ($p = -0.04$).

Table 1
Meta-Analytic Results for Perceptions of Organizational Politics Relationships

Variable	K	N	\bar{r}	P	Corrected Variance	Artifact Variance	% Artifact Variance	Credibility Interval	95% Confidence Interval	Fail Safe N
Organizational										
Centralization	7	5,062	0.43	0.53	0.011743	0.001347	12%	(0.33 0.73)	(0.45 0.73)	297
Formalization	12	6,258	-0.15	-0.18	0.026626	0.002900	11%	(-0.48 0.12)	(-0.27 -0.09)	162
Hierarchical Level	11	6,216	0.06	0.07	0.015736	0.002073	13%	(-0.16 0.30)	(-0.01 0.14)	NA
Span of Control	3	619	0.07	0.07	0.001690	0.005596	100%	0.07	(-0.01 0.15)	NA
Procedural Justice	13	3,238	-0.50	-0.59	0.011262	0.003217	29%	(-0.77 -0.42)	(-0.65 -0.54)	634
Job/Work Environment										
Autonomy	12	3,874	-0.23	-0.27	0.019200	0.003863	20%	(-0.52 -0.03)	(-0.35 -0.20)	266
Feedback	9	4,997	-0.27	-0.32	0.063231	0.002260	4%	(-0.80 0.16)	(-0.48 -0.16)	230
Skill Variety	4	1,755	-0.15	-0.18	0.003014	0.003105	100%	-0.18	(-0.22 -0.13)	NA
Advancement Opportunity	8	6,685	-0.43	-0.50	0.048772	0.001099	2%	(-0.93 -0.07)	(-0.65 -0.35)	334
Trust	7	1,987	-0.55	-0.64	0.050431	0.002295	5%	(-1.00 -0.21)	(-0.80 -0.47)	380
Leader-Member Exchange	11	4,640	-0.49	-0.58	0.010088	0.001913	19%	(-0.75 -0.40)	(-0.63 -0.52)	529
Cooperation	6	6,039	-0.27	-0.32	0.010861	0.001254	2%	(-0.84 0.20)	(-0.53 -0.11)	153
Participation in Decision-Making	10	5,373	-0.45	-0.57	0.023371	0.001725	7%	(-0.83 -0.25)	(-0.63 -0.45)	438
Met Expectations	5	1,090	-0.50	-0.61	0.004465	0.003855	86%	(-0.66 -0.56)	(-0.65 -0.57)	245
Development Opportunity	5	4,783	-0.53	-0.65	0.010737	0.000803	8%	(-0.8 -0.46)	(-0.74 -0.56)	261
Personal										
Age	47	18,229	-0.02	-0.03	0.007822	0.003088	40%	(-0.16 0.11)	(-0.0 0.00)	NA
Gender	35	15,832	0.00	0.00	0.009662	0.002607	27%	(-0.16 0.17)	(-0.03 0.03)	NA
Tenure	42	15,309	0.05	0.05	0.007485	0.003153	42%	(-0.08 0.18)	(0.02 0.08)	155
Education	13	5,979	-0.02	-0.02	0.013890	0.002855	21%	(-0.23 0.19)	(-0.08 0.04)	NA
Minority Status	8	5,058	0.00	0.01	0.004417	0.001920	44%	(-0.09 0.10)	(-0.04 0.05)	NA
Machiavellianism	8	10,706	0.34	0.42	0.009471	0.000914	10%	(0.24 0.61)	(0.36 0.49)	263
Self Monitoring	5	632	-0.04	-0.04	0.008343	0.011782	100%	-0.04	(-0.1 0.03)	NA
Locus of Control-External	8	8,919	0.26	0.31	0.022067	0.001078	5%	(0.02 0.59)	(0.21 0.41)	202
Positive Affect	14	7,225	-0.27	-0.31	0.003835	0.002159	56%	(-0.39 -0.23)	(-0.34 -0.28)	370
Negative Affect	13	6,802	0.36	0.41	0.014761	0.001895	13%	(0.19 0.63)	(0.35 0.48)	456

Note. K = number of studies; N = total sample size; \bar{r} bar = average observed effect size; \bar{r} bar = r bar corrected for measurement error in both the predictor and the criterion; Corrected Observed Variance = observed variance in corrected correlations; Artifact Variance = variance in corrected correlations attributable to all artifacts.

Overall, the results also suggest that moderators are present in most of the relationships because of the relatively low amount of variance explained by sampling and measurement error. The only relationships with perceptions of politics that were found to exceed the "75% rule" are span of control, skill variety, met expectations, and self-monitoring.

