UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

ORGANISATIONAL POLITICS IN CAPE COAST POLYTECHNIC: CAUSES,

PREVENTION AND MANAGEMENT

BY

VIVIAN HANNAH ATTAH

Dissertation submitted to the Department of Human Resource Management, School of Business, College of Humanities and Legal Studies University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Master of Business Administration Degree in Human Resource Management.

DECEMBER 2016

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby declare that this dissertation is the result of my own original work and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Candidate's Signature ……………………… Date………………………

Name: Vivian Hannah Attah

Supervisor's Declaration

I hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the dissertation was supervised in accordance with guidelines on supervision of dissertation laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Supervisor's Signature ……………………… Date…………………………

Name: Mr. John E. Seddoh

ABSTRACT

Organisational politics plays a large role in how most organisations function and develop. Thus, organisational politics is an unavoidable factor at the workplace, and has so many influences on the affairs and behaviour of employees in an organisation. It is in recognition of these facts that an effort was made in this research to find out the causes, prevention and management of organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic. The target population for the study consisted of employees (teaching and non-teaching staff) of the Cape Coast Polytechnic. Stratified random sampling method was used in selecting both the teaching and non-teaching staff. Questionnaires as well as structured interviews were used to gather data from respondents. Statistical tools used to analyse the data included frequencies, percentages, means and T-tests. The findings revealed that unclear job descriptions, power struggle, favouritism, competition and inadequate information were responsible for organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic. It was concluded that organisational politics, if not managed appropriately could create a hostile organisational environment which would hamper the growth of the organisation. It was therefore recommended that both Management and employees set aside their personal interests and go along with the mission and vision of the organisation for the achievement of stated goals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am sincerely grateful to my supervisor, Mr. John E. Seddoh for his guidance, assistance, encouragement, patience and advice during the process of putting this piece of work together.

My sincere thanks also go to the staff of Cape Coast Polytechnic for their assistance. I also like to thank Mr. Benjamin Edu Mensah and Mr. OseiAkotoof Cape Coast Polytechnic for taking time to proof read my initial work and offer their invaluable comments.

DEDICATION

To my family and loved ones.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

x

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Backgroundof the Study

Organisational politics is endemic to organisations, people come to work situations with many goals not just one unified goal. These goals invoke conflict and competition among workers in the organisation. Chaudhary et al. (2012) observed that organisational politics involves amassing organisational power for personal benefits, rather than organisational objectives. George & Jones (2011) accepted that organisational politics can be dysfunctional to the organisational but when organisational interest integrates with employee interests and when used for the benefit of the organisation then it can be functional and advantageous for the organisation.Some of the personal advantages may include access to either tangible or intangible benefits such as statusor pseudo-authority that influences the behavior of others (Dwyer, 2007).Both individuals and groups may engage in office politics which can be highly destructive, as people focus on personal gains at the expense of the organisation. "Self-serving political actions can negatively influence our social groupings, cooperation, information sharing, and many other organisationalfunctions. According to Krackhardt (1990), it is vital to pay attention to organisationalpolitics and create the right political landscape.

According to Bolander (2012), it is self-deceit to believe that one's organisation has no politics. Organisational politics was captured in the words ofSonaike, K. (2013)and the author posits that politics is the lubricantthat oils the

1

organisation's internal gears.When the proper lubricant is applied, things will work fine. When we forget to lubricate it, the organisation will grind to a halt. Thompson (2008) therefore asserted that political action in an organisation focuses on how people use power to affect decision. Organisation members therefore tend to use different methods to secure for themselves as much power aspossible to enhance their position in the organisation, increase their status and ensure their long-term existence.Office politics has also been described as simply how power gets worked out on a practical, day-to-day basis.

Organisations are social entities that involve a struggle for resources, personal conflicts, and a variety of influence tactics are executed by individuals and groups to obtain benefits and goals in different ways (Molm, 1997).Power and politics play a huge role in business, from governing how decisions are made to how employees interact with one another. In businesses big and small, the impact of power depends on whether employees use positive or negative power to influence others in the workplace. Politics may directly influence who has the power and determine whether the overall culture of the workplace encourages productivity. Generally, negative organisational politics stands to minimise the production of an organisations and potentially undermine an organisations ability to function at the most basic levels.Office politics no doubt can affect an employee's work performance because if an employee feels that no matter how hard he works, he will never receive the recognition for his hard work just because he is not in the good graces of his line manager. So he comes to work and does not put in the extra effort to ensure that the organisation grows. This in turn

may affect the organisation's financial turnover and this may lead to layoffs (www.thedailymba.com).

Political behavior refers to "intentional acts from a broad repertoire that may include influence tactics, self-presentation, impression management, voice and helping behavior to manage (create, maintain, modify or abandon) the shared meanings of organisational situations so as to produce desired outcomes that would otherwise be unfeasible" (Kapoutsis&Thanos 2016). However, such activities influence or attempt to influence the distribution of advantages or disadvantage in the organisation. Office politics can affect an employee's job because it encourages jealousy, hypocrisy, cliques, and et cetera among colleagues in the office; this is not ideal for organisations that thrive on teamwork. When people are not united and working for a common goal, conflicts will occur (www.thedailymba.com). If the office administrator spends his or her time settling office disputes, there will be no time left to run the office.Organisational politics is known to have turned friends to foes, caused serious disaffection between teams and made permanent enemies out of erstwhile easy-going individuals.

Politics is described as a necessary evil and someone who never uses political behavior will have a hard time achieving goals. Organisations are made up of people with different values, goals and interest. Due to allocation of limited resources in organisation, not everyone's interest can be satisfied. This creates competition among members (Vigoda-Gadot&Drory2006).The forms of illegitimate political behaviour pose a real risk of losing organisational

3

membership or incurring extreme sanctions. Most people believe political behavior is a major part of organisational life and that certain level of political behaviour is both ethical and necessary as long as it does not directly harm anyone (Kreitner&Kinicki, 2007).

Power and politics play a huge role in organisation, from governing how decisions are made to how employees interact with one another. One of the reasons politics exist in organisation is some employees who do not believe in working hard depend on nasty politics to make their position secure at the workplace. Employees play politics simply to come in the limelight and gain undue attention and appreciation from the seniors. In other words, politics refers to irrational behavior of the individuals at the workplace to obtain advantages which are beyond their control. Nobody has ever gained anything out of politics instead it leads to a negative ambience atthe workplace(www.thedailymba.com).

Aristotle wrote that politics stems from a diversity of interests and those competing interests must be resolved in some way. "Rational" decision making alone may not work when interests are fundamentally incongruent so political behaviours and influence tactics arise. Today, work in organisations requires skill in handling conflicting agendas and shifting power bases. Effective politics is not about winning at all cost but maintaining relationships while achieving results. Although often portrayed negatively, organisational politics are not inherently bad.However,Kotter(2010) stated that without political awareness and skill, we face the inevitable prospect of becoming immersed in bureaucratic infighting, parochial politics and destructive power struggles which greatly retard

4

organisational initiative, innovation, morale and performance. Some view organisational politics as a means for working through conflicts in organisations, and employees use their perception of organisational politics to make sense of the environment they work in (Ladebo, 2006). Others argue that being politically skilled may improve an individual's and the organisation's success, and can facilitate organisational change and adaptation to the environment. Political decisions encourage hypocrisy, secrecy, deal making, rumors, power brokers, self-interests, image building, self-promotion, and cliques which is not a receipt for effective teamwork.Although organisational politics can be destructive, organisations can develop a political culture easy for employees to understand. Establishing clear policies and chains of command makes it easier for employees to find answers they need and spend more time on producing quality work which will also encourage productivity.On the other hand,organisations that develop climates of negativity and conflict will suffer as a result. If employees are encouraged to engage in dishonest or unethical behavior to get ahead and favoritism trumps the quality of work, the organisation faces decreases in productivity and higher turnover rates.

Cape Coast Polytechnic is one of the ten Polytechnics in Ghana established in 1984 and started operation in 1986 to provide middle manpower needs for the country. The Polytechnic has since its establishment, been providing competency-based training to equip students to acquire skills much needed to service industry and commerce. Situated in the regional capital of the Central region, the Polytechnic and its staff are characterised by people with different

religions and geographical background. The Polytechnic as a human institution, has over the years battled with politics and is still putting in all possible efforts to handle this problem so as not to affect the achievement of its goals and objectives.

Statement of the Problem

Organisationalpolitics is a reality which managers and employees usually grapple with and it affects organisational operations (Nyikayaramba&Mutimadye, 2014). Politics is a part of most organisations if not all organisations in some form. Its omnipresent nature requires that it's not only understood but also addressed by managers (Brouer, Harris &Kacmar, 2011). Further, the changes that shape the nature of work in contemporary organisations require managers who can develop the political will, expertise and personal skills to deal with organisational politics (Sibanda et al. 2014).

Thus without sound political awareness and skills, organisations, which include Cape Coast Polytechnic will continue to face the inevitable challenge of being immersed in bureaucratic infighting, parochial politics and destructive power struggles that affects organisational life, initiative, innovation, productivity, morale and performance by unleashing a stressful environment that ultimately retards organisational performance.This research investigates the causes, prevention and management of organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study is to investigate the causes, prevention and management of organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic. The specific objectives of the research were to:

6

1. To find out the causes of organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic.

2. Ascertain the preventive measures put in place by the management of Cape Coast Polytechnic.

3. Identify the extent to which organisational politics affect the performance of employees of Cape Coast Polytechnic.

4. Find out the coping strategies used by employees in managing organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What causes organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic?

2. What strategies are put in place to prevent organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic?

3. How does organisational politics affect the performance of employees in Cape Coast Polytechnic?

4. How do employees in Cape Coast Polytechnic manage in a political environment?

Significance of the Study

The results of this research would be of enormous benefit to the organisation understudy (Cape Coast Polytechnic) and to other organisations as well. This is because the research will bring out the bare facts about the harm politics can cause the organisation in its growth and help minimiseit if not

alleviate the problems that arise from politics in the organisation.Again, officers at the helm of affairs especially, the Managementof Cape Coast Polytechnic will be informed of the positive and negative effects of organisational politics in order to be able to deal with it constructively to help achieve the overall goals of the organisation.

Limitations

One of the limitations worth noting was the lack of co-operation from respondents for fear of being victimised or intimidated hindered getting the appropriate information needed for the study.

Delimitations

The topic under study is "Oranisational Politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic: causes, prevention and management. The study is confined to senior members and senior staff of Cape Coast Polytechnic. Organisationalpolitics is seen in every human institution but the study is confined to only Cape Coast Polytechnic and conclusions may only be applicable to Cape Coast Polytechnic. However, other organisations may adopt the findings of this research.

Organisation of the Study

The study isorganised into five (5) chapters.Chapter one discusses the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, limitations, delimitations and organisation of the study.Chapter two reviews relevant literature related to the study which is examined under four (4) related topics.Chapter three consists of the methodology

8

for the study. This consists of research design, population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instruments, data collection procedure and data analysis plan.Chapter four discusses findings of the study.Chapter fiveconsists of the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATUREREVIEW

Introduction

This chapter reviews literature related to the issues under investigation. Specifically, the chapter focuses onthe concept of organisational politics,causes,prevention and management of organisational politics.

Concepts of Organisational Politics

The literary discourse regarding organisational politics began in the 1970's with a focus on aspects of power and bureaucracy in the work place specifically focused on management and leadership (Drory&Romm, 1988). Mintzberg (1985) acknowledges that the topic received only fragmented exposure in the literature prior to the 1980's and associates the phenomenon primarily with conflict. The initial literary explorations attempted to justify its existence and relevance and struggled with defining the experience (Drory&Romm, 1988). Organisational politics started getting attention when the concept of organisational rationality was challenged because of the emergence of concepts like person-organisation misfit and incompatibility of personal and organisational goals. The concept of organisational rationality was based on the idea that individuals decide their goals by keeping in view the organisational goals and are expected to work for the achievement of their personal goals according to the rules and regulations within the organisation. This existence of conflicting goals

within the organisation gave birth to organisational politics (Vigoda-Gadot, 2000).

