

ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS AND PERFORMANCE OF STATE DEPARTMENTS IN KENYA

Judith E. Bwonya

*School of Management and Leadership,
The Management University of Africa, Kenya*

Prof. Martin Ogutu, PhD

*Department of Business Administration,
School of Business, University of Nairobi, Kenya*

Dr. Washington O. Okeyo, PhD

*Vice-Chancellor and Senior Lecturer,
Management and Leadership,
School of Management and Leadership,*

Abstract

Organizational politics has been one of the popular subjects in industrial or organizational psychology due to its impact on organizational outcomes such as job dissatisfaction, turnover intent, disloyalty and lowered perceived innovation, as well as lowered job performance. Organizational politics arise in any organization due to power, influence, and self-interest among the employees. There is no doubt that organizational politics is a common practice at the work place in every organization. Due to the huge impact politics can have on decisions of all kinds and sizes, as well as organizational health and employee engagement, this paper focuses on the impact internal workplace politics has on individuals and organizations. Organizational politics is an elusive type of power relations in the workplace. It represents a unique domain of interpersonal relations, characterized by the active or passive engagement of people who engage in constant influence tactics and power struggles. These activities are frequently aimed at securing or maximizing personal interests or, alternatively, avoiding negative outcomes within the organization. Organizational politics can be beneficial for the employees and can be a threat to the carrier as well. For instance, most employees may want to avoid the rigorous structured chains of command that have been put in place by management for their own self-benefits and rewards, undermining the repercussions in the long run. Organizational politics result in negligent behavior and obstructive organizational performance. The negligent behavior and negative job attitudes of employees are likely to cause damage to positive organizational outcomes. Therefore, it is important to understand and evaluate the perceptions regarding organizational politics by studying its relationship with organizational performance. This paper reinforces that the management needs to understand the employee's perception about the organizational politics prevailing in their organizations and to therefore adopt strategies that would minimize the perception on organizational politics and enhance employee performance. This paper revealed that internal politics had both positive and negative influence on an organization's performance. The paper recommends future studies should consider introducing different variables and parameters to check on the relationship between organizational politics and performance.

Keywords: Organizational politics, Political behaviour, Workplace, Organizational performance

INTRODUCTION

Background

Recently studies conducted in different organizational and regional contexts show that low performance of individuals is largely attributed to organizational politics (Abbas, & Awan, 2017; Samad, & Amri, 2017; Vimala, 2013; Ugwu, Ndugbu, Okoroji, & Kalu, 2014; Park, & Jee, 2020; Ahmad, Hashmi, & Akhtar, 2016; Rahman, Hussain, & Haque, 2011; Bodla, Afza, & Danish, 2014). Organizational politics is a prevailing issue in today's organizations, thus, a thorough investigation would help prevent its harmful results. It is further stated by the researchers that employee's perception regarding organizational politics contributes to some adverse and negative outcomes, such as lesser commitment towards the organization, lowered performance of tasks, narrowed behavior of citizenship of the organization and satisfaction about their job (Asrar-ul-Haq et al., 2019). Yet in recent years some studies suggest that positive relationships exist between perceived organizational politics and individual outcomes like career advancement, the achievement of organizational and personal goals, enhancement of positive position and power, successful implementation of organizational policies, especially during the time of change in procedures and processes (Kane-Frieder, Hochwarter, Hampton, & Ferris, 2014; Vigoda Gadot, 2007; Hochwarter, 2012; Eldor, 2017).

Organizational politics within a workplace is implied by Bouckenooghe, Zafar and Raja (2015) as the premeditated use of power by individuals to satisfy personal interests and goals within their workplace. Many managers resort to using their positions of power within an organization to affect decision making and influence an action. Organizational politics can manipulate behaviors and transform organizational harmony and effectiveness to a more destructive outcome. Researchers portray organizational politics negatively as well as neither completely illegal nor legal action (Ferris & King, Judge, & Kacmar, 1991). Organizational politics is conceived as the enemy of any organization by researchers (Allen, Madison, Porter, Renwick, & Mayes, 1979; Mintzberg, 1983, 1985). This perception is very crucial for employees and organizations equally (Pfeffer, 1981). Researchers shed light on the consequences of organizational politics as well as antecedents, which highlights what happens to career or job related issues (Jawahar, Meurs, Ferris & Hochwarter, 2008; Blickle, Schneider, Liu & Ferris, 2011; Todd, Harris, Harris, & Wheeler, 2009). The perception of organizational politics is subjective, varies in situations, times, individual, and is different from actual organizational politics which is objectively observable (Cohen, Vigoda, & Samorly, 2001). It may be concluded from the notion that it is individual centered and closely related to one's emotions (Vigoda-Gadot, Vinarski-Peretz, & Ben-Zion, 2003).

Driven heavily by self-interest, organizational politics can result in myriad negative organizational outcomes that can lead to the ultimate demise of the organization by reducing productivity and profits (Miller, Rutherford, & Kolodinsky, 2008; Vigoda-Gadot & Talmud, 2010). Organizational politics sets the stage for a negative work environment (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997), which does not support production. Fear and low employee confidence are by-products of organizational politics that support a disruptive organization thus making goal achievement difficult (Cropanzano et al., 1997). Employee perceptions of organizational politics can also negatively impact job related outcomes and does so when employees perceive their work environment to be political (Vigoda-Gadot & Talmud, 2010). Overall, organizational politics impacts employees negatively because they feel like they have no control within the organization, in addition to a lack of trust of those in power positions (Malik, Danish, & Ghafoor, 2009).

