IMPACT OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS AND PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT ON BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES

By

SYED MUHAMMAD IMRAN BUKHARI

A dissertation submitted to

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY
Centre of Excellence
Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.

In partial fulfillment of the requirement for the

DEGREE OF MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

PSYCHOLOGY

2008

IMPACT OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS AND PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT ON BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES

By

SYED MUHAMMAD IMRAN BUKHARI

Approved by

_____

Supervisor

_____

Director, NIP

_____

External Examiner

CERTIFICATE

Certified that M.Phil. dissertation on "Impact of Perceived Organizational Politics and Perceived Organizational Support on Behavioral Outcomes" prepared by Mr. Syed Muhammad Imran Bukhari has been approved for submission.

(Prof. Dr. Anila Kamal)
Supervisor

List of Contents

Acknowledgement

All the praises and thanks be to Allah, the lord of Aalmeen. This is all His blessing and encouragement that made me able to accomplish this task. He is the sole compassionate and worthy of all the praises as He blessed us with His prophet (PBUH) to set standards of a successful life for all of us and along with Him (PBUH), He bestowed upon us with His ultimate guideline (Quran).

My feeling of gratitude further extends to Dr. Anila Kamal's help, support and guidance, without which I can hardly imagine to make this industrious and complex job done. Her diligent, competent and elegant style has come out as a source of inspiration for me. I also feel myself bound to pay my admiring comment to Dr. Anees-ul-Haq who had always been very generous and sympathetic to me whenever I asked him for guidance. His humbleness and selflessness are worthy of praise and comment.

I cannot think, even dare, to forget the contribution of my mother who keeps the place of a milestone in my whole life building. Her sacrifices and commitment to build my life keeps no word to cover. I feel proud and blessed one to admit that I am her son. It seems incomplete if I do not mention Rizwan, my elder brother, who bears second place, to mention, in my life building. His fatherly character, support and guidance have made me able to fulfill my desire of getting higher education. I feel compelled to mention the one, my soul partner, who kept this painstaking and hectic task all the pleasant for me with her presence. I feel proud to be her husband as she is always concerned, encouraging and sympathetic whenever I am losing hope.

Last of all, I must pay my honest gratitude to my dearest friend Adnan who helped and guided me on every single step while doing my research. His contribution and selfless concern really keeps a unique place in my heart. My precious friends Abdul Hyee and Salman also keep a special place in my heart, with a sense of gratitude, as they have always been encouraging and helpful to me during my course of research.

List of Tables

List of Appendices

ABSTRACT

The present study was focused on measuring the moderating effect of perceived organizational support on the relationship between perceived organizational politics, and affective commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and ingratiation behavior. Sample of the study included 200 (152 men, 48 women) employees from cellular and banking organizations. Moderated multiple analysis showed that perceived organizational support moderated significantly between the negative relationship of perceived organizational politics and affective commitment, while it did not moderate between the relationship of perceived organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior. Similarly, it also did not moderate between the relationship of perceived organizational politics and ingratiation behavior. Correlational analysis showed that perceived organizational politics was significantly correlated with perceived organizational support and affective commitment in negative direction, positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior and its relationship with ingratiation was found to be non significant. Similarly, perceived organizational support was significantly correlated with perceived organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior in negative direction, positively correlated with affective commitment, and its relationship with ingratiation was found to be non significant. Overall the study demonstrated organizational support as an important factor in maintaining the affective commitment of employees in organizations with higher levels of organizational politics. Limitations of the current study and suggestions for future empirical endeavors have been discussed.

INTRODUCTION

The present study focuses on the impact of perceived organizational support on behavioral outcomes. The behaviors being measured in this study are organizational citizenship behavior, ingratiation and affective commitment. The perceived organizational support is being taken as the moderator in this study. As it is difficult to measure organizational politics in behavioral terms, its perception is the focus of this study. Similarly, as the steps or strategies adopted for the welfare of the employees vary from organization to organization, the perception of organizational support is being taken as the variable of this study.

Politics is a term with multifarious connotations which are described by the context of its usage. Talking of public sector, politics is defined as the means used by the political figures to achieve their desired results and goals which are spurred by a long range of values and vested interests. Viewed from this angle, politics is an important component of the list of functions performed by a firm or organization in its daily routine with positive outcomes for it. Zooming more into this, takes us to the micro level of perception according to which organizational politics refers to the 'actions by individuals which are directed toward the goal of furthering their own self-interests without regard for the well-being of others or their organization' (Kacmar & Baron, 1999).

Both the perspectives are useful in their own way, the first being the general and the second being the more specific one. The second one will do for the present study where the definition of the organizational politics would be as per the fact that when asked to describe political behavior, individuals typically list self-serving and manipulative activities that observers do not evaluate positively (Drory & Romm, 1988; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Gandz & Murray, 1980; Madison, Allen, Porter, Renwick & Mayes, 1980). In other works, politics is treated in a narrower perspective, where it is defined as unsanctioned influence attempts that seek to promote self-interest at the expense of organizational goals (e.g. Drory & Romm,

1990; Ferris, Frink, Beehr, & Gilmore, 1995; Ferris & Judge, 1991; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Ferris, Russ, & Fandt, 1989; Kacmar & Ferris, 1993).

In consonance with the much contemporary research (e.g., Ferris, Fedor, Chachere, & Pondy, 1989; Ferris et al., 1996; Ferris & Judge, 1991), this study also makes use of the specific definition of the term. Partly, this is so because of the more amenability of the pluralistic terminology to the empirical testing (Drory & Romm, 1990). When asked about the definition of political behavior, individuals tend to enumerate actions which are manipulative and self-serving (Drory & Romm, 1988; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Gandz & Murray, 1980; Madison et al., 1980; Romm & Drory, 1988).

Definition of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) is 'employees' global beliefs about the extent to which the organization values employees' contributions and cares about their well being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). As an antithesis to a political environment, some organizations are perceived as being concerned with the welfare of their employees. This scenario could be thought of as the one which is characterized by organizational support (Fasolo, 1995; George, Reed, Ballard, Colin, & Fielding, 1993; Shore & Shore, 1995). Organizations which are supportive in nature, take pride in their employees, and are found to be on fair terms while compensating them and also taking care of their needs. In case of such employers, ones investment in time and effort is relatively safe. In such instances, the individuals are expected to raise their investments in terms of higher performances and more civilized and conforming citizenship behaviors. There is ample evidence supportive of this proposition, but it can also be extremely limited. High levels of POS are thought to engender feelings of trust, long-term obligations, and organizational identification among employees (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002). However, inculcation of new corporate policies and practices that beneficial to employees or are a response to the critical events signaling organizational support, may bring changes in POS.

Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) introduced the construct of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). OCB has been defined as an "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (Organ,

1988, p. 4). Later, Organ (1990) redefined OCB 'as contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance' and hence, removed the requirements that OCB be discretionary and unrewarded. For instance, behaviors like these include helping a new employee to catch up, helping a co-worker to deal with work overload or staying at work after hours (Organ, 1988).

Ingratiation can be defined as a set of influence behaviors designed to improve one's interpersonal attractiveness and are used by subordinates to gain the approval of supervisors who distribute desired rewards (Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). In the workplace, subordinate ingratiation can be a manipulative and political influence strategy (Kumar & Beyerlein, 1991) that appears individually initiated and organizationally induced (Ralston, 1985), and is among the most commonly used influence strategies (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1982).

Whereas it is easily discernible why organizational commitment is an important variable in the organizational sciences, however, the issue about how to best define the organizational commitment has proven to be a more difficult task. The search for definitions has led to competing unidimensional definitions, which, in turn, has led to the development of Meyer and Allen's (1991) widely recognized three-component model. Meyer and Allen's model proposes that organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct consisting of three variants of commitment. These variants are (a) affective commitment, (b) continuance commitment, and (c) normative commitment. Of the three variants of commitment, affective commitment and continuance commitment have been studied most frequently (Becker & Kernan, 2001; Gade, 2003). Affective commitment refers to an employee's "emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization" (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 11).

Organizational Politics

Politics defined as self-interested machinations, although a narrower definition of the term fits well in the context of social marketplace which is its definition in pluralistic meanings and describes how interpersonal transactions could proceed. The

term in its broader definition acknowledges that these exchanges take place, but their substance is not defined here.

Risk factor in investments is made for, by the politically motivated environments. Owing to this factor, it is recommended that workers should put in as less amount of their contribution to the organization as is permitted by the reason. Consequently, low performance and reduced OCB should be the outcome of politics. Few studies have examined these associations unfortunately and the findings are not encouraging either. In one study, Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey and Toth (1997) found no relationship between politics and OCB; however, this investigation was hampered by a small sample size ($n = 59$). Despite the paucity of supportive evidence, Cropanzano et al. (1997) anticipated a significant relationship between perceived politics and supervisory ratings of OCB and between politics and in-role job performance. Variables as attitude and perception should also be impacted by the character of social marketplace. In general, people should feel abhorrent and have a desire to depart from the settings where their needs are not expected to be met. Consistent with this, several studies have found that organizational politics is negatively related to job satisfaction (Bozeman, Perrewe, Hochwarter, Kacmar, & Brymer, 1996; Cropanzano et al., 1997; Drory, 1990; Ferris et al., 1993; Ferris et al., 1995; Ferris et al., 1996; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Gandz & Murray, 1980; Nye & Witt, 1993; Parker, Dipboye, & Jackson, 1995) and positively related to turnover intentions (Bozeman et al., 1996; Cropanzano et al., 1997, Ferris et al., 1993).

Kacmar and Ferris (1991) used a three factor-solution: general political behavior, going along to get ahead, and pay and promotion. In a later study, Nye and Witt (1993) also found that the Kacmar and Ferris (1991) model produced a good fit. However, decrease in frugality and prudence undermined these gains. Nye and Witt (1993) suggested the use of the more parsimonious single-factor model. In consonance with the modern empirical researches, unifactor model has been utilized for the present study. Politics is negatively associated with organizational commitment in general, as is suggested by the available work. (Bozeman et al., 1996; Cropanzano et al., 1997; Drory, 1990; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Nye & Witt, 1993).

Political actions are treated on the premise of being informal and not explicitly prohibited by the organization in the present study. These actions which typically

occur in organizations, in which there are few rules and regulations to act as guidance for decision making, are often enacted behind the scenes. Instances of such actions are; use of improper means and channels to gain special equipments bypassing of proper chain of command in order to obtain approvals and lobbying amongst managers of high level just in advance of promotion decisions. Such actions severely undermine the rules of fair play and merit as everyone does not engage oneself in politicking in order to achieve their goals. This naturally leads to jealousy and justified resentment on the part of those who resort to proper procedures and this is largely because of their perceptions of unfair distributions of the organization's resources including rewards and recognition (Parker et al., 1995).

Contemporary research began treating the organizational politics as a perceptual phenomenon with negative consequences for those imagine it to occur. As such, it is a subjective evaluation made by organizational members. Those who perceive politics occurring within their organization experience reduced job satisfaction (Kacmar, Bozeman, Carlson, & Anthony, 1999; Zhou & Ferris, 1995) and organizational commitment (Randall et al., 1999), increased job stress (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Kacmar et al., 1999), and are more likely to leave the organization (Kacmar et al., 1999).

It is suggested by the empirical evidence that perceptions of organizational politics are related not only to lower levels of organizational commitment, but also to higher levels of anxiety, stress, and job dissatisfaction, as well as lower levels of in- and extra-role job performance (Kacmar & Baron, 1999). Given the dearth of talent in the current labor market, an outcome of politics is employee commitment. As noted by Angle and Lawson (1993), a central theme in the literature is that there are two forms of organizational commitment. One is a psychological attachment to the organization that reflects the employee's identification with and involvement in the organization (e.g., Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). The other is a desire to maintain membership in the organization, which is reflected as an assessment of the exchange between the employee and employer (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981). Researchers have found that workers high in organizational commitment are less likely to leave than are workers low in organizational commitment, regardless of how commitment was operationalized (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Whitener & Walz, 1993).

Politics Perceptions in Organizational Settings

Relevancy of individual's view of politics is more, for the current purposes than the actual presence of organizational politics and the reason for this is that individuals respond to what they perceive, not necessarily to what is objectively real (Ferris et al., 1996; Ferris et al., 1993; Weick, 1979). Taken into this scenario, strongest relationship to work productivity should be displayed by the perception of reality which however, does not undermined the importance of objective environment. In fact, as demonstrated by Parker et al. (1995), Gandz and Murray (1980) and Madison et al. (1980), analyzing the organizational antecedents of perceived politics is useful for a more comprehensive understanding of the work environment. Likewise, Witt (1995) has examined the role of supervisors in raising and lowering levels of workplace politics. However, to conduct the present study, focus will be laid on work outcomes as function of role of political perceptions. Once these perceptions have proved themselves as important predictors, then the subsequent work will serve to examine their distal antecedents.

The concept of political explanation for organizational activity has become an ever increasing popular concept among the researchers during the past two decades. Research has developed along two ostensibly corresponding, but intrinsically differing streams: research involving the actual strategy and practice of the politician (e.g., Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980), and research dealing with perceptions of politics of the individuals inside the organization (e.g. Ferris, Russ, & Fandt, 1989). The relation between political perceptions and actual political actions is, for the most part, underdeveloped (Valle & Perrewe, 2000), and some authors have suggested that the quest to define political behaviors is difficult at best. These theorists suggest that political behavior is defined by the attributions the receiver makes toward it (Ferris, Bhawuk, Fedor, & Judge, 1995), and, by itself, the same behavior may possibly be seen as political by one individual and pro-social by another.