Like the unseen elephant in the living room, one knows it is there, even though it is difficult to describe and define. The human relations movement forged new inquiry into the discourse regarding human behavior in the work place. As early as 1938, Chester Barnard described the organisation as a social structure integrating traditional management and behavioral science applications (DeSimone& Harris, 1998). While social scientists explored human behavior, motivation, and need fulfillment in relationship to work, management practices primarily remained modeled after a mechanistic organisational structure. In the late 1970's and early 1980's the social sciences met head on with organisational management methods.

The label "organisationalpolitics" found its way into the literature oforganisationalbehaviour in 1983 in publications by Robbins, Hellrigel, Solcum and Woodman (Drory&Romm, 1998). Notwithstanding this, organisational politics remained relatively undefined. Mintzberg (1985) couples politics with influence when he writes that "politics may be considered to constitute one among a number of systems of influence in the organisation, the others include authority, ideology and experience may be described as legitimate in some sense". Organisational politics has proved to be a significant part of both public and private organisations, therefore researchers argued for the need of further investigation of the issue (Mayes &Allen, 1977; Pfeffer&Pfeffer 1981, 1992; Dubrin, 1988; Mintzberg, 1983; Drory&Romm, 1990; Parker, Dipboye& Jackson,

1995).Once the concept received a label even though undefined, it was ripe turf for grounded theory and hypotheses. The literary dialogue continued with the struggle to define the playing field.

As asserted by Othman (2008), definitions of organisational politics fall into two broad categories. The first is organisational politics as negative and involves self-serving and unsanctioned behaviour. Such behaviours are divisive, illegitimate, dysfunctional and conflict achieving (Gilmore et al, 1996). The second view perceives politics in a more neutral light and accepts that it can sometimes be functional (Kumar &Ghadially, 1989). McShane and Von Glimow (2005) opined that organisational politics is the pursuit of individual agendas and self-interest in an organisation without regard to their effects on the organisation's effort to achieve its goals. Politics is neutral and is not necessarily harmful to the organisation (Daft, 2007). Political action in organisations therefore focuses on how people use power to affect decision making (Thompson, 2008). Studies that have focused on organisational politics have taken different approaches. An extensive bank of knowledge has been accumulated in recent years about organisational politics and their relationship with organisational performance.

Perception of Organisational Politics

Organisational politics can be a nasty business where people promote their own self-interests at the expense of company goals. It can also be secretive and it can cause us to doubt the intentions of other people. Different people perceive the same events differently. One person may find a series of events to be very political with some people benefiting at the expense of others, while another person may not recognise these events as political at all.

Perception "is a process by which individuals organise and interpret their sensory impressions in order to give meaning to their environment" (Robbins et al, 2008). Robbins (1983) concluded that all behavior in organisations is political. However, Drory and Romm found in a 1988 study that organisational politics is more associated with informal than with formal or illegal behaviors. In fact, the Drory and Romm's study found that employees' perception of politics are dependent upon circumstances and that as circumstances or elements of a situation vary so do perceptions regarding the politics.

As asserted by Ferris andKacmar (1992), perception is the way we all interpret our experiences. Having the right perception is a significant skill for any effective leadership. It is important to understand that perception is often portrayed through communication in any organisation be it big or small and therefore, it is a pertinent tool in leadership. Perception of organisational politics consists of an individual's observation of others' self-interestedbehaviours, such as the careful manipulation of organisational policies. However one's perceptions can largely be different from objective reality. In organisations, people behave on

Digitized by UCC, Library

the basis of their perceptions about reality, not reality itself. Ferris et al (1989) emphasised that "organisational politics is a subjective perception but not necessarily an objective reality". The basis for this argument is that even if an individual's perception of politics affect organisational activities and decision making process it is a misperception of actual events, this perception is part of the individuals' views of reality and therefore, will drive their associated cognitive and behavourial responses.

However, perception of organisational politics has negative outcomes and is harmful for employees as well as for organisation (Byrne, 2005). According to the theory of procedural justice as used by (Folger, Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1992; Ferris et al, 1996) in their studies argued that organisational politics is related to the efficiency of human resource systems and to decision-making process. Thus lack of minimal justice and fairness in these systems is found as the main cause of higher perceptions of organisational politics and therefore of hampered organisational outcomes/performance. When employees realise they have not been treatedfairly or justice have not been served them properly, they tend to believe that hard work does not always pay. Such employees with this perception will always want to seek revenge in their own way through organisational politics. This behaviourin turn hinders productivity and also sways the organisation from achieving it goals.

Much of the work related to the perception of organisation politics revolves around the research of Ferris, Russ, and Fandt (1989) who developed a subjective framework of organisational politics which posits that workers

perceiving high levels of organisational politics are dissatisfied with their jobs. They also claimed that workers who are lower in the hierarchy and have an external locus of control experience the organisation as more political. Ferris and Kacmar (1992) embraced an earlier work by Gandz and Murray (1980) who suggested that "rather than exclusively an objective state, it is appropriate to construe organisational politics is a subjective experience and, thus as a state of mind".

Ferris and Kacmar(1992) focused on the "cognitive evaluation and subjective experience of those behaviors and events occurring in the work environment that seem to constitute political behaviors". They proposed a model of organisational politics perception that formed a relationship between organisational, environmental, and personal factors that influence job involvement, job anxiety, job satisfaction, and withdrawal from the organisation. They proposed that perceptions of organisational politics defer in direct relationship to one's position in the hierarchical. An employee at a lower level perceives more politics than those higher in the organisation. Additionally, they proposed that organisations that are more centrally controlled are inherently more political.

Ferris and Kacmar (1992) conducted two separate studies to determine antecedents of organisational politics perceptions. In the first study, they found that feedback, job autonomy, skill variety, and opportunity for promotion correlated with perceptions of organisational politics. Additionally, they found that age, sex or supervisory status did not correlate positively with perceptions of

politics. In the second study, they found that relationship with supervisor, work group cohesion, and opportunity for promotion all were statistically significant for predicting negative relationships with organisational politics perceptions. Interestingly, Ferris and Kacmar found that work group cohesion accounted for the largest variance in job satisfaction. They concluded that,organisational politics perceptions play a role in employee job dissatisfaction, and more specifically, that it is the coworker and clique (political) behavior of politics perceptions that seems to explain this role. This makes sense in light of the critical role coworkers play in influencing employee definition and interpretation of work environmental stimuli.

Ferris and Kacmar's study advanced the research regarding the perceptions of organisational politics by providing correlations to supervisory and coworker behavior as well as opportunity for promotion. In their concluding statements, they offer a mitigating caution. Most people perceive only the dark side of politics, and indeed there is a dark side, characterised by destructive opportunism and dysfunctional game playing. However, politics can be positive as well, for organisations and for individuals. Politics are essential to the effective functioning of organisations. The two studies by Ferris and Kacmar provides insight into employees' perceptions of organisational politics. Following their research, Drory conducted further inquiry into the perceptions of politics.

Drory (1993) designed the Political Climate Scale for use in a study of 200 employees. He hypothesised that two factors impact one's perception of organisational politics: satisfaction with superior and satisfaction with co-workers. His rationale was that, employees who have access to sources of

16

organisational power and status are in a position to take advantage of the political game and to gain a greater share of organisational benefits than they formally deserve. Consequently, they may not consider organisational politics as necessarily undesirable or detrimental to their own interests. Low status employees, on the other hand, who are not in a position to benefit from a political decision-making style, are more likely to feel disadvantaged in a prevailing political climate. Their attitudes toward their work situation are therefore more likely to be negatively affected.Drory's results supported his hypothesis.

O'Connor and Morrison (2001) studied both situational and dispositional predictors of perceptions of organisational politics. They found like Ferris, Russ, and Fandt (1998) that job autonomy, formalisation, and organisational climate were negatively correlated with perceptions of political activity. Male and female employees were more likely to perceive their organisation as political if they (a) occupied lower hierarchical levels within the organisation, (b) saw themselves as possessing low levels of job autonomy, (c) believed the workplace was low in formalisation, and (d) negatively evaluated the climate of their organisation. Additionally, they found that two dispositional variables impact perception of politics. Both external locus of control and Machiavellianism were correlated positively with perceptions of organisational politics. Specifically male and female employees who evidenced greater levels of Machiavellianism and a more external (or less internal) work locus of control tended to view their organisations as more political. The most powerful finding that emerged from the O'Connor and Morrison study was the relationship between organisational climate and the

17

perception of politics. "This variable may be an important determinant of whether an employee views his or her workplace as political".

An aspect of the organisational climate is teamwork. Valle and Witt (2001) analysed the correlation of organisational politics and teamwork. They hypothesised that "individual perceptions of teamwork importance would lessen the negative effects of politics perceptions on job satisfaction". Working from the framework proposed by Ferris (1989), Valle and Witt studied 355 white-collar employees of a private sector, customer-service organisation in the Eastern United States. Using Kacmar and Ferris' Perceptions of Organisational Politics Scale (POPS) (1991), they assessed the perceptions of the value of teamwork within the organisation. They found that, the relationship between politics perceptions and job satisfaction was stronger among employees reporting low levels of teamwork importance than among individuals reporting high levels of teamwork importance. Teamwork importance was relevant to job satisfaction only when employees perceived average to high levels of organisational politics.

This study demonstrated that the effects of teamwork importance on organisational politics were statistically significant even when control features of gender, ethnic minority status, tenure, and supervisory status were included. Valle and Witt (2001) concluded that organisational politics subsumes all forms of influence in organisations and includes both positive and negative connotations. Influence, they comment, drives much of the activity in today's organisations and ought to be the focus of additional research in the correlation with organisational politics.

Organisations thus become political arenas wherein employees are matched against each other with each trying to outwit each other. Thus, spreading gossip and rumors about another person, thereby showing the person in a bad light in front of supervisors is an example of political behaviour in an organisation. We can say that politics is essentially an intentional influence process the person is mainly concerned with maximising his self interest either in the short-term or in the long-term.

Factors Contributing to Political Behaviour in the Organisation

According to Vredenburgh&Shea-VanFossen (2010), some research has identified organisational conditions that cause employees to engage in workplace political behaviours, they argue that the origins of individual attributes and the nature of their interactions with organisational conditions that foster political strategies in work organisations come from evolution of an individual's hereditary genetic structure. Power or politics grows tangibly and non-tangibly even as individuals compete neck to neck for a one up on one another. Politics brews up in the organisation due to numerous reasons which are discussed.

Availability of Information

Employees getting access to information is very necessary and is found to be one of the factors contributing to politics in the organisation. Poon (2003) found that employees will perceive their work environment as politically charged if they lack the information about job objectives, job opportunities and the outcome of job performances. This result in low levels among organisational members tends

19

to be very suspicious of motives, intentions and prospective actions of other members.

The outcome of lack of information to organisation members is often marked by a lack of trust, accusations of exceeding authority and territorial infighting. The rumor mill cranks up and soon individuals are swayed by all manner of perceptions and assumptions that have no basis in fact but everything to do with the way we choose to interpret others' behaviour (www.alchemyformanagers.co.uk).

Power

According to (Vigoda-Gadot, 2003), an individual has power if they exert control over the allocation of resources and if they are in a position to make and enforce decisions. Power therefore can exist formally and informally at every level within an organisation. It has been widely recognised that both politics and power are significant part of human behaviour as they affect the ability to secure one's goals and interests in a social system (Vigoda-Gadot, 2003).Daft (2007), also asserted that the use of power in organisations however requires both skill and willingness. Many decisions are made through political processes because rational decision processes do not fit. Uncertainty or disagreement is too high. Political tactics for using power to influence decision outcomes include, build coalitions and expanding networks, assign loyal people to key positions, control decision premises, enhance legitimacy and expertise, make a direct appeal and use of power however should be obvious.