The negative influences of organizational politics that, over time, can render the organization dysfunctional are many and somewhat subjective; thus, those presented here are not to be considered exhaustive. Negative influences of organizational politics include: the playing of favorites (Malik, et al., 2009); poor organizational citizenship behaviors such as backstabbing among employees (Chang, Rosen & Levy, 2009); the decline in job satisfaction and increases of job stress (Miller, et al., 2008); an indifferent employee attitude demonstrated by decreases in commitment to the organization and its goals; and poor job performance (Witt, Andrews, & Kacmar, 2000); negligent behaviors (Vigoda, 2000); disruption of return on employee investment (Hochwarter, Kacmar, Perrewe, & Johnson, 2003); lower morale (Chang et al., 2009); and higher rates of employee turnover (Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann & Birjulin, 1999).

Organizational Politics

Organizational politics has been defined and measured in several different ways due to diverse definitions and measures in the scholarly literature. In the early works like Allen, Madison, Porter, Renwick and Mayes (1979), organizational politics is defined as intentional acts of influence to enhance or protect the self-interest of individuals or groups. Pettigrew (2014) defined organizational politics as the use of power to influence decision making, while Pfeffer (1981) described organizational politics as how power is used to resolve uncertainty and or dissention regarding organizational

actions and objectives. Despite various definitions offered by scholars however, according to Kacmar and Carlson (1997), the definitions of organizational politics share common points in terms of: (a) political activities are a means of exercising social influence, (b) political behaviors are designed to promote or protect one's self interests, (c) at least two parties with the potential to possess different interests must be involved. This paper adopted the definition of organizational politics as suggested by Cropanzano *et al.*, (1995), which defined organizational politics as social influence to those who can provide rewards that will help promote or protect the self-interests of the actor(s). This definition is also shared by Kacmar and Carlson (1997), Harris, James and Boonthanom (2005) and Daft (2015). Much of the scholarly research in the field of organizational theory is originated from a quest to understand the antecedents and effects of organizational politics on individual productivity and job performance in the workplace. Political activities play key roles in the organization, which are; structural change, management succession and resource allocation (Daft, 2015). This suggests that organizational politics can be defined based on these three perspectives. Structural change or structural reorganization relates to power and authority which will affect the underlying power base from strategy contingencies that lead to an explosion of political activity (Galbraith, 1977). Management succession refers to organizational changes such as promotion, transfers and new hiring of staff, which according to Daft (2015), have great political impact, especially at top management level in terms of network of trusts, cooperation and communication, where uncertainty is high. Meanwhile, resource allocation relates to the decision made to determine required resources for organization performance such as salaries, operating budgets, employees, office facilities and equipment which require political processes to resolve dilemmas due to conflicts and disagreement (Daft, 2015). Pfeffer (1981) stated that organizational politics involves activities to acquire, develop and use power, and other resources to influence others as well as to obtain the desired outcome under uncertainty or disagreement of choices.

Amongst the studies done in the domain of perceived organizational politics, its linkage with work outcomes such as job performance, has drawn the interests of few researchers (Aryee, Chen & Budhwar, 2004; Byrne, 2005; Chen & Fang, 2008; Zivnuska, Kacmar, Witt, Carlson & Bratton, 2004). However, despite the abundance of organizational politics and related research in literature, the results are still far from generalizable due to the settings of the studies (Parker *et al.*, 1995; Vigoda, 2007). This indicates that although several studies have been devoted to this topic, the results have reported mixed findings. Some researchers report a significant effect between organizational politics and job performance (Chen & Fang, 2007), while few others did not find any relationship (Aryee *et al.*, 2004; Zivnuska *et al.*, 2004). This, together with the pervasiveness and effects of organizational politics in the workplace, makes further investigation still necessary (Poon, 2003). In addition, researchers have suggested that further investigation need to be conducted on the antecedents of job performance, on behavioral aspects such as organizational politics (Rosen, Chang & Levy, 2006). Due to this scenario and organizational politics characteristics as an unavoidable construct in organizations, therefore, organizational politics deserves more attention and further investigation (Byrne, 2005).

Gull and Zaidi (2012) explained organizational politics as the process of attaining power to control others through diverse ways except merit or fortune. The utilization of political strategy and political activities such as non-availability of rules, manipulations and decision based on incomplete information in an organization, are inevitable and widespread. Employees in today's organization can recount political activities that they engaged in. Employees perceive organizational politics in a different way as a result of the effect of politics on them. While a workforce that identifies organizational politics as negative is one that does not gain from political activities. According to Cacciattolo (2014) organizational politics should not be power manipulating with hidden agendas. That is to say, organizational politics can be done in a way that will improve trust and foster organizational positive change and adaptation to work environment. An open political process in an organization enables employees to become determined towards learning ideas. At group level, organization politics fuel harmony and innovation among employees working together. Political games encourage grapevine and informal groups that stand as whistle blowers, it is used to correct inefficient, unethical behaviour and provides insight information about management. As indicated by Cacciattolo (2014), political conduct is actually connected with struggle and frequently certain workers challenge the official and formal specialist.

Organizational politics within a workplace is implied by Bouckennooghe *et al.* (2015) as the premeditated use of power by individuals, to satisfy personal interests and goals within their workplace. Many managers resort to using their position of power within an organization to affect decision making and influence an action. organizational politics can manipulate behaviors and transform organizational harmony and effectiveness to a more destructive outcome. Destructive outcomes include but not limit to reduction in job satisfaction and commitment to the overall organization, reduction in job effectiveness, higher intents to turnovers and higher job anxiety. Daskin and Tezer (2012) illustrated some of these destructive organizational consequences in their research.