Research during the last decade has focused itself primarily on the antecedents and outcomes of politics perceptions in the workplace, perhaps for the very reason of inherent difficulty in identifying political behaviors. Grounded in the work of Lewin (1951), researchers have argued that politics is best conceived as a subjective state

rather than an activity amenable to objective measurement (Ferris et al., 1989; Gandz & Murray, 1980).

A definition frequently cited in the politics perceptions research is that of Mintzberg (1983), who described organizational politics as "individual or group behavior that is informal, ostensibly parochial, typically divisive, and above all in a technical sense, illegitimate—sanctioned neither by formal authority, accepted ideology, nor certified expertise (although it may exploit any one of those)". The fact that political activity can occur, and subsequently be perceived by others, at various levels involved, is inherently present in this definition. Despite this realization, most of the research conducted on politics perceptions has taken political activity as close circuit phenomenon that crosses at all levels at the same time.

While proposing new dimensions in the field of research on politics in organizations, Ferris et al (1989) suggested that more work needed to be done on the conditions under which political behavior occurs, as well as the types of political behaviors that are demonstrated and their consequences. However, a third dimension of research, which did not get attention to date, was also proposed: that is, the determination of antecedents and consequences of individuals perceiving a work atmosphere as political. However, this arena of research is somewhat at variance from the other two as it focuses primarily on the experience of organizational politics as a subjective perception. Although it may be taken for granted that typically the correspondence between actual political behavior (i.e., to the extent that an indication of "objective" political behavior could be obtained) and behavior that is perceived as political is very strong, however, it needs to be acknowledged that difference in perceptions do happen and it is important to try to better understand how and why this happens.

The current perception of political behavior, in this area of research coincides with that of Gandz and Murray's (1980) who suggested that rather than exclusively an objective state, it is appropriate to construe organizational politics as a subjective experience and thus, as a state of mind. Many years ago, Lewin (1936) suggested the very important notion that people respond on the basis of their perceptions of reality, not reality per se, and later on, Porter (1976) argued that perceptions are important to study and to understand, even if they are misperceptions of actual events, with particular

reference to organizational politics. Furthermore, researchers interested in other aspects of work environments (e.g., organizational climate), in discussing true versus perceived attributes, have argued for a definition of work environments based on perceived attributes (James & James, 1989; Naylor, Pritchard, & Ilgen, 1980; Schneider, 1975).

As compared to the number of scholars who have commented on organizational politics, only a few have carried out investigations on empirical standards to test their ideas and conceptions. Difficulties in the measurement of organizational politics have been a potent factor for lack of relative lack of empirical research (Cropanzano, Kacmar, & Bozeman, 1995). Because of the symbolic and often covert nature of political behavior (Drory & Romm, 1990), a number of researchers have taken a perceptual approach to measure organizational politics empirically (e.g. Ferris, Russ, & Fandt, 1989; Gandz & Murray, 1980; Madison et al., 1980). This approach when taken into its essence, works on the premise that whatever is perceived to be real by the individuals is real in its effects on them.

Perhaps the most comprehensive approach to studying organizational politics through individual-level perceptions has been forwarded by Ferris and his colleagues (e.g. Ferris et al., 1989, 1993; Ferris, Frink, Gilmore, & Kacmar, 1994; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Kacmar & Ferris, 1991). According to Kacmar and Ferris, perceptions of organizational politics consist of an individual's observations of others' self-interested behaviors, such as the suppression of competing entities and selective manipulation of organizational policies. In general, Ferris and his colleagues proposed that organizational-politics perceptions have detrimental effects on individual and organizational outcomes (e.g., decreased job satisfaction and increased intention to turnover).

Among the findings of subsequent empirical tests of the politics model are the negative effects of perceived politics on outcomes such as job anxiety, dissatisfaction and withdrawal behaviors (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Ferris et al., 1996; Gilmore, Ferris, Dulebohn, & Harrell-Cook, 1996). However, Ferris and his colleagues also suggested that individual reactions to perceptions of organizational politics are a function of interpretation of it. According to Ferris et al. (1989), the strength of relationships between perceptions of organizational politics and individual and

organizational outcomes may be a function of moderating influences, such as perceived control.

It was proved by Gandz and Murray's (1980) early work that perception of political activity can be different given the various levels of an organization. Among the findings they made, was the discovery that the general perception for the political activity was that it was most prevalent at the top of the corporate hierarchy and least prevalent at non-managerial ranks. Moreover, Ferris et al. (1989) maintained that political activity could occur at individual, group, or organizational levels. Further, theoretical work has implied that political activity could be undertaken for the purposes of organizational decision making, group power development, attaining the desired outcomes of powerful interest groups, and securing valued individual goals (Ferris & Mitchell, 1987; Pfeffer, 1981), each of which conceivably may occur at different organizational levels.

Considerable research has attempted to identify the consequences of politics perceptions in the workplace (Ferris et al., 2002; Kacmar & Baron, 1999). Generally speaking a host of negative outcomes have been foretold by these studies. However, wherever there has existed inconsonance in their mutual relationships, instances have shown themselves up. For example, Cropanzano et al. (1997) failed to detect a significant relationship between politics perceptions and OCB, while Vigoda (2000) found that perceptions of politics did predict extra-role behaviors (e.g., organizational citizenship). Similarly, Kacmar, Bozeman, Carlson, and Anthony (1999) found that politics perceptions predicted overall satisfaction.

It was suggested by Ferris et al (2002) that levels one of explanations may be the level of analysis issues. Research, analyzing the interrelationship between politics perceptions and work outcomes, is supportive of this notion, which has tended to be more consistent when researchers are able to correlate specific levels of perceived political activity and predicted outcomes. To that point, measures of facet satisfaction have been found to be differentially predicted by the three sub-dimensions of the Ferris and Kacmar's (1992) Perceptions of Politics Scale (POPS). For instance, it was found by Zhou and Ferris (1995) that coworker satisfaction is affected by perceptions of coworker political behavior, perceptions of politics in reward practices predicted supervision satisfaction, and perceptions of a dominating group within the

organization influenced pay satisfaction and promotion satisfaction. In a study similar to this, Ferris and Kacmar (1992) found that supervisor behavior is predicted by one's relationship with the supervisor, coworker and clique behavior is predicted by the cohesiveness of the work group, and organizational policies and practices are predicted by the opportunities for promotions. Extending these findings, Maslyn and Fedor (1998) evaluated the impact of various foci of politics within the organization. With regard to political activity emerging from different organizational levels, Maslyn and Fedor (1998) found that perceptions of politics at the organization level predicted intention to leave, while politics perceptions at the group level predicted citizenship behavior.

The dynamic nature of the hierarchy in organization is emphasized by these studies. Production of dynamic power relationships within the workplace is the result of intricately woven structure and action (Giddens, 1979). Further, it has been found that these relationships are too complex to be grasped by one's title of position, as is suggested by the inconsistent findings regarding the relationship between hierarchical level and the formation of politics perceptions. Yet, the structure of an organization, and hence one's position within the organization, define the rules and resources of any organizational interaction (Riley, 1983). It is therefore, our suggestion that a key role is played by one's relative hierarchical position in relation to the location of the perceived political activity, in one's effective reaction to these perceptions. Particularly we offer the notion that job satisfaction, leader member exchange and organizational commitment are predicted by perceptions of political behavior at the coworker, supervisor and highest organizational levels respectively. Each of these outcomes has been shown to possess significant relationships with the current more global operationalization of perceptions of politics (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Hochwarter, Perrewe, Ferris, & Guerico, 1999; Maslyn & Fedor, 1998). However, instead of employing politics perceptions as a catch all term that captures political activity at all organizational levels simultaneously, we contend that an individual's view of politicking at relative hierarchical levels will predict these outcomes.

Organizational Support

Organizations supposed to be caring about the welfare and requirements of their members are termed as Supportive organizations (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Contributions by their members are rewarded by praise, recognition and value giving by these organizations. Three important elements of POS are the use of discretionary rewards, employer commitment, and trust. When members are reciprocated in terms of rewards which are beyond the dictations of formal policies, they perceive the organizations to be supportive. These discretionary rewards make members feel appreciated, thereby enhancing feelings of POS (Shore & Shore, 1995). Using a social exchange framework, Eisenberger et al. (1986) proposed that members' beliefs concerning POS are the foundation for perceptions of employer commitment. Strong perceptions of employer commitment generate feelings of reciprocity on the part of members thus promoting members' commitment to the organization (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996). Trust is a crucial part of social exchange theory. Employees trust the organization that it will keep providing rewards and the organization trusts that employees will continue performing well (Shore & Wayne, 1993). A violation of trust occurs when either the organization or employee fails to do their part (i.e., provide adequate rewards or reduce efforts at work). The employee will view the exchange as unfair if the organization does not provide support (Shore & Wayne, 1993).

Erdogan and Liden (2002) contend that POS acts as another source of support that may help employees deal with the potential challenges presented by low value congruence for two reasons. First, POS may help facilitate communication and cooperation among organizational members. POS has been associated with trust in management (Whitener, 2001) and cooperative behaviors, including helping behaviors towards coworkers (Eisenberger et al., 2002). Hence, individuals are motivated and encouraged by the organizational support, to interact and collaborate with other organizational members. Secondly, POS may compensate for the lower levels of organizational identification that may occur when employees' values do not match those of the organization because POS makes employees feel valued (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Shore & Tetrick, 1991). In their conceptualization of a construct labeled perceived organizational membership, Masterson and Stamper

(2003) identified belonging (through organizational identification) and feeling that one is valued by the organization (through POS) as two dimensions driving employees' perceptions of organizational membership. Although employees with low value congruence are less likely to identify with the organization, through POS, they may still feel like they are valued by the organization and that the organization is concerned for their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Masterson & Stamper, 2003) and perceive that they are organizational insiders (Stamper & Masterson, 2002).

More positive work attitudes are seemed to be engendered by heightened support. For example, Cropanzano et al. (1997) and Nye and Witt (1993) both obtained a positive relationship between perceptions of support and job satisfaction. Likewise, field studies by Cropanzano et al. (1997) and Liden, Sparrowe and Wayne (1997) both found that perceived support is negatively correlated with turnover intentions. Similarly, Eisenberger, Fasolo, and Davis-LaMastro (1990) determined that absenteeism is lower when a company is perceived as supportive. Positive associations also exist with regard to support and organizational commitment (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Nye & Witt, 1993; Settoon et al., 1996; Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997).

Predictors of POS have included goal setting and feedback which were both positively related to POS (Hutchison & Garstka, 1996). POS has been positively associated with job satisfaction, job performance, citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment, and negatively associated with turnover intentions (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Eisenberger, Cummings, Axmeli & Lynch 1997; Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999). POS also has been positively linked with employee innovation and employee affective attachment to the organization (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Hutchison & Garstka, 1996).

A long history hangs to the credit of the study of organizational support. Researchers, dating back to 1950s had been proposing that global perceptions of support are generated at the employees' level and these perceptions are related to a variety to positive work outcomes (e.g. Etzioni, 1961; Kelman, 1961; Levinson, 1965; March & Simon, 1958). It was maintained by this early work that organizational support indicates a secure, positive environment (Shore & Shore, 1995). An

organization which is supportive in nature would be synonymous to a caring workplace. Employees form these beliefs by examining such things as their relationships with their supervisor (Shore & Wayne, 1993), discretionary rewards dispensed by the organization (Eisenberger et al., 1986), and procedural justice (Fasolo, 1995). The employees then may feel obligated to respond to such behavior with increased effort, citizenship behaviors, and loyalty (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Fasolo, 1995; Shore & Wayne, 1993).

Relationship between organizational politics and organizational support

A disagreement seems to occur considering the relationship between organizational politics and organizational support. According to one perspective, politics and support are opposite poles along a single conceptual dimension. This single continuum would range from self-interest (politics) to altruism (support) (Witt, 1995). There is some evidence to support this reasoning. Based on the results of a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), Nye and Witt (1993) concluded that politics and support are best viewed as opposite ends of a single construct. Moreover, Cheng (1983) operationalized the absence of politics as the presence of support.

Inspite of the plausibility of the previous work, the two constructs seem to be conceptually different Cropanzano et al., 1995). Being nonpolitical does not necessarily make an organization supportive. Similarly a work environment in which policies and practices are carried out fairly and in which the same rules apply equally to everyone would likely not be perceived as political. Yet if the same organization is unwilling to extend itself, it may not be seen as supportive either. Yet if the same organization is unwilling to extend itself, it may not be seen as supportive either. Furthermore, operationalization of politics and support, in the current literature and also as measured here, have a bit different focal point. Political perceptions are referred to, in the context of one's colleagues and superiors and these are about other individuals. However, contrary to this POS deals with the organization treating it as a whole. Organizational support is empirically and conceptually distinct from social support, as the former focuses on groups and the latter focuses on individuals (George et al., 1993). For this reason, organizational politics and organizational support have slightly different frames of reference, and each may afford a unique perspective on the social marketplace.