DISCUSSION

The results of the present study confirm many, but not all, of Ferris *et al.*'s (2002) broad conclusions about the predictive validity of the theoretical predictors of perceptions of organizational politics. However, because the analysis presented here is based upon meta-analysis and substantially more studies than reviewed by Ferris *et al.* (2002), the results of this study provide a much more informed understanding of the antecedent framework which has guided organizational politics research for the past two decades.

Overall, the results indicate that eighteen of the twenty-five antecedents examined exhibit a statistically significant relationship with perceptions of organizational politics, although one variable has no practical significance (i.e., tenure, $p = 0.05$). Five of these antecedents are new variables which Ferris *et al.* (2002) added to Ferris *et al.*'s (1989) original model to guide future research (i.e., participation in decision-making, met expectations, development opportunities, positive affect, and negative affect). Therefore, one contribution of this study is that it represents the first integration of empirical literature examining these newer antecedents and the results. In contrast, the results show hierarchical level, span of control, age, gender, education, minority status, and self-monitoring exhibit no statistically significant relationship with perceptions of politics. These results support Ferris *et al.*'s (2002) decision to remove demographic variables from the antecedent model. While the results reported here indicate that Ferris *et al.* (2002) reached many of the right conclusions in revising the antecedent model, they also indicate that Ferris and colleagues (2002) came to the wrong conclusion in some cases. Based upon the results presented here, one variable that Ferris *et al.* (2002) retained in the revised model should be removed (i.e., hierarchical level), two variables which Ferris *et al.* (2002) removed from the model should be added back (i.e., job autonomy and skill variety), and two variables that were mentioned by Ferris *et al.* (2002) but not added to the model (i.e., trust in coworkers and locus of control) should be incorporated into the antecedent model.

Another important contribution of the present study is that it provides new insight into the relative effect size (i.e., magnitude, not character/sign of relationship) of each antecedent variable. Examination of the confidence intervals for each relationship provides a basis for comparison across antecedents. With regard to the three different categories of antecedents, job/work environment variables are more consistently and, in general, more strongly related to perceptions of politics than those in the organization and personal categories. This general finding is new and not mentioned in the last review of the literature (i.e., Ferris *et al.*, 2002). This general finding is important from a managerial standpoint because the job/work environment variables are those which managers should be most capable of changing (Valle and Perrewé, 2000). With regard to job/work environment influences, the most influential variables are leader member exchange, participation in decision-making, trust in coworkers, met expectations, opportunity for advancement, and opportunity for development. The job design variables (i.e., autonomy, feedback, skill variety) and cooperation appear to have

weaker associations with perceptions of organizational politics than the other job/work environment variables. One interesting result is that opportunity for development is more strongly related to organizational politics than opportunity for advancement. With regard to the organizational influences, centralization and procedural justice appear to be much more strongly related to perceptions of politics than formalization. With regard to personal variables, the results indicate Machiavellianism and negative affect are more closely associated with perceptions of politics than either locus of control or positive affect. However, the Machiavellianism and negative affect relationships are of lesser magnitude than the aforementioned group of influential job/work environment variables (i.e., leader member exchange, participation in decision-making, trust in coworkers, met expectations, opportunity for advancement, and opportunity for development) or centralization. The results for the personality variables suggest that researchers who are interested in isolating the influence of organizational and job/work environment influences upon perceptions of politics should consider controlling for the influence of personality.

From a managerial perspective, the findings suggest specific means by which managers might act to reduce perceived organizational politics and its detrimental effects. For example, the results suggest increasing the level of employee involvement in decision-making and developing better social exchange relationships between supervisors and subordinates. The results also suggest that human resource management practices might be useful in reducing perceptions of organizational politics. For example, companies interested in reducing perceptions of politics could place greater emphasis on incorporating higher levels of autonomy, feedback, and skill variety into new/re-designed jobs. Placing a greater emphasis on career planning and training is also likely to reduce perceptions of organizational politics. The strong negative correlation between met expectations and perceptions of politics suggests that managers wishing to reduce the level of perceived organizational politics might also fruitfully incorporate realistic job previews into their recruiting and selection process. Further, the magnitude of the correlations for the personality traits suggests that these variables might also be incorporated into the selection process if managers wish to reduce perceptions of organizational politics. Positive affect and negative affect, for example, are both related to job performance (e.g., Kaplan *et al.*, 2009) which supports their use as valid selection tools.