According to Abbas and Raja (2014), organizational politics can be considered a portion of organization's social fabric. Although some researchers consider organizational politics to be a necessity for the growth of the organization, others

argue that it is an organizational stressor that negatively affects proper functioning of an organization. However, mixed evidence has been found regarding the impact of perceived organizational politics on various job outcomes. For instance, a study conducted by Chang, Rosen and Levy (2009) suggests that the impact of organizational politics on job outcomes varies across cultures. Globalization has emphasized the importance of organizational justice effects across different cultures. They outlined differences in cultures that may lead to differences in reactions and practices of organizational politics (Shao, Rupp, Skarlicki, & Jones, 2013). It is argued that reaction of employees towards organizational politics might be culture-dependent. Organizational politics within organizations is seen to be more prominent in countries that are labeled as being linked to individualism, femininity, uncertainty avoidance, and low power distance (Shao et al., 2013).

Performance

Performance is a multidimensional construct where different types of behaviors need to be considered in order to understand it (Aguinis, 2009). Literature has related employees' performance in organization based on two perspectives namely task performance (TP) and contextual performance (CP) (Borman *et al.*, 1997). Task performance refers to two activities mainly 1) activities that transform raw materials into goods and services in organization and 2) activities that help with the transformation process by for example providing planning, coordination and supervision to ensure organization efficiency and effectiveness (Casio & Aguinis, 2014). Accordingly, skills and abilities are the two main factors that contribute to task performance.

Contextually performance refers to behaviors that influence the effectiveness and efficiency of organization. Aguinis, (2009) suggested that a good environment in which task performance can occur will help to achieve these goals. Additionally, personality is one of the important aspects that plays a significant role in influencing contextual performance. Among the characteristics of CP as suggested by Aguinis, (2009) are: 1) persisting with enthusiasm and exerting extra effort to complete task activities 2) volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job, 3) helping and cooperating with others, 4) following organizational rules and procedures and 5) endorsing, supporting and defending organizational objectives.

Richard, Devinney, Yip and Johnson (2009) observed that performance measures should not be made specific to research questions but be sufficiently robust to cover the domain of organizational performance. In conclusion, Richard et al. (2009) noted that organizational performance is one of the most important constructs in management research. Reviewing past studies reveals a multidimensional conceptualization of performance related to stakeholders, heterogeneous product market circumstances, and time (Richard, et al., 2009). O'Reilly *et al.* (2014) used the six factors method to measure organizational effectiveness and performance. The six factors include (a) adaptability, (b) integrity, (c) collaboration, (d) result oriented, (e) customer oriented, and (f) detail-oriented factors. Flamholtz and Randle (2012) also identified three evaluation elements to evaluate the organization culture effectiveness. The three elements include (a) cultural alignment, (b) behavioral consistency, and (c) cultural gaps. The six factors of O'Reilly et al. are more detailed and suitable to measure the organizational values, beliefs, and norms (as cited in Hacker, 2015). The result from the evaluation may identify cultural gaps that show the difference between the desired values and the actual values in practice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Politics and Performance

Organizational politics also referred to as internal politics is the complex mixture of power, influence, behaviour and understanding leadership processes, self-interest behaviour in the organization (Vigoda-Gadot, 2002) and is generally related to the situations such as power struggles, conflicts over the sources of power and responsibilities to influence (Vigoda-Gadot, 2006). Researchers like Bodla and Danish (2010) define organizational politics in terms of behaviour and action of individuals in an organization to enhance their performance and professional career. The organization faces an external challenge like a competitor, and new technology, but within an organization, the organizational politics is a big issue that recently attracted the researcher attention. Organizational politics depend on the organization environment because the environment develops the political activities and develop favoritism (Arasli, Bavik & Ekiz, 2006; Arasli & Karadal, 2009; Poon, 2003; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Ferris *et al.*, 1991; Kusluvan, Ilhan & Buyruk, 2010; Ross, 2005; Vigoda-Gadot, 2002). Mintzberg (1983) stated that organizational politics is an informal and illegitimate employee behavior that shows legitimate power in different ways.

According to researchers, organizational politics works as an antecedent to outcomes of employees. As people act according to the perception of reality, perception of politics is important for the employees in an organization (Boerner, Eisenbeiss & Griesser, 2007). Bodla and Danish (2010) have stated that people can respond to the situation according to their perception and the real situation could be different from that. Pfeffer and Vega (1999) has termed politics as a dominant and wider social mean that determines the basic functioning of the organization, and commonly indicate power and influence tactics. Researchers like Vigoda-Gadot, Vinarski-Peretz and Ben-Zion (2003) have highlighted that the “self-serving behaviour of individuals is not accepted in the organization” is a common theme. In a common perception, the original meaning of politics is when an individual strives for their right in the society, with the help of negotiation and consultation (Watson, 2006). When employees perceive organizational politics at a high level, it indicates their dissatisfaction with the job (Robbins, 2003). Bodla and Danish (2010) highlight several factors which have an influence on the perception of organizational politics. Generally, antecedents of organizational politics can be categorized into demographics such as personal characteristics, needs and values, and the situational factors such as the level of the job and autonomy at organizational level. The outcomes and consequences of organizational politics are related to attitudinal and behavioural outcomes such as job stress, job satisfaction and employee turnover.