Organizational politics and POS have been studied in relation to each other and there is disagreement about whether the two are separate, distinct concepts (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Nye & Witt, 1993; Randalls et al., 1999). Cropanzano et al. (1997) argued that organizational politics and POS are best treated as separate constructs because each contributed above and beyond the other in predicting the variance of turnover intentions, organizational commitment, job involvement, and job satisfaction. They also have been considered distinct from each other because POS represents a global view (Eisenberger et al., 1986) while organizational politics has a more narrow (i.e., individual and group) focus. POS is often measured by asking members the extent to which the organization as a whole notices and rewards their efforts. Organizational politics is often measured by asking respondents their perceptions of behaviors of specific individuals in the workplace (e.g., supervisors or co-workers) (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997; Kacmar & Ferris, 1991). Irrespective of the fact that their exact relationship is still far from being clear, politics and support are highly correlated. Inspite of being highly correlated, the true nature of relationship between politics and support is far from being clearly understood. It has been found and validated by the studies done on the available data that both two-factor and unifactor model fit well. The two-factor model provides a slightly better fit, but the unifactor model is more parsimonious (Nye & Witt, 1993; Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Btrjulin., 1994). Thus, from the factor analytic data, one could plausibly argue for either collapsing the two constructs together or keeping them separate.

A competitive and self-serving style is espoused by the members in some organizations. In such cases they form small self serving groups which are unresponsive to the needs of others. Such formations are inattentive and perhaps even destructive to the interests of others. This sort of make up of an organization is political. In case of politicization of an organization, the two key factors for the individuals for attainment of rewards are, by competition and by amassing power. Its implications are multifarious for the nature of the marketplace. One of the implications is that majority of the people will not identify themselves with the strongest cabal. Consequently troubles will be faced by them in the gratification of their aspirations. The extent of dissatisfaction and stress is directly related to the degree to which aspirations of the individuals go unfulfilled. Another implication of politics is that the marketplace becomes more volatile and less predictable. As the

allocation of rewards is based on power, the rules may change from day to day. A negative impact of this uncertainty is that the individuals are less confident about their efforts bringing any positive outcomes. Owing to this lack of confidence, there are fewer chances for allocation of additional resources to the organization, by the individuals. And lastly, as the formation of different cabals is sure to lead to a situation where they will be trying to harm the interests of others while safeguarding their own, there are more chances for the political firm to be threatening to a greater degree. As a result, the individuals are going to be at a risk of having lost their gains at one hand, but the goals are less likely to be accomplished on the other.

On the basis of these considerations, it may be said that a political environments in a firm is a risky investment. With the environment becoming more political, there is no guarantee for the individuals for high payoffs. Furthermore, there is a danger of increase in the stress levels of the individuals as they may even be scary of the overt and covert threats. As a result, individuals lose confidence in their efforts, yielding any concrete results. On the contrary, with no politics in the marketplace, the environment is sure to be more in favor of the individuals.

However, these are no hard and fast rules and all organizations need not be governed by them in all circumstances. A collaborative and supportive approach is taken up by the individuals in some organizations where they act as helping hands to one another for the gratification of their needs. Here they offer assistance to their fellows for the attainment of their goals. The outcome of this approach yields three potent consequences. First, there is a distinct resource advantage available to the individuals in such an atmosphere. He finds himself in a supporting setting where there are more people working with him for the attainment of his goal. Naturally the objectives set by an individual, have more chances of being achieved and that too, in a comforting situation. In the longer run, better payoffs can be expected by the individuals. Second, as a result of this supportive approach, a more stable working environment is created and which has the advantageous characteristic of being predictable. It can therefore, be said that loyalty pays better. One is more confident of the benefits which one's investment would yield. Third, though least, since there are less chances from the friends for initiating an assaulting move, this supportive setting lowers the frequency of threatening occurrences. Thus, the marketplace and working

setting becomes more favorable in the eyes of the individuals by achievement of objectives, concrete stable environment, and reduced threats. As a natural consequence to this, reduced stress and increased satisfaction is to be found among the individuals. They are more chances for them to stay in such a favoring marketplace as it guarantees the possibility of future benefits.

Organizational politics and organizational support, as per the definitions above, refer to the one's perception of the organizational marketplace as a whole. A great deal of study has been conducted to examine the response of individuals to specific aspects of the work setting, for instance their supervisor, co-workers and so and so forth. However, our concern of study here is one's overall perception of the social setting in the workplace. Particularly, our main focus is to examine the extent to which the work environment is characterized by individuals and groups competitively and selfishly pursuing their own objectives i.e. politics, or by helpful and cooperative individuals who care and are on the look out for the needs of their co-workers i-e support.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organ's (1988) framework of OCB and its five dimensions: altruism (e.g., assisting others who have heavy workloads), conscientiousness (e.g., work attendance beyond the norm), sportsmanship (e.g., not complaining about trivial matters), courtesy (e.g. consulting with others before taking action) and civic virtue (e.g. involvement in the political process of the organization) have been the subject of the greatest amount of empirical research. For example, based on political philosophy, Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994) suggested five dimensions that underlie OCB: obedience, loyalty, social participation, advocacy participation and functional participation.

The literature was reviewed on citizenship-like behaviors by Farh, Podsakoff, and Organ (1990) and they found 30 constructs of citizenship behavior which were potentially different. Inspite of the diversity in the nature of the constructs, they managed to organize them into seven dimensions resembling much of Organ and colleagues' classification (e.g., Organ, 1988; Smith et al., 1983). LePine, Colquitt, and Erez (2002) who recently conducted a meta-analysis of OCB dimensions, noted that

the literature on OCB and related concepts is fairly diverse with respect to both the nature of the behavioral dimensions studied, and perhaps more so the jargon used by scholars to label the dimensions (LePine et al., 2002). The research having mostly focused on linking predictors to an overall measure of OCB or to a particular OCB dimension, rather than defining the nature of citizenship itself, with precision and developing a theory that can guide OCB measurement and analysis, is one of the reasons for the ambiguity concerning the definition (LePine et al., 2002). Researchers have only recently started to systematically address the question of which OCB operationalization is most appropriate, and how the different dimensions are related to one another (Farh et al., 1990; LePine et al., 2002).

According to LePine et al. (2002), there are three reasons because of which the largest amount of empirical research has been attracted by Organ's five-dimensional framework. First, Organ's framework has the longest history and he and his co-workers have been extremely prolific so far as the publishing of their works is considered. Secondly, the base for OCB measurement in a great number of empirical studies has been made for, by Farh et al. (1990), by providing the field with a solid measure of Organ's five dimensions. Third, it is the general assumption of OCB scholars that Organ's dimensions are beneficial during situations and across organizations over long periods of time, therefore, all or most of the dimensions are usually measured in the same manner across the studies.

A very important correlation was found between OCB and politics by Randall et al. (1994). However, Randall et al. (1994) did not replicate these findings. Studying 276 employees and their supervisors, Shore and Wayne (1993) also supported this expectation. A study of 276 employees and their supervisors was conducted by Shore and Wayne (1993) and the results supported the same expectation. There was a positive correlation between employee's POS and their supervisor's ratings of OCB. Randall et al. (1994) obtained the same results.

Wayne et al. (1997) found that support was significantly correlated with OCB. Wayne et al. (1997) study was limited in that it only considered a single dimension of OCB. Most research suggests that OCB is multidimensional (Organ, 1988). With regard to OCB, less supportive findings were obtained by Cropanzano et al. (1997) and Settoon et al. (1996).

Ingratiation

Ingratiating activity was classified into three categories by Jones (1964) i.e. other enhancement, opinion conformity and self-presentation. First, in 'other enhancement' or flattery usage of high, positive evaluation of the supervisor is included e.g. speaking of their superior in high sounding words by the subordinates in the presence of their supervisor's immediate superior. Second, opinion conformity means expressions of values, beliefs and opinions akin to those of the supervisor. Opinion conformity is best demonstrated in situations where subordinates uncritically accept and conform to the ideas of their supervisor on work or non-work related issues. Third, self-presentation means behaving in a way or projecting an image of one's own self that is supposed to be appropriated by the target i.e. the supervisor, of this ingratiatory exercise. For example, a situation where subordinates try to make their superiors believe that these are the ones who behave in a manner desired by them, by arriving early and staying late at the workplace.

Previous research examining ingratiation in the workplace has suggested that the tactic may be used by subordinates to acquire raises and promotions from supervisors (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Cheng, 1983). Similarly, in a laboratory experiment, Wayne and Kacmar (1991) used undergraduate students to show the beneficial influence of subordinate ingratiation on supervisor performance appraisals. Kipnis and Schmidt (1988) also reported a positive relationship between ingratiation and performance appraisals, but only among female subordinates.

Further, Pandey (1981) showed that subordinates used ingratiation as a means of controlling supervisors to attain desired rewards. Rao, Murray, Schmidt, and Swaffin-Smith (1991) reported mixed support for the use of ingratiation by subordinates seeking personal goals. Thus there was a positive correlation between ingratiation and favorable evaluations and personal gains but unrelated ot assistance with work and accepting responsibility.

Other studies have suggested that the successful use of ingratiation may be reciprocated (Miller & Kenny, 1986; Sims & Manz, 1984). For example, from the subordinate's perspective, the purposes of ingratiating behavior are to be liked (e.g., Godfrey, Jones, & Lord, 1986; Wayne & Ferris, 1990) and to mold a beneficial bond

with the supervisor (Wayne & Ferris, 1990). Because liking tends to be reciprocated (Heider, 1958), the intent is to present oneself as interpersonally attractive, and eventually cash in on future needs. These needs might include desirable performance appraisals, promotions, salary increases, and attractive task assignments (benefits usually associated with higher quality exchanges).

Tsui and Barry (1986) found that there was a direct relationship between liking of a subordinate and more favorable performance appraisals and thus this also provided evidence for this reciprocal process. Similarly, a further demonstration of this was given by Kipnis and Vanderveer (1971) where they proved in a laboratory experiment that there was a tendency among the supervisors to reward ingratiating than non-ingratiating subordinates.

Why liking tends to be reciprocated and rewarded? Two possible explanations come across as plausible. One, interpersonal attraction increases as a result of opinion conformity because the agreement increases the confidence of the person being agreed to, that his beliefs and thoughts are correct, as is argued by Byrne, Nelson, and Reeves (1966). Furthermore, the investigation carried out by Johnson and Johnson's (1972) also supports the idea that conformity increases the chances of goal achievement which is of critical importance to a supervisor in an organization.

Finally, prior research has produced mixed evidence for the relationship between the quality of Leader Member Exchange (LXM) and subordinate ingratiation. For example, Dockery and Steiner (1990) reported, in a sample of undergraduate students, a positive relationship between quality of LMX and ingratiation during initial interactions. In the same way, path analysis was made use of, by Wayne and Ferris (1990) to show the positive effects of subordinate ingratiation on exchange quality through its influence on liking and performance ratings. However, Deluga and Perry (1991) showed in one study, the non significance of relationship between quality and LXM and ingratiation tactics.

The categorization of Jones and Pittman (1982) distinguished the ingratiator, whose intent is to be liked, from the self-promoter, who desires to appear competent. Godfrey et al. (1986) characterized ingratiation behaviors as less proactive (i.e., more reactive) verbal and non-verbal behaviors. The argument put forth by them was that

the goal of other-enhancement (and the primary goal of gaining the acceptance or liking of the target individual) would require more attention to the target and to the target's responses. The person displaying ingratiation behavior is focusing on 'attention-giving' by conforming to the opinions, ideas, and values of his target personality and by praising and passing flattering remarks towards him.

It is suggested by previous research on ingratiation that this is an effective tool to augment liking of the target towards the source (e.g., Wayne & Ferris, 1990) and affect performance ratings (Kipnis & Vanderveer, 1971), as well as career success (Judge & Bretz, 1992). Usage of ingratiation by employees as an influence tactic is supposed to increase liking of the supervisor toward the employee. Indeed, some have argued that ingratiation is a tactic designed to increase liking (Ralston, 1985; Wortman & Linsenmeier, 1977). Others argue that ingratiatory behaviors are employed to increase perceived similarity between the source and the target through such tactics as opinion conformity, for example (Byrne & Griffit, 1966). Causal attribution research suggests that the more similar an observer and a subject, the less likely the observer will assign responsibility to the subject for any negative outcomes (Burger, 1981; Shaver, 1970). Generally, the ultimate result i-e enhanced assessments promotability should achieved by ingratiatory tactics which increase the chances of perceived similarity between supervisor and subordinate.

Affective Commitment

As there are at least two different varieties of the commitment, the relationship between politics and organizational commitment require a bit more explanation (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1984; Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990; Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Coffin, & Jackson, 1989). One type of organizational commitment is affective that is degree of emotional bond between the individual and the organization. Here it is supposed such ties are formed by the individuals because of the organization's non-political orientation because in the longer run, there are more chances for this sort of organizations to meet their needs. Second type of commitment is continuous or calculative commitment which refers to one's decision to stick to an organization due to potential economic losses that are sure to come across in case of departure from the organization. For instance, he may find it difficult to engage himself in a new job with comparable pay scale and other

20

benefits. As compared to affective commitment, value of available alternatives form major part of continuance commitment than the prevailing social climate at work. Furthermore, more emphasis is laid by continuous commitment upon narrow economic goals e-g pay, rather than broader socio-emotional goals e.g. status, dignity, and a sense of worth. Thus as against our expectation that it would be related to politics, continuous commitment is heavily influenced by economic alternatives.