20

Individuals in positions of greater formal responsibility are often both politically active within an organisation and the subject of political activity themselves within the organisation. They tend to be politically active because they have something of value to trade, batter exchange, namely resource allocation and decision making and of course it is for these same reasons that they are the subject of political maneuverings initiated by others. The proper use of this sort of organisational power is a huge test of a leader's authenticity (Roger Delves- The political life in organisations).Organisations have power structures that compete amongst themselves. Different coalitions are formed in organisations between people who think alike in the organisation. These coalitions then therefore compete for power. Various groups within organisation protect themselves, in order to achieve this protection they may either try to acquire power themselves or join coalitions in the organisation and politics stems up (www.alchemyformanagers.co.uk).

Promotion

According to Robbins et al(2010), promotion decisions have consistently been found to be one of the most political actions in organisations. The opportunity for promotion or advancement encourages people to compete for limited resources and try to positively influence the decision outcome.When promotion opportunities are not freely available, it creates pressures and feeling of competition among fellow members of an organisation. A marked distinction occurs between those who have and those who don't have power which in turn spurs under currents in day to day affairs and dealings. This result is a more

21

aggressive behaviour on the part of ambitious individuals in the organisation who are driven to get ahead of colleagues if they are to obtain the scarce senior roles they aspire to. Aggressive does not mean using fists but it does entail competing against other members of staff who just happen to be in the same team. (www.alchemyformanagers.co.uk).There is nothing under hand in this, everyone "knows the score", which only serves to perpetuate a climate of suspicion, rumor and gossip to the detriment of getting the job done, unfortunately, staying out of the fray simply is not an option if you want to succeed. (www.alchemyformanagers.co.uk)

Ambiguous decisions and goals

Most decisions have to be made in a climate of ambiguity in organisations where facts are rarely fully objective and thus are open to interpretation. People within organisations will use whateverinfluence they can to taint the facts to support their goals and interest. This creates the activities known as politicking.Again, if goals in organisations are ambiguous, the people may want to interpret them to meet their personal goals. This also contributes to politics in the organisation (www.alchemyformanagers.co.uk).

Equity

Leaders of an organisation engage in politics to achieve goals but the question is why the use of politics? If political tactics are used to advance courses in the organisation that serve to benefit everyone equally, then they are more likely to be seen as purposeful and legitimate (Simmons, 2009).Power, influence and politics have some effects on every member of an organisation and thus on the entire

22

organisational unit. Based on the equity theory by Adams(1965), employees seek to maintain equity between the inputs they bring to a job and the outcomes that they receive from it against the perceived inputs and outcomes of others.

Thebelieve is that people value fair treatment which causes them to be motivated to keep the fairness maintained within the organisation.As one move higher up in the organisation, opportunity of wielding formal positions becomes smaller and the amount of power available seems scarce. Here individuals struggle to prove themselves superior, either by gaining power at someone else's expense or by a comparative gain of perceived power, eg. better impression on immediate superior, higher proximity or visibility in the organisation. It is here that the mentality of equity as a basis of measuring his/her self esteem takes over an employee. Therefore, many scholars have argued that the relationship between organisational politics and organisational outcomes is an important one that deserves careful and thorough investigation (Ferris &Kacmar, 1991; Zhou & Ferris, 1995; Kacmar& Carlson, 1997) and one that has potential to enhance our understanding to multiple aspects of performance.Power within an organisationmay be unequally distributed which is dehumanising. The unequal distribution of power creates a sense of unfairness in the organisation and causes individuals in the organisation to react by yearning for power.

Change

The modern manager is faced with a constant barrage of initiatives such as the pursuit of quality, continuous improvement and business process re-engineering. When combined with rapid technological advances, the result is a climate of constant change (www.zeepedia.com). Change is unsetting and often results in winners and losers. When this is the case, it is hardly surprising that more extreme-subtle, underhand, covert or just downright devious behaviours surface. Individuals start to position themselves in advance of the change, simply preserving the status quo can often generate such behaviour or often sabotage. It is little wonder that so many change initiatives fail.

One of the major catalysts of perceived political behaviour in organisations occurs when there has been a new appointment at a senior level. Individuals get busy brushing up their credentials to benefit from any promotions, appointments or restructures. Where the activity is open and above board it is probably healthily acceptable. However, when the activities include bad-mouthing colleagues, questioning abilities or reputations, starting rumors and generally creating unrest, it is usually on account of certain individuals who see an opportunity to get ahead of others by foul means (www.alchemyformanagers.co.uk).People in the organisation are often resistant to change and try to evade the change through acquisition of power. This also causes politics to stem up in organisations.

Limited Resources

Resources in organisations are limited which often turns potential conflicts into real conflict. If resources were abundant, then all the various constituencies within the organisation could satisfy their goals. But because they are limited, not everyone's interest can be provided for. Further, whether true or not, gains by individuals or groups are often perceived as being at the expense of others within the organisation. These forces create competition among members of the organisation which results in politics (www.zeepedia.com).

Not surprisingly, when organisations set budgets to drive down costs and end prices to the customer, there is enormous pressure to hold down expenditure and investment. Consequently, department heads have to compete with colleagues for a share of a pot that is rarely large enough. Finance Directors who make these allocations will find themselves on the receiving end of bribes, threats, propositions, sales pitches, gifts, violence and affection, except of course we don't call it that, we call it politics. Relationships may become strained, perhaps even permanently damaged within a group of people who are supposed to collaborate with each other to best effect on a daily basis (www.zeepedia.com).Employees involve in clashes and implement different influence strategy to get profits and achieve their objectives in a variety of ways (Molm, 1997). The desirability and immediate benefit of the resources will direct to the decision to take part in political activities (Drory&Romm, 1990).

Effects of Organisational Politics on Employee Performance

Employee performance is a term that is often used but loosely defined, which deals with the individual at his or her workplace. The most commonly used definition of workplace is from John P. Campbell et al where they describe employee/job performance as an individual level variable which wholly depends on the individual considered. That is, performance is completely dependent and determined by the individual's functioning. Smith (2007) submitted that, organisational politics does not have positive and negative effects to the organisation. Robbins et al. (2009) argued that organisational politics can become too much to handle leading to high turnover, decreased production levels, increased anxiety, stress and reduced performance.

In a research conducted by Smith (2007) on the effects of organisational politics on the manager's work, the findings were that, many participants admitted they found politics stressful and that they experienced the negative effects of such behaviour. In some cases organisational politics had led people to resign. The research highlighted that increased political behaviour undermines trust between people at all levels in organisations, a mistrust caused by people creating their own hidden agendas and being encouraged to compete with one another, rather than work collaboratively. The research further revealed that the effects of political behaviour manifest in organisations with around 1 in 2 managers reporting political behaviour as a key cause of conflict in their organisation (44%) and the most significant stressor in their working life (53%) (Smith, 2007).

McShane and Von Glinow (2000) also investigated that organisational politics is more of a problem than the benefit. The major concern is that organisational politics consume time and disrupt activities. When people operate in a tensed political environment, they have difficulty relating to other employees. This ultimately undermines the conditions for active knowledge sharing. Studies by McShane and Von Glinow (2000) further revealed that employees who experienced more organisational politics report higher stress, psychological withdrawal and turnover. However, people tend to feel stress and dissatisfaction as they experience the political tactics. Robbins et al. (2009) agreed that an individual who has a clear understanding of who is responsible for making decisions and why they were selected to be the decision makers would have a better understanding of how and why things happen the way they do than someone who does not understand the decision making process in the organisation.

However, when both politics and performance are high, performance is likely to increase because the individual regards political action as an opportunity. Contrary, when understanding is also low, individuals are more likely to see organisational politics as a threat which would have negative effects on performance. When organisational politics is seen as a threat and consistently respond to with defensiveness, negative outcomes are almost sure to surface eventually. This situation is prevalent in Cape Coast Polytechnic. If employees are encouraged to engage in dishonest or unethical behaviour to get ahead and favouritism trumps the quality of work, organisation faces decrease in

productivity and higher turnover rates. An organisation without clear politics and chains of command leads to employees spending more time searching for answers and attempting to fix problems than actually completing quality work (www.wikipedia.org/wiki/officepolitics).

The impact of organisational politics is very critical in nature. Political behaviours are found to have both functional and dysfunctional effects at organisational levels. Employee involvement in organisational politics affects organisational performance, effectiveness, decision making and change process within the organisation (Buchanan&Badham, 2008). Organisational politics is also found to be negatively related to employee perception about fairness and justice within the organisational setup and process (Ferris et al, 1992; Andrews &Kacmar, 2001; Chen &Budhwar, 2004; Beugre& Liverpool, 2006). Fedor, Maslyn&Betternhausen, (2008) were of the view that positive perception about organisational politics is related to satisfaction with job, supervisor and work environment.

The research firm Roffey Park conducted a poll of 490 managers and found that 60% of these managers believe that an increase in office politics is the greatest source of their stress. This stress filters down to employees and can cause morale problems. The more negative morale, the more likely you are going to lose good employees, have higher absenteeism and more disciplinary problems. It was also observed from the research that operations are also negatively impacted by politics. When employees are fighting over resources and power they are not as likely to be focused on the welfare of the company. Judgment can become

28

clouded if it violates a political taboo, for example, a good candidate is passed up for promotion for a poor one only because he does not play golf or associate with the "right" people. Depending on the nature and extent of the political impact on operations, the financial strength of the organisation can be hampered.

Organisational politics is not always a bad practice, as it is a natural part of human life, its negative effectives can be diminished by powerful leadership and transparency throughout the company. Giving employees the power to make decisions, rewarding employees who perform and appointing employees who perform strongly to supervise other employees can also prevent some of the factor that leads to organisational politics. Positive politics builds employee confidence and motivates employees to work harder. Employees who learn to navigate the politics of an organisation are more productive than those who are left out of the loop. To encourage productivity, organisations must develop a political culture easy for employees to understand. Establishing clear policies and chain of command makes it easier for employees to find the answers they need and rather spend more time on producing quality work. A climate focused on collaboration and equal treatment prevents conflicts that can reduce productivity (www.smallbusiness.chron.com). Overall, organisational politics impacts employees negatively because they feel like they have no control within the organisation, in addition to lack of trust of those in power positions (Malik, Danish &Ghafoor, 2009)

Effects of OrganisationalPolitics on the Organisation

Being involved in politics requires a lot of "mental and emotional energy" that could best be put into working. According to McKay (2009), it is estimated that employees spend an average of 64 minutes a day engaging in office politics. Donating less time to actually working can lead to financial loses for an organisation and translate into lost opportunities for all stakeholders.In addition, it is estimated that more than $100 billion is lost in unproductivity each year (due to stress-related factor) in the United State alone (Serven, 2002).Serven (2002) hypothesised that the "crippling forces of office politics" contributes to an organisation's performance gap (the difference between actual and potential performance) by an increase of about 30%. In addition, office politics inhibits the consistency of profits by undermining the decision making process, corroding trust and pride in work, stifling innovation, driving employee turnover and distorting communication.

Nelson and Quick (2010) contented that the effects of political behaviour in organisations can be quite negative when the political behaviour is strategically undertaken to maximise self-interest. If people within the organisation are competitively pursuing selfish ends, they are unlikely to be attentive to the concerns of others. Schermerhor et al. (2008) eluded that organisational politics can help identify problems and move ambitious problem solving managers into breach. Organisational politics allows the organisation to meet unanticipated problems with people and sources quickly before small headaches become major problems. Political behaviour is perceived positively when it is seen as the only

means by which to accomplish something. Schermerhor et al. (2008) further reveals that organisational politics can facilitate adaption to changes in the environment and technology of the organisation. In view of the issues in Cape Coast Polytechnic, this could be a positive factor of organisational politics, employees and management are made to think outside the box in ensuring that the goals of the institution are met.