Organizational politics exist in all organizations and have a strong effect on diverse organizational processes, structures and procedures. Dubrin (cited in Olorunleke, 2015) described organizational politics as improper approaches of achieving supremacy through unmerited channels. Employees practise politics in different ways such as manipulating existing culture and promotion policies which are made to attain individual goals; and adoption of a particular behaviour for personal objectives. Political activities largely impact on employees' job satisfaction because it stimulates and fuels negative reactions. When employees perceive politics in how salary increases and payments are allocated to workers, their feelings about work environment will change dramatically. Politics in salary decision and promotion policies will reduce the level of employee satisfaction. Witt, Andrews and Kacmar (cited in Malik, Danish & Ghafoor, 2009) maintained that employees react negatively if it is seen that the pay system is based on political decisions. Aino and Sini (2009) revealed more that when politics is involved in salary decision-making, the less the employee satisfaction and the less the effectiveness of the organizational system.

Parvin and Kabir (2011) noted that contentment and competent employees are vital to the achievement of a corporate goal. According to Jitendra and Mini (2013), Employee job satisfaction is a set of positive feelings of an employee about the condition of the job. Spector (Cited in Jitendra and Mini, 2013) noted that job satisfaction is how employees feel about their jobs and diverse aspects such as the pay system, salary structure and opportunities for promotion, are used to ascertain the level of satisfaction an employee can achieve. General political behaviour and promotion policies positively or irrelatively associate with job satisfaction. In the same vein, Muhammad, Rizwan and Mudassar (2009) avers that the perception of organizational politics is negatively related to employee job satisfaction. Witt, Andrews and Kacmar (cited in Muhammad, Rizwan and Mudassar, 2009) revealed a negative association between promotion policies based on politics and promotional opportunities.

The organizational politics have been termed as an approach to gain power, not through merit and luck (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007). Influence is when power tactics are actually exercised and power is when there is a potential that exists to exercise power. In organizations, self-serving behaviour is normally adopted by the people. Small groups are formed and these groups are insensitive towards the needs of others. There is a possibility that such behaviour could create trouble for others. It is called politics. There are nine taxonomies of power tactics such as collision, rational persuasion, exchange, inspirational appeal, negotiation, personal appeal, consultation, legitimating and pressure (Cable & Judge, 2003). getting things done through influence and through means of self-motivation is called power. In organizations, employees believe that things are done through the use of power and during intra-organizational conflicts and in power, plays (Herrenkohl, Judson, & Heffner, 1999). Studies have shown that organizational politics is an important element of every organization, but there is a difference at the level of intensity of politics (Cable & Judge, 2003) having an effect on employee performance (Herrenkohl et al., 1999) and creating an image in terms of the environment and the culture of an organization in the minds of multiple stakeholders (Sussman, Adams, Kuzmits, & Raho, 2002).

Beugré and Liverpool (in Vigoda-Gadot & Drory, 2006) state that individuals engaging in political behaviour often treat others with disrespect and try to thwart formal procedures, especially when these procedures are not clear. As such, research has identified several areas in which employees engage in political behaviour, namely pressures for economy, management and subordinates relationships, structural power struggles between configured groups such as unions and employers, conflicts between the workforce and management for construing agreements, uncertainty about standards and strategies of promotion, difficulty in linking reward with productivity, and policies and procedures (Gotsis & Kortezi, 2010; Latif, Abideen & Nazar, 2011).

Indeed, individuals are more likely to engage in political behaviour when there is uncertainty involved in decision-making procedures and performance measures, and when competition is present among individuals and groups for limited resources (Gotsis & Kortezi, 2010; Othman, 2008; Poon, 2003). Moreover, according to Vigoda-Gadot (2007) the lack of nominal integrity and equality in these systems is a main root of higher perceptions of organizational politics. In organizations that adopt clear decision making processes and where competitive behaviour is less, a high level of political behaviour is not likely to be present.

According to Buchanan (2008), politics may also be caused by structural relationships within an organization. One group of employees may have particular performance indicators and tasks to fulfil that are very different from those of another group. Jehn (1997) refers to these diversities as task-focused conflicts. According to Jehn, these types of conflicts may be beneficial to an organization since they improve the decision making results and outputs through constructive criticism (Jehn, 1997). However, it is also likely that these task-related conflicts change into relationship conflicts, resulting into one group or individual disliking another group or individual and attach these task-related conflicts to personality issues (Jehn,1997).

Sussman, Adams, Kuzmits and Raho (2002) argue that political behaviour in organizations often conveys a normative, unethical implication. They confirm this through their quantitative study which they carried out regarding seven types of political behaviour in organizations as illustrated by Allen *et al* (1979), and their influence on communication media. The types of behaviour used in the study include: (1) Attacking or blaming others, (2) Using information as a political tool, (3) Creating a favourable image (impression management), (4) Developing a base of support, (5) Praising others (ingratiation), (6) Forming power coalitions with allies, and (7) Creating obligations (reciprocity). As will be seen, these types constitute an important part of the analytical framework of this study, and so merit some further explanation here. Attacking or blaming others is a tactic that includes both reactive and proactive behaviours. Allen *et al* (1979) state that the reactive behaviour involves scapegoating: more specifically, the individual concerned in this behaviour avoids his or her involvement with a detrimental or failing situation at work. On the other hand, proactive behaviour involves an individual making a rival look bad in the eyes of significant members of the organization (Allen *et al*, 1979). Using information as a political tool includes individuals who engage in preserving, twisting or using information to devastate another individual.

Hypothesis

The following research hypothesis was developed in order to accomplish the aims of the study:

H0₁: There is no significant effect of organizational politics on performance of State Departments of Kenya.