In general, the results are suggestive of new approaches that might yield new insight into those factors that influence the development of POP. First, for most of the relationships, the results indicate that there are moderators present. This suggests that Ferris *et al.*'s (2002) decision to incorporate moderator variables into their revised model of organizational politics antecedents was an important revision to the model. However, the decision to only incorporate demographic variables as potential moderators is likely to constrain future research; researchers should explore more than just demographic moderator variables providing there is a theoretical foundation for the moderator. Second, many of the variables reported here to be related to POP are associated with key elements of High Performance Work Systems (Appelbaum *et al.*, 2000; Zachartos *et al.*, 2007). For example, autonomy, feedback, promotion opportunities, participation in decision-making, procedural justice, leader-member exchange, and formalization map neatly onto the factors that are generally discussed as comprising a high-performance work system (HPWS). Accordingly, it seems likely that those firms that have adopted high performance work practices will actually reduce the overall level of perceived

organizational politics. This is a potentially important insight in that there has been some discussion about the need for developing an organization-level model of POP (e.g., Dipboye and Foster, 2002); however, not much has been done in establishing a theoretical foundation for this research. The authors could find no research examining the relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and specific types of HR systems or different “bundles” of HR practices, although Ferris *et al.* (1998) broadly discuss a potential relationship between organizational politics and human resource management systems. Accordingly, it seems that a focus upon high performance work systems as a potential means of reducing organizational politics might be a fruitful area for future research.

LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

A few of the current analyses are based upon a relatively small number of samples which raises questions about the stability of the results for these analyses. A general rule of thumb in meta-analysis is that any analysis with fewer than five studies or less than 1,000 observations may provide somewhat unstable estimates. In the end, three of the 25 analyses did not meet these minimum criteria (span of control, skill variety, and self-monitoring). However, because these antecedents are all critical components of early theoretical models, they were included in the results. However, these results should be viewed with some degree of caution. Failsafe Ns also provide some indication of the stability of each analysis. It is important to know that the number of studies reviewed in the analyses presented here is no smaller than the number of studies used in other initial integrations of a literature stream (e.g., Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002).

In short, the present study is the first with enough power to be considered a basis for managerial action. The results suggest specific courses of action that organizations might take to reduce the perceptions of organizational politics and its deleterious effects. However, this study is only a beginning. As more research is conducted, meta-analysis can be used to examine new variables (e.g., authentic leadership and other personality variables) and thereby identify additional ways for organizations to reduce perceptions of organizational politics.

References

References marked with * indicate the studies included in the meta-analysis.

- *Adams, G. L., D. C. Treadway, and L. P. Stepina. 2008. “The Role of Dispositions in Politics Perception Formation: The Predictive Capacity of Negative and Positive Affectivity, Equity Sensitivity, and Self-Efficacy.” *Journal of Managerial Issues* 20 (4): 545-63.
- *Andrews, M. C. and K. M. Kacmar. 2001. “Discriminating among Organizational Politics, Justice, and Support.” *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 22 (June): 347-66.
- *_____, L. A. Witt, and K. M. Kacmar. 2003. “The Interactive Effects of Organizational Politics and Exchange Ideology on Manager Ratings of Retention.” *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 64 (December): 357-69.
- Appelbaum, E., T. Bailey, P. Berg, and A. L. Kalleberg. 2000. *Manufacturing Advantage: Why High Performance Work Systems Pay Off*. NY: Cornell University Press.
- *Aryee, S., Z. X. Chen, and P. S. Budhwar. 2004. “Exchange Fairness and Employee