Managing Politics in the Organisation

Organisations make a serious mistake when they ignore/underestimate political risk. Organisations tend either to accept or ignore these risks or to avoid altogether situations that seemingly pose large political risks, even when those risks are accompanied by significant opportunity. The instruments used by many organisations are simply too blunt for the changing, complex political environment in which they operate. Political risk may have different characteristics than other types of risks but it can and should be managed. Effective management of political risk can enable companies to enter and navigate new markets and business environment, providing a potential for competitiveadvantage (www.forbes.com).

Managerial awareness of organisational politics is helpful, if not necessary for the most effective reduction in politics through the implementation of strategies. Research consistently supports the idea that organisational politics has to be carefully managed or it will be detrimental to the work environment (Chang et al, 2012). A classic concept of quality management presented by W. Edward Deming, "it's the system, not the man" (Serven, 2000), is especially relevant in

31

the case of office politics because of the very nature of office politics. Politics can be considered an important social influence and behaviour process, capable of being constructive or disruptive to the organisation and its employees. Managers should therefore familiarise themselves with the political process in order to effect necessary changes.

However, careful consideration must be taken when undertaking changes to ensure that they do not, instead, feed the dilemma. (Anderson, 1999):

> *One of the greatest knowledge gaps in management is the belief that you can unilaterally impose change upon a segment of an organisation and expect the change to be accepted and implemented. The fact is of course; those employees in most organisations have a myriad of alternative ways of sabotaging, rejecting and redirecting such imposed change.*

Several recommendations may be considered to counteract this possibility:

(a) involve the change agents in the politics of the organisation to facilitate the change efforts

(b) identify possible sources of political resistance to change efforts (and remove), and

(c) apply a sequential approach to political resistance awareness, facilitation and interventions.

However, a follow-up process be conducted to measure consequential behavior and performance, to see if the desired change has occurred.Management consultants agree that negative office politics are more prevalent in organisation with ineffectual communication, apathetic management, and unethical leaders. Similarly concluded in the classic management text, "Managing" by Harold Geneen (1984), is the first rule, safeguarding the policy of open and honest communication; is not to be toleratedin office politics in any shape or form. The second rule is the practice of meritocracy – recognising and rewarding performance and not showing favouritism.

Effectively managing office politics requires being diplomatic, collaborating, and enhancing cooperation and confidence among employees. Employees must be given a clear message that politics and analogous unethical behavior will not be tolerated in any form. Osborn (2000) gives emphases to removing any sense of mystery from office activities, maintaining that openness will increase communication and create a more supportive work environment. The following actions are recommended to accomplish this: (a) emphasize integrity: stress ethics and honesty; (b) eliminate office rivalry: encourage collaboration for the good of the organisation; (c) reward team result give public recognition to group efforts to motivate and inspire, based on performance and contributions;(d) show empathy: watch for burnout, stress can have many unfavourable results; and, (e) use humor: a little humor can ease stress and promote camaraderie.

33

Politics is neither good nor bad, use of illegitimate objectives make politics bad. Pfeffer (1992) maintained that effective and efficient functioning of an organisation politics is essential and indispensable. Politicalbehaviourcannot be eliminated but needs to be managed properly to reduce the possibility of its negative impact. Managing politics can be doneby:(a)defining and defining job duties clearly; (b) encouraging ethical behaviour; (c) promoting understanding and trust between formal and informal groups; (d) allocating resources judiciously; (e) implementing appropriate performance appraisal system; and, (f) optimising job pressures. (www.answers.com)

Summary

Organisational politics is a significant player in almost every organisation, the bigger the organisation, the bigger the politics becomes. This is because there is always some combination of open and hidden organisational agendas alongside open and hidden personal agendas. These agendas need not to be malevolent though they are too often selfish rather selfless with individuals pursuing an agendas which favours them or their team or department rather than one which selflessly favours the organisation or the organisation's clients and customers.

Organisations that want to beat out their competitors need to keep down the level of politics that are being played in the nooks and crannies of the office. It appears as though office politics is becoming more widespread, this is happening because we have moved from an era of command and control type structures to ones that encourage leadership.The reviewed literature has brought to the fore some major issues such as lack of information, promotion, equity, power, change,

34

limited resources, ambiguous decisions and goals as reasons why organisationalpolitics brews up in most organisations.

Politics in the organisation cannot be eliminated as it is a normal part of doing business and will be part of any organisation. People are political creatures who naturally fight over resources. Even though the main goal of each employee is to protect the shareholder's wealth, they also want to increase or maintain their own standard of living.We will never be able to create a working culture which removes hidden agendas, so the politics of organisational life will always be with us. Evading politics removes us from the mainstream of organisational life, without of course protecting us from any political maneuvering in which others may choose to involve the passive us.

The issues mentioned were related to the objectives of the study which sought to find out the cause of organisational politics, measures to prevent organisational politics, the extent to which organisational politics affect the performance of employees and also how organisational politics can be managed in order not to sway the organisation from achieving its set goals and objectives. If one believes that politics can be eradicated from an organisation, he/she is most likely naive. Even a strict implementation of a performance based approach will not make for a politically free organisation. Peter Drucker may have summarised it best when he suggested that "no leadership education is complete until it is grounded in the political realities of everyday life".

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the methods that were used in conducting the study on thecauses, prevention and managementof organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic. The sections contained in this chapter are the research approach, research design, population of the study, sample and sampling procedure, research instruments, ethics, data collection procedure and data analysis plan.

Research Approach

In the handbook of qualitative research Denzin and Lincoln (2011) describe qualitative research as involving and an interpretive naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. When applying qualitative research methods, the emphasis is put on the natural setting and the points of views of the research participants. The qualitative approach consists of open-ended information that the researcher usually gathers through interviews, focus groups and observations. The quantitative approach on the other handis based onnumerical representation and manipulation of observations for the purpose of describing and explaining the phenomena that those observations reflect. It is used in a wide variety of natural

36

and social sciences, including physics,biology, psychology, sociology and geology(Wikipedia Encyclopedia, 2005).

Quantitative and qualitative research approaches were adopted for this study. The choice for this approach was influenced by the use of questionnaire and structured interview which allowed for the collection of large amount of data from a sizeable population. Data collection was done through structured questionnaires which is basically a quantitative approach. Both primary and secondary sources of data were used for the study.

Research Design

The study was based on a descriptive research design. As a descriptive study, it sought to find the causes, prevention and management of organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic. According to Keller and Warrack (2000), descriptive surveys depend on direct contact with those persons or a sample of those whose characteristics, behaviours or attitudes for a specific investigation. Anderson (1995) also explains that descriptive survey affords the researcher the opportunity of getting the opinion of the population concerning some issues which is of relevance to the study.

The descriptive survey was appropriate because it helped to obtain responses from a large group of individuals who might be difficult to locate and whose cooperation might be difficult to obtain. Moreover, the researcher had the opportunity to directly ask questions from respondents about the topic under study and from the data that were collected, inferences were drawn about the situation. Again the use of this survey created the opportunity for the researcher to

administer the questionnaire personally to the respondents and consequently in-depth and follow-up questions were asked and items that were unclear were explained further.

Population of the study

Polit and Hungler (1999) refer to the population as an aggregate or totality of all objects or members that conform to a set of specifications. In this study, the population was the employees of the various departments in Cape Coast Polytechnic.This included academic staff and administrative staff of all categories. The available figures from the Personnel Department of the Polytechnic put the target population at 394.

Table 1: Target population of categories of respondents – Cape Coast

Polytechnic

Category	Target Population
Teaching Staff	180
Non-teaching Staff	214
Total	**394**

Source: Personnel/Welfare Department (Cape Coast Polytechnic, 2015)

Sample and sampling procedure

The target population (394) were stratified into two categories, teaching and non-teaching staff. A population size (N) of 200 was selected from the target population of 394. Using the sample size determination method by Krejcie and Morgan (1970), a sample size (S) of 132 was chosen. From a chart of Krejcie and Morgan (1970), for a population size (N) of 200 the sample size (S) must be 132.Krejcie and Morgan (1970) further state that although larger samples are in

38

general better than smaller samples, very large samples can lead to erroneous conclusions. It is on this basis that the researcher believed that a sample size of 132 was large enough to help elicit the responses needed for the study and also avoid a situation where data collected could not be up to the sample size required for the said population. The respondents comprised 70 teaching staff and 62 non-teaching staff from various departments.

Table 2 gives the breakdown of the distribution of categories of respondent's namely teaching and non-teaching staff from Cape Coast Polytechnic.

Table 2: Distribution of Categories of Respondents – Cape Coast Polytechnic

Category	Target Population	Population Size (N)	Sample Size (S)
Teaching Staff	180	120	70
Non-teaching Staff	214	80	62
Total	**394**	**200**	**132**

Source: Field survey,Attah(2015)

Simple random sampling was used due to the nature of the study. This afforded each individual in the population an equal chance of being selected. The simple random procedure was done in the fish bowl form to select each of the categories. This involved writing the serial numbers of all the names on manila card cut into thin strips. This was done for each category until a total number of the accessible population was selected. The categories comprised Academic staff and Administrative staff.

The deans and heads of department were included in the study. This was because since they were in the helm of affairs and had also been in the Institution for quite some time, they were able to give very good analysis of the politics that went on in the Polytechnic and how it affected the day-to-day activities in the institution. With respect to the teaching staff, random selection was used to obtain the actual number required for the administering of the questionnaire.

Research Instruments

The man instruments used to elicit information for the study were questionnaire and structured interview.The questionnaire was structured to consist of both closed and open ended type questions were used to get answers from the respondents. The use of carefully structured questionnaire enabled the collection of large quantities of data and also had a wider coverage at less cost. Few interviews were also conducted, personal observations were also made. However, care was taken in order not to biased in order to give an objective analysis of what was observed.

Administration of Research Instruments

The questionnaire was designed to capture the demographic data of respondents and their opinion with respect to the research questions. The questionnaire was divided into two sections, section A was designed to obtain information on the demographic and subject details of respondents, while section B consisted of questions to determine the effects of organisational politics on productivity.The questionnaire was constructed using a five-point Likert type scale. The respondents were required to indicate the extent of their agreement or

40

disagreement with each statement on a score of one (1) to five (5). A score of one represented strong agreement with the statement, while a score of five represented strong disagreements.

Ethical Considerations

In gathering data for the study, the respondents were about the purpose of the research and the objective it meant to achieve. Respondent were encouraged to feel free and be objective as possible in given out their responses as outmost confidentiality was assured and they had the option to either participate or not. The respondents were again informed of the importance of the research to the as staff and the Polytechnic as a whole.

Data Collection Procedure

The questionnaire was self delivered to the respondents.The respondents were taken through the questions to avoid any doubts that could have occurred. The answered questionnaires were retrieved from the respondents a week after it had been administered to them. With respect to interview, the researcher booked an appointment with the officers of the institution. The interview was conducted on agreed dates and time, approximately an hour was used for each interview session.

Field work Challenges

Some of the respondents were reluctant in providing the needed information as they saw the exercise as a waste of time and also scared of being victimised. While some of the respondents took few days to respond to the

questionnaire, it took others a week or more in getting back their responses for the study. It also worth mentioning that due to some of these challenges, the research work was delayed.