Conceptual Framework for the Study

Literature review reveals gaps in the findings and opinions of past studies. Whereas some views agree that organizational politics has a direct influence on organizational performance, others argue that this relationship is not conclusive and is subject to other factors. This paper investigated the effect of organizational politics in this relationship as presented in a diagrammatical form in Figure 2.1.



Figure1: Conceptual Framework

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopted a cross-sectional survey research design. This study aimed at empirically examining the relationship between measurable variables using a validated measurement instrument. This paper was guided by positivistic philosophy. The review mainly used quantitative analysis which were mentioned, and discussions specific to the study variables were identified, analyzed, and critiqued

Population

This study targeted the 40 State Departments in 21 Ministries in Kenya. These State Departments constituted the units of analysis. The units of observation were the top, middle and low-level management. The top-level management were included since they are the visionary, strategy and policy level individuals. The middle level management included the Director Administration, Technical Directors and Director Support Services. The low-level management were the Assistant Directors. Hence the population of the study was 40 State Departments. The target population of 40 State Departments was too small to be sampled. Therefore, all State Departments, of this population participated in the study. The 40 State Departments have 282 employees.

Sampling Design

Cooper and Schindler (2014) indicate the two conditions appropriate for a census study being that it is feasible when the population is small and necessary when the elements are quite different from each other. The size of the population of 282 suggests that a census is feasible and it eliminates sampling error and provides data on all the individuals in the population (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). Finally, in view of the poor response rate from this category of respondents, a census was preferred so that the responses received back would still be adequate for data analysis.

Data Collection

Data was collected by use of questionnaires. The study used primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected through questionnaires. Secondary data was obtained from performance reports. A structured questionnaire was administered; the questions were in closed and open-ended format based on the research objectives. The questionnaire was distributed by the researcher through drop and pick method to the selected respondents.

Data Analysis

Content analysis and statistics were employed. The qualitative data from the open-ended questions were analysed using thematic content analysis and presented in narrative form. The data analysis was done using quantitative techniques. The data collected was summarized, categorized and presented using frequency distribution tables. Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was used for testing the hypothesis to show the strength of the linear relationships between the variables in the regression.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Response Rate

The researcher distributed 272 questionnaires, out of which 250 responded positively by filling and returning the questionnaires. This represented an overall positive response rate of 91.91%. The remaining 8.09% were unresponsive even after several follow-ups and reminders.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

Category	Questionnaires distributed	Questionnaires filled returned	Percentage % response rate
Respondents	272	250	91.91

Reliability of the questionnaire was tested using Cronbach Alpha. The research instrument was reliable as the alpha for the variables was above 0.7. Table 4.6 shows the reliability results.

Table 4.6: Reliability

Variable	α =Alpha	No of Items	Comment
Internal Politics	.886	19	Reliable
Performance	.964	23	Reliable

Descriptive Statistics

Internal politics

The study sought to establish the influence of organizational politics on performance. The results in table 4.15 show the overall mean of statements depicting internal politics was 2.79, standard deviation of 1.241 and coefficient of variation of 45%, a low mean indicating a work environment that was not conducive. The statement with the highest mean was “Feeling that you are not liked nor accepted by your work mates is very stressful with a mean of 3.26, standard deviation of 1.438 and coefficient of variation of 44%. Forms of intimidation and unacceptance at the workplace may lower one's self esteem, hence reducing the morale thus leading to low employee commitment; which eventually result into organization failure. These finding indicate that internal politics greatly affect an organization's performance. The statement “I do not know what opportunities for career advancement or promotion exist for me in this State Department” (Mean=2.27, SD=1.177 and CV=52%) scored the lowest mean.

Table 4.2: Internal Politics

Dimension of internal Politics	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Coefficient of Variation (%)
People in this State Departments attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down	250	2.50	1.213	49
Sometimes it is easier to remain quiet than to fight the system	250	3.16	1.356	43
Telling others what they want to hear is sometimes better than telling the truth	250	2.80	1.319	47
Since I have worked for this State Departments, I have never seen the pay and promotion policies applied politically.	250	3.07	1.284	42
It is safer to think what you are told than to make up your own mind	250	2.93	1.302	44
When it comes to pay raise and promotion decisions, policies are irrelevant	250	2.49	1.281	51
There has always been an influential group in this State Departments that no one ever crosses	250	2.79	1.301	47
There is no place for yes-men and yes-women in this State Departments; good ideas are desired even if it means disagreeing with superiors	250	2.93	1.187	41
Agreeing with powerful others is the best alternative in this organization	250	2.82	1.161	41
It is best not to rock the boats in this organization	250	3.06	1.273	42
States department can appropriately deal with political issues.	250	3.12	1.125	36
Creates a hostile work environment	250	2.41	1.202	50
Internal politics have affected my long-term commitment with State Departments.	250		1.277	50
It is easy to adapt to the internal politics within the State Departments.	250	2.82	1.145	41
Internal politics ruin the collective efforts of employees in the States department..	250	3.12	1.21	39
Employees work under tension	250	2.31	1.122	49
Feeling that you are not liked and accepted by your work mates is very stressful	250	3.26	1.438	44

Table 4.2: Internal Politics (cont....)