- Performance: An Examination of the Relationship Between Organizational Politics and Procedural Justice." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 94 (May): 1-14.
- *Bencaz, N. A. 2008. "The Impact of Organizational Politics on Mentoring Relationships." Dissertation. University of Central Florida.
- *Breux, D. M., T. P. Munyon, W. A. Hochwarter, and G. R. Ferris. 2009. "Politics as a Moderator of the Accountability-Job Satisfaction Relationship: Evidence across Three Studies." *Journal of Management* 35: 307-26.
- *Byrne, Z. S. 2005a. "Fairness Reduces the Negative Effect of Organizational Politics on Turnover Intentions, Citizenship Behavior and Job Performance." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 20 (December): 175-99.
- *_____, C. Kacmar, J. Stoner, and W. Hochwarter. 2005b. "The Relationship Between Perceptions of Politics and Depressed Mood at Work: Unique Moderators Across Three Levels." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 10 (4): 330-343.
- Chang, C. H., C. C. Rosen, and P. E. Levy. 2009. "The Relationship between Perceptions of Politics and Employee Attitudes, Strain, and Behavior: A Meta-analytic Examination." *Academy of Management Journal* 52: 779-801.
- *Chang, H. 2008. "The Antecedents of Politics Perceptions of Organizational Members – A Cross-level Analysis of Both Individual and Overall Levels." Thesis, National Sun Yat-sen University.
- *Chang, P. 2003. "The Perception of Organizational Politics and the Reason of Perception of Organizational Politics for Public and Private Enterprises." Thesis, National Sun Yat-sen University.
- Chatman, J. A. and S. G. Barsade. 1995. "Personality, Organizational Culture, and Cooperation: Evidence from a Business Simulation." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 40 (September): 423-43.
- *Chen, Y. Y. and W. C. Fang. 2008. "The Moderating Effect of Impression Management on the Organizational Politics-Performance Relationship." *Journal of Business Ethics* 79 (May): 263-77.
- *Chivakidakarn, Y. 2000. "Perceptions of Organizational Politics: A Comparison of Local Thai Companies and Multinational Corporations in Thailand." Dissertation. Nova Southeastern University.
- *Christiansen, N., P. Villanova, and S. Mikulay. 1997. "Political Influence Compatibility: Fitting the Person to the Climate." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 18 (November): 709-30.
- *Collins, B. J. 2008. "One Size Does Not Fit All: Nurturing or Neglecting the Nature of an Individual's Core Self-Evaluation." Dissertation. University of Alabama.
- Connolly, J. J. and C. Viswesvaran. 2000. "The Role of Affectivity in Job Satisfaction: A Meta-analysis." *Personality and Individual Differences* 29 (August): 265-81.
- *Cropanzano, R., J. C. Howes, A. A. Grandey, and P. Toth. 1997. "The Relationship of Organizational Politics and Support to Work Behaviors, Attitudes, and Stress." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 18 (March): 159-80.
- *Darr, W. and G. Johns. 2004. "Political Decision-Making Climates: Theoretical Processes and Multi-level Antecedents." *Human Relations* 57 (February): 169-200.
- Dipboye, R. L. and J. B. Foster. 2002. "Multi-level Theorizing about Perceptions of Organizational Politics." Chapter in *Research in Multi-level Issues Volume 1: The Many Faces of Multi-Level Issues*. Eds. F.J. Yammarino and F. Dansereau. Kidlington, OX: Elsevier Science. pp. 179-254.

- *Doucet, O., M. Lapalme, and G. Simard. 2009. "Leader and Context Influences on Employees' Perception of Organizational Politics." Paper presented at the 2009 Academy of Management meeting, Chicago, IL (paper available upon request).
- *Drory, A. 1993. "Perceived Political Climate and Job Attitudes." *Organization Studies* 14: 59-71.
- _____ and T. Romm. 1990. "The Definition of Organizational Politics: A Review." *Human Relations* 43 (November): 1133-54.
- Ferris, G. R., G. Adams, R. W. Kolodinsky, W. A. Hochwarter, and A. P. Ammeter. 2002. "Perceptions of Organizational Politics: Theory and Research Directions." Chapter in *Research in Multi-level Issues Volume 1: The Many Faces of Multi-Level Issues*. Eds. F.J. Yammarino and F. Dansereau. Kidlington, OX: Elsevier Science. pp. 179-254.
- _____, M. M. Arthur, H. M. Berkson, D. M. Kaplan, G. Harrell-Cook, and D. D. Frink. 1998. "Toward a Social Context Theory of Human Resource Management-Organization Effectiveness Relationship." *Human Resource Management Review* 8 (Autumn): 235-64.
- _____, J. F. Brand, S. Brand, K. M. Rowland, D. C. Gilmore, T. R. King, K. M. Kacmar, and C. A. Burton. 1993. "Politics and Control in Organizations." *Advances in Group Processes* 10: 83-111.
- *_____, D. D. Frink, D. P. S. Bhawuk, J. Zhou, and D. C. Gilmore. 1996a. "Reactions of Diverse Groups to Politics in the Workplace." *Journal of Management* 22 (Spring): 23-44.
- *_____, _____, M. C. Galang, J. Zhou, K. M. Kacmar, and J. L. Howard. 1996b. "Perceptions of Organizational Politics: Prediction, Stress-related Implications, and Outcomes." *Human Relations* 42 (February): 233-66.
- _____, G. Harrell-Cook, and J. H. Dulebohn. 2000. "Organizational Politics: The Nature of the Relationship between Politics Perceptions and Political Behavior." In: *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 17: 89-130.
- *_____ and K. M. Kacmar. 1992. "Perceptions of Organizational Politics." *Journal of Management* 18 (March): 93-116.
- _____ and T. R. King. 1991. "Politics in Human Resource Decisions: A Walk on the Dark Side." *IEEE Engineering Management Review* 20: 52-9.
- _____, G. S. Russ, and P. M. Fandt. 1989. "Politics in Organizations." In: *Impression Management in the Organization*. Ed. Giacalone, Robert A. and P.L.E. Rosenfeld, NJ: Hillsdale.
- *Ford, J. M. 1996. "Organizational Politics and Multisource Feedback." Dissertation. Louisiana State University.
- *Gandz, J. M. and V. Murray. 1980. "The Experience of Workplace Politics." *Academy of Management Journal* 23 (June): 237-51.
- *Gilmore, D. C., G. R. Ferris, J. H. Dulebohn, and G. Harrell-Cook. 1996. "Organizational Politics and Employee Attendance." *Group and Organization Management* 21 (December): 481-94.
- Graen, G. 1976. "Role-making Processes Within Complex Organizations." In: *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Ed. Dunnette, M.D. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Hall, S. M. and M. T. Brannick. 2002. "Comparison of Two Random Effects Methods of Meta-analysis." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87 (April): 377-89.
- *Harris, H. L. and T. P. Munyon. 2009. "Developing Organizational Commitment in Political Environments: An Empirical Investigation." Paper presented at the 2009

- Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, Illinois (paper available upon request).
- *Harris, K. J., M. James, and R. Boonthanom. 2005. "Perceptions of Organizational Politics and Cooperation as Moderators of the Relationship between Job Strains and Intent to Turnover." *Journal of Managerial Issues* 17 (1): 26-42.
- *_____ and K. M. Kacmar. 2005. "Easing the Strain: The Buffer Role of Supervisors in the Perceptions of Politics-strain Relationship." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 78 (September): 337-54.
- *Harris, R. B., M. C. Andrews, and K. M. Kacmar. 2007a. "The Moderating Effects of Justice on the Relationship between Organizational Politics and Workplace Attitudes." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 22: 135-144.
- *_____, K. J. Harris, and P. Harvey. 2007b. "A Test of Competing Models of the Relationships among Perceptions of Organizational Politics, Perceived Organizational Support, and Individual Outcomes." *Journal of Social Psychology* 147: 631-55.
- *Hochwarter, W. A., M. James, D. Johnson, and G. R. Ferris. 2004. "The Interactive Effects of Politics Perceptions and Trait Cynicism on Work Outcomes." *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 10 (4): 44-57.
- *_____, C. Kacmar, P. L. Perrewe, and D. Johnson. 2003a. "Perceived Organizational Support as a Mediator of the Relationship between Politics Perceptions and Work Outcomes." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 63 (February): 438-456.
- *_____, C. Kiewitz, S. L. Castro, P. L. Perrewe, and G. R. Ferris. 2003b. "Positive Affectivity and Collective Efficacy as Moderators of the Relationship between Perceived Politics and Job Satisfaction." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 33 (5): 1009-35.
- *_____ and D. C. Treadway. 2003c. "The Interactive Effects of Negative and Positive Affect on the Politics Perceptions-Job Satisfaction Relationship." *Journal of Management* 29: 551-67.
- *Howell, S. K. 2005. "Adaptive Self-regulation and Organizational Politics: Investigating the Effects in the Accounting Profession." Dissertation. University of Central Florida.
- *Huang, I. C., C. H. J. Chuang, and H. C. Lin. 2003. "The Role of Burnout in the Relationship Between Perceptions of Organizational Politics and Turnover Intentions." *Public Personnel Management* 32 (Winter): 519-31.
- Hunter, J. E. and F. L. Schmidt. 2004. *Methods of Meta-Analysis: Correcting Error and Bias in Research Findings* (Second Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- _____ and _____. 1990. *Methods of Meta-Analysis: Correcting Error and Bias in Research Findings* (First Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- *Innes, P. B. 2004. "The Influence of Leadership on Perceptions of Organizational Politics, Job Involvement, and Organizational Commitment." Dissertation. Regent University.
- *James, M. 2005. "Antecedents and Consequences of Cynicism in Organizations: An Examination of the Potential Positive and Negative Effect on School Systems." Dissertation. Florida State University.
- *_____, D. C. Treadway, D. C. Conner, and W. A. Hochwarter. 2005. "The Interactive Effects of Positive Affect and a Sense of Competency on the Politics Perceptions-Job Satisfaction Relationship." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 35: 798-820.
- Kacmar, K. M. and R. A. Baron. 1999. "Organizational Politics: The State of the Field, Links to Related Processes, and an Agenda for Future Research." Chapter in *Research*