Mostly it has been shown by research that individuals who perceive high level of political activity are found to be less committed to the organization (Drory, 1993; Hochwarter et al., 1999; Maslyn & Fedor, 1998; Witt, Hilton, & Hochwarter, 2001). The most predominant view of organizational commitment is that it represents an affective or emotional attachment to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Further, individuals possessing high levels of commitment enjoy being part of an organization, irrespective of other attachments (Becker, 1992). The most predominant view of organizational commitment is that it represents an affective or emotional attachment to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Further, individuals possessing high levels of commitment enjoy being part of an organization, irrespective of other attachments (Becker, 1992). Commitment to one's organization can be badly affected by organizational politics which has the potential danger of eroding one's attachment to the organization. By setting up boundaries to success, basing pay and promotion decisions on factors extraneous to performance, and providing development and skills acquisition activities only to those in the clique, individuals are likely to see their investment in the organization as risky (Cropanzano et al., 1997). Research has shown the utility of matching the level of analysis with respect to commitment as a dependent variable. For example, Settoon, Bennett, and Liden (1996) and Wayne et al. (1997) both found that organizational-level antecedents predicted organizational commitment, while antecedents occupying other levels failed to do so.

The perspective that commitment is based on an exchange relationship has a long-established history (Etzioni, 1961; Gouldner, 1960; Mowday, Porter, & Steers 1982). To prove that POS an antecedent to organizational commitment, Eisenberger et al. (1986) made use of social exchange view according to which employee's subsequent commitment to the organization mainly depends upon his perception of the organization's commitment to him. Many studies have established this social

exchange view of commitment in which POS is antecedent to affective commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Guzzo, Noonan, & Elron, 1994; Randall et al., 1994; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001; Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Wayne et al., 1997). Furthermore, it has also been proved that POS, are distinct entity from affective and continuance commitment (Shore & Tetrick, 1991) and also to explain uniqueness in variance beyond affective and continuance commitment in cases of outcomes such as citizenship and impression management (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Shore & Wayne, 1993).

Wide ranging studies have been conducted on organizational commitment in contrast to interpersonal conflict, in the field of organizational sciences (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Perhaps one of the key reasons for this is that a decline in organizational commitment is often cited as a precursor to employee turnover (e.g., Angle & Perry, 1981; Horn & Griffeth, 1995; Mowday et al., 1982; Somers, 1995; Whitener & Waltz, 1993) and as a predictor of job performance (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Riketta, 2002).

There has been found a positive relationship between affective commitment and the extent of employees' belief that the organization takes care of their needs, supports them when they need it, gives importance to their contribution, and is on the look out for their better well being. Inspite of the fact that they suggested that perception of support by the individuals would also enhance this form of commitment by creating an emvironment of ot trust, and faith in the organization's willingness to fulfill its obligations towards its employees, those involved in investigation, did not directly explore the connections between these variables and continuance commitment.

Strong positive correlations between POS and affective commitment were found by Shore and her colleagues (Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993). According to them, individuals perceptions of 'being cared' by the organization may help the employees, experience affective attachment, whereas, continuance commitment is probable to invoke perceptions of being poorly treated by the organization rather than perceptions of support.

It has been argued by Ferris et al. (1989) that feelings of commitment among the employees are less likely to prevail when they perceive the organizations as being

political. In the same way, it was suggested by Cropanzano et al. (1997) that if the organization is unpredictable about supporting the individuals at work, which jeopardizes the persistence of long-term organizational membership. The politics-commitment link is based on the exchange between the employee and employer, which is a mixture of economic and social exchanges (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). For instance, in response to employer providing for compensations, high-visibility job assignments and marketability-enhancing occupational development, the employee works with diligence and devotion. Moreover, employees provide each other with net-working and relationships. Economic exchanges are thought to be undermined by organizational politics. As for instance, when employees observe that promotions are being awarded chiefly to clique members, integrity of the organization's human-resource system is seriously damaged. Furthermore, social exchange also becomes jeopardized as a result of politics. Involvement in saboteur activities, strategic impression management and other political behaviors, which have the ulterior motives of self-interest and which are done at the cost of others may act as hindrances in social relationships. As workers view advancement, support, and job security as employer obligations, and loyalty and minimum stay as their obligations (Taylor, Audia, & Gupta, 1996), it may be reasonable to suggest that workers may show decreased loyalty when they see high levels of politics in the organization.

The present study aims at exploring the relationship between perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational support with affective commitment, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. As the literature suggests that when ingratiation behavior is used effectively, it may enhance liking of the target toward the source (e.g. Wayne & Ferris, 1990) and affect performance ratings (Kipnis & Vanderveer, 1971), as well as career success (Judge & Bretz, 1992). Employees who use ingratiation as an influence tactic may also enhance liking of the supervisor toward the employee, it is assumed that political environment is likely to enhance ingratiation behavior. Similarly, research has shown that individuals who perceive high levels of political activity in the organization are less committed to the organization (Drory, 1993; Hochwarter et al., 1999; Maslyn & Fedor, 1998; Witt, Hilton, & Hochwarter, 2001). While Randall et al. (1994) did also find a significant correlation between OCB and politics. Keeping all such literature in view, in the present study, it is assumed that perceived organizational support would

weaken the relationships between perceived organizational politics and affective commitment, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior, as the literature suggest that perceived organizational support also has significant relationship with affective commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1990) and organizational citizenship behavior (Wayne et al., 1997).

Rationale of the Present Study

In Pakistan, research on the topic of organizational politics and organizational support is quite scarce despite the fact that in our wok milieu organizational politics is very common. Such a wide spread phenomenon as organizational politics must bear certain consequences for organizational life which must be explored in order to ensure the optimal organizational productivity in terms of resources as well as personnel. The current study is an important step in this direction as it intended to explore the impact of organizational politics on some of the very salient behavioral outcomes which are quite significant in work settings.

In Pakistan, cellular and banking sector are among the progressively growing private sector organizations. Therefore, it is desirous to explore the relationship among these variables such work settings.

The current investigation is a multifaceted endeavor as it not only explored the impact of organizational politics on affective commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and ingratiation but also tried to examine the paths by which organizational support may moderate the effects of organizational politics on the aforementioned behavioral outcomes. In the third world countries like Pakistan, issues of politics and support are very important because here employee rights are mostly ignored or violated. On account of lack of political agendas in organizations, leg-pulling, ingratiation, threats, alliances, aggression, are common practices to achieve one's personal motives. In such a dire scenario, a thread of carefully designed and methodologically sound studies on the dynamics of organizational politics and support is the need of hour. The organizational efficiency and work effectiveness can only be achieved if we have strong institutions complying with the political ethics. It is, therefore anticipated that the present study would go a long way in spawning new insights into the dynamic of organizational politics and support which may have

certain implication pertaining to OCB, affective commitment, ingratiation, alliances in the work place, promotional structures, HR practices, and organizational justice.

The literature suggests that organizational politics and organizational support are two different and opposite constructs (Cropanzano et al., 1997). One of the purposes of the research is to highlight the significant role of organizational support in enhancing employee's well-being, as well organizational productivity. As supportive environment enhances affective commitment to the organization and organizational citizenship behavior, it is assumed that such an environment would decrease the impact of organizational politics on these behaviors.

The present study would be first of its kind in our endemic culture and therefore occupies an exploratory status in the given settings. The practical utility of the study is quite promising too. It intends to predict certain work outcomes with reference to organizational politics and support which will surely pave a way for the further studies in this dimension. The predictions of the present study would serve as an invaluable source of initiating and sustaining certain behavioral outcomes at the work place to ensure the optimum productivity and growth.

METHOD

Objectives of the Present Study

The current study was primarily undertaken in order to study how perceived organizational politics might influence certain behavioral outcomes in organizational settings including affective commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and ingratiation. Furthermore, the present study was an empirical attempt to find out how perceived organizational support might moderate the impact of perceived organizational politics on the aforementioned behavioral outcomes. More specifically, the present study has been executed in order to achieve the following objectives:

1. To investigate the impact of perceived organizational politics upon certain behavioral outcomes in work setting including perceived organizational support, affective commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and ingratiation behavior.

2. To examine the moderating impact of perceived organizational support on the relationship between perceived organizational politics and the aforementioned behavioral outcomes.

3. To study the gender difference among perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and ingratiation behavior.

4. To explore how cellular service providers and banks differ in terms of perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and ingratiation behavior in cellular organizations with a sample of 200 employees.

5. To explore how employees of State Bank of Pakistan and all other banks differ in terms of perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and ingratiation behavior.

Hypotheses

The present study was undertaken in order to test the following hypotheses:

1. Perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and affective commitment.

   a. Employees high on perceived organizational support will be more affectively committed to their organization despite greater perceptions of organizational politics.

2. Perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior.

   b. Employees perceiving their organizations as highly supportive will demonstrate greater organizational citizenship behavior despite the high perception of organizational politics.

3. Perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and ingratiation behavior.

   c. Employees perceiving their organizations as highly supportive will have low ingratiation behavior despite the high perception of organizational politics.

Operational Definitions of Variables

The current study was planned to see the impact of perceived organizational politics and various behavioral outcomes in the organizational settings. The operational definitions of all the variables being studied in the current investigation are as follows:

Organizational Politics

Organizational Politics refers to the actions by individuals which are directed toward the goal of furthering their own self-interests without regard for the well-being of others or their organization (Kacmar & Baron, 1999). Individuals scoring high on

Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997) will show higher perception of organizational politics.

Organizational Support

Organizational Support is defined as the extent to which the organization values employees' contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Individuals who score high on Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986) will exhibit higher perception of organizational support.

Ingratiation

Ingratiation can be defined as a set of influence behaviors designed to improve one's interpersonal attractiveness and are used by subordinates to gain the approval of supervisors who distribute desired rewards (Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). Those, showing high score on Ingratiation Subscale (Bolino & Turnley, 1999) will show higher level of ingratiation behavior.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational Citizenship Behavior is defined as "performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place" (Organ, 1997, p. 95). Those individuals who score high on Organizational Citizenship Scale (Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1990) will exhibit higher level of organizational citizenship behavior.

Affective Commitment

Affective commitment is defined as ''an affective or emotional attachment to the organization such that the strongly committed individual identifies with, is involved in, and enjoys membership in the organization'' (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 2). People whose score is high on Affective Commitment Subscale (Allen & Meyer, 1990) will manifest higher affective commitment to the organization.

Sample

A sample of 200 employees from various cellular services (100) and banks (100) was drawn. Sample included all the employees from non-managerial staff. Data was collected from Multan and Lahore due to time constraints, as it was easy to access the data from these two cities for the present study. 75% data was collected from Multan and 25% data was collected from Lahore (150 and 50 respectively). The sample included 152 men and 48 women and all the participants belonged to non-managerial jobs within the aforementioned occupational groups. The sample included 77 men and 23 women from cellular services and 75 men and 25 women from banking sector. The base line of academic qualification of the sample was graduation (14 years of education). Participants in the current sample belonged to Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor, Warid, State Bank of Pakistan, City Bank, HSBC, NIB Bank and ABN Amro Bank.

Instruments

In order to measure the proposed variables, following scales were used:

Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS)

Shortened version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al., 1986) comprising of eight items was used (see Appendix D). These eight items were those that loaded the highest in Eisenberger et al. (1986) factor analysis. The scale was scored on a 7-point Likert type rating scale where "strongly disagree" was scored as 1 and "strongly agree: as 7. The score on the scale ranged from 8 to 57. Items no. 2, 3, 5 and 7 were reversed scored. The Cronbach's alpha found for this scale was .90 (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997).

Perceptions of Organizational Politics (POPS)

Organizational politics was measured using the 15-item Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS) developed by Kacmar and Carlson (1997) (see Appendix E). The scale was scored on a 5-point Likert type rating scale where "strongly disagree" was scored as 1 and "strongly agree" as 5. The score on the scale ranged from 15 to 75. Items no. 3, 4, 10 and 11 were reversed scored. A sample item

is "People in this organization attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down." The internal consistency estimate for the 15 items was found to be .87 (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001).

Affective Commitment

Affective commitment was measured with six items taken from the affective commitment subscale developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) (see Appendix F). Scores are reported on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The score ranged from 1 to 42. Items no. 3, 4 and 5 were reversed scored. Sample items are "This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me" and "I feel emotionally attached to this organization." Cronbach alpha was .72 for affective commitment. (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Ingratiation

Ingratiation was measured with Ingratiation Subscale of Impression Management Scale developed by Bolino and Turnley (1999) (see Appendix G). The subscale was composed of four items. The scale was scored on a 5-point Likert type rating scale where "never" was scored as 1 and "always" as 5. The score on the scale ranged from 4 to 20. None of the items was reverse scored. The Cronbach alpha found for this scale was .85 (Bolino & Turnley, 1999).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB was measured based on the five dimensions scale developed by Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1990) (see Appendix H). The scale comprised of 24 items which tapped five facets of OCB- altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue. These dimensions have been conceptualized by Organ (1988) and selected for this study because it is frequently used by researchers (LePine et al., 2002; Schnake and Dumler, 2003). Managers and subordinates indicated their agreement on each item using a 5-point Likert scale format ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The score ranged from 24 to 120. Items no. 2, 3, 4, 7, 16 and 19 were reversed scored. The psychometric properties of this scale have been reported in Moorman (1991). The study by Moorman supports a five dimensions model of OCB and the reported reliabilities are 0.81 (altruism), 0.88

(courtesy), 0.87 (sportsmanship), 0.83 (conscientiousness), and 0.76 (civic virtue). Minor modifications were made to the questionnaire to suit the study sample.

Procedure

The management of Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor, Warid, Stete bank of Pakistan, City bank, ABN Amro bank, NIB bank, and HSBC were contacted by the researcher on behalf of National Institute of Psychology in order to get the approval of sample recruitment. After the official permission, the participants were individually contacted in their respective departments. They were briefed about the rationale and objectives of the current study and be provided with the booklet containing the aforementioned scales (see Appendix A). The instruments were accompanied by written as well as oral instruction on how to respond each question/item (see Appendix B). They were assured of the confidentiality of the information that they were going to provide as it would only be used for research purpose. Finally the participants were heartily thanked for their support and cooperation.