Data Analysis Procedure

The Statistical Package for Social Services (SPSS) was the main statistical tool used in analysing the data. This statistical tool gave a full range of contemporary descriptive statistical methods. It also had the tendency to produce output in both report and table formats which were of tremendous help in analysing the data. Concerning the organisation of the data obtained, closed-ended items were coded and fed into the computer for detailed analysis of the data. Open-ended questions were also grouped based on the similarity of responses, coded and also fed into the computer for analysis and descriptions of the results. Furthermore, the interview results were also grouped based on the similarity of responses for the detailed analysis of the data. Again, mean values, frequencies and percentages were computed from the data obtained for the detailed analysis of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter deals with the analyses and discussion of data obtained from respondents of the study. It begins with an analysis of background characteristics of respondents and then followed with the analysis of responses to the research question. In all, 136 responses were received, comprising 116 respondents representing the senior members and senior staff (teaching and non-teaching staff) in addition to sixteen (16) assistant/senior assistant registrars in the administrative category.

Background Characteristics of Respondents

The first part of the questionnaire sought to obtain demographic information about the respondents. This was to enable the researcher to make comparison among the respondents. Informationobtained includedcategory of staff, position, level of educational qualification,and length of service.

Table 3: Category of Staff

Categories	Freq.	%
Senior Member	44	37.9
Senior Staff	72	62.1
Total	**116**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey, Attah (2015)

Table 3 shows the category of staff in the institution. Out of the total sample of 116 respondents, 72 representing 62.1% were made up of senior staffwhile44 representing 37.4% were senior members. This indicates that the respondents were senior staff dominated.

Table 4: Level of Education

Level	Freq.	%
HND	20	17.2
Bachelor's Degree	50	43.1
Masters	46	39.7
Total	**116**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey, Attah (2015)

Table 4 examines the level of education of respondents. The Table shows that 50 respondents representing 43.1% were bachelor's degree holders. This represent majority of the respondents. On the other hand, 46 respondents representing 39.1% were second degree holders, whereas 20 respondents representing 17.2% were Higher National Diploma (HND) holders.Out of these respondents (Masters, Bachelor's Degree and HND), some were found to be administrative assistants, procurement officers, assistant registrars, clerks, instructors, lecturers and so on.The study further examined the length of service of the respondents in the Polytechnic.

Table 5: Years of Experience at the Polytechnic

Years	Senior Member		Senior Staff		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1-5yrs	2	4.5	22	30.6	24	20.7
6-10yrs	23	52.3	35	48.6	58	50.0
11-15yrs	5	11.4	15	20.8	20	17.2
16-20yrs	11	25.0	0	0.0	11	9.5
21-25yrs	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
26-30yrs	3	6.8	0	0.0	3	2.6
Total	**44**	**100.0**	**72**	**100.0**	**116**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey, Attah (2015)

Table 5 shows that out of116 respondents, 58 representing 50.0% had worked with the Polytechnic for between 6 and 10 years whereas 24 respondents representing 20.7% had worked with the Polytechnicfor 1 to 5 years. Three (3) respondents representing 2.6% had workedfor more than 20 years.

Table 6: Causes of Organisational Politics

Variables	Senior Members			Senior Staff			Overall			Mann-Whitney U
	% Agreement	Mean	Standard Deviation	% Agreement	Mean	Standard Deviation	% Agreement	Mean	Standard Deviation	P-Value
Organisational politics is caused by limited resources	77.27	2.82	.786	61.11	2.75	.960	67.24	2.78	.895	.689
Politics in the office is caused by ambiguous decisions and roles	81.82	2.98	.731	75.00	2.81	.781	77.59	2.87	.764	.249
Organisational politics in cape coast polytechnic is caused by inappropriate use of the communication chain	86.36	3.30	.701	68.06	2.75	.818	75.00	2.96	.817	.001
Employees engage in office politics due to unfair promotion of staff	77.27	3.09	.741	61.11	2.63	1.027	67.24	2.80	.953	.023
Organisational politics occur when there is change eg, reshuffle and transfer of staff	90.91	3.18	.582	52.78	2.47	.769	67.24	2.74	.782	.000
Organisational politics is caused by unrealized expectations	81.82	3.09	.802	69.44	2.76	.778	74.14	2.89	.800	.023
Organisational politics is caused by differences in goals	70.45	2.77	.831	65.28	2.79	.855	67.24	2.78	.842	.983

Source: Field survey, Attah (2015)

Table 6 presents the perception of staff on the causes of organisational politics. From Table 6, it can be seen that 67.24% of the respondents agreed that organisational politics is caused by limited resources. This also recorded a mean level of agreement of 2.78 with a standard deviation of .895. Specifically, the senior staff recorded a mean of 2.75 with a standard deviation of .96, whereas the senior members recorded a mean of 2.82 with a standard deviation of .786. This shows that the level of agreement of the senior members concerning organisational politics caused by limited resources was slightly above that of the senior staff. However, the Mann-Whitney U test recorded a p-value of .689 (p>0.05) indicates that there is no significant differences in level of agreement between senior staff and senior members with regards to organisational politics caused by limited resources.

The finding is in agreement with this assertion that the desirability and immediate benefit of resources will direct to the decision to take part in political activities (Drory&Romm, 1990). Molm (1997) also opined that employees involve in clashes and implement different strategy to get profits and achieve their objectives in a variety of ways.

47

Table 7: Organisational Politics Prevention Strategies

Variables	Senior Members			Senior Staff			Overall			Mann-Whitney U test
	% Agreement	Mean	Standard Deviation	% Agreement	Mean	Standard Deviation	% Agreement	Mean	Standard Deviation	P-Value
the management of cape coast polytechnic make sure that there is a free flow of information to all staff	72.7	2.93	.873	52.8	2.71	.830	60.3	2.79	.850	.110
cape coast polytechnic management ensures the appropriate use of chain of communication/command	68.2	2.80	.930	61.1	2.78	.859	63.8	2.78	.883	.764
management ensures that roles are well defined	68.2	2.75	.991	58.3	2.57	.784	62.1	2.64	.869	.179
management of the polytechnic is always fair in its dealings with all department and staff	45.5	2.36	1.036	34.7	2.18	.845	38.8	2.25	.922	.367
resources are made available to all staff equally	63.6	2.70	1.173	31.9	2.08	1.084	44.0	2.32	1.154	.006

Source: Field survey, Attah (2015)

48

Table 7 presents the perception of staff on the strategies to prevent organisational politics. From Table 7, it can be seen that 60.3% of the respondents agreed that the management of the Polytechnic should make sure that there is a free flow of information to all staff. This also recorded a mean level of agreement of 2.79 with a standard deviation of .85. Specifically, the senior staff recorded a mean of 2.71 with a standard deviation of .83, whilessenior members recorded a mean of 2.93 with a standard deviation of .873. This shows that the level of agreement of the senior membersconcerning free flow of information to all staffwas slightly above that of the senior staff. However, the Mann-Whitney U test recorded a p-value of .110 (p>0.05) indicates that there is no significant differences in level of agreement between senior staff and senior members with regards to free flow of information to all staff.

This finding is in agreement with Poon (2003) that employees will perceive their work environment as politically charged if they lack the information about job objectives, job opportunities and the outcome of job performance. The outcome of lack of information results in organisational members becoming suspicious of motives, intentions and prospective actions of other members.

Table 8: Managing Organisational Politics

Variables	Senior Members			Senior Staff			Overall			Mann-Whitney U test
	% Agreement	Mean	Standard Deviation	% Agreement	Mean	Standard Deviation	% Agreement	Mean	Standard Deviation	P-Value
the management of cape coast polytechnic relies on the use of power/ authority to ensure compliance	81.8	3.02	.821	66.7	2.75	.835	72.4	2.85	.837	.063
by use of threats	25.0	2.11	.618	27.8	2.07	.699	26.7	2.09	.667	.764
disputing parties agree to accept the decision of a neutral arbiter	52.3	2.41	1.064	66.7	2.69	.521	61.2	2.59	.781	.154
involving a third party instead of dealing with the persons involved	38.6	2.30	.930	70.8	2.74	.692	58.6	2.57	.815	.003

Source: Field survey, Attah (2015)

Table 8 presents the perception of staff on managing organisational politics. From the table, it can be seen that 67.24% of the respondents agreed that the management of Cape Coast Polytechnic relies on the use of power or authority to ensure compliance. This also recorded a mean level of agreement of 2.85 with a standard deviation of .837. Specifically, the senior staff recorded a mean of 2.75 with a standard deviation of 835, assenior members recorded a mean of3.02 with a standard deviation of .821. This shows that the level of agreement of the senior members concerning organisational politics caused by limited resources was slightly above that of the senior staff. However, the Mann-Whitney U test recorded a p-value of .063 (p>0.05) indicates that there is no significant differences in level of agreement between senior staff and senior members with regards to the use of power or authority to ensure compliance.

This is in relation to (Hohfl, 1999) whotalks about the three Latin words of different types of power, Auctoritas, Potestas and Potentia. Potentia, he explained as the exercise of incentives and rewards as powers which encourage compliance and dispel sanctions for non-compliance. That is the right to coerce through the use of incentives and rewards.

Table 9: Perception of organisational politics as a bad practice

Response	Senior Member		Senior Staff		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Yes	31	70.5	46	63.9	77	66.4
No	13	29.5	26	36.1	39	33.6
Total	**44**	**100.0**	**72**	**100.0**	**116**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey,Attah (2015)

Table 9 presents the distribution of respondents' views on organisational politics as a bad practice. From the table, of the 116 respondents, 77 of them representing 66.4% said organisational politics is a bad practice, whereas 39 representing 33.6% said it is not a bad practice. Specifically, 31 of the senior members representing 70.5% of themand 46 of the senior staff representing 63.9% said it is a bad practice. Those who said organisational politics is a bad practice explained that it brings divisions and does not enhance peace at work. It also curbs fairness in management practices, it destroys team or organisational success, it distracts smooth flow of work,it does not bring unity among staff and also pave the way for favouritism which makes the system unfair.They further said it hindered efficiency and development,it might skew the distribution of resources,it does not promote transparency and fairness,it retards productivity and progression; it makes staff not willing to give out their best during working.Theorganisation does not improve and have no competitive advantage, it brings a lot of diversion in whatever decision taken by the management.

This is a quote from one of the respondents:

"*Organisational politics is a bad practice because workers who are deprived of some opportunities in turn become demoralised since their effort is not recognised*". This is in agreement with earlier studies by Parker et al (1995) that perception of politics by employees greatly affects their and also makes the organisations having political environments are very uncertain.

One respondent commented that;

"*Employee used it as basis to get what they want instead of hard work and discipline*".

while another respondent also stated that;

"*It does not promote effective development of an organisation since individuals most often think of desecrating the other parties*".

Those who said organisational politics is not a bad practice explained that it helped people to negotiate in a more ethical manner and if well managed, could greatly benefit the organisation.Additionally, it always put governance straight,it puts management on its toesand opposing ideas are healthy for organisation within reason.Respondents identified that the perception of politics is situational and how one views the situation or one's state of mind factors into the strength of perception.Employees who have high level of trust do not perceive a need for political action and are consequently less likely to engage in politics than those with lower levels of trust. Parker et al., (1995) found out that trust maybe moderate to the extent to which organisational politics is related to positive or negative attitudes. Trust is a key ingredient in the perception of politics.