Dimension of internal Politics	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Coefficient of Variation (%)
Feeling that you are not liked and accepted by your work mates is very stressful	250	3.26	1.438	44
Employees have little authority to carry out the responsibilities assigned to them	250	2.56	1.202	47
I do not know what opportunities for career advancement or promotion exist for me in this State Departments	250	2.27	1.177	52
Overall mean	250	2.79	1.241	45

Performance

From the results in table 4.16, the average mean of statements depicting performance of the State Departments was 3.35, standard deviation of 1.123 and coefficient of variation of 34%, a moderately high mean depicting effective resource allocation and distribution of budget to the county governments which in turn facilitate efficient service delivery. All the service delivery measures mean were above 3.0 implying that service delivery to citizens by county governments were above averagely met. Hence from the findings, it is evident that State Departments have an above average performance since it has facilitated effective resource allocation which in turn leads to effective service delivery by county governments. Traditionally, many government services in Kenya were centrally controlled directly by the government. Over time, the government adopted devolution through which provision of services in the county governments were channelled. This expansion has broadened the scope for public service. The devolution has broadened the scope for public services. These include subsidies to ensure availability of services at reasonable price as well as application of licensing and regulatory arrangements that are designed to impact the market for services.

Table 4.3: Performance

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Coefficient of Variation (%)
Appropriations –in- Aid	250	3.23	1.13	35
Settling Pending bills	250	3.07	1.214	40
Absorption of Allocated Funds	250	3.27	1.126	34
Implementation of Citizens’ Service Delivery Charter	250	3.39	1.142	34
Application of Service Delivery Innovations	250	3.32	1.06	32
Resolution of Public Complaints	250	3.37	1.054	31
Alignment of MDA’s priority projects/ programmes (“Big Four” Initiatives, Vision 2030 Flagship Projects, SDGs /SPS	250	3.64	1.083	30
Reviewing/ Development of Strategic Plan	250	3.63	1.106	30
Release of Budgetary Allocation	250	3.27	1.239	38
Project Completion Rate	250	3.15	1.071	34
Ease of doing Business	250	3.15	1.12	36
Asset Management	250	3.26	1.094	34
Competence Development	250	3.38	1.023	30
Revenue Collection	250	3.26	1.056	32
Development Index	250	3.26	0.991	30
Youth Internships /Industrial Attachments/ Apprenticeships	250	3.91	1.03	26
Disability Mainstreaming	250	3.46	1.151	33
Prevention of HIV Infections	250	3.39	1.136	34

Table 4.3: Performance (cont...)

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Coefficient of Variation (%)
Prevention of HIV Infections	250	3.39	1.136	34
Safety and Security Measures	250	3.39	1.171	35
National Cohesion and Values	250	3.6	1.123	31
Corruption Prevention	250	3.29	1.192	36
Access to Government Procurement Opportunities	250	3.18	1.251	39
Promotion of Local Content in Procurement	250	3.16	1.264	40
Overall Mean	250	3.35	1.123	34

Inferential Statistics

Inferential analysis was conducted to generate correlation results, model of fitness, and analysis of the variance and regression coefficients. The study first determined the relationships among the study variables. The association between the independent variable and the performance of the State Departments were determined through correlation coefficient determination. The relevant results are presented in Table 4.17

Table 4.4: Correlation of Study Variables

		Internal Politics	Performance
Internal Politics	Pearson Correlation	1	.457**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	250	250
Performance	Pearson Correlation	.457**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	250

Recommendations

The paper concluded by providing recommendations and suggestions for future study. The paper recommends future studies should consider introducing different variables and parameters to check on the relationship between organizational politics and performance. This paper also recommends that researchers replicate this study in other studies. Both the contextual and organizational factors in these institutions will be different and so are bound to influence the study variables differently.

References

Abbas, M., & Raja, U. (2014). Impact of perceived organizational politics on supervisory-rated innovative performance and job stress: Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, 2(2).

Abbas, Q., & Awan, S. H. (2017). Impact of organizational politics on employee performance in public sector organizations. *Pakistan Administrative Review*, 1(1), 19-31.

Aguinis, H. (2009). *Performance management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Ahmad, J., Hashmi, M. S., & Akhtar, H. M. W. (2016). Effect of Organizational Politics on Job Performance: The Mediating Role of Emotional Intelligence. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(1).