RESULTS

The present study was conducted to assess the relationship among perceived organizational politics (Independent variable), affective commitment to the organization, organizational citizenship behavior (dependant variables) and perceived organizational support (Moderator). To assess these relationships, moderated multiple regression analysis was used. The results are mentioned in the Table 7 to 9.

Furthermore, organizational mean differences were also measured using t-analysis. Gender differences were also measured at inter as well as intra-organizational levels using t-analysis. The results are mentioned in Table 3 to 6. Table 1 demonstrated correlation matrix whereas Table 2 presented alpha co-efficient of reliability in order to identify the pattern of relationship among all the variables of study and the internal consistency of the scales, respectively.

Relationship between Perceived Organizational Politics, Perceived Organizational Support, Affective Commitment, Ingratiation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

A correlation matrix was computed in order to see the relationship between the variables of perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, ingratiation and organizational citizenship behavior. The purpose of correlation matrix was to yield an initial insight into the pattern of relationships that might exist among the various variables. Since all the variables involved were continuous variables, therefore, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed as indices of the magnitude and direction of relationship between various variables.

Table 1

Inter Scale Correlations among Perception of Organizational Politics Scale, Perception of Organizational Support Scale, Affective Commitment Scale, Ingratiation Scale and Organizational Citizenship Scale (N = 200)

Scales	Perceived Organizational Support	Perceived Organizational Politics	Organizational Commitment	Ingratiation	Organizational citizenship behavior
Perceived Organizational Support	-	-.56***	.51***	.11	-.27***
Perceived Organizational Politics	-	-	-.47***	.05	.29***
Organizational Commitment	-	-	-	.07	-.41***
Ingratiation	-	-	-	-	-.13
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	-	-	-	-	-

***$p < .001$

Table 1 shows that the correlation patterns of the scales of Perceived organizational politics, Perceived organizational support, Affective commitment, Ingratiation and Organizational citizenship behavior in Table 1 show that all these scales are significantly correlated to one another at the 0.001 level, except the ingratiation subscale. Perceived organizational politics correlates negatively with perceived organizational support and affective commitment, and it is positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior and ingratiation behavior, while its relationship with ingratiation behavior is not significant. Perceived organizational support correlates negatively with perceived organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior, and it is positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior and ingratiation behavior, while its relationship with ingratiation behavior is non significant

Alpha Coefficients of Reliability

In order to estimate the reliability of measurement in the current study, alpha coefficients of reliability were computed for all the scales used in the current study. Alpha reliability estimates were the most appropriate indices of internal consistency

of measurement as all the scales of the current study were rating scales on a 5- or 7-point Likert type response format specifically designed to measure a particular construct. Since the scores on these scales produced continuous measurements, computation of alpha coefficients of reliability as the indices of internal consistency was warranted.

Table 2

Alpha Reliabilities of the Scales Used in the Current Study (N = 200)

Scales	No. of Items	α
Organizational Support	8	.81
Organizational Politics	15	.69
Organizational Commitment	6	.72
Ingratiation	4	.85
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	24	.66

Table 2 shows that all the five scales used in this study obtained satisfactory levels of reliability co-efficient. The reliability measures ranged from .66, minimum, to .85, highest level.

Impact of Occupation and Gender on **Perceived Organizational Politics, Perceived Organizational Support, Affective Commitment, Ingratiation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

The impact of all the demographics taken into account in the current study including gender and occupation was investigated through t-test. This test was the best available test of statistical significance as the study aimed at exploring the impact of certain dichotomous variables (gender, occupation) on the continuous variables of perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational support.

Table 3

Occupational Differences in the Perceived Organizational Support, Perceived Organizational Politics, Ingratiation Behavior, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (N = 200)

Variables	Cellular Services (n = 100)		Banks (n = 100)			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Perceived Organizational Support	42.83	9.18	38.57	9.28	3.26	.001
Perceived Organizational Politics	42.78	8.54	44.20	9.51	1.11	.268
Organizational Commitment	32.71	5.89	30.18	6.59	2.86	.005
Ingratiation Behavior	12.88	4.32	12.30	4.57	.92	.358
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	55.87	8.07	56.09	7.64	.19	.843

df = 198

Table 3 shows the organizational differences in the mean scores on perception of organizational support, perception of organizational politics, affective commitment to the organization, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. The difference of mean was found to be significant on perception of organizational support and affective commitment {t (198) = 3.26, p < .01 and t (198) = 2.86, p < .01 respectively). It implies that the employees in the cellular organization perceived their organization as more supportive and they also tended to be more affectively committed to their organization than their banking counterparts. There was no significant mean difference found between the employees of cellular and banking sector on perception of organizational politics, ingratiation and organizational citizenship behavior that implies that the employees of both the organizations are comparable in terms of these variables.

Table 4

Gender Differences in the Perceived Organizational Support, Perceived Organizational Politics, Ingratiation Behavior, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (N = 200)

Variables	Men (n = 152)		Women (n = 48)		t	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Perceived Organizational Support	40.71	9.13	40.67	10.51	.03	.978
Perceived Organizational Politics	43.80	9.25	42.50	8.40	.87	.386
Organizational Commitment	31.45	6.18	31.44	7.01	.01	.993
Ingratiation	12.65	4.27	12.40	5.00	.35	.730
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	55.60	7.89	57.19	7.68	1.22	.222

df = 198

Table 4 shows the gender differences in the mean scores on perception of organizational support, perception of organizational politics, affective commitment to the organization, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. There was no significant mean difference found between the male and female employees of cellular and banking sector on perception of organizational support, perception of organizational politics, affective commitment to organization, ingratiation and organizational citizenship behavior that implies that the employees of both the genders are comparable in terms of these variables.

Table 5

Gender Differences in the Perceived Organizational Support, Perceived Organizational Politics, Ingratiation Behavior, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Telecommunication Organizations (N = 100)

Variables	Men (n = 77)		Women (n = 23)			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	p
Perceived Organizational Support	42.57	9.20	43.70	9.28	.51	.609
Perceived Organizational Politics	43.75	8.98	39.52	5.97	2.12	.036
Organizational Commitment	32.34	5.88	33.96	5.88	1.16	.250
Ingratiation	12.78	4.50	13.22	3.73	.42	.672
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	55.62	7.98	56.70	8.53	.56	.579

df = 198

Table 5 shows the gender differences in the mean scores on perception of organizational support, perception of organizational politics, affective commitment to the organization, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior in cellular organizations. The mean difference was found to be significant on perception of organizational politics. It implies that the male employees of cellular organizations tended to perceive their organizations as more political than their female counterparts. There was no significant mean difference found between the male and female employees of cellular organizations on perception of organizational support, affective commitment to organization, ingratiation and organizational citizenship behavior that implies that the employees of both the genders in cellular organizations are comparable in terms of these variables.

Table 6

Gender Differences in the Perceived Organizational Support, Perceived Organizational Politics, Ingratiation Behavior, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Banking Organizations (N = 100)

Variables	Men (*n* = 75)		Women (*n* = 25)		*t*	*p*
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*		
Perceived Organizational Support	38.80	8.71	8.71	10.98	.43	.670
Perceived Organizational Politics	9.34	9.58	9.58	9.45	.63	.531
Organizational Commitment	30.53	6.37	6.37	7.27	.93	.356
Ingratiation	12.52	4.05	4.05	5.91	.83	.407
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	55.57	7.84	7.84	6.95	1.17	.244

df = 198

Table 6 shows the gender differences in the mean scores on perception of organizational support, perception of organizational politics, affective commitment to the organization, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior in banking organizations. There was no significant mean difference found between the male and female employees of banking organizations on perception of organizational support, perception of organizational politics, affective commitment to organization, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior that implies that the employees of both the genders in banking organizations are comparable in terms of these variables.

Moderating Impact of Perceived Organizational Support on the Relationship between Perceived Organizational Politics, Affective Commitment, Ingratiation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

One of the major objectives of the current study was to investigate how the impact of perceived organizational politics on organizational commitment, ingratiation, and organizational citizenship behavior might have been influenced by the perceived organizational support. This objective was achieved though the computation of multiple moderated regression analyses. Multiple moderated regression was the best available statistical tool in order to see whether perceived organizational support moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics (independent variable) and organizational commitment, ingratiation, and organizational citizenship behavior (dependent variables). The choice of this statistical procedure was justified as all the variables involved (independent as well as dependent variables) were continuous. Moreover, as our objective was to see the moderating impact of perceived organizational support in the relationship between the aforementioned independent and dependent variables, each regression analysis included two main effects and one interactive effect in terms of one of the dependent variables. Hence, multiple moderated regression analyses proved to be essential in order to meet the aforesaid end of this investigation.

Table 7

Moderated Multiple Regression Analysis of Perceived Organizational Politics and Perceived Organizational Support for Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Model	B	SE B	β	t	R²	F
Constant	56.296	.599				
Perceived Organizational Politics	1.49	.65	.19	2.275*		
Perceived Organizational Support	-1.30	.64	-.17	2.026*	.11	8.10***
Perceived Organizational Politics * Perceived Organizational Support	.57	.51	.08	1.114		

*$p < .05$

Table 7 shows that the findings of the moderated regression analysis indicated that perceived organizational support had no influence on the relationship of

perceived organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior. The results in Table 7 showed that the 11% of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior was due to perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support and their interaction {$R^2 = .11$, F (2, 197) $= 8.10$, $p < .05$ }. Whereas perceived organizational politics ($\beta = .19$, $t = 2.275$, $p < .05$) and perceived organizational support ($\beta = -.17$, $t = -2.026$, $p < .05$) were proved to be significant indicators. The interaction between perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational support turned out to be non significant and indicated that our second hypothesis "perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior" was rejected.

Table 8

Moderated Multiple Regression Analysis of Perceived Organizational Politics and Perceived Organizational Support for Ingratiation

Model	B	SE B	β	t	R²	F
Constant	12.28	.35				
Perceived Organizational Politics	.87	.38	.20	2.265*		
Perceived Organizational Support	.96	.38	.22	2.558*	.05	3.18*
Perceived Organizational Politics * Perceived Organizational Support	-.57	.30	-.13	1.881		

*$p < .05$

Table 8 shows that the findings of the moderated regression analysis indicated that perceived organizational support had no influence on the relationship of perceived organizational politics and ingratiation behavior. The results in Table 8 showed that the 5% of the variance in ingratiation behavior was due to perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support and their interaction {$R^2 = .05$, F (2, 197) $= 3.18$, $p < .05$ }. Whereas perceived organizational politics ($\beta = .20$, $t = 2.265$, $p < .05$) and perceived organizational support ($\beta = .22$, $t = 2.558$, $p < .05$) were proved to be significant indicators. The interaction between perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational support turned out to be non significant and indicated that our third hypothesis "perceived organizational support

will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics ingratiation behavior" was rejected.

Table 9

Moderated Multiple Regression Analysis of Perceived Organizational Politics and Perceived Organizational Support for Affective Commitment

Model	B	SE B	β	t	R²	F
Constant	31.00	.42				
Perceived Organizational Politics	-1.52	.46	-.24	3.296**		
Perceived Organizational Support	2.40	.45	.38	5.335***	.33	32.36***
Perceived Organizational Politics * Perceived Organizational Support	-.80	.36	-.13	2.214*		

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001,

Table 9 shows that the findings of the moderated regression analysis indicated that perceived organizational support had influenced significantly on the relationship of perceived organizational politics and affective commitment behavior. The results in Table 8 showed that the 33% of the variance in affective commitment behavior was due to perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support and their interaction {$R^2 = .33, F (2, 197) = 32.36, p < .05$ }. Whereas perceived organizational politics ($\beta = -.24, t = 3.296, p < .01$), perceived organizational support ($\beta = .38, t = 5.335, p < .001$) and their interaction ($\beta = -.13, t = 2.214, p < .05$) were proved to be significant indicators. The interaction was significant and in negative direction, that implies that employees who had higher levels of perception of organizational support will have higher level of affective commitment to their organization despite their higher level of perception of organizational politics as compared to those who had lower levels of perception of organizational support. Hence our first hypothesis "perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and affective commitment" was supported.

Impact of Organizational Difference on **Perceived Organizational Politics, Perceived Organizational Support, Affective Commitment, Ingratiation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

To explore how employees of State Bank of Pakistan differ from the employees of City Bank, HSBC, NIB Bank and ABN Amro Bank in terms of perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and ingratiation behavior, t-test was applied to the sample of 100 bank employees.

Table 10

Organizational Differences between employees of State bank of Pakistan and other banks in the Perceived Organizational Support, Perceived Organizational Politics, Affective Commitment, Ingratiation Behavior, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (N = 100)

Variables	State Bank (*n* = 39)		Other Banks (*n* = 61)		*t*	*p*
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*		
Perceived Organizational Support	36.13	10.71	40.13	7.94	2.14	.035
Perceived Organizational Politics	47.49	10.19	42.10	8.50	2.86	.005
Affective Commitment	29.36	7.48	30.70	5.97	1.00	.322
Ingratiation Behavior	13.64	4.46	11.44	4.47	2.40	.018
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	57.44	7.58	55.23	7.62	1.41	.160

df = 98

Table 10 shows the organizational differences in the mean scores on perception of organizational support, perception of organizational politics, affective commitment to the organization, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. The difference of mean was found to be significant on perception of organizational support, perception of organizational politics and ingratiation behavior {*t* (98) = -2.14, *p* < .05, *t* (98) = 2.86, *p* < .01 and *t* (98) = 2.40, *p* < .05 respectively). It implies that the employees in the City Bank, HSBC, NIB Bank and ABN Amro Bank perceived their organization as more supportive and they also tended to show less ingratiatory behavior as compared to the employees of State Bank of Pakistan.