- in Personnel Human Resource Management*. Ed. G. R. Ferris. Amsterdam: JAI Press. Pp.1-39.
- * _____, D. P. Bozeman, D. S. Carlson, and W. P. Anthony. 1999. "An Examination of the Perceptions of Organizational Politics Model: Replication and Extension." *Human Relations* 52 (March): 383-415.
- _____ and D. S. Carlson. 1997. "Further Validation of the Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS): A Multi-sample Investigation." *Journal of Management* 23 (5): 627-758.
- * _____, B. J. Collins, K. J. Harris, and T. A. Judge. 2009. "Core Self Evaluations and Job Performance: The Role of the Perceived Work Environment." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94 (6): 1572-1580.
- _____ and G. R. Ferris. 1991. "Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS): Development and Construct Validation." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 51 (Spring): 193-205.
- * _____, S. Zivnuska, and C. D. White. 2007. "Control and Exchange: The Impact of Work Environment on the Work Effort of Low Relationship Quality Employees." *The Leadership Quarterly* 18: 69-84.
- Kaplan, S., J. C. Bradley, J. N. Luchman, and D. Haynes. 2009. "On the Role of Positive and Negative Affectivity in Job Performance: A Meta-analytic Examination." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94: 162-176.
- *Kiewitz, C., S. Restubog, D. Lloyd, T. J. Zagenczyk, and W. A. Hochwarter. 2009. "The Interactive Effects of Psychological Contract Breach and Organizational Politics on Perceived Organizational Support: Evidence from Two Longitudinal Studies." *Journal of Management Studies* 46: 806-34.
- *LaCost, H. A. 2005. "Attributions of Organizational Politics: An Investigation of Locus of Causality, Justice, and Intentionality as Factors in Perceptions of Politics." Dissertation. Northern Illinois University.
- Lepine, J. A., N. P. Podsakoff, M. A. Lepine. 2005. "A Meta-Analytic Test of the Challenge Stressor-Hindrance Stressor Framework: An Explanation for Inconsistent Relationships among Stressors and Performance." *Academy of Management Journal* 48 (5): 764-775.
- Lewin, K. 1936. *Principles of Topological Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- *Lin, W. 2003. "The Reason Formed of Perceptions of Organizational Politics and the Effects of Perception of Organizational Politics on Organizational Citizenship Behavior." Thesis, National Sun Yat-sen University.
- *Linton, L. L. 2003. "Explaining the Relationship between Politics Perceptions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Dimensional Approach." Dissertation. Central Michigan University.
- Lipsey, M. W. and D. B. Wilson. 2001. *Practical Meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- *Liu, C. 2002. "Perceptions of Organizational Politics: An Investigation of Antecedents." Thesis, National Sun Yat-sen University.
- *Miller, B. K. and K. M. Nichols. 2008. "Politics and Justice: A Mediated Moderation Model." *Journal of Managerial Issues* 20: 214-37.
- _____, M. A. Rutherford, and R. W. Kolodinsky. 2008. "Perceptions of Organizational Politics: A Meta-Analysis of Outcomes." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 22 (March): 209-22.
- Mintzberg, H. 1983. *Power in and Around Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-

Hall.