- Aino, S. and Sini, J. (2009). Perceptions of politics and fairness in merit pay. *Journal of managerial power psychology*, 4(2), 31-46
- Allen, R. W., Madison, D. L., Porter, L. W., Renwick, P. A., & Mayes, B. T. (1979). Organizational politics: Tactics and characteristics of its actors. *California management review*, 22(1), 77-83.
- Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2001). Discriminating among organizational politics, justice, and support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 22(4), 347-366.
- Arasli, H., Bavik, A., & Ekiz, H. E. (2006). The effects of nepotism on HRM and psychological outcomes: The case of 3, 4, and 5 star hotels in Northern Cyprus. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 26(7/8), 295-308.
- Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., & Budhwar, P. S. (2004). Exchange fairness and employee performance: An examination of the relationship between organizational politics and procedural justice. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 94(1), 1-14.
- Asrar-ul-Haq, M., Ali, H.Y., Anwar, S., Iqbal, A., Iqbal, M.B., Suleman, N., Sadiq, I. & Haris-ul-Mahasbi, M. (2019). Impact of organizational politics on employee work outcomes in higher education institutions of Pakistan: Moderating role of social capital. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 8 (2), 185-200
- Blickle, G., Schneider, P. B., Liu, Y., & Ferris, G. R. (2011). A predictive investigation of reputation as mediator of the political skill/career success relationship 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(12), 3026-3048.
- Bodla, M. A., & Danish, R. Q. (2010). The Perceptions of Organizational Politics and Work Performance: Exploring the Differences in Public and Private Sector. *International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, 8 (4), 123-132.
- Bodla, M. A., Afza, T., & Danish, R. Q. (2014). Relationship between organizational politics perceptions and employees' performance: Mediating role of social exchange perceptions. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 8(2), 426-444.
- Boerner, S., Eisenbeiss, S. A., & Griesser, D. (2007). Follower behavior and organizational performance: The impact of transformational leaders. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 13(3), 15-26.
- Bouckennooghe, D., Zafar, A., & Raja, U. (2015). How ethical leadership shapes employees' job performance: The mediating roles of goal congruence and psychological capital. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129(2), 251-264.
- Buchanan, D. A. (2008) You Stab My Back, I'll Stab Yours: Management Experience and Perceptions of Organization Political Behaviour, *British Journal of Management*, 19, pp. 496-4.
- Byrne, Z. S. (2005). Fairness reduces the negative effects of organizational politics on turnover intentions, citizenship behavior and job performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(2), 175-200.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Managers' upward influence tactic strategies: The role of manager personality and supervisor leadership style. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24 (2), 197-212.
- Cacciattolo, K. (2014). Defining organizational politics. *European Scientific Journal*.
- Casio, W.F., Aguinis, H. (2014). *Applied Psychology in Human Resource Management*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Chang, C. H., Rosen, C. C., & Levy, P. E. (2009). The relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and employee attitudes, strain, and behavior: A meta-analytic examination. *Academy of Management journal*, 52(4), 779-801.
- Chen, Y. Y., & Fang, W. (2008). The moderating effect of impression management on the organizational politics-performance relationship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 79(3), 263-277.
- Cohen, A., Vigoda-Gadot, E., & Samorly, A. (2001). Analysis of the mediating effect of personal psychological variables on the relationship between socioeconomic status and political participation: A structural equations framework. *Political psychology*, 22(4), 727-757.
- Daft, R. L. (2015). *Organization theory and design*. Cengage learning.
- Daskin, M., & Tezer, M. (2012). Organizational politics and turnover: An empirical research from hospitality industry. *Turizam: međunarodni znanstveno-stručni časopis*, 60(3), 273-291.
- Dubrin, A.J. (2007). *Fundamentals of Organizational Behaviour*. USA: Thomas Higher Education.
- Eldor, L. (2017). Looking on the bright side: The positive role of organizational politics in the relationship between employee engagement and performance at work. *Applied Psychology*, 66(2), 233-259.
- Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Perceptions of Organizational Politics. *Journal of Management*, 18, 93-116
- Ferris, G. R., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2011). Organizational politics. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association. (Vol. 3, pp. 435-459).
- Ferris, G. R., Adams, G., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., & Ammeter, A. P. (2002). Perceptions of organizational politics: Theory and research directions.

- Ferris, G. R., King, T. R., Judge, T. A., & Kacmar, K. M. (1991). The management of shared meaning in organizations. In: Giacalone RA, Rosenfeld P, editors. *Applied impression management*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 41 – 64
- Flamholtz, E. G., & Randle, Y. (2012). Corporate culture, business models, competitive advantage, strategic assets and the bottom line: Theoretical and measurement issues. *Journal of Human Resource Costing & Accounting*, 16(2), 76-94.
- Galbraith, J. R. (1977). *Organization design*. Addison Wesley Publishing Company.
- Gotsis, G. N. & Kortezi, Z. (2010) Ethical Considerations in Organizational Politics: Expanding the Perspective, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93, pp. 497-517.
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 327-347.
- Gull, S., & Zaidi, A. A. (2012). Impact of organizational politics on employees' job satisfaction in the health sector of Lahore Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(2), 156-170.
- Hacker, S. K. (2015). Leading cultural transformation. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 37(4), 13-16.
- Harris, K. J., James, M., & Boonthanom, R. (2005). Perceptions of organizational politics and cooperation as moderators of the relationship between job strains and intent to turnover. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 26-42.
- Herrenkohl, R. C., Judson, T. G., & Heffner, J. A. (1999). Defining and measuring employee empowerment. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, 35 (3), 373-87
- Hochwarter, W. A. (2012). The positive side of organizational politics. In G. R. Ferris & D. C. Treadway (Eds.), *SIOP organizational frontiers series. Politics in organizations: Theory and research considerations* (p. 27–65). *Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group*
- Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C., Perrewe, P. L., & Johnson, D. (2003). Perceived Organizational Support as a Mediator of the Relationship between Politics Perceptions and Work Outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 438-456.
- Jawahar, I. M., Meurs, J. A., Ferris, G. R., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2008). Self-efficacy and political skill as comparative predictors of task and contextual performance: A two-study constructive replication. *Human Performance*, 21(2), 138-157.
- Jehn, K. A. (1997) A Qualitative Analysis of Conflict Types and Dimensions in Organizational Groups, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(3), pp. 530-557.
- Jifendra, K. S. and Mini, J. (2013). A study of employee's job satisfaction and its impact on their performance. *Journal of India research*. 1(4) 1-7
- 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.
- Kane-Frieder, R. E., Hochwarter, W. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2014). Terms of engagement: Political boundaries of work engagement–work outcomes relationships. *Human Relations*, 67(3), 357-382.
- Karadal, H., & Arasli, H. (2009). The impacts of superior politics on frontline employees' behavioral and psychological outcomes. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 37(2), 175-190.
- Kusluvan, S., Kusluvan, Z., Ilhan, Z. & Buyruk, L. (2010). The human dimension: a review of human resources management issues in the tourism and hospitality industry. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 51(2), 171–214.
- Latif, A., Abideen, Z. U., & Nazar, M. S. (2011) Individual Political Behaviour in Organizational Relationship, *Journal of Politics and Law*, 4(1), pp. 199-210
- Malik, M. E., Danish, R. Q., & Ghafoor, M. (2009). Relationship between Age, Perceptions of Organizational Politics and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 19.
- Miller, B. K., Rutherford, M. A., & Kolodinsky, R. W. (2008). Perceptions of organizational politics: A meta-analysis of outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22(3), 209-222.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Mintzberg, H. (1985). The organization as political arena. *Journal of management studies*, 22(2), 133-154.
- Muhammad, E. M., Rizwan, Q. D. and Mudassar, G. (2009) Relationship between age, perception of organizational politics and job satisfaction. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*. 19 (1) 25-40.
- O'Reilly III, C. A., Caldwell, D. F., Chatman, J. A., & Doerr, B. (2014). The promise and problems of organizational culture: CEO personality, culture, and firm performance. *Group & Organization Management*, 39(6), 595-625.
- Olorunleke, G.K. (2015). Effects of organization politics on organizational goals and objectives. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, 4(3)59-70.
- Othman, R. (2008). Organizational Politics: The Role of Justice, Trust and Job Ambiguity, *Singapore Management Review*, 30 (1), pp. 43-53.