Also the employees of State bank of Pakistan perceived their organization to be more political as compared to their other banking counterparts. There was no significant mean difference found between the employees of State bank of Pakistan and City Bank, HSBC, NIB Bank and ABN Amro Bank on affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior which implies that the employees of both the organizations are comparable in terms of these variables.

DISCUSSION

The present study was conducted to explore the effect of perceived organizational support on the relationship between perceived organizational politics and certain behavioral outcomes in organizational setting. The behavioral outcomes being studied include affective commitment, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational politics is a phenomenon that is prevalent in almost every organization to a lesser or more extent. As this behavior varies in its manifestation from organization to organization, depending upon the organizational goals, values and culture, its perception among the employees was adopted as the variable of this study. Same is the case with perception of organizational support, as it also shares the same issues as with organizational politics.

In the present study perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational support were adopted to explore the impact of their mutual interaction on the behavioral outcomes mentioned above. It was assumed that employees' perception of high organizational support would weaken the relationship between their perception of organizational politics and behavioral outcomes in organizational setting.

Correlational analysis was conducted in order to assess the proposed strengths and directions among the variables of study. It was assumed that perceived organizational politics will show negative correlation with affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior and positive relationship with ingratiation behavior. Similarly, it was assumed that perceived organizational support will show positive relationship with affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior and negative relationship with ingratiation behavior. Perceive organizational politics was found to be significantly correlated with perceived organizational support, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, while its relationship with ingratiation was found to be non-significant. On the other hand, Perceive organizational support was found to be significantly correlated with perceived organizational politics, affective commitment and organizational citizenship

behavior, while its relationship with ingratiation was found to be non-significant (see Table 1).

The correlation matrix showed that both perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational support were negatively correlated to each other (r=-.56) and that negative correlation was highly significant (see Table 1). Moderated multiple regression analysis showed that POS influenced only one relationship out of the three proposed relationships. It was assumed that POS, as a moderator, would weaken the relationships between perceived organizational politics (Independent variable) and affective commitment, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. The results of the moderated multiple regressions showed that POS influenced only the relationship between perceived organizational politics and affective commitment, as it was proposed (see Table 9). On the other hand, the effects of perceived organizational politics, POS and their interaction on the dependant variables of ingratiation (see Table8) and organizational citizenship behavior (see Table 7) were not found to be significant.

Ferris (1989) proposed his model of organizational politics perception. It was revised in 2002 making the inclusion of organizational citizenship, trust, cynicism, justice, and political behavior as consequences of politics perceptions. The relationships between independent and dependant variable were adopted from this model, partially. The variable of ingratiation behavior was adopted due to its significance in relation to organizational politics, as it is a political tactic. Very few researches are available related to this variable of study. Variable of affective commitment was included in the research due to its relevance to Pakistani culture in relation of organizational politics and organizational support.

Drory (1993) argued that individuals who perceive organizational environment to be highly political will be less committed to the organization. Similar findings have been explored by many other researchers who support the notion that increased perception of political activity will decrease employee's commitment to the organization (Hochwarter, Perrewe, Ferris, & Guerico, 1999; Maslyn & Fedor, 1998; Witt, Hilton, & Hochwarter, 2001). There are many researches establishing view point of social exchange, arguing that POS is antecedent to affective commitment (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Guzzo, Noonan, & Elron, 1994;

Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin 1994; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001; Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Wayne, Shore, & Liden 1997). Eisenberger et al. (1990) observed a positive relationship between affective commitment and the extent to which employees believe the organization provides them with needed support, values their contribution, and cares about their well-being. Shore and her colleagues (Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993) found strong positive correlations between POS and affective commitment.

Organizational-level politicking has the potential to adversely affect commitment if it erodes attachment to the firm. By setting up boundaries to success, basing pay and promotion decisions on factors extraneous to performance, and providing development and skills acquisition activities only to those in the clique, individuals are likely to see their investment in the organization as risky (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth 1997). Ferris, Fedor, Chachere and Pondy (1989) argued that employees are unlikely to feel committed to organizations they see as political. Similarly, Cropanzano et al. (1997) suggested that the lack of predictable support at work makes risky the investment of long-term organizational membership. The politics-commitment link is based on the exchange between the employee and employer, which is a mixture of economic and social exchanges (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). As workers view advancement, support, and job security as employer obligations, and loyalty and minimum stay as their obligations (Taylor, Audia, & Gupta, 1996), it may be reasonable to suggest that workers may show decreased loyalty when they see high levels of politics in the organization.

The results of the present study also reinforce the previous research findings. The relationship between the perceived organizational politics and affective commitment was found to be negatively correlated and this relationship was highly significant. The relationship between the perceived organizational support and affective commitment was found to be positively correlated and this relationship was also highly significant (see Table 1).

Moderated multiple regression analysis was also conducted to measure the impact of perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support and their interaction on affective commitment to the organization. Perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational support, their main effect on affective

commitment and the relationship was found to be significant. The impact of perceived organizational politics and POS and their interaction on affective commitment was also found to be significant. The relationship between perceived organizational politics and affective commitment was found to be negative as a result of main effect and this relationship was highly significant. Result shows that this relationship between perceived organizational politics and affective commitment was weakened when perceived organizational support was introduced as a moderator. The results in moderated multiple regression analysis shows that the relationship still existed in the negative direction but its intensity was decreased as its t-value decreased (see Table 9). So, this finding further validated the phenomenon that perceived organizational politics will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and affective commitment and concludes that employees perceiving their organization to be caring and supportive for their well-being will tend to be effectively committed to their organization despite their high perception of political activity in their organizational setting. So the results confirmed our first hypothesis stating that "perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and affective commitment."

The researches on the relationship among perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior are still inconclusive because some researches found negative relationship between perception of organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior while others did not find any relationship between the two variables. Same is the case with perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior, as the findings regarding their relationship are with mixed results, some supporting their relationship while other rejecting any relationship between them.

Organ's (1988) hypothesized Organizational citizenship behavior into five dimensions: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue, and all these five dimensions have been the subject of the greatest amount of empirical research. Randall et al. (1994) did find a significant correlation between OCB and politics. However, these findings were not replicated by Randall et al. (1994). Shore and Wayne (1993) supported this expectation with a study of 276 employees and their supervisors. The employee's perceived organizational support was positively related

to their supervisor's ratings of organizational citizenship behavior. Similar results were obtained by Randall et al. (1994). Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997) found that support was significantly correlated with OCB. Wayne et al. (1997) study was limited in that it only considered a single dimension of OCB. Most research suggests that OCB is multidimensional (Organ, 1988). With regard to OCB, less supportive findings were obtained by Cropanzano et al. (1997), and Settoon, Bennett and Liden. (1996). Cropanzano et al. (1997) failed to detect a significant relationship between politics perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Maslyn and Fedor (1998) found that politics perceptions at the group level predicted citizenship behavior. The results of the present study were also found in the same fashion, as in the Correlational matrix perceived organizational politics was found to be positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior and this relationship was highly significant, although the magnitude of their relationship was found to be low. In the same fashion, perceived organizational support was found to be negatively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior and the relationship between the two variables was also found to be highly significant. The magnitude of the relationship between the two variables was also found to be low (see Table 1).

Our second hypothesis stating that "perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior" was not supported by the obtained data. The moderated multiple regression analysis shows that the impact of perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support and their interaction on organizational citizenship behavior was not found to be significant. The main effects of the variables of perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational support were found to be significant and its direction was same as in the Correlational matrix. So, our second hypothesis could not get support from the data obtained as there was no interaction effect found on organizational citizenship behavior (see Table 7).

The reasons for the found positive relationship between perceived organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior can be attributed to many factors. Ferris et al. (1989) suggested that at least three potential responses to politics perceptions would be to withdraw from the organization, remain a member of

the organization but do not become involved in the politics, and to remain a member of the organization and become involved in the politics. These responses appear similar in nature to Hirschman's (1970) exit, loyalty, and voice, respectively. So, one key factor causing the positive relationship between the two variables may be that the persons who remain part of the organization and do not get involved in political activities may get inclined to adopt citizenship behavior as a compensatory phenomenon. As people with such orientation perceive political activity to be an unhealthy or unrelated, they tend to facilitate others and the work environment in order to compensate such unhealthy practices like politics. On the other hand, those who remain the part of the organization and get involved in political activities may tend to adopt citizenship behavior as a political tactic to enhance their self-interest. As the phenomenon of organizational politics deals with individual as well as group interactions, it has sociological aspect in its orientation. As organizational citizenship behavior has pro-social orientation in it, the individuals involved in it may use this phenomenon as a mean to achieve their self-interest by developing favorable impression among their cliques and superiors.

Another factor influencing the relationship between perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational citizenship behavior is contextual factor. Hofstede (1980) analyzed the variations in values among the cultures. He found that managers and employees vary on five dimensions of national culture. Those five dimension are power versus distance, individualism versus collectivism, achievement versus nurturing, uncertainty avoidance and long-term versus short-term orientation. His work is one and the most referenced works in analyzing the variation in values among cultures. Hofstede (1980) reported that Asian countries were more collective in their orientation than the other European countries and the United States. As the phenomenon of organizational politics deals with individual and organizational citizenship behavior is a pro-social behavior that incorporates the essence of collectivism. People tend to behave collectively in this culture and reinforce their citizenship behavior despite their high perception of the organizational politics.

The key factor influencing the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior is also contextual factor. Hofstede's stated dimension of achievement versus nurturing deals well with the obtained results

of the present study. Achievement is the degree to which values such as assertiveness, the acquisition of money and material goods, and competition prevails. Nurturing is the degree to which people value relationships, and show sensitivity and concern for the welfare of the others. The results of Hofstede's study showed that Asian countries tended to be nurturing oriented as compared to the other western countries. This nurturing oriented tendency may enhance citizenship behavior in the employees of this culture. When citizenship behavior is incorporated as a socially learned phenomenon, then material gains keeps the opposite position, making the individuals believe that striving for such gains is going against the cultural norms.

As Godfrey, Jones, and Lord (1986) characterized ingratiation behaviors as less proactive (i.e., more reactive) verbal and non-verbal behaviors, it was assumed that high perceptions of organizational politics would enhance ingratiation behavior, while high perception of organizational support would decrease ingratiation behavior. Wayne & Ferris (1990) suggested that liking of the target toward the goal will get enhanced with the effective use of ingratiation tactic. Kipnis and Vanderveer (1971) also proposed that the effective use of this tactic would affect performance ratings. Judge and Bretz (1992) argued that ingratiation behavior will enhance career success. Employees who use ingratiation as an influence tactic may also enhance liking of the supervisor toward the employee (Ralston, 1985; Wortman & Linsenmeier, 1977). Ansari and Kapoor (1987) and Cheng (1983) suggested that in the marketplace this tactic may be used by subordinates to acquire raises and promotions from supervisors. Burger (1981) and Shaver (1970) in their causal attribution research suggested that ingratiatory the tactics that enhance perceived similarity between supervisor and subordinate should increase liking for the subordinate, ultimately resulting in enhanced assessments of promotability.

Results showed that ingratiation behavior was not found to be significantly correlated with both perceived organizational politics and perceived support (see Table 1). This discrepancy in the obtained results may be attributed to different factors. One of the key factors is the cultural perceptual manifestations. People in different cultures perceive different phenomena in different ways. As majority of the Pakistani population is illiterate, and even those who are considered to be literate, among them, majority of the population is unskilled. For such people, the desire of

excelling in the walk of life force them to use tactics that would help them in getting approval and liking of their superiors, without any extraordinary intellectual as well as behavioral maneuvering. Ingratiation is one of these behavioral tactics. In this society, ingratiatory behavior is not supposed to be a political tactic or a behavior with negative connotation like organizational politics itself. People consider it as a socially accepted phenomenon.

The moderated multiple regression analysis showed that impact of perceived organizational politics, perceived organization support and their interaction on ingratiation behavior was not found to be significant. To obtain such result in regression analysis was quite expected and logical as both perceived organizational politics and POS did not show significant correlation with ingratiation behavior in the simple Correlational matrix (see Table 1). So the results did not support our third hypothesis stating that "perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and ingratiation behavior."

In order to see the impact of sample selection on the results, the employees of State Bank of Pakistan were compared with the employees of City Bank, HSBC, NIB Bank and ABN Amro Bank, as the State Bank of Pakistan was a public organization and all other banks were multinational private organizations. The results showed that there was a significant mean difference found between the employees of State Bank of Pakistan and the employees of City Bank, HSBC, NIB Bank and ABN Amro Bank on perception of organizational politics, perception of organizational support and ingratiation behavior. From these results, it can be concluded the discrepancy in the results could have its roots in organizational culture of public and private organizations.