Table 10: Experience withorganisational politics with regard to staff promotion procedure

Response	Senior Member		Senior Staff		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Yes	31	70.5	51	70.8	82	70.7
No	13	29.5	21	29.2	34	29.3
Total	**44**	**100.0**	**72**	**100.0**	**116**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey, Attah (2015)

53

Table 10 presents the distribution of respondents' views on their experience with organisational politics with regard to staff promotion procedure. From the table, 82respondents representing 70.7% said they have experiencedorganisational politics with regards to staff promotion procedure, whereas 34 representing 29.3% said they have not. Specifically, 31 of the senior members representing 70.5% and 51 of the senior staff representing 70.8% said they have experiencedorganisational politics with regards to staff promotion procedure. Those who said they have experiencedorganisational politics with regards to staff promotion procedure were of the view that if it is not handled properly, the effects are embitteredstaff, less motivated staff and employees become disappointed. Itbreeds segregation; it brings about disputein the organisation;it leads to disharmony among staff; it leads to litigation,mistrust and misgiving; staffs begin to take side on issues rather than being objective;staffs will be aggrieved by not putting their best in terms of working; staff who are disadvantaged will intend not perform their mandated task since their tasks are not recognise; the aggrieved staff would feel reluctant to put up their best towards the development of the organisation.

This is a quote from one of the respondents:

"*It creates mistrust between the management and employees, causing tension among workforce*".

Another quote from one respondent:

"*Itbrings dissatisfaction and break down of moral in the evaluation of duties*".

Another quote from another respondents also state that:

"*It leads to negative effect such as misgiving, lack of trust, apathy, and demoralises staff which consequently affects their work*".

Table 11: Experience with organisational politics with regard to staff development

Response	Senior Member		Senior Staff		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Yes	33	75.0	50	69.4	83	71.6
No	11	25.0	22	30.6	33	28.4
Total	**44**	**100.0**	**72**	**100.0**	**116**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey, Attah (2015)

Table 11shows that majority of staff (83) representing 71.6% said they hadexperiencedorganisational politics with regard to staff development.However,33 representing 28.4% said they had no problem with staff development. Specifically, 33 of the senior members representing 75.0% of them and 50 of the senior staff representing 69.4% said they hadexperiencedorganisational politics with regard to staff development. Those who said they had experiencedorganisational politics with regard to staff developmentindicated that if it is not handled properly, individuals are likely to become less motivated and a balanced staff development may not be attained which would affect the development of the institution.

The respondents again indicated that anytime issues concerning staff development arose, solutions found to reduce the tension were in favour of some departments. However, alternative measures were put in place to minimise this, as staff that did not get the chance to further their studies abroad were sponsored locally. Their observation was that whenever there were lapses in the staff development system, employees got dissatisfied and consequently, it affectedtheir

55

work output. This means that employees become less enthusiastic about anything when politics in connection with staff development was not handled appropriately.

Table 12: Experience with organisational politics when roles are not well defined

Response	Senior Member		Senior Staff		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Yes	31	70.5	41	56.9	72	62.1
No	13	29.5	31	43.1	44	37.9
Total	**44**	**100.0**	**72**	**100.0**	**116**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey, Attah (2015)

Table 12 presents the distribution of respondents' views on their experience with organisational politics when roles are not well defined. From the table, 72respondents representing 62.1% said they hadexperiencedorganisational politics when roles were not well defined, whereas 44 representing 37.9% said they had not. Specifically, 31 of the senior members representing 70.5% of them and 41 of the senior staff representing 56% said they hadexperiencedorganisational politics when roles were not well defined.Those who said they had experiencedorganisational politics when roles were not well defined shared their views that as a result of duplication of roles and functions in the various departments, employees become inefficient and they pretend to work to please their superiors.

The respondents further indicated that if roles are not well defined one becomes uncertain as to what to do and this gives room for possible manipulation and since roles are not well defined people capitalise on it and act irresponsibly.

56

Table 13: Impression about the way Organisational Politics are handled by the Polytechnic Administration

Response	Senior Member		Senior Staff		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Very Good	0	0.0	2	2.8	2	1.7
Good	16	36.4	22	30.6	38	32.8
Fairly Good	16	36.4	32	44.4	48	41.4
Not Very Good	12	27.3	16	22.2	28	24.1
Total	**44**	**100.0**	**72**	**100.0**	**116**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey, Attah (2015)

Table 13 presents the distribution of respondents' views on their impressions about the way organisational politics is handled by the Polytechnic Administration. From the table, out of the 116 respondents, 48 of them representing 41.4% had fairly good impression about the way organisational politics was handled by the Polytechnic Administration.However 2respondents representing 1.7% said they had very good impression about the way organisational politics is handled by the Polytechnic Administration. Also, 28respondents representing 24.1% did not have a very good impression about the way organisational politics was handled by the Polytechnic Administration.

Table 14: Organisational Politics Bad or Good Practice

Response	Senior Member		Senior Staff		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Bad	30	68.2	41	56.9	71	61.2
Good	14	31.8	31	43.1	45	38.8
Total	**44**	**100.0**	**72**	**100.0**	**116**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey, Attah (2015)

57

Table 14shows the ratings of the views of the respondentswhether organisational politics is bad or good practice. From the table, of the 116 respondents, 71 of them representing 61.2% said organisational politics is a bad practice, whereas 45 representing 38.8% said it is a good practice. Specifically, 30 of the senior members representing 68.2% of them and 41 of the senior staff representing 56.9% said organisational politics is a bad practice.The result also goes to confirm the assertion by Ferris and Kacmar (1992) that most people perceive only the dark side of politics characterised by destructive opportunism and dysfunctional game playing. However, politics can be positive both for the organisation and employees.

Interview Data fromAssistant/Senior Assistant Registrars in theAdministrative Category

The combined data obtained during the interview with sixteen (16) other senior members comprising assistant/senior assistant registrars (heads of department) in the administrative category who were interviewed are presented below.In response to item one on the interview schedule about their position in the Polytechnic, twelve (12) were assistant registrars and four (4) were senior assistant registrars. Item 2 on the interview schedule sought to find out about the length of years they had worked with the Polytechnic. Out of the sixteen interviewees, 10 had worked with the Polytechnic for 16 to 20 years, 4 had worked with the Polytechnic for 11 to 15 years. Also 2 of the interviewees had worked with the institution for 6 to 10 years.

58

In relation to item 3,the interviewees indicated that in an institution like Cape Coast Polytechnic politics is inevitable. This response is in relation to Bolander (2012) assertion that leaders should not deceive themselves by thinking their organisation has no politics. Most of the heads of department/section had similar views with regards to the causes of organisational politics in the institution. They indicated that when the structures/policies are not allowed to work properly, singing the praise of management to secure positions even when not qualified. Others also indicated that politics often occur due to unfair treatment of staff in relation to staff development and sharing of limited resources. Others also said that when some staff desires to fulfill their own interest other than that of the corporate interest also causes politics in the Polytechnic.

On the issue of how they perceived organisational politics, they were of the view that organisational politics was not bad after all but if not handled well can be detrimental to the organisation. Thus organisational politics had both negative and positive effects. They also indicated that when organisational politics is not handled well it could demoralise efficient staff as promotion might not be based on competence. In handling politics that brew up as a result of promotion, some were of the view that if structures thus human resource policies are put in place, scheme of service and the policies enshrined in the statutes are adhered to, it will alleviate the politics that usually occur due to promotion procedures. Again with regard to transfer procedures, they indicated that in an institution like Cape Coast Polytechnic, proper human resource policies must be

59

put in place and transfers should be based on abilities and capabilities and not punitive.

On the issue of allocation of resources, most of the interviewees were of the view that resources were not allocated fairly and this sometimes created enmity between some heads of department/section thereby creating an atmosphere for organisational politics. Moreover due to the kind of politics practiced in the Polytechnic roles/responsibilities were often assigned to people those in the helm of affairs were comfortable with. More often than not, roles were assigned to ''friends'' whereas appropriate officers for the job were side lined. This normally hampers the productivity of the various departments.

It was gathered from the interview conducted that communication flow was not the best. This actually goes to suggest that there was the absence of frequent communication as indicated by majority of the respondents. They again said that some sectional heads hold on to information due to personal interest, leaving the staff on the hook. Information usually goes out through the grape vine which does not auger well organisational growth. Poon (2003) points out that employees will perceive their work environment as politically charged if they lack the information about job objectives, job opportunities and the outcome of job performances.

Considering the issue with respect to job description, it was realised that most positions lacked clear job descriptions to enable staff perform creditably. Due to undefined roles there was always duplication of functions. It was also observed from the study that those from the teaching field actually stick to their

respective roles but those in the non-teaching field for one or two reasons did sometimes ''cross carpet'' while their respective roles. This also prevents staff from working efficiently and effectively.

Furthermore, unclear job descriptions had always created difficulties over responsibility/authority. Individuals or groups may be uncertain as to who is responsible for performing which task/duties and who has the authority to direct whom. Each party may claim to reject responsibility and the result can be organisational politics. This occurs particularly when individual roles and responsibilities are not spelt out explicitly. This is confirmed by Nnadi (1997) in his observation that unclear job descriptions and employee roles create conflict because such a worker is unsure of what his/her job responsibilities are.

The study also sought to find out how members of staff were treated. It was gathered from the interview that members of staff were not treated fairly especially in the area of allocation of office logistics, promotion as well as staff development as laid down rules were normally set aside and favouritism comes to play. This is a quote from one of the interviewees; "there is inequality in the way members of staff were treated as there were factions everywhere that lobby for their personal interest". Another respondent indicated that "fairness is subjective and it can be assessed better by the person to whom the decision affects".

It was again gathered from the interview that members of staff did not trust each other due to the politically charged environment that had developed in the Polytechnic. One respondent indicated that the level of mistrust is very high as the perception of cliques with the institution creates mistrust among staff. This

61

explains that when employees see others around them using politics to their advantage, they perceive such outcomes as unfair and thus a sense of distrust and suspicion as regard to the person employing politics as well as the person giving rewards creeps in (Ferris et al, 1995). Organisations that are characterised by climates of mistrust, anxiety and stress, defensiveness, low support and poor communication are very difficult ones in relation to effective performance (Heneman, Ledford & Gresham, 2000).

The study also sought to find out if the Polytechnic had experienced any form of politics in the last six months. It was realised from the interview that the Polytechnic had indeed experienced politics in the last six months, this occurred due to the election of Vice Rectorshipposition and sometimes in appointment of heads of department as favouritism always comes to play. Again differences in views /opinions with regard to leadership, promotion and transfer of staff from one department to the other also accounted for the political environment in the Polytechnic.

On the issue of how the Polytechnic manage organisational politics when it brews up, the interviewees indicated that management sometimes remains adamant to the situation. Their observation was that anytime politics arose, solutions found to reduce the tension was in favour of some departments. There is always the issue of blame game and pointing of accusing fingers. The statute was also sometimes used as the basis for managing the internal politics in the Polytechnic. Again they indicated that when politics are not managed well it

usually creates a hostile organisational environment which does not foster organisational growth.

The study further sought to find out the effects of organisational politics to the Polytechnic. It was established from the interview that when the Polytechnic faces politics, it becomes very difficult for management to take certain vital decisions which tends to affect the growth of the institution. Moreover as hard work fails to become the yardstick for recognition and promotion for deserving staff, it gives way for politics among staff which negatively affects the productivity of the Polytechnic. This observation confirms the equity theory by Adams (1965), where he opined that employees seek to maintain equity between the inputs they bring to a job and the outcomes that they receive from it against the perceived inputs and outcomes of others. Thus when staff are not treated fairly, it causes them to be de-motivated which goes a long way to negatively influence employees to be efficient and effective in order to achieve organisational goals and objectives.

They further stated thatpolitics in the organisation negatively affects employee morale, promotes the use grapevine which affects team work and as a result hinder their output.The response further explains studies done by Parker et al (1995) which establish that if an employee perceives the political environment around him to be negative it leads to a variety of outward outcomes like decreased organisational commitment, job stress, turnover, job dissatisfaction decreased productivity and overall organisational inefficiency.

The study showed that organisational management mechanism employed by the Management of Cape Coast Polytechnic did not help keep the politics at an appreciable level. This was due to unfair or indiscriminate job rotation/transfers from one section to the other. The respondents further explained that the mechanism employed was not appropriate as it usually results in mistrust, misgivings and negative attitude toward work. Moreover the mechanisms employed had failed to solve most of the issues that occurs.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the findings of the study, conclusions and recommendations. The study analysed the causes, prevention and management oforganisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic. Areas for further research are also suggested in this chapter.