- Park, J., & Lee, K. H. (2020). Organizational politics, work attitudes and performance: the moderating role of age and public service motivation (PSM). *International Review of Public Administration*, 1-21.
- Parvin, M. M., & Kabir, M. N. (2011). Factors affecting employee job satisfaction of pharmaceutical sector. *Australian journal of business and management research*, 1(9), 113.
- Pettigrew, A. M. (2014). *The politics of organizational decision-making*. Routledge.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in organizations* (Vol. 33): Pitman Marshfield, MA.
- Pfeffer, J., & Veiga, J. F. (1999). Putting people first for organizational success. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 13(2), 37-48.
- Poon, J. M. (2004). Moderating effect of perceived control on perceptions of organizational politics outcomes. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 7(1), 22.
- Poon, J.M.L., (2003). Situational antecedents and outcomes of organizational politics perceptions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18: 138-155.
- Rahman, S., Hussain, B., & Haque, A. (2011). Organizational politics on employee performance: an exploratory study on readymade garments employees in Bangladesh. *Business Strategy Series*.
- Raja, U., Zafar, A., & Bouckennooghe, D. (2015). How Ethical Leadership Shapes Employees' Job Performance: The Mediating Roles of Goal Congruence and Psychological Capital.
- Randall, M. L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C. A., & Birjulin, A. (1999). Organizational Politics and Organizational Support as Predictors of Work Attitudes, Job Performance, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(2), 159-174.
- Richard, P. J., Devinney, T. M., Yip, G. S., & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: Towards methodological best practice. *Journal of management*, 35(3), 718-804.
- Robbins, S. (2003). *Organizational Behavior, International Edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ.: Prentice-Hall.
- Rosen, C. C., Chang, C. H., & Levy, P. E. (2006). Personality and politics perceptions: A new conceptualization and illustration using OCBs. *Handbook of organizational politics*, 29-52.
- Ross, G. F. (2006). Tourism industry employee work stress-A present and future crisis. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 19(2-3), 133-147.
- Samad, S., & Amri, S. (2011). Examining the influence of organizational politics on job performance. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(12), 1353-1363.
- Shao, R., Rupp, D. E., Skarlicki, D. P., & Jones, K. S. (2013). Employee justice across cultures: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management*, 39(1), 263-301.
- Sussman, L., Adams, A. J., Kuzmits, F. E., & Raho, L. E. (2002). Organizational Politics: Tactics, Channels, and Hierarchical Roles. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 40(4), 313-329.
- Todd, S. Y., Harris, K. J., Harris, R. B., & Wheeler, A. R. (2009). Career success implications of political skill. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 149(3), 279-304.
- Ugwu, K. E., Ndugbu, M. O., Okoroji, L., & Kalu, A. U. (2014). Organizational politics and employees' performance in private sector investment: A comparative study of Zenith Bank Plc and Alcon Plc. Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, Vol.6, No.26, 103-113.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2002). Stress-related aftermaths to workplace politics: the relationships among politics, job distress, and aggressive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 571-591.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007). Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees' performance: An empirical examination of two competing models. *Personnel Review*, 36(5), 661-683.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. G., & Drory, A. (2006). *Handbook of Organizational Politics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E., & Talmud, I. (2010). organizational Politics and Job outcomes: the moderating Effect of trust and social support. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40(11), 2829-2861.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E., Vinarski-Peretz, H., & Ben-Zion, E. (2003). Politics and image in the Organizational landscape an empirical examination among public sector employees. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18 (8), 764-787.
- Vimala, V. (2013). *The effects of organizational politics on employee's performance: The role of emotional intelligence and spirituality* (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Utara Malaysia).
- Watson, T. J. (2006). *Organising and Managing Work*. London: Pearson.
- Witt, L. A., Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2000). The Role of Participation in Decision- Making in the Organizational Politics- Job Satisfaction Relationship. *Human Relations*, 53(3), 341-358.
- Zivnuska, S., Kacmar, K. M., Witt, L. A., Carlson, D. S., & Bratton, V. K. (2004). Interactive effects of impression management and organizational politics on job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 25(5), 627-640.