- *Muhammad, A. H. 2007. "Antecedents of Organizational Politics Perceptions in Kuwait Business Organizations." *Competitiveness Review* 17 (4): 234-47.
- Netemeyer, R. G., W. O. Bearden, and S. Sharma. 2003. *Scaling Procedures: Issues and Applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nunnally, J. C. 1978. *Psychometric Theory*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- *O'Conner, W. E. and T. G. Morrison. 2001. "A Comparison of Situational and Dispositional Predictors of Perceptions of Organizational Politics." *Journal of Psychology* 135 (May): 301-12.
- *Parker, C. P. 1995. "An Assessment of Constructs Underlying Perceptions of the Work Environment and their Correspondence with Current Models of Psychological Climate." Dissertation. Rice University.
- *_____, R. L. Dipboye, and S. L. Jackson. 1995. "Perceptions of Organizational Politics: An Investigation of Antecedents and Consequences." *Journal of Management* 21 (5): 891-912.
- *Phillips, C. U. 2004. "An Assessment of the Factors That Affect the Level of Perception of Office Politics." Dissertation. Lynn University.
- *Poon, J. M. L. 2006. "Trust-in-Supervisor and Helping Coworkers: Moderating Effect of Perceived Politics." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 21 (6): 518-32.
- *_____. 2003. "Situational Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Politics Perceptions." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 18 (2): 138-55.
- Rhoades, L. and R. Eisenberger. 2002. "Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87 (August): 698-714.
- *Rosen, C. C., C. Chang, and P. E. Levy. 2005. "Personality and Politics Perceptions: A New Conceptualization and Illustration using OCBs." Chapter in *Handbook of Organizational Politics* pp. 29-52.
- *_____, C. H. Chang, R. E. Johnson, and P. E. Levy. 2009a. "Perceptions of Organizational Context a Psychological Contract Breach: Assessing Competing Perspectives." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 108: 202-17.
- *_____, K. J. Harris, and K. M. Kacmar. 2009b. "The Emotional Implications of Organizational Politics: A Process Model." *Human Relations* 62: 27-57.
- *_____, P. E. Levy, and R. J. Hall. 2006. "Placing Perceptions of Politics in the Context of the Feedback Environment, Employee Attitudes, and Job Performance." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 91 (January): 211-20.
- *Shin, S. and F. Yuan. 2009. "When the True Color Shines: Creative Self-efficacy and Employee Creativity in China." Paper presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, Illinois (paper available upon request).
- Thibaut, J. and L. Walker. 1975. *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Treadway, D. C., G. L. Adams, and J. M. Goodman. 2005b. "The Formation of Political Sub-Climates: Predictions from Social Identity, Structuration, and Symbolic Interaction." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 20 (Winter):201-219.
- *_____, G. R. Ferris, W. A. Hochwarter, P. Perrewe, L. A. Witt, and J. M. Goodman. 2005a. "The Role of Age in the Perceptions of Politics – Job Performance Relationship: A Three-study Constructive Replication." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 90 (September): 872-81.
- *Tseng, S. 2002. "What Roles Three Factors: Personal Factor, Organizational Factor, and Environmental Factor Play During the Process of Perceptions of Organizational

- Politics Forming.” Thesis, National Sun Yat-sen University.
- *Valle, M., K. M. Kacmar, and S. Zivnuska. 2003. “Self Efficacy, Outcome Expectations and Organizational Politics Perceptions.” *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management* 5: 18-30.
- *_____ and P. L. Perrewe. 2000. “Do Politics Perceptions Relate to Political Behaviors? Tests of an Implicit Assumption and Expanded Model.” *Human Relations* 53 (March): 359-86.
- *_____ and L. A. Witt. 2001. “The Moderating Effect of Teamwork Perceptions on the Organizational Politics-Job Satisfaction Relationship.” *Journal of Social Psychology* 141 (3): 379-88.
- *_____, L. A. Witt, and W. A. Hochwarter. 2002. “Dispositions and Organizational Politics Perceptions: The Influence of Positive and Negative Affectivity.” *Journal of Management Research* 2 (3): 122-28.
- Vigoda, E. 2003. *Developments in Organizational Politics*. Northhampton, MA: E. Elgar.
- *_____. 2002. “Stress-related Aftermaths to Workplace Politics: The Relationships among Politics, Job Distress, and Aggressive Behavior in Organizations.” *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23 (August): 571-91.
- *_____. 2001. “Reactions to Organizational Politics: A Cross-cultural Examination in Israel and Britain.” *Human Relations* 54 (11): 1483-1518.
- *_____ and A. Cohen. 2003. “Work Congruence and Excellence in Human Resource Management: Empirical Evidence from the Israeli Nonprofit Sector.” *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 23: 1-24.
- *_____ and _____. 2002. “Influence Tactics and Perceptions of Organizational Politics: A Longitudinal Study.” *Journal of Business Research* 55: 311-24.
- *Vigoda-Gadot, E. 2007. “Leadership Style, Organizational Politics, and Employees’ Performance. An Empirical Examination of Two Competing Models.” *Personnel Review* 36: 661-83.
- *_____ and G. Meisler. 2010. “Emotions in Management and the Management of Emotions: The Impact of Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Politics on Public Sector Employees.” *Public Administration Review* 70 (January): 72-86.
- *_____ and I. Talmud. 2008. “Organizational Politics and Job Performance: The Moderating Effect of Social Capital.” Paper presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, California (paper available upon request).
- *_____, H. Vinarski-Peretz, and E. Ben-Zion. 2003. “Politics and Image in the Organizational Landscape.” *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 18: 764-787.
- *Wheeler, A. R., J. R. B. Halbesleben, and C. J. Sablinski. 2008. “The Moderating Role of POPS in the Job Embeddedness-Job Performance Relationship.” Paper presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, California (paper available upon request).
- Whitener, E. M. 1990. “Confusion of Confidence Intervals and Credibility Intervals in Meta-analysis.” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 75 (June): 315-21.
- *Wilson, J. W. 2000. “The Relation of Individual Political Behavior, Perceptions of Organizational Politics, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Integrating Organizational Justice.” Dissertation. University of Houston.
- *Witt, L. A., M. C. Andrews, and K. M. Kacmar. 2000. “The Role of Participation in Decision-making in the Organizational Politics-Job Satisfaction Relationship.” *Human Relations* 53 (3): 341-58.
- *_____, K. M. Kacmar, D. S. Carlson, and S. Zivnuska. 2002. “Interactive Effects