Summary

The study was conducted to find out the causes, prevention and management of organisational politics at Cape Coast Polytechnic. The study was based on a descriptive research design and the population for the study was staff from the various departments of Cape Coast Polytechnic (teaching and non-teaching staff).Simple random sampling was used for the study.Questionnaires and structured interviews were used to solicit for data for the study. The questionnaire consisted of 26 items to elicit information from both the teaching and non-teaching staff whereas 17 structured interview questions were used to elicit information from the Deans and Heads of departments/sections of the various departments. The study used statistical tools to analyse the data. The following are the findings of the study:

1. Politics in the organisation was not really as bad as it is perceived. Organisational politics could negatively affect the performance of the employee and the organisation as a whole if the right mechanisms are not put in place to manage it.

2. The findings again clearly revealed that staff becomes less enthusiastic about their duties/tasks leading to low productivity. This impedes management decisions negatively as expressed by most of the respondents.

3. Majority of the respondents agreed that organisational politics was caused by limited resources in the Polytechnic. This indicates that there has not been much effort with regard to increasing the Polytechnic resource base.

4. Furthermore, it was observed that non-management of organisational politics led to apathy on the part of employees, dissatisfaction and aggrieved members resigned their jobs. In these times where most organisations place more emphasis on experience, it was rather observed that Cape Coast Polytechnic staff after acquiring experience which makes them more marketableleave the institution due to the high level of politics in the institution.

5. It was again realised from the study that failure on the part of management to share ideas and necessary information leaves the employees at bay making them guess to conclude on their own observation.

6. Again, the study shows that as measures to reduce if not eliminate politics in the institution, the Management of the Polytechnic has put in place

66

some committees, however it failed to implement some decisions made by thesesame committees.

7. The study again reveals that Management of the Polytechnic sometimes does not ensure fairness in dealing with some issues like promotion, staff development among others. It is said that "a supervisor who favours one side makes the losing side to be resentful".

8. It was again observed from the study that unclear job descriptions and employee roles creates organisational politics, because the employee is unsure of what is expected of him or her.

9. Finally, the study revealed that sometimes, Management relies on formal authority to ensure compliance. Authorities of Cape Coast Polytechnic always want to maintain the status quo and therefore see threats as a defensible mechanism. Employees tend to go the way of the authorities for fear of being victimised. This also gives way to a hostile environment.

Conclusions

Organisational politics has become a common scourge in modern organisations. Even when organisations are properly structured with appropriate policies, there will still be the natural tendency for people to act beyond expectation in efforts to have an edge over others in a world characterised by scarcity and uncertainty. The study has established that some individuals or groups will naturally take advantage of circumstances at work which will benefit them personally.

Finally, it may be concluded from the findings of the study that, if organisational politics is not managed properly it will lead to de-motivation and then low productivity. Moreover, organisational politics impedes the implementation of certain major policies in the Polytechnic. Politics in the organisation has both negative and positive influences on employees and the organisation as a whole.

Recommendations

From the findings and conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are made:

1. There should be awareness creation about the dangers of organisational politics since it has the tendency of retarding the growth of the Polytechnic.

2. It is recommended that management of the Polytechnic address themselves to how they can curtail the emergence of organisational politics rather than concentrating on how to manage it in the various departments.

3. Management of Cape Coast Polytechnic should ensure the free flow of information. This will curtail inaccurate information that normally characterises the use of grape vine.

4. Top management should try to avoid the accumulation of scarce resources in the hands of some individuals/groups and ensure that there is equitable distribution of resources within all section of the organisation

5. The use of dialogue in managing organisational politics should be embraced by the Polytechnic Management. Moreover, there is the need to carefully study the causes of politics in the respective departments and adopt appropriate strategies for managing organisational politics so as to enhance effective and maximum results.

6. It is also recommended that heads of department/sections should be fair minded, articulate and committed to high quality service in order to set the tone for the creation of a healthy organisational climate.

7. Management should ensure that individual roles and responsibilities are clearly spelt out.

8. The Polytechnic Management should try as much as possible to discourage victimisation of employees. It is also recommended that a good atmosphere that is reciprocal, fair and fulfills the expectation and needs of employees as well as the organisation is created.

9. Both Management and employees should set aside their personal interests in the pursuit of organisational goals.

10. A good interpersonal relationship should exist between Management and employees so as to identify the needs of employees and provide them in order to create a peaceful environment, prevent divisions and conflict.

Suggestion for Further Research

Although the study examined the effects of organisational politics on the performance of employees in Cape Coast Polytechnic, further research can be conducted to include more diverse industry types to add more insight to current issues surrounding organisational politics.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in experimental social Psychology, 2, 267-299.*

Anderson, P. (1999). Perspective: Complexity theory and organisation science. *Organisation science*, *10*(3), 216-232.

Andrews, M. C., &Kacmar, K. M. (2001). Discriminating among organisational politics, justice, and support. *Journal of organisational behavior*, *22*(4), 347-366.

Beugré, C. D., & Liverpool, P. R. (2006). Perceptions of organisational politics: A justice perspective. *Handbook of organisational politics*, 122-135. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Bolander, J. (2012). How to Deal with Organisational Politics. The *Daily MBA*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Brouer, R. L., Harris, K. J., &Kacmar, K. M. (2011). The moderating effects of Political skill on the perceived politics–outcome relationships. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, *32*(6), 869-885.

Buchanan, D., &Badham, R. (2008). *Power, politics, and organisational change: Winning the turf game*. Sage Publications.

Byrne, Z. S. (2005). Fairness reduces the negative effects of organisational Politics on turnover intentions, citizenship behavior and job performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *20*(2), 175-200.

71

Cacciattolo, K. (2014). Defining organisational politics. *European Scientific Journal*.

Chang, C. H., Rosen, C. C., Siemieniec, G. M., & Johnson, R. E. (2012). Perceptions of Organisational Politics and Employee Citizenship Behaviors: Conscientiousness and Self-Monitoring As Moderators. Journal *of Business and Psychology,* 27(4), 395-406.

Chaudhary, R., Rangnekar, S., &Barua, M. K. (2012). Relationships between occupational self efficacy, human resource development climate, and work engagement. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 18(7/8), 370-383.

Chen, Z. X., &Budhwar, P. S. (2004). Exchange fairness and employee performance: An examination of the relationship between organisational politics and procedural justice. *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *94*(1), 1-14.

Daft, R. L. (2007). *Understanding the Theory and DesignLofJOrganisations*. Mason: Thomson.USA: Vanderbilt University

Denzin, N. K.& Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. USA: Sage Publications.

DeSimone, L. R., & Harris, M. D. (1998). Coaching. *Human Resource Development, 2nd, America, Dryden*, 277-301.

Drory, A., &Romm, T. (1988). Politics in organisation and its perception within the organisation. *Organisation Studies*, *9*(2), 165-179.

Drory, A., &Romm, T. (1990). The definition of organisational politics: A review. *Human relations*, *43*(11), 1133-1154.

Drory, A. (1993). Perceived political climate and job attitudes. *Organisation studies*, *14*(1), 59-71.

Dubrin, R. (1998). Central life interests and organisational commitment of workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *20*, 411-421.

Dwyer, K. P.(2007, July 2). *"How to Win at Office Politics",*CBS MoneyWatch. Retrieved from http:www.bnet.com

Fedor, D., Maslyn, J., Farmer, S., &Bettenhausen, K. (2008). The contribution of positive politics to the prediction of employee reactions.*Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *38*(1), 76-96.

Ferris, G. R., Russ, G. S., &Fandt, P. M. (1989). Politics in organisations. In R. A. Giacalone& F. Rosenfield (Eds.), Impression management in the organisation: 143-170. Hillsdale, NJ Lawrence Erlbaum

Ferris, G. R., Fedor, D. B., Chachere, J. G., &Pondy, L. R. (1989). Myths and politics in organisational contexts. *Group &Organisation Management*, *14*(1), 83-103.

Ferris, G. R., King, T. R., Judge, T. A., &Kacmar, K. M. (1991). The management of shared meaning in organisations: Opportunism in the reflection of attitudes, beliefs, and values.USA: Sage Publications.

Ferris, G. R., &Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Perceptions of organisational politics. *Journal of management*, *18*(1), 93-116.

Ferris, G. R., Fedor, D. B., & King, T. R. (1994). A political conceptualisation of managerial behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, *4*(1), 1-34.

Ferris, G. R., Frink, D. D., Beehr, T. A., & Gilmore, D. C. (1995). Political Fairness and Fair Politics: The Conceptual Integration of Divergent Constructs. In Cropanzano, R. S.&Kacmar, K. M. (eds.), Organisational Politics, Justice and Support. Managing the Social Climate of the Workplace (21-36), Quorum, Westport, CT.

Ferris, G. R., Frink, D. D., Galang, M. C., Zhou, J., Kacmar, K. M., & Howard, J. L. (1996). Perceptions of organisational politics: Prediction, stress-related implications, and outcomes. *Human relations*, *49*(2), 233-266.

Folger, R., Konovsky, M. A., &Cropanzano, R. (1992). A due process metaphor for performance appraisal. *Research in organisational behavior*, *14*, 129-129.

Gandz, J., & Murray, V. V. (1980). The experience of workplace politics. *Academy of Management journal*, *23*(2), 237-251.

Geneen, H. (1984). *Managing*. USA, New York: Doubleday Publishing Group.

George JM, Jones G. R. (2011). *Contemporary Management*. (7th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Gilmore, D. C., Ferris, G. R., Dulebohn, J. H., & Harrell-Cook, G. (1996). Organisational politics and employee attendance. *Group &Organisation Management*, *21*(4), 481-494.

Grote, J., &McGeeney, J. (1997). *Clever as serpents: Business ethics and office politics*. Liturgical Press.

Heneman, R. L., Ledford Jr, G. E., & Gresham, M. T. (2000). *The changing n nature of work and its effects on compensation design and delivery In RL Rynes, & B. Gerhart (Eds.),* Compensation in organisations.

Höpfl, H. M. (1999). Power, authority and legitimacy. *Human Resource Development International*, *2*(3), 217-234.

Hungler, B. P., &Polit, D. F. (1999). *Nursing research principles and methods.* USA:Lippincott Company

Kacmar, K. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1991). Perceptions of organisational politics scale (POPS): Development and construct validation. *Educational and Psychological measurement*, *51*(1), 193-205.

Kacmar, K. M., & Carlson, D. S. (1997). Further validation of the perceptions of politics scale (POPS): A multiple sample investigation. *Journal of management*, *23*(5), 627-658.

Kapoutsis, I., &Thanos, I. (2016). Politics in organisations: Positive and negative aspects of political behavior. *European Management Journal*, *34*(31), 0e312.

Keller, G., &Warrack, B. (2000). Statistics for Managing and Economics. Pacific Grove. Thomson Learning.

Kotter, J. P. (2010). *Power and influence*. USA, New York: The Free Press. Simon and Schuster Inc.

Krackhardt, D. (1990). Assessing the political landscape: Structure, cognition, and power in organisations. *Administrative science quarterly*, 342-369.

Kreitner, R., &Kinicki, A. (2007). Organisational behaviour. New York, NY.:

Irwin/McGraw- Hill.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Table for determining sample size from a given population. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *30*(3), 607-610.

Kumar, P.,&Ghadially, R. (1989). Organisational politics and its effects on members of organisations. *Human Relations*, *42*(4), 305-314.

Ladebo, O. J. (2006). Perceptions of organisational politics: Examination of a situational antecedent and consequences among Nigeria's extension personnel. *Applied Psychology*, *55*(2), 255-281.