Conclusion

The results obtained in the study proved that perceived organizational support moderated significantly in the relationship between perceived organizational politics and affective commitment and this impact of perceived organizational support was as related as it was proposed in the hypothesis. On the other hand, perceived organizational support did not moderate significantly in the relationship between perceived organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior and this

impact of perceived organizational support was opposite to the proposed effect in the hypothesis. Similarly, perceived organizational support did not moderate significantly in the relationship between perceived organizational politics and ingratiation behavior and this impact of perceived organizational support was opposite to the proposed effect in the hypothesis.

In the correlational analysis, perceived organizational politics was found to be negatively correlated to affective commitment, while perceived organizational support was found to be positively correlated to affective commitment and the correlations between them were highly significant, reinforcing the past literature related to their relationship. On the other hand, perceived organizational politics was found to correlate positively with organizational citizenship behavior, while POS was found to be negatively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior and these correlations were highly significant. These present findings between the relationship of perceived organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior, and POS and organizational citizenship behavior may have cultural implications in it. While, both perceived organizational politics and POS were not found to be significantly correlated to ingratiation behavior. Again, this finding may have cultural implications in it.

Limitations of the Study

There may be certain issues that contribute to the weaknesses of the study. For example, the data were collected exclusively through self-report method, without the inclusion of multiple sources. Consequently, the relationships between our variables of study may have been inflated due to response bias. So, the perceptual nature of the data collection mandates that the results reported in this study are viewed with caution.

The variables of perceived organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior have further sub-components. It is quite possible that some of the facets or sub-components may have correlated significantly with the other variables but the over all relationship of that variable with other variables would have minimized their impact or diminished it.

The most common and prevalent issue, like most other researches, is the issue of the sample size. It is somewhat difficult to generalize the findings as sample included only 200 employees from only two sectors of the private industrial cluster i.e. cellular organizations and banking organizations. This method of purposive sampling may face the issues of external validity while interpreting the data in general terms.

Organizational differences may also have their role in affecting the results, as State Bank of Pakistan is a public organization and all other banks in the sample were private banks. Mean differences were also found to be significant between employees of State Bank of Pakistan and employees of other banks. This analysis was not further extended to explore the differences among the variables of the study on perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior, due to time constraints.

While studying organizational politics, organizational support and affective commitment, it is also important to see pay level as a demographic variable. Unfortunately, people did not elicit information about this variable, considering this information as too personal. Lack of such information may also affect the interpretation of the relationship between these variables.

Age is another demographic variable that keeps its place in studying organizational citizenship behavior and its relationship with other variables. This variable was not included into the study because majority of the sample ranged between 30-40 years of age. This range did not provide with distinct age categories to measure variability. So that homogeneity in the sample regarding age lead to the exclusion of this variable in the demographics.

Recommendations for Future Research

Keeping in view the current issues contaminating the present research, it is recommended that, to overcome the issue of method variance, future researcher use multiple sources for data collection along with self-report measures. It is also recommended that the future researches should attempt to measure the relationship of the sub-components of the variables of perceived

organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior with other variables and their sub-components.

The study could not be extended to explore the differences between the variables of study on perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior, due to time constraints. Interaction affect of perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational support on affective commitment, ingratiation behavior and organizational citizenship behavior could, also, not be explored due to time constraints. Future research should attempt to measure these relationships.

To deals with the issues of external validity, the sample size should be increased and the sample should also include a number of other private sector organizations as well like pharmaceuticals, medical practitioners, engineers etc. The demographic information related to income level and age level is also worth significant for studying the relationship between these variables.

Implications of the present Study

In the present study perceived organizational support moderated the relationship between perceived organizational politics and affective commitment to the organization. This finding supported the previous literature regarding perceived organizational politics and its relationship with perceived organizational support and affective commitment. This finding further extends the scope of research, previously conducted in the developed countries, to the developing countries like Pakistan relating perceived organizational politics with perceived organizational support and affective commitment.

The present study did not support the previous literature regarding the relationship among perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support, organizational citizenship behavior and ingratiation behavior. These findings lead to the need for the further investigation of the impact of collectivist culture on the relationship among perceived organizational politics, organizational citizenship behavior and ingratiation behavior.

The findings of the present study reinforce the previous literature suggesting that employees are more committed to the organizations where the environment is supportive. In today's work milieu the issue that is very important to almost every organization is to reduce its rate of employee turn over. As a result of organizational commitment, the rate of turn over is decreased. At the same time, the findings of the present study also support the previous literature regarding impact of perceived organizational politics on affective commitment of the employees to the organization. Results of the present study confirm that political environment reduces affective commitment of the employees to the organization.

The present study is one of its kinds in the present work environment where human values and resources are ignored. This study would definitely help in paving the ways to improve the present work environment in the third world countries like Pakistan. This study would also reinforce the research community in the collectivist cultures like Pakistan to further extend its endeavors in this area of research and find out its further practical and research implications.

REFERENCES

Ahearn, K. K., Ferris, G. R., Hochwarter, W. A., Douglas, C., & Ammeter, A. P. (2004). Leader political skill and team performance. *Journal of Management*, *30*, 309-327.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 1-18

Angle, H. L., & Lawson, M. B. (1993). Changes in affective and continuance commitment in times of relocation. *Journal of Business Research, 26,* 3-15.

Angle, H., & Perry, L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26*, 1-14.

Ansari, M. A., & Kapoor, A. (1987). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 40,* 39-49.

Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology, 66*, 32-42.

Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of employee commitment: Are they distinctions worth making? *Academy of Management Journal, 35,* 232-244.

Becker, T. E., & Kernan, M. C. (2001). *Affective and continuance commitment and performance: A closer look.* Paper presented at the 16th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Measuring Impression Management in Organizations: A Sale Development Based on the Jones and Pittman Taxonomy. *Organizational Research Methods, 2*, 187-206.

Bozeman, D. P., Perrewe, P. L., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, K. M., & Brymer, R. A. (1996). Opportunity or threat? An examination of differential reactions to perceptions of organizational politics. In M. Schnake (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Southern Management Association.* Southern Management Association, FL.

Burger, J.M. (1981). Motivational biases in the attribution of responsibility for an accident: A meta-analysis of the defensive attribution hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 90, 96*-112.

Byrne, D. D., Nelson, D., & Reeves, K. (1966). Effects of consensual validation and invalidation on attraction as a function of verifiability. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 2, 98*-107.

Byrne, D., & Griffit, W. (1966). A developmental investigation of the law of attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 699*-702.

Cbonko, L. B., Howell, R. D., & Bellinger, D. N. (1986). Congruence in sales force evaluations: Relation to sales force perceptions of conflict and ambiguity. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, Spring/Summer*, 35-48.

Chao, G. T., O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Wolf, S., Klein, H. J., & Gardner, P D. (1994). Organizational socialization: Its content and consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 730-743.

Cheng, J. L. (1983). Organizational context and upward influence: An experimental study in the use of power tactics. *Group and Organizational Studies, 8*, 337-355.

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. C. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*, 281-302.

Cropanzano, R. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Bozeman, D. P. (1995). The social setting of work organizations: Politics, justice, and support. In R. S. Cropanzano & K. M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing the social climate of the workplace* (pp. 2-18). Westport, CT: Quorum.

Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C, Grandey, A. A., & Toth, P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18,* 159-18.

Daft, R. L. (1989). *Organization theory and design* (3rd ed..). St Paul: West Publishing Co.

Deluga, R. J., & Perry, J. T. (1991). The relationship of subordinate upward influencing behaviour, satisfaction and perceived superior effectiveness with leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 64,* 239-252.

Dockery, T. M., & Steiner, D. D. (1990). The role of the initial interaction in leader-member exchange. *Group & Organization Studies, 15,* 395-413.

Douglas, C., & Ammeter, A. P. (2004). An examination of leader political skill and its effect on ratings of leader effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*, 537-550.

Drory, A. (1993). Perceived political climate and job attitudes. *Organization Studies, 14*, 59-71.

Drory, A. (1990). 'Perceived political climate and job attitudes', *Organization Studies, 14 (1)*, 59-71.

Drory, A., & Beaty, D. (1991). Gender differences in the perception of organizational influence tactics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*, 249-258.

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

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

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Axmeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 812-820.

Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 51-59.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 500-507.

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 565-573.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bourgeois, L. J. (1988). Politics of strategic decision making in high velocity environments: Toward a midrange theory. *Academy of Management Journal, 31*, 737-770.

Erdogan, B., & Liden, R. C. (2002). Social exchanges in the workplace: A review of recent developments and future research directions in leader-member exchange theory. In L. L. Neider & C .A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership* (pp. 65-114). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.

Farh, J., Podsakoff, P. M., *&* Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management, 16*, 705-722.

Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C. E. (1981). Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 27,* 78-95.

Fasolo, P. M. (1995). Procedural justice and perceived organizational support: Hypothesized effects on job performance. In R. Cropanzano & K. M. Kacmar. (Eds.), *Organizational politics. justice, and support: Managing the social climate of work organizations* (pp. 185-195). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Freedheim, D. K., Weiner, I. B., Velicer, W. F., Schinka, J. A., &. Lerner, R. M. (2003). *Handbook of psychology*. NY: John Wiley & Sons

Ferris, G. R., & Judge, T. A. (1991). Personnel/human resources management: A political influence perspective. *Journal of Management, 17*, 447-488.

Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational polities. *Journal of Management, 18*, 93-116.

Ferris, G. R., Brand, J. F., Brand, S., Rowland, K. M., Gilmore, D. C., King, T. R., Kacmar, K. M., & Burton, C. A. (1993). Politics and control in organizations. In' Lawler, E. J., Markovsky, B., O'Brien, J., & Heimer, K. (Eds.), *Advances in Group Processes, 10*, 83-111.

Ferris, G. R., Fedor, D. B., Chachere, J. G., & Pondy, L. R. (1989). Myths and politics in organizational contexts. *Group and Organization Studies, 14*, 83-103.

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 R. Cropanzano & K. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing the social climate of the workplace* (pp. 21-36). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

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

Ferris, G. R., & Mitchell, T. R. (1987). The components of social influence and their importance for human resources research. In K.M. Rowland & G.R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management,* (pp. 103-128). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Ferris, G. R., Bhawuk, D. P. S., Fedor, D. B., & Judge, T. A. (1995). Organizational politics and citizenship: Attributions of intentionality and construct definition. In M. J. Martinko (Ed.), *Advances in attribution theory: An organizational perspective* (pp. 231-252). Delray Beach, FL: St. Lucie Press

Ferris, G. R., Frink, D. D., Gilmore, D. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (1994). Understanding as an antidote for the dysfunctional consequences of organizational politics as a stressor. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*, 1204-1220.

Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., & Frink, D. D. (2005). Development and validation of the political skill inventory. *Journal of Management, 31*, 126-152.

Ferris, G., Adams, G., Kolodinsky, R., Hochwarter, W., & Ammeter, A. (2002). Perceptions of organizational politics: Theory and research directions. In F. Dansereau & F. Yammarino (Eds.), *Research in multi-level issues* (pp. 179-254). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science/JAI.

Ferris, G.R., & Buckley, M. R. (1990). Performance evaluation in high technology firms: Process and politics. In L. R. Gomez-Mejia & M. W. Lawless (Eds.), *Organizational issues in high technology management* (pp. 243-263). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

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

Frost, P. J. (1987). Power, politics, and influence. In E. M. Jablin, L. L. Putname, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 503-548). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Gade, P. A. (2003). Organizational commitment in the military: An overview. *Military Psychology, 15,* 163-166.

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

George, J. M., Reed, T. F., Ballard, K. A., Colin, J., & Fielding, J. (1993). Contact with AIDS patients as a source of work-related distress: Effects of organizational and social support. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 157-171.

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

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

Godfrey, D. K., Jones, E. E., & Lord, C. G. (1986). Self-promotion is not ingratiating. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 106-115.

Godfrey, D. K., Jones, E. E., & Lord, C. G. (1986). Self-promotion is not ingratiating. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,*106-115.

Gomez-Mejia, L. R. (1983). Sex differences during occupational socialization. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 492-499.

Gouldner, A. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociology Review, 25,* 161-178.

Graen, G. (1976). Role-making processes within complex organizations. In M. Dunnette. (Ed.), *The handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1201-1245). Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally.

Guzzo, R. A., Noonan, K. A., & Elron, E. (1994). Expatriate managers and the psychological contract. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 617-626.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations.* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Hirschman, A. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hochwarter, W. A., Perrewe , P. L., Ferris, G. R., & Guerico, R. (1999). Commitment as an antidote to the tension and turnover consequences of organizational politics. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 55,* 277-297.

Hofstede, G (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. CA: Sage, Beverly Hills.

Horn, P. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (1995). *Employee turnover.* Cincinnati, OH: South Western.

Howes, J. C., Citera, M., & Cropanzano, R. S. (1995). Total quality teams: How organizational politics and support impact the effectiveness of quality improvement teams. In R. S. Cropanzano & K.M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice, and support* (pp. 1-18). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Hughes, E. C. (1958). *Men and their work.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Hutchison, S., & Garstka, M. L. (1996). Sources of perceived organizational support: Goal setting and feedback. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*, 1351-1366.

James, L.A., & James, L.R. (1989). Integrating work environment perceptions: Explorations into the measurement of meaning. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 739-751.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, S. (1972). The effects of attitude similarity, expectation of goal facilitation, and actual goal facilitation on interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 8,* 197-206.

Jones, E., & Pittman, T. (1982). Toward a general theory of self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 261-271.

Kacmar, K. M., & Baron, R. A. (1999). Organizational politics: The state of the field, links to related processes, and an agenda for future research. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management, 17*, 1-39. Stanford, CT: JAI.