- of Personality and Organizational Politics on Contextual Performance.” *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23 (December): 911-26.
- * _____, D. C. Treadway, and G. R. Ferris. 2004. “The Role of Age in Reaction to Organizational Politics Perceptions.” *Organizational Analysis* 21 (1): 39-52.
- *Yang, C. 2003. “Perceptions of Organizational Politics Model Examination and Reform: The Affect of Clusters.” Thesis, National Sun Yat-sen University.
- Yang, K. 2009. “Examining Perceived Honest Performance Reporting by Public Organizations: Bureaucratic Politics and Organizational Practice.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19 (1): 81-105.
- *Yang, S. 2002. “The Types of Perception of Organizational Politics and the Reason of the Types of Perception of Organizational Politics.” Thesis, National Sun Yat-sen University.
- *Yen, W., S. Chen, S. Yen. 2009. “The Impact of Perceptions of Organizational Politics on Workplace Friendship.” *African Journal of Business Management* 3 (10): 548-554.
- Zachartos, A., M. S. Hershcovis, N. Turner, and J. Barling. 2007. “Human Resource Management in the North American Auto Industry.” *Personnel Review* 36 (2): 231-54.
- *Zellars, K. L. and J. Fiorito. 1999. “Evaluations of Organizational Effectiveness among HR Managers: Cues and Implications.” *Journal of Managerial Issues* 11: 37-55.
- *Zivnuska, S., K. M. Kacmar, L. A. Witt, D. S. Carlson, and V. K. Bratton. 2004. “Interactive Effects of Impression Management and Organizational Politics on Job Performance.” *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 25: 627-64.

a survey (n = 1,875) measuring five discrete dimensions of perceptual PE fit (Person-Organization, Person-People, Person-Job, Person-Group, and Person-Vocation) and three outcomes (organizational commitment, intention to leave, and job satisfaction). The first sequence of analysis tested the proposed model using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) statistical approaches. Model comparisons showed that Jansen and Kristof-Brown's (2006) original model in which the five dimensions of fit coalesce into a multidimensional construct was a poor fit with the data, but that a model in which the five dimensions of fit operate independently fit the data well. The second sequence of analysis found that the model without the multidimensional construct strongly predicted the outcomes of commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to leave. This paper discusses the implication of this research in relation to the PE fit literature.

Perceptions of Organizational Politics: A Meta-Analysis of Theoretical Antecedents 494
Guclu Atinc, Mahmoud Darrat, Bryan Fuller, and Barry W. Parker

This study presents a quantitative review of research examining variables thought to influence the development of perceptions of organizational politics (POP). The results provide support for most of the relationships proposed in theoretical models (e.g., Ferris *et al.*, 1989; Ferris *et al.*, 2002). Job/work environment influences are found to have the strongest and most consistent relationship with politics perceptions (e.g., trust, participation in decision-making, leader-member exchange, met expectations, and opportunity for development). Organizational influences which are found to be related to perceptions of organizational politics include centralization, formalization, and procedural justice. Demographic variables are found to have little or no relationship with politics perceptions, although personality variables (i.e., Machiavellianism, locus of control, positive affect, and negative affect) exhibit moderate to moderately strong relationships.

Research Report

The Relationship between Accounting and Market Measures of Firm Financial Performance: How Strong Is It? 513
Richard J. Gentry and Wei Shen

This study addresses an important ongoing debate in the management literature about the relationship between accounting and market measures of firm financial performance, namely, whether it is sufficiently strong so that researchers can treat them as equivalent, interchangeable indicators of firm financial performance. Using annual financial data from all the publicly traded U.S. firms in the COMPUSTAT database from 1961 to 2008, this study finds that, although measures of accounting profitability and market performance are positively correlated across industries, their

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.