Malik, M. E., Danish, R. Q., &Ghafoor, M. (2009). Relationship between age, perceptions of organisational politics and job satisfaction. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, *19*(1/2), 23.

Mayes, B. T., & Allen, R. W. (1977). Toward a definition of organisational politics. *Academy of Management Review*, *2*(4), 672-678.

McKay, D. (2009). *American politics and society*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

McShane, S. L. &Von Glinow. M. A. (2000). *Organisational Behavior: Emergingrealities for the workplace revolution*.Boston: McGraw-Hill.

McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2005). OrganisationalBehaviour: The power of people and leadership in what the best MBAs know.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organisations* (Vol. 142). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1985). The organisation as political arena. *Journal of management studies*, *22*(2), 133-154.

Molm, L. D. (1997). *Coercive power in social exchange*. Cambridge University Press.

Nelson D. & Quick J. (2010). *OrganisationalBehaviour: An Instructors Manual.* Mason, OH: South Western College.

Nnadi, E. E. (1997). *Handbook on human resources management for healthcare professionals*. Washington D.C:Howard University Press.

Norman, K. D. &Yvonna, S. L. (2005). *The Sage handbook ofqualitative research*. Sage Publications.

NyikayarambaM. B., &MutimudyeM. G. (2014). Integrating organisational politics intoorganisational systems, functions and procedures. A human capital performance enhancement strategy. *International Journal of Marketing,Financial Services and Management Research,* 3(6): 144-159.

O'connor, W. E., & Morrison, T. G. (2001). A comparison of situational and dispositional predictors of perceptions of organisational politics. *The Journal of Psychology*, *135*(3), 301-312.

Osborn, M. M. (2000). Why communication is important: A rationale for the centrality of   the study of communication. *JACA-ANNANDALE-*, (1), 1-25.

Othman, R. (2008). Organisational politics: the role of justice, trust and job ambiguity. *Singapore Management Review*, *30*(1), 43.

Parker, C. P., Dipboye, R. L., & Jackson, S. L. (1995). Perceptions of organisational politics: An investigation of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Management*, *21*(5), 891-912.

Pfeffer, J., &Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in organisations* Marshfield,MA: Pitman Publishing.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organisations*. Harvard Business Press.

Poon, J. M. (2003). Situational antecedents and outcomes of organisational politics perceptions. *Journal of managerial psychology*, *18*(2), 138-155.

Randall, M. L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C. A., &Birjulin, A. (1997). Organisational Politics and Organisational Support as Predictors of Work Attitudes, Job Performance, and OrganisationalCitizenship Behavior. Journal of Organisational Behavior, 20(2), 159-174.

Robbins, S. P. (1983). The theory Z organisation from a power-control perspective. *California management review*, *25*(2), 67-75.

Robbins, S.P., Judge, T.A., &Sanghi, S. (2008). *Organisational Behavior.* (12th ed).

Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., Odendaal, A., &Roodt, G. (2009). Organisational behaviour: Global and South African perspectives. Cape Town.

Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., Millett, B., & Jones, M. (2010). *OB: the essentials*. Pearson Higher Education AU.

Schermerhor J. R., Hunt J. G., &Osborn R. N.(2008).*OrganisationalBehaviour.*(10th ed). New Delhi: Wiley India.

Serven, L. B. M. (2002). *End of Office Politics as Usual*. American Management Association International.

Sibanda, P., Muchena, T., &Ncube, F. (2014). Employee engagement and organisational performance in a public sector organisation in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, *4*(1), 89-99.

Simmons, B. L. (2009). Negative effects of bad politics at work. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Smith G. R. (2007). *Political Behaviour in the Workplace, the Management Agenda*.Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Sonaike, K. (2013). Revisiting The Good And Bad Sides Of Organisational Politics. *Journal of Business & Economics Research (Online)*, *11*(4), 197.

Thompson, L. L. (2008). *Organisational behavior today*. Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Valle, M., & Witt, L. A. (2001). The moderating effect of teamwork perceptions on the organisational politics-job satisfaction relationship. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *141*(3), 379-388.

Vigoda, E. (2000). Organisational politics, job attitudes, and work outcomes: Exploration and implications for the public sector. *Journal of vocational Behavior*, *57*(3), 326-347.

Vigoda-Gadot, (2003). *Developments in organisational politics:How political dynamics affect employee performance in modern worksites*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Vigoda-Gadot, E., &Drory, A. (2006). *Handbook of organisationalpolitics*.

Edward Elgar Publishing.

Vredenburgh, D., &Shea-VanFossen, R. (2010). Human nature, organisational politics, and human resource development. *Human Resource Development Review*, *9*(1), 26-47.

Witt, L. A., Patti, A. L., & Farmer, W. L. (2002). Organisational politics and work identity as predictors of organisational commitment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *32*(3), 486-499.

Yousef, D. A. (1999). Organisational commitment: A mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *15*(1), 6-24.

Zhou, J., & Ferris, G. R. (1995). The Dimensions and consequences of organisational Politics perceptions: A confirmatory analysis1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *25*(19), 1747-1764.

http://www.alchemyformanagers.co.uk (2014, October 30).

http://www.forbes.com (2014, October 30).

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Office_politics. (2014, November 17).

http://www.zeepedia.com (2014, October 30).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STAFF (TEACHING & NON-TEACHING)

INTRODUCTION

This research is being conducted to assess the causes, prevention and management of Organisational Politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic. Your response will be aggregated to other responses and would be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Please tick (√)the appropriate box and provide answers where space is provided.

1) Category of staff :

Senior member [   ]   Senior staff [   ]

2) Level of education:

Higher National Diploma [   ] Bachelor's Degree [   ]Masters Degree [   ]

PhD [   ]

Any other, please specify……………………………………………….

3) Present position/status...

4) How long have you been working in the Polytechnic

a) 1-5   [   ]   b) 6-10   [   ]   c) 11-15   [   ]   d) 16-20   [   ]

e) 21-25 [   ]   f) 26-30   [   ]

81

Kindly complete this section by circling the appropriate response to each of the statement as follows:

4 Strongly agree

3 Agree

2 Disagree

1 Strongly disagree

Causes of Organisational Politics

NO.	STATEMENTS	RESPONSES			
5	Organisational politics is caused by limited resources.	1	2	3	4
6	Politics in the office is caused by ambiguous decisions and roles.	1	2	3	4
7	Organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic is caused by inappropriate use of the communication chain.	1	2	3	4
8	Employees engage in office politics due to unfair promotion of staff.	1	2	3	4
9	Organisational politics occur when there is change eg, reshuffle and transfer of staff.	1	2	3	4
10	Organisational politics is caused by unrealized expectations	1	2	3	4
11	Organisational politics is caused by differences in goals	1	2	3	4

Any other, please specify

…………………………………………………………………………………….…………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

Kindly indicate the importance Cape Coast Polytechnic attaches to the following in the prevention of politics in the organisation by circling the appropriate response to each of the statements as follows:

4 Strongly agree

3 Agree

2 Disagree

1 Strongly disagree

Organisational politics prevention strategy

NO.	STATEMENTS	RESPONSES			
12	The Management of Cape Coast Polytechnic makes sure that there is a free flow of information to all staff.	1	2	3	4
13	Cape Coast Polytechnic Management ensures that the appropriate use of chain of communication/command.	1	2	3	4
14	Management makes ensures that roles are well defined.	1	2	3	4
15	Management of the Polytechnic is always fair in its dealings with all departments and staff.	1	2	3	4
16	Resources are made available to all staff equally.	1	2	3	4

Please specify any other

……………………………………………………………………………………...……………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

Kindly indicate the importance Cape Coast Polytechnic attaches to the following in managing politics in the organisation when it occurs by circling the appropriate response to each of the statements as follows:

4   Strongly agree

3   Agree

2   Disagree

1 Strongly disagree

Managing Organisational politics

NO.	STATEMENTS	RESPONSES			
17	The Management of Cape Coast Polytechnic relies on the use of power/authority to ensure compliance.	1	2	3	4
18	By use of threats.	1	2	3	4
19	Disputing parties agree to accept the decision of a neutral arbiter.	1	2	3	4
20	Involving a third party instead of dealing with the persons involved.	1	2	3	4

Please specify any other

………………………………………………………………………………....………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

Please tick **(√)**the appropriate box and provide answers where space is provided.

21. i) Do you perceive organisational politics as a bad practice?

       a) Yes [   ]   b) No [   ]

 ii)   if   yes,   please   state   your   reasons

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

iii)   If   no   please   state   your

reasons…………………………………………………………………………..……….

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

22. i) Do you experience orgainasational politics with regard to staff promotion procedure?

       a) Yes [   ]   b) No [   ]

 ii)   What   are   the   effects   when   such   issues   are   not   handled appropriately…………………………...………………………………………….

………………………………………………………………………………………

23. i) Do you experience organisational politics with regard to staff development?

       a) Yes [   ]   b) No [   ]

 ii)   What   are   the   effects   when   such   issues   are   not   handled appropriately…………………………...………………………………………….

………………………………………………………………………………………

24. i) Do you experience organisational politics when roles are not well defined?

      a) Yes [   ]   b) No [   ]

  ii)   If   yes,   how   does   it   affect   your   performance   at   the workplace……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………

25) What are your impressions about the way the above issues are handled by the Polytechnic   administration?

a) Very good [   ]   b) Good [   ]   c) Fairly good [   ]

d) Not very good [   ]

26) Is organisational politics a bad practice?

      a) Yes [   ]   b) No [   ]

86

APPENDIXB

INTERVIEW GUIDE

INTRODUCTION

This research is being conducted to assess the causes, prevention and management of organisational politics in Cape Coast Polytechnic. Your response will be aggregated to other responses and would be treated with utmost confidentiality.

1. What is your position in the Polytechnic?

   a) Rector   [   ]

   b) Vice Rector   [   ]

   c) Registrar   [   ]

   d) Deputy Registrar   [   ]

   e) Senior Assistant Registrar   [   ]

   f) Dean   [   ]

   g) Head of Department   [   ]

2. Number of years worked with Cape Coast Polytechnic.

   a) 1-5 [ ]   b) 6-10 [   ]   c) 11-15 [   ]   d) 16-20   [   ]

   e) 21-25 [   ]   f) 26-30   [   ]

3. In an institution like Cape Coast Polytechnic, organisational politics is inevitable.

87

In your view what do you think are some of the causes?

……………………………………………………………………………………………….

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

How do you perceive organisational politics?

4. How does organisational politics affect work performance in your institution?

5. In what situation(s) do you experience politics in the organisation?

6. How do you handle politics with regard to promotion procedure?

7. How do you handle politics with regard to transfer procedure?

8. How do you handle politics with regard to staff development system?

9. Please comment on how the Polytechnic goes about the following:

a) Allocation of funds and other resources to various department/sections.

....

b) Delegation of authority

....

c) Communication flow

....

d) Job descriptions

....

11) Please comment on the following:

a) Members of staff are treated fairly

88

………………………………………………………………………………………….,

b) Members of staff have trust for each other

…………………………………………………………………………………………

12) Has the Polytechnic experienced any form of politics in the last six months?

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

a) If yes, what accounted for/caused it?

....

b) If no, what accounted for the absence of politics?

....

13) How does the Polytechnic manage when Organisational Politics when it brews up?

…………………………………………………………………………………………

14) How does organisational politics affect the performance of staff of the Polytechnic if not   resolved appropriately?

…………………………………………………………………………………………

15) How does organisational politics affect the Polytechnic if not resolved appropriately?

…………………………………………………………………………………………

16) What mechanisms does the Polytechnic employ in managing politics when it occurs?

……………………………………………………………………………………

17) Do you consider the mechanism employed as appropriate?

    Yes [   ]   No [   ]

a) Please give reasons for your response.

     ....