Kacmar, K. M., & Carlson, D. S. (1997). Further validation of the Perceptions of Politics Scale (POPS): A multiple sample investigation. *Journal of Management, 23,* 627-658.

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

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

Kacmar, K. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1993). Politics at work: Sharpening the focus of political behavior in organizations. *Business Horizons, 36*, 70-74.

Kacmar, K. M., Bozeman, D. P., Carlson, D. S., & Anthony, W. P. (1999). An examination of the perceptions of organizational politics model: Replication and extension. *Human Relations, 52*, 383-416.

Kelman, H. C. (1961). Processes of opinion change. *Public-Opinion Quarterly, 25*, 57-78.

Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, S. M. (1982). *Trainer's manual for the Kipnis-Schmidt profiles of organizational influence strategies.* San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*, 440-452.

Kipnis, D., & Vanderveer, R. (1971). Ingratiation and the use of power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17,* 280-286.

Kumar, K., & Beyerlein, M. (1991). Construction and validation of an instrument for measuring ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 619-627.

LePine, J., Colquitt, J., & Erez, A. (2000). Adaptability to changing task contexts: Effects of general cognitive ability, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. *Personnel Psychology, 53,* 563-594.

Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 9, 370-390.

Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science.* New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 75*, 47-119.

Liden, R., & Graen, G. (1980). Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal, 23*, 451-465.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice.* New York: Plenum.

Madison, D. L., Allen, R. W., Porter, L. W., Renwick, P. A., & Mayes, B. T. (1980). Organizational politics: An exploration of managers' perceptions. *Human Relations, 33*, 79-100.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations.* Wiley, New York.

Markham, W. T., Harlan, S. L., & Hackett, E.J. (1987). Promotion opportunity in organizations: Courses and consequences. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management,* (pp. 223-287). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Maslyn, J., & Fedor, D. B. (1998). Perceptions of politics: Does measuring different foci matter? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84,* 645-653.

Masterson, S. S., & Stamper, C. L. (2003). Perceived organizational membership: An aggregate framework representing the employee-organization relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24,* 473-490.

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 171-194.

McGee, G. W., & Ford, R. C. (1987). Two (or more?) dimensions of organizational commitment: Reexamination of the Affective and Continuance Commitment Scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72,* 638-642.

McGrath, J. E. (1976). Stress and behavior in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1351-1395). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the ''side-bet theory'' of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 372-378.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, *1*, 61-98.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 710-720.

Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 152-156.

Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly. I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Affective commitment and job performance. It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*. 152-156.

Miller, L. C, & Kenny, D. (1986). Reciprocity of self-disclosure at the individual and dyadic levels: A social relations analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 713-719.

Mintzberg, H. (1979a). Organizational power and goals: A skeletal theory. In D. Schendel & C. Hofer (Eds.), *Strategic management: A new view of business policy and planning* (pp. 143-171). Boston: Little Brown.

Mintzberg, H. (1979b). *The structuring of organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

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

Moorman, R, H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 845-855.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

Mowday, R. T., steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*, 224-247.

Naylor, J. C., Pritchard, R. D., & Ilgen, D. R. (1980). *A theory of behavior in organizations.* New York: Academic Press.

Niehoff, B.P., & Moorman, R.H. (1993). *Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior.* Academy of Management Journal, *36*, 527-556

Nye, L. G., & Witt, L. A. (1993). Dimensionality and construct validity of the Perceptions of Politics Scale (POPS). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*, 821-829.

Organ, D, W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 43-72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 157-164.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytical review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48,* 775-802.

Pandey, J. (1981). A note about social power through ingratiation among workers. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 54,* 65-67.

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

Podsakoff, P., & Organ, D. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management, 12*, 531-44.

Porter, L. W. (1976). *Organizations as political animals*. Presidential Address, Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, 84th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC: Quorum Press.

Ralston, D. A. (1985). Employee ingratiation: The role of management. *Academy of Management Review, 10,* 477-487.

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,* 159-174.

Randall, M., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C., & Btrjulin, A. (August, 1994). *The relationship of organizational politics and organizational support to employee attitudes and behavior*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Dallas, TX

Rao, A., Murray, L. H., Schmidt, S. M., & Swaffin-Smith, C. (1991). *Upward influence in impression management: Goals, strategies and consequences.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Miami Beach, FL.

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 698-714.

Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 825-836.

Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23,* 257-266.

Riley, P. (1983). A structurationist account of political cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28,* 414-437.

Romm, T., & Drory, A. (1988). Political behavior in organizations—a cross-cultural comparison. *International Journal of Value Based Management, I,* 165-179.

Rosin, H. M., & Korabik, K. (1990). Marital and family correlates of women managers' attrition from organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37*, 104-120.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information sources, applicant perceptions of fit, and work outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, *50,* 395-426.

Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schneider, B. (1975). Organizational climates: An essay. *Personnel Psychology, 28*, 447-479.

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 580-607.

Semadar, A., Robins, G., & Ferris, G. R. (2006). Comparing the effects of multiple social effectiveness constructs in the prediction of managerial performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27*, 443-461.

Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81,* 219-227.

Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 774-780.

Shore, L. M., & Shore, T. H. (1995). Perceived organizational support and organizational justice. In R. S. Cropanzano & K. M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice, and support* (pp. 149-164). Quorum Books: Westport, CT.

Shore, L. M., & Tetrick, L. E. (1991). A construct validity study of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 637-643.

Shore, L. M., & Tetrick, L. E. (1991). A construct validity study of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 16,* 637-643.

Sias, P. M., & Xablin, F. M. (1995). Differential superior-subordinate relations, perceptions of fairness, and coworker communication. *Human Communication Research, 22*, 5-38.

Sims, H. P., & Manz, C. C. (1984). Observing leader verbal behavior: Toward reciprocal determinism in leadership theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69,* 222-232.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 653-663.

Somers, M. J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover, and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15,* 535-547.

Spector, P. E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employee's locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin*, *91*, 482-497.

Stamper, C. L., & Masterson, S. (2002). Insider or outsider? How employee perceptions of insider status affect their work behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23,* 875-894.

Taylor, M., Audia, G., & Gupta, A. (1996). The effect of lengthening job tenure on managers' organizational commitment and turnover. *Organizational Science, 7,* 137-152.

Tedeschi, J., & Melburg, V. (1984). Impression management and influence in the organization. In S. B. Bacharach, & E. J. Lawler (Eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations* (pp. 31-58). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Tsui, A. S., & Barry, B. (1986). Interpersonal affect and rating errors. *Academy of Management Journal, 29,* 586-599.

Turban, D. B., & Dougherty, T. W. (1994). Role of protege personality in receipt of mentoring and career success. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 688-702.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 765-802.

Van Maanen, J. (1975). Police socialization: A longitudinal examination of job attitudes in an urban police department. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 20*, 207-228.

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 1*, 209-264.

Vecchio, R. P., Griffith, R. W., & Horn, P. W. (1986). The predictive utility of the vertical dyad linkage approach. *Journal of Social Psychology, 126*, 617-625.

Valle, M., & Perrewe, P. (2000). Do politics perceptions relate to political behaviors? Test of an implicit assumption and expanded model. *Human Relations, 53,* 359-386.

Vigoda, E. (2000). Internal politics in public administration system: An empirical examination of its relationship with job congruence, organizational citizenship behavior, and in-role performance. *Public Personnel Management, 29,* 185-210.

Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 487-499.

Wayne, S. J., & Kacmar, K. M. (1991). The effects of impression management on the performance appraisal process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 48,* 70-88.

Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 40,* 82-111.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing* (2nd ed.). NY: Random House.

Welsh, M. A., & Slusher, E. A. (1986). Organizational design as a context for political activity. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31*, 389-402.

Whitener, E. M. (2001). Do "high commitment" human resource practices affect employee commitment? A cross-level analysis using hierarchical linear modeling. *Journal of Management, 27,*515-535.

Whitener, E. M., & Waltz, P. M. (1993). Exchange theory determinants of affective and continuance commitment and turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42,* 265-281.

Witt, L. A. (1995). Influences of supervisor behaviors on the levels and effects of workplace politics. In R. Cropanzano & M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing social climate at work* (pp. 37-53). Westport CT:

Witt, L., Hilton, T., & Hochwarter, W. (2001). Addressing politics in matrix teams. *Group and Organization Management, 26,* 230-247.

Wortman, C. B., & Linsenmeier, J. A. W. (1977). Interpersonal attraction and techniques of ingratiation in organizational settings. In B. W. Staw & G. R. Salancik (Eds.), *New directions in organizational behavior,* 133-178. Chicago: St. Clair**.**

Zhou, J., & Ferris, G. R. (1995). The dimensions and consequences of organizational politics perceptions: A confirmatory analysis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*, 1747-1764.

Appendix A

I am an M.Phil research student at National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad. I am doing a research that is related to the perception of organizational politics and organizational support and their impact on behavioural outcomes.

The purpose of my research is to find out the relationship between perceived organizational politics and perceived organizational support with behavioral outcomes in organizational setting.

I request you to support my purpose and participate in this research project. I assure you that the information taken from you will be kept confidential and will be used only for the research purposes. You have full right to withdraw your information during any stage of the research.

Your help, support, and participation will be highly appreciated.
Thank You!

Name: _____

I am willing to participate in this research.

_____

Signature

Syed Muhammad Imran Bukhari
M. Phil. (Semester-IV)
National Institute of Psychology,
Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad
Ph: 0321-6350701

Appendix B

Demographic Information Sheet

Name: _____

Gender: _____

Name of the organization: _____

Job experience in current organization: _____ Years _____ Months

Appendix C

Instructions

Each test requires you to answer on 5-Point or 7-Point rating scale. Each statement represents some possible opinion that you may have about your organization or your behaviour at work. Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by selecting the option that best represents your point of view. It will take approximately 30 minutes to fill up these scales. You are assured of the confidentiality of the information that you provide

Appendix D

Perceived Organizational Support Scale

Listed below are the statements that represent possible opinions that you may have about this organization. Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by selecting the option that best represents your point of view about your organization. Please choose from the following answers:

Serial.#.	Items	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1	The organization values my contribution to its well-being.							
2	The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.							
3	The organization would ignore any complaint from me.							
4	The organization really cares about my well-being.							
5	Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice.							
6	The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.							
7	The organization shows very little concern for me.							
8	The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.							

Appendix E

Perceived Organizational Politics Scale

Listed below are statements that represent possible opinions that you may have about working in your organization. Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by selecting the appropriate option that best represents your point of view about your organization.

Serial.#.	Items	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
1	People in this organization attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down					
2	There has always been an influential group in this organization that no one ever crosses					
3	Employees are encouraged to speak out frankly even when they are critical of well established ideas					
4	There is no place for yes-men and yes-women in this organization; good ideas are desired even if it means disagreeing with superiors					
5	Agreeing with powerful others is the best alternative in this organization					
6	It is best not to rock the boat in this organization					
7	Sometimes it is easier to remain quiet than to fight the system					
8	Telling others what they want to hear is sometimes better than telling the truth					
9	It is safer to think what you are told than to make up your own mind					
10	Since I have worked for this organization, I have never seen the pay and promotion policies applied politically					
11	I can't remember when a person received a pay increase or promotion that was inconsistent with the published policies					
12	None of the raises I have received are consistent with the policies on how raises should be determined					
13	The stated pay and promotion policies have nothing to do with how pay and promotions are determined					
14	When it comes to pay raise and promotion decisions, policies are irrelevant					
15	Promotions around here are not valued much because how they are determined are so political					

Appendix F

<center>**Affective Commitment Scale**</center>

Listed below is a series of statements that represent feelings that you might have about the organization for which you work. With respect to your own feelings about the organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by selecting the option that best represents your point of view:

Serial.#.	Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Undecided	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization							
2	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own							
3	I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization							
4	I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization							
5	I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization							
6	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me							

Appendix G

Ingratiation Scale

Listed below are the statements that represent your possible behaviours that you may have while working in this organization. Respond to the following statements by thinking about "how often you behave this way":

Serial.#.	Items	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Mostly	Always
1	I compliment my colleagues so they will see me as likable					
2	I take an interest in my colleagues' personal lives to show them that I am friendly					
3	I praise my colleagues for their accomplishments so they will consider me a nice person					
4	I do personal favours for my colleagues to show them that I am friendly					

Appendix H

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale

Listed below are the statements that represent your possible behaviours that you may have while working in this organization. Read the following statements carefully and indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by selecting the option that best describes your behaviour on job in the best way:

Serial.#.	Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	I help others who have heavy workloads					
2	I am the one who always need to be pushed to do things					
3	I believe in giving honest day's work for an honest day's pay					
4	I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters					
5	I try to avoid creating problems for co-workers					
6	I keep abreast of changes in the organization					
7	I tend to exaggerate petty matters					
8	I consider the impact of my actions on co-workers					
9	I attend meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important					
10	I am always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me					
11	I attend functions that are not required, but help the company image					
12	I read and keep up with organizational announcements, memos, and so on					
13	I help others who have been absent					
14	I do not abuse the rights of others					
15	I willingly help others who have related problems					
16	I always focus on what is wrong rather than the positive side					
17	I take steps to try to prevent problems with other workers					
18	I have a better attendance than others					
19	I always find fault with what the organization is doing					
20	I am conscious about how my behavior affects the people's job					
21	I do not take extra breaks					
22	I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching					
23	I help to familiarize people even though it is not required					
24	I am one of the honest employees of